

JOURNAL NO. 55

VOL. III, October 03, 1934

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/9832338202a6/>

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION RECORD

APERTURA DE LA SESION

Se abre la sesion a las 5:10 p.m., bajo la presidencia del Presidente, Hon. Claro M. Recto.

EL PRESIDENTE: Lease la lista de Delegados.

SR. ESCAREAL: Senor Presidente, pido que se dispense la lectura de la lista.

EL PRESIDENTE: ¿Hay alguna objecion (Silencio.) La Mesa no oye ninguna. Se dispense la lectura de la lista.

APROBACION DEL ACTA

SR. ESCAREAL: Senor Presidente, pido igualmente que se dispense la lectura del acta y que la misma se de por aprobada.

EL PRESIDENTE: ¿Hay alguna objecion? (Silencio.) La Mesa no oye ninguna. Se dispensa la lectura del acta. Aprobada.

DESPACHO DE ASUNTOS

EL PRESIDENTE: Leanse los documentos recibidos.

EL SECRETARIO:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

The President
Constitutional Convention
Mr. President:

Your Committee on Scientific Research has the honor to submit herewith the draft of the proposed constitutional precepts regarding scientific researches and investigations, the result of various meetings and deliberations held by the same and the studies of the provisions of the constitutions of various countries dealing with this subject and of the Memorial submitted by the National Research Council of the Philippine Islands.

Economic development is necessary in order to provide increased revenues for our Government. The economic development of a country can only be hastened by encouraging, fostering and supporting scientific and research activities.

The improvement of agricultural methods, the conservation of our forest resources, the development of our

fishery and mineral resources, the improvement of our present industries and the creation of new industries are undertakings that can be successfully carried out only after the necessary scientific investigations of the different phases involved therein have been properly pursued. To emphasize the need of directing our attention to the necessary industrialization, the following figures, being our annual tribute in pesos for what we import, are illuminating:

Textiles	P41,000,000.00
Meat and dairy products.....	13,000,000.00
Milk	4,000,000.00
Wheat and flour and other breadstuffs	9,000,000.00
Rice	1,000,000.00
Paper	8,000,000.00
Tobacco	6,000,000.00
Vegetables, fruits and nuts	6,000,000.00
Eggs	3,000,000.00
Perfumery and soap	2,500,000.00
Fish and fish products	2,000,000.00
Glass, glassware, China and earthenware	2,000,000.00
Leather and leather goods	2,000,000.00
Chemicals, drugs, dyes, and medicines	1,500,000.00
Coffee and cacao	1,500,000.00
Paints and varnishes	1,000,000.00

All of these can be grown, raised, or manufactured here even in excess of what home consumption will require, if only we know how to do it.

In considering the host of problems confronting us in connection with our economic development and readjustment, we find that whether we view things purely from the standpoint of material prosperity which applied science brings because of increased raw products, or the creation of new industries not before possible; whether we view them from the standpoint of physical well-being or a lengthened life span gained through the discovery and application of the rules of hygiene and sanitation; whether we view them from the standpoint of national defense possibilities in the form of increased manpower, efficient chemical warfare gases, explosives, guns, tanks, submarines, airplanes, and other means of defense; or whether, as is most likely, we look at things from all of these standpoints together, the fact remains that we must not only take all possible advantages of the contributions of science, but must actively encourage scientific and research activities to the full with those various ends in view. Economic progress during the last hundred years has been chiefly industrial progress, which is basically scientific progress.

That this is fully appreciated everywhere is evident from the inclusion of more or less express provisions for scientific and research activities to be found in the constitutions adopted by several nations in the world, namely,

United States (1787), Argentina (1853), Guatemala (1879), Brazil (1891), Mexico (1917), Finland (1919), Germany (1919), Peru (1920), Czechoslovakia (1920), Austria (1920), Poland (1921), Yugoslavia (1921), Russia (1923), Turkey (1924), Spain (1931), and China (1932). The fact that it is manifestly to the interest of every state to provide for scientific and research work as a means of preserving itself makes the inclusion all the more significant.

The inclusion in the provisions of the phrase "securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings, works, or discoveries" is made because it is one of the ways to be found in almost all constitutions of the different nations.

