

Sr. GUARIÑA. Es que el Colector de Aduanas tiene en cuenta las circunstancias que atraviesa el cabotaje del país; sabe que no puede exigir más de los navieros, y tiene que obrar de acuerdo con esas circunstancias.

Sr. FESTÍN. ¿Le ha dicho eso a Su Señoría el Colector de Aduanas?

Sr. GUARIÑA. No, señor.

Sr. FESTÍN. ¿Conoce Su Señoría el desastre del *Quantico*?

Sr. GUARIÑA. Sí, señor.

Sr. FESTÍN. ¿No sabe Su Señoría que el *Quantico* era uno de los barcos más fuertes y consistentes?

Sr. GUARIÑA. Es una excepción.

Sr. FESTÍN. Cuando se trata de un barco nuevo, fuerte y consistente y que reúne las mejores condiciones y naufraga, es una excepción.

Sr. GUARIÑA. Sí, señor, porque en Filipinas es inconcebible que se hayan hundido muchos barcos en nueve años.

Sr. FESTÍN. ¿No sabe Su Señoría que hace dos meses, un barco extranjero naufragó también cerca de Balabag?

Sr. GUARIÑA. Otra excepción.

Sr. GARCÍA. Señor Presidente, para algunas preguntas al orador.

El PRESIDENTE PRO TEMPORE. El orador puede contestar, si le place.

Sr. GUARIÑA. Sí, señor.

Sr. GARCÍA. Si no he comprendido mal, parece que por algún tiempo, la Compañía Tabacalera se ha visto precisada a fletar algunos barcos de la Casa Madrigal para operar en la línea del Norte.

Sr. GUARIÑA. Sí, señor.

Sr. GARCÍA. Y que la Tabacalera fletó a su costo en la precisión de fletar esos barcos, y que sus costos no son suficientes.

Sr. GUARIÑA. Sí, señor, hay una carga y pasaje, que un barco no es bastante.

Sr. GARCÍA. ¿Y no cree Su Señoría que quitando el privilegio de reponer los barcos que tiene la Tabacalera, los navieros filipinos podrían hacer mejor negocio allí?

Sr. GUARIÑA. Es que no somos partidarios de la reposición del tonelaje perdido, sino que estamos pidiendo ahora, que sean sustituidas las unidades que tienen los extranjeros.

Sr. GARCÍA. Adoptando esa actitud que Su Señoría acaba de manifestar, y buscando solamente que se permita a los navieros extranjeros sustituir sus viejos barcos con otros nuevos, ¿no cree Su Señoría que dando esa oportunidad a los navieros filipinos antes que a los extranjeros, los barcos de los navieros filipinos que operan esa línea, operarían mejor?

Sr. GUARIÑA. Eso si el filipino puede cubrirla, pues si no la cubre, daría lugar a que el extranjero tenga más, y no queremos eso, porque somos protectionistas.

Sr. GARCÍA. ¿De modo que Su Señoría presume en este momento que los navieros filipinos no podrán obtener el tonelaje suficiente para responder a las demandas de la línea del Norte?

Sr. GUARIÑA. No me refiero a una ruta determinada, sino que tengo entendido que las casas navieras filipinas no pueden traer muchos barcos para

cubrir las líneas marítimas. Eso lo ha dicho el mismo Fernández.

Sr. GARCÍA. Yo me he referido a una línea específica en mi pregunta y quisiera una contestación sobre esa línea. Digo yo, que si nosotros no permitiésemos a los navieros extranjeros que pongan nuevos barcos en sustitución de los que tienen ahora, ¿no cree Su Señoría que la presunción es que el filipino podrá también hacerlo?

Sr. GUARIÑA. Madrigal mismo, retiró la consignación o dejó de fletar esos barcos. Madrigal puede operar ahora mismo, juntamente con el *Mauban* de la Tabacalera.

Sr. GARCÍA. ¿Pero no ha dicho Su Señoría que la Compañía Tabacalera es quien ha fletado los barcos de Madrigal?

Sr. GUARIÑA. No, están consignados a la Tabacalera. Y si eso es verdad, el verdadero propietario es Madrigal.

Sr. GARCÍA. Lo que he querido saber de Su Señoría es, si la Compañía Tabacalera tiene fletados esos barcos.

Sr. GUARIÑA. No sé si están fletados o consignados a la Tabacalera; pero sea lo uno o lo otro, si están consignados, eso prueba que el naviero filipino compite con la Tabacalera en el Norte, cuando Madrigal no ha dicho que está perdiendo. Si están fletados por la Tabacalera y no hemos podido filipinar la línea del Norte, la culpa la tiene Madrigal, que es un filipino como nosotros. El debía operar esos barcos. La Comisión de Servicios Públicos puede reservar una parte de la carga de la Tabacalera para otros barcos. Es una utilidad pública, y la Comisión de Servicios Públicos puede compeler a la Tabacalera.

El PRESIDENTE PRO TEMPORE. Ha expirado el tiempo del Caballero por Sorsogón.

Sr. PERFECTO (G.). Pido el consentimiento unánime de la Cámara para que se concedan 20 minutos más al Caballero por Sorsogón.

El PRESIDENTE PRO TEMPORE. ¿Hay alguna objeción?

Sr. PALARCA. Me opongo.

Mr. MARCOS. I object.

Sr. GUARIÑA. Voy a dejar de contestar a las preguntas, para que los otros puedan hablar.

DISCURSO EN PRO, DEL SR. MARCOS

Mr. MARCOS. Mr. Speaker, misunderstanding is the cause of nearly all troubles. And we can go as far as to say that misunderstanding is the cause of all troubles. Because of misunderstanding a brother has to fight a brother, a wife to fight a husband, and nation to fight a nation. And in many instances it had been the cause of many a national conflagration. Misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, entered the portals of this magnificent hall and is now creating a rumpus among the members of this august body. Because of this rumpus, it is said that a certain group has formed a bloc, another group another bloc, and then there goes the story that some Representatives were bribed to favor or to oppose the measure. And yet if each and every one of us would only be willing enough to take the medicine in order that our passion and emotion

would subside down to normal condition, I am sure that such a misunderstanding would be ironed out.

