

mada y uso de armas de fuego sin licencia, es decir, con todas las agravantes citadas en el Código Penal, fueron solamente condenados unos a cadena perpetua y otros a 30 años de prisión.

Al levantar mi humilde voz en esta ocasión, deseo llamar la atención de todo el país al hecho de que el Comunismo se ha caracterizado siempre por su crueldad, por su menosprecio a la vida y la libertad, a pretexto de propulsar el bienestar de las masas. Stalin y sus colaboradores sacrificaron millones de vidas para poner en vigor sus pretendidas reformas agrarias. Mao Tse Tung no ha titubeado en sacrificar la vida de millones de sus súbditos. Pero, señor Presidente, no obstante todas las crueldades, no obstante los torrentes de sangre inocente vertida en Rusia, en China y en los demás satélites de la Rusia Soviética, no sabemos de ningún crimen tan horrendo, tan sangriento y tan brutal como el que acaba de perpetrarse en Laguna. Este crimen, señor Presidente, y otros que están en la memoria de todos, prueban concluyentemente que el Hukbalahap, que al principio hizo campaña de prosetismo bajo pretexto de propulsar el bienestar de las masas, es, en realidad, ahora una pandilla de bandoleros que para obtener dinero y cosas de valor no titubean en sacrificar las vidas de mujeres indefensas y dignas de respeto.

Muchas gracias.

Senator PRIMICIAS. Mr. President, the distinguished gentleman from Iloilo, Senator López, would like to use the rest of the privilege hour and I ask that he be recognized.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman from Iloilo is recognized.

MANIFESTACIONES DEL SEN. LOPEZ

Senator LOPEZ. Mr. President, and gentlemen of the Senate: "I declare myself a Catholic and in this religion in which I was born and educated, I wish to live and die."

This beautiful passage from Rizal's retraction impressed me deeply when I first learned it as a young student, and since then, the message has become an inspiration for me, giving me pride at being a Catholic, and providing me strength and assurance in my belief that my Catholic faith is the medium through which I can attain eternal salvation and partake of the glories of my God and Creator in the life hereafter.

In these feelings, I have also come to feel a sense of attachment to our former Mother Country Spain to whom we owe everlasting gratitude for having given us not only our culture and our civilization, but most of all, the Catholic faith, which, up to

this day, forms a significant part of the spiritual lives of the great majority of our countrymen, and by reason of which, we have been proclaimed as the only Christian country in the Far East.

It cannot be denied that although the colonial policy adopted by Spain when she set forth to build herself an Empire had its merits, it was also full of grave defects. If such defects did not exist, some of Spain's representatives would have never succeeded in committing injustices and ignominies in some of her far-flung colonies. The Spanish government meant well when it adopted those policies, particularly those that affected public administration and religious conversion. But then, perhaps distance, the lack of communication and transportation facilities, the absence of a militant press and human weakness conspired together to help distort those aims, thus giving way to the abuses perpetrated by her local political administrators and by some of the friars entrusted with the work of evangelization and conversion of the natives.

In the case of our country, the abuses and the indiscretions committed by some of Spain's political as well as religious representatives in this country gave cause to our people to unite, inflamed their patriotism, and aroused in them a desire for reforms and to emancipate themselves from the yoke of Spanish rule and domination.

With this end in view, and inspired with patriotic order, our ancestors sought to liberate their native land from the shackles of tyranny and oppression. Those patriots waged the struggle for freedom in many ways, so that while Bonifacio and Aguinaldo took up the weapons of revolt, Rizal and del Pilar gave their brilliant minds and their genius to support the cause of their countrymen by exposing the evils obtaining during that period and advocating for reforms by means of their pens and literary works.

It is our hope and our desire that present-day Filipinos be imbued with the patriotism which inspired those heroes in their struggle for liberty and freedom. The patriotism of Bonifacio can only be imbibed if we learn the zeal and self-sacrifice that made him disregard his own personal safety and led the Cry of Balintawak to call upon his countrymen to rise up in arms against Spain. We will never know Rizal, his patriotism, his genius and his greatness unless we read his books. It is not enough that our people be informed that Rizal paid the supreme sacrifice by offering his very life on the altar of freedom. It is necessary that his countrymen, particularly the youth whom Rizal called

"the hope of the fatherland," learn why they honor and venerate the memory of their national hero and martyr by studying and reading the products of his intellect—the weapon which he used to fight wrong and injustice. In "Noli Me Tangere" and in "El Filibusterismo" Rizal showed his patriotism, his courage to express his feelings and the truth no matter whom they hurt, his indomitable love of country and his nationalism, so that a study of his life will never be complete unless those two books are read. It is also in these books where Rizal aired the grievances of his countrymen, pleaded for reforms which he believed would cure the ills that beset his country in his times and voiced the legitimate aspirations of his country and people.

Every year, as June 19th and December 30th come around, the nation honors the memory of Dr. Jose Rizal. Many of our countrymen, young and old alike, take to the public plaza not mainly to honor Rizal but only to join the mood of the festivities. For them, Rizal Day is one of those days to take off from office and daily routine work, a day of fun and merrymaking. They are incapable of rendering due honor to Rizal because they are not fully informed as to how and why Rizal became a hero and a patriot. The "how" and "why" could have been learned by them if they read his life story and his works, particularly the "Noli Me Tangere" and "El Filibusterismo."

Verily, our people have to know more of Rizal. It is in this spirit that it is now proposed that the reading of his two main works, the "Noli Me Tangere" and "El Filibusterismo" be made compulsory in all our public and private schools.

It is my considered opinion that the introduction of this bill is quite late, but then it is often said that it is the better part of wisdom to act late than never. Had this bill become a law before, perhaps we would find more patriots among the Filipinos of the present generation. The celebration of Rizal Day would hold greater and more significant meaning to many of our countrymen. The compulsory reading of these two books would also make our youth imbibe the patriotic zeal and fervor that drove Rizal and their forefathers to fight for their convictions and for a just and righteous cause, love their country above self and her liberty and freedom ever supreme and uppermost in their hearts and in their minds.

The overwhelming public sentiment in favor of this bill justifies my belief and opinion in this respect. It is for this reason that I stand today before this august body to voice my support for this bill.

As representatives of the people, it is our duty to listen to public opinion and to enact measures demanded by the people of us. This bill pending before the Senate is one such measure. If I know that public opinion were against the passage of this bill, I would be the first to withdraw my support for it. This is not mere statement of the lips, for I have already proven it by deeds in the past.

Two years ago, when I found out that public opinion ran high against the passage of the controversial textbooks bill, I immediately withdrew my sponsorship of the said measure. If I did that before, I would gladly do it again. I would withdraw my sponsorship of this bill and speak against it if necessary if I were convinced that the opposition were well founded and that public opinion and the majority of our people are opposed to its passage. Up to this time, however, I have found no basis nor heard a convincing argument that can prevail upon me to withdraw my support for this bill. Hence, my stand on the measure proposing the compulsory reading of the "Noli Me Tangere" and "El Filibusterismo" in our public and private schools.

Mr. President, gentlemen of the Senate:

I was reared and educated in two Catholic institutions of learning ran and administered by Dominican fathers—the Colegio de San Juan de Letrán and the Pontifical University of Santo Tomás. My educational background, therefore, is impregnated with the teachings and doctrines of the Catholic faith, and I consider it a duty to my Church to defend her from those who may seek to defile her. It is also my obligation as a member of that Church to see to it that the faith of her sons and daughters remain unsullied. I must confess, however, that I do not see light in the argument that compulsory reading of these two books would endanger or weaken the faith of our young Catholic students.

When I was in my early High School days, I read the "Noli Me Tangere" and "El Filibusterismo" at the suggestion of my late mother. When I started to take up law, I read and studied them again. In neither instance has my faith in my religion wavered for a moment as a result thereof. On the other hand, I developed greater respect for the Catholic Church and a higher regard for her priests and ministers. This is best proven by the fact that I continued and finished my law studies at Santo Tomas, and on top of that, I sent all my sons and daughters and am still sending some of them to Catholic schools and universities. I took

the abuses narrated by Rizal as inconsequential to the good name and reputation of the Catholic Church, the institution which has lasted and shall last through the ages. I considered those abuses and malpractices as mere ripples if compared to events like the Inquisition, the Western Schism and other destructive waves of discord that rocked Catholic countries during the Middle Ages and threatened to destroy the Church which Christ has founded.

I am a member of the Knights of Columbus, a Catholic organization that teaches not only love of God but also love of country. I would be recreant to the mandates of that organization if I now fail to support a measure designed to instill patriotism into the youth of the land.

The Knights of Columbus, a Catholic organization that teaches not only love of God but also love of country, has to my best knowledge and belief, so far not made known its official stand on this bill. Although I am a member of that organization I do not wish to speak for its members nor for the association itself because I do not have the authority to do so. However, I am of the personal opinion that I would be recreant to its mandate of love of country if I now fail to support a measure designed to instill patriotism into the youth of the land.