The Committee recommends the inclusion of the article which provides for the establishment of a National Research Council whose functions shall be determined by law. As has been proven in all countries where research councils are existing, research has been promoted in the most effective manner through the instrumentality of such councils. In order to realize, therefore, the indispensable economic development and readjustment through the application of the results of scientific investigations, the National Research Council should be maintained. The inclusion of the necessary proviso for the maintenance of a National Research Council in the Constitution for the first Malay Republic will, it is believed, correct the wrong world-wide impression about the superstitious nature of the Malay mind, inasmuch as it will show that the Malay appreciates the value of such, scientific institutions as the National Research Council.

It is recommended that the same be approved.

Respectfully submitted,

(Sgd.) JUAN ORTEGA

Chairman

Committee on Scientific Research

PROVISIONS APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATION

ART. The State shall encourage, foster, and support activities and investigations for the progress of science and useful arts, securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings, works and discoveries.

ART. There shall be a National Research Council whose functions shall be determined by law.

ART. The State shall protect and preserve works, remains, and relics of historic, cultural, artistic or scientific values.

EL PRESIDENTE: Al Comite de Ponencias.

Esta en orden ahora la continuacion del preambulo de la Constitucion.

MR. ABORDO: Mr. President, I understand in yesterday's session that the second part of my amendment will be taken into account today by this Convention. Having observed the attitude of the majority members who voted against my amendment with respect to the appreciation we should offer to the United States of America, making it plain that the appreciation of gratitude to America should not be embodied in the Constitution but placed only in a separate document in the nature of a resolution, and for the Convention to be consistent with its attitude, it is necessary that the second part of my amendment be also of the same nature. I, therefore, move that the second part of my amendment on the recognition of the labors and sacrifices of our patriots be withdrawn.

MR. CONFESOR: Mr. President, will the gentleman yield?

THE PRESIDENT: The gentleman may yield, if he desires.

MR. ABORDO: I am simply announcing my intention to withdraw this second part of my amendment, so I believe that there is no need of asking me any further questions?

MR. ROXAS: Mr. President, will the gentleman from Palawan kindly answer a question?

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

MR. ABORDO: Certainly.

MR. ROXAS: Why is the clause "to strengthen the solidarity" better than "to maintain the unity"? Does it not seem to the gentleman from Palawan that when you say in the Constitution that the purpose of the Constitution is to strengthen national solidarity, you are implying that the people of the Philippine Islands, or the nation, or the country, if you please, is not yet united nor solid?

MR. ABORDO: I will answer the Gentleman from Capiz by saying that the word "maintain" simply means to sustain, uphold or support our present status or our present unity, whereas the phrase "to strengthen" growth in power, to fortify, invigorate the existing unity. The word "solidarity" means union or consolidation of interest and responsibility in a constituted government, or in other words, it is a community taken as a whole. Consequently, my idea is to see to it that our objective must be to establish a stronger and more forceful unity in the government, in our nation by employing the word "solidarity" rather than "unity," which is only oneness. We must understand that there is no perfect unity in any constituted form of government; consequently, as a nation we should see to it that that unity must augment, increase, and fortify the solidarity of the nation.

MR. ROXAS: I see the point that the gentleman is making. I have, however, a doubt in my mind. Is it not true that "unity" is an absolute concept that does not admit of degrees? If "unity" means oneness, it is either oneness or it is not. When you say "to maintain the unity," it means you cannot improve on that. If the people are united, it would only be a generalization, hence perhaps acceptable in popular language to say "to increase the unity, to augment the unity." But if the people are united you cannot make them more united. It is an absolute concept.

MR. BUENO: May I answer the Gentleman from

Capiz? I merely want to point out the fact, Mr. President ...

MR. ROXAS: Mr. President, I am just inquiring from the Gentleman from Palawan if it is proper for the Convention to imply that we are not united; that we need to strengthen the solidarity. The advantage of the phrase as it exists in the report of the Committee is this: If we take for granted—and we recognize that we are now one people—that we are united territorially and as a people, and that we want to maintain that unity, I do not believe that you can make unity more perfect than as it is. It is either oneness, or it is none at all. And it is for that reason that I would like the Gentleman from Palawan to explain why "to strengthen the solidarity" is better and more expressive of our purpose than "to maintain the unity."

MR. BUENO: Mr. President, may I ask the Gentleman from Palawan to allow me.....

THE PRESIDENT: The delegate from Palawan is still yielding to the Gentleman from Capiz.

MR. ABORDO: Mr. President and gentleman from Capiz, I will explain my reason for insisting on my amendment. "Solidarity" for me is better than "unity" because the latter simply means one in nature of interest, concord and oneness in nature. What we want now is not only to preserve our present unity but to see that it is increased or it becomes stronger and more forceful to the interest of the Filipino people as a whole. Without my

amendment, the present status quo of unity, for me, will be no unity at all for the future, for no unity is ever perfect in any constituted government.