What is the cause of the misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker? Those who are against the measure claim and assert that we have to improve the inter-island service because it is inadequate, unsatisfactory, and unsafe. And those who are on the other side, those who are now favoring the measure, claim the same thing. They assert the same thing as proven by this explanatory note of the bill. It says here:

"This bill is introduced with the hope that it will respond to the unceasing clamor of the public for better treatment of passengers on board vessels plying in Philippine waters. It assures the passengers the space, food, sanitary necessities and all other privileges to which they are entitled in proportion to the fare that they pay. The bill also prohibits the carrying on board of all such objects and articles as may endanger the life or health of the passengers, as well as the carrying of horses, and cattle, and other animals on deck near or appurtenant to the berth or compartments of the passengers for hygienic reasons."

Such being the case, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see why we should be fighting on this point when both sides agree on the same matter. They agree upon the same principle. Both, in other words, are in favor of correcting the anomaly. Both are in favor of making the interisland service more adequate, more satisfactory, and safer. So, in so far as that point is concerned, there is no question.

Those who are in favor of the measure claim and assert that in matters of this kind we should not lose sight of protectionism and nationalism. The other side claim that the bill does not protect the nationals. In other words, they want a bill that would protect the nationals, yes, one that would protect the Filipino people. So, there again is another point on which the two parties agree.

Mr. PERFECTO (F. A.). Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for some questions?

The SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE. The gentleman may yield if he so desires.

Mr. MARCOS. With pleasure.

Mr. PERFECTO (F. A.). Has the gentleman from Ilocos Norte sailed on any of the steamers from his province to this place?

Mr. MARCOS. Yes, sir.

Mr. PERFECTO (F. A.). Has he observed the conditions found on those steamers?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, gentleman from Albay, may I know what your purpose is, to cut short with the interpellations?

Mr. PERFECTO (F. A.). I think my question is very clear.

Mr. MARCOS. That is it; if you have many questions to ask which can be asked only in one question, it would be better. You see, you have interrupted me in the middle of my speech, and I would like to go ahead with my remarks.

Mr. PERFECTO (F. A.). My question is, do you know the conditions of the steamers and the kind of service given by the steamers?

Mr. MARCOS. Yes.

Mr. PERFECTO (F. A.). My question was clear enough.

Mr. MARCOS. Exactly.

Mr. PERFECTO (F. A.). Has the gentleman from Ilocos Norte taken into consideration the fact, that in the lines in the Bicol region, some of the merchants cannot load or contract the service of the steamers plying between those places, because the present number of steamers cannot meet the necessities of the merchants in that region?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, I cannot see why you ask me that question when in fact I am in favor of improving the interisland service. You should direct that question to one who is not in favor of improving the shipping service.

Mr. PERFECTO (F. A.). I believe that the gentleman from Ilocos Norte should be kind enough to give good answers because if the answers are bad they would create some misunderstanding. It seems to me that the gentleman from Ilocos Norte started by saying that he is desirous of clarifying misunderstanding, but in fact he seems to foster it in his answers.

Mr. MARCOS. Well, gentleman from Albay, I am not creating misunderstanding; I am clarifying misunderstanding. You say I am fostering it, but I am pacifying it and I am trying to clarify misunderstanding. You have taken just the opposite view.

Mr. PERFECTO (F. A.). We will leave that aside. The gentleman from Ilocos Norte knows that the present bill he is now favoring provides for the creation of a board that will determine the sufficiency or insufficiency of the tonnage in the different lines in the Philippine Islands. Does he favor that provision of the bill?

Mr. MARCOS. I shall answer that question in the course of my peroration.

Mr. PERFECTO (F. A.). I would like an answer now.

Mr. MARCOS. My answer is long, so allow me to answer your question in the course of my remarks.

Mr. PERFECTO (F. A.). Does the gentleman from Ilocos Norte know that the Morton Committee and the Collector of Customs have already given their reports stating that there is insufficiency of tonnage in all the lines of the Philippines?

Mr. MARCOS. Probably so.

Mr. PERFECTO (F. A.). If that is true, will not the gentleman from Ilocos Norte agree with me that that precise provision of the bill is unnecessary because we know already that there is insufficiency of tonnage in all the lines?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, gentleman from Albay, as I have already said, I will answer that question in the course of my speech. However, if that is your only objection, you can present an amendment.

Mr. PERFECTO (F. A.). Will the gentleman from Ilocos Norte accept an amendment to that effect?

Mr. MARCOS. I am not in a position to answer for the committee. However, I am sure the members of the committee will have no objection to accept any feasible amendment.

Mr. PERFECTO (F. A.). The gentleman in speaking in favor of the bill, must have taken notice that the bill provides for the filing of bonds on the part of the Filipino shipowners to give them a chance to provide for the necessary tonnage?

Mr. MARCOS. That is true.

Mr. PERFECTO (F. A.). And yet those who sponsor the bill say that they favor a policy of national-ism to protect shipping in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. MARCOS. I shall answer that in the course of my peroration, because your questions are not side issues—they are the principal issues. Naturally, I shall have to limit my arguments to those issues.

Mr. PERFECTO (F. A.). The gentleman from Ilocos Norte must have taken notice that some of those who favor the present bill seem to claim that we must give a nationalistic and protectionist law in favor of five or six shipowners in the Philippine Islands, and let the service as it is.

Mr. MARCOS. That is where I disagree with you, and if you would allow me to continue my remarks, I believe we shall come to a point on which to agree.