In almost every part of the country today, we find monuments which have been erected to give lasting honor to the memory of Dr. Jose Rizal. If this measure now pending before us is not approved, these monuments will serve no purpose but merely illustrate the physical features of Rizal and it would be better if we tear down these symbols that represent our national hero and do away with the yearly celebration of Rizal Day which would be meaningless to a good majority of our people who otherwise, could learn more and know more of Rizal and give him his rightful place in our history if they read the "Noli Me Tangere" and "El Filibusterismo," the living symbols that reveal the character of their author—his patriotic spirit and intellectual greatness.

I sincerely believe that the fears being presently entertained by ecclesiastical authorities and administrators of Catholic schools and colleges on the possible destructive effects of this measure upon the Catholic faith and religion will not come to pass if this bill is approved. I do not believe that the reading of the "Noli Me Tangere" and "El Filibusterismo" will have precisely that effect. These works of Rizal are being read by many people, including Catholics. They are being read by

students of our public and private schools, in Catholic and non-Catholic institutions of learning. I have yet to hear of cases where Catholics, after a reading of these books, have wavered in their faith or changed their religion. If this has not happened in our public and non-Catholic schools, with less reason can we expect it to happen in Catholic institutions where the students receive more intensive training and education in the tenets of the Catholic faith.

Mr. President, gentlemen of the Senate: During the last two weeks, much has been said and discussed about this bill on Rizal's two great books not only within the Halls of Congress but throughout the land. I appeal for tolerance, broadmindedness and serenity.

I urge the approval of this bill but not without reserving my right to support any amendment, which, without defeating its purpose will eliminate the grounds and the basis to its opposition.

There cannot be conflict between religion and nationalism. There is always room for both, provided we "give unto Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's."

Concluding, I wish to take advantage of this occasion to sound the call for national unity. In the midst of conflicting world ideologies and the threat of the infiltration of political ideas that may destroy our faith, our free institutions and democratic way of life, we have no alternative but to unite and to emulate the patriotism of Dr. Jose Rizal, otherwise, this country which Rizal and every patriotic Filipino love so much shall perish from the earth.

CONSIDERACIÓN DEL S. NO. 438

(Continuación)

Senator PRIMICIAS. Mr. President, I now ask that we resume consideration of Senate Bill No. 438.

The PRESIDENT. Consideration of Senate Bill No. 438 is in order.

Senator PRIMICIAS. Mr. President, the distinguished gentleman from Batangas and Tayabas will use his turn to speak in favor of the measure.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman from Batangas and Tayabas has the floor.

DISCURSO DEL SEN. RECTO A FAVOR DEL PROYECTO

(Continuación)

Senator RECTO. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, I was saying yesterday, when the session of the Senate was suspended on account of

the advanced hour, that the authors of this so-called pastoral, unable to find in the *Noli Me Tángere* and *El Filibusterismo* any passage with which to prove his or their thesis that Dr. Rizal attacked the Catholic religion in his two novels, resorted to what we call in legal parlance proof *aliunde* by citing a supposed conversation had between Dr. Rizal and Dr. Pardo de Tavera when the latter met Rizal in London sometime in 1889. To suit his purpose the author of the "pastoral" reproduced a garbled version of the conversation, suppressing that part which would have disproved his contention, which would have proved that Rizal did not attack the Catholic religion itself but at most the disrepute into which it had fallen in the Philippines in his day because of the way it was being practiced. Rizal said, in effect, in the course of said conversation with Tavera—and this is the passage that was suppressed by the author or authors of the pastoral: "God should not be utilized as a shield and protector of abuses, nor should religion be made use of for that purpose. What happened in the Philippines in those days is horrible"—Rizal continued. "They abused the name of religion to enrich their *haciendas*; they seduced an innocent girl to destroy an enemy; they disturbed the peace of a married couple and robbed the wife of her honor. Why should I not fight religion like that, when it is the basic cause of our miseries and fears?" The author of this so-called pastoral, if he was honestly concerned with knowing Rizal's true intentions in writing the disputed passages of his novels, could have resorted to authentic documents which were certainly available to him. One is a letter from Rizal to Blumentritt written sometime in 1888 or 1889. The pertinent part of this letter says: "If you have grown in one of our towns in the Philippines as I did, and witnessed the sufferings of the peasants, you would have a different conception of Catholicism in the Philippines. I have had the opportunity of studying all the religions in Europe. *I have found Christianity splendid and Catholicism attractive as well as poetic. It is Christianity made poetic and beautiful, Catholicism made finer than any Protestantism.* But all those are unknown in my country."

Then there is this other document which could not have possibly escaped the attention of the author of this so-called pastoral. It is a letter written by Rizal in French where he explained to his friend and countryman, that great painter Félix Resurrección Hidalgo, the purposes he had in mind when he wrote the *Noli Me Tángere*.

The letter says as it appears translated into English:

"My dear friend:

"In your last letter you complained of my silence. You are right; forgetfulness is the death of friendship; but I must add that in true friendship forgetfulness does not exist, and I shall give you at once proof of it.

"You have long desired a novel written by me. You told me it was necessary to do something serious and not to write any more articles which live and die with the page of a newspaper. Well then, to your three letters I answer with a novel of which I am sending you a copy by mail.

"*Noli Me Tángere*, words taken from the Gospel of St. Luke, mean 'do not touch me.' The book contains things of which no one among ourselves has spoken up to the present; they are so delicate that they cannot be touched by anybody. In so far as I am concerned, I have tried to do what nobody likes to do. I have endeavored to answer the calumnies which for centuries had been heaped on us and our country; I have described the social condition, the life, our beliefs, our hopes, our desires, our grievances, our griefs; I have unmasked hypocrisy which under the guise of religion, came to impoverish and to brutalize us; *I have distinguished true religion from the false, from superstition, from that which Catholicism would be ashamed of if it were aware of them.* I have raised the curtain to show what is behind the deceitful glittering words of our government; I have told our countrymen our defects, our vices, our culpable and cowardly complaisances with our miseries. Whenever I have found virtue, I have proclaimed it to render it homage; and, rather than weep in relating our misfortunes, I have laughed, because nobody likes to weep with me over the misfortune of our country, and laughter is always good to hide suffering. *The facts I narrate are all true and actually happened;* I can prove them. My book may have (and has) defects from the artistic or esthetic point of view; I do not deny it. But what cannot be placed in doubt is the impartiality of my narration".

JOSÉ RIZAL

This is one of the documents the author of the so-called pastoral conveniently ignored in order to prove his contention that Rizal not only confined himself to attacking the Catholic religion in the Philippines, as practiced in those days, but the Catholic religion in general.

To prove that the ideas expressed by the characters in the two novels in derogation of Catholic dogmas and morals and religious observances were Rizal's own, the author of the "pastoral" says that the pertinent utterances were made by noble and virtuous characters.

The statement is unfounded. Those utterances were made in the course of conversations among ignorant peasants and superstitious old women which we called "beatás," whose practice of religion is characterized with fanaticism and like Hermana Rufa, Hermana Sipa, Hermana Pulé and Doña

Consolación, the wife of the Alferez. But the author of this pastoral has failed to note that Crisóstomo Ibarra, the hero of the *Noli Me Tángere*, the bright, cultured and highly educated young man who made his studies in the Ateneo of the Jesuits and later in Europe, the character of the *Noli* who, in the opinion of all, depicts Rizal himself, this Crisóstomo Ibarra speaks throughout the pages of the *Noli*, even in his moments of bitterness against the behaviour of the friars, as a defender of the Catholic Religion.

For instance, under the chapter entitled, "IN THE PHILOSOPHER'S HOUSE," we find this discussion or argument between Crisóstomo Ibarra and Filósofo Tasio. Please note the statements of Ibarra in the course of the dialogue:

"Oh!" interrupted Ibarra, "that's asking too much; Let us content ourselves with observing that our people do not complain or suffer as do the people of other countries, thanks to Religion and the benignity of the governing powers."

"God, the government, and Religion will not allow that day to come!" replied Ibarra, impressed in spite of himself. "The Philippines is religious and loves Spain, the Philippines will realize how much the nation is doing for her. There are abuses, yes, there are defects, that cannot be denied, but Spain is laboring to introduce reforms that will correct these abuses and defects, she is formulating plans, she is not selfish!"

"Either lower my head or lose it!" repeated Ibarra thoughtfully. The dilemma is hard. But why? Is love for my country incompatible with love for Spain? Is it necessary to debase oneself in order to be a good Christian, to prostitute one's conscience in order to carry out a good purpose? I love my native land, the Philippines, because to it I owe my life and my happiness, because every man should love his country. I love Spain, the fatherland of my ancestors, because in spite of everything the Philippines owes to it, and will continue to owe, her happiness and her future. I am a Catholic, I preserve pure the faith of my fathers, and I do not see why I have to lower my head when I can raise it, to give it over to my enemies when I can humble them! (Derbyshire translation)

Under the Chapter, A GOOD DAY IS KNOWN BY THE MORNING (The Fair Day is Foretold by the Morn), we find "Don Filipino," and "Tasio, the Philosopher," both noble characters, praising the Jesuits in the following words (Derbyshire translation):

"... progress continues on its way, and from the blood of those who fall new and vigorous offspring is born. See, press itself, however backward it may wish to be, is taking a step forward. The Dominicans themselves do not escape the operation of this law, but are imitating the Jesuits, their irreconcilable enemies. They hold fiestas in their cloisters, they erect little theaters, they compose poems, because, as they are not devoid of intelligence in spite of believing in the fifteenth century, they realize that the Jesuits are right, and they will still take part in the future of the younger peoples that they have reared."