MR. BUENO: May I ask the gentleman from Palawan for the privilege of answering the gentleman from Capiz.

THE PRESIDENT: Is the gentleman from Palawan willing to yield to the gentleman from Ilocos Norte?

MR. ABORDO: The Gentleman from Ilocos Norte is asking for an opportunity to be heard in my stead, in order to answer the gentleman from Capiz.

MR. GRAFILO: Mr. President, will the gentleman yield?

THE PRESIDENT: The gentleman may yield if he so desires.

MR. ABORDO: Willingly.

MR. GRAFILO: Is it not true that while unity is oneness, yet there is such a thing as lax unity, and when that unity is lax, it can be strengthened, such that the substitution "to strengthen" the unity is to fortify the oneness of that unity?

MR. ABORDO: Certainly.

MR. BOCAR: Mr. President, will the gentleman yield?

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

MR. ABORDO: With pleasure.

MR. BOCAR: In the opinion of the gentleman from Palawan, is the Philippines united at present or not?

MR. ABORDO: That is a question which the gentleman himself can answer. I say we are united but we want our unity to become stronger and more forceful in the future.

MR. BOCAR: If the Philippines is united, is such existing unity satisfactory or not?

MR. ABORDO: As it is, the present unity is good, but we want not only that our present unity be as it is, but as a Filipino and an independent people, we should see to it that such unity is increased.

MR. BOCAR: If the union is satisfactory to the gentleman from Palawan, will he still contend that such satisfactory union can be improved upon?

MR. ABORDO: Certainly. In a constituted government there is no such thing as perfect unity.

In order to cut short the discussion of this question, Mr. President, I decline to answer any further questions.

MR. CINCO: Mr. President, inasmuch as the gentleman from Palawan refuses to answer questions, I should like to speak against the amendment.

EL PRESIDENTE: Si no hay objecion por parte de la Asamblea, se aprueba la peticion.

Esta en orden la tercera enmienda del Caballero de Palawan.

MR. ABORDO: Mr. President, I have filed a third amendment to the Preamble in the sense of suppressing or eliminating the phrase "in order to maintain the unity of our nation," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "in order to strengthen the solidarity of the nation."

MR. SOTTO (F.): The committee is willing to accept amendment No. 3.

EL PRESIDENTE: ¿Que dice el Comité de Ponencias?

SR. VILLANUEVA: Señor Presidente, mi enmienda es anterior.

EL PRESIDENTE: Parece que se ha acordado ayer que no habríamos de guardar el orden de precedencia. Aunque se presente después, no se declarará fuera de orden la enmienda de Su Señoría.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Señor Presidente, si no tiene inconveniente la Asamblea, voy a enunciar mi enmienda por si encuentra acogida en esta Convención.

EL PRESIDENTE: ¿Tiene inconveniente la Asamblea en que el Caballero de Negros enuncie su enmienda? (Silencio.) ¿Cuál es su enmienda?

SR. VILLANUEVA: Mi enmienda consiste en tres palabras nada más. No se si tiene relación con la enmienda del Caballero de Palawan.

EL PRESIDENTE: La enmienda del Caballero de Palawan está en la parte que se refiere a fortalecer la solidaridad nacional.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Entonces, esta mi enmienda es una secuela de la del Compañero.

EL PRESIDENTE: Puede enunciarla Su Señoría.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Tengo en mi mano el texto inglés y mi enmienda consiste en insertar las palabras "peace" y "provide" en las palabras "foster friendship and harmony with other nations."

EL PRESIDENTE: Es una enmienda completamente independiente de la del Caballero de Palawan.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Voy a esperar entonces que termine el Caballero de Palawan.

MR. ORTIZ (M.): Mr. President, I have an amendment to the amendment.

THE PRESIDENT: What is the amendment of the gentleman?

MR. ORTIZ (M.): Inasmuch as I had presented a similar amendment to the amendment presented by the delegate from Palawan [Mr. Abordo], I would like to submit another amendment in the sense that instead of the word "nation," we use "country." My reason is that nation is a racial concept while country refers to both nation and territory. There may be a nation without a definite territory or without a government, so instead of "our nation" we should put "our country."

MR. ABORDO: I have no objection, Mr. President.

MR. CINCO: I would like to present an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Palawan.

THE PRESIDENT: Properly, the gentleman cannot present any more amendment to the amendment. However, we will discuss the first amendment to the amendment.