(Continuing.) Mr. Speaker, both parties agree that we need a safer, more adequate and more efficient interisland service. That point is agreed. We want a law that protects our nation. Those who are on the liberal party as we may call it, that is, those who are against the measure, say that the bill does not protect the nationals. In so far as that is concerned, it is a matter of interpretation because those that favor the measure say that it protects the nation. Let us then come to the interpretation of the provisions of the bill. We must not lay aside the intention of the legislators. The explanatory note of the bill emphatically states that it is for the purpose of giving protection to the nationals. So on those two points we agree. The other point is that those who are against the measure say that it is a dilatory measure, because it will require the appointment of a committee to make a report to the Governor-General, and after some days the Governor-General will make a proclamation, and after that it will require the shipowners to file a bond of not less than ₱25,000 and not more than ₱50,000 for each ship, and many other things more. That means to say that it will need about two years before a ship could be introduced. But, gentlemen of the liberal group, did not the representative of the Tabacalera state in the public hearing that they could not introduce a new ship in less than two years' time? Such being the case, neither your stand nor our stand can immediately improve the inter-island service. At least two years must elapse before any improvement could be made.

Mr. BITENG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit some questions?

The SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE. Does the gentleman from Ilocos Norte yield to the gentleman from Ilocos Sur?

Mr. MARCOS. I yield.

Mr. BITENG. Will the gentleman from Ilocos Norte please inform the House whether the Filipino shipowners may not, according to the present laws of the land, bring in new vessels?

Mr. MARCOS. Yes, sir; they can.

Mr. BITENG. And does the gentleman from Ilocos Norte know that the law involved in the bill under discussion was approved in 1918?

Mr. MARCOS. That is well known, gentleman from Ilocos Sur.

Mr. BITENG. Therefore, the gentleman from Ilocos Norte must admit that since 1918 up to the present time the Filipino shipowners have had a chance to bring in as many vessels as they wanted to in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. MARCOS. Gentleman from Ilocos Sur, your question needs a very long answer. I have to relate to you the story of the Filipino shipowners from 1918 up to the present time. It will cover a book or perhaps volumes.

Mr. BITENG. Cannot the Filipino shipowners improve the lines without interfering with the rights of the foreign shipowners conceded by the Philippine Legislature?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, gentleman from Ilocos Sur, I know that you understand that there will come the question of competition.

Mr. BITENG. In other words, gentleman from Ilocos Norte, do you admit that the Filipino shipowners are not in a position to compete with the foreign shipowners unless we approve the bill under discussion?

Mr. MARCOS. And there is where I should have you remember the principle of protectionism, which is the one that I am going to discuss. There is where our shipowners need protection. Of course, we know already that they cannot compete with the foreign companies because the latter are very rich. Everything is at their disposal, but our Filipino shipowners comparatively are poor.

Mr. BITENG. Does not the gentleman from Ilocos Norte know that the foreign shipping companies in the Philippine Islands have a right to repair their vessels from year to year?

Mr. MARCOS. That is the very reason why the law, in 1918, was adopted that way, gentleman from Ilocos Sur.

Mr. BITENG. Now, if the foreign shipping companies have a right to repair their vessels from year to year, that means that their present vessels could ply on the Philippine waters, may be for 50, 70, 100 years, or more.

Mr. MARCOS. Well, that is only a probability, gentleman from Ilocos Sur, for you must not lose sight of the intention of the legislators when they approved the bill in 1918. They had in mind the idea that the shipping business would gradually fall into the hands of the nationals.

Mr. BITENG. But will any foreign vessels ever fall into the hands of the Filipinos if the foreign shipping companies have a right to repair them from year to year?

Mr. MARCOS. It is very simple. There will be a time when the cost of the repair of one of these foreign ships will be more than the cost of a new ship, so the owners will prefer to buy new ones.

Mr. BITENG. Now, how many years shall we have to wait until that time comes when the foreign vessels will no longer be of any service? Can the gentleman from Ilocos Norte say more or less how many years—30, 40, or 100 years?

Mr. MARCOS. As I understand, gentleman from Ilocos Sur, the moment the Collector of Customs

declares that a steamship is unseaworthy, on that moment she ceases to ply in the Philippine waters. So it will depend upon the seaworthiness of the vessel. Even five years from now if the Collector of Customs says this ship is unseaworthy, she shall have to stop.

Mr. BITENG. Mr. Speaker, we would be glad to hear the story of the gentleman from Ilocos Norte from 1918 up to the present time.

Mr. MARCOS. (*Continuing.*) So, Mr. Speaker, the question then that arises is contained in section (b) on page 2 of the explanatory note. It says here: "To grant to the domestic companies the preferential opportunity of improving the said service, giving such opportunity only in a secondary manner to the foreign companies authorized by the law of 1918 to engage in the shipping trade in the event that the domestic companies are unable, or unwilling to take advantage of such preference."

Sr. PAREDES. ¿Tendría Su Señoría la amabilidad de informarnos si es uno de los que han firmado una enmienda, por la cual se autoriza la reposición de barcos extranjeros bajo ciertas condiciones?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, I am one of them, gentleman from Abra. And I am speaking in favor of the bill because as I understand, the rules and regulations of the House require that those who are ready to present an amendment should speak in favor. I may be mistaken, but that is the way I understand the rules and regulations of the House.

Sr. PAREDES. ¿Pero no cree Su Señoría que este bill respecto al cual Su Señoría está hablando ahora, es esencialmente proteccionista, mientras que el bill que Su Señoría ha presentado es reposicionista, o sea anti-proteccionista?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, this is the thing, gentleman from Abra. The amendment which we have presented by substitution, contains something like this:

"* * * those new vessels to replace the old ones will last only a number of years during which time the old vessels will continue plying on the Philippine waters."

Let us take for example, steamship "B." After investigation the committee may say it would last only fifteen years. Then a new boat will be built to replace that old vessel only during fifteen years. If steamship "B" will last twenty years more, the foreign companies will be authorized to buy a new boat to replace this old vessel for a twenty-year term. That is the way I understand our amendment. And you are also one of the authors of the amendment.

