

Noli-Fili *cont from p 9*

has considered the same and has the honor to report it back to the Senate with the following recommendation:
That it be approved without amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

(Sgd.) PEDRO SABIDO
Chairman
Committee on Banks, Corporations
and Franchises

The Honorable
The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE
Manila

El PRESIDENTE. Al calendario de asuntos ordinarios.

El SECRETARIO:

(Informe Número 977)

Mr. President:

The Committee on Labor to which was referred Senate Bill No. 452, 3rd C. R. P., introduced by Senators Lim, Sabido and Rodrigo, entitled:

An Act to authorize the taking of an unemployment census; provide funds for it; and for other purposes,
has considered the same and has the honor to report it back to the Senate with the following recommendation:

That it be approved without amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

(Sgd.) ROSELLER T. LIM
Chairman
Committee on Labor

The Honorable
The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE
Manila

El PRESIDENTE. Al calendario de asuntos ordinarios.

El SECRETARIO:

PROYECTOS DE LEY EN PRIMERA LECTURA

Del Senador López (S. No. 464, 3.^{er} C. R. F.),
titulado:

An Act to amend section seven of Commonwealth Act numbered four hundred seventy, otherwise known as the Assessment Law.

El PRESIDENTE. Al Comité de Hacienda.

El SECRETARIO:

Del Senador López (S. No. 465, 3.^{er} C. R. F.),
titulado:

An Act prohibiting assessment of lands within public forest and penalizing violation thereof.

El PRESIDENTE. Al Comité de Hacienda.

The PRESIDENT. The public is enjoined from showing signs of approval or disapproval of any remarks made on the floor.

Senator PRIMICIAS. Mr. President, the distinguished gentleman from Batangas and Tayabas, Senator Recto, would like to make use of the privilege hour. I ask that he be recognized.

The PRESIDENT. The distinguished gentleman from Batangas and Quezon is recognized.

MANIFESTACIONES DEL SEN. RECTO

Senator RECTO. Mr. President, I have not taken the floor to make a speech on the merits of the Senate bill providing for the compulsory reading of the *Noli Me Tangere* and the *El Filibusterismo* in all our schools, colleges and universities, neither to refute the claims contained in the manifesto or pastoral of the Catholic Hierarchy in the Philippines, nor to answer the propositions advanced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Bulacán, Mr. Rodrigo, in the speech which he delivered the other day before us. I am afraid I may disappoint those who have come here this morning in the expectation that I would do either thing. The time for it has not come.

I have taken the floor, Mr. President, first to offer to read to the Senate certain important historical documents relative to Rizal, his writings and his trial and execution. No particular effort will be exerted by me to convince my distinguished colleagues in this body of the validity of the propositions that I shall presently announce. The documents speak for themselves.

After listening to the reading of these documents, my colleagues in the Senate will find, I hope, as a fact that while the Philippine Catholic Hierarchy of this day, composed exclusively of Filipino Bishops, Filipino priests, have condemned the books of Rizal as heretical and impious, the Catholic Hierarchy in the days of Rizal, composed of friars who abhorred Rizal, did not come out with any pastoral or manifesto with any such condemnation regarding the same books. The only pronouncement to that effect when copies of the *Noli Me Tangere* began to circulate clandestinely here was made by Spanish friars who were entrusted with the examination of the book. Even Dominican Archbishop Pedro Payo, the head of the hierarchy in those days, after being apprised of the opinion rendered at his behest by said friars, remained silent and contented himself with referring the matter to *Capitán-General* Emilio Terrero for the latter to act as he pleased. And while the present Philippine hierarchy composed of Filipino bishops have condemned both the *Noli Me Tangere* and the *El Filibusterismo* as heretical and impious, the friars of those days limited their condemnation to the *Noli Me Tangere*. They did not make any pronouncement on the *El Filibusterismo* after this book was published. It was natural for the friars to retaliate when they could against Rizal. They were made the targets of

Rizal's attacks in his portrayal of them as characters in his two novels. Yet the Filipino bishops composing the Catholic hierarchy of our time—these Filipino priests who have been exalted by Rizal in *El Filibusterismo* in the noble character of Father Florentino—are now the ones holding out in condemnation of the books of Rizal without stopping to think that if Rizal had not written the *Noli Me Tangere* and *El Filibusterismo* there would be no Filipino bishops of today but only *coadjutores*, or assistant parish priests as in the days of Rizal.

My colleagues in this chamber will also find that the charges formulated now against the books of Rizal and against Rizal himself, of heresy and impiety, are similar to, in fact they are the same, charges formulated by the friars of those days and by the public prosecutor, or *Fiscal de su Majestad*, at the trial of Rizal, except that, while those friars who condemned the books of Rizal called him a traitor to Spain, the Filipino bishops composing the present Catholic hierarchy proclaim him, while condemning his books, as the foremost Filipino patriot and hero. So to the friars Rizal was a heretical traitor, and to our Filipino bishops he is a heretical patriot, that is a heretic in both cases. But, Mr. President, we cannot separate Rizal from his books, we cannot detach him from his writings. What would be Christianity without the Scriptures? What would be Jesus without the Gospels? Could we understand Philippine history, the struggle for freedom we carried on for centuries, without knowing Rizal's books? What would be Mohammedanism without the Koran, Mr. Senator from Lanao? Well, if there can be no Christianity without the Scriptures, if there can be no Christ without the Gospels, we can have no Filipinism, no true Filipinism, no Filipino nation, without these gospels of Filipino patriotism, without the *Noli Me Tangere* and *El Filibusterismo*.

Mr. President, I was saying that my purpose in taking the floor was not to speak on the merits of Senate Bill No. 438. There will be time and opportunity for that. After Senator Rosales, and Senator Cuenco, and perhaps again Senator Rodrigo, shall have given us their respective points of view, I shall ask again your leave to speak. I know it will not be a hard task to refute the claims advanced by friar Father Cavanna in this alleged pastoral—it is an open secret that he is the author of the draft—not because I presume to know as much theology as the bishops' spokesman, but because it is easy to demonstrate that the document is an unfair—not to say distorted—presentation of the contents of the *Noli Me Tangere* and *El Filibus-*

terismo, and an erroneous application of the provisions of the Canon Law. I have been going over it many times and I have found that the charges of heresy and impiety therein formulated are false and unjust.

Now, Mr. President, as I have announced, I shall now proceed to read to you certain important documents, historical national documents, and make some brief, scanty remarks about them, calling your attention to circumstances of persons and time, to show their relevance. And because all these documents appear written in Spanish, I shall have to avail myself of this language in my accompanying remarks.

(*Prosiguiendo.*) Señor Presidente, los señores Senadores, y quizás muchos compatriotas presentes aquí esta mañana, recordarán que fue a mediados del año 1887 cuando los primeros ejemplares del *Noli* circularon en Filipinas, clandestinamente, desde luego, porque nadie podía admitir ni confesar, sin peligro de encarcelamiento, que tenía en su poder un ejemplar de la gran novela. Pero, había entre nosotros,—los hay aún, y en mayor número quizás—hombres de espíritu servil, y por medio de uno de ellos un ejemplar del *Noli* fué a parar en manos del arzobispo dominico Fray Pedro Payo, quien, inmediatamente—pues la lectura del libro causó no poco revuelo en los círculos españoles en Manila, particularmente entre las órdenes religiosas—lo pasó a Fr. Echevarría, Rector de la Universidad de Santo Tomás, para que el claustro o un comité del claustro de dicha Universidad emitiera un dictamen sobre el libro. De ello se hicieron cargo tres miembros del Claustro Universitario que eran todos padres dominicos: Profesores Fray Matías Gómez, Fray Norberto del Prado y Fray Evaristo Fernández Arias.

No voy a transcribir por entero el dictamen sino solamente la parte que considero importante desde el punto de vista de mi proposición de que los cargos formulados ahora por los obispos filipinos contra el *Noli Me Tangere* y *El Filibusterismo* son casi exactas reproducciones de los formulados por los frailes en aquella época contra el primero de estos libros, pues debo advertir que *El Filibusterismo* vió la luz cuatro o cinco años más tarde. Dice así:

“DICTAMEN DE LA U. DE STO TOMÁS”
 “REAL Y PONTIFICIA UNIVERSIDAD DE SANTO TOMÁS DE MANILA.—Rectorado.—Excmo. e Ilmo Sr.—“En contestación al atento oficio de V. E. Ilma., de fecha 18 del corriente, en el cual V. E. Ilma. se dignó encomendar a este Claustro Universitario la revisión e informe sobre el libro *Noli me tangere*, novela tagala, publicada por J. RIZAL en una imprenta de Berlin, tengo el honor de manifestar a V. E.

Ilma. que, examinada dicha obra por una Comisión de este Claustro nombrada al efecto por el que suscribe, sus individuos por unanimidad la han encontrado herética, impía y escandalosa en el orden religioso, y anti-patriótica, subversiva del orden público, injuriosa al Gobierno de España y a su proceder en estas Islas, en el orden político.

"Toda la narración, absolutamente toda, en su conjunto y en sus detalles, en lo primario como en lo secundario, en lo principal como en los pormenores, al parecer más insignificantes, va contra el dogma, contra la iglesia, contra las órdenes religiosas y contra las instituciones civiles, militares, sociales y políticas, que el Gobierno de España ha implantado en estas Islas.—Y por eso el que suscribe, apoyado en el dictamen de la Comisión examinadora, tiene el honor de informar a V. E. Ilma. que la narración *Noli Me Tangere* de J. Rizal, impresa en Berlín, si llegara a circular por Filipinas, causaría gravísimos daños a la fé y a la moral, amortiguaría o extinguiría el amor de estos indígenas a España, y perturbando el corazón y las pasiones de los habitantes de este país, podría ocasionar días muy tristes para la madre Patria.—Dios gue. a V. E. Ilma. ms. as.—Manila, 30 de Agosto de 1887,—Excmo. E Ilmo. Sr.—FR. GREGORIO ECHEVARRIA.—Excmo. e Ilmo. Sr. Arzobispo de Manila."

La diferencia, como se ve, entre el juicio que había merecido de aquellos frailes de antes el *Noli Me Tangere*, y el que lo acaba de merecer de los obispos filipinos de hoy, se reduce al aspecto político del caso: En cuanto al orden religioso, los juicios formulados son exactamente los mismos: que la obra es herética e impía, y va contra el dogma y la Iglesia, y su lectura es dañosa a la fe y a la moral.

El Arzobispo Payo no actuó sobre el dictamen, sino que lo pasó al Capitán General Terrero, que era la suprema autoridad civil en Filipinas bajo aquel régimen. Este, a su vez, lo pasó a la Comisión Permanente de Censura, una institución que parecía formar parte integrante de aquel régimen colonial.

Senator TAÑADA. Mr. President, will the gentleman yield?

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman may yield, if he so desires.

Senator RECTO. Gladly.
Senator TAÑADA. May I request the distinguished gentleman from Batangas, before he proceeds to another point, if he will do us the favor of reading that last portion of the letter of the Rector of the University of Sto. Tomás, referring the NOLI back to the Archbishop, and with a little less speed.

Senator RECTO. The one I have just read?
Senator TAÑADA. Yes, please. The last part as to the effect of the NOLI after calling it heretic, impious.

El Sen. RECTO. (*leyendo despacio.*)
"Va contra el dogma, contra la Iglesia, contra las órdenes religiosas y contra las instituciones civiles,

militares, sociales y políticas, que el Gobierno de España ha implantado en estas Islas.—Y por eso el que suscribe, apoyado en el dictamen de la Comisión examinadora, tiene el honor de informar a V. E. Ilma. que la narración *Noli Me Tangere* de J. Rizal, impresa en Berlín, si llegara a circular por Filipinas, causaría gravísimos daños a la fé y a la moral, amortiguaría o extinguiría el amor de estos indígenas a España, y, perturbando el corazón y las pasiones de los habitantes de este país, podría ocasionar días muy tristes para la madre Patria."—Es decir, para España.

Senator TAÑADA. Would the distinguished Senator give us his opinion as to what subject was emphasized by that last paragraph as the possible effect of the *NOLI ME TANGERE*?

Senator RECTO. Well, the separation from Spain—the independence of the Philippines from Spain, of course.

Senator TAÑADA. Thank you.

Senator RECTO. Rizal did not pretend to teach religion or theology when he wrote these books. He aimed at inculcating civic consciousness in the Filipinos, national dignity, personal pride, and patriotism, and if references were made by him in the course of his narration to certain religious practices in the Philippines in those days and to the conduct and behavior of erring ministers of the church, it was because he portrayed faithfully the general situation in the Philippines as it then existed; nobody can dispute that the situation described by Rizal in those days, political, social and religious, was the one then actually obtaining in the Philippines; but while he criticized and ridiculed the unworthy behavior of certain ministers of the church, he made exceptions in favor of the worthy ones, like the Dominican Friar Padre Fernández, and the virtuous native priest, Padre Florentino, and the Jesuits, in general. At the opportune time I shall point to the pertinent passages in the *NOLI* and in the *FILI* in substantiating my propositions against those set forth by Father Cavanna in his "pastoral".