"So, according to you, the Jesuits keep up with progress?" asked Don Filipino in wonder. "Why then, are they opposed in Europe?"

"I will answer you like an old scholastic," replied the Sage, lying down again and resuming his jesting expression. "There are three ways in which one may accompany the course of progress: in front of, beside, or behind it. The first guide it, the second suffer themselves to be carried along with it, and the last are dragged after it—and to these last the Jesuits belong."

I find, Mr. President, a passage in this so-called Pastoral, identified as No. 7, paragraph 2, which is a great untruth. It says that "in these two novels we can hardly find even one acceptable religious priest, because all were depicted as haughty, cruel, ignorant, licentious and lecherous, and that even among the Filipino clergy only one Filipino priest appears as an exception." This statement is a falsehood, Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, this statement that in Rizal's two novels not even one acceptable friar can be found. Either the author of the Pastoral has not read carefully the *Noli Me Tángere* and the *El Filibusterismo* before making his criticism, or he has acted in bad faith. Of course, there is one respectable and venerable friar among the characters of *El Filibusterismo*. It is Padre Fernández, a Dominican, one of the professors in the University of Santo Tomás. In the chapter entitled "El Fraile y el Filipino" (The Friar and the Filipino) Rizal speaks of Father Fernández in this way:

"We left Isagani haranguing his friends. In the midst of his enthusiasm an usher approached him to say that Padre Fernández, one of the higher professors, wished to talk with him.

"Isagani's face fell. Padre Fernández was a person greatly respected by him, being the one always excepted by him whenever the friars were attacked."

The correct translation from the original Spanish should say that Padre Fernández is a very respectable person, that is, a person not only respected by Isagani, but by everybody. The first mention of Padre Fernández, the Dominican professor of the University of Santo Tomás, was made earlier in the novel, in the chapter "Los Baños" in the following words (Derbyshire translation):

"At this point Padre Fernández, who thus far in the discussion had merely contented himself with smiling, began to talk. All gave him their attention, for they knew him to be a thoughtful man.

"Don't take it ill of me, Padre Sibyla, (another Dominican) if I differ from your view of the affair, but it's my peculiar fate to be almost always in opposition to my brethren. I say, then, that we ought not be so pessimistic. The instruction in Castilian can be allowed (the friars in general did not favor the teaching of the Spanish lan-

guage) without any risk whatever, and in order that it may not appear to be a defeat of the University, we Dominicans ought to put forth our efforts and be the first to rejoice over it—that should be our policy. To what end are we to be engaged in an everlasting struggle with the people, when after all we are the few and they are the many, when we need them and they do not need us? Wait, Padre Zamora, wait! Admit that now the people may be weak and ignorant—I also believe that—but it will not be true tomorrow or the day after. Tomorrow and the next day they will be the stronger, and they will know what is good for them, and we cannot keep it from them, just as it is not possible to keep from children the knowledge of many things when they reach a certain age. I say, then, why should we not take advantage of this condition of ignorance to change our policy completely, to place it upon a basis solid and enduring—on the basis of justice, for example, instead of on the basis of ignorance? There's nothing like being just; that I've always said to my brethren, but they won't believe me. The Indian (Filipino) idolizes justice, like every race in its youth; he asks for punishment when he has done wrong, just as he is exasperated when he has not deserved it. Is theirs a just desire? Then grant it! Let's give them all the schools they want, until they are tired of them. Youth is lazy, and what urges them to activity is our opposition. Our bond of prestige, Padre Sibyla, is about worn out, so let's prepare another, the bond of gratitude, for example. Let's not be fools, let's do as the crafty Jesuits—".

This is Padre Fernández, as portrayed by Rizal in *El Filibusterismo*, and yet the author of the "pastoral" says that not one single good friar was to be found in either of the two novels. The "pastoral" says further that even among the Filipino clergy only one worthy Filipino priest appears in one of the novels, and that is an exception. That is another falsehood. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, at least we have four venerable Filipino priests in *El Filibusterismo*, three to whose memory *El Filibusterismo* was dedicated by Rizal, Fathers Burgos, Gómez and Zamora; Filipino Catholic priests who were executed in Bagumbayan for defending the rights and the dignity of the native clergy. One of the charges made against Rizal when he was brought to trial was that he dedicated *El Filibusterismo* to the memory of these three Filipino priests whom the Spanish government and the friars at that time called traitors to the country, that is, traitors to Spain. Who is the fourth venerable native priest in *El Filibusterismo*? None other than Father Florentino, one of the noblest, if not the noblest character, in the novel. The author of the pastoral says he is an exception. But if the only Filipino priest character in the novel is Father Florentino, and he is good, the conclusion must be that the Filipino priests in those days were all good, and it is not right to say that only one was good, by way of exception. I would

invite those who defend this so-called pastoral to point to me a passage in the *Noli Me Tangere* and *El Filibusterismo* from which we can infer the conclusion made here by the author of this pastoral that only one noble Filipino priest is found as an exception in the books of Rizal, the rest of the Filipino priests being as unworthy as the friars. Father Florentino is the personification and incarnation of the Filipino priest in the days of Rizal. Rizal describes Father Florentino in one of the early chapters of the *El Filibusterismo*, in the following words (Derbyshire translation).

(*En este momento el Sen. Mabánag asume la Presidencia por designación de la Mesa*)

"On one of the benches at the astern (of the steamer "Tabo"), huddled in among the other passengers, sat a native priest gazing at the landscapes that were successively unfolded to his view. His neighbors made room for him, the men on passing taking off their hats, and the gamblers not daring to set their table near where he was. He said little, but neither smoked nor assumed arrogant airs, nor did he disdain to mingle with the other men, returning the salutes with courtesy and affability as if he felt much honored and very grateful. Although advanced in years, with hair almost completely gray, he appeared to be in vigorous health, and even when seated held his body straight and his head erect, but without pride or arrogance. He differed from the ordinary native priests, few enough indeed, who at that period served merely as coadjutors (assistant parish priests) or administered some curacies temporarily, in a certain self-possession and gravity, like one conscious of his personal dignity and the sacredness of his office. A superficial examination of his appearance, if not his white hair, revealed at once that he belonged to another epoch, another generation, when the better young men were not afraid to risk their dignity by becoming priests, when the native clergy looked any friar at all in the face, and when their class, not yet degraded and vilified, called for free men and not slaves, superior intelligences and not servile wills. In his sad and serious features was to be read the serenity of a soul fortified by study and meditation, perhaps tried out by deep moral suffering. This priest was Padre Florentino, Isagani's uncle, and his story is easily told.

"Scion of a wealthy and influential family of Manila, of agreeable appearance and cheerful disposition, suited to shine in the world, he had never felt any call to the sacerdotal profession, but by reason of some promises or vows, his mother, after not a few struggles and violent disputes, compelled him to enter the seminary. She was a great friend of the Archbishop, had a will of iron, and was as inexorable as is very devout woman who believes that she is interpreting the will of God. Vainly the young Florentino offered resistance, vainly he begged, vainly he pleaded his love affairs, even provoking scandals: priest he had to become at twenty-five years of age, and priest he became. The Archbishop ordained him, his first mass was celebrated with great pomp, three days were given over to feasting, and his mother died happy and content, leaving him all her fortune."

Now, if you want to refresh further your memory about Father Florentino, I shall refer you to the last chapter of the *El Filibusterismo*, which contains the denouement of the plot. In the last chapter, in that conversation he had with Simoun, in the latter's last moments as he made his confession, you will admire once more the towering figure of Father Florentino. Not only does he appear as a great Filipino but also as a holy man, a man of wisdom, and a true orthodox Catholic priest. To me he is the hero, the protagonist, of *El Filibusterismo*, as Ibarra is of the *Noli*.

Again the "pastoral" says:

"... all good and pious Catholics are pictured—in Rizal's books)—as grossly ignorant and ridiculously superstitious."

Who were these people who, according to the "pastoral," existed in real life and who were portrayed by Rizal in his novels as good Catholics and, at the same time, ignorant and ridiculously superstitious? The "pastoral" fails to explain how they could be good Catholics, if they were ridiculously superstitious. I don't believe any opponent of the bill can present to us, can point to us any character, whether in the *Noli Me Tángere* or *El Filibusterismo*, who can be called on the one hand a good and pious Catholic and, on the other, ignorant and superstitious. Who are the ignorant and the superstitious in the *Noli Me Tángere* and the *El Filibusterismo*? Capitán Tiago, Hermana Rufa, Hermana Bali and a host of other hermanas or "manangs," Doña Victorina de Espadaña, Doña Consolación, the wife of the Alferez. Dr. Pasta was not superstitious. He was a great jurist. He was the legal consultant of the religious orders according to the *El Filibusterismo*. He was a good Catholic, in the sense of being a faithful observant of Catholic practices, but he could not be called superstitious. He was an opportunist and a selfish man. He wanted position, influence, material comforts, respectability, in this world, and a good share of God's glory in the other. He would not help any one, if it meant displeasing the government or the religious orders, or jeopardizing his own position in society. When Isagani, in the name of his fellow students, paid him a visit to enlist his help in such a worthy enterprise as the establishment of an Academy of the Spanish language, he refused to give a helping hand because he knew that the project was frowned upon by the friars. A good Catholic this Doctor Pasta, and a wise person, too, but

far from being ignorant and superstitious, as the "Pastoral" suggests.