Sr. PAREDES. ¿No estaría entonces en conflicto ese bill que nosotros hemos firmado, Su Señoría y su servidor, con el bill que se está ahora discutiendo y que defiende Su Señoría? Mientras que por el presente bill se da absoluta preferencia a los filipinos a poner los barcos antes que el extranjero, por el bill que Su Señoría y su servidor hemos firmado, y que está en la Cámara, damos al extranjero derecho de preferencia para reponer sus propios barcos. ¿Que voto podríamos esperar de Su Señoría en el caso en que se plantee la siguiente cuestión: votad por el bill Briones o por el bill Marcos, Paredes, etc?

Mr. MARCOS. Gentleman from Abra, I will have to state frankly and sincerely that I consider you as one of the brains of the party. However, if you would permit me to explain the way I view the very amendment that we have prepared it runs thus. The amendment that we have presented aims to have new boats in order to correct the anomaly existing, that is, the inadequate, unsatisfactory and inefficient service given at present. We want these old boats which could continue for twenty years to ply yet in Philippine waters to be changed with new ones, and we would get what we are after. In other words, we can get new accommodation, better satisfaction and a greater measure of safety for the Filipino people. So in that case, I am not favoring the foreigners, but I am only giving justice to them. I may be mistaken, gentleman from Abra, but that is the way I understand these two words. With the amendment I do not favor the foreigners, but I give them justice. Is it not true that favor and justice differ in meaning?

Sr. PAREDES. Agradezco las distinciones hechas por Su Señoría y temiendo abusar de su bondad, me permitiría una indiscreción más. ¿Permitiría Su Señoría que le preguntase cómo votaría, si yo llegase a presentar como una enmienda a este bill el bill que Su Señoría y otros más, con un servidor, hemos firmado?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, as I have already said, gentleman from Abra, my speaking in favor of the bill does not make me inconsistent. You have watched the way I stand here. There may be a seeming inconsistency on my part but the moment our amendment is put to a vote, inasmuch as it is not in conflict with the bill we are discussing, I shall have to vote for the amendment which your honor and I have presented.

Sr. PAREDES. Muy satisfecho, Caballero por Ilocos Norte.

Mr. MARCOS. (*Continuing.*) Mr. Speaker, it is a wonder to me why it is claimed that those who are in favor of the bill that is now under consideration do not know how to respond to the claim of the public. They claim that those who are in favor of the measure would only put to a dangerous situation those hundreds and hundreds of people who travel from Manila to many islands of the country. If hundreds and hundreds of persons are put in a very dangerous position, those representatives who are speaking in favor of the measure will be included in that group, and put their lives in a very dangerous condition. Take, for example, the representatives from Cebu, Messrs. Briones, Cuenco, and Ybañez. There is no means by which they can reach Cebu from Manila except by steamboats, yet they are in favor of the Briones bill, because they want protectionism or nationalism.

Sr. OPPUS. ¿Sabe Su Señoría que la línea mejor servida, la que tiene mejores buques, es la línea de Manila-Cebú, de manera que no se puede hablar allí de proteccionismo, porque ya estamos muy seguros?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, you want me to go ahead and cite other names, gentleman from Leyte. We have Representatives Kapunan and Marcaida and then

Representative Reyes from Sorsogon who have announced their desire to speak in favor of the measure, and there is no way by which they could reach their homes except by steamboats.

Sr. OPPUS. Desgraciadamente para Su Señoría tanto el Representante Kapunan como el Representante Reyes, viajan muy bien, porque el Representante Kapunan tiene a su disposición cuatro buques, el *Chirruca*, el *Leyte*, el *Sontua* y el *Visayas*, y el Representante Reyes no tiene por que preocuparse, porque viaja en tren.

Mr. MARCOS. Well, that is a question of appreciation, gentleman from Leyte. I am glad you said before this august body that you are satisfied with the service of our Filipino shipowners. I thought that all of those belonging to the liberal party claim the interisland service is unsatisfactory!

Sr. OPPUS. Satisfecho con esa línea, nada más.

Sr. GUARIÑA. Señor Presidente, para algunas preguntas al orador.

El PRESIDENTE PRO TEMPORE. El orador puede contestar, si le place.

Sr. MARCOS. Sí, señor.

Sr. GUARIÑA. ¿Considera Su Señoría proteccionista este bill que está bajo nuestra consideración?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, gentleman from Sorsogon, that is the way I see it. I may be wrong, I am sorry to state, but I have studied the matter conscientiously and with mature reflection, and I have come to the conclusion that this bill is for the protection of nationals.

Sr. GUARIÑA. ¿Cuál es la parte del bill por la cual podemos llegar a la conclusión de que es proteccionista?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, the nature of the bill itself.

Sr. GUARIÑA. ¿Cuál es la parte del bill que concede preferencia al naviero filipino?

Mr. MARCOS. It says here: "to have a careful study and investigation."

Sr. GUARIÑA. ¿Quiere decir Su Señoría que ya sabe el report del Comité de que se crea en el bill, y las rutas que se van a abrir en el Archipiélago, ya le son conocidas?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, in that very case, gentleman from Sorsogon, I cannot answer you categorically.

Sr. GUAU. ¿Sabe Su Señoría poco más o menos cuáles son esas rutas?

Mr. MARCOS. The same thing, gentleman from Sorsogon. Nobody can answer that question categorically.

Sr. GUARIÑA. ¿Y no sabe Su Señoría que esa ruta que mañana se va a abrir, puede ser cubierta por los navieros filipinos?

Mr. MARCOS. The point is we do not yet know. That is why we want to create a committee to investigate the matter. I think it is a wrong idea to begin with the premise that we already know the situation because the moment we know it there is no need for an investigation.