Senator DELGADO. Mr. President, will the gentleman yield for some information?

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman may yield, if he wishes.

Senator RECTO. Gladly.

Senator DELGADO. Will the gentleman be good enough to tell whether in that report just read there is nothing at all denying directly or impliedly the truth?

Senator RECTO. That is the most amazing thing, Your Honor, that the members of the religious

orders who rendered their opinion on the *Noli Me Tangere* confined themselves to concluding that the book was impious and heretical, but failed to challenge the truth of the facts narrated therein.

Senator DELGADO. Does the Senator mean that what was at issue in that report was the effect to the readers of what was narrated without in anyway disputing the truth of the narration?

Senator RECTO. Yes, just conclusions.

(*Prosiguiendo.*) Voy a continuar, señor Presidente. Como yo decía, el Capitán General Terrero endosó el dictamen del Claustro Universitario de Santo Tomás a la Comisión Permanente de Censura que al parecer presidía el fraile agustino Salvador Font. Tocóle a éste evacuar el dictamen que, en parte, dice así:

"Fundado, Excmo. Sr. (Gobernador General), el que suscribe, en los textos que, literalmente copiados, acabo de presentar a la ajustada y patriótica consideración de V. E., es de parecer que *prohiba en absoluto por su Autoridad la importación, reproducción y circulación de este pernicioso libro en las Islas.*"

* * * * *

"Además de atacarse tan directamente, como V. S. ha visto, la *Religión del Estado*, a instituciones y personas respetables por su carácter oficial, está vaciado el libro en enseñanzas y doctrinas extranjeras; y la síntesis general del mismo es inspirar a los sumisos y leales hijos de España en estas apartadas islas odio profundo y encarnizado a la Madre Patria, posponiéndola a las naciones extranjeras, especialmente a Alemania, por quien parece tener preferente predilección el autor del *Noli Me Tangere*. SU OBJETIVO ÚNICO ES LA INDEPENDENCIA DEL PAÍS, queriendo romper con impía y osada mano la integridad sagrada de la Patria, de esa Patria que le dió el ser, que le crió a sus nobles pechos, que le alimentó con el pan y la doctrina de la civilización, y que de idólatra, ignorante y degradado, ha hecho de Filipinas el país católico por excelencia, el más libre e ilustrado de los pueblos que viven bajo el amparo inmediato de las naciones europeas, y la raza más feliz que ha vivido bajo la benéfica sombra de las paternales Leyes de Indias, * * * Este es el parecer del que suscribe para que se *prohiba en absoluto la circulación de este libro . . .* Manila, 29 de Diciembre de 1887. Fr. SALVADOR FONT, Agustino calzado."

A pesar de estos dictámenes, del Claustro Universitario y la Comisión permanente de Censura, nada se hizo por la jerarquía católica de entonces, que se componía, si no estoy errado, del Arzobispo Metropolitano de Manila, y de los obispos de Nueva Cáceres y Nueva Segovia, todos frailes, dominico el uno, agustino el otro y franciscano el tercero, contra el libro de Rizal.

Se abstuvieron no sólo de expedir una pastoral sino de decir cosa alguna, no porque tuvieran reparo, pues ellos mandaban aquí y eran órdenes religiosas las que mandaban en España; se abstuvieron sencillamente porque no hallaron nada herético ni impio en el libro de Rizal.

Pero es que no fue sólo la jerarquía católica en Filipinas que se abstuvo de hacer ningún pronunciamiento contra el *Noli me Tangere*; la misma abstención hubo por parte de la jerarquía católica en España y el Vaticano, pues nunca se puso el libro en el Índice, y esto debe constarles a sus trasnochados impugnadores.

Ahora pasaré a hablar de la deportación de Rizal, y de su proceso y ejecución. El año 1892, cuando Rizal fue deportado por orden del Capitán General Despujol . . .

Senator DELGADO. Before the gentleman passes to another point, may I ask another question for clarification?

Senator RECTO. Gladly.

Senator DELGADO. So that thus far up to the time Rizal was deported in 1892 notwithstanding that the *Noli Me Tangere* was already published and circulated to a certain extent in the Philippines, and also the *El Filibusterismo*, no ban was issued by the hierarchy of the Catholic church listing it in the index. There was no ban issued by the local hierarchy nor by the Vatican.

Senator RECTO. And no pastoral, for sure.

Senator DELGADO. And the only thing done was, it was ruled that this book be not permitted to enter the Philippines because it would cause loss of love to the mother country, Spain. Is that correct?

Senator RECTO. Yes, that is correct. As a matter of fact, the only purpose of the book, as Father Font said in his opinion, was to obtain the independence of the Philippines from Spain. That was the ultimate purpose.

Senator LIM. Mr. President, will the gentleman from Batangas kindly yield?

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman from Batangas may yield, if he so desires.

Senator RECTO. Willingly.

Senator LIM. Last night, we received, each and everyone of us, a copy of the letter of Father Piñon of Santo Tomás.

Senator RECTO. I have received my copy but I have not had time to read it.

Senator LIM. I was reading it last night, but I do not have it at present. If you have your copy right now, I would like to borrow it.

Senator RECTO. I do not have it with me either.

Senator LIM. I would like to say that I remember that in that letter of Father Piñon, as I perused it, he cited Canon Laws 1399 or 1398 by which he seeks to prove that the *Noli Me Tangere* and the *El Filibusterismo* are not included among the books prohibited by the church, but by virtue of the pro-

visions of these Canon Laws, the *Noli Me Tangere* and the *El Filibusterismo* are supposed to be included. Canon Law No. 1398:

"CAN. 1398.—La prohibición de los libros implica que sin la debida licencia no se les puede editar, ni leer, ni conservar, ni vender, ni traducir a otra lengua, ni en forma alguna comunicar a otros.

2. Un libro de cualquiera manera prohibido no se le puede volver a publicar, a menos que, hechas las correcciones, otorgue la licencia el que lo había prohibido o su Superior o sucesor."

But more particularly, perhaps in Canon No. 1339 cited by Father Piñón, it is stated:

"CAN. 1399.—Están prohibidos por el derecho mismo . . .

3.° Los libros que atacan de propósito la religión o las buenas costumbres; . . .

6.° Los libros que impugnan o se mofan de algún dogma católico, los que defienden errores condenados por la Sede Apostólica, los que desprestigian el culto divino, los que intentan destruir la disciplina eclesiástica, y los que adrede injurian a la jerarquía eclesiástica, o al estado clerical o religioso; . . ."

Tenemos, pues, que, según el P. Piñón, aunque no menciona específicamente el *NOLI* y *EL FILIBUSTERISMO*, estas obras de Rizal vienen a ser libros prohibidos.

El Sen. RECTO. ¿Quién los prohíbe, el P. Piñón, con su interpretación?

El Sen. LIM. Con la interpretación que hace en sus Observaciones.

El Sen. RECTO. No acepto esa autoridad por grande que sea; tiene que venir de la Santa Sede.

El Sen. LIM. Esa es la interpretación que él da.

El Sen. RECTO. Contestaré después que haya tenido oportunidad de examinar la llamada Pastoral de la jerarquía católica y entonces tendré ocasión de demostrar que, según el Derecho Canónico, tal como esos señores lo interpretan, aun los evangelios pueden caer bajo alguna prohibición.

El Sen. LIM. Quisiera informar al caballero de Batangas que en esa carta u Observaciones del P. Piñón, Vuestra Señoría y este humilde servidor aparecemos mentados allí adversamente.

I would like to stand and speak on a question of privilege for five minutes because of the insinuation of Father Piñón against my humble person, and Your Honor is alluded to there adversely if you will have the time to read that letter.

Senato- RECTO. I do not care about Father Piñón's allusions against my person, providing he spares Rizal, our national hero.

(Prosiguiendo.) Señor Presidente y caballeros del Senado:

En 1892 Rizal llegaba a Manila de Hongkong—

procuraré ser lo más breve posible en este relato—

y fueron ocupadas en su equipaje por sabuesos de la Aduana unas hojas volantes que se titulaban "¡POBRES FRAILES!" Parecía ser que dichas hojas volantes habían sido introducidas en el equipaje de Rizal por agentes mismos del gobierno; Rizal tenía suficiente discreción y cordura para no llevar consigo documentos que podrían comprometerle gravemente. Dichas hojas habían sido impresas en la Imprenta del Asilo de Malabón, de los padres agustinos. Cómo pudieron imprimirse estas hojas volantes en una imprenta de la cual eran dueños los frailes es cosa que no se puede imaginar. De ahí la sospecha de que eran agentes de los frailes los que las imprimieron para hacer aparecer después que se encontraron en el equipaje de Rizal, cuyo registro se verificó a espaldas del interesado. Pues bien, estas hojas volantes contenían ataques contra los frailes, más hirientes que los que habían aparecido en el *NOLI ME TANGERE* y *EL FILIBUSTERISMO*. Bastó la declaración de los oficiales de Aduana de que las mismas habían sido halladas en el equipaje de Rizal para que el General Despujol decretara su deportación a Dapitan. La orden de deportación dice en parte lo siguiente:

"Resultando que su último libro *El Filibusterismo* está dedicado a la memoria de los tres traidores a la Patria, condenados y ejecutados después de los sucesos de Cavite en virtud de sentencia de autoridad competente y ensalzados por él como mártires, haciendo suya además, en el epígrafe de la portada de dicho libro, la doctrina de que, en virtud de los vicios y errores de la administración española, no existe otra salvación para Filipinas que la separación de la madre Patria.

"Considerando que con ello, y por mucho que cueste crearlo, ha quedado por fin descorrido el velo más o menos transparente con que hasta ahora procuraba disfrazar su verdadero objeto, pues ya no se trata de meros ataques al monaquismo, que más o menos casuísticamente se quería suponer compatibles en Filipinas con el respeto a la creencia católica, ni se limita tampoco a sus insidiosas acusaciones contra los tradicionales agravios y torpezas de la política colonial española, ni al sistemático rebajamiento de las patrias glorias, que farisaicamente se pretendía conciliar con un mentido amor a la madre Patria, sino que resulta ya evidente y aparece probado por modo innegable a los ojos de todos, que el doble fin que en sus trabajos y escritos persigue no es otro que el arrancar de los leales pechos filipinos el tesoro de nuestra Santa Fe Católica, vínculo inquebrantable en este suelo de la integridad nacional:

"Considerando que precisamente en previsión de casos tales, y para librar de todo peligro los sagrados ideales de Religión y Patria, tiene concedidas la Autoridad superior de Filipinas facultades discrecionales, de las que esperaba no tener jamás que hacer uso;

"En cumplimiento de los altos deberes que como Gobernador General y Vicerreal patrono me incumben, y en virtud de las facultades que por razón de dicho doble cargo me asisten, he venido en decretar lo siguiente:

"1.° Será deportado a una de las islas del sur el Sr. D. JOSE RIZAL cuyo proceder en esta ocasión será juzgado

como merece por todo filipino católico y patriota, por toda conciencia recta, por todo corazón delicado.

"2.º *Queda en adelante prohibida*, si ya no lo hubiese sido anteriormente, *la introducción y la circulación en el Archipiélago de las obras del mencionado autor*, así como de toda proclama u hoja volante en que directa o indirectamente se ataque a la religión católica o la unidad nacional.

"La responsabilidad de estas medidas de rigor que un penoso deber me impone caíga por entero sobre los que, con sus desatentados propósitos e ingrato proceder, vienen a estorbar las paternales miras de este Gobierno general, dificultando al par la ordenada marcha del progreso filipino.—Manila 7 de Julio de 1892.—DESPUJOL."

Por algún tiempo estuvo Rizal deportado en Dapitan. De allí le sacaron después . . .

Senator DELGADO. Mr. President, will the gentleman yield for a question of information just for the sake of completing the facts that the gentleman has enumerated?

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman may yield, if he so desires.

Senator RECTO. With pleasure.

Senator DELGADO. Would Your Honor mind telling us why those three beloved fathers, heroes and martyrs were executed?

Senator RECTO. Because they fought in reality for the rights of the Filipino priests. That was political treason in those days. Rizal himself expressed his doubts as to whether they had at heart the political freedom of their country. Rizal said they were victims of the evil he was himself combatting.

Senator DELGADO. Was there anything in the charge against those three beloved priests imputing to them irreligiousness or anything against the Roman Catholic religion?

Senator RECTO. None, just for their alleged involvement in the Cavite uprising.

Senator DELGADO. In other words, they were executed because of political grounds exclusively?

Senator RECTO. Correct.

Senator DELGADO. Not because of any irreligiousness or impiety?

