

JOURNAL NO. 81

VOL. II, September 13, 1986

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/5a24627a9602/>

Friday, September 12, 1986

CALL TO ORDER

At 9:38 a.m., the President of the Constitutional Commission, the Honorable Cecilia Muñoz Palma, called the session to order.

NATIONAL ANTHEM AND PRAYER

The National Anthem was sung followed by a prayer led by Mr. Jose E. Suarez, to wit:

Dear Lord, this morning, we pause briefly for a group picture-taking; a composite group with diverse backgrounds, disparate ideas, laboring to attain an elusive ideal, to craft, with Your Divine guidance, a solid nationalist pro-people charter. This may be the only occasion we will ever group happily together, a fleeting moment I cherish.

Muslims, Tagalogs, Cebuanos, Ilongos, Ilocanos, Pampangueños — Filipinos above all — pictured together, unity in diversity indeed, a bunch of Runyonesque characters I have learned to love and to respect.

Shower upon them, dear Lord, all Your blessings. Bless this law professor who yells like an excited jungleman, but whose heart is as big as the island of Palawan. Bless this law dean, whose tongue tries to catch up with the rapidity of his brainwaves, leaving him breathless, necessitating his being rushed to the hospital for oxygen priming. Bless also this respected president of a private university, which we had favored with fantastic tax exemptions, whose Mafia connections are belied by his soft purring voice, drawing sharp reminders from the Chair to "Speak louder, please". Bless likewise this exuberant evangelist, who gushes with joy at every approved provision, even if they are addressed against his big brothers. Bless this stern retired military officer, ideal for the position of Military Ombudsman to strike terror among the scoundrels and the scalawags in the army — but who had unfortunately applied for the position of security guard at the Subic Bay shipyards. Bless also this declared champion of every conceivable popular cause, whose stentorian voice could be heard all the way to Malacañang where, with the reluctance of a Julius Caesar spurning the crown thrice at the Lupercal, he may finally land.

Bless the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse — one of whom is a lovable bully who jumps at everyone approaching the microphone trying to gag him. Bless also the notorious Gang of Five, one of whom is a Gabriela who lashes at everyone waving an imperialist flag.

But dear Lord, reserve Your special blessings for this serene lady who manages crisis after crisis without a single strand falling from her well-coiffed head.

And, Lord, please do not forget to bless me too, now that I am about to enter the gates of Clark Air Base and Subic Base.

May God bless us all!

Amen.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

At this juncture, the Chair suspended the session for the offering of a Mass for the speedy recovery of Mr. Rosales and for the good health of all the Members, to be followed by a group picture-taking.

It was 9:44 a.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 11:38 a.m., the session was resumed.

ROLL CALL

Upon direction of the Chair, the Secretary-General of the Commission called the Roll and the following Members responded:

Abubakar, Y. R.

Garcia, E. G.

Alonto, A. D.

Gascon, J. L. M. C.

Aquino, F. S.

Guingona, S. V. C.

Azcuna, A. S.

Jamir, A. M. K.

Bacani, T. C.

Laurel, J. B.

Bengzon, J. F. S.

Lerum, E. R.

Bennagen, P. L.

Maambong, R. E.

Bernas, J. G.

Monsod, C. S.

Rosario Braid, F.

Natividad, T. C.

Calderon, J. D.

Nieva, M. T. F.

De Castro, C. M.

Nolledo, J. N.

Colayco, J. C.

Ople, B. F.

Concepcion, R. R.

Padilla, A. B.

Davide, H. G.

Muñoz Palma, C.

Foz, V. B.

Quesada, M. L. M.

Rama, N. G.

Sumulong, L. M.

Regalado, F. D.

Tadeo, J. S. L.

De los Reyes, R. F.

Tan, C.

Rigos, C. A.

Tingson, G. J.

Rodrigo, F. A.

Treñas, E. B.

Romulo, R. J.

Uka, L. L.

Rosales, D. R.

Villacorta, W. V.

Sarmiento, R. V.

Villegas, B. M.

Suarez, J. E.

With 47 Members present, the Chair declared the presence of a quorum.

READING AND APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL

On motion of Mr. Calderon, there being no objection, the reading of the Journal of the previous session was dispensed with and the said Journal was approved by the Body.

REFERENCE OF BUSINESS

On motion of Mr. Calderon, there being no objection, the Body proceeded to the Reference of Business.

REFERRAL TO COMMITTEES OF A PETITION

AND COMMUNICATIONS

Upon direction of the Chair, the Secretary-General read the titles of the following Petition and Communications which were, in turn, referred by the Chair to the Committees hereunder indicated:

PETITION

Petition No. 3 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Petition of the Committee on the Legislative, signed by its Chairman, the Honorable Hilario G. Davide, Jr., earnestly requesting the Constitutional Commission to vote unanimously for the re-opening of Sections 5 and 11 of the Article on the Legislative Power

TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE

COMMUNICATIONS

Communication No. 853 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Position paper submitted by Datu Zacarias T. Cotejar and Datu Bangkal Matanog of the Cultural Communities Association of Surigao del Sur, Inc., Dapja, Cabas-an, Cantilan, Surigao del Sur, urging the Constitutional Commission to grant the Manobo Tribe of Mindanao autonomous government

TO THE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Communication No. 854 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Mr. Pancho S. Domiar of Cotabato City, urging the Constitutional Commission to review the provisions of P.D. No. 704 because it is believed that there are provisions that make the rich richer and the poor poorer

TO THE COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL JUSTICE

Communication No. 855 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Mr. Angel V. Sanchez of San Jose, Antique, and thirty other signatories, submitting specific proposals to protect children from exploitation, white slavery and exposure to drug addiction

TO THE COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL JUSTICE

Communication No. 856 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Mr. Ramon R. Leuterio, 105 P. Cruz St., Mandaluyong, Metro Manila, expressing his views that in drafting the new Constitutions the gallery should be closed and the press should be banned to enable the Commissioners to work in privacy just like the 1787 U.S. Constitutional Convention wherein the members isolated themselves from the public to protect their integrity and reputation

TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE

Communication No. 857 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Mr. Benjamin C. Canlas of 5 Chaparral St., Rancho Estate II, Marikina, Metro Manila, suggesting

that in the printing of money and minting of coins this motto shall be inscribed: "Ang lakas ng Bayan ay galing sa Diyos".

TO THE COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PROVISIONS

Communication No. 858 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Mr. Jovencio C. Bernardo of the Good Samaritan Association and one hundred thirty-one other signatories of Tacloban City, seeking the retention of the U.S. military bases in the Philippines

TO THE COMMITTEE ON PREAMBLE, NATIONAL TERRITORY AND DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

Communication No. 859 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Mr. Ranolfo P. Goze of Buguey, Cagayan, containing various electoral reforms for consideration by the Constitutional Commission

TO THE COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL COMMISSIONS AND AGENCIES

Communication No. 860 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Mr. Alfonso O. Santiago of the Language Education Council of the Philippines, suggesting that the Constitution be written and promulgated in the national language

TO THE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

Communication No. 861 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Atty. Jovencio Bereber of Pres. Roxas, Capiz, submitting a number of constitutional proposals for consideration in the framing of the Constitution, notably those pertaining to declaration of principles, President and Vice-President, national legislature, national economy and transitory provisions

TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE

Communication No. 862 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Mr. Edgar U. Leuenberger, UP College of Pharmacy, submitting specific recommendations for inclusion in the Article on Education, Science, Technology, Sports, Arts and Culture

TO THE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

Communication No. 863 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Communication from Mr. Lunaz El Mismo of 264 N. Burlington Avenue, Los Angeles, California, submitting a number of proposals for consideration in the framing of the new Constitution, notably those pertaining to presidential and vice-presidential term of office, citizenship, national language and the U.S. military bases

TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE

Communication No. 864 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Communication from the officers and members of the Sangguniang Panlungsod of Batangas City, signed by its presiding officer, Casiano T. Ebor, urging the Constitutional Commission to create a Commission on National Language

TO THE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

Communication No. 865 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Communication from Mr. Rizalito P. Barrientos of 1051 Matimyas St., Sampaloc, Manila, and fifty-nine other signatories, expressing conformity to the proposal to allow the people to cast "yes" votes for portions of the new Constitution they support and "no" votes for those they strongly dislike during the plebiscite on the draft charter

TO THE COMMITTEE ON AMENDMENTS AND TRANSITORY PROVISIONS

Communications Nos. 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880 and 881 —
Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letters urging the Constitutional Commission to incorporate in the Constitution a provision that the separation of the Church and the State shall be inviolable as embodied in the 1973 Constitution and as understood historically and jurisprudentially in the Philippines, from:

- Pastor Alfredo K. Cudiamat
Faith Christian Church
Sta. Monica Subdivision
Dalandan, Valenzuela, Metro Manila
- Polo-Obando Gospel Church, Inc.
Palasan, Valenzuela, Metro Manila
- Bishop Emerito P. Nacpil and Mr. Emmanuel Cleto
The United Methodist Church in the
Philippines, 900 U.N. Avenue, Manila
- Mr. Rolando Colangco and eight other
signatories of San Jose, Dinagat,
Surigao del Norte
- Ms. Marianita H. Teves
Mindanao Bible Training Institute
Cantilan, Surigao del Sur
- Rev. Toto B. Felongco
Southern Baptist Convention
97 Cayetano Bangoy St.
P.O. Box 94, Davao City
- Rev. Ernesto Bullag
Panay Alliance Church
Barangay Panay, Sto. Nino
South Cotabato
- Rev. Fr. Francisco C. Mangubat and eleven others
Iglesia Filipina Independiente
Diocese of Agusan and Surigao
Cortes, Surigao del Sur
- Mr. Venancio Salcedo and twelve others
Full Gospel Fellowship Centre
Viernes Subdivision, New Carmen,
Tacurong, Sultan Kudarat
- Ms. Rosario J. Angana and forty-nine others