Sr. GUARIÑA. ¿Entonces, dónde está el proteccionismo del bill, cuando los extranjeros entrarán, en caso de no cubrirse esas rutas por los filipinos?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, gentleman from Sorsogon, if that is your very question, can you assure us that the foreigners will be able to do the same?

Sr. GUARIÑA. ¿Está seguro Su Señoría de que las rutas que ese Comité va a abrir, van a ser cubiertas mañana por los navieros filipinos?

Mr. MARCOS. But they will have to replace only those boats that are old now so in that case we are giving protection to our nationals.

Sr. GUARIÑA. ¿No sabe Su Señoría que hay una puerta abierta, por donde pueden entrar los extranjeros?

Mr. MARCOS. I should think so.

Sr. GUARIÑA. Entonces Su Señoría no ha leído el bill. Este da oportunidad al extranjero, siempre que el filipino no pueda cubrir la ruta.

Mr. MARCOS. Well, gentleman from Sorsogon, the moment no Filipino can do it, we cannot do anything else. But the point is that we should give preference to the nationals, we should give preference to the Filipinos. The moment they cannot do it, give the chance to the foreigners.

Sr. GUARIÑA. Vamos a suponer que hay cuatro rutas. Las dos rutas se cubren por navieros filipinos. Ahora pregunto; ¿es proteccionista este bill, cuando hace entrar a los extranjeros en las dos rutas restantes?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, gentleman from Sorsogon, as I have said, both parties agree on the principle of protectionism. If you believe that the bill that is now under discussion does not protect the nationals, I can anticipate that the members of the Committee on Navigation will accept an amendment which would protect the nationals. That is all agreed. Both parties agree to the principle of protectionism.

Sr. GUARIÑA. No es bastante dar preferencia al filipino, si no estamos seguros que el filipino puede llenar esa ruta. ¿Cómo vamos a correr el riesgo de que puedan entrar por esa puerta los extranjeros? El Bill no es, acaso, proteccionista?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, gentleman from Sorsogon, that is the very thing now that we want to approve. That is the very reason why we should give preference to the Filipinos.

Sr. GUARIÑA. ¿Está seguro Su Señoría de que las rutas que ese comité va a abrir, serán cubiertas por navieros filipinos?

Mr. MARCOS. Gentleman from Sorsogon, that shows that you do not have faith in your own country men. You doubt it now, although you have not given them a chance. Why not give them a chance before doubting their ability?

Sr. GUARIÑA. La consecuencia es falsa.

Mr. MARCOS. I am sorry I have made that conclusion, but that is the best way I can express what I think of it.

(Continuing). Now, granting for the sake of argument, Mr. Speaker, that the inter-island service is unsafe, inadequate and unsatisfactory as proven by the Negro disaster which they have continuously mentioned, I am pleaded to see that those who are greatly concerned, those who have no means of transportation from Manila to their homeland, are even supporting the bill. That shows, Mr. Speaker, that they are willing to make it known to the members of this august body and to the Filipino people in general that it matters not whether their lives are put in a very dangerous condition as long as it

is for their country's sake. Their stand means that at all costs they want in to preserve this law for their countrymen. And in this connection, I remember that immortal statement of Mabini, which runs thus:

"Love thy country next to God and thine honor, and more than thyself, for she is the sole patrimony of thy race, the only legacy of thy forefathers, and the only hope of thy descendants. To her thou owest thy life, thy liberty and thy God."

Sr. GUARIÑA. Señor Presidente, para otras preguntas al orador.

El PRESIDENTE PRO TEMPORE. El orador puede contestar, si le place.

Mr. MARCOS. Yes, sir.

Sr. GUARIÑA. Navegó alguna vez Mabini, con excepción de su viaje a Guam?

Mr. MARCOS. Gentleman from Sorsogon, I already understand what you mean. I am not quoting Mabini here as one who had navigated, but I am quoting Mabini as a man who was a patriot and a martyr to his country, and who enjoined us, his country men, to "love your country more than yourself." I quoted his precept to show that it has guided those persons who are depending nationalism although they cannot reach their home except by boat. They say: "We are willing to find our death-bed under the sea as long as we can preserve the Philippines for the Filipinos."

Sr. GUARIÑA. ¿Fué naviero alguna vez Mabini?

Mr. MARCOS. I do not know, but that is the very thing that I have in mind. Gentleman from Sorsogon, let me repeat that I am not mentioning Mabini as a navigator, but I am mentioning him as a patriot whose example as well as his precept are being exemplified by some legislators in this chamber.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for some questions?

The SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE. Does the gentleman from Ilocos Norte yield to the gentleman from Zambales?

Mr. MARCOS. With pleasure.

Mr. LABRADOR. Does the gentleman from Ilocos Norte believe that it is sane patriotism to let his country men die and find their death-bed in the bottom of the sea?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, as I already said, gentleman from Zambales, there are many legislators here who are favoring the Briones bill, and these legislators are included in that group of persons whose lives are put to danger because of the alleged unsafe inter-island service.

Mr. LABRADOR. And your honor would be willing to go with them to the bottom of the sea just to protect the Filipino shipping?

Mr. MARCOS. Your honor, if there is any necessity for any Filipino to find his death-bed in the bottom of the sea for the purpose of preserving the Philippines for the Filipinos, or in other words, of preserving the shipping business in the hands of nationals and the natural resources in the hands of the present generation, our posterity and our children's children, I sincerely state before this august body,

before my conscience and before God that I am ready to die for my country. (*Long applause.*)

El PRESIDENTE PRO TEMPORE. Están prohibidos los aplausos. La Mesa hará desalojar los pasillos, si vuelven a aplaudir.

Mr. LABRADOR. But what is the need of sacrificing the life, your very dear life, especially in this Legislature,—what is the use of sacrificing this life, if we could save it for a more noble purpose and service in this Legislature?

