

they call the National Cuban party, with the intention of making Gomez the first president of the Cuban republic; while an opposing party is organizing to support the assembly against what it calls the Gomez dictatorship.

Besides the generation of political parties in Cuba, this clash between the assembly and the late commander-in-chief has precipitated rioting in Havana. A desperate fight occurred late at night on the 18th, between the Havana police and partisans of Gomez. Nearly 1,000 shots were exchanged. There were numerous minor disturbances of similar character on the 19th, but after that quiet was restored. The casualties chronicled for the two days were 7 killed, two of them being policemen and one a woman, and 50 wounded.

The discontent in Porto Rico, reported last week, gives no indication of having been allayed. According to mail advices received on the 19th, it is expected that the feelings of the Porto Ricans may culminate in open rebellion. Arms and ammunition are reported to have been smuggled into the island and secreted in the mountains for rebellious use; and 100 rounds of ammunition have been issued to the American troops.

There has been friction for more than two months between the natives of Porto Rico and the American military authorities. It seems to have had its origin in a growing conviction on the part of the Porto Ricans that their island is to be held as an American colony. About Christmas time a delegation representing several Porto Rican cities arrived in this country to protest against the continuance of the military administration. They claimed that they had enjoyed a higher degree of freedom under the old Spanish regime, and expressed an earnest wish for a reasonable civil government, asking to be accepted by the United States as brothers and not as subjects—to have the island made a territory the same as the territories that have come to be states. For Gen. Henry, the American military governor, they expressed respect and esteem, but insisted that his government was that of a man and not of the people. About a month after arriving, this delegation had an interview with President McKinley. Their formal petition to him requested the appointment of a civil governor, either a native or an American, with

provision for a legislative assembly. It complained that there were then two governments on the island—the American military government, rigid and exacting; and the island government, which was a mere relic of Spanish sovereignty. The president reassured the delegates in general terms; and promises of a colonial commission to administer the affairs of Porto Rico, were cabled to San Juan. The commission consists of Gen. Robert P. Kennedy, Maj. Charles W. Watkins, and Henry G. Curtis. Even at that time prominent Porto Rican officials were quoted as intimating that there would be trouble if the American government did not soon terminate the military regime upon the island.

Subsequently the dissatisfaction grew, and in the latter part of February, the mayor and the majority of the municipal council of San Juan resigned rather than comply with a decree of the military governor. This incident excited much local irritation. It is chiefly important as indicating the feeling of subjection which the Porto Ricans feel that they are under to the military power of the United States. Gen. Henry insists, however, that he has strenuously avoided giving cause for such a feeling. In a newspaper interview on the subject early in the present month, he said:

Military government is not the best kind. I do not believe in military government. The American people do not believe in it. The army does not believe in it, and, as far as possible, I wanted these people to govern themselves and keep militarism in the background. I put the alcaldes and municipal council in control of the towns and cities. I established a native police force. The army was invariably kept from interfering in civil affairs unless the actions of the alcaldes and councils became so outrageous, as it has become in many places, that I was forced to declare martial law in each one.

An adjournment of the German reichstag was taken on the 21st until April 11. Dissolution had been imminent, over the defeat of the emperor on a provision of the army bill. The budget committee had disallowed an item for increasing the infantry by 7,000 men; and on the 14th, against the protests of the war minister, the reichstag sustained the committee, upon the second reading of the bill, by a vote of 209 to 141. It was then predicted in Berlin that if the vote upon the third reading did not change

this result and override the committee, the emperor would dissolve the reichstag, he being determined upon having the full quota of infantry asked for by the ministry. But the threatened crisis was averted by a compromise. The reichstag adopted the report of the committee disallowing the increase of 7,000 infantrymen, but passed a resolution to the effect that if at the expiration of five years it should be found that the army cannot be maintained on a satisfactory footing without the increase, the increase shall be allowed. This compromise was reluctantly accepted by the emperor, as the alternative of dissolving the reichstag and changing the result of a new election. But the ministry formally insisted upon the increase, for the purpose, it is surmised, of leaving the emperor free to renew his demand at subsequent sessions before the expiration of the five years. The bill was adopted on the 16th, with the additional resolution noted above, by a vote of 222 to 132. This bill increases the peace footing of the German army for the seventh time since 1872.

The most significant event of the week in American politics, is the publication of the correspondence between Perry Belmont and Wm. J. Bryan relative to an invitation to Mr. Bryan to attend a banquet of a Tammany hall social club at New York, of which Belmont is president, on the occasion of the anniversary of Jefferson's birthday. Mr. Bryan, in declining the invitation, expressed his appreciation of the compliment, but, referring to Mr. Belmont's having bolted the party at the late presidential election, he said:

Antagonism between our opinions is so great that we can't with propriety join in a political banquet in honor of Democracy's patron saint. Jefferson stood for certain well defined principles. If your views are a correct reflection of his ideas, I fear that my views would sound a discordant note at your banquet. If, on the other hand, the Chicago platform applies (as I believe it does) Jefferson's principles to present conditions, then your conspicuous presence at the Jefferson banquet would not honor the memory of the world's greatest Democrat. Do not misunderstand me. You may be right and I may be wrong, but I take it for granted that we are equally conscientious, and I trust that I may not show myself less courageous than you. You proclaimed to your fellow-citizens in 1896 that my election upon the Democratic platform would endanger the