Faith Tabernacle
Dumaguete City

- Mr. Roldan E. Maquiling and twenty others
The Salvation Army
Ozamiz City Corps

- Rev. Lemuel Felicio and ninety-six others
Christ Faith Fellowship
Bais City

- Carlatan Christian and Missionary
Alliance Church of the Philippines
Carlatan, San Fernando, La Union

- Rev. Damaso S. Bautista and Mr. Reynaldo I. Atienza
Capitol City Baptist Church
111 West Avenue, Quezon City

- Ms. Norma S. Marapao
Church of the Foursquare Gospel in the Philippines
Bislig, Surigao del Sur

- Ms. Sarah Mendoza and twenty-two others
Suaran Alliance Church
North Upi, Maguindanao

TO THE COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PROVISIONS

MOTION OF MR. RAMA

Mr. Rama moved for the consideration, on Second Reading, of Proposed Resolution No. 637 prepared by the Committee on Preamble, National Territory and Declaration of Principles (Committee Report No. 36), entitled:

Resolution to incorporate in the new Constitution an Article on the Declaration of Principles.

He stated that the consideration would include Proposed Resolution No. 532 (Committee Report No. 28) prepared by the same Committee.

INQUIRY OF MR. SUAREZ

Mr. Suarez noted that the Business for the Day calls for the consideration of Committee Report No. 28 on Proposed Resolution No. 222 while Committee Report No. 36 on Proposed Resolution No. 537 mentioned by the Floor Leader appears under Unassigned Business, in view of which, he inquired if Committee Report No. 28 should take precedence over Committee Report No. 36.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

At this juncture, the Chair suspended the session.

It was 11:50 a.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 11:53 a.m., the session was resumed.

MANIFESTATION OF MR. RAMA

Upon resumption of session, Mr. Rama manifested that Committee Report No. 28 on Proposed Resolution No. 522 is a partial report of the Committee on Preamble, National Territory and Declaration of Principles and that Committee Report No. 36 on Proposed Resolution No. 537 is the complete report of the same Committee.

He then asked for the recognition of Mr. Bengzon, Chairman of the Steering Committee.

The Chair recognized Mr. Bengzon.

REMARKS OF MR. BENGZON

Thereupon, Mr. Bengzon manifested that he called for the simultaneous consideration of the two reports of the Committee on Preamble, National Territory and Declaration of Principles following the precedent set by the Body when it considered a partial report of the Committee on Local Governments which was calendared for the Business for the Day together with the complete report which was submitted thereafter.

The Chair noted that the mistake was on the part of the Secretariat which failed to transfer Committee Report No. 36 on Proposed Resolution No. 537 to the Business for the Day.

Mr. Suarez stated that he had actually no objection to the consideration of both Committee Report Nos. 28 and 36 except for the parliamentary impediment he had pointed out, that is, that Committee Report No. 28 takes precedence over Committee Report No. 36.

Mr. Bengzon reiterated the precedent he had cited and maintained that the Body could proceed to the consideration of the two Committee Reports which refer to the same article and subject matter.

In support of Mr. Bengzon's stand, Mr. de Castro pointed out that Committee Report Nos. 28 and 36 were scheduled together with the report on Family Rights and Duties on August 18, 1986 but that the Secretariat committed an error.

The Chair stated that the Business for the Day should therefore be a joint consideration of Committee Report Nos. 28 and 36. She inquired whether Committee Report No. 28 was incorporated with Committee Report No. 36, in which case, the latter should be the basis of the day's discussion.

Mr. Tingson, Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Preamble, National Territory and Declaration of Principles, confirmed that Committee Report No. 28 was so incorporated.

In reply to Mr. Garcia's observation that the agreement in the previous caucus was that the Declaration of Principles would be discussed only after most of the committee reports would have been considered and, on the query as to when the decision was made that said Declaration of Principles would be discussed before the General Provisions, Mr. Bengzon stated that at the instance of Mr. Tingson, it was agreed in caucus that the Declaration of Principles shall not be the last but shall be discussed before the Transitory Provisions, hence the schedule released included the consideration of the Article on the Declaration of Principles and on Family Rights on August 18, 1986. He stressed that in the Order of Business Committee Report No. 28 had always taken precedence over the Committee Report on the General Provisions.

Mr. Garcia disagreed, pointing out that records would indicate that during the caucus in which the Members

discussed whether the Commission could finish the draft Constitution on time, there was a decision to discuss the Article on the Declaration of Principles after the Article on General Provisions and the other Articles. He did not recall any other caucus in which the original decision was reversed.

The Chair inquired if Mr. Garcia received a memorandum dated August 18, 1986 from the Chairman of the Steering Committee which scheduled the discussion of the Article on the Declaration of Principles after the Article on Human Resources. In reply, Mr. Garcia inquired on the authority to change the schedule without discussion by the Members.

Mr. Bengzon recalled that during the caucus it was agreed that the Article on the Declaration of Principles should not be considered after but prior to the Article on Transitory Provisions although there was no definite decision on how prior it should be. He stated that under the Rules, one of the functions of the Steering Committee is to make the schedule.

He informed that in the schedule made on July 30, 1986 the Article on the Declaration of Principles was scheduled ahead of the Articles on National Economy and Patrimony; and Human Resources and thereafter, because of the request to move the discussion of the Article on the Declaration of Principles to the very end, which was changed in the caucus, the Body decided to schedule it before the Article on Transitory Provisions but there was no definite decision as to the date.

In view thereof, Mr. Bengzon stated that as Chairman of the Steering Committee, he prepared the August 18, 1986 schedule which was distributed on that same day.

Thereupon, the Chair stated that consideration of the two Committee Reports was in order.

At this juncture, Mr. Tingson signified the Committee's readiness to sponsor the Committee Reports.

BUSINESS FOR THE DAY: COMMITTEE REPORT NO. 36 ON PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 537 ON
THE ARTICLE ON THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Rama, there being no objection, the Body proceeded to the consideration, on Second Reading, of Proposed Resolution No. 537 on the Article on the Declaration of Principles (Committee Report No. 36), entitled:

Resolution to incorporate in the Constitution an Article on the Declaration of Principles.

Thereupon, the Chair recognized the Chairman and members of the Committee on Preamble, National Territory and Declaration of Principles.

SPONSORSHIP REMARKS OF MR. TINGSON

Mr. Tingson, Vice-Chairman of the Committee, acknowledged the help extended by Mr. Decoroso Rosales, Chairman of the Committee, in the formulation of the Committee Report in spite of his absence from most of the Committee deliberations because of illness.

Mr. Tingson underscored the salient features, especially the new sections incorporated therein, of the Proposed Article on the Declaration of Principles and State Policies which consists of 27 sections. He noted that the 1935 Constitution contains only 5 provisions while the 1973 Constitution contains 10 provisions on the same Article and that the Committee, cognizant of the importance of the Declaration of Principles, felt the need for including many more sections in the new charter. He manifested that the Committee on Sponsorship is formally recommending, through the Subcommittee on Rubrics, that the Declaration of Principles and State Policies immediately follow the Preamble inasmuch as it makes positive affirmations; asserts national intentions;

proclaims the kind of country the Philippines has; nature of government; dimensions of power, privileges and responsibilities of citizens.

He noted that the declarations in the Article were elucidated on, explained further, made more lucid and compellingly clear in succeeding articles of the proposed Constitution. Support of the Committee's stand, he informed, comes from Messrs. Bernas and Nollado whose books on constitutionalism are widely read and authoritatively cited. He observed that in substance, both of them maintain that the Declaration of Principles and State Policies in the Constitution function as a statement of the basic ideological principles underlying the Constitution. As such, he stated, they would shed light on the meaning of other Constitutional provisions and serve as a guide for all government departments in the implementation of the Charter. He noted that the inclusion of 17 new sections in the Article is a manifestation that the Charter which accompanies the rebirth of the Filipino nation, must truly reflect the genuine and inherent ideals and aspirations of the Filipino people. The Article, he noted, aside from presenting the basic ideological principles, equally reflects the all-embracing sentiments of the people in their renewed desire to achieve a society that is founded on justice, freedom, equality, love and peace.

On the concept of the State and its relations with other States, Mr. Tingson explained that the Committee retained Section 1 of the 1973 Constitution, restating the country's adherence to republicanism and reinforcing the same with the stronger word "democratic" to make it consistent with the proposed Preamble.

Section 2, he observed, retains the phrase on the renunciation of war along with a confirmation of the State's adherence to international harmony and order, which has been reinforced by two new sections — one on "neutrality" and the other declaring the country as a nuclear-free territory. Section 24, a new section, he stated, would grant asylum to persecuted foreigners who are human rights and political liberation advocates.

On the responsibilities of the State to the people — individually and collectively — the Committee, he stated, included policies and principles on the dignity of the human person.

Mr. Tingson observed that Section 10 would enshrine the highest regard for the welfare of the youth in their role as future leaders of the country. He stated that the Members in writing the Constitution, should be guided by a vision that this fundamental law is more important to the future generations inasmuch as what is done today would shape the destiny of the youth.