MR. CINCO: The chairman of the committee has just accepted the amendment of Mr. Abordo. Mr. President, does the Committee on Sponsorship accept the amendment of Delegate Abordo?

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair will consult the assembly regarding the amendment that instead of "nation" the word "country" be placed.

(Prosiguiendo en castellano.) ¿Hay objeción por parte de la Asamblea de que la palabra "nation" se sustituya por la palabra "country"?

MR. OSIAS: Mr. President, and gentleman of the Convention: I am opposed to the amendment to the amendment.

I hope I can prevail upon my colleague to withdraw that amendment to the amendment. Is it not true that "country" is a broader concept than "nation"? I maintain that "country" is broader. "Nation," in this case, would cover both "territory" and "people," so I am asking the gentleman who presented the amendment to the amendment to reconsider by withdrawing his amendment, because it is not quite proper to speak of strengthening the solidarity of the country as if it refers only to territory.

"Nation," in reality, is a concept that takes in both territorial integrity and unity of the people themselves and that is what we are seeking to strengthen. You can speak of unity of a country and maintain it, but you can not speak of strengthening the solidarity of a country conceived primarily as a territory, that is why we speak of country and people. I hope the gentleman who presented the amendment to the amendment will withdraw that to preserve the concept of the nation which involves both people and territory wherein they reside.

I would like to strengthen national solidarity. I am very glad the chairman of the Committee on Sponsorship accepted the amendment of the Delegate from Palawan, Mr. Abordo. I have a similar amendment and if that is the case—not changing the word "nation" to "country"—I wish to announce the withdrawal of my amendment.

Note, Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention, that the amendment seeks to change the phraseology, "maintaining the unity of our nation" to "strengthening the solidarity of the nation." It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the essential concept of a nation is neither territorial nor racial; primarily those two concepts are important although not even cultural. In truth and in fact, the basic concept of a nation is the organic community of the interest of the people residing within a given territory, and I ask that we do not change the word "nation" for that reason.

The other reason, Mr. Chairman, is that it will be the first time that we place in an official document the existence of the Filipino people and their country as a nation before the family of nations of the world. I trust that the Convention, since the Committee on Sponsorship has accepted the dropping of the phrase "maintaining the unity of our nation," will admit that "strengthening the solidarity of the nation" is more important than the concept of nation rather than country alone.

For that reason, I hope the amendment to the amendment will not prevail,

MR. ORTIZ (M.): Mr. President, I should like to answer the Gentleman from La Union. I am sorry to disagree to his definition of "nation." There is a Jewish nation, but there is no definite territory. The gentleman says that the word "country" refers only to territory. That is not what Webster says about country. "Country," as Webster defines means a territory of an independent nation. It may also mean the inhabitants or the people of a state. Therefore, the word "country" refers both to territory and to its inhabitants; while there may be a nation without a definite territory, just like the nation of Jews.

MR. PEREZ (J.): Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

THE PRESIDENT: The gentleman may yield if he so desires.

MR. ORTIZ: Willingly.

MR. PEREZ (J.): Does not the clause "in order to strengthen the solidarity of our nation" mean that we are seeking the spiritual oneness of the nation? This refers to solidarity and does not refer to the word "country" but to the spiritual unity of the people.

MR. ORTIZ (M.): Solidarity may refer to both people and territory. That is my opinion.

SR. ORTEGA: Senor Presidente, para una cuestion de caracter privilegiado. Ya que se trata de una palabra cuya definicion se puede hallar en el diccionario, creo que es mejor que esto se decida por la Asamblea y sugeriria

ademas que se consultase el mejor diccionario.

SR. ORTIZ (M.): Ya he citado la definicion del diccionario.

MR. CONFESOR: Mr. President, I would just like to speak against the amendment.

EL PRESIDENTE: La Mesa ha concedido la palabra al Delegado por Negros, Senor Perez.

MR. PEREZ (J.): Is it not a fact that we cannot do anything to strengthen the solidarity of a territory because a territory is already a fixed thing?

MR. ORTTZ (M.): It is not a territory only that is conveyed in the word "country." It includes both territory and people. It is broader; it is more ample than the word "nation."

MR. CONFESOR: Will the gentleman yield?

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

MR. ORTIZ (M.): Willingly.

MR. CONFESOR: When one speaks of country, does it necessarily mean that "country" constitutes a nation?

MR. ORTIZ (M.): A country may be composed of a nation.

MR. CONFESOR: But a country may not constitute a nation.

