by the news received before December 7th. Should this be favorable to the success of the Spanish army, it is probable the President would continue to pursue his policy of non-interference; should it be distinctly favorable to the insurgent cause, especially should Weyler be defeated, Mr. Cleveland, it is believed, would no longer hesitate to recommend recognition of their rights as belligerents or some other action equally undesirable to Spain. What action would follow a simple negative result of the campaign—that is a fruitless chase after the insurgents by Weyler—is less clear. Probably the administration's course would be influenced, in some measure, by the representations Spain will make as to the policy it would pursue and the instructions given the new captain general in the event General Weyler should be summoned home.

General Fitzhugh Lee, consul general to Cuba, called at the state department today and was with Secretary Olney half an hour. As far as could be learned, there was no special significance in the visit beyond a discussion of the general situation. The consul general had not called at the White House up to noon and hardly is expected to go there today. Mr. Cleveland is engaged on his annual message and few callers see him.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 16.—It is learned on authority that the Spanish government has given General Weyler to understand that he must push operations against the insurgents aggressively and vigorously. Unless he soon achieves a decisive victory over the Cubans, it is believed he will be recalled. Weyler, it is understood, is aware of the alternative and the present campaign in Pinar Del Rio is expected to result in an engagement that will put a new aspect on the Cuban situation, one way or the other.

Weyler has all the troops he can use. There are over 200,000 Spanish soldiers in Cuba and the force under the captain general in the present operations is over 60,000 men. Maceo, against whom he is now operating, has under him, it is estimated, about 7,000 men. Spain, having fulfilled all that Weyler wishes as to troops, expects results.

BERLIN, Nov. 16.—In anticipation of a statement from the imperial chancellor, Prince Hohenlohe, on the subject of the revelations made by Prince Bismarck through his organ, the Hamburger Nachrichten, regarding the secret treaty which existed between Russia and Germany from 1884 to 1890, there was a large attendance in the Reichstag today. Among those present were Count Herbert Bismarck, the son of the ex-chancellor, who, it was rumored, was to take active part in the debate and defend his father against the attacks.

Count Von-Hempresick, the centrist leader, introduced an interpellation notice of which was given on Wednesday last. In brief, the question was, did a secret convention between Russia and Germany exist up to 1890, and if so why was it not prolonged? Finally, have the recent disclosures had any influence upon the Dreibund and Germany's relations with the other powers? In reply Prince Hohenlohe said:

"In reference to the negotiations between Russia and Germany from 1887 to 1890, it was agreed at the time that absolute secrecy should be observed. Therefore, for the moment, I am not in a position to give official information concerning the result of these negotiations.

"As regards the tendency of the German policy towards Russia since 1890, it is equally impossible to give an exhaustive reply as long as that obligation continues, and I leave it to the foreign secretary who took part in the deliberations to say what can be said in that respect.

"As to the effect the recent publications have had upon the position of Germany in the dreibund and her relations with other European powers, I am glad to be able to declare the cloud of distrust which at the first moment was observable among some classes of the population of these countries has again disappeared and our relations with our allies are marked now as before by absolute mutual confidence. In the same way, our relations with Russia never for a moment ceased to be good and friendly.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 16.—The United States Supreme court has rendered an opinion sustaining the constitutionality of the Wright irrigation law of California, and overruling the decision of the United States circuit court of California district, which was against the law's validity.

The case in which the opinion was rendered was that of the Fall Brook Irrigation Company vs Maria King Bradley. It has attracted widespread interest throughout the Rocky Mountain and coast regions, because of its importance to the material interests of the entire arid belt and in central west and east. The suit gained prominence through the fact that ex-President Harrison was one of the counsel who argued the case before the Supreme Court, whose decision has been awaited for months, having been pending for a considerable part of the preceding term of court. Justice Peckham delivered the court's decision today. He departed from the custom of the justices in that he did not read the opinion on which the court based its conclusion, but simply announced that it had decided to uphold the law.

There were two cases before the Supreme Court involving the constitutionality of the Wright law, permitting California to be divided into irrigation districts and the property in the districts taxed for the construction of irrigation works. One of the suits involved the Fall Brook Irrigation district and the other the Modesti district. The same points were raised in both, but the Fall Brook case was appealed from the decision of the federal circuit court, while the Modesti case was brought up from the California state supreme court. In the federal court the decision was against the Wright law, while in the state court the law was sustained. Today's decision will apply to both suits. The importance of the decision is not confined to the state of California but affects the irrigation interests of the semi-arid regions, many states of which have adopted the law.

The case also involved the broad constitutional question of the right of taxation and taking private property without due process of law. Most of the irrigation districts have made large bond issues which are affected by the decision.

The Fall Brook case was brought before the federal courts because Mrs. Bradley was an alien. Justice Peckham, in his written opinion said action was commenced by Mrs. Bradley for the purpose of procuring an injunction restraining the collector of the irrigation district from giving a deed to premises belonging to Mrs. Bradley, based on the sale of her land by the collector for the non-payment of certain assessment upon such land under the act incorporating the irrigation district and to set aside such assessment and for other relief, on the ground that the act incorporating the irrigation district was in violation of the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of the state of California. One of the principal objections made to the law was that water taken under it was not for public use. The court in its decision today gives this objection the first place in the consideration.

On this point Justice Peckham said: "To provide for the irrigation of lands in states where there is no color of necessity therefore, within any fair meaning of the term, and simply for the purpose of gratifying the owner, or his desire to enter upon the cultivation of an entirely new kind of crop, not necessary for the purpose of rendering the ordinary cultivation of land remunerative, might be regarded by the courts as an improper exercise of the legislative will, and the use might not be held to be public in any constitutional sense, no matter how many owners were interested in the scheme. On the other hand in a state like California, which confessedly embraces millions of acres, an act providing for their irrigation might well be regarded as an act devoting the water to public use and therefore as a valid exercise of the legislative power.

"The people of California and members of her legislative body must, in the nature of things, be more familiar with the facts and circumstances which surround the subject and with the necessities and occasion for irrigation of lands than can any one be who is a stranger to her soil. This knowledge and familarity must have their due weight with the state courts which are to pass upon the question of public use, in the light of the facts which surround the subject in their own state. For these reasons, while not regarding the matter as concluded by those various declarations and acts and decisions of the people and legislature and courts of California, we yet, in considering the subject, accord to and treat them with very great respect and we regard the decisions as embodying the deliberate judgment and matured thought of the courts of that state on this subject. Viewing the subject for ourselves and in the light of these considerations we have very little difficulty in coming to the same conclusion as reached by the courts of California.

"The use must be regarded as public use or else it would seem to follow that no general scheme of circulation can be formed or carried into effect."