Mr. Tingson explained that Section 7 would clearly establish the primary concern of the State to promote and establish a wholesome socio-political and economic system in society, which section is buttressed by Section 8 of the Article on Social Justice.

With respect to the separation of Church and State, Mr. Tingson stated that democracies of the free world have kept close to this time-honored principle, which principle the Committee felt should be reiterated in the Declaration of Principles from its original situs in the Article on the General Provisions in the 1973 Constitution.

Religion, he stated, is a pervasive and overwhelming fact of national existence. He maintained that while the observance of religion should not be regulated by the State, religion should not unduly influence the formulation and implementation of State policies. He stressed that these two permanent institutions have existed alongside each other owing to the separation of Church and State which has long been established with each enjoying a place in the constitutional heritage and legal jurisprudence.

The Committee's overwhelming concern, he manifested, is that the Church and the State can destroy themselves by interfering in each other's business. He noted that the Holy Book's passage "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's" is an established principle, the violation of which could mean disaster for each other.

Mr. Tingson stressed the need for the government to referee the people's conflicting aspirations, to guide and give them direction. He noted that there is also a need for religion to carry the people above mundane realities where government cannot.

He cautioned that the Committee is aware that the Report contains in Sections 2, 3, 4 and 9 as well as in the portion appended for inclusion in the Transitory Provisions, some explosive and divisive issues such that the discussions on these critical issues — if not guided and controlled by reason, tolerance and compassion could tear the Commission apart destroy friendship and fellowship which have been built up during the past three and a half months, to the detriment of the country. The Book of Proverbs, he stated, has wise words to guide the Commission in the next few days: “The wise man is known by his common sense, and a pleasant teacher is the best. Wisdom is a fountain of life to it, but a fool's burden is his folly. From those who possess it, a wise mind comes careful, persuasive and loving speech.” He noted that the Members can intelligently disagree without being disagreeable and that the word “love” which the Commission has enshrined in the Preamble should be observed in the days ahead.

Mr. Tingson concluded his remark with the following: “Love is giving with no thought of getting. It is tenderness enfolding with strength to protect. It is forgiveness without further thought of the thing forgiven. It is understanding of human weakness with knowledge of the true man shining through. It is quiet in the midst of turmoil. It is trust in God with no thought of self. It is the refusal to see anything but good in our fellowmen. It is the voice that says 'no' to our brother though 'yes' might be more conveniently and easily said. It is resistance to the world's lust and greed and fame and popularity, thus becoming a positive law of annihilation to error. Love, the one thing no one can take from us; the one thing we can give constantly and become increasingly rich in the giving. Love can take no offense for it cannot know that which it does not of itself conceive. It cannot hurt or be hurt for it is the purest reflection of God. It is the one eternal indestructible force for good. Love is the will of God, preparing, planning, proposing, always what is best for all His universe.”

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

At this juncture, on motion of Mr. Rama, the Chair suspended the session until 2:30 in the afternoon. Mr. Rama informed that one of the sponsorship speakers had been called away to attend to her ailing father.

It was 12:22 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 2:45 p.m., the session was resumed.

Upon resumption of session, the Chair recognized Mr. Nollado and the Members of the Committee.

SPONSORSHIP REMARKS OF MR. NOLLEDO

Mr. Nollado stated that as a member of the family of nations, the country and its people pretend to have independence, thinking that with the declaration of the country's independence in 1946, its leaders could really chart the destiny of the nation freed from foreign interference. He opined that such independence has been illusory and has remained an unfulfilled dream.

He noted that since 1946 the Filipinos have been too dependent on the United States whose military bases in the country have spawned irritations and have generated bitterness and protests from right-thinking Filipinos who aspire for real national independence. He stated that the country has become a virtual satellite of the United States whose yearly aid is too little in exchange for the country's almost total subservience to U.S. policies and interests.

Mr. Nollado stressed that with the adoption of neutrality and neutralism in the form of non-alignment by the Philippines, the country shall be emancipating itself from the parental authority of Mother America.

He stated that the Committee recommends the adoption of neutrality and neutralism and explained that in its legal sense, neutrality is the legal status arising from the abstention of a State from all participation in war between other states, the maintenance of an attitude of impartiality towards the belligerents, and the recognition by the belligerents of this abstention and impartiality.

On the other hand, he defined neutralism as neutrality basically in time of peace. He pointed out that in international politics, neutralism is the policy of non-alignment with major power blocs pursued in the post World War II period by countries like India, Burma, Kenya and Yugoslavia. Neutralism, he stated, does not imply being isolationist because these nations seek cooperation in economic, social and non-political affairs with other nations of the world; that neutralism also followed from the policy of avoidance of entangling alliances advocated for the United States by Washington and Jefferson and pursued during the European wars by France and Great Britain; and that neutralism is a policy necessary to preserve the nation's independence and to serve the national interests; however, neutralism enables countries to get much needed economic assistance from both power blocs, the United States and Russia, and avoids a form of dependence on one power bloc. However, he stressed that the declaration of neutrality and non-alignment necessarily results in the prohibition of foreign bases in the country.

Mr. Nollado stated that the existence of American bases in the country is an infringement of its sovereignty as well as jurisdiction; has made the country and its leaders subservient to American policies and interests; contradicts the rule of self-determination guaranteed by the United Nations Charter because, in effect, such bases constitute intervention in the country's domestic affairs; violates the rule of disarmament sought for by the United Nations; diminishes national dignity and honor; promotes immorality of all sorts; and constitutes an affront to the intelligence of Filipinos because of the one-sided provisions of the RP-US Military Bases Agreement.

He stressed that the existence of the American bases is a continuing threat to and constitutes an undue influence upon the country's leaders, it having been a truism that a Filipino political leader, to enjoy support openly or clandestinely by the United States, must agree with the maintenance of American bases in the country, and that only a leader who is willing to be an American tool in this respect can get aid from the United States including the U.S.-dominated World Bank and the International Monetary Fund,

It is a well known fact, Mr. Nollado pointed out, that American Presidents Nixon, Ford, Carter and Reagan had supported the repressive regime of former President Marcos and that the cosmetic moves of Mr. Marcos to have Filipino commanders in American bases and to require these bases to fly the Philippine flag do not, in any way, lessen the validity of the arguments against the bases.

He charged that the Marcos regime wrought havoc to the country, intensified insurgency and was guilty of rampant violations of human rights; commission of injustices; causing economic turmoil; institutionalizing graft and corruption; and bleeding dry the national treasury. He stated that the United States, through its bases, has become a criminal participant in the Marcos grand design to devastate the country. Because of the American participation in this devilish design, he would request President Aquino to ask reparations from the United States similar to war damage payments from Japan after World War II amounting to at least P5 billion.

Mr. Nollado subscribed concurrence to the view of former Senator Jose W. Diokno that the RP-US Military Bases Agreement is null and void for being violative of the 1935 Constitution, which includes the Tydings-McDuffie Act as an Ordinance thereof, and which was ratified by the people in a plebiscite, with a provision calling upon the U.S. President to enter into negotiations with foreign powers for the conclusion of a treaty leading to the perpetual neutralization of the Republic of the Philippines. He pointed out, however, that the provision was never

implemented because of the outbreak of World War II. He recalled that on June 29, 1944 President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the U.S. Congress Joint Resolution No. 93 which authorized the President of the United States to negotiate with the President of the Philippine Commonwealth for the retention or acquisition of bases in the Philippines and for mutual protection by both countries. He stated that the Resolution was approved by the Philippine Congress on July 28, 1945 but was never submitted to a plebiscite and, therefore, said Resolution could not be part of the constitutional environment of 1935 and could not have superseded the Tydings-McDuffie Act.

He noted that the RP-US Military Bases Agreement, with its disadvantageous terms, was entered into when the Filipinos could not muster the national will to oppose it and that Ambassador Emmanuel Pelaez' claim that the Philippines is estopped from raising the invalidity of said Agreement is not tenable in the light of the settled rule in political law that the State is not estopped by the illegal acts of its officers and that prescription does not lie against the State.

Mr. Nollado disclosed that the consultations revealed that a great number of people, especially the students in different parts of the country, are against the U.S. military bases in the Philippines. He expressed the hope that their plea does not fall on deaf ears lest the future generation judge the Body harshly.

Mr. Nollado concluded in the words of the late Mayor Lacson, "I am not anti-American; I am not anti-alien; I am just pro-Filipino." He beseeched, God bless and save the Philippines!

REMARKS OF MR. RODRIGO

Noting that the issue on the American bases in the Philippines is of utmost interest to the people, Mr. Rodrigo proposed the manner of its discussion by pinpointing the subject, defining the issues and determining the points of agreement and disagreement.

He stated that Committee Report No. 36 of the Committee on Preamble, National Territory and Declaration of Principles provides the principal subjects of discussion, to wit:

SECTION 3. The State shall pursue an independent course in sovereign relations and strive to promote and establish, together with other States agreeable thereto, a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in this part of the world.

The State has the inherent right to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty. Subject to existing treaties, international or executive agreements, foreign military bases, troops or facilities shall be forbidden in any part of the Philippine territory.

SECTION ____ (for the inclusion in the Transitory Provisions). Upon the expiration of the RP-US Bases Agreement in 1991, foreign military bases, troops and facilities shall no longer be allowed in any part of the Philippine territory.

Mr. Rodrigo stated his stand that these provisions should not be incorporated in the new Constitution and that the decision on the continuation or termination of the RP-US Military Bases Agreement should be entrusted to the government on the basis of changing events, changing needs and circumstances of the times rather than tying its hands with inflexible constitutional mandates.