Mr. President, I will resume my discussion of the main syllogisms advanced by the author of this "pastoral" and point out to you, after examining its premises and conclusions, that his apologetics suffer from the major vices of argumentation from which they suffer. For instance, the author says that Rizal regarded his country and his people with affectionate realism, that he was fearless in denouncing the evils of the colonial administration of his times; that he examined and analyzed our national problems—which naturally were cultural, religious and social—with deep insight, rising above petty passions and prejudices; that, as promised in the dedication, he uncovered the ills and maladies of the Philippines of his time in the hope of finding a remedy for them, that all the characters of the two novels had their counterparts in the life of the Philippines in those days and that the object of his novels was to expose in terms of fictional narrative the actual evils which then afflicted Philippine society. From all these truthful, magnificent premises whose correctness no one can challenge, the author comes to the strange conclusion that Rizal wrote fiction and not history.

Another example of the bizarre syllogisms of the "Pastoral." The author says:

The social cancer from which the Philippines suffered was largely due to the decadent state of the religious orders and to some practices of the Catholic religion, and so the larger part of Rizal's novels was devoted to castigating disedifying priests and to satirizing what he deemed to be superstitious observations and practices of the Church, but the Church must be distinguished from the human and fallible individuals that compose it.

From such unimpeachable premises the author of the Pastoral draws the astonishingly absurd conclusion that Rizal attacked in his novels the Catholic faith, and Catholic dogmas and morals and the pious observance of the Catholic Church, in general, and not alone as practiced in the Philippines in Rizal's time.

I now come to that part of this document which contends that these books of Rizal are condemned by the Canon Law. Its author invokes Canon 1399, particularly paragraph 2, which says: "Books of any writers defending heresy or schism." "Defending" is the English word for the original "propugnantes" in the original Latin. And "propugnare," from which "propugnantes" is derived, means "to defend with arguments." So if a book contains a heretical statement but this is not defended with arguments, the book, or the par-

ticular heretical passage, does not come under the prohibition of Canon 1399.

I give you here another specimen of the strange logic of the "Pastoral's" author. Here is a premise, or rather, two premises, a major and a minor, from which no valid exception may be taken: "Rizal examined and analyzed (in his novels) our national problems with depth of insight, sifting from the complexities of his time ideas which, for their universal and timeless validity, are applicable in our own time, regarding the function of government, the well-being of society, the dignity of the individual, the necessity of popular education, the native traits and possibilities of the Filipino character, and the special mission and destiny of our nation under God. Our leaders of today and our people as a whole should put into practice *more faithfully* the patriotic teachings contained in the writings of our national hero. But men cannot put into practice teachings which they do not thoroughly and rightly understand, and we can think of no more effective means, after the formal teaching of religion, to develop in our youth a sane and constructive nationalism and the civic virtue of subordinating individual ambition to the common good, than that the writings of Rizal be more circulated and read, and even introduced as reading matter in the public and private schools of the nation." From these irrefutable premises of the "Pastoral" its author draws the following *non sequitur*:

"We, the Catholic Philippine Hierarchy, maintain that these novels do contain teachings contrary to our faith, and so, we are opposed to the proposed compulsory reading in their entirety of such books in any school in the Philippines where Catholic students may be affected."

Parenthetically one might be inclined to suspect, with justification that there were two authors who worked independently in the preparation of this pastoral: one who laid down the predicates, and another who made his own conclusions along preconceived lines, and without minding the predicates laid down by his co-author, and the correct predicates and the false conclusions were pieced together resulting in this hybrid product: the "Pastoral." Now, can it be pointed out that in the "Noli Me Tángere" or "El Filibusterismo" that Rizal himself, or through any of his characters, made any argumentative defense of any particular heresy against a dogma or an article of faith of the Catholic Church?

Perhaps I shall be referred to that chapter of the *Noli* about the purgatory, where Filósofo Tasio appears indulging in disquisitions on the subject. What did he, Tasio, madman or philosopher, say about purgatory after all? In the first place he

accepted the existence of purgatory, in the following words:

"Entre nosotros podemos decir que la idea del purgatorio es buena, santa y razonable; continúa la unión entre los que fueron y los que son, y obliga a una mayor pureza de vida. El mal está en el abuso que de él se hace."

The only matter on which he disagreed was that purgatory is an exclusive conception of the Catholics, as he contended that long before other religions acknowledged its existence, and that even early Christians did not believe in it. And, in expressing his own opinion that purgatory exists, he made a distinction between a pure faith and fanaticism or superstition in this wise: "I hate to destroy the faith which is in her (Doray's) heart. A faith pure and simple is distinguished from fanaticism, as flame from smoke, as melody from dissonance, but idiots, like deaf and the dumb, confuse one with the other. Among ourselves, we can say that the idea of purgatory is good, holy and reasonable. It links those who are with those who have ceased to be, leading us to greater purity of life. The evil is in the abuse."

The author of the "pastoral" conveniently failed to make reference to this passage and went headlong to the conclusion that Rizal, through Filósofo Tasio, denied the existence of the purgatory.

In paragraph 15 of this "Pastoral", we find the following: "Let us be sincere and straightforward, in order to imbue our youth with patriotism, is it necessary to make them read that 'confessionals are made so that we may sin?' And then there is a footnote marked 15. Let us examine this footnote and verify on what particular page of the *Noli* or *Fili* the alleged statement appears. The footnote says 15, and immediately, these words: Opus citatum, 280. Let us see what page is that of 'P. Sayo Bookstore.' Well, on page 280 of this 'P. Sayo edition of the *Noli*,' there is nothing said about confession, and not even once the word 'confession' is mentioned. Now, let us see if page 280 of the *Fili* will yield something, about 'confession.'"

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

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

Senator RECTO. I will finish the sentence. There is nothing about "confession" here on page 280 of *El Filibusterismo*. It is a chapter narrating the revolt that preceded the death of Simoún. . . . What is the question, gentleman from Bulacán?

Senator RODRIGO. Is it not true that there are more than one edition of *Noli Me Tángere* and *El Filibusterismo*?

Senator RECTO. You mean in English and Spanish?

Senator RODRIGO. In Spanish.

Senator RECTO. Yes, but this is the particular edition pointed to by the author of the "pastoral." Here it is in the footnote. You are right in saying that there are several editions. But the edition referred to by the "Pastoral" is this by P. Sayo Book Store, Nueva Edición 1950. As to *El Filibusterismo*, the edition referred to is that by Manila Filatélica, 1908. These are the two editions expressly mentioned by the "pastoral."

Senator RODRIGO. Very good. Granting that those are the two particular editions pointed out, now the gentleman himself a few days ago stated that those might be typographical errors. Now, is the gentleman very certain and very sure that that passage in the pastoral cannot be found in any other page?

Senator RECTO. I have to locate the quotation with the aid of the footnotes carefully placed, I suppose, by the author of the pastoral, and if you will pardon me, both the gentleman from Samar and Your Honor said the other day that even clerical errors in this so-called pastoral are matters of faith. I even tried to open the door for an explanation so that the statement of the gentlemen would be less absolute, by pointing out that there are typographical errors in the pastoral, and the answers I obtained both from the gentleman from Samar and from Your Honor was that everything in this document, which it is now clear is not a pastoral, is article of faith for the Catholics.

Senator RODRIGO. Mr. President, I would like to make it clear in the record that I never told the gentleman from Batangas and Quezon that I subscribe to that pastoral as an article of faith even in matters of typographical errors, just as I would not subscribe to a Supreme Court decision even on typographical errors. I would subscribe to a Supreme Court decision in substance, but if there is typographical errors . . .

Senator RECTO. What particular decision of the Supreme Court containing typographical errors has been accepted by the legal profession as jurisprudence?

Senator RODRIGO. Precisely, Mr. President, I do not say that we accept as jurisprudence the typographical error. Now, of course, I cannot name the particular case now, but I say that it is very

possible that in a decision of the Supreme Court reported in the Philippine Reports, there might be typographical errors; it is possible that in a decision of the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court cites a case decided by the United States Supreme Court, and it is possible that in the citation, the volume or at least the page of the United States Supreme Court reports is not cited correctly. But that does not mean to say that the substance or the essence of the decision itself is vitiated. May I come back to my question.

