

## Governor Shaw on the Philippines.

Knoxville, Iowa, Sept. 6.—Governor Shaw addressed the Marion county republican convention here to-day. He said in part:

THE democratic party, at their recent state convention summoned to their aid their avowed standard-bearer for 1900, and on the evening preceding their convention, he delivered a carefully prepared speech to a large audience, composed of about one-half republicans, one-fourth democrats, and one-fourth populists. It was a great occasion and the audience must have been an inspiration. The speech afforded unmistakable evidence of its having been carefully committed and it was declaimed verbatim. I listened to it with great interest. It was the foreshadowing of the campaign of 1900. The speaker spent two-thirds of his two and a half hours in discussing the money question, and in so doing reiterated his faith in the doctrine of the free coinage of silver at the ratio of sixteen to one with gold. His utterances on this branch of the case were cheered more vigorously, and by a larger proportion of his audience than was anything else he said. The proportion of time given to this subject was not in disproportion to its importance. The money question is and must be the paramount issue both in this and in next year's campaign. No other question has thus far developed on which an issue can be predicated.

What is an issue? It is a policy proposed and advocated by one party and opposed by the other. One party must favor that which the other party opposes or there is no issue. If both parties oppose the same thing, there is no issue. If both parties favor the same thing there is no issue. If both parties agree as to a state of facts, there is no issue as to the facts. If both parties agree as to a remedy, there is no issue as to remedy. Cases tried in the courts involve both issues of fact and issues of law, but there has never been yet tried a case where both parties agreed both as to facts and as to the law. There must be a disagreement somewhere, and this disagreement must be defined. Twenty years' experience in the trial of cases has led me to believe it always helpful to agree as far as possible; it narrows the issue and saves much time, and the trial proceeds more intelligently.

### How the Question Arose

I desire, this afternoon, to examine and learn, if possible, whether there be an issue on the Philippine question; and if there be, to discover of what it consists, and whether it be an issue of law or of fact. To this end, I propose going back to the beginning of that out of which has come our responsibility to the Filipino people. First, Spain was cruelly mistreating the inhabitants of Cuba. That is a statement of fact, and democrats and republicans agree thereon. Therefore, no issue. The president of the United States asked congress for an appropriation of fifty millions of dollars to prepare for war—the wisdom of this request is admitted, for it was unanimously granted. Another fact on which both parties agree. The declaration in the Iowa democratic platform, denouncing the administration of President McKinley in whole and in part, was probably not intended to touch on this recommendation. No issue yet. A little later, President McKinley by special message recommended a declaration of war against Spain. Another admitted fact, and another approved act of the administration, for war was unanimously declared. The democratic declaration of incompetency might with safety have excepted this recommendation also. A loan with which to carry on the war against Spain was authorized and floated, and no important issue arose in connection therewith. No issue yet. The act of congress declaring war against Spain authorized the president to make use of the armies and navies with which to crush Spanish power. The president of the United States called for troops; and, without regard to party, there arose a response, the equal of which this world has not yet witnessed. In the organization of that army, the president of the United States having been thus far supported, and his hands upheld by all parties, issued to those of opposite political faith commissions as to those who had helped

to place him in that most exalted position, and no one raised an objection. In the organization of that army, there was no north, no south, no east, no west, no rich, no poor, no high, no low, no bond, no free. All distinctions growing out of the struggle for the preservation of the union, all distinctions arising out of previous conditions of servitude, and all distinctions arising out of the struggle for commercial and industrial success and supremacy were lost sight of. Those who had taken part under the confederate flag, together with their sons, joined hands and touched shoulders with those from the north; while millionaire employers served as privates under the command of their employes. It was a beautiful picture, and well worth to us as a people all it has cost, for during those few months partisanship was made to hide its head, and patriotism, in its most attractive form, was exalted in its place. No issue yet. No criticism yet. The democratic platform of Des Moines not yet adopted. The president, as authorized by congress, made vigorous use of army and navy, and prosecuted the war with approved vigor. Two great fleets were sunk without casualty, a few battles fought, and always with success. During those few months, the standards of American valor, of American heroism, and of American push and daring were placed, if possible a notch higher than they had ever before touched. In that struggle we demonstrated to the world that we were not effete, and showed no tendency towards retrogression. The pessimist, who has for more than a hundred years been tolling the knell of our decline was again rebuked. No issue yet. Then came the protocol. This instrument, which virtually ended the war with Spain, seems, however, not to have been universally approved. By its terms, Spain agreed to release her sovereignty over Cuba and to cede to the United States Porto Rico; and by its terms it was mutually agreed that the future disposition of the Philippine islands should be left to a commission composed of five Americans and five Spaniards.