Mr. MARCOS. Gentleman from Zambales, you should not forget that we proceeded with the premise that we want to preserve the Philippines for the Filipinos. The shipping business must be preserved in the hand of the nationals in order to safeguard the foundation of our national existence. The Philippines being composed of more than a thousand islands the communication by sea constitutes the vital arteries of the national organism. Now, with all these points in view, I cannot see why I should be questioned for voicing my patriotic sentiment.

Mr. LABRADOR. So that you would be willing to let these ships belonging to the foreigners continue indefinitely, at the same time exposing the lives of many people just to save your principle, or theory of protectionism. Do you believe that many of the people would be willing to go with you to find their graves in the bottom of the ocean for the sake of patriotism?

Mr. MARCOS. Gentleman from Zambales, with that very question of yours, I feel that you question the spirit by which a person shows his patriotism. Are you not aware of the fact that there are different ways by which a person can show his love to his country? I honestly and sincerely believe that I serve my country if I am offered at the altar as a sacrifice for the preservation of the shipping business in the hands of the nationals, a thing which is equivalent to the preservation of the foundation of our national existence. The trouble with the gentleman from Zambales is that he does not take into consideration the far-reaching consequences of the falling of the shipping business into the hands of the foreigners. Let me reiterate my stand that the means of communication by sea, in a country like ours, constitutes the vital arteries of the national organism. Once it falls into the hands of the foreigners, the foundation of our national existence is destroyed.

Mr. LABRADOR. So you believe that you will be rendering a great service to your country by going to the bottom of the sea, just to preserve the theory or principle of protectionism?

Mr. MARCOS. The fact that the gentleman from Zambales continuously pounds on the question of my willingness to go to the bottom of the sea for the sake of protectionism, I no longer doubt that his intention is to make fun out of my statement. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman already forgotten the fact that different persons have different ways of expressing themselves? I am not so absent-minded as to have said that I am willing to go to the bottom of the sea just for the sake of these old ships; what I said was that I am willing to go to the bottom of

the sea to preserve the Philippines for the Filipinos. The gentleman must understand that the moment the shipping business falls into the hands of the foreigners, on that moment we give away the defense and life of our country. Does not the gentleman from Zambales still understand, after several repetitions, that I have in mind the far-reaching consequences of the falling of the shipping business into the hands of the foreigners?

Mr. PAREDES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE. The gentleman may yield if he so desires.

Mr. MARCOS. Willingly.

Mr. PAREDES. Do I understand the gentleman from Ilocos Norte to say that many of the gentlemen, or practically all of the gentlemen who spoke in favor of the measure are willing to find their graves at the bottom of the sea for protectionism? And do all these Representatives have the right to invite their constituents to find also that same grave without consulting them first?

Mr. MARCOS. Mr. Speaker, I have answered all questions seriously but I am afraid those who are interpellating me are just doing it for fun. That statement, however, does not refer to the gentleman from Abra because I can see that he is serious. Gentleman from Abra, please bear in mind that I do not invite nor shall I invite my constituents to joint me in finding their graves at the bottom of the sea. What I said was that I am willing to find my grave at the bottom of the sea to preserve the Philippines for the Filipinos, and to preserve the foundation of our national existence.

Sr. OPPUS. Señor Presidente, para algunas preguntas al orador.

El PRESIDENTE PRO TEMPORE. El orador puede contestar, si le place.

Mr. MARCOS. Mr. Speaker, for an information. How many more minutes have I?

El PRESIDENTE PRO TEMPORE. Quince minutos más.

Sr. OPPUS. Señor Presidente, para algunas preguntas al orador.

El PRESIDENTE PRO TEMPORE. El orador puede contestar, si le place.

Sr. MARCOS. Sí, señor.

Sr. OPPUS. Continuando la pregunta del Caballero por Abra, ¿no cree Su Señoría que es un egoísmo de su parte el ser el único patriota y morir solo en el mar, sin tener el valor de invitar a otros para que se hundan consigo en el fondo del mar?

Mr. MARCOS. Gentleman from Leyte, I am sorry to say that we do not agree on that case, for you are no longer following the principles of logic. I do claim that I am willing to go to the bottom of the sea to preserve the Philippines for the Filipinos and to preserve the foundation of our national existence. We who favor the measure are being branded as inconsistent to their constituents, and those who are against the bill are patriotic. Those who are against the measure should not claim for a monopoly of patriotism. We are in favor of the bill because we honestly believe that it will preserve the ship-

ping business in the hands of the nationals—a thing which preserves the foundation of our national existence.

Sr. OPPUS. ¿Su Señoría concurre con la opinión del ilustre Senador por Cebú, Sr. Rodriguez, en el sentido de que prefiere una banca filipina a un vapor extranjero?

Mr. MARCOS. Exactly. The Senator from Cebu has a way of viewing the question, and I have also my own.

Sr. OPPUS. Lo que queria saber es si Su Señoría concurre.

Mr. MARCOS. That is what I said. I have a different way of viewing the question. I did not say I am not in accord, but I have a different way of comparing the question.

Sr. OPPUS. Está bien.

Mr. DACANAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for some questions?

The SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE. The gentleman may yield, if he so desires.

Mr. MARCOS. With pleasure.

Mr. DACANAY. As I understand in the course of the speech and answers of the gentleman from Ilocos Norte, he subscribed to an amendment which would allow the foreign shippers to improve their ships, but limiting their activities for a period of twenty years. Do I understand the gentleman from Ilocos Norte to subscribe to such an amendment?

Mr. MARCOS. Not only to subscribe to an amendment. We have presented a bill to substitute the present bill that we are now discussing.

Mr. DACANAY. And because of this amendment, do I understand the gentleman from Ilocos Norte to oppose the proposition embodied in the present bill under our consideration which would open or may tend to open the other lines at present covered by Filipino shippers that would make it liable to be placed under foreign hands or foreign shippers?

Mr. MARCOS. I did not say that.