Senator RECTO. Certainly not. They were not charged as heretics or impious. It was for that reason that the Church refused to degrade them before execution. And Rizal, to show his true Christianity and sound Catholicism, dedicated his book to their memory.

(*Prosiguiendo.*) Iba a decir cuando fui interrumpido que estando Rizal en Dapitan solicitó ser enviado como médico militar a Cuba y para ello le permitieron salir de Filipinas para España. Pero poco antes de desembarcar en aquella metrópoli el capitán del barco recibió orden de ponerle bajo arresto, y traerle de vuelta a Filipinas para

responder de cargos criminales que se habían formulado contra él.

Dióse comienzo al proceso con la querrela que presentó ante el Consejo de Guerra el Fiscal de su Majestad, Enrique Alcocer, por los delitos de rebelión, sedición y asociación ilícita. Ya estaba implantado aquí el régimen militar con motivo del levantamiento del 26 de Agosto de 1896. Decía, en parte, el fiscal de su Majestad:

"Al Consejo de Guerra.—El Teniente fiscal, dice: Que después de examinar las diligencias del plenario, sostiene las conclusiones provisionales que constan en su dictamen de calificación.

"*En 1879 y contando apenas diez y nueve años*, aparece RIZAL por primera vez en público, asistiendo a un certamen literario celebrado en esta capital, y en el que consiguió premio (*Primer premio*) por una oda ("A la Juventud Filipina") en la que ya dejaba traslucir su manera de pensar en la cuestión colonial. A partir de esta fecha no ha cesado en su labor demoledora para la soberanía de España en Filipinas, y el año de 1886 publica, impresa en Berlín, una novela tagala, escrita en castellano, con el título "*Noli Me Tángere*", llena de odio para la Patria, en la que fustiga con los más denigrantes epítetos a los españoles, *escarnece la religión*, tratando de demostrar que nunca será civilizado el país, ínterin esté gobernado, según él, por los canallas y degradados castellanos."

"Pasado algún tiempo publica otro libro con el título "*El Filibusterismo*", dedicado exclusivamente a ensalzar la memoria de los tres curas indígenas (Burgos, Gómez y Zamora) que por haber tomado parte en la insurrección de Cavite el año de 1875, fueron condenados a muerte, y a los que considera como mártires, lanzando de paso amenazas para la Nación, que en uso de su derecho no podían consentir que quedaran impunes atentados contra su legítima soberanía."

Se siguió un simulacro de proceso en que Rizal fue defendido por un Teniente del Ejército, el Señor Don Taviel de Andrade que no era, al parecer, abogado. Tenía el Señor Andrade muy buena voluntad, y Rizal le estuvo agradecido, pero la defensa fue bastante débil; tanto que Rizal, por su propia cuenta, tuvo que hacer adiciones a su defensa. Después vino el fallo, que ya todo el mundo esperaba del Consejo de Guerra que dicé así:

"En la plaza de Manila, a los veintiséis días del mes de Diciembre de mil ochocientos noventa y seis; reunido el Consejo de Guerra ordinario de plaza celebrado en este día bajo la presidencia del Sr. Teniente coronel Don José Tagores Arjona, para ver y fallar la causa instruida contra don José RIZAL Y MERCADO Y ALONSO, acusado de los delitos de rebelión, sedición y asociación ilícita; la ha examinado con toda detención y cuidado, previa la lectura de sus actuaciones, hecha por el señor Juez Instructor, vista la acusación fiscal, oído el alegato de defensa y la adición a la misma hecha por el acusado; el Consejo de guerra ordinario de plaza declara que el hecho perseguido constituye los delitos de fundar Asociaciones ilícitas y de promover e inducir a ejecutar el de rebelión, siendo el primero medio necesario

para ejecutar el segundo: *resultando responsable en concepto de autor el procesado D. JOSÉ RIZAL.*

"En su virtud, falla: que *debe condenar y condena al referido DON JOSÉ RIZAL a la pena de muerte, * * * debiendo satisfacer en concepto de indemnización al Estado la cantidad de cien mil pesos, con la obligación de transmitirse la satisfacción de esta indemnización a los herederos. * * **

"Así lo pronuncia y manda el Consejo de guerra ordinario de plaza, firmándolo el Presidente y Vocales del mismo—JOSÉ TAGÓRES, BRAULIO RODRÍGUEZ NUÑEZ.—RICARDO MUÑOZ.—FERMÍN PÉREZ RODRÍGUEZ.—MANUEL REGUERA.—MANUEL DÍAZ ESCRIBANO.—SANTIAGO IZQUIERDO."

La sentencia pasó, para su revisión, al Auditor de guerra. Parece que bajo aquel sistema el Auditor de guerra era superior al mismo Consejo de guerra y tenía facultad de revisar los fallos de éste. En el caso de Rizal, el Auditor de guerra, un tal Nicolás de la Peña, confirmó el fallo del Consejo de guerra con un dictamen donde se desató en impropiedades contra Rizal y los patriotas filipinos. El tal Señor De la Peña hasta se las echó de crítico literario. De tal desgraciado documento tomo este pasaje:

"Como único procesado figura en esta pieza separada, deducida de la causa matriz que se instruye por rebelión y asociaciones ilícitas, D. JOSÉ RIZAL Y MERCADO ALONSO, natural de Calamba (Provincia de La Laguna), de treinta y cinco años de edad, soltero, mestizo-chino, a quien halagos de la suerte elevaron en pasados días a ídolo de desleales bullangueros y reveses de fortuna conducen a la muerte sin gloria y sin honor; porque Rizal, estudiante por su profesión de las Ciencias naturales y de las físico-químicas, laborioso y activo cual ninguno de sus paisanos, viajero infatigable por Europa y poseedor de varias lenguas vivas, admirado de sus paisanos menos cultos, y aplaudido por sus maestros y amigos sin distinción de razas, lanzóse por el derrotero de las Ciencias morales y de los estudios sociológicos, que tan honda preparación requieren, y se lanza a propagar activamente entre los habitantes de estas regiones de España sentimientos de deslealtad y de traición, doctrinas contrarias a la unidad nacional, ideas hostiles a la soberanía española. * * *

"Rizal no es tribuno; sus discursos, que por pequeña muestra pueden conocerse al fol. 18 vuelto, encierran vulgaridades que ha medio siglo pudieron ser de efecto en las masas populares, pero merecedoras del mayor desdén al presente. Rizal no es escritor correcto ni pensador profundo, sus escritos, unidos a autos, acusan la mayor imperfección de lenguaje y no gran energía intelectual. Y sin embargo, Rizal ha sido el Verbo del Filibusterismo, el más inteligente director de los separatistas, el ídolo, en fin, de la muchedumbre ignorante y aun de personajes incultos, que han visto en el agitador perpetuo un sér sobrenatural a quien apellidan Supremo.

"Está, pues, bien calificado Rizal como promovedor del delito de rebelión, consumado por medio de Asociación ilícita; y es justa la sentencia que por sus propios fundamentos procede aprobar, disponiendo que se ejecute pasando al rescripto D. JOSÉ RIZAL Y MERCADO ALONSO, por las armas, en el sitio y hora que V. E. tenga a bien designar, y con las formalidades que establece el 2.º párrafo del artículo 637

del Código de Justicia militar. Si V. E. se sirve decretar su conformidad, deberá volver este proceso al Instructor para que notifique la sentencia al reo en el momento de ponerle en capilla, la dé el debido cumplimiento en todas sus partes, deduzca el testimonio que ha de remitir al Consejo Supremo de Guerra y Marina y cumpla lo prevenido sobre estadística criminal.

"Manila, veintisiete de Diciembre de mil ochocientos noventa y seis.—Excmo. Sr.:—NICOLÁS DE LA PEÑA."

El General Camilo Polavieja, de la misma tristísima memoria del Arzobispo Nozaleda, expidió al punto el siguiente decreto:

"Manila, 28 de Diciembre de 1896.—Conforme con el anterior dictamen, apruebo la sentencia dictada por el Consejo de guerra ordinario de plaza en la presente causa, en virtud de la cual se impone le pena de muerte al reo JOSÉ RIZAL MERCADO, la que se ejecutará pasándole por las armas a las siete de la mañana del día 30 del actual en el campo de Bagumbayan y con las formalidades que la ley previene.—Para su cumplimiento y demás que corresponda, vuelva al Juez instructor, capitán D. Rafael Domínguez.—CAMILO G. DE POLAVIEJA."

El siguiente relato sobre la ejecución de Rizal está tomado del libro de Retana:

"Habíase despedido Rizal de su defensor con un fuerte apretón de manos; había hecho otro tanto con los Jesuitas, y después de breve diálogo que mantuvo con el Capitán, y volviéndose de cara al mar, y quedó por consiguiente, de espaldas al piquete que debía fusilarle. Formaba el piquete una línea de ocho soldados indígenas, del regimiento núm. 70, provistos de fusil Remington, tras de la cual había otra de ocho cazadores peninsulares, provistos de Mausser, en previsión de que los indígenas se resistieran a disparar . . . Rizal se hallaba con el cuerpo erguido, sin oscilación alguna, con los brazos caídos a los lados del cuerpo, como en la posición de firmes, y así estuvo un rato mientras se preparaban las armas."

En ese preciso momento, el médico militar Sr. Ruiz y Castillo, que estaba próximo a Rizal, se le acercó y le dijo:

"Compañero, ¿me permite usted el pulso?"

"Rizal, sin contestar nada, separó el brazo izquierdo del cuerpo y le tendió la mano para que se le tomase.

"Lo tiene usted muy bien," le dijo Ruiz Castillo.

"Rizal tampoco contestó nada. Hizo un leve encogimiento de hombros, y breves momentos después sonó la descarga. Giró el cuerpo hacia la derecha, y cayó muerto sobre el costado derecho, presentando al aire la cara. Eran las siete y tres minutos.

"Se dieron dos vivas a España y un viva a la Justicia, y por delante del cadáver desfilaron las tropas . . .

Así murió el héroe más grande de la epopeya patria. Murió para darnos vida, cayó para darnos vuelo, como dijo en rimas inmortales momentos antes de verter su sangre para teñir con su grana la aurora de nuestra redención. No sólo murió como morían los cristianos en el anfiteatro de Diocleciano, sólo por profesar una fe; murió, como Jesús, por la

verdad y la gloria de su apostolado. Si a Cristo no le crucificó Pilatos sino los príncipes de los sacerdotes que vieron en Él al sedicioso y al revolucionario que hablaba de destruir el templo, que se había hecho nido de supersticiones y refugio de fórmulas vanas, para reedificarlo en tres días con arreglo a la nueva doctrina, a Rizal no le fusiló la España Oficial, sino los "príncipes de los sacerdotes" que "ordenaban y mandaban" en Filipinas en los días de Rizal. Y no es porque fué ejecutado por los opresores del pueblo, por rebelde y sedicioso, que Rizal ha sido consagrado como héroe nacional: lo ha sido por las enseñanzas que dió a su pueblo en esa biblia del patriotismo filipino que es el *Noli Me Tángere* y *El Filibusterismo*, sellándolas con el supremo sacrificio de su vida. Incontables filipinos dieron la suya por la patria "en campos de batalla", en el "cadalso", o sufriendo "cruel martirio" en el "campo abierto" de Bagumbayan, y establecieron su derecho a ser consagrados héroes; pero Rizal es el héroe nacional, por excelencia, porque su martirio fué la culminación no sólo de una profesión de amor a la patria, sino de un apostolado cuya quintaesencia destiló en estos dos libros, el *Noli Me Tángere* y *El Filibusterismo*, sin los cuales Rizal no tendría en la historia mayor significación que cualquiera de los millares de compatriotas que fueron torturados, degollados, agarrotados, fusilados, ahorcados, por españoles, americanos y japoneses, en la larga y luctuosa historia de nuestra esclavitud. Proclamar a Rizal el más grande de los héroes nacionales y suprimir o expurgar sus libros, es la mayor altura a que puede llegar la hipocresía. Borrada el nombre de Rizal del mapa, de la historia, de las crónicas nacionales, derribad sus monumentos, pero no atentéis contra la integridad de sus escritos, no profanéis cosas que deben ser sagradas para todo filipino bien nacido.

Voy a terminar leyéndoos otros documentos importantísimos, por ejemplo, los que atañen a la defensa del *Noli Me Tángere* por el gran teólogo y canonista filipino, Padre Vicente García, y la carta sentidísima, llena de religiosidad y patriotismo, que a éste ilustre sacerdote escribió Rizal al agradecerle dicha defensa.

Don Mariano Ponce estaba a la sazón en Filipinas, y era, naturalmente, de los que le daban cuenta a Rizal de todo lo que aquí ocurría, sobre todo del efecto general que había producido el *NOLI*.

