

ideals that no American statesman would have publicly disputed them ten years ago.

The Filipinos point out that the Americans lack that sympathy for, and interest in, the Filipinos necessary to just legislation, and this argument is no reflection upon the good intentions of Americans. In fact, good intention is generally admitted, but Americans at home recognize, as do Filipinos here, that good intentions are not all that is required. We have in the United States men of equal general intelligence but differing so in sympathy that no amount of good intent can keep one from doing what the other regards as unjust. Take for instance, the representative capitalist and the average laboring man; neither would feel that the other, however well meaning, was competent to speak for him.

The Filipinos also deny that the Americans are sufficiently acquainted with Philippine affairs to legislate wisely. We also recognize the force of this argument at home, and we leave the people of each state to act upon their own affairs. The people of a city would resent interference in their local affairs by the people of the county although identical in race and language. And they would resent just as much the attempt of any group of men, however wise, to direct their government during a temporary residence. How, then, can congress expect to legislate wisely for people who are not only separated from America by the widest of the oceans, but differ from the people of the United States in color, race, history and traditions. How can a body of men, however benevolent and intelligent, hope by a few months' residence to so identify themselves with the Filipinos as to make rules and regulations suited to their needs?

The Filipinos also present an argument against the expensiveness of American rule, and this argument is not only unanswerable, but it is directed against an evil which is without remedy. If Americans are to hold office in the Philippines, they must be well paid. They must not only receive as much as they would receive in the United States for the same work, but they must receive more in order to compensate them for serving so far from home. This is not only theoretically true, but the theory is exemplified in the pay roll. The governor general receives \$20,000 a year, two-fifths of the salary of the president of the United States, and yet, what a contrast between the duties and responsibilities of the two positions! And what a difference, too, in the wealth of the two countries and in the ability of the taxpayers of the two countries to pay the salaries!

The three American members of the commission (excluding the governor general) receive \$15,000 per year, almost twice the salary of cabinet officers and three times the salary of senators and members of congress. It is true that these salaries do not appear as salaries paid for work on the commission, but as each American member of the commission receives \$10,000 as head of a department and \$5,000 as a member of the commission, his total income is \$15,000 while the Filipino members of the commission receive but \$5,000.

The members of the Philippine supreme court receive \$10,000 each (the Filipino members of the court receiving the same as the Americans), a sum much larger than that usually paid to judges in the United States in courts of similar importance. This high range of salaries runs through the entire list of civil officials, and there is no chance of lowering it. Except in the case of judges, the Filipino officials, as a rule, receive considerably less than the Americans performing similar work, and this is a constant source of complaint. To Americans it is a sufficient answer to say that high salaries are necessary to secure able and efficient officials from the United States, but the Filipino is quick to respond, "why, then, do you insist upon sending us Americans to do what our people can do and would do for less compensation?"

Not only must the salaries of Americans be high, but Americans must be surrounded with comforts to which the average Filipino is not accustomed. No one can remain in the Philippines long without hearing of the Benguet road and the enormous amount expended in its construction. There is a mountain resort in Benguet Province, in north central Luzon, which the commission thought might be developed into a summer capital or a place to which the families of the officials, if not the officials themselves, might retreat during the heated term. The railroad running from Manila to Dagupan would carry the health-seeker to within thirty or forty miles of Benguet, and an engineer estimated that a wagon road could be constructed the rest of the way for \$75,000. It seemed worth while to the commission to appropriate that much for a pur-

pose which promised so much for the health and comfort of those engaged in the benevolent work of establishing a stable government. The commission could hardly be blamed for relying upon the opinion of the engineer, and the engineer doubtless meant well. But the first appropriation scarcely made an impression, and the second engineer estimated that the cost would be a little greater. Having invested \$75,000, the commission did not like to abandon the plan and so further appropriations were made until more than two millions and a half dollars, gold, have been drained from the Insular treasury, and the Benguet road is not yet completed. If it is ever completed, it will require a constant outlay of a large sum annually to keep it in repair.

Having met the members of the commission and other Americans residing in the Philippines, I am glad to testify that they are, as a rule, men of character, ability and standing. The personnel of Philippine official life is not likely to be improved, and so long as we occupy the islands under a colonial policy, the Benguet experiment is liable to be repeated in various forms, and yet the Filipinos point to the Benguet folly to illustrate both ignorance of local conditions and partiality toward the foreign population.

The third question, are the Filipinos competent to govern themselves? is the one upon which the decision must finally turn. Americans will not long deny the fundamental principles upon which our own government rests, nor will they upon mature reflection assert that foreigners can sympathize as fully with the Filipino as representatives chosen by the Filipinos themselves. The expensiveness of a foreign government and its proneness to misunderstand local needs will be admitted by those who give the subject any thought, but the well-meaning persons may still delude themselves with the belief that Spanish rule has incapacitated the present generation for wisely exercising the franchise or that special conditions may unfit the Filipinos for the establishment and maintenance of as good a government as can be imposed upon them from without.