### Early Democratic Position

It was quite manifest, I think, that it was not the intention of the president at that time to demand the cession of the Philippine islands. If this had been his purpose, it would have been provided for in the protocol, as was the cession of Porto Rico. It certainly would not have been left to a commission in which neither country was to have a majority. This interpretation of the administration's purpose was, I think, quite general, for it was only a few days after this that the democratic party met in Colorado, and, thinking they had discerned the presidential intention, and that the war was now over and the time for partisanship to supersede patriotism had arrived, proceeded, in their platform, to express their views on the subject of expansion in this language: "We favor the independence of Cuba and the retention by this government of the other Spanish West India possessions, and the control of all other Spanish territories taken by the American forces in the war just closed."

The democrats of California declared themselves "opposed to the surrender to Spain of any of the territory that has been acquired by American valor and the expenditure of the blood and treasure of our people. And we do not favor the surrender to Spanish dominion of the people of any of the Spanish colonies who co-operated with our forces against our enemy in the late war."

The democratic party in other states also placed themselves on record as in favor of the acquisition of the Philippine islands. The democratic press, quite generally, fell in line and prepared the way to condemn the administration in case the Philippine islands were surrendered.

### Philippine Commission

A COMMISSION was appointed to meet at Paris. It was a non-partisan commission. On it was placed Senator Gray of Delaware, a life long democrat and a most vigorous anti-expansionist. They met; and there was summoned before them a large number of persons who were familiar with conditions in the Philippine islands, and others who had lived there for years were asked to express their opinions in writing. Time would not permit a review, or anything like a review, of

the evidence adduced, or even the mention of the names of the parties who thus appeared and whose opinions were secured. But no one, I think, can read the proceedings without realizing that a good faith effort was made to do right, and to act wisely; and I think one can but discover, as he notes the examination of the witnesses before that commission, a disposition on the part of the American representatives to avoid the responsibility of Philippine control, if it could be wisely and safely done. Nearly all the witnesses called attention to the fact that the only conception of government which the Filipino has he derived from the Spaniard, and many of them say that when the Filipino is given the least authority he is more arrogant, more exacting, and more cruel than his Spanish teacher.

### Some Unbiased Testimony

I CANNOT resist the temptation to quote briefly from a Mr. Andre, who had spent fourteen years at Manila, as the representative of the Belgian government. He says: "If the United States does not take these islands under their protection, the country will be utterly ruined and all the foreign merchants will leave the islands."

He further says: "Even those who occupy the very highest posts in the Philippines only attend to their own fortune and hardly pay attention to public affairs. As they give the example of the most corrupt administration, they are unable to prevent their subordinates to do the same. Justice is likewise mismanaged, and when the accused does not bribe the judges they will leave them in jail for years without paying the slightest attention to these unfortunates and some of these prisoners have been in jail for more than ten years."

Speaking of laborers, he says: "If they do not work fast enough, they treat them exactly as slaves were treated in South America. The most common punishment is to lash their backs with a thin bamboo; twenty-five lashes is the most ordinary punishment. I saw some receive one hundred lashes in Negros island."

After giving some severe instances, he says: "Since then I always stop this treatment when I happen to know it and more than once had rows about it with the Spanish governor of the province. He told me that he would put me in prison if I interfered with the authorities. The custom all over the Philippines is to engage men and to pay for them their personal debts. This is the beginning of a debt that will make a slave of a man. At the slightest fault, the man is fined and his debt grows. Whenever he needs money to baptize a baby, or bury a parent, the planter pays the fees direct to the curate, and always adds to the small sum advanced two or three dollars and the interest. At the end of the year he owes his master fifty or sixty dollars, and as long as he does not pay his debt he is considered as a slave, and if he runs away he will be arrested and returned to his master and awfully lashed."