However, before presenting arguments in support of his stand, Mr. Rodrigo manifested agreement with the Committee Report on the following points: 1) that action on foreign military bases, troops, facilities in the Philippines shall be subject to existing treaties, international or executive agreements; 2) the clear averment in the report that the Philippines shall honor and respect the RP-US Military Bases Agreement until its expiry date in 1991.

On the RP-US Military Bases Agreement, he stated that whether or not said bases should be allowed to remain beyond 1991 is an issue which should be left to the government to decide rather than manacle its hands by means of a constitutional fiat. He underscored that the Committee Report itself contains the provision "subject to existing treaties international or executive agreements." He also adverted to a provision in the Bases Agreement as amended by the Marcos-Mondale Joint Statement on May 4, 1978 and implemented by the Romulo-Murphy Exchange of Notes on January 7, 1979 stipulating a review of said Agreement every five years and inviting attention to the fact that the first renegotiation was done in 1973 with the next renegotiation scheduled in 1988 or 1989. He argued that conformably with the Committee Report enjoining compliance with existing treaties, international or executive agreements, the Commission should not render futile and useless the stipulated renegotiation by foreclosing through the Constitution the possibility of extending the period of the Bases Treaty beyond 1991. He maintained that 1) it is premature to make a firm decision on whether or not to extend the US Military Bases Agreement beyond 1991 because many things can happen between now and the year of renegotiation which could materially affect the decision on the matter; and 2) the renegotiation should be allowed to proceed as scheduled in 1988, considering that the Philippines and the United States have agreed on allowing the bases to remain until 1991 and that the Committee itself has manifested its concurrence to the Agreement.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY OF MR. SUAREZ

At this juncture, Mr. Suarez asked for the parliamentary situation. He noted that the Body was in the period of sponsorship but Mr. Rodrigo's remarks practically presented a repudiation of the Committee's recommendation. He suggested strict observance of the Rules to avoid misunderstanding.

In reply thereto, Mr. Rama stated that the Body was in the period of general debate.

The Chair sustained Mr. Suarez' observation by stating that the sponsorship has just started and other Committee members would still speak in favor of the various concepts contained in the report.

Mr. Rama explained that before he asked for the recognition of Mr. Rodrigo, Messrs. Suarez and Azcuna and Mrs. Quesada had previously agreed to a pro and con discussion when they were consulted but, if it is the desire of the Body, the sponsorship may proceed with the Members of the Committee delivering their sponsorship speeches first.

Mr. Rodrigo informed that he was more than halfway with his remarks.

The Chair allowed Mr. Rodrigo to finish his remarks on the understanding that the procedure would be, as indicated, sponsorship speeches first.

Mr. Tingson agreed with the Chair's ruling and manifested that after Mr. Rodrigo, Messrs. Azcuna and Garcia, to be followed by the other Committee Members, would take turns for the rest of the sponsorship.

REMARKS OF MR. RODRIGO

(Continuation)

Continuing his remarks, Mr. Rodrigo urged giving a chance to a renegotiation of the Bases Agreement. He stated that it is probable that the amount of the "rental" would be increased substantially; the bases area would be significantly reduced; Philippine sovereignty within the bases would be greatly enhanced; conditions for Filipino workers in the bases would be better protected, other problems like criminal jurisdiction, customs rules and others would be defined in favor of the country. He stressed that the people should be given the opportunity to wait and see the renegotiated terms rather than for the Body, in an uncalled-for hurry and haste, to foreclose all options to

the people for a renegotiation; 3) the Body should recognize the fact that the President of the Philippines is in a better position to judge on such a vital issue since she is the Commander-in-Chief of the country's Armed Forces; is in control of all the government agencies, including embassies and consulates all over the world; and is better acquainted with all the facts which should be considered and weighed before arriving at a correct decision. He stated that the President should not be preempted or deprived of room to negotiate and maneuver; 4) after the renegotiation either in 1988 or in 1989, the draft of the renegotiated treaty should be submitted to the people in a national referendum or plebiscite for approval or disapproval; 5) it would be unfair to the electorate if the highly controversial provision is incorporated in the Constitution and submitted to a vote by the people in a plebiscite together with the whole Constitution; and 6) although it is legally possible to segregate the provisions on the bases from the body of the whole Constitution so that in the same plebiscite the people could vote on said provisions separately from the whole Constitution, this is undesirable for the following reasons: a) it is premature to submit this issue to the people before the renegotiated terms could be agreed upon and made known to them; and b) the highly sensitive and controversial issue cannot be amply discussed and understood by the people if submitted simultaneously with the whole Constitution because it would be buried in a multitude of other controversial issues such as bicameralism vs. unicameralism; unitary vs. federal and presidential vs. parliamentary form of government; abolition of the death penalty; adoption of the "sectoral" and "party list" system of voting; introduction of the system of recall, referendum and initiative; expansion of agrarian and urban land reform; Filipinization and protectionism of the economy; and protection of the unborn child from the moment of conception.

He stressed that it would be unwise to insist that the issue be voted upon by the people simultaneously, although separately, with the whole Body of the Constitution. He manifested that at the proper time he would move for the deletion of the provisions.

SPONSORSHIP REMARKS OF MR. AZCUNA

Mr. Azcuna, confining his remarks on Section 4 which seeks to declare the Philippines as a nuclear weapons-free territory, stated that this provision is not too radical as it might seem but a culmination of modern trends in international law as well as of modern political democracies which have been noted by academic writers as a reconstruction or re-ordering of international society. He pointed out that this restructuring of the international order has been going on and has found its effects not only in the realm of economics and in the social dimensions of society, but also in the field of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Azcuna stated that he need not elaborate on the enormous destructive capacity of nuclear weapons particularly because Asia has had the distinct misfortune of being the only place in the world where nuclear weapons were dropped and exploded during the war and that it was not too long ago when this fateful event was commemorated. Since then, he said, the technology on nuclear weapons has multiplied tremendously such that the atomic bombs dropped in Japan are only used at present as trigger devices for present day weapons because those bombs only used the principle of fission whereas the bombs of today are hydrogen bombs which use fusion which is the very power of the sun.

Mr. Azcuna stated that an explosion of a nuclear bomb is considered an uncontrolled nuclear reaction and he stressed that this should be prevented from happening in the country. On the suggestion as to why the provision should be placed in the Constitution, Mr. Azcuna expressed the view that since the Body is already on the Article on the Declaration of Principles and State Policies, and considering further that the Constitution is a reflection of the aspirations, the ideals, and even the fears of the people, with more reason that the Body should not be silent on this matter, and declare as one of the principles that the Philippines should be free from this nightmare of nuclear weapons. He pointed out that this is a global aberration which mankind would hopefully reverse — the invention of

nuclear weapons. He lamented the unfortunate fact that the tremendous energy that lies in nuclear reaction was first used and discovered for destructive purposes and the fact remains that the nuclear genie has been out of the bottle and man has since then been trying to put him back. It is for this reason, he stated, that the Body should grab this opportunity to take the first initial steps along with neighboring countries all over the world of putting the nuclear genie back into the bottle. He informed that in the past decade, the United Nations together with other states in Latin America, the Middle East and the South Pacific, have all been taking steps towards the declaration of nuclear weapons-free zone all over the world, which they hope to achieve in a not too distant future.

Mr. Azcuna stated that as early as February 14, 1967, the states of Latin America already adopted the Treaty of Tlatelolco in Mexico which declared South America a nuclear weapons-free zone and that as early as August 6, 1985, the states of the South Pacific led by New Zealand converged to endorse the Treaty of Rarotonga which declared the South Pacific a nuclear weapons-free zone. He pointed out that the Philippines should take her turn to declare this part of the world or at least this country, a nuclear weapons-free zone.

Mr. Azcuna stated that much have been said about the protection of the country's arts and culture, the national language, the poor and the underprivileged and yet it seems no one wants to state in the Constitution that the country should ban nuclear weapons which is the single most potent danger to all these. This, he stated, is a defiance of logic, for it seems that nobody wants the Constitution to protect the people from the spectre of nuclear weapons. He stressed that it is the position of the Committee to state, at least, as a principle in the Declaration of Principles that no portion of Philippine territory should be used for the purpose of storing or stockpiling nuclear weapons or parts thereof.

On whether this provision would not become academic if the U.S. military bases are retained in the Philippines, Mr. Azcuna expressed the Committee's view that this could stand independently from whether or not these U.S. bases would be allowed to continue in the Philippines and it is for this reason, he stated, that this provision on nuclear weapons-free declaration was separated from the provision on U.S. bases. He maintained that even if the U.S. bases are allowed to stay in the country, they could stay without nuclear weapons because in 1902 when they started, they never had these weapons. He stated that at present nobody knows whether these U.S. bases have nuclear weapons because the United States Government has adopted the policy of neither confirming nor denying the presence of nuclear weapons in their bases around the world. He opined that if ever the country would enter into a new treaty with the United States, it could possibly work out a provision that the latter must not have nuclear weapons stored therein, a position which the United States may be willing to accept.

Mr. Azcuna stated that the United States does not really stockpile all of its weapons in one place because it has so many bases all over the world. He pointed out the fact that its Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBM) are in Guam and not in the country, and that what it probably would have here are nuclear weapons carried by its naval ships. He invited attention to the fact that the Treaty of Rarotonga does not forbid major powers within the context of a nuclear weapons-free zone from carrying nuclear weapons aboard naval vessels and that it left to each State the adoption of a policy of whether or not to allow a foreign power to carry nuclear weapons on its ship while passing through its territory.