En una carta que por aquel entonces escribió Ponce a Rizal, decía:

"Un ilustre paisano, conocido en Manila por un profundo teólogo y gran filósofo, en vista del opusculito del P. Rodríguez, ha pretendido escribir a éste, demostrándole las aberraciones católicas de que está lleno su librito (del P. Rodríguez)

y defendiendo al propio tiempo al *NOLI ME TANGERE* contra sus afirmaciones de contener proposiciones heréticas, blasfemas e impías; carta que por consejo de los amigos de aquel paisano no llegó a manos del bendito P. Rodríguez. Pero el autor encomendó a un joven el trabajo de formar con dicha carta un opúsculo que demuestre lo contrario de las afirmaciones apasionadas del autor fraile en punto a religión; trataré de extractar dicha carta.

Después de manifestar que ha leído y releído el *NOLI* afirmando no haber visto comprobadas las afirmaciones del P. Rodríguez, manifiesta su juicio envuelto en las observaciones siguientes:

"El Dr. Rizal bajo alusiones veladas censura duramente los grandes abusos de los individuos de ciertas instituciones, si bien con absoluta abstracción de éstas, sin envolver en la censura su bondad inherente debido a su espíritu primitivo. La maldad de los abusos inficiona, sí, como una lepra, a los miembros de una corporación; no así la crítica que se haga de ellos para que se corrijan. Desgraciadamente la pasión o el interés suele confundir a los hombres con las cosas; la persona de los religiosos con la religión immaculada, identificándoles. Cita el ridículo alarde de las locas sonas que se dicen devotas, disputando a tontas y a locas quién de ellas ha ganado más indulgencias, etc. Poner de relieve con vivos y fuertes colores de la crítica ese alarde tonto, esa soberbia jactancia y ridiculez de tales devotas, ¿es acaso negar la existencia del purgatorio, la eficacia de las indulgencias y el valor infinito del sacrificio de la misa? ¿Puede alguno afirmarlo sin estar obcecado por la pasión?"

Prosigue Mariano Ponce diciendo que el teólogo filipino

"demostró que Ud. (Rizal) prueba la existencia del Purgatorio citando concilios y decretos eclesiásticos."

Y copia, dice Ponce, aquel pasaje de Tasio (el filósofo) donde afirma, entre otras cosas: "Creemos en la existencia del Purgatorio, pero que no se abuse. El mal está en el abuso."

¿Quién era el teólogo filipino que, según Mariano Ponce, había defendido a Rizal y al *Noli Me Tángere* a capa y espada contra las arremetidas de Fray Rodríguez, un fraile agustino? Al recibir la carta de Ponce, Rizal se sintió agradecido por la defensa que había hecho del *Noli* el teólogo filipino a quien aún no conocía, y quiso indagar quién era, y Ponce se lo reveló en esta carta:

"Empezaré por decirle el nombre del teólogo que quiso defender a Ud. contra los ataques injustos del P. Rodríguez: es P. Vicente García, canónigo penitenciario de la catedral. Dado el carácter eclesiástico de este sabio doctor se comprende perfectamente la conveniencia de quedarse oculto su nombre en cuestiones de esta índole, so pena de correr la misma suerte del nunca bastante deplorado P. Burgos."

Rizal replicó a Ponce en estos términos:

"El hecho de que el P. Vicente García me defiende, me conmueve y me dice que debo continuar en el camino que me he trazado. Tener un anciano así a mi lado, es crecer que no estoy en contra del espíritu de mi país. Es la más agradable noticia que Ud. me ha dado hasta ahora."

Ponce vuelve a escribir a Rizal diciéndole, y de esto se servirán tomar nota los presentes enemigos de los libros de Rizal, lo siguiente:

"Su obra de Ud. sigue despertando el entusiasmo entre nuestros paisanos con muy cortas excepciones: excepciones que no comprendo ni puedo explicar tratándose de una obra eminentemente patriótica, en la que Ud. arrojó su porvenir y su nombre a los buitres del clericalismo, para enseñar algún remedio a infinitos males de que se queja nuestra desdichada patria. Los que censuren tales actos de abnegación y heroísmo merecen eterna maldición de la historia patria."

Vuelvo a preguntar, ¿quién era el Padre García, este gran teólogo filipino que defendió el *Noli Me Tangere* contra los ataques de los frailes de que el libro era herético e impío?

Murió el Padre García en olor de santidad, a la edad de 83 años el año 1899, en Rosario, Batangas, su pueblo natal que ahora se llama el municipio de "Padre Vicente García", creado por ley hace cinco años para honrar su memoria. Al año siguiente, a su muerte, un cura español, llamado Salvador Pons y Torres, publicó un opúsculo que en su página 30 contiene estos datos biográficos sobre aquel gran sacerdote, el mayor timbre de gloria del clero filipino de todos los tiempos, por su santidad, por su sabiduría, por su patriotismo, y por el coraje moral que desplegó en aquellos días de persecución religiosa en que para muchos era excusable la cobardía.

"VICENTE GARCIA (Rd. Sr. Dr.), tagalo, natural de Rosario, (Batangas), alumno y después rector muchos años del Real Colegio de San José, Presbítero de superior ingenio y de extraordinaria erudición en todas las materias eclesiásticas; Doctor en Sagrada Teología, bachiller en Derecho Canónico; Canónigo Penitenciario de la S. I. Catedral de Manila; Provisor y Gobernador Eclesiástico del obispado de Nueva Cáceres, Sede Vacante. Consultor privado de los Exmos. Sr. Arzobispo Pedro Payo, y Señor Francisco Gainza, Obispo de Camarines.

"El Reverendísimo Padre García era sacerdote de humildísimas apariencias, en quien nada se descubría que oliese a las vanidosas fastuosidades personales con que suelen rodearse los dignatarios de raza blanca *vanitas vanitatum!*

"Era un sabio que llevaba en su privilegiado cerebro un mundo de ideas, y que más de una vez dejó desconcertados, con peregrinos razonamientos, a émulos vanidosos de raza blanca en pleno Cabildo

"Fundador de un hospital para leprosos en Nueva Cáceres, sostenido de su peculio privado; restaurador del Santuario de Ntra. Sra. de Peñafrancia (Camarines).

"Gran bienhechor de la Comunidad de PP. Paúles en Manila, y de la Catedral, ascendiendo a más de cincuenta mil duros el valor de sus ofrendas y donaciones para aquellos fines piadosos indicados.

"Gloria a Filipinas que tales hijos ha dado a la Iglesia Católica!"

Son numerosos los trabajos publicados por el Padre García. Tradujo al tagalo el Kempis, o la "Imitación de Cristo", 448 páginas. Escribió los "Ayes de las almas del purgatorio", lo cual prueba que Rizal no atacó en el *Noli* la existencia del purgatorio, como se pretende por los anti-Rizalistas, porque de haber sido así el Padre García no hubiera tomado la defensa del libro.

Escribió el Padre García otra obra, "La vida de San Eustaquio", en bicol.

Escribió también la "Novena de Nuestra Señora de Peñafrancia" en bicol. Y luego dice el Padre Cavanna, que se dice portavoz de los obispos, que Rizal se burló de las novenas. Si tal fuese cierto, el Padre García no hubiera defendido el *Noli*.

Escribió otro libro, "Explicación de las gracias otorgadas por Nuestra Señora del Rosario", en tagalo, 109 páginas, en Manila en 1884; y finalmente, el artículo "Defensa del Noli Me Tangere del Dr. Rizal", en español,—el mismo trabajo aludido por Mariano Ponce en su carta a Rizal—en "La Solidaridad", órgano de los laborantes filipinos en Madrid, bajo el pseudónimo de V. CARAIG.

Aquí terminan los datos biográficos sobre el Padre Vicente García, que tomamos de un opúsculo publicado en 1900 por el presbítero español, el Padre Salvador Pons y Torres.

A raíz de la muerte del padre García se publicó la siguiente reseña en el periódico "LA PATRIA" de aquel año. La reseña dice así:

"Ha fallecido el sabio y virtuoso sacerdote filipino Sr. Vicente García, canónigo penitenciario de la Iglesia Metropolitana de Manila, el 12 del actual, a los 82 años de edad.

"Este santo varón nació en el pueblo de Rosario (Batangas) el 5 de Abril de 1817 y se ordenó de Sacerdote en Junio de 1849.

"Hizo sus estudios con notable aplicación y aprovechamiento, tanto de filosofía y derecho civil y canónico como de teología, siendo tenido por todos como un notable sacerdote.

"Fue coadjutor en dos parroquias y sustituto e interino en las capellanías de algunos regimientos del ejército, obteniendo después en propiedad y por oposición la del regimiento núm. 8.

"Renunció más tarde este destino y fué cura del Sagrario de la diócesis de Nueva Cáceres, desempeñando al mismo tiempo los cargos de rector de aquel Seminario, provisor, vicario general y gobernador eclesiástico.

"En Noviembre de 1879 hizo brillantes oposiciones a la canongía magistral vacante de esta diócesis, pero aunque sus ejercicios fueron aprobados, no fue nombrado para dicha canongía porque era clérigo de color.

"Además, no era conveniente ni político que se supiera que había aquí filipinos capaces de desempeñar el sacerdocio con tanta idoneidad como cualquier dignatario de la Iglesia.

Fue, además, el Padre García capellán del Regimiento de Artillería Peninsular, cura interino del Sagrario de esta Iglesia Catedral, director del Colegio de niños tiples, canónigo penitenciario y examinador sinodal de este Arzobispado.

"Marchó en Febrero último a su pueblo natal para recuperar la salud perdida y allí murió con la muerte de los justos.

"Dios premie en el cielo las altas virtudes del P. García, eminente teólogo y ejemplar sacerdote, digno émulo de sus compañeros los señores Peláez y Burgos, mártir este último de la patria filipina."

Quisiera enfatizar un hecho entre los que van relatados en los últimos documentos que acabo de leer referentes al Padre Vicente García, y es el de ser él, por aquel tiempo en que el *Noli Me Tangere* empezó a leerse en Filipinas, nada menos que el Consejero, por sus grandes conocimientos en teología y derecho canónico, del Arzobispo de Manila y de los obispos de Nueva Cáceres y Nueva Segovia, esto es de la jerarquía católica de aquellos días. Si fijáis vuestra atención en ese hecho, comprenderéis al punto por qué aquella jerarquía católica, aquellos señores obispos, a pesar de la presión ejercida sobre ellos por las órdenes religiosas, se abstuvieron de condenar oficialmente el libro de Rizal, ya por medio de una pastoral, ya por cualquier otro documento de menor importancia. Eso se debió sin duda al consejo que les diera el Padre García, aquel "presbítero de superior ingenio y extraordinaria erudición en materias eclesiásticas", como dice su biógrafo. Si los obispos filipinos de hoy día hubieran contado con un consultor en teología y cánones como el Padre Vicente García, en vez del Padre Cavanna, otro gallo nos cantarían, es decir, no se hubieran descolgado con ese manifiesto, que están haciendo pasar por pastoral, que declara al *Noli Me Tangere* y *El Filibusterismo* libros heréticos e impíos, repitiendo y ampliando los pronunciamientos del fraile agustino, Salvador Font, de la Comisión Permanente de Censura de los últimos años del régimen español.

Me falta por leer un documento de suma importancia, que es la carta sumamente conmovedora, que escribió Rizal al Padre García desde Madrid, el 7 de enero de 1891.

MADRID, PRÍNCIPE, 7 de enero de 1891

Sr. D. Vicente García, Pbro.
Manila

MI MUY ESTIMADO SEÑOR: Tiempo hacía que deseaba escribirle a V., no para darle gracias por la justa defensa que

V. antes que nadie se atrevió a escribir de mi primer libro sino para dirigirme a V. en busca de luces para el incierto camino del porvenir. Digo que no tenía intención de darle a V. las gracias porque le ofendería, y porque pasos parecidos a los dados por V. en defensa de la verdad, de la humanidad y de la justicia, desmerecen, si se agradecen; que Dios los premie y que los hombres se contenten en admirarlos e imitarlos!

Yo que pertenezco a una generación joven, ansiosa de hacer algo por su país e inquieta ante el misterioso porvenir, necesito acudir a los hombres que han visto mucho y estudiado más para, con su experiencia, suplir nuestros pocos años y cortos conocimientos. Necesitamos además el colosal y la bendición de los ancianos para alentarnos en la colosal lucha y en la gigantesca campaña que nos hemos echado sobre nuestros hombros de enano. Por grande que sea nuestro entusiasmo, por confiada que sea nuestra juventud, por risueñas que sean nuestras ilusiones, vacilamos, sin embargo, en ciertos momentos sobre todo cuando nos vemos solos y abandonados.

En la titánica obra de la regeneración común, sin dejar de marchar adelante volvemos de cuando en cuando la vista hacia nuestros mayores para leer en sus rostros el fallo de nuestras acciones. Por esta sed de conocer lo pasado, de saber, para entrar en el porvenir, acudimos a las personas como usted. Déjenos Vds. escritos sus pensamientos y los frutos de su larga experiencia para que condensados en un libro, no tengamos que volver a estudiar lo que han Vds. estudiado sino que la herencia que de Vds. recibamos la aumentemos tan sólo, o bien ampliándola o bien añadiendo a ella nuestra propia cosecha.