MR. ORTIZ (M.): For example, Austria. There are several nations in Austria.

MR. CONFESOR: Not now.

MR. ORTIZ (M.): I think there are still some nations, some belonging to Germany and Prussia.

MR. CONFESOR: Let us go back to history. Before the unification of Italy by Cavour, there existed a country called Italy; but was there a nation existing therein?

MR. ORTIZ (M.): We called it Italy, both as nation and country, because there can be a country and a nation at the same time.

MR. CONFESOR: I am going to ask this historical question: Before the unification of Italy through the patriotic labors of Cavour, there was a country called Italy; but was there an Italian nation before such unification?

MR. ORTIZ (M.): There was a nation and a country. In that case, nation and country are united.

MR. CONFESOR: Then the word "country" is liable to misinterpretation, because when you make reference to the Philippines as a country, it may be taken as comprising various groups of people, each one constituting a nation.

MR. ORTIZ (M.): Not in the case of the Philippines. When we speak of country we refer only to one country, and that is the Philippines.

SR. ABELLA: Senor Presidente, para una cuestion de privilegio. Yo sugiero, para cortar toda discusion, que se refiera esto al Comite de Estilo.

MR. ORTIZ (M.): Mr. President, we are clarifying here terms of great importance; this is a very important question.

That is a good proposition, I believe, because it is too delicate a phrase to be inserted in the Constitution without proper study.

SR. ABELLA: Es cuesti6n de gramatica, solamente, Senor Presidente.

EL PRESIDENTE: Es que hay muchos oradores que quieren hacer uso de la palabra y se va a alargar la cuestion sobre este extreme. Vamos a nombrar un comite de tecnicos para que se encargue de averiguar la verdadera diferencia entre estas dos palabras, y que manana informe a la Asamblea durante la sesion. En el entretanto podemos suspender la discusion de esta enmienda y considerar las otras enmiendas.

La Mesa va a nombrar un comite compuesto de los Senores Romero, Roxas, Nepomuceno (N.), Laurel y Zavalla, para que se sirva estudiar esta pequena cuestion e informar en la sesion de la Asamblea manana.

MR. CINCO: Mr. President, may I speak against the amendment?

THE PRESIDENT: Is the gentleman raising a point of order?

MR. VENTURA: Mr. President, I suggest to the committee appointed by the Chair to take into consideration the propriety of the words "solidarity" and "unity" and the propriety of the preposition "of" and the article "the" before the word "nation." The preposition "of" was used by the Committee on Sponsorship in submitting the Preamble. That Committee should take into consideration the propriety of the use of these words.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair understands that those words which seem to be simple do not need to be endorsed to the Committee. The whole Convention can decide that matter.

MR. CINCO: Mr. President, I have asked for the privilege to speak against the amendment because the amendment as phrased at present does not give the true meaning intended by the Gentleman from Palawan. In my opinion this phrase should be "in order to strengthen our unity as a nation" instead of "to strengthen the solidarity of the nation."

Mr. President, I do not claim to be proficient in the English language or in its use, but precisely because of this feeling of deficiency in the use of the language, I have consulted authorities thereon. The word "solidarity" in Webster's dictionary means an entire union or consolidation of interests and responsibilities, whereas "unity" means the state of being one, oneness, individuality. The word "nation" is defined in Words and Phrases and also in Webster's dictionary as follows: nation is defined as a body politic.

MR. GRAFILO: Point of order, Mr. President. The word "nation" is already in the hands of the committee appointed by the Chair.

MR. CINCO: I am making this definition of the word "solidarity" because in my opinion that word and "nation" can never go together. "Nation" is a body politic, a society of men united together for the purpose of promoting mutual safety and advantage by the joint effort of combined strength. If we maintain the phrase "to strengthen the solidarity of the nation," it would mean "to strengthen the consolidation of responsibilities and interests of the society of men." It seems to me that this is an absurd statement because there can be no solidarity of interests and responsibilities of one nation, but there may be solidarity of interests and responsibilities of two or more nations.

So, Mr. President, I propose that this phrase be stated as follows: "to strengthen our unity as a nation." Unity means oneness, harmony. It will not be a redundancy to say "to strengthen the union and the harmony of the peoples as a nation." We are not here to unite the nation; we are here to unite the people, so we can not say "unity of the nation" because nation is one and unity is another. They cannot go together. We have here unity of the people, unity of interest, etc. But we cannot say unity as a nation, much less can we say solidarity of the nation, because there can be solidarity of interests and responsibilities only if there be two or more nations. So, Mr.