Senator RECTO. No, let me answer the gentleman first. The gentleman is my guest on the floor. The difference is that the Supreme Court does not require that its decisions be taken as articles of faith, as dogmas, while here it is pretended that even typographical errors in the so-called pastoral are to be taken as articles of faith. If Your Honor will allow me to continue reading this paragraph, Your Honor will find that there are so many typographical errors, that I am compelled to believe that the cited passages do not exist either in the *Noli* or the *Fili*. If I may be allowed, I will proceed. I call attention to footnotes 15-16, which make reference to pages 106-107. The "pastoral" says, "in order to teach our youth love of country, is it necessary to expose them to jeers at Catholic worship, or to say of stole fees that 'divine justice is not merely so exacting as human,' to say 'novenas, responsories, versicles and prayers have been composed for those who lack original ideas and feelings', that 'the Church does not gratuitously save the beloved souls for you nor does it distribute indulgences without payment?'" Pages 106-107 of either of the two books may be looked up, and those quotations of the Pastoral cannot be found.

Senator RODRIGO. Maybe I can grant that. This is the first time I heard these alleged errors in printing. But granting that, I want to make it clear in my case at least and in order to make this clear in the record, that I never told the gentleman from Batangas that I abide with that Pastoral as a matter of faith even on typographical errors. So that the only claim of the gentleman from Batangas and Quezon is that these alleged exceptions in the Pastoral are not found in the particular pages cited in the Pastoral as an Appendix.

Senator RECTO. That is not the only claim I have made. I have been speaking here for hours yesterday and today, and in that period of time I have made more than one claim. I have proved to the gentlemen of the Senate how the "Pastoral"

is full of inaccuracies and in some respects untruths, and of course, inconsistencies. Does Your Honor accept, for instance, the correctness of that statement in the "Pastoral" that not a single good friar can be found among the characters in the *Noli Me Tángere* and *El Filibusterismo*? Does Your Honor subscribe to that? What about Padre Fernández, the Dominican Professor of Santo Tomás University?

Senator RODRIGO. I would not say that I subscribed to that particular one or another one. But the thing is that in this Pastoral there are many instances cited. As a matter of fact, as far as I am concerned, the attacks on the friars are immaterial to me. What is material are the attacks against matters of faith or dogma or teachings of the Catholic Church. But as I said in my speech or I think in my answer also to questions of the gentleman from Batangas, I myself admit that there had been acts by the friars which are abusive and in answer to the gentleman from Quezon I said I condemned those Spanish friars who abetted the government in condemning Dr. José Rizal to death. To me that is immaterial. But there are many other things cited in the Pastoral. Let me come to proposition. Granting that due to a typographical error these passages are not in those particular pages, supposing that tonight I research on the whole two books and find out that while those passages are not in those particular pages cited but in other pages, will the Pastoral suffer in substance and in essence?

Senator RECTO. How about the denial made in the Pastoral that Rizal has not found a single good friar in the Philippines?

Senator RODRIGO. These are particular points that I cannot discuss now. I will have to make a research on them.

Senator RECTO. It is late to make a research now. We are going to vote on this matter soon. Your Honor cannot delete the passage in *El Filibusterismo* where the Dominican Friar, Padre Fernández is portrayed by Rizal as a noble character.

Senator RODRIGO. Granting that I said that it is not the only basis of the Pastoral. As I said I want to make a research on that more carefully, but the point I want to raise is this, that those passages are not found in the particular and specific pages cited in the Pastoral. Does it necessarily mean that they do not appear in other pages of the Pastoral? In other words, they are mere typographical errors.

Senator RECTO. That was not the understanding of the gentleman from Samar.

Senator RODRIGO. That is not my understanding of the statement of the gentleman from Samar. Anyway, that is not my understanding. I appeal to the records. I never said in my speech or in the interpellation that typographical errors are articles of faith.

Senator RECTO. Can you quote to me those passages in the *Noli Me Tángere* and the *El Filibusterismo* that were referred to by the "pastoral," even if they appear on pages other than those pointed in the footnotes of the "pastoral?"

Senator RODRIGO. I do not have the copy of the books, but give me a few days and I shall strive to show that these particular passages appear in other pages of these two books. Thank you very much.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT. The gentleman may yield if he so wishes.

Senator RECTO. Gladly.

Senator ROSALES. I rise simply to correct what I would consider a misstatement made by the gentleman from Batangas and Quezon about the fact that I admitted on the floor of the Senate that even if there is a typographical error that it will still be all right in an article of faith.

Senator RECTO. That was your answer to my question.

Senator ROSALES. That is wrong, Your Honor. Let us appeal to the record, because if I remember right, when you asked me a question whether even typographical errors can be considered as part of an article of faith, I pointed to you citations made in certain passages of the *Noli Me Tángere* and *El Filibusterismo* which might be wrong to consider them as part of the article of faith and I said that might be only typographical error.

Senator RECTO. Gentleman, I have been asking for a copy of your speech but the stenographers have not been able to deliver it to me until now. They say that up to now you have not finished going over the transcript of your speech.

Senator ROSALES. I appeal to the records, Mr. President.

Senator RECTO. To your records, perhaps, you may appeal, to the records that have been already revised by Your Honor.

Senator ROSALES. Mr. President, I appeal to the records of the Senate and not to my records.

Senator RECTO. To the records of the Senate as revised by Your Honor, no. You are my guest on the floor, Mr. Senator.

Senator ROSALES. I consider that.

Senator RECTO. Under our Rules, every Senator has a right to go over his speech and make corrections, and no copy of that speech can be furnished anybody until the revision by the author of the speech has been effected.

Senator ROSALES. But the gentleman from Batangas and Quezon will remember that this point was not brought up in the course of my written speech but under interpellation, which I have no right to correct.

Senator RECTO. Your Honor cannot correct the text of my question, but you can correct your answer.

Senator ROSALES. I have no right to revise the records of this chamber, but I have the right to revise with respect to my speech and the interpellations in the course of my speech.

Senator RECTO. But just the same Your Honor may have revised that part, that is, my own question.

Senator ROSALES. I have not reviewed or revised that part as the stenographers until now cannot even produce that part of the proceedings of this chamber. Thank you, gentleman.

Senator RECTO. I am sorry I cannot take your word for that, but I appeal to the members of the Senate and of the gentlemen of the press who heard your answer to my question. In fact, I reheard that fact in my speech yesterday, and iterated that fact in my speech yesterday, and the gentleman did not rise to protest. I said that, according to Your Honor, even typographical errors in the pastoral are articles of faith for every Catholic. Nobody interrupted me yesterday when I said that.

Senator ROSALES. I wish to state that if yesterday I did not interrupt the gentleman from Batangas it was through tolerance. But I cannot tolerate it any more when he made this specific and categorical statement.

Senator RECTO. Because the revision of your speech must not have been completed yesterday.

Now, Mr. President, there is a statement in the so-called pastoral to the effect that the issues of patriotism and faith are inextricably entangled in Rizal's novels—I do not remember the particular words but they conveyed the same meaning. There is also a statement which says: "This does not mean however, that each and every portion of the novels falls under this law. Those portions which do not contradict the content and practices of the Catholic Faith are evidently not affected by the law." If I interpret correctly this statement, it means that the portions which do not come under the prohibition

of the Canon Law can be left out and only those portions which contradict the content and practices of the Catholic faith must be considered as prohibited. May I ask the gentleman from Bulacán if I am correct in my interpretation.

Senator RODRIGO. What is that?

Senator RECTO. This portion of the pastoral says: "This does not mean, however, that each and every portion of the novels falls under this law. Those portions which do not contradict the content and practices of the Catholic faith are evidently not affected by the law."

Senator RODRIGO. Well, I think there is no need for explanation because those two sentences are very clear.

Senator RECTO. Well, I am asking Your Honor's interpretation because you seem to represent here the author of the pastoral.

Senator RODRIGO. As a matter of privilege, Mr. President, I would like to correct that statement. I never assumed, Mr. President, that I represent the author of the pastoral here, and I object to that word "author" because that is singular. I know the implication that the gentleman from Batangas wants to make that this was prepared by only one man, Father Cavanna, which I deny. And so, Mr. President, as a matter of privilege as a member of this august body, I protest against the insinuation of that statement and, if I may be permitted, I do not want to answer any more questions in that vein.

Senator RECTO. (Continuing) Now, who are the authors of the "pastoral?" I understand the position of the gentleman from Bulacán; he refuses to answer any more questions on that point because for the last two or three days I have been demanding here the presentation or production of either the original or a photostat copy of the "pastoral," and the gentleman from Bulacán has not been able to do it until now, because the truth is that there is no such pastoral, because the bishops could not have subscribed to this document which is full of inaccuracies, inconsistencies and untruths, libels and slanders against Rizal.

I have always believed that their excellencies, the bishops composing the Catholic hierarchy in the Philippines, could not have subscribed, could not have signed this document. I even deny that they gave their approval to this document because before giving their approval to it, they should have studied its contents carefully. I have shown here a sample of a true pastoral, which is the joint pastoral issued by the entire hierarchy of the Philippines on January 29, 1953, carrying the title "Joint

Pastoral of the Philippine Catholic Hierarchy on Religious Instruction in Public Schools," and signed by around 30 members of the hierarchy, bishops, archbishops and apostolic administrators, and published in all the newspapers in the Philippines. As I said, this so-called pastoral is entitled "Statement of the Philippine Hierarchy" and it is unsigned. Well, the members of the hierarchy in the Philippines even issued a pastoral outlawing the Lipa miracles regarding the shower of petals. That pastoral, which was a true pastoral, was signed, if not by all, by many bishops, members of the Philippine hierarchy and that was also published in all the newspapers.