Mr. DACANAY. Do I understand the gentleman from Ilocos Norte to be opposed to the idea embodied in the present bill providing for an investigation on the part of the committee? There would be a necessity of new ships or additional tonnage, and in case the Filipino shippers cannot cover the same the foreign shippers may enter or may supply that additional tonnage. Do I understand you to be opposed to that proposition in the bill?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, I am not going to answer you categorically, gentleman from La Union, because I know you are an intelligent man, and it is up to you to deduce my stand from the amendment I have presented.

Mr. DACANAY. Of course, that part of the bill has nothing to do with the amendment of the gentleman from Ilocos Norte.

Mr. MARCOS. That is why I say that you can deduce my stand from the amendment I have presented.

Mr. DACANAY. In other words you are opposed to the measure in so far as enabling the foreign shippers to enter a service which cannot be covered by the Filipino shipowners. Do I understand you to subscribe to that idea?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, it is in the amendment that I have presented. Any doubt which you have and any thing which you cannot understand can be explained by the amendment which we have presented. And I believe you also signed that amendment.

Mr. DACANAY. In other words I understand that the gentleman from Ilocos Norte is opposed to the creation of a board of investigation to investigate the shipping conditions in the Philippine Islands, but if we are to legislate here we should limit our legislation to enabling foreign shipping companies now operating in the Islands to improve their present ships without any preferential right to be given to the Filipinos.

Mr. MARCOS. Without any preferential right to be given to Filipinos?

Mr. DACANAY. That is the amendment as explained here by the gentleman from Abra.

Mr. MARCOS. Well, I view it in a different way because the moment that you make me understand that it does not give preferential right to Filipinos I would oppose. Did you read the amendment carefully?

Mr. DACANAY. I am sorry to state that I am not one of those who subscribe to the amendment.

Mr. MARCOS. If you were not one and if you did not have the chance to read the amendment, I cannot see how you can argue with me an amendment that you have not yet read.

Mr. DACANAY. Does not the gentleman from Ilocos Norte believe that an amendment limiting the foreign shipping companies now operating in the Philippine Islands to improve their ships without touching any other lines or any other activities in the present shipping service is a more protectionist legislation that could be enacted by this Legislature than to approve in its entirety the Briones bill which would tend to open the other lines as well as would enable the foreign shippers to increase their tonnage as well as their number of ships that are plying in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. MARCOS. I am not going to answer your question, gentleman from La Union, but with your permission, permit me to ask this question: What is it that you are trying to extract from me so that I may satisfy you?

Mr. DACANAY. I just want to have the opinion of the gentleman from Ilocos Norte, if he thinks that those who are advocating the improvement of the present ships of the foreign companies by limiting the number of years that they may stay in the service are any less protectionists than those who are advocating the Briones bill.

Mr. MARCOS. Well, as I said, that is a question of appreciation or interpretation, gentleman from La Union. Mr. Speaker, I should like to go ahead with my peroration.

Sr. CARRANCEJA. Señor Presidente, para algunas preguntas al orador.

El PRESIDENTE PRO TEMPORE. El orador puede contestar, si le place.

Sr. MARCOS. Si, señor.

Sr. CARRANCEJA. Su Señoría se ha estado refiriendo a barcos extranjeros. ¿A qué barcos extranjeros se refiere Su Señoría?

Mr. MARCOS. The Tabacalera and Ynchausti.

Sr. CARRANCEJA. ¿Pero ignora Su Señoría que desde el año 1918 esos barcos, en virtud del bill de cabotaje que nosotros aprobamos, quedaron convertidos en barcos casi de ciudadanía filipina, y por tanto, parte Su Señoría de un principio falso al hablar de barcos extranjeros, porque no existe ningún barco extranjero en el río Pásig?

Mr. MARCOS. Well, I am sorry I differ with the gentleman from Camarines Norte, because the moment they are "semi"—the phrase you used was "casi de ciudadanía filipina"—they are not real citizens of the Philippines.

Sr. CARRANCEJA. He usado las palabras "casi de ciudadanía filipina," porque la palabra *ciudadanía* se refiere a personas y los barcos son cosas y no personas.

Mr. MARCOS. But, gentleman from Camarines Norte, do you want me to understand that the Ynchausti and Tabacalera are citizens of the Philippine Islands?

Sr. CARRANCEJA. Los peticionarios puede que no lo sean, pero los barcos han quedado filipinos.

Mr. MARCOS. I thought, gentleman from Camarines Norte, that we are talking about the ships. But even then, may I ask what is the nationality of the owners of these ships?

Sr. CARRANCEJA. La culpa la tiene la Legislatura, la Legislatura de 1918, en haber convertido en filipinos los barcos de matrícula filipina.

Mr. MARCOS. It only extended the right, but it did not extend the citizenship. It is a different matter.

Sr. CARRANCEJA. ¿Qué banderas llevaban esos barcos? Las banderas americana y filipina. Las nacionalidades se asignan por las banderas. Es así que las banderas que llevan esos barcos son las banderas americana y filipina, luego esos barcos son filipinos.

Mr. MARCOS. I view it the other way, gentleman from Camarines Norte, because you must understand that the corporation is controlled by foreigners, and naturally the properties are properties of foreigners. They cannot be properties of nationals. They cannot be properties of the citizens of the Philippine Islands.

(Continuing.) 'Then, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, commerce is in the hands of foreigners; troops and battalions of foreigners are invading our shores to transform our virgin lands into verdant fields; regiments of foreigners are invading our shores to harvest our reaping crops. We can see that foreign capital is now invading our shores, and the only thing left in the hands of the nationals is the shipping business, and still others would want to amend the law in such a way that the shipping business would fall into the hands of foreigners.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my countrymen to cast off that hypnotic spell of the seeming greatness of heart and bigness of soul of the foreigners. They act in a gentleman-like manner to all the Filipinos, yet we must understand that they are trying to control everything in our country, which finally will make us foreigners in our own country. I invite my countrymen not to allow the immense rivalries of business and politics, the retarding shocks of conflicting interests and claims, and the natural pre-

judices and perversities of our people, to bar our way towards patriotic consecration. The question of preserving the inter-island business to the Filipinos and the question of preserving the natural resources for our countrymen, for this generation, for the coming generation, and for our children's children, need the disinterested sacrifice of every individual. This question needs the concentration of all the energies and efforts of the Filipinos. It needs the commendation of every heart. It needs the sanction of every conscience of all the Filipino people.