Todo el poco adelanto que los filipinos han tenido en estos tres siglos de españolismo se debe, a mi ver, a que nuestros talentos han muerto sin legarnos nada más que la fama de su nombre. Hemos tenido grandísimas inteligencias, hemos tenido un Pinpín, un Dr. Pilápil, un Padre Peláez, un Padre Mariano García, un Dr. Josen, etc.; tenemos aún un Benedicto Luna, un Lorenzo Francisco y otros más, y sin embargo, todo lo que estos hombres han estudiado, aprendido y descubierto morirá en ellos y concluirá en ellos, y nosotros volveremos a recomenzar el estudio de la vida. Hay, pues, un progreso o perfeccionamiento *individual* en Filipinas, pero no lo hay *nacional*, *general*. He aquí por qué el individuo es el único que se perfecciona y no la especie.

En el ocaso de la vida, cuando a la brisa fresca de la tarde se reflexiona sobre las luchas y fatigas del día, ¡cuán dulce no sería comunicar sus pensamientos a los que se preparan para los combates del día siguiente!

La hermosa e inmaculada carrera de su vida de Vd. terminándose en la sublime obra de la redención de los miserables y de los que sufren, sería la más bella sanción de nuestros sacrificios y la santa bendición para animarnos en la lucha. Yo no quiero halagarle diciéndole que mucho ha de vivir aún. ¡Ojalá viva más que yo para gloria de la patria y para mi satisfacción, pues de seguro que tendrá Vd. una lágrima y una palabra de justicia cuando sucumba por la causa que defiende. Pero el orden natural de las cosas parece que pide que Vd. muera antes que yo en época más o menos lejana; ¿qué le dirá a su Dios, usted, sacerdote de una religión que ha declarado iguales a todos los hombres? ¿Qué le dirá V. al Dios que ha odiado la tiranía y ha hecho por la independencia libre cuando le pregunte, ¿qué ha hecho por los infelices y por los oprimidos? ¿En qué ha empleado su extraordinaria inteligencia y su ilustración? ¿Por qué no ha seguido

los impulsos de su corazón que se ha estremecido al ver por todas partes injusticia, ignorancia, abyección y sufrimientos? ¿Qué le responderá V. a ese Dios cuando le diga a usted: "Yo he sufrido dura muerte por salvar a los hombres. ¿Que has hecho por tus hermanos?"

Perdone V. estas expansiones de mi corazón porque en ellas no va ninguna censura. ¿Quién soy? Un joven que aún no es hombre, que no tiene más méritos que el de pensar con arreglo a sus convicciones y expresarlas después francamente.

Admirándole siempre y desseando nos comunique parte de sus conocimientos, corto esta larga carta mía deseándole goce de buena salud.

Su afmo, s.q.b.s.m.

JOSÉ RIZAL."

(*Prosiguiendo.*) Señor Presidente, he abusado no poco de la benevolencia de mis colegas, y quiero dar término a este breve coloquio, con la promesa de que, después de que hayan hablado los señores que, según entiendo, consumirán turnos en contra de este proyecto de ley, pediré de nuevo la indulgencia del Senado para exponer mis puntos de vista, sobre todo en refutación de la llamada Pastoral de los señores Obispos filipinos que constituyen la jerarquía católica en Filipinas.

Senator SABIDO. Mr. President, will the gentleman yield?

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman may yield, if he so desires.

Senator RECTO. With pleasure.

Senator SABIDO. When Rizal wrote that letter addressed to Father García, did Rizal know the identity of Father García that he was a priest?

Senator RECTO. That he was a priest?

Senator SABIDO. Of the Catholic church.

Senator RECTO. Yes, because he was so informed by Mariano Ponce.

Senator SABIDO. So that letter was addressed by Rizal to a priest?

Senator RECTO. That is correct.

Senator SABIDO. Thank you.

Senator RECTO. The Senator must have observed how respectful was Rizal to this old priest, because of his age and his wisdom and his religious character as a priest.

Senator RODRIGO. Mr. President, will the gentleman yield to a few questions?

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman may yield, if he so desires.

Senator RECTO. With pleasure.

Senator RODRIGO. Mr. President, before I propound my questions, may I be allowed to make a short introductory remark to clarify my stand. First of all, Mr. President, I must confess publicly that I fell humble that I am now called upon to propound questions to our distinguished colleague,

Senator Recto. Since I was a young man I had already known Senator Recto as one of our greatest parliamentarians. I feel unequal of propounding questions to Senator Recto, and so, may I ask the gentleman here and those who are listening to please not touch the merits of this, because by comparing my very limited capacity to the brilliance of Senator Recto, your humble servant would suffer by the comparison.

Mr. President, I would like to announce that I venerate Dr. José Rizal as our greatest national hero and, as I said in my privilege speech, even with the attacks against his own teachings of the Church, I will still venerate him as our greatest national hero, and I would, even if Rizal were a Protestant, even if Rizal were a Moslem or a Buddhist, and even if he ridiculed, I suppose, the Catholic Church and did not retract, I would still consider him as our greatest national hero, because of the services and the sacrifices that he made for our country. I would like to clarify also, Mr. President, that I am not against the books of Rizal. I am not even against the reading. As a matter of fact, I read these books of Rizal when I was an A.B. student at the Ateneo de Manila.

Senator RECTO. May I interrupt the gentleman with a question.

Senator RODRIGO. May I continue first. Mr. President, I just want to finish this thought, and I beg the indulgence of the gentleman from Batangas. After all, when the gentleman was speaking for almost one and a half hours, I kept my peace. I waited until everything was finished before I stood up to propound my questions.

As I said, I read these books but since I am a Filipino and at the same time a Catholic, I sought the permission of ecclesiastical authorities to read the book, and I was so granted, because to their mind at that time, my faith was strong enough and my knowledge thereof sound enough to make me understand that if there were attacks in that book that does not mean that I would weaken in my faith, or lose my faith. I would like to state also that I have children, six of them, and when the time comes I shall tell them to read these two books because I want them to imbibe the nationalism that is the main message, one of the main messages, of these books. But at the same time, Mr. President, in my concern for the well-being of my children, I have two points of view. I look after their temporal well-being, but I also look after their eternal salvation. I want them to be nationalists. I want them to love their country, but at the same time I want to preserve in them also the Catholic faith. I

los impulsos de su corazón que se ha estremecido al ver por todas partes injusticia, ignorancia, abyección y sufrimientos? ¿Qué le responderá V. a ese Dios cuando le diga a usted: "Yo he sufrido dura muerte por salvar a los hombres. ¿Que has hecho por tus hermanos?"

Perdone V. estas expansiones de mi corazón porque en ellas no va ninguna censura. ¿Quién soy? Un joven que aún no es hombre, que no tiene más méritos que el de pensar con arreglo a sus convicciones y expresarlas después francamente.

Admirándole siempre y desseando nos comunique parte de sus conocimientos, corto esta larga carta mía deseándole goce de buena salud.

Su afmo, s.q.b.s.m.

JOSÉ RIZAL."

(*Prosiguiendo.*) Señor Presidente, he abusado no poco de la benevolencia de mis colegas, y quiero dar término a este breve coloquio, con la promesa de que, después de que hayan hablado los señores que, según entiendo, consumirán turnos en contra de este proyecto de ley, pediré de nuevo la indulgencia del Senado para exponer mis puntos de vista, sobre todo en refutación de la llamada Pastoral de los señores Obispos filipinos que constituyen la jerarquía católica en Filipinas.

Senator SABIDO. Mr. President, will the gentleman yield?

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman may yield, if he so desires.

Senator RECTO. With pleasure.

Senator SABIDO. When Rizal wrote that letter addressed to Father García, did Rizal know the identity of Father García that he was a priest?

Senator RECTO. That he was a priest?

Senator SABIDO. Of the Catholic church.

Senator RECTO. Yes, because he was so informed by Mariano Ponce.

Senator SABIDO. So that letter was addressed by Rizal to a priest?

Senator RECTO. That is correct.

Senator SABIDO. Thank you.

Senator RECTO. The Senator must have observed how respectful was Rizal to this old priest, because of his age and his wisdom and his religious character as a priest.

Senator RODRIGO. Mr. President, will the gentleman yield to a few questions?

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman may yield, if he so desires.

Senator RECTO. With pleasure.

Senator RODRIGO. Mr. President, before I propound my questions, may I be allowed to make a short introductory remark to clarify my stand. First of all, Mr. President, I must confess publicly that I fell humble that I am now called upon to propound questions to our distinguished colleague,

Senator Recto. Since I was a young man I had already known Senator Recto as one of our greatest parliamentarians. I feel unequal of propounding questions to Senator Recto, and so, may I ask the gentleman here and those who are listening to please not touch the merits of this, because by comparing my very limited capacity to the brilliance of Senator Recto, your humble servant would suffer by the comparison.

Mr. President, I would like to announce that I venerate Dr. José Rizal as our greatest national hero and, as I said in my privilege speech, even with the attacks against his own teachings of the Church, I will still venerate him as our greatest national hero, and I would, even if Rizal were a Protestant, even if Rizal were a Moslem or a Buddhist, and even if he ridiculed, I suppose, the Catholic Church and did not retract, I would still consider him as our greatest national hero, because of the services and the sacrifices that he made for our country. I would like to clarify also, Mr. President, that I am not against the books of Rizal. I am not even against the reading. As a matter of fact, I read these books of Rizal when I was an A.B. student at the Ateneo de Manila.

Senator RECTO. May I interrupt the gentleman with a question.

Senator RODRIGO. May I continue first. Mr. President, I just want to finish this thought, and I beg the indulgence of the gentleman from Batangas. After all, when the gentleman was speaking for almost one and a half hours, I kept my peace. I waited until everything was finished before I stood up to propound my questions.

As I said, I read these books but since I am a Filipino and at the same time a Catholic, I sought the permission of ecclesiastical authorities to read the book, and I was so granted, because to their mind at that time, my faith was strong enough and my knowledge thereof sound enough to make me understand that if there were attacks in that book that does not mean that I would weaken in my faith, or lose my faith. I would like to state also that I have children, six of them, and when the time comes I shall tell them to read these two books because I want them to imbibe the nationalism that is the main message, one of the main messages, of these books. But at the same time, Mr. President, in my concern for the well-being of my children, I have two points of view. I look after their temporal well-being, but I also look after their eternal salvation. I want them to be nationalists. I want them to love their country, but at the same time I want to preserve in them also the Catholic faith. I

am interested in the well-being of their body, in their well-being during their lifetime on earth. But at the same time, as a Catholic, I am also interested in their eternal happiness and, therefore, I must confess that I will not compel and I will not advise my son who is now 16 years old to read an unexpurgated edition of this book, because while it will inculcate in him nationalism, perhaps he cannot understand yet the philosophic messages of Rizal. It might weaken and destroy his faith.

But, Mr. President, when the time comes and I know that he can understand this book—I read it when I was 20 years old way back in 1934—I will prevail upon him to read this book. What I mean, Mr. President, is this. There are two things in the life of man. There are two loves in the heart of every Filipino, and that is, his love for his country, and his love for God—his feeling for nationalism and his feeling for religion. What I am trying to avoid, Mr. President, is for a conflict to arise between these two loves: between the love for country and the love for religion. And there are two loyalties in every man: loyalty to the government, and loyalty to his church. Every man wants to obey the government. It is the duty of every man to obey the laws passed by the government, but at the same time, every man who knows the real meaning of his religion, also wants to obey the rules and laws of the church. And what I want to avoid is the conflict where to obey the government is to violate the church, and where to obey the church is to disobey the government. And my understanding is very clear—as much as possible, I would like for us here to try our very best to look for a common ground, a middle ground, a *modus vivendi* where instead of conflict, there can be agreement between these two, and that is why Mr. President, I am suggesting a round-table conference.

Now, I would like to make it clear also, Mr. President, that in the same manner that the distinguished gentleman from Batangas reserved his right yesterday, when I delivered day before yesterday my speech, to propound more questions to me, after the gentleman has received a copy of my speech, may I also ask that permission to propound more questions to him, after I have been furnished by the Secretary with a copy of his speech and copies of the documents that he read.

Senator RECTO. Any time, Mr. Senator. May I propound some questions, before you propound yours, on your statement. I would like to know if you read the *NOLI* at the age of 20?

Senator RODRIGO. That is right, twenty.

Senator RECTO. Suppose you had read the *NOLI* at the age of 18, could you have lost your faith?

Senator RODRIGO. At the age of 18?

Senator RECTO. Yes, Your Honor.

Senator RODRIGO. Well, it is very hard to project my memory at that time.

Senator RECTO. What is your present reaction; would you have lost your faith if you had read the *NOLI* at 18?