In this context, Mr. Azcuna stated that this is not an absolutist position. He stressed that this is just a statement of principle and he believed that this is something, in the context of present realities, which everybody should not close his eyes to. He pointed out that there is a very strong demand to put this nuclear genie back into the bottle and he urged the Body to take the first step which is within its golden opportunity to do so.

Mr. Azcuna stated that according to Henry Kissinger, the world at present is faced with a situation where there are two combatants who are armed to the teeth and blindfolded, but there is the conviction of both that one is

blindfolded while the other is not. This, he pointed out, is the kind of scenario the world has at present and one could imagine what kind of a fight they are going to have. He stressed that everybody wants the world to be freed from thermonuclear destruction by limiting these two armed combatants to traditional weapons so that perhaps the world could survive.

Quoting Mr. Jonathan Schell in his book *The Fate of the Earth*, Mr. Azcuna said that nuclear weapons threaten culture and art because they threaten generations in which art serves as the instrument of communication. He pleaded, on behalf of the Committee, that everyone adopt this concept of heritage of mankind because this fragile world is for everyone to take care of so that it will last not only for the next generation but also for generations to come. He read to the Body a letter of a nine-year old student whose vision of the Philippines is spelled out in a short essay, to wit:

"I wish and hope for a Philippines where the grass is green; where no one is rich or poor; where the roads are paved; where there are no buses and jeepneys. I wish for a Philippines where no one is hungry . . ."

He asked whether there is indeed a future for this child. He stated that the future is uncertain and in the words of President Kennedy "Only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed." He lamented that not even the United States could say that its arms are sufficient beyond doubt because that ideal could no longer be attained. He pointed out that once progress and technological destructive capabilities are achieved, the next threshold is just around the corner. He asked "When will it end? "

Mr. Azcuna concluded with an appeal to everyone to take this small step of declaring just as a principle that the country should be free from nuclear weapons and that as much as possible never to allow the country to be used for the stockpiling of nuclear weapons. Doing so, he stated, is doing it for the people, for the next generation and for the future that otherwise would not be.

SPONSORSHIP REMARKS OF MR. GARCIA

Mr. Garcia stated that his remarks would be in defense of Section 3 which reads:

"The State has the inherent right to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty. Subject to existing treaties, international or executive agreements, foreign military bases, troops or facilities shall be forbidden in any part of the Philippine territory."

Mr. Garcia stated that Section 3 has a companion provision for inclusion in the Transitory Provisions which reads:

"Upon the expiration of the RP-US Bases Agreement in 1991, foreign bases, troops and facilities shall no longer be allowed in any part of the Philippine territory."

He pointed out that there are three reasons why he is against the presence of foreign military bases in the country, namely: 1) national survival, security and safety of the people; 2) national sovereignty; and 3) the unique Filipino contribution to world peace and disarmament in this part of the world.

Mr. Garcia read the letter of ex-Senator Lorenzo M. Tañada to the Committee which summarized the points he raised during the public hearings held at the Old Congress Building, on July 4, to wit:

"That the bases no longer serve the national interest should be clear to anyone who keeps himself well-informed of current affairs, far from defending us for until now there is no defense against nuclear missiles and we have no foreign enemies.

"They would pull us into the arena of nuclear conflict in the event of war between the United States and Soviet Russia because of their nuclear capability and the actual existence of nuclear weapons in the bases. We have become real targets for attack by any power at war with America whether or not, we ourselves are at war with

that power."

Mr. Garcia opined that a country's foreign policy must proceed from the paramount national interest and that more paramount than any other national interest are the safety of the people and their survival as a nation. He argued that the bases, instead of providing safety and security, are a threat to the nation's survival. This, he said, is a fact which could not be disputed and the protestations about the need for the country to contribute its bid to the strategic defense of "freedom and democracy" are already empty and meaningless because the country had lived for 14 years under a dictatorship with the full sanction and actual encouragement of the United States Government. He opined that this is possible because of the existence of these military bases and the rights granted to the United States under the RP-US Military Bases Agreement. He pointed out that the argument invoking overall defense of the world is false and hypocritical for it is the strategic defense and hegemony of the United States which these bases are all about.

Mr. Garcia maintained that the RP-US Military Bases Agreement from the very beginning was basically flawed, and therefore, null and void. He pointed out that no renegotiation since then have been able to rescue that agreement from that fatal, historical aberration.

He then recounted a brief history of the RP-US Military Bases Agreement. He recalled that on January 17, 1933, the US Congress passed the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Law which provided for a ten-year transition period towards Philippine independence and gave the US President the authority to retain military and naval bases in the Philippines after independence. This law, he stated, was rejected on October 17, 1933 by the Philippine Legislature through Resolution No. 46 because among other reasons, the military, naval and other reservations provided in said Act were inconsistent with Philippine independence and it violated national dignity. With this misunderstanding, he recalled that President Quezon was mandated to head another Philippine Independence Mission to the United States for more favorable terms from Washington and in President Quezon's memoirs, he recalled that President Roosevelt agreed that the maintenance of American military reservations after independence would make independence a farce. In view thereof, he stated that on March 24, 1934 the Tydings-McDuffie Law was approved by the United States President and on May 1, 1934, the Philippine Legislature also approved the law, but this was virtually a restatement of the Hare-Hawes Cutting Bill except for the following: 1) the retention of the bases and other reservations was reworded into retention of naval reservations and fueling stations for a period of two years after the grant of Philippine Independence; and 2) the perpetual neutralization of the Philippine Islands if and when Philippine Independence shall have been achieved. He stressed that the provisions of the Philippine Independence Act or the Tydings-McDuffie Law were incorporated in the 1935 Constitution. It was for this reason, he stated, that this law bound the Filipino people and the US Government. He stated that there could be no changes without the consent of the Filipino people, in fact, in a 1939 plebiscite, there were only minor amendments. He pointed out that when World War II broke out, the Philippines became a prime target because of the American presence and it was at this point when President Quezon requested President Roosevelt to immediately grant Philippine independence and declare its neutral status as a last ditch effort to spare the country from greater devastation. He recalled that President Quezon demanded the withdrawal of all US bases from the country but this was flatly rejected by President Roosevelt when on June 29, 1944, the US Congress passed Resolution No. 93 authorizing the US President after negotiations with the Philippine President to retain and acquire military bases in the country, which, in effect, amended the Tydings-McDuffie Law and re-enacted the provisions of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Law Bill that the Philippine Legislature rejected. He stated that President Quezon had no choice but to accede.

He recalled that on May 14, 1945, President Osmeña signed an agreement with President Truman to allow the retention of U.S. military and naval bases in nineteen provinces; and on July 28, 1945, the Philippine Congress

approved Joint Resolution No. 4 authorizing the Commonwealth President to negotiate with the U.S. President regarding the military bases in order to ensure the territorial integrity of the Philippines, the mutual protection of the U.S. and the Philippines, and the maintenance of peace in the Pacific. He noted, however, that neither Resolution No. 3 nor Resolution No. 4 was submitted to the Filipino people for approval.

In this connection, Mr. Garcia adverted to a letter he recently received from a researcher named Steve Shalom, which enclosed a copy of a letter dated October 29, 1946 from General Douglas MacArthur to President Roxas containing the former's response to the latter's complaint about the excessive nature of U.S. Government demands regarding the military bases in the Philippines, including the desire of the Pentagon to establish army bases in Metro Manila but if the agreement could not be reached, the neutralization of the Philippines would be considered. He stated that General MacArthur added that

"the question of bases is not in my hands. Washington has handled it from the beginning and the decisions are made there . . . The question of foreign bases is a touchy subject at best and it can be accepted as axiomatic and immutable that the country of domicile must have the final word as to their acceptability. With the menace of Japan now eliminated, there is really no military threat to the future security of your land."

Mr. Garcia pointed out that reports in the U.S. Congress echoed General MacArthur's opinion that there was no immediate military threat to the Philippines, refuting one of the reasons for the establishment of U.S. military bases in the Philippines.

He pointed out that the RP-US Military Base Agreement entered into on March 14, 1947 violated the Philippine Independence Act and the Tydings-McDuffie Law, and without the approval of the Filipino people through a plebiscite, was null and void ab initio. He disclosed that settlements on such bases agreement already took place in Washington even before the proclamation of independence, and were undertaken with all the infirmities of law by the Philippine Commonwealth then in exile which existed under the benevolence of the Truman Administration.

He recalled that as early as April, 1945, President Osmeña, as head of the Philippine Government in exile, manifested his intention to abide by the proposals of the United States regarding the military bases in the Philippines after the war; and on May 14, 1945, President Osmeña signed with President Truman a secret preliminary statement of general principles on the U.S. bases in the Philippines, incorporating therein all the provisions of the draft drawn by the U.S. War Department, thus, making the military bases agreement a fait accompli even before it was concluded in 1947.

He pointed out that Ambassador to the U.S. Emmanuel Pelaez concluded that there were serious attempts made over the last 38 years to purge from the 1947 Military Bases Agreement the rights of extraterritoriality, and although some rectifications had been made, the bases continue to be under the control and sovereignty of the United States.

Furthermore, he underscored that the Constitution is a document of an eminently sovereign character, and that the U.S. Military Bases issue would affect the very heart of the national sovereignty. He then adverted to two letters he received stating the reasons why the issue should be bravely and fairly considered in the Constitution, one of which was that the U.S. bases had been used by the United States as a justification for wholesale support to the Marcos dictatorship and intervention in the affairs of the country.

