

tercourse with foreign nations the government of the United States has, from its origin, always recognized de facto governments. We recognize the right of all nations to create and reform their political institutions according to their own will and pleasure. * * * It is sufficient for us to know that a government exists, capable of maintaining itself, and then its recognition on our part inevitably follows."

That the government of the Philippine republic is amply able to maintain itself has received a practical demonstration.

Nor is it in any wise important that Spain herself has up to the present time failed to recognize the Philippine government, for, as was said by Mr. Webster, secretary of state, in writing to Mr. Hulsemann in December, 1850:

"It is not to be required of neutral powers that they should await the recognition of a new government by a parent state."

It is to be borne in mind that beyond the limits controlled by American armies in Manila, there is no government existing offering any opposition to that of the Philippine republic or in any manner questioning its authority or its right to control the future of the islands.

I refrain from adding to the long list of similar citations that can be made, but can not pass over without remark a sentence in a letter from Mr. Clay, secretary of state, to Mr. Middleton in 1825:

"An attempt of the British parliament to tax without their consent the former British colonies, now these United States, produced the war of our Revolution and led to the establishment of that independence and freedom which we now so highly prize. Moderation and forbearance on the part of Great Britain might have postponed, but could not have prevented our ultimate separation."

If, therefore, the Americans were justified, as undoubtedly they were, in throwing off a foreign yoke for the reason indicated by Mr. Clay, how much more justified were the Filipinos. Their taxation was excessive, it was levied without representation, their services were enforced without compensation, and the relations between themselves and the government levying the tax, unlike the relations between America and England, were those of distinct peoples, not descendent one from the other, but influenced by different religions and of a different race and civilization.

Is it, therefore, to be supposed that with all these existing differences, alien government, no matter what nation might be the governor, would be more acceptable to the Filipinos than was the government of Great Britain to the Americans?

May I further call your attention to the fact that, although a treaty of peace has been signed between the United States and the kingdom of Spain, by the terms of which Spain ceded her sovereignty over the Philippine islands to the United States, in fact Spain had no sovereignty whatever to cede?

As before recited, at the time of such signature an independent government, performing all its functions as a government and entitled to recognition as such by the strictest rules laid down by all the American secretaries of state, was in possession of all of the islands except the port of Manila, controlled by the Americans, and the port of Iloilo, where the Spanish were besieged; the possession of Manila by the Americans having been obtained by them through the joint action of the American and Philippine armies, the Filipinos having prevented exit from the city on several

sides while the Americans attacked on one side.

Spain was unable to deliver actual and peaceable possession of anything to the Americans, nor could she deliver the insignia of title to them in any shape whatever through any treaty of peace, all government buildings and archives having long before passed from her. All that Spain had to give was a claim, incapable of enforcement, save by larger armies and navies than Spain had at her control, and all, therefore, that Spain did give to America was the naked opportunity to overwhelm the Filipinos, if possible, and establish a form of foreign rule, a thing against which they struggled for a hundred years and had at last succeeded in throwing off.

Of course, if, as before stated, Spain could cede to the United States nothing but an empty and exploded claim, it follows that a ratification of a treaty of peace could confer no greater right upon the United States than its signing; for if the right to own the Philippine Islands and people was incapable of transfer from Spain to the United States, the ratification of a treaty could not give life to such dead claim.

Recognizing, as the Americans have, in their declaration of independence, in their constitution, and in their history of more than one hundred years, the absolute right of all nations to rule themselves, free from the control of alien masters, I submit to you, with entire confidence, the right of the Filipinos to their self-government.

Summarizing the foregoing permit me to say:

1. American precept and example have influenced my people to desire independent government.
2. Suffering, as did the Americans, from alien rule, they rose and drove out foreign masters.
3. They established, and for seven months have maintained, a form of government resembling the American in that it is based upon the right of the people to rule.
4. This government has, according to doctrines laid down by distinguished American secretaries of state, become entitled to recognition by the American republic.
5. The expelled government of Spain having, at the time of the signing of the treaty of peace, possession of only one port, and the remainder of the Philippines, except Manila, being in the possession of the Philippine republic, and all insignia of sovereignty having passed from Spain, that country could give no title to the United States for the Philippine Islands.
6. Spain having no title to give, her claim can not be rendered better by the ratification of the treaty of peace.
7. From the foregoing it would seem to follow that the present recognition of the first republic of Asia by the greatest republic of America would be consonant with right, justice, and precedent.

I can not close this memorandum without taking occasion to assure you of the gratitude felt by my countrymen toward the Americans for the assistance rendered them in the attainment of their liberty, and of their strong desire, in every way less than their effacement as a nation, to give practical expression to this gratitude, and further to hope that as self-respecting nations the bonds of friendship between the two may grow stronger with the passage of years.

FELIPE AGONCILLO.

THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE.

An important step in currency reform will be the selection of a new chairman of the banking and currency committee by the speaker of the next house of representatives. Since the constitution of the present senate is such as to render the passage of any effective measure of currency reform improbable, the matter is likely to go over until next December, or to be taken up at an extra session called for that specific purpose, as strongly advocated by a leading senator. A new chairman must be designated when the next congress meets, as Mr. Walker, the present chairman, failed of re-election, his opponent—also a sound-money man—defeating him by a narrow plurality.

Hon. Charles N. Fowler, a representative from the Eighth New Jersey district, is being strongly urged for the position, and we believe that no selection could be made that would be more acceptable to the friends of currency reform. In the first place his views upon this subject—now of most vital concern to our national interests—are thoroughly sound. As a member of the banking and currency committee he has labored with great energy and ability to promote the cause of currency reform along the safest lines, and his work has been very effectual in securing a gradual concentration of opinion in the committee as to the proper methods to be followed in order to gain the best results.

Mr. Fowler, in addition to being a close student of monetary and banking science, is well equipped in other respects to lead in the coming fight. Though aggressive and earnest, he is sufficiently regardful of the opinions of others as to avoid unnecessary antagonisms, while his sincerity of purpose and the forceful manner in which his views are presented, are calculated to win support for any measure which the committee may frame.

He possesses the qualities of leadership essential to one who must guide the sentiment of the house toward a common purpose in what promises to be the greatest legislative contest in recent years.

Mr. Fowler is a man of affairs, is in touch with the business interests of the whole country, and we know of no man in the house to whom the task of currency reform may be entrusted with greater prospects of success.—Bankers Magazine.

A little squirt of Brown-Sequard's elixir of life might be a good thing to inject into the Nebraska senatorial deadlock.—St. Joseph Daily News.

Too many "little squirts" made the deadlock. The News did not diagnose the disease correctly and must try again. Like cures like sometimes but not always in politics where innumerable "little squirts" are frequently involved.