Mr. Speaker, the proper solution of this measure necessitates that the Filipinos should forget party alignment, that all parties should unite, and with a united front of 12,000,000 Filipinos, they will be able to assert more effectively before the world that the Philippines should be for the Filipinos.

Sr. KAPUNAN. Sencillamente, para insinuar a Su Señoría que expresara, si no tiene inconveniente, la idea que tiene de la cuestión, de si debemos conceder o no a los navieros extranjeros la facultad de cambiar sus buques o el tonelaje de los mismos.

Mr. MARCOS. How many more minutes have I, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE. The gentleman from Ilocos Norte has one more minute.

Mr. MARCOS. Well, as I stated, gentleman from Leyte, if the Filipinos cannot do it, then we need the improvement of this interisland service by foreigners.

El PRESIDENTE PRO TEMPORE. Tiene la palabra el Caballero por Leyte.

DISCURSO EN CONTRA DEL SR. OPPUS

(Este discurso se publicará como apéndice en el número correspondiente al 9 de noviembre de 1927.)

El PRESIDENTE PRO TEMPORE. Léase el mensaje del Senado sobre el Proyecto de Ley No. 113 del mismo.

El CLERK DE ACTAS, leyendo:

MENSAJE DEL SENADO

MANILA, octubre 17, 1927

SEÑOR PRESIDENTE:

Se me ha ordenado que ponga en conocimiento de esa Honorable Cámara que el Senado ha disuelto de las enmiendas de la Cámara de Representantes al Proyecto de Ley del Senado No. 113, titulado:

"Ley que declara obligatoria la instalación de aparatos radiográficos a bordo de los buques de matrícula filipina, que dispone las condiciones para su funcionamiento, y que provee penas en caso de infracción."

Y por tal motivo solicita una conferencia con la Cámara de Representantes sobre los votos en discordia de ambas Cámaras, habiendo nombrado como representantes suyos en dicha conferencia a los Senadores Salazar, Ledesma y Veloso.

Muy respetuosamente,

(Fdo.) FAUSTINO AGUILAR
Secretario del Senado

Al Honorable PRESIDENTE DE LA CÁMARA DE REPRESENTANTES.

Sr. ALCAZAREN. Señor Presidente, el Comité de Navegación insiste en sus enmiendas a dicho pro-

yecto de ley y pide se nombre un Comité de conferencia.

El PRESIDENTE PRO TEMPORE. ¿Hay alguna objeción a este informe? (Silencio.) La Mesa no oye ninguna. Aprobado. Está en orden el nombramiento del Comité de Conferencia.

COMITÉ DE CONFERENCIA SOBRE EL S. 113

Sr. NEPOMUCENO. Señor Presidente, el Comité de Control propone el nombramiento de los Sres. Alcazaren, Torralba y Ortiz, para formar el Comité de conferencia por parte de la Cámara sobre el Proyecto de Ley No. 113 del Senado.

El PRESIDENTE PRO TEMPORE. ¿Hay alguna objeción? (Silencio.) La Mesa no oye ninguna. Aprobado.

Sr. GULLAS. Señor Presidente, pido que los otros asuntos señalados para hoy se consideren en la sesión siguiente.

El PRESIDENTE PRO TEMPORE. ¿Hay alguna objeción? (Silencio.) La Mesa no oye ninguna. Aprobado.

El PRESIDENTE. Léase el Proyecto de Resolución No. 66 de la Cámara.

RESOLUCIÓN DE CONDOLENCIA

El CLERK DE ACTAS, leyendo:

PROYECTO DE RESOLUCIÓN NO. 66 DE LA CÁMARA

[Presentado por el Representante Leuterio]

RESOLUCIÓN EXPRESANDO LA CONDOLENCIA DE LA CÁMARA DE REPRESENTANTES POR EL FALLECIMIENTO DEL HONORABLE PABLO GUZMÁN, DIPUTADO QUE FUE A LA PRIMERA ASAMBLEA FILIPINA.

POR CUANTO el Hon. Pablo Guzmán, Diputado que fué a la primera Asamblea Filipina, ha fallecido el día primero de noviembre de mil novecientos veintisiete en la ciudad de Manila;

POR CUANTO el finado Hon. Pablo Guzmán ha prestado relevantes servicios al país y ha laborado arduamente por la pronta realización de los supremos ideales del pueblo filipino; Por tanto,

Se resuelve, Expresar, como por la presente se expresa, el profundo pesar con que ha sido recibida por la Cámara de Representantes la noticia del fallecimiento del Honorable Pablo Guzmán, Diputado que fué a la primera Asamblea Filipina, ocurrido en la ciudad de Manila el día primero de noviembre de mil novecientos veintisiete;

Se resuelve, además, que se envíe copia de esta Resolución al Senado de Filipinas y a la familia del finado, y que una vez adoptada esta resolución se levante la sesión en señal de duelo.

Adoptada,

Sr. MENDOZA. Pido que se apruebe por unanimidad el proyecto de Resolución.

El PRESIDENTE. ¿Hay alguna objeción al proyecto de Resolución? (Silencio.) La Mesa no oye ninguna. Aprobado por unanimidad.

LEVANTAMIENTO DE LA SESIÓN

De conformidad con la precedente Resolución, se levanta la sesión en señal de duelo.

Eran las 8.47 p. m.