Further adverting to the letter which he earlier mentioned, Mr. Garcia quoted ex-Senator Tañada who said,

"It is erroneous to claim that incorporating in the Constitution the bases provision for any restrictive element relative to foreign policy has not been practiced in the past. The paramount interest of the country should

always be openly and plainly stated in our fundamental law to serve as a guide and determinant of our policy and to shield and strengthen our policymakers when they deal with representatives of the superpowers who do suffer from a tendency to bully their way into getting what they want from the representatives of weaker and smaller countries . . ."

Finally, Mr. Garcia reiterated his objection to the presence of foreign military bases in the Philippines. He pointed out that the February 1986 revolution, which was basically political but largely peaceful, should be continually shared for the advancement of world peace. He urged that the Constitutional Commission be part of the Filipino tomorrow, today.

MANIFESTATION OF MR. TINGSON

At this juncture, Mr. Tingson stated that since the Committee was divided on the U.S. bases issue, Mr. de Castro would speak for the minority in the Committee.

POINT OF ORDER

Thereupon, Mr. Davide raised a point of order, stating that Mr. de Castro's speech should be considered in the turno en contra, and not in the period of sponsorship, in reply to which, the Chair explained that there were two views in the Committee and, therefore, both should be represented before any debate could ensue on the Committee Report.

Thereupon, the Chair recognized Mr. de Castro.

SPONSORSHIP REMARKS OF MR. DE CASTRO

Mr. de Castro noted that the decision of the Commission on the military bases issue would affect the very life of the country and its people.

He opined that Section 3(1) of the Article on Declaration of Principles which provides that "The State shall pursue a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality"; Section 3(2) which provides for the dismantling of the U.S. military bases; and Section 4 which provides for the "Philippines as a nuclear free country", should be deleted, not because he was in favor of maintaining the U.S bases in the country or of dismantling them, but because the Members of the Commission do not have the knowledge and expertise necessary to make the right decision on this vital issue.

He stated that this question should rather be addressed to the Executive and Legislative departments which will have enough time until 1991 when the present Military Bases Agreement will expire to avail of the advice of experts on strategy, nuclear weapons, neutrality laws and agreements, and other related matters. He pointed out that based on public hearings and communications received by the Commission, the Filipino people are still divided on the bases issue.

Moreover, he explained that the Philippines is located at strategic crossroads between the Pacific Ocean in the East and the South China Sea in the West; it is near and accessible to the Asian countries; and it faces three critical naval points, namely the straits of Malacca, Sunda and Lombok, which lead to the Indian Ocean, Middle East, Europe, Australia and Africa. He disclosed that about one-half of Asia's oil supply and four-fifths of its strategic materials pass through said choke points, and the U.S. naval and air forces can effectively protect regional air and sealanes leading to and from these areas through the two most important U.S. military facilities in Subic Naval Base and in Clark Air Base.

He underscored the significance of the U.S. military facilities in the Philippines in relation to the takeover by Russia of the U.S. military facilities in Cam Ranh Bay, immediately after the U.S. troops abandoned it, becoming

the Soviet military base that maintains support facilities for submarines, surface ships and aircrafts, and constitutes the largest concentration of Soviet naval forces deployed outside Russia. He stated, however, that the U.S. military facilities in the Philippines offset the expanding Soviet military presence in Cam Ranh Bay and other areas in the Pacific; provide for a deterrent and defense against external threat to the country; save the Philippines from a large amount of military expense; and enable the country to concentrate its limited resources on economic development.

He also noted the strategic value of the Philippines for East and Southeast Asia during World War II when the Japanese forces first landed in the Philippines after neutralizing the U.S. naval forces in Pearl Harbor, to next occupy Thailand, Burma and practically the whole Southeast Asia.

He opined that with the dismantling of the U.S. bases in the Philippines, the country could not be assured that no other power would be enticed to occupy said military establishments, in the light of the comments of Alexei Drugov and Victor Gorchagov, members of the Presidium of the U.S.S.R., that it is necessary "to scuttle the American military bases, if not, the Soviet Union will rain nuclear death on the Philippines." He stated that said statements were naive, if not a direct threat to the sensitivity of the Filipino people.

Furthermore, he recalled that in August, 1986, fifteen statesmen and scholars from the United States, Japan, Korea, Taiwan and the Philippines, convened through the auspices of the International Security Council to consider the security of the Philippines and the South China Sea region, and expressed concern over the expanding influence of the Soviet Union in the region and its consequent threat to the economies of the non-Communist states of Asia. He said they noted the Kremlin's determination to make the Soviet Union the dominant Asian power by neutralizing Japan and the newly industrialized nations of Northeast Asia.

On the provision of the first paragraph of Section 3, Mr. de Castro stated that the concept enumerated therein is the best position every nation can make if it is something that could be enforced but that as Napoleon Bonaparte said, "neutrality" is a word without meaning because it is deliberately violated. He cited examples of violations of neutrality such as Hitler's invasion of Belgium to be able to attack France.

He stressed that one of the essential elements in order to maintain inviolability of a state's territory and air space is a strong military defense, the lack of which serves as an irresistible temptation for invasion by a superpower on the pretext that it is done in the name of the people of the country.

From the standpoint of national security, he stressed the adverse consequences of removing the U.S. bases because of the dependence of the Armed Forces of the Philippines on American military assistance. He pointed out that all the country could produce are ammunitions for small arms which would place the Armed Forces in an untenable position in the face of the insurgency problem. He stated that a declaration of neutrality would require the added responsibility of defense of the air space.

He stated that making the Philippines a nuclear-free zone is a beautiful dream but, for reason of practicality, could be fatal unless all nuclear weapons are destroyed from the face of the earth, as no nation can escape the terrible effects of a nuclear war.

He stated that there is a continuing global struggle between two ideologies, communism or socialism led by Soviet Russia on the one hand, and the free world led by the United States on the other, and that the Philippines is right in the midst of this struggle.

He stated that in Southeast Asia, there are two opposing powerful naval and aircraft bases, merely 700 miles apart from each other — the Soviet Cam Ranh Base in Vietnam and the American Subic-Clark Bases in the Philippines.

Offering his advice based on his observations and experience, he stated the following:

- A committee should be formed composed of persons knowledgeable on the issues involved. There should be a plan both on the strategic and tactical aspects, and the economic and political stability. The people must be informed and their minds must be prepared for the moment of truth when they will have to make a definite stand on the military bases issue consistent with their security and well-being.
- One year before the termination of the Bases Agreement, or sometime in 1990, the United States must be informed that the Philippines is terminating the Agreement. Let the initiative of renewal of the Agreement come from them.
- If and when the United States decides to rent the Bases Agreement, the Filipino negotiators should sit with them as co-equals, decidedly, truthfully and frankly facing the issues, always bearing in mind what is good for the country and the Filipino people.
- The payments for the bases in the country must be in the form of rents and not in the form of assistance or aid, taking into consideration the rentals of U.S. bases in other countries, such as:

- Spain — \$415M
- Greece — \$501M
- Turkey — \$938M, for a listening post
- Egypt — \$1.75B, only for landing rights
- Israel — \$1.4B, only for landing rights

He stated that these figures should be compared to the \$900M paid to the Philippines for the use of the bases for a five-year period.

Thereupon, Mr. de Castro stated that his position is to leave the issue to the Executive and the Legislative branches of government.

Finally, he asked that the Members decide the issue not on the basis of emotions.

INQUIRY OF MR. SARMIENTO

Mr. Sarmiento pointed out that the procedure being followed is different from what was observed and stated that some Members are at a loss. He adverted to Mr. de Castro's sponsorship remarks during which he introduced amendments by deletion. He noted that following the procedure, other Members may not be prevented from speaking against the propositions.

Mr. Tingson stated that Mr. de Castro is a member of the Committee and is one of the sponsorship speakers.

At this juncture, the Chair urged the Members to listen to the speeches with some amount of understanding, candor and sincerity to be able to weigh both sides of the issue.

INQUIRY OF MS. TAN

Sharing the observations of Mr. Sarmiento, Ms. Tan inquired whether sponsorship could likewise mean nonsponsorship, to which the Chair replied that the procedure being followed would allow the Committee Members to express different views on the subjects covered by the Committee Report.

REMARKS OF MR. TINGSON

At this juncture, Mr. Tingson adverted to Section 9 of the proposed Article, to wit:

"The State recognizes the sanctity of family life and shall protect and strengthen the family as a basic social institution. The State shall equally protect the life of the mother and the life of the unborn from the moment of conception. The natural right and duty of parents in the rearing of the youth for civic efficiency and the development of moral character shall receive the aid and support of the government."

Upon his request, the Chair recognized Mr. Villegas to sponsor the provision.

SPONSORSHIP REMARKS OF MR. VILLEGAS

Speaking in support of Section 9, particularly the second sentence thereof, Mr. Villegas underscored the mandate to the State to equally protect the life of the mother and the life of the unborn from the moment of conception.

He stated that while Mr. Azcuna and other Members spoke of the possible annihilation of the world by a nuclear holocaust, the 50 million unborn babies killed each year pales into insignificance the monstrosity of Hitler against the Jews.

Adverting to the debates on Section 1 of the Bill of Rights, he stated that it raised the question of personality of the unborn child from the moment of conception.