The gentleman from Bulacán says that he has not assumed the representation of the author or authors of the pastoral. He may not have used exactly those words, but he has been defending the contents of the pastoral. When I yielded the floor to the gentleman for questions, he even defended the character of this document as a real pastoral. So I concluded that the gentleman was representing the author, and if he wants it in plural, the authors of the "pastoral." It is possible that besides Father Cavanna, there were other priests, not bishops, who took part in the preparation of this document—it is possible that even a member of Congress who claims he has knowledge of theology had a hand in it. So, when I said what I said, which provoked the protest of the gentleman from Bulacán, I meant those who are defending the contents of this document in this Chamber.

Now, I requested the favor from the gentleman from Bulacán, because I did not want to make any mistake in giving my construction or my interpretation of any passage of this so-called pastoral, of telling me if my interpretation is correct, because if it is, then, gentlemen, this particular passage of the pastoral that says that those portions which do not contradict the content and practices of the Catholic faith are evidently not affected by the law, that is, are not prohibited and, therefore, can be read, is itself a violation, an infringement of the Canon Law. We find in the Preface of the edition of Leo the XIII's Index, made upon order of Benedict the XV, the following:

"Prohibitio se extendit ad totum librum, non tantum ad eam partem quae errorem continet,"

that is, prohibition extends to the entire book and not only to that part which contains the error. In other words, when part of the book is prohibited, and particularly in this case where, according to the "pastoral," the parts that are prohibited are in-

extricably and intimately linked with those that are not, the prohibition extends to the totality of the book and not only to that part which contains heresies and impieties. So this very passage of the so-called pastoral shows that the bishops must not have participated in its preparation, because they are not supposed to make in it any statement which is contrary to the Canon Law.

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

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

Senator RECTO. Willingly, Mr. Senator.

Senator TAÑADA. So far, Mr. Senator, you have expressed opinions and conclusions showing that that pastoral cannot really be considered as a pastoral because that is not a product of a deliberation of the bishops and archbishops in the Philippines.

Senator RECTO. That is from the intrinsic point of view. From the point of view of external formalities, it is not signed.

Senator TAÑADA. Now let us go to the facts. This is a very important matter.

Do you know, Mr. Senator, whether the bishops and archbishops met in Manila or in any other place to deliberate and consider this statement now foisted on us as a pastoral?

Senator RECTO. As far as my knowledge is concerned, they have not met either here or in any other place.

Senator TAÑADA. It is a fact which can easily be checked, because if they have met in any place here in the Philippines, the transportation companies, the airlines can easily be requested to show whether those bishops have used their lines and the ships in coming to a place to deliberate on this so-called pastoral.

Senator RECTO. Correct. And through the press also.

Senator TAÑADA. Does Your Honor know, considering the time this bill has been presented or filed in the Senate and the date of the pastoral, whether there is physical time for this bill or for that statement to be circulated to the different bishops all over the Philippines so that these bishops could make their own this so-called pastoral?

Senator RECTO. Absolutely no time, unless, like Joshua, they detained the sun in its course.

Senator TANADA. Now has Your Honor been informed that a bishop, two bishops, or three bishops have denied that claim that that is a pastoral?

tioned so convincingly by the gentleman from Batangas. Now, I would like therefore to make it of record that I as a Catholic, as a humble member of the Senate, I would not call it a challenge, but would invite openly the Catholic hierarchy either to confirm or to deny the category of this statement—whether it is a mere statement, or in the category of the pastoral letter.

Now, I will come to another point, gentleman from Batangas. I am very much interested in finding a solution to this problem, because I am quite convinced that it is possible—I would not say it is probable—that dissensions might occur if we approve this bill in its present form.

Senator RECTO. The dissension has already arisen.

Senator LIM. That is my humble opinion only, that it might be possible that perhaps the Catholic church might feel discriminated against. I have been convinced by the brilliant analysis of the gentleman from Batangas regarding the contents of these two novels when he says particularly that Rizal never attacked the Catholic Church as a religion or as a whole, but attacked the Philippine clergy as it was practiced during his time. I agree also with the gentleman from Batangas that Rizal never attacked the Filipino clergy . . .

Senator RECTO. Not only that; Father Florentino appears to be a towering figure, the real protagonist, in the *El Filibusterismo*.

Senator LIM. . . . as a personification of the Filipino priests at that time. But I am afraid, gentleman from Batangas, and my question is whether you would agree with me or not, that there are few Filipinos with analytical mind such as yours, because I must confess that, as a member of the Senate and member of the Philippine bar, this is the first time that I am convinced that your claims are correct, that Rizal never attacked the Catholic religion as a whole, and not even the Catholic Church in the Philippines, but only as it was administered at the time.

Senator RECTO. Correct.

Senator LIM. Does not the gentleman believe that we should find ways and means, when the implementation of the law comes, some kind of a resumé of your analysis so that the students may know that Rizal did not attack the Catholic Church and, perhaps, incorporate those letters and conversations written by Dr. Rizal, and letters to his friends and their answers to him, as well as conversations and interviews cited by Your Honor, does not the gentleman believe that that would be an injustice to the Catholic church, when we approve this bill, or perhaps, only to satisfy them of

your sincerity, gentleman from Batangas, that you are not presenting this bill for the purpose of attacking the Catholic church?

Senator RECTO. Of course not; far from that.

Senator LIM. I agree with you. I believe in your sincerity. But before I proceed, you said that you are not aiming at the Catholic church, but only in inculcating patriotism and nationalism in the minds of our youth?

Senator RECTO. Civic consciousness, and all that.

Senator LIM. Does not the gentleman believe that we can find means of inserting in the bill a statement that it is the sense of the Congress—I admit that this proposition may not be acceptable to the Senate—but just the same, can we not insert a section in the bill stating that it is the sense of this Congress that Dr. José Rizal, in his novels, had never attacked the Catholic church as a religion, and that he retracted whatever he may have said which may be found derogatory to the teachings and dogmas of the church, just to pacify the Catholic elements?

Senator RECTO. Your Honor cannot pacify them that way. They don't want these novels read at all. That is the truth. If you propose that amendment to the bill, that will give rise to the suspicion that he really attacked the Catholic church, and I deny it, because it is not true.

Senator LIM. What I mean is, in a hypothetical sense, in case his utterance or writings may draw the conclusion that he really attacked the Catholic church.

Senator RECTO. Not in the *Noli*, nor in the *Fili*, but in subsequent writings, for instance in his debate with Father Pastells, where he said plenty against the Catholic church, but, I repeat, not in the *Noli* and *Fili*.

Senator LIM. I gave that as a food for thought. Thank you, gentleman from Batangas.

MANIFESTACIONES DEL SENADOR RODRIGO

Senator RODRIGO. Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT. Gentleman from Bulacán.

Senator RODRIGO. Mr. President, I am not going to interpellate. I rise on a matter of personal privilege. It has been insinuated here that we who invoke this document, which has been termed the pastoral, did so without knowing or verifying whether this letter is a document by the Philippine hierarchy. Now, that is to me a serious imputation against my standing as a member of this august body, so I would like to clarify that.

I would like to state, Mr. President, that a copy of this pastoral was given to me; that this document was given to me, the gentleman from Quezon was trying to correct me, so let me say "document," and it has the stamp of the Catholic Welfare Organization of the Philippines, signed by Fernando Mempin. I know, Mr. President, that Fernando Mempin is Monsignor Fernando Mempin, who is the secretary-general of the Catholic Welfare Organization of the Philippines, and I also know that the Catholic Welfare Organization of the Philippines is the official organization in Manila of all the bishops all over the Philippines. And so, when this was given to me signed by the secretary-general of the Catholic Welfare Organization, I take it that this is an authentic document, and this really is the document, official document of the hierarchy, either acting distinctly or through duly authorized representatives. Now, this statement was likewise published in the papers of all the Metropolitan dailies not only as news item but as fully paid editorial. Now, Mr. President, being a Catholic citizen I know my duty as a citizen and I also know my duty or duties as a Catholic. My duty as a Catholic is this: If a document like this, purportedly like this document of the Philippine hierarchy, is given to me with the stamp and signature of the Catholic Welfare Organization and I was told that same copies stamped and signed were given to all the members of the Senate, now, as I repeat, if I received copy like this and if I see this is published as full-page editorial in the papers and no denial is made by the members of the hierarchy, and if I still have doubt as to the authenticity and veracity of this document, my duty as a Catholic, before doubting and proclaiming it as spurious, is to go to the Archbishop of Manila and ask him and I know personally, Mr. President, not that I doubt the veracity of this Pastoral, but I know because I talked with Archbishop Rufino Santos and I would like to announce here that it was Archbishop Rufino Santos who said that that is true. It was Archbishop Rufino Santos, a patriotic Filipino, a Filipino who had suffered imprisonment in Fort Santiago for ten months during the Japanese Occupation who told me that this statement is official and is binding in conscience to the Catholics. That is all I want to say.