Before visiting the Philippines, I advocated independence on the broad ground that all people are capable of self-government—not that all people, if left to themselves, would maintain governments equally as good, or that all people are capable of participating upon equal terms in the maintenance of the same government, but that all people are endowed by their Creator with capacity to establish and maintain a government suited to their own needs and sufficient for their own requirements. To deny this proposition would, as Henry Clay suggested more than a half century ago, be to impeach the wisdom and benevolence of the Creator. I advocated independence for another reason, viz., because a refusal to admit the Filipinos capable of self-government would tend to impair the strength of the doctrine of self-government when applied to our own people. Since becoming acquainted with the Filipinos I can argue from observation as well as from theory, and I insist that the Filipinos are capable of maintaining a stable government without supervision from without. I do not mean to say that they could maintain their independence, if attacked by some great land grabbing power, but that so far as their own internal affairs are concerned, they do not need to be subject to any alien government. There is a wide difference, it is true, between the general intelligence of the educated Filipino and the intelligence of the laborer on the street and in the field, but this is not a barrier to self-government. Intelligence controls in every government, except where it is suppressed by military force. Where all the people vote, the intelligent man has more influence than the unintelligent one, and where there is an obvious inequality, a suffrage qualification usually excludes the more ignorant.

Take the case of the Japanese for instance, no one is disposed to question their ability to govern themselves and yet the suffrage qualifications are such that less than one-tenth of the adult males are permitted to vote. Nine-tenths of the Japanese have no part in the law making, either directly or through representatives, and still Japan is the marvel of the present generation. In Mexico the gap between the educated classes and the peons is fully as great, if not greater than the gap between the extremes of Filipino society, and yet Mexico is maintaining a stable government, and no party in the United States advocates our making a colony of Mexico on the theory that she cannot govern herself.

Those who question the capacity of the Filipinos for self-government overlook the stimulating influence of self-government upon the people; they forget that responsibility is an edu-

cating influence and that patriotism raises up persons fitted for the work that needs to be done. Those who speak contemptuously of the capacity of the Filipinos ignore the fact that they were fighting for self-government before the majority of our people knew where the Philippine islands were. Two years before our war with Spain, Rizal was put to death because of his advocacy of larger liberty for his people, and when I witnessed the celebration of the ninth anniversary of his death, I could not doubt that his martyrdom would be potent to stir the hearts of coming generations whenever any government, foreign or domestic, disregarded the rights of the people.

A year before our war with Spain the Filipino people were in insurrection against that country, and they demanded among other things "parliamentary representation, freedom of the press, toleration of all religious sects, laws common with hers, and administrative and economic autonomy."

Here was a recognition of the doctrine of self-government and a recognition of the freedom of the press as the bulwark of liberty. There was also a demand for freedom of conscience and the right to administer their own affairs for their own interests. In the proclamation from which I have quoted there was no demand for independence, but it must be remembered that we did not demand independence from England until after we found it was impossible to secure justice under a colonial system.

Whether by the demand for "laws common with hers" the Filipinos meant that they wanted the protection of laws made by the Spanish for themselves, I do not know. If that is the meaning of their demand, they must be credited with understanding the importance of a principle to which some of our own public men seem to be blind. The evil of a colonial policy, the gross injustice of it, arises largely from the fact that the colony is governed by laws made for it, but not binding upon the country which makes the laws. The Mexican who does not participate in the making of the laws of his country has at least the protection of living under laws which bind the maker as well as himself. So with the Filipino who does not vote, the laws which he must obey must be obeyed by those who do vote, and the taxes which he pays must be paid also by those who enjoy the franchise.

But under a colonial system the subject must obey a law made for him by one who is not himself subject to the law. The distinction is so plain that it ought to be apparent to anyone upon a moment's thought.

If it is objected that but a small proportion of the Filipinos are educated, it may be answered that the number of the educated is increasing every day. The fact that the Filipinos support the schools so enthusiastically, even when those schools are established by outsiders and when the teaching is in a language strange to them, speaks eloquently in their behalf. Nor is this a new born zeal. The Aguinaldo government provided for public schools and, cock fighting being prohibited, cock pits were actually turned into school houses in some sections over which the authority of his government extended.

It is objected by some that the intelligent Filipinos would, under independence, use the instrumentalities of government to tyrannize over the masses. This is not a new argument; it is always employed where an excuse for outside interference is desired, but there is no reason to believe that the Filipinos would be less interested in the people of their own race and blood than are aliens whose salaries are such as to make it impossible for them to claim that they serve from purely altruistic motives.

That those in power in Washington contemplate independence must be admitted unless those who speak for the administration intend gross deception. In his speech on the evening of Rizal Day, December last, General Smith, one of the Philippine commission and head of the educational department, said: "Popular self-government for the Philippines is the purpose of both people. If either seeks to achieve it independent of the other, the experiment is doomed to failure. If both work for it harmoniously, there is no reason why it should not be accomplished. If it is accomplished, the history of the Philippines will hold no brighter page than that which recites the struggle of a simple people to fit themselves for independent government. If it is accomplished, the fairest page in American history will be that which records the creation of a new nation and the unselfish development of an alien race." If this is not a promise of ultimate independence, what possible meaning can the language have? If the administration does not intend that the Filipinos