Reviewing the issue, he stated that biology categorically proves that the fertilized ovum is alive, first, because like living organisms, it takes in nutrients which it processes by itself and it begins doing this upon fertilization; secondly, as it takes in these nutrients it grows from within; and, thirdly, it multiplies itself at a geometric rate in the continuous process of cell-division, all of which processes are vital signs of life and that the fertilized ovum itself is biologically alive.

On the question whether the fertilized ovum is human, he stated that genetics equally gives a categorical "yes" answer. He explained that at the moment of conception, the nuclei of the ovum and the sperm rupture at which point 23 chromosomes from the ovum combine with 23 chromosomes of the sperm to form a total of 46 chromosomes, a count which is found only in human cells; therefore, the fertilized ovum is human and that human life begins at conception.

He stated that the question as to whether a fertilized ovum is a person is where legal necromancy comes in, which legal necromancy opened the floodgates for 50 million abortions committed on innocent lives.

It appears, he said, that the true answer to the question does not lie in physical or legal science for the reason that there is no physical evidence of personality yet but the answer lies in the science of moral ethics which defines a person as an individual substance of a rational nature.

He maintained that when the Constitution speaks of the Declaration of Principles, it speaks mostly of principles borrowed from the science of ethics which is speculative science and that ethics is the source of many of the principles embodied in the Declaration of Principles.

He stated that while it is true that no unicellular human being performs rational acts, it does not follow that its nature is not rational since it has all the essential properties of humanity. He explained that it is true that the manifestations of essential personality are in real potency in the early stages of pregnancy and there would be no such real potency if essential personality were absent from the very beginning. This explains, he said, the difficulty of the law to grasp the inalienable right to life of the human being upon conception. He maintained that it would be most unfortunate if the law — the fundamental law at that — were to be divorced from ethics and ethical

principles.

He stressed that in the absence of proof to show that the human organism from the moment of conception is not a person, the law must presume that it is. The awesome risk of injustice to unduly terminate an innocent human life is far too great to take.

He appealed to the Members not to be constrained by inferior laws, particularly if they are open to amendment or repeal or if they are beset with internal contradictions. He mentioned as ridiculous American jurisprudence which vests upon the unborn child the right to inheritance and damages while the basic right to life is not respected.

Mr. Villegas informed that the medical journal, entitled *The California Medicine* known for its pro-abortion stand, contains a condemnation of American morality, saying:

Since the old ethics has not yet been fully displaced, it has been necessary to separate the idea of abortion from the idea of killing which continues to be socially abhorrent. The result has been a curious avoidance of the scientific fact which everyone really knows that human life begins at conception and this continues whether intra or extra uterine until death. The very considerable semantic gymnastics which are required to rationalize abortion as anything but taking human life would be ludicrous if they were not often put forth under socially impeccable auspices. It is suggested that the schizophrenic sort of subterfuge is necessary because while a new ethics is being accepted, the old one has not yet been rejected.

Mr. Villegas stated that there are those who argue that abortion should be allowed for certain hard cases such as in pregnancies resulting from rape or incest for reasons of compassion to the woman. The main reasons for saying "no", he stated, are: 1) a wrong cannot be righted by another wrong; 2) no one should be deprived of human life without due process and it has been established scientifically that from the moment of conception the fertilized ovum already has life; 3) a fetus, like any human, must be presumed innocent unless proven guilty. The fetus, he noted, has done no wrong except to be unwanted. Laws legalizing exceptions, he observed, would be prejudicial to the common good as the proverb says "hard cases make bad laws" and such exceptions would create a precedent which can very well turn the rule for the few into a rule for all. He pointed out that this has happened in Great Britain, the United States and other advanced countries.

Citing statistics, Mr. Villegas informed that before the notorious *Roe vs. Wayde* decision of the U.S. Supreme Court on January 22, 1973, there were about 100,000 illegal abortions a year which increased to 586,000 abortions and which, in turn, increased by 27% or 745,400 in 1973; by 20% or 900,000 in 1974. He underscored that the floodgates were opened and that, consequently, there are more than 2,000,000 abortions in the U.S. at present.

On pregnancies resulting from rape, Mr. Villegas cited that the chances of such conception is 22 for every 3.5 million fertile women or .006% probability. He noted that in Czechoslovakia, out of 86,000 abortions, 63 were claimed to be caused by rape or .07% probability.

Mr. Villegas observed that rape is difficult to prove mainly because of the victim's reluctance to report the crime and pregnancies resulting therefrom would be even harder to prove especially if the woman is married or known to have an active sex life. He argued that allowing abortion for rape, incest, mental illness or any hard case would invite a flood of bogus hard case abortions. He stated that mental illness would not be a valid reason for legal abortion inasmuch as it does not necessarily cause the same mental illness in the fetus. He stated that the problem does not lie in the pregnancy itself but on how the child shall be nourished and reared after birth which can be addressed through social services which the Commission has established would be open to all, especially the underprivileged. He stated that the most underprivileged of them all would be the unborn child who cannot protect himself.

He stressed that abortion has been found to cause mental disturbances and instead of being a solution to unwanted pregnancy, has resulted in stress, anxiety and guilt which follows normally after the commission of a crime. He observed that behind the arguments of those who support abortion is a racist philosophy and the pleasure principle which concludes that persons who cannot enjoy life must not be allowed to live — a principle which would lead eventually to an obsession with racial purity.

He argued that death is never a solution to problems of life and that the solution thereto would lie in the social and loving concern and abilities of the more fortunate. Poverty, he stated, cannot be used as a reason for legalizing abortion which would be tantamount to saying that only the rich have a right to life which is a gross violation of justice. He argued that the problem of the poor woman is that she is poor, not that she is pregnant. He stressed that he would oppose a Constitutional provision which would mandate the State to determine the “optimum population” of the country, giving it the power to be God. He stressed that the most effective solution to the population problem is economic development and social justice and addressing the root causes of economic underdevelopment and social injustice would solve the population problem.

Mr. Villegas stated that the doctor is morally obliged to save the lives of the mother and the child and when medically impossible to do so, he could then act in favor of one, provided that no direct harm is intended to the other. If such principle is observed, he explained that the loss of the child's life is not intentional and is unavoidable — hence, the doctor would not be guilty of abortion or murder.

He further argued that the principle of double effect cannot be applied in such cases, stating that when a medical operation is to be performed on the mother which indirectly kills the child, this would not be considered murder as there is no direct intention to kill the child, the direct intention being only to operate on the mother. Such situations, he said, are very few and far between.

Mr. Villegas maintained that the most radical solution to hard cases would be a caring and loving society that would provide services and support to the woman and the child psychologically and physically — a pro-life solution. The abortion solution on the other hand, he contended, kills the fetus and also kills the care and love which society could have offered the mother.

Additionally, Mr. Villegas stated that implicit in the arguments against Section 9 is the desire to place in the Constitution an opening to legalize abortion. He cautioned that unless the Commission explicitly provides “from the moment of conception” there would be reason to fear that the Constitutional Commission itself would be used to buttress the campaign for legalized abortion. He stated that merely providing protection for the unborn would be falling into the trap because there is a need to protect life from the moment of conception. He warned that with the current economic crisis and the large population, the country would be vulnerable to a temptation to legalize abortion. He stressed that the country must learn from the experiences on abortion of other developed countries. He noted that the International Planned Parenthood Federation is not about to relax until abortion is legalized.

Mr. Villegas recalled that in Resolution No. 175 which he, Mrs. Quesada, Messrs. Sarmiento, Bengzon, Colayco and Romulo proposed, they insist on a balanced regard for the right to life of both woman and child. He maintained that Section 9 gives due regard to the right to life in cases of ectopic pregnancies and so-called “medical dilemmas” and at the same time restrains a discontented woman from killing her unwanted child, which although currently depending on her, is really a distinct and separate human being. He noted that the argument that the woman has the right to do whatever she wants with her body is irrelevant inasmuch as the fertilized ovum is already a separate human being.

Mr. Villegas reasoned that what is being affirmed in Section 9 is the moral and constitutional right of the unborn child to life and it entails the granting of presumptive personality to the unborn from the moment of conception.

He noted that respect for the rights of the woman with child and respect for the rights of the child in her womb are by nature intimately linked such that any deliberate harm that should come upon one will also harm the other.

He opined that conflict of rights is fictitious inasmuch as the woman has her basic rights and the unborn child's rights to life is also recognized. The conflict, he noted, is only apparent and can be decided by applying the principle that when two basic rights come in conflict, the more basic right and/or the right concerning the graver matter takes precedence over rights involving less basic or serious matter. He stated that the right to life is more basic than the right to privacy or any posterior rights. He observed that removal of the fetus would be a violation of its right to life and that the woman has no right to evict the temporary resident in her womb. He noted that it is said that the law is hard but nevertheless it is law, *dura lex sed lex* and even more demanding is life, *dura vita sed vita*. He stressed that law is for the sake of life and must come from life, not vice-versa. He underscored that the views he had expressed transcends religious differences.

Thereafter, he adverted to the statement of Commissioner Uka during a public hearing, to wit: "As a Muslim, I believe in the Ten Commandments, and one of the Ten Commandments is, 'Thou shall not kill'. From the time of conception, there is already life. Now if you put out that life, there is already killing, a violation of one of the Ten Commandments." He informed that the overwhelming majority of Filipinos support Section 9 and that the Committee had received more than 50,000 signatures. He argued that the Commission should listen to all these voices and mandate that the State should equally protect the life of the mother and the unborn from the moment of conception.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

The Chair suspended the session.