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

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

Senator RODRIGO. Willingly.

Senator TAÑADA. While Your Honor was making his remarks, he used the word "Pastoral" and because I could not control myself I said "Pastoral" and the gentleman corrected himself by saying "document", adding that he was doing so because the gentleman from Quezon questioned him with respect to the use of the word "Pastoral". Is that not true?

Senator RODRIGO. Yes, I heard the gentleman from Quezon himself, who is sitting right beside me.

Senator TAÑADA. And because of that remark when Your Honor used the word "Pastoral", referring to that document, Your Honor changed his statement and used "document".

Senator RODRIGO. Yes, Your Honor.

Senator TAÑADA. Did Your Honor correct himself because of my observation or because of the fact that he believes that that is not a Pastoral?

Senator RODRIGO. In all frankness and humility, I admit that I might have been wrong in referring to this document as a Pastoral, but the fact that I know this as a Pastoral which might not have been a Pastoral just shows I am not a spokesman of the hierarchy. But I would like to state, Mr. President, that even if this is not technically a Pastoral I know for sure because as a Catholic I asked ecclesiastical authorities, if this can be considered a pastoral in the broad meaning of that word. It is an official interpretation by the Catholic hierarchy of the Canon Law in relation to these two books and therefore, this document, no matter what its technical meaning will be, is binding in conscience to the Catholics.

Senator TAÑADA. I am very much interested to learn that Your Honor was not the only one who consulted the Philippine hierarchy on this matter because I am also a Catholic and I would like to obey Pastorals. My question is, considering the fact that Your Honor has been studying this question very thoroughly, does Your Honor really believe that that document is a pastoral?

Senator RODRIGO. I inquired about that matter when that was raised in the Senate from the ecclesiastical experts. Some of them say in a general sense that this can be called pastoral but in strict meaning this cannot be called pastoral. However, this document is official and authentic, it is an official interpretation of the hierarchy of the meaning of the Canon Law 1399 in connection with these two books and whether or not it is pastoral in a general sense or strict sense, this is binding in

conscience to the faithful. And this is the material point at issue in this case, Mr. President.

Senator TAÑADA. This document is one of the issues in this case, that is why I did not want to consume the valuable time of this Body as to stand up and object when we come to discuss this pastoral. This is an issue, there is no question. I am not at least questioning the authenticity of this document which I got from Your Honor containing the statement of the Philippine hierarchy on the novels of Dr. Jose Rizal, the *Noli Me Tangere* and *El Filibusterismo*. This is authentic, but is it a pastoral? That is the issue.

Senator RODRIGO. My claim, Mr. President, and I said it already and I will repeat it to put in a light vein what Shakespeare said:

"What is in a name? that which we call a rose
By any other name would smell as sweet;"

My statement is this: I am the one who started calling this Pastoral in my privilege speech. Maybe I was wrong and when this matter was brought up before this august body I started inquiring whether I was wrong in calling it Pastoral. Some ecclesiastics told me that in the broad meaning I could have been right in calling it such, but in the strict meaning maybe I was wrong. But the thing is not in the name. Whether that is pastoral or not, the substance and essence is the most important thing. The substance and essence of that document is that it is an official statement by the hierarchy proclaiming their interpretation of Canon Law 1399 in connection with these two books and that substance of the Pastoral is the thing that is material to this issue. If we will start arguing now on terminology, I think we will be wasting our time on things which are not vitally material to the issue.

Senator TAÑADA. No, because when you call something as Pastoral you are to be understood as referring to a Pastoral, otherwise you can say: "No, I do not mean it is pastoral, it is only semi-pastoral." Let us go to another point. What do you call this document? According to Your Honor it is not in a strict sense pastoral. What is it in a broad sense?

Senator RODRIGO. In a broad sense, Mr. Speaker, as I said, that can be called a Pastoral. In the strict sense, I was told it is not strictly a pastoral. But the real meaning of that is an official statement of the Philippine hierarchy. And the ordinary meaning of an official statement—I as a Catholic consulted our ecclesiastical authorities on that statement made by the hierarchy officially like that document—is binding in conscience on Catholics.

Senator TAÑADA. Will Your Honor please tell us how the hierarchy arrived at a statement? What is the procedure followed before the hierarchy could issue a statement like this?

Senator RODRIGO. As I said, I am not a spokesman for the hierarchy. But I would like to announce that since this matter and this point has been emphasized here, I as a member of the Senate, and at the same time a Filipino citizen and a Catholic, I shall try to request the members of the hierarchy to clarify the meaning of that document.

Senator TAÑADA. That is purely a personal matter of what Your Honor wants to do. But what we want to know is how this statement is arrived at by the hierarchy. You said this is a statement by the hierarchy. Now, who compose the hierarchy?

Senator RODRIGO. The question is asked in a way which would give the meaning that I am the only one is a position to talk to any member of the hierarchy and inquire. I believe that, in all humility, as good Catholics, if we want to know the real meaning, I should not be the one to go there and ask the hierarchy. I think Senator Tañada himself, as a Catholic, can go to the Archbishop of Manila, Monsignor Santos, Monsignor Reyes or Monsignor Antiporda. Why is that attitude taken, as if under the separation of Church and State a Catholic Senator cannot even go to the bishops and inquire, and they must have to require this subterfuge?

Senator TAÑADA. I am sorry, Your Honor, that you are misinterpreting my words and ideas. I am not adopting the attitude which you now want to convey here that a Catholic Senator, because he is a Senator, cannot go to the archbishop and find out what is this. I am cross-examining you on your statement and assertion here in the Senate that this is an official statement of the hierarchy. Now, which is that hierarchy that made that statement? Who compose that hierarchy that made that statement? Let us go to the points one by one. I thank you for your advice, although I know my duties as a Catholic. But let us go to the facts. You say that this is an official statement of the hierarchy. Who compose that hierarchy that made this statement?

Senator RODRIGO. As I said I would not want to speak officially here for the hierarchy. But in my personal capacity and out of my knowledge, without in any way making this official or without in any way claiming that this is the actual fact, I shall just give to the gentleman from Quezon my knowledge of the organization of the hierarchy. The hierarchy is composed of the bishops and the arch-

bishops spread out all over the Philippines. However, like the Nacionalista Party spread out all over the Philippines, it has an executive committee or directorate which can meet in Manila without calling all the members. Now, this is called the Ecclesiastical Committee of the Catholic Welfare Organization, and that Catholic Welfare Organization, to my mind, I might be mistaken, is the official organization of all the bishops. Now, I would say that it is possible that this official organization, authorized by the Philippine hierarchy to act for the members of the hierarchy, prepared that statement and issued that statement. And it is also possible that before issuing that statement they consulted by telegram, by telephone, or by whatever means, the other members of the hierarchy. That is my personal opinion. And I repeat, if the gentlemen of the Senate wants an official statement regarding this official document, then I shall be the intermediary. Right this afternoon, I shall go and see Archbishop Rufino Santos and tell him this doubt created about the official standing of this document, and I shall ask him to please make an official statement regarding this document.

Senator TAÑADA. In other words, as far as you know, you cannot state here that this document is an official statement of all the bishops and archbishops of the Philippines.

Senator RODRIGO. As far as I know, I confess, personally I am convinced that this is official. Now, whether this was issued directly by all or issued through a duly authorized smaller body, or issued by a smaller body after consultation with the other members of the hierarchy, I am not sure. But as a Catholic, after this point was brought out on the floor of the Senate, I went to Archbishop Santos and inquired about this point that was raised, and he told me that there can be no doubt about that. He said that this is the official interpretation of the Philippine hierarchy; that is their interpretation of Canon 1399 in connection with these two books, and that is binding in conscience on all Catholics.

Senator TAÑADA. You know, Your Honor, when you took the floor and referred to this document as a pastoral, I accepted it as a pastoral. But when the distinguished gentleman from Batangas started to analyze the contents of this document and to state facts showing that this document cannot possibly be a pastoral as this word is ordinarily understood, I started to doubt whether this is a pastoral or not. I accepted that this was a pastoral before Senator Recto started to analyze the contents of this document. I even asked Senator Rosales concerning this pastoral the minute I started to enter-

tain doubts regarding the same and, with your answers now, I am more in doubt than before. And like you, gentleman from Bulacán, like you, I am going to the archbishop and I am going to ask him all the questions that I asked Senator Recto. I will ask him if there was a meeting, when and where that meeting was; what has been discussed in that meeting; how this document was prepared; who gave approval to it; and as it has been referred to as a pastoral, whether this is really a pastoral or not. Your Honor, this is a very important matter. As I said, if I take the floor of the Senate, and I say something to be a fact, I am willing to stand by it. I am not going to say that this is a pastoral when it is not.

Senator RODRIGO. I am different. If I say something as a fact and later on find out that I was mistaken, I will humbly admit that mistake.

Senator TAÑADA. When I state something as a fact, I do so knowing that it is a fact. And in my long stay here in the Senate, since 1948, no one has succeeded in showing that I have made a misstatement or misrepresentation of facts.