Senator RODRIGO. I think in my particular case, if I read it at the age of 18, when I have not yet taken scholastic Philosophy and Literature, I have not yet taken advance subjects in religion, I might have wavered in my faith.

Senator RECTO. But what subjects did you take at that time on religious instruction when you were eighteen?

Senator RODRIGO. When I was eighteen? I stood up, Mr. President, to ask questions, but it seems that I am asked questions instead.

Senator RECTO. But the Senator made preliminary statements.

Senator RODRIGO. But first of all I would state this to the gentleman from Batangas. I think that the question of the gentleman from Batangas will have no bearing on the issue. Why, because he is asking me of my particular case, but the law seeks compulsory reading of these books by everybody, but as I said, I was prepared at the age of eighteen to read the two books when every student is not prepared to read the books at eighteen. But all these have no materiality to the discussion.

Senator RECTO. The gentleman is wrong in his assumption because all I wanted was to establish a comparison between him and his son who is now sixteen, because the gentleman said he would not allow his son to read the *Noli Me Tangere* until he is twenty. I think the Senator could have read the *Noli Me Tangere* even at the age of sixteen and preserved just the same his faith.

Senator RODRIGO. I do not know. Senator Recto is a better judge regarding himself and his son than I.

Senator RECTO. On that point. What was the Senator's religious instruction when he was sixteen?

Senator RODRIGO. (Silent)

Senator RECTO. If the gentleman declines to answer, it is his privilege. I made that question, Mr. Senator, the question on what his religious instruction was at the age of sixteen because, after all, the Senator must remember that during the last election campaign, the Senator had been facing his audience with the question of "What was he, the

Senator, before he was born?" It was a question nobody could answer except the Senator and the Senator answered it to his own satisfaction telling his audience what he was before he was born. Now, the Senator should know what religious preparation he had at the age of sixteen.

Senator RODRIGO. Well, Mr. President, I would have to bow down to Senator Recto in parliamentary procedure, in making people here laugh at his opponent. May I proceed to the question now? The gentleman from Batangas stated that the pastoral letter of the bishops condemned the two books as heretical and impious and condemned Rizal himself as heretical and impious. Now, the impression that that gives to me, more so to the man who has not read the pastoral is that these two books were heretical and impious, and that Rizal himself was heretical and impious. My question is, I have here a copy of the pastoral which I shall give to the gentleman from Batangas, may I request the gentleman to point to the pastoral where he read the portion to the effect that these books were condemned because they were heretical and impious and Rizal also was heretical and impious?

Senator RECTO. I have plenty of copies of that so-called pastoral because Father Mempin sent me one, you gave me one, and I have the newspapers' clippings. I have read this document carefully. Now, Your Honor, what conclusion would you draw from the statements made in the pastoral that certain passages of the books in question contained impieties and heresies?

Senator RODRIGO. Is that conclusion there? Senator RECTO. If you say, for instance that a book contains heresy, you mean to say that it is heretical; and if an author writes a heretical book, he is a heretic himself. That is the trouble with this pastoral. At the very start it makes strong protestations of veneration for Rizal's patriotism and his unparalleled service to his country, for which reason he should be foremost in our devotion. After these praises to Rizal the document points to certain passages of the book and states that they contain heresies and impieties, attacks on the dogmas and morals of the Catholic Church. And I checked the number of pages where the bishops allegedly found those passages, and I counted 170 or more pages in the *Noli Me Tangere* and over 50 pages in the *El Filibusterismo*. The Senator will still remember the old principle we were taught by the Jesuits: *Bonum ex integra causa, malum ex quocumque defectu*.

Senator RODRIGO. May I propose my question now? Well, I ask a very clear and categorical question. Therefore, there is no definite state-

ment in that pastoral made by the bishops that these two books are heretical and impious?

Senator RECTO. In a subtle and indirect way.

Senator RODRIGO. Or that Rizal was heretical or impious because words were not used to that effect but those words were used by the gentleman from Batangas himself.

Senator RECTO. The gentleman is a great literary man, everybody supposes or knows that, and he must agree that when one makes a long statement trying to demonstrate a particular proposition, a conclusion may be drawn from the entire statement as to what his intention and what his conclusion are. Does the gentleman mean to say that in examining this pastoral I have to find the very words "heretical" and "impious" before forming my judgment that the intention of the writer was to conclude that the books are heretical and impious containing, as he pretends they do, heretical passages and impieties? After all, what was the reason for the issuance of this pastoral if not to show that Rizal's books are impious and heretical? If they are not, why the pastoral, and why the opposition to the bill?

Senator RODRIGO. Mr. President, may I ask the question now? I just asked that question because this discussion is being heard by a lot of people, this will be broadcast over the radio and among those who will listen 90 per cent or 95 per cent will not have read the pastoral.

Senator RECTO. I desire to correct the gentleman. It has been published in all the papers, and it must have been widely read.

Senator RODRIGO. May I be allowed to finish before I am interrupted? Just as I said a while ago in this pastoral there is no direct statement by the bishops and that is in fairness to the members of the hierarchy who, according to the gentleman from Batangas, are Filipinos and who, according to the gentleman from Batangas also, are patriotic Filipinos, one of the highest in rank, Archbishop Rufino Santos, was in Fort Santiago during the Japanese occupation for ten months. But in fairness to them, I would like those who have listened to us but who have not read the pastoral to know, and I just want to make it clear to them, that those two words were not directly said in the pastoral. Maybe, that is the conclusion of the gentleman from Batangas, but those two words were not used in the pastoral.

Senator RECTO. That is the same conclusion of the pastoral and I know that it is the same conclusion of Your Honor. Does Your Honor consider these books not heretical? As a Catholic, from

Senator, before he was born?" It was a question nobody could answer except the Senator and the Senator answered it to his own satisfaction telling his audience what he was before he was born. Now, the Senator should know what religious preparation he had at the age of sixteen.

Senator RODRIGO. Well, Mr. President, I would have to bow down to Senator Recto in parliamentary procedure, in making people here laugh at his opponent. May I proceed to the question now? The gentleman from Batangas stated that the pastoral letter of the bishops condemned the two books as heretical and impious. Now, the impression that that gives to me, more so to the man who has not read the pastoral is that these two books were heretical and impious, and that Rizal himself was heretical and impious. My question is, I have here a copy of the pastoral which I shall give to the gentleman from Batangas, may I request the gentleman to point to the pastoral where he read the portion to the effect that these books were condemned because they were heretical and impious and Rizal also was heretical and impious?

Senator RECTO. I have plenty of copies of that so-called pastoral because Father Mempin sent me one, you gave me one, and I have the newspapers clippings. I have read this document carefully. Now, Your Honor, what conclusion would you draw from the statements made in the pastoral that certain passages of the books in question contained impieties and heresies?

Senator RODRIGO. Is that conclusion there?

Senator RECTO. If you say, for instance that a book contains heresy, you mean to say that it is heretical; and if an author writes a heretical book, he is a heretic himself. That is the trouble with this pastoral. At the very start it makes strong protestations of veneration for Rizal's patriotism and his unparalleled service to his country, for which reason he should be foremost in our devotion. After these praises to Rizal the document points to certain passages of the book and states that they contain heresies and impieties, attacks on the dogmas and morals of the Catholic Church. And I checked the number of pages where the bishops allegedly found those passages, and I counted 170 or more pages in the *Noli Me Tangere* and over 50 pages in the *El Filibusterismo*. The Senator will still remember the old principle we were taught by the Jesuits: *Bonum ex integra causa, malum ex quocumque defectu*.

Senator RODRIGO. May I propose my question now? Well, I ask a very clear and categorical question. Therefore, there is no definite state-

ment in that pastoral made by the bishops that these two books are heretical and impious?

Senator RECTO. In a subtle and indirect way.

Senator RODRIGO. Or that Rizal was heretical or impious because words were not used to that effect but those words were used by the gentleman from Batangas himself.

Senator RECTO. The gentleman is a great literary man, everybody supposes or knows that, and he must agree that when one makes a long statement trying to demonstrate a particular proposition, a conclusion may be drawn from the entire statement as to what his intention and what his conclusion are. Does the gentleman mean to say that in examining this pastoral I have to find the very words "heretical" and "impious" before forming my judgment that the intention of the writer was to conclude that the books are heretical and impious containing, as he pretends they do, heretical passages and impieties? After all, what was the reason for the issuance of this pastoral if not to show that Rizal's books are impious and heretical? If they are not, why the pastoral, and why the opposition to the bill?

Senator RODRIGO. Mr. President, may I ask the question now? I just asked that question because this discussion is being heard by a lot of people, this will be broadcast over the radio and among those who will listen 90 per cent or 95 per cent will not have read the pastoral.

Senator RECTO. I desire to correct the gentleman. It has been published in all the papers, and it must have been widely read.

Senator RODRIGO. May I be allowed to finish before I am interrupted? Just as I said a while ago in this pastoral there is no direct statement by the bishops and that is in fairness to the members of the hierarchy who, according to the gentleman from Batangas, are Filipinos and who, according to the gentleman from Batangas also, are patriotic Filipinos, one of the highest in rank, Archbishop Rufino Santos, was in Fort Santiago during the Japanese occupation for ten months. But in fairness to them, I would like those who have listened to us but who have not read the pastoral to know, and I just want to make it clear to them, that those two words were not directly said in the pastoral. Maybe, that is the conclusion of the gentleman from Batangas, but those two words were not used in the pastoral.

Senator RECTO. That is the same conclusion of the pastoral and I know that it is the same conclusion of Your Honor. Does Your Honor consider these books not heretical? As a Catholic, from

the point of view of religion, what is Your Honor's opinion? Are these books heretical?

Senator RODRIGO. This is my opinion and this is what is stated in the pastoral, and I am going to read it. This is my opinion, that the pastoral says. I want to make it clear of what the pastoral says, and it says:

"Some of Rizal's most cogent insights into the political and social order are undoubtedly contained in his two novels, *Noli Me Tangere* and *El Filibusterismo*. * * *

"We wish to make it clear that insofar as these novels give expression to our people's desire for political freedom and a social order based on justice they are not at variance with the practical applications of Catholic doctrine to the exigencies of the social milieu as it existed at the time. The Catholic Church in itself, as distinguished from the human and fallible individuals who compose it, is not, never has been, and never will be arrayed against the legitimate political and social aspirations of any people. If it were, it should not be what it is called: Catholic, that is universal. Hence it follows that the clear and even forceful expression of such aspirations can never be injurious to the Catholic Church. The aims and objectives of that Church, being supernatural, are also supra-national; between them and national aims, provided these are in conformity with the principles of morality, no conflict is possible."

Unfortunately, however, these novels written when our national hero, estranged for a time from our faith and religion, did contradict many of our Christian beliefs. Then the pastoral goes on:

"In these two novels we find passages against Catholic Dogma and morals where repeated attacks are made against the Catholic religion in general, against the possibility of miracles, against the doctrine of Purgatory, against the Sacrament of Baptism, * * *"

Senator RECTO. Those are charges of heresy.

Senator RODRIGO. Now, this is what I would like to clarify. The Catholic church or the Catholic Hierarchy was very, very respectful to Dr. Rizal in this pastoral. We can say one thing in different ways. The Church says in conclusion that they find certain passages are objectionable. Now, if that is the definition of heresy, well and good, then that is heresy. But what I would not want to remain in the minds of our people is that the Catholic bishops used that very strong and insulting term—heretic. Maybe, the same conclusion was arrived at, but couched in very respectful language out of respect for the memory of our national hero.

Senator RECTO. May I answer Your Honor's question instead of your answering it.

Senator RODRIGO. Yes. I was waiting for the gentleman to answer my question, but instead of

answering my question, the gentleman asks me questions.

Senator RECTO. Your Honor asked me to read passages of this pastoral which will justify my conclusion that the bishops in the Philippines have called the books of Rizal heretical and impious.

Senator RODRIGO. That is not my question, Mr. President.

Senator RECTO. Your Honor has challenged me to find in this pastoral these passages . . .

Senator RODRIGO. No, No. Let me clarify my question. The meaning of my question is being distorted a little the way the gentleman interprets it. The gentleman says that I asked him to point out passages in the pastoral which lead him to the conclusion that the two novels are heretical. My question, Mr. President, was and is: Is there any direct statement in the pastoral where the bishops said expressly that these two books are "heretical and impious", or any portion of the pastoral where the bishops . . .

Senator RECTO. They said so, not in so many words, not necessarily by using the words "heretic" or "heretical", but by proving that they are so. I will show the gentleman the pertinent passages. On page 7, paragraph 10, the pastoral says:

"In these two novels we find passages against Catholic Dogma and morals, where repeated attacks are made against the Catholic religion in general, against the possibility of miracles, against the doctrine of Purgatory, against the Sacrament of Baptism, against Confession, Communion, Holy Mass, against the doctrine of Indulgences, Church prayers, the Catechism of Christian Doctrine, sermons, sacramentals and books of piety. There are even passages casting doubts on or covering with confusion God's omnipotence, the existence of hell, the mystery of the Most Blessed Trinity, and the two natures of Christ."