It was 5:04 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 5:45 p.m., the session was resumed.

REMARKS OF MR. NOLLEDO

Apropos the proposed Section 9, and speaking in support of the second sentence thereof, Mr. Nollado stated that the unborn child from the time of conception has life, it is human and it possesses presumptive personality. He pointed out that Article 40 of the Civil Code of the Philippines provides that the conceived child shall be considered born for all purposes favorable to it as long as it is born normally later, thus, it can accept a donation and can inherit.

Adverting to the doctrine of presumptive personality, Mr. Nollado expressed the view that protecting the unborn from the moment of conception will give meaning and substance to the Constitutional declaration that the State recognizes the dignity of the human personality and to the constitutional injunction that in educating the youth, the curriculum should include love of humanity.

He stated that the Commission values human life when it decided to abolish the death penalty for which and with more reason, it should protect the helpless and innocent human being in the womb of the mother.

Finally, Mr. Nollado pointed out that killing the fetus which is categorized as abortion in the Revised Penal Code is plain murder because of its inability to defend itself. He urged that the unborn as a cherished, precious and loving gift from God be allowed to enjoy constitutional protection in a Christian country like the Philippines.

RESERVATION OF MR. MONSOD

Considering that the Members were not yet furnished a clean copy of the Article on Human Resources, Mr. Monsod made a reservation to seek clarifications or to propose amendments should there be need for them upon receipt of said copy.

The Chair took note of the reservation.

MANIFESTATION OF MR. TINGSON

Mr. Tingson stated that Mrs. Quesada, a member of the Committee; would speak on the concept of sovereignty as embodied in Section 1, to wit:

"The Philippines is a republican and democratic State. Sovereignty resides in the Filipino people and all government authority emanates from them and continues only with their consent."

SPONSORSHIP REMARKS OF MRS. QUESADA

Mrs. Quesada stated that she would speak on sovereignty drawing inspiration from the proposed Preamble of the new Constitution. Adverting to the Preamble, she asked whether the provisions which the Committee drafted truly reflect the sovereignty of the Filipino people.

On the suggestion to delete the provisions which would be enshrined in the Constitution, Mrs. Quesada stated that the moment presents a very rare opportunity for everyone to prove that indeed there is a sovereign Filipino people. She stressed that sovereignty is an inalienable right of an independent country, it being a prerequisite for the exercise of statehood without which a nation cannot be considered a state much less an independent one. She stated that a sovereign country is one that exercises full control and governance over all its territory and over the affairs within that territory, thereby moving towards the fulfillment of the needs of the majority of its people rather than towards the direction charted by an alien power. She maintained that a state that does not command dominion over every inch of its territory is not a sovereign state and that there are no degrees to sovereignty. She stressed that a state is either sovereign or not; there is no such thing as a substance or shadow of sovereignty. She opined that a review of historical facts and the presence of foreign bases would indicate that indeed sovereignty is not exercised by the Filipinos. She adverted to a discussion paper of Mr. Gerardo G. Valero, grandson of Commissioner Concepcion, which states that 1) foreign bases understood in the Philippine context do not exist in countries like Spain, Greece or Turkey because unlike in such places the US bases in the Philippines are extraterritorial enclaves where Philippine laws do not apply; 2) Philippine criminal jurisprudence could not be enforced unless the US Base Commander chooses to cooperate; 3) Philippine currency is not accepted and Filipinos are not allowed to enter; 4) Filipinos could not explore or exploit the natural resources therein; and 5) all information produced by the installation including raw data should be shared by both governments.

Mrs. Quesada stated that in the 1935 and 1973 Constitutions and even in the new Charter, it is declared that sovereignty resides in the people and all government authority emanates from them. She stressed that if this is so, only the people themselves must decide on matters that concern sovereignty. She stressed that sovereignty could neither be a matter of legislation nor an executive prerogative and the people could never waive it unless they decide to make the waiver an act of sovereign will.

Finally, Mrs. Quesada urged the Commission to prove that the Filipinos are indeed a sovereign people by converting itself into a constituent assembly with plenary powers to discuss the breadth and scope of Philippine sovereignty and to decide all relevant questions like neutrality, nonalignment and removal of foreign military bases from the country's shore

SPONSORSHIP REMARKS OF MRS. ROSARIO BRAID

Adverting to the article of Fr. Shay Cullen, a Columban priest who runs a drug treatment center in Subic Naval Base and who exposed child prostitution in Olongapo City, Mrs. Rosario Braid read the following statistics which shows the extent of prostitution in Olongapo, to wit: 1) a city population of 255,000 whose livelihood and economic survival are dependent on sex for sale; 2) 16,000 women registered with the social hygiene clinics; 3) 500 clubs, bars, hotels, Turkish baths and massage parlors; 4) of more than 20,000 prostitutes, more than 9,000 are registered, 8,000 are unlicensed and 3,000 are part-time prostitutes with the rest representing support services for the "profession".

With respect to Angeles City where Clark Air Base is located, Mrs. Rosario Braid disclosed that there are 450 hotels, cabarets, disco joints, bars and cocktail lounges which employ over 7,000 hospitality girls.

She stated that many children in these two cities virtually grow up on their own and inevitably end up in prostitution. She also revealed that in Macapagal and Marcos villages, which are adjacent to Clark Air Base, the Aetas live by scavenging scrap metal from the dumpsite and since they are regarded as security risks, they have been treated as animals.

Mrs. Rosario Braid pointed out that the Philippine Labor Code issued under the Marcos regime contained some of Asia's most repressive anti-worker provisions which consider 15,000 of the 18,000 Clark Air Base employees contractual workers without security of tenure, aside from the fact that they are insulted and treated like dogs and as "no class" citizens.

Finally, she urged the abrogation of the RP-US Military Bases Agreement in 1991 for the sake of sovereignty and national pride. She recalled her experience in Sri Lanka when the Philippines had a difficult time getting an observer's status in a non-alignment conference because of the presence of bases in the country while other ASEAN countries were granted membership. She stressed that it is about time that the Philippines show that it is truly a sovereign state.

MANIFESTATION OF MR. TINGSON

Mr. Tingson stated that except for Ms. Aquino, the Committee members were through with their sponsorship. He then made a reservation for Ms. Aquino to be allowed a turn to speak in the next session.

REMARKS OF MR. PADILLA

Mr. Padilla expressed support for the views expressed by Mr. Villegas relative to Section 9 on the right of the unborn from conception. As stated by Mr. Villegas, his expressed views are the result of logical thinking, not creative, much less critical thinking.

He pointed out that the Revised Penal Code penalizes not only infanticide but also abortion, whether intentional or unintentional, and whether by the mother or by the physician or midwife; and the dispensation of abortives.

He opined that the proponents of Section 9 intend not only to affirm the provisions of the Revised Penal Code but also to make the right of the unborn a fundamental right which deserves mention in the Constitution.

PARLIAMENTARY STATUS

In reply to the Chair's query, Mr. Rama stated that the Body was still in the period of debate.

On Mr. Sarmiento's inquiry on whether the period of sponsorship had already been terminated, considering the

reservation for Ms. Aquino, the Chair stated that Ms. Aquino would be allowed to deliver her sponsorship speech in the next session and, thereafter, the interpellations.

Mr. Tingson affirmed that the Committee would like to allow its Members to first express their views before any interpellation.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

At this juncture, the Chair suspended the session.

It was 6:02 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 6:10 p.m., the session was resumed.

MANIFESTATION OF MR. RAMA

Upon resumption of session, Mr. Rama stated that upon agreement with the President of the Commission and the Committee, the discussion on the military bases would be taken up in the next session.

ADJOURNMENT OF SESSION

On motion of Mr. Rama, there being no objection, the Chair declared the session adjourned until nine o'clock in the morning of the following day.

It was 6:10 p.m.

I hereby certify to the correctness of the foregoing.

(SGD.) FLERIDA RUTH P. ROMERO

Secretary-General

ATTESTED:

(SGD.) CECILIA MUÑOZ PALMA

President

Approved on September 13, 1986

ABOUT BATAS.ORG

Study smarter at BATAS.org

The Philippine bar review and law-school companion built around how your brain actually remembers.

The complete Philippine law library - free for everyone.

More than 100,000 Supreme Court decisions, Republic Acts, and executive issuances - full-text searchable, browsable by category and year, and always free. No paywall, no login. This PDF came from it.

Audio case-brief lectures.

Any decision becomes a podcast-style lecture - facts, issues, ruling, and doctrine - with read-along highlighting and a hands-free presentation mode. Study while commuting, working out, or resting your eyes.

Bar review built on the science of memory.

Complete, sequenced courses for all eight bar subjects, narrated like podcasts and reinforced with retrieval practice and spaced review - the study techniques with the strongest evidence behind them.

The full law-school curriculum.

One subscription unlocks the entire J.D. curriculum - every subject, every lesson, with your progress tracked down to the paragraph so you can pick up exactly where you left off, on any device.

Mock exams that tell you where you stand.

Timed multiple-choice exams graded instantly, with per-subject score breakdowns and focus suggestions that point you at your weakest topics first.

A study planner that keeps you on pace.

Set your schedule and BATAS tells you every day whether you are on track for bar day - and exactly which lesson to take next.

Start free at <https://batas.org>

The law library is free forever - and your first lesson is one click away.

The text of this document is an official public record and remains in the public domain. Formatting, presentation, and compilation © 2026 batas.org.

Downloaded free from the batas.org Law Library. Share it freely - the library is free for every law student, bar reviewee, and practitioner.