"The United States can assure a steady government in these islands, and in their hands the country will increase in wealth, and will in a short time be able to return to the United States the money laid out; and it would be certainly much cheaper and more humane to take the entire Philippines than to keep only part of it and to run the risk of a second war with Spain for the very same reason that provoked the present conflict. It is the duty of the United States to do so and to protect the entire country. Everybody in the Philippines begs them for protection; even the Spanish merchants. Now, it is to be hoped that the United States will not deceive those who anxiously await the result of the meeting in Paris. The Indians do not desire independence. They know that they are not strong enough. They trust the United States and they know that they will be treated rightly. The present rebellion only represents a half percent of the inhabitants, and it would not be right to oblige 6,000,000 inhabitants to submit to 30,000 rebels. Luzon is only partially held by them, and it is not to be expected that a civilized nation will make them a present of the rest of the island, which is hostile to the Tagals of Luzon."

### Why Treaty Was Ratified

MANY suggested that the Filipinos demand self-government with an American protectorate, but they said

that the Filipinos' idea of a protectorate is for them to collect the revenues and to disburse the same according to Spanish methods (under which not a public improvement has been made for two hundred years) while the United States, at its own expense, maintains both an army and a navy to protect them from the outside world and to preserve peace within their borders.

I do not refer to these things in justification of the treaty; the terms of the treaty are not in issue; but to show that there were reasons why the anti-expansionist, Senator Gray, changed his mind and was one of the urgent advocates of the treaty as finally formulated.

The treaty, as signed by the commissioners at Paris, embodied the provisions of the protocol, and provided further that Spain should cede to the United States the Philippine islands. This treaty subsequently came to the United States senate for ratification. Neither Spain nor the United States was bound by its terms until it was ratified. Its ratification was not sought as a party measure. The republican party was in the minority in the senate and a two-thirds majority was necessary. Fearing that the treaty would not be ratified, the standardbearer of the democratic party for 1896, and the express choice of the democrats of Iowa for 1900 went to Washington. He vigorously urged his followers in the United States senate to vote for the ratification of this treaty. The same leader and orator, openly stated, in his speech at Des Moines that he had advocated the ratification of the treaty. That treaty was ratified; and it was ratified by the votes of democrats, of populists, of free silver republicans, of independents, and of republicans, and it was opposed and voted against by democrats, by populists, by free silver republicans, by independents, and by the republicans. Neither party can claim its ratification as a party measure, and neither party can shirk the responsibility of its ratification. Whether the president erred in dictating the terms of the protocol, whether he erred in the appointment of that commission, whether the treaty was wise in its provisions or not, have passed into history, and the wisdom of all has been approved by a non-partisan vote. No issue yet. No chance for an issue on the terms of the treaty, because it has been ratified; and no one proposes now to change its terms. Its terms cannot now be changed. The provisions of that treaty are in writing, and are binding on all parties thereto. There is therefore no issue of fact. If an issue exists it must be based upon an interpretation of that treaty. What is our duty under the treaty? The treaty is a contract. What are its terms? It may be well for us to examine it that we may find out the obligations of the United States. I suppose that no party will allege that we shall not fulfill the terms of our contract.

### What the Treaty Guarantees

ARTICLE one of the treaty contains this language: "Spain relinquishes all claim of sovereignty over and title to Cuba. And as the island is, upon its evacuation by Spain, to be occupied by the United States, the United States will, so long as such occupation shall last, assume and discharge the obligations that may under international law result from the fact of its occupation, for the protection of life and property."

Article second contains this language: "Spain cedes to the United States the island of Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies, etc."

Article three contains this language: "Spain cedes to the United States the archipelago known as the Philippine islands, etc."

Article four reads as follows: "The United States will, for the term of ten years from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty admit Spanish ships and merchandise to the ports of the Philippine islands on the same terms as ships and merchandise of the United States."

What does this imply? It is a written guaranty on the part of the United States that Spain shall have the same access to the Philippines and the same chances in the Philippine markets as the people of the United States. With this provision, with this guaranty with this obligation on the part of the United States staring him in the face, the avowed leader of the democratic party urged his people to vote