Well, if, according to the pastoral, Rizal attacked everything in Catholic Dogmas, Faith and Morals, how can Your Honor deny my right to say that, according to this pastoral, these bishops called Rizal a heretic and his books heretical and impious? I will proceed. Paragraph 11 of the pastoral says:

"Similarly, we find passages which disparage divine worship especially the veneration of images and relics, devotion to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, the use of scapulars, cords and habits, the praying of rosaries, novenas, ejaculations and indulgenced prayers. Even vocal prayers are included such as the Our Father, the Hail Mary, the Doxology, the Act of Contrition, and the Angelus, Mass ceremonies, baptismal and exequial rites, worship of the Cross, the use of holy water and candles, processions, bells and even the Sacred Sunday obligations do not escape scorn."

Well, after the above enumeration what is left of the Catholic Dogma and Morals that Rizal did not scorn and attack, granting the conclusions of the pastoral to be correct? What is left? I proceed. Paragraph 12 of the pastoral says:

"We also find passages that make light of ecclesiastical discipline, especially in what concerns stole fees, alms to the Church, alms in suffrages for the dead, authority of the Pope, excommunication, education in Catholic schools, Pontifical privileges, Catholic burial, the organization of nunneries and monasteries, Confraternities, Third Orders, etc."

These are the actual findings, according to the pastoral, from its author's serene and impartial reading of the two novels. On the basis of said findings, I said that the pastoral has called Rizal's books, or passages thereof, heretical and impious, and I know that in doing so, I even spoke with sobriety and I made an understatement.

Senator RODRIGO. May I proceed now? Therefore, my question has been answered that in the pastoral there is no direct and definite statement, specific statement. That has been answered. That is all that I want, because as I said . . .

Senator RECTO. But what has Your Honor proved with that point. Supposing that the very words "heresy" and "impiousness" have not been used, what the pastoral says includes them, and more. What the pastoral says is more than what these words imply.

Senator RODRIGO. There are words, distinguished gentleman from Batangas, which do not sound . . .

Senator RECTO. Unless the passages I have read of the pastoral are withdrawn, I cannot withdraw my conclusion that the bishops called these books heretical and impious.

Senator RODRIGO. Well, I just wanted to clarify that, because there are words which might be the same but words which might be used which hurt the ears and which might be considered as absolute disrespect for Dr. José Rizal, and that is the only thing I would like to clarify.

Now, may I go to my next question. The gentleman from Batangas made the statement that this pastoral was signed by the bishops by merely perhaps following Father Cavanna.

Senator RECTO. I did not say that it was signed by the bishops. In fact, it is not signed by any bishop, by anybody. It simply says it is a statement of the Catholic hierarchy.

Senator RODRIGO. Well, the presumption is that this was approved by the Catholic hierarchy.

Senator RECTO. Well, I do not know what they mean by "Catholic hierarchy": The question is that

I have not seen any signature under the document, and it is an open secret that it was Father Cavanna who wrote it.

Senator RODRIGO. In fairness to the members of the Philippine hierarchy who are our countrymen and whom we will not deny patriotism and a certain amount of wisdom, most of them are Doctors of Divinity, theologians, now before making that insinuation or accusation, did the gentleman from Batangas . . .

Senator RECTO. What is the accusation? I protest against your assumption, because there is no accusation involved in my statement that they adopted as their own the draft prepared by Father Cavanna. What is the charge?

Senator RODRIGO. The accusation is that it is an open secret that it was only Father Cavanna who prepared this pastoral.

Senator RECTO. I did not exactly say it was only Father Cavanna who prepared the pastoral, or the draft thereof; he may have been helped by others; but as I was told by a distinguished lady of the Catholic movement, and I will give you the name, Father Cavanna was the one who was preparing it.

Senator RODRIGO. Will you give the name, please?

Senator RECTO. Mrs. Josefa Estrada. She asked me to wait for this document because it was still being written by Father Cavanna. I asked her who was Father Cavanna because I did not know really who Father Cavanna was and she answered: "Oh, he is a very wise theologian, a philosopher." And I said, "All right, there is time for that, because we are still holding public hearings; we would be very glad to read it."

Senator RODRIGO. Now, but let me clarify that in justice to the members of our hierarchy. From my own knowledge, I would like to state that the Philippine hierarchy appointed a committee of Filipino theologians, and by the way, Father Cavanna is a Filipino, to study this matter.

Senator RECTO. Was Father de la Costa in that committee?

Senator RODRIGO. No, Father de la Costa is now in the United States, but there was one Jesuit, Father Ledesma; there was one Filipino S.V.D. I forgot his name; but I think they were about five or six who made a joint study of these two novels, then they reported the findings to the bishops.

Senator RECTO. Was the committee headed by Father Cavanna?

Senator RODRIGO. I do not think so. It was headed by a bishop.

Senator RECTO. Who was the bishop?

Senator RODRIGO. I do not know. It was either Bishop Reyes or Bishop Gonzaga.

Senator RECTO. Did the bishops meet in council?

Senator RODRIGO. They met.

Senator RECTO. In Manila?

Senator RODRIGO. I do not know. I think it was in Manila.

Senator RECTO. All the bishops?

Senator RODRIGO. Only Filipino bishops, because there are some bishops who are not Filipino.

Senator RECTO. Yes, I know; all the Filipino bishops came here for that meeting?

Senator RODRIGO. I cannot say that all of them, but if not all, most of them.

Senator RECTO. Most of them? Can I have the names?

Senator RODRIGO. I do not know the names.

Senator RECTO. But the gentleman gives us the impression that he is furnishing the Senate with some information of his own knowledge and I have not disputed the opportunities that the gentleman has had to have this kind of information.

Senator RODRIGO. I am only giving the knowledge in so far as my knowledge reaches; now I cannot be expected to give information where my knowledge no longer reaches, but my knowledge up to that.

Senator RECTO. So the gentleman was not present at the meeting of the bishops?

Senator RODRIGO. Of course not. It would not be proper for a layman or a Senator of this Republic to be present at the meeting of the bishops.

Senator RECTO. It would not have been proper but Your Honor could have been present just the same.

Senator RODRIGO. No, Senator Recto, I was not present.

Senator RECTO. So your knowledge on this matter is pure hearsay.

Senator RODRIGO. In so far as the existence of the committee is concerned and in so far as the knowledge of the gentleman from Batangas, which is likewise hearsay from Mrs. Josefa González Estrada.

Senator RECTO. It was not hearsay. I had direct conversation with her.

Senator RODRIGO. Yes, but Mrs. Josefa González Estrada was not present. Did she tell the gentleman that she was present?

Senator RECTO. She told me that Father Cavanna was preparing the draft of the pastoral. She did not tell me that she was present at the bishops' council.

Senator RODRIGO. Well, does Your Honor know for sure whether she was present when Father Cavanna was preparing it?

Senator RECTO. I did not inquire about that.

Senator RODRIGO. In the same way I did not inquire.

Senator RECTO. Well, I did not ask you to.

Senator RODRIGO. Let us just exchange our own knowledge.

Senator RECTO. Your Honor, I did not ask you to make inquiries about that. I wanted to establish the nature and character of your knowledge. That is all. I am not interested whether you were present at those councils.

Senator RODRIGO. But I would like to tell the gentleman from Batangas that the source of my information about this is more reliable in so far as the knowledge of what is going on in the council is concerned.

Senator RECTO. Is the gentleman attacking the credibility of Mrs. Josefa González Estrada?

Senator RODRIGO. No, I do not, but I say that my informant is more reliable than Mrs. Estrada. I did not say that she is not reliable.

Senator RECTO. Well, I will inquire further where she got her information. I will tell her about your claim that you are better informed than she is.

Senator RODRIGO. Now, may I go to my next question, and Mr. President, I would like to announce that my personal feelings here do not matter. I am defending a cause, even if I am subjected to any kind of ridicule I am just here to present a cause and to defend the people who need to be defended.

Senator RECTO. I do not think anybody is ridiculing the Senator.

Senator RODRIGO. I do not mind all of this. Now, may I go to my next question? The gentleman stated that these two books were already passed upon during the Spanish time.

Senator RECTO. No, no, no.

Senator RODRIGO. Not by the church but by that sort of committee.

Senator RECTO. No, no, neither. The "Noli" is the only book passed upon by the Claustro Universitario de Santo Tomás composed of professors of the University. They were all Spaniards and Dominicans.

Senator RODRIGO. Only the "Noli"?

Senator RECTO. Yes.

Senator RODRIGO. Is it not true that the "Noli" was written way ahead of the "Filibusterismo"?

Senator RECTO. Of course "El Filibusterismo" was written after the "Noli".

Senator RODRIGO. About five or six years after the "Noli"?

Senator RECTO. "El Filibusterismo" is the second part of the "Noli". I think the "Noli" was written in 1886, but the first copy arrived in Manila by the middle of 1887, and if my memory is correct, "El Filibusterismo" was printed in 1891.

Senator RODRIGO. Now, and Your Honor said that the "Noli" was submitted to this committee for study and conclusion?

Senator RECTO. Yes, first to the Claustro Universitario of the University of Santo Tomás, then the opinion or report of this committee was passed on to General Terrero, who referred the whole matter to the "Comisión Permanente de Censura" headed by an Agustinian father, Salvador Font, who took charge of preparing another report.

Senator RODRIGO. Is the gentleman sure that when the "Noli" referred to that committee at that time, the Filibusterismo was already distributed and already known?

Senator RECTO. It was not yet published. That was by the end of 1887 and, as I said, FILIBUSTERISMO was not printed before 1891.

Senator RODRIGO. Because the gentleman stated in the Spanish time only the NOLI was printed but not the FILIBUSTERISMO. The reason for that is when this was submitted to the committee for study, only the NOLI was in existence, but the FILIBUSTERISMO was not yet in existence.

Senator RECTO. But the friars and bishops could have taken action against the FILIBUSTERISMO when it was distributed and circulated five years after the NOLI and five years before the execution of Rizal. From 1891 to 1896 they had plenty of time to act on the FILIBUSTERISMO.

Senator RODRIGO. But the fact is since the committee released its report regarding the book, only the NOLI was in existence and, therefore, the NOLI was submitted to them, and the FILIBUSTERISMO was not yet submitted?

Senator RECTO. That is correct as a fact.

Senator RODRIGO. The gentleman stated that the committee arrived at two conclusions there. This was treason against Mother Spain and against religion.

Senator RECTO. Not only against Spain, but as heretical and impious.

Senator RODRIGO. At that time the words "heretic" and "impious" were expressly used in the findings.

Senator RECTO. Well, I have the document here, if the gentleman wants me to read it again.

Senator RODRIGO. I heard it already. It is very clear, and the gentleman made a distinction between that pronouncement and the pastoral now.

Senator RECTO. May I complete my answer? Those pronouncements, those findings, made by friars were milder pronouncements if compared to those made by our own bishops.

Senator RODRIGO. May I continue. The gentleman from Batangas made the statement, and may I request that I just be allowed to finish the question. I am so inexperienced in this thing, and am so young in politics. I am just requesting a little leeway.

Senator RECTO. I will ask the gentleman to make the same concession, to allow me to complete my answer. I was not interrupting him.

Senator RODRIGO. May I go to my question now, I am not a parliamentarian. When my question is interrupted, I lose the tread of thought.

Senator RECTO. The gentleman is an excellent parliamentarian, and I think that is the unanimous opinion of this body.

Senator RODRIGO. Except me. I consider myself not even a parliamentarian at all. Mr. President, may I continue. The gentleman stated that there is a difference between that pronouncement then, and the pronouncement now. While in the pronouncement made during the Spanish times the books were considered against Spain, as treasonous against Spain, they are now considered as heroic, nationalistic and patriotic. Now, I am sure the gentleman from Batangas will agree with me that the reason for the change is because of the change in circumstances. At that time we were under Spain, and the committee assigned to study the books was composed of Spaniards. So they looked at it from the point of view of Spain, and they considered them against Spain; while now the pastoral was prepared by Filipino bishops, and they considered the books as patriotic, instead of impious.

Senator RECTO. Heretical, just the same.

Senator RODRIGO. There is a change from the point of view of nationalism, not from the point of view of religion. My question is: While there is a change in circumstances regarding our country politically, while there is a change in the nationality of the people, was there any change in the dogma or teachings of the Catholic church, and was there any change in the wording of these books?

Senator RECTO. The change is that these friars who called the books heretical were milder in their pronouncements than the Filipino bishops who would not have been bishops had it not been for Rizal and his writings.

Senator RODRIGO. About five or six years after the "Noli"?

Senator RECTO. "El Filibusterismo" is the second part of the "Noli". I think the "Noli" was written in 1886, but the first copy arrived in Manila by the middle of 1887, and if my memory is correct, "El Filibusterismo" was printed in 1891.