Senator RODRIGO. Well, I am not infallible as the gentleman from Quezon. I admit that there are times when I do commit mistakes, and I pray God that I be given enough humility, when I commit a mistake and find out later on that I committed a mistake, to admit the mistake with humble grace and correct my mistakes.

Senator TAÑADA. I am not claiming infallibility. What I am claiming is that when I take the floor, I weigh my words and investigate and study, and I would not hesitate at all to say, perhaps, that this is a semi-pastoral when it is not really a pastoral.

Senator RODRIGO. When I say that this is a pastoral that is an honest belief. As I said, when the gentlemen from Batangas and Quezon started questioning the proper use of the term like the gentleman from Quezon, I started to entertain some doubt. And so I inquired and I think that is what we should do, inquire from the ecclesiastical authorities. They told me that in a general sense, I can be right. But in a strict sense, it is not strictly a pastoral. But in substance, it is official, and it is binding. So that in substance and it is the substance that is important here and not the name, the issue has not changed, Mr. President. Thank you very much.

Senator RECTO. May I resume, Mr. President. I will be through in a few minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT. The gentleman from Batangas may proceed.

Senator RECTO. (*Continuing*) One of the reasons, Mr. President, why I don't believe that their excellencies, the members of the hierarchy, could have issued this document, and much less intended it as a pastoral, is because of this other important consideration. This document makes the works of Rizal or passages thereof fall under the Canon Law, more precisely under Canon 1399, paragraph 6 because of the attacks on the religious orders, and on Father Dámaso, Father Salvi, Father Sibyla and other friars who were among the characters of these two novels. This so-called "pastoral" says that these books are prohibited because of their avowed aim of defaming the clerical or religious states, meaning the attacks on members of the religious orders in the Philippines, or friars, or on the orders themselves.

Mr. President, this is a wrong interpretation of the Canon Law. The following is a passage from a Commentary to the Canon Law, used in Catholic seminaries:

The term insult is liable to a more or less subjective interpretation. Essentially it means an undeserved affront or indignity offered to one's self-respect. The insult, to bring a book within the prohibited class, must strike at the hierarchy *as such*, not at single persons. The same is true of the clerical or religious state. Therefore an insult hurled against a clergyman, or several clergymen, or against a religious, or one house or congregation or religious, or even a whole order could not be called an affront against the religious state.

(A Commentary on Canon Law, Vol. VI, Canon 1399, p. 473)

From this we may infer that the attacks contained in the *Noli* and *Fili* against individual friars and even against certain religious orders in the Philippines in Rizal's time, do not fall under the provision of Canon 1399, which prohibits books the set purpose of which is to insult the ecclesiastical hierarchy or the clerical or religious state.

Now, Mr. President, yesterday I was reminded by a distinguished member of this body of a speech I delivered before an Ateneo gathering three years ago, if I am not mistaken, where I made the statement that in my belief the document of retraction of Rizal, which is attributed to Rizal, is incontestably genuine. That reminder was made presumably because of late I have qualified said admission because of new facts in connection with said retraction that recently have come to my knowledge. One of them is that Rizal was denied a Christian burial. I only discovered this a few days ago. I had the idea that because he was buried in the Cemetery of Paco, he was *ipso facto* given Christian burial, but the fact is,

as I learned it the other day, the ecclesiastical authorities did not permit that his remains be buried within the inner wall, or in one of the niches of the Paco Cemetery intended for Catholics. He was buried outside the inner wall, on the side walk, where the infidels and suicides were given burial. When I was told this I asked myself: If he died a Catholic because of his alleged retraction, why then was he denied a Christian burial? Why was he buried as an infidel or as a suicide, if, according to the claim of the ecclesiastical authorities, he died in the bosom of our religion, the Catholic religion? This finding gathered a cloud of doubts over my former belief in the authenticity of the supposed retraction.

But it was the indubitable intention of the gentleman who had the kindness of reminding me of that Ateneo speech to show a contradiction between what I stated then and what I have said recently. I wish to inform him that my former belief in the authenticity of the document of retraction was based on the great similarity of Rizal's signature thereon and other signatures of his that are admittedly genuine.

But that is not the point. The important point is not whether the signature on the document of retraction is authentic or not, because there is the other question that even if the signature were authentic, it could have been obtained through fraud, duress, threat, or false promises. And then, what is more important is to determine the phraseology of the retraction. What did Rizal retract from in that document? I said in that Ateneo speech, and this passage has been conveniently omitted by the gentleman from Bulacán when he read part of the speech, the following:

"Rizal abjuró de la masonería y se desdijo de todo lo que, según él, pudiera haber dicho que fuese contrario a su calidad de hijo de la Iglesia. Pero eso sí, no se retractó, porque la ortodoxia religiosa no riñe con el patriotismo, de cuanto dijo y escribió para escarnecer los vicios de aquel régimen y la pusilanimidad y culpable conformismo de sus propios paisanos, para defender la dignidad de la patria contra los malandrines que la ultrajaban, y para proclamar con los más viriles y patéticos acentos el derecho de su pueblo a una vida libre e independiente."

Impliedly, but clearly, I meant the "Noli Me Tángere" and "El Filibusterismo" because it is in these books that he set forth all those ideas I have alluded to. Allow me to render a rough translation in English of that part of the speech in question:

"... Rizal abjured from masonry and retracted everything that he could have said that was contrary to his status

as a son of the church, but mind you, he did not retract anything that he said or subscribed to, to castigate the vices of that regime and the apathy and culpable acquiescence of his own countrymen, to defend the dignity of the nation against the rascals that were oppressing it, and to proclaim with the most courageous words the right of his people to a free and independent life."

I made special reference although in an implied way, to the *Noli* and *Fili*. So, the important thing, Mr. President, is the contents of this retraction.

Now, Mr. President, there are many more things to be said in connection with this matter. But I understand I have devoted more time—thanks to the indulgence of the members of the Senate in connection with this matter. I said and I repeat now that I profess the Catholic faith. I may not be a virtuous man. Maybe, I am a sinner unlike other Catholics. I do not claim saintliness. As far as dogmas are concerned, I am a Catholic and to me God is before country, because God gave me this country. Certainly, I do not admit that church should come before country, because church is just an instrument of God. Churches are composed of fallible beings. According to this document referred to as a pastoral, the church can and does commit mistakes as it did when it burned Joan of Arc, at the stake, a mistake it acknowledged after a lapse of 500 years, not only by wiping out the stigma of witch and heretic with which she had died but also by elevating her to sainthood. It would be a blasphemy to say that God can commit mistakes. Therefore, we should not impute to God the mistakes committed by the church, because the church is run by fallible human beings, and as it is said in this document, those faults belong only to those men and to the church in the Philippines at that time.

Now, Mr. President, before closing this address, allow me to paraphrase the last words of Rizal in his dedication of *El Filibusterismo* to the sacred memory of Father Gómez, Father Burgos, and Father Zamora: "Let anyone who would attack Rizal, by attacking the writings that he left to us, particularly the *Noli* and the *Fili*, let anyone who would do that, stain his hands in his blood."

I thank you, Mr. President.

MANIFESTACIONES DEL SEN. TAÑADA

Senator TAÑADA. Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT. Gentleman from Quezon. Senator TAÑADA. On the floor I made the promise that I would see the Archbishop to find out whether this document is a pastoral or not and find out how

the hierarchy came to issue that statement. I asked our Sergeant-at-arms to contact the office of the Archbishop so that I could make an appointment, but I have been informed that the Archbishop does not go to the office in the afternoon, and he is out at present.

But, Mr. President, I don't think I will have to do that, because I have here a letter of Father Mempin, addressed to me, which reads as follows:

"My dear Mr. Senator:

"This organization has the honor to furnish you a certified true copy of the statement of the Catholic hierarchy on the *Noli* and *Fili*, subject of Senate Bill 438, for your record and reference.

"Respectfully,

"FATHER MEMPIN"

Now, in other words, according to this correspondence that I received, this is a statement, not a pastoral. Furthermore, Mr. President, I have been informed by a person whose veracity I cannot doubt at all, that what really happened was that the more than forty bishops here in the Philippines did not meet to consider and issue this statement; that this statement was issued by a committee that administers the Catholic Welfare Organization and that, according to my information, this committee is authorized to make such statement as this.

Now, Mr. President, whether there has been an express or specific authorization to issue this statement which has been referred to as a pastoral I do not know. But I have no doubt in my mind now that this so-called pastoral is but a statement issued by that executive committee, or ecclesiastical committee, to use the words of Senator Rodrigo, with or without prior specific authority. There is therefore a big difference between the idea entertained by us before that this document was a pastoral, and our idea now of this document. Now it is clear that this document is but a statement, not a pastoral, issued by said ecclesiastical committee. Thank you very much.

SUSPENSIÓN DE LA SESIÓN

Senator PRIMICIAS. Mr. President, I move to suspend the session of the Senate until this afternoon at 5:00 o'clock.

The ACTING PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the session is suspended until this afternoon at 5:00 o'clock.

Eran las 12:50 p.m.