Senator RODRIGO. Now, and Your Honor said that the "Noli" was submitted to this committee for study and conclusion?

Senator RECTO. Yes, first to the Claustro Universitario of the University of Santo Tomás, then the opinion or report of this committee was passed on to General Terrero, who referred the whole matter to the "Comisión Permanente de Censura" headed by an Agustinian father, Salvador Font, who took charge of preparing another report.

Senator RODRIGO. Is the gentleman sure that when the "Noli" referred to that committee at that time, the Filibusterismo was already distributed and already known?

Senator RECTO. It was not yet published. That was by the end of 1887 and, as I said, FILIBUSTERISMO was not printed before 1891.

Senator RODRIGO. Because the gentleman stated in the Spanish time only the NOLI was printed but not the FILIBUSTERISMO. The reason for that is when this was submitted to the committee for study, only the NOLI was in existence, but the FILIBUSTERISMO was not yet in existence.

Senator RECTO. But the friars and bishops could have taken action against the FILIBUSTERISMO when it was distributed and circulated five years after the NOLI and five years before the execution of Rizal. From 1891 to 1896 they had plenty of time to act on the FILIBUSTERISMO.

Senator RODRIGO. But the fact is since the committee released its report regarding the book, only the NOLI was in existence and, therefore, the NOLI was submitted to them, and the FILIBUSTERISMO was not yet submitted?

Senator RECTO. That is correct as a fact. Senator RODRIGO. The gentleman stated that the committee arrived at two conclusions there. This was treason against Mother Spain and against religion.

Senator RECTO. Not only against Spain, but as heretical and impious.

Senator RODRIGO. At that time the words "heretic" and "impious" were expressly used in the findings.

Senator RECTO. Well, I have the document here, if the gentleman wants me to read it again.

Senator RODRIGO. I heard it already. It is very clear, and the gentleman made a distinction between that pronouncement and the pastoral now.

Senator RECTO. May I complete my answer? Those pronouncements, those findings, made by friars were milder pronouncements if compared to those made by our own bishops.

Senator RODRIGO. May I continue. The gentleman from Batangas made the statement, and may I request that I just be allowed to finish the question. I am so inexperienced in this thing, and am so young in politics. I am just requesting a little leeway.

Senator RECTO. I will ask the gentleman to make the same concession, to allow me to complete my answer. I was not interrupting him.

Senator RODRIGO. May I go to my question now, I am not a parliamentarian. When my question is interrupted, I lose the tread of thought.

Senator RECTO. The gentleman is an excellent parliamentarian, and I think that is the unanimous opinion of this body.

Senator RODRIGO. Except me. I consider myself not even a parliamentarian at all. Mr. President, may I continue. The gentleman stated that there is a difference between that pronouncement then, and the pronouncement now. While in the pronouncement made during the Spanish times the books were considered against Spain, as treasonous against Spain, they are now considered as heroic, nationalistic and patriotic. Now, I am sure the gentleman from Batangas will agree with me that the reason for the change is because of the change in circumstances. At that time we were under Spain, and the committee assigned to study the books was composed of Spaniards. So they looked at it from the point of view of Spain, and they considered them against Spain; while now the pastoral was prepared by Filipino bishops, and they considered the books as patriotic, instead of impious.

Senator RECTO. Heretical, just the same.

Senator RODRIGO. There is a change from the point of view of nationalism, not from the point of view of religion. My question is: While there is a change in circumstances regarding our country politically, while there is a change in the nationality of the people, was there any change in the dogma or teachings of the Catholic church, and was there any change in the wording of these books?

Senator RECTO. The change is that these friars who called the books heretical were milder in their pronouncements than the Filipino bishops who would not have been bishops had it not been for Rizal and his writings.

Senator RODRIGO. But has there been a change in the Catholic dogmas and Catholic teachings during those times and now?

Senator RECTO. If there has been a change in the dogmas, the gentleman should know better than I.

Senator RODRIGO. Apparently, the gentleman wants me to answer my own question. There has been no change in dogmas.

Senator RECTO. Where did the Senator acquire that knowledge?

Senator RODRIGO. I acquired that from the Ateneo de Manila where the gentleman also studied.

Senator RECTO. I was not the recipient of that benefit.

Senator RODRIGO. That is my stand now on the basis of my own knowledge, and I do not look for disagreement, other people might disagree. I will not compel other people might agree with me but that is my own knowledge.

Senator RECTO. I am not so sure if there have been changes. But there was a time, according to Catholic doctrine, when the earth was flat, and the sun was moving around the earth. Now, the church has yielded to science, and has accepted the principle first espoused by Galileo that the earth is round and it moves around the sun. Now, may I remind Your Honor that Joan of Arc was burned at the stake as a heretic? One of the charges was that she pretended to hear "voices", in direct communication with heaven, through St. Catherine, and not through the ministers of the church. She was burned at the stake, by order of the Church. The case was reviewed by order of the Holy Father twenty-five years later. The whole process was re-examined, with the result that the Vatican pronounced Joan of Arc, orthodox, not heretical. Shortly after 1906 Joan of Arc was beatified, and twenty years ago, she was canonized. Apparently, there has been a change of dogmas, because she was ordered burned by the Holy Inquisition as a heretic, guilty of heresy, for communicating directly with God, instead of through the ministers of the Church. But exactly on the same facts she was pronounced orthodox by the same institution that had burned her as a heretic.

Senator RODRIGO. Gentleman from Batangas, may I clarify that that is not a matter of dogma, that is a matter of appreciation of facts. As a matter of fact, there are several other facts.

Senator RECTO. By the way the gentleman is talking about this matter, he makes me suspect

that he has had a hand in the preparation of this pastoral. And I think that is paying a tribute to the gentleman. I do not mean to deride the gentleman.

Senator RODRIGO. I would like to state that I had no part in the preparation of this pastoral. If I had a part in this pastoral, that would have been my suggestion, which I declared publicly, about having footnoted editions which would have been incorporated in the pastoral. Now, the only thing I wanted to clarify is this, that if there was a similarity or identity of findings of the Council during the Spanish times and the Church now, it is because the Catholic dogma and faith have not changed and the book itself has not changed, but to show that the people have changed, the Catholic bishops who are Filipinos and who know how to abide by the changing circumstances disagreed with the findings of the Spanish friars then in a display of nationalism.

Senator RECTO. That is very unusual, that the Filipino bishops should speak of patriotism and the Spanish friars should speak of treason against Spain, in either case on the basis of the same books.

Senator RODRIGO. There is nothing unusual in that and there is nothing unusual in the bishops today. May I be allowed to finish what I am saying? There is nothing unusual in that.

Senator RECTO. Is there anything particularly meritorious in that?

Senator RODRIGO. Mr. President, may I be allowed to finish what I am saying? There is nothing unusual in the members of our hierarchy disagreeing with the Friars on their decision regarding the works of Rizal. From the national aspect, I agree there is nothing unusual in that. Their findings on the religious aspect should be the same as the findings of these Spaniards then on the religious aspect.

Senator RECTO. May I say that the findings of the Filipino bishops are more severe against Rizal than the findings of the Spanish friars?

Senator RODRIGO. But the findings of the Filipino bishops are more specific, but as to the wording, I request everybody here who may be listening if this is broadcast to please read the pastoral. I will not argue on that anymore, just read the pastoral in fairness and in justice to our countrymen who are the bishops of our hierarchy. Mr. President, the gentleman from Quezon, called my attention to the fact that it is already one o'clock but I have still some questions I want to clarify.

SUSPENSIÓN DE LA SESIÓN

Senator PRIMICIAS. Mr. President, with the permission of the two gentlemen who are engaging in an interchange of ideas, I wish to state that it is now one o'clock p. m. and without prejudice to continuing their interesting tirades this afternoon, I request that we suspend discussion of this question until five o'clock.

The PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the session is suspended until five o'clock this afternoon.

Era la 1:05 p. m.

REANUDACIÓN DE LA SESIÓN

Se reanuda la sesión a las 5:30 p. m.

El PRESIDENTE. Se reanuda la sesión.

MOCIÓN PRIMICIAS

Senator PRIMICIAS. Mr. President, this noon we suspended the session of the Senate reserving the right of the distinguished gentleman from Bulacán, Senator Rodrigo, to continue interpellating the gentleman from Batangas and that the said continuation be held this afternoon. I ask that that continuation be postponed until tomorrow. In the meantime we can proceed considering these various measures in the calendar of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT. If there is no objection to the motion on the part of the Senate, the same is carried. *(There was none.)*

CONSIDERACIÓN DEL C. R. NO. 2896

(Continuación)

Senator PRIMICIAS. Mr. President, I now ask that we resume consideration of House Bill No. 2896. The sponsor of this measure was the distinguished gentleman from Manila and Pampanga. He was sponsoring this measure when the consideration thereof was suspended. I ask that he now be recognized.

The PRESIDENT. The resumption of the consideration of House Bill No. 2896 is in order. The gentleman from Manila and Pampanga has the floor.

Senator PÚYAT. Mr. President, when we were discussing this bill after my sponsorship speech, the gentleman from Iloilo, Senator López, expressed his opposition to this bill. Now he admitted that perhaps his opposition will be solved by the amendments which I have prepared. I distributed copies of the amendments and the gentleman from Iloilo now asks that he be given a few days within which to study these amendments.

MOCIÓN DE APLAZAMIENTO

Therefore I ask for the postponement of the discussion of this bill until next Wednesday.

Senator PRIMICIAS. Mr. President, I second the motion of the gentleman from Manila and Pampanga to postpone consideration of this bill until Wednesday.

The PRESIDENT. If there is no objection on the part of the Senate, the motion is carried. *(There was none.)*

SEGUNDA LECTURA Y CONSIDERACIÓN DEL
C. R. NO. 2676

Senator PRIMICIAS. Mr. President, I now ask that we consider House Bill No. 2676.

The PRESIDENT. Consideration of House Bill No. 2676 is now in order. The Secretary will please read the bill.

The SECRETARY:

ELECTION CODE OF THE PHILIPPINES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Philippines in Congress assembled:

ARTICLE I.—General Provisions

SECTION 1. [Short] Title.—This Act shall be known and cited as the [Revised] Election Code OF THE PHILIPPINES. (R. A. 180-1)

SEC. 2. [Elections governed by this Code] APPLICABILITY OF THIS ACT.—All elections of public OFFICIALS [officers by the people] and all votings in connection with plebiscites shall be conducted in [conformity with the provisions of this Code] THE MANNER PROVIDED BY THIS ACT AND BY SUCH RULES AND REGULATIONS ISSUED BY THE COMMISSION ON ELECTIONS [IN PURSUANCE THEREOF]. (C. A. 357-1; R. A. 180-2)

SEC. 3. Supervision of elections.—THE PROVISIONS OF ANY [EXISTING] LAW TO THE CONTRARY NOTWITHSTANDING, the Commission on Elections shall [in addition to the powers and functions conferred upon it by the Constitution,] have direct and EXCLUSIVE [immediate] supervision AND CONTROL:

(A) Over [the] NATIONAL, provincial, CITY, municipal, [and city] AND MUNICIPAL DISTRICT officials REQUIRED [designated] by law to perform duties relative to the conduct of elections, IN THE PERFORMANCE THEREOF;

(a) OVER NATIONAL AND LOCAL OFFICIALS, INCLUDING MEMBERS OF ANY (LOCAL OR) NATIONAL OR LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY [OR] AND INSTRUMENTALITY OF THE GOVERNMENT, WHEN DESIGNATED OR APPOINTED BY THE COMMISSION ON ELECTIONS AS ITS DEPUTIES OR REPRESENTATIVES, RELATIVE TO THE CONDUCT OF ELECTIONS, [THE] AND SAID OFFICIALS AND MEMBERS OF ANY [LOCAL OR] NATIONAL OR LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY AFOREMENTIONED [SHALL PERFORM THEIR DUTIES AS THE LAW OR THE COMMISSION ON ELECTIONS MAY DETERMINE AND] SHALL, WHEN SO REQUIRED BY THE COMMISSION, PROCEED IMMEDIATELY TO THE DESIGNATED TERRITORY OR AREA TO WHICH THEY MAY BE ASSIGNED AND NOT LEAVE NOR TRANSFER FROM SUCH TERRITORY OR AREA TO ANOTHER, DURING THE ELECTION PERIOD, WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OR CONSENT OF THE COMMISSION ON ELECTIONS.

[It] THE COMMISSION ON ELECTIONS may suspend [from the performance of said duties] any [of said] official [s] REFERRED TO IN THE PRECEDING PARAGRAPHS FROM THE PERFORMANCE OF HIS DUTIES, who [shall] VIOLATES THE ELECTION LAW OR fails to comply with its instructions, orders, decisions or rulings; and appoint [their temporary] HIS substitute [s], and upon recommendation of the Commission, the President of the Philippines OR THE CORRE-