President, I think that the meaning has been changed by using "solidarity of the nation," whereas we mean to say "the unity of the people as a nation."

MR. MARAMARA: I suggest that if the gentleman wants to be heard, he should do so in the committee and not before the Convention.

THE PRESIDENT: Is the speaker explaining the difference between nation and country?

MR. CINCO: No, I am not. I am speaking of the difference in the phrases. The amendment says "to strengthen the solidarity of the nation," which to me is an absurdity, because solidarity means the whole consolidation of interests and responsibilities. We cannot consolidate the interests and responsibilities of one nation. If we are to have a solidarity of interests and responsibilities there must be two or more nations.

MR. MARAMARA: Mr. President, I think he is not explaining the phrase. He is explaining the meaning of terms. It should be referred to the committee.

THE PRESIDENT: No. The committee has been appointed to study the difference between "nation" and "country."

MR. CINCO: If the Convention resolves to adopt the amendment, I suggest that the same phrase should also be referred to the same committee appointed by the Chair.

EL PRESIDENTE: Para ganar tiempo, la Mesa va a hacer esta sugestion: que la Asamblea deje de considerar todas las enmiendas no solamente al Preamble sino tambien a la Constitucion, respecto a la gramatica, en la inteligencia de que una vez terminada la discusion pase el texto, tanto en ingles como en castellano, a los diferentes comites de estilo,

ØEsta conforme la Asamblea con esto? (Una mayoria: Si.)

SR. PERFECTO: Senor Presidente, un turno en contra de la enmienda Abordo.

EL PRESIDENTE: Tiene la palabra el Delegado por Manila.

DISCURSO DEL SR. PERFECTO

SR. PERFECTO: Senor Presidente, el efecto de la enmienda es limitar, restringir y reducir la idea envuelta en el proyecto del Comité de Ponencias. Solidaridad, como todos los Caballeros de esta Convencion saben, expresa nada mas que una parte del concepto de la idea. Solidaridad es el concepto espiritual de la unidad; la solidaridad esta incluida en la idea de la unidad. Por consiguiente, si se acepta la enmienda, el resultado seria que en este Preamble lo que se persigue unicamente es mantener y fortalecer la unidad espiritual de la nacion; mientras que, de acuerdo con los terminos del proyecto del Comité de Ponencias, se incluye la idea envuelta en la enmienda; es decir, la unidad espiritual, pero, ademas de la unidad espiritual, se quiere mantener la unidad material, fisica; es decir, todo aquello que esta en esa suprema expresion del Estado, en ese su-premo desarrollo del Estado que se llama nacion, que es el ultimo desarrollo de la idea de Estado.

Por eso, senor Presidente, estoy opuesto a la enmienda y prefiero que se mantenga el proyecto del Comité de Ponencias, porque la frase utilizada por dicho Comité comprende ya la idea que el proponente de la enmienda quiere introducir.

Es todo.

MR. PELAYO: President.

EL PRESIDENTE: Senor Delegado.

MR. PELAYO: Mr. President, just a few words in favor of the amendment. I believe that the purpose of this Constitution is to strengthen the solidarity of the nation not merely to maintain unity. Take the question of economic patriotism. Just see how it prejudices our business men. We do not have in mind the idea of patronizing our own industries. We do not buy our necessities and other commodities from Filipino stores. That means we do not have the idea of protecting our own businessmen, and so I see that we are not united because we are not protecting our own businessmen.

From that point of view, I believe that the Filipino people are not united, economically speaking. The purpose of the Constitution is to strengthen the solidarity of our people. Different constitutional precepts have been presented here; and one of them allows only Filipinos to engage in the retail business. That is one of the forms by which we can strengthen the solidarity of the Filipino people.

MR. NEPOMUCENO (R.): Mr. President, will the gentleman yield?

THE PRESIDENT: The gentleman from Davao may answer.

MR. PELAYO: With pleasure, Mr. President.

MR. NEPOMUCENO (R.): When the gentleman spoke in favor of the phrase "to strengthen the solidarity of the nation," does he not imply that there exists a solidarity now which is not strong so that it needs to be strengthened?

MR. PELAYO: I think there exists a certain form of national solidarity, but from the economic point of view is not quite strong, it can be improved.

MR. NEPOMUCENO (R.): The gentleman maintains then that the existing solidarity of the Filipino people is defective.

MR. PELAYO: I should say it is defective because the Filipino people nowadays do not have yet the economic patriotism which requires us to help our people in business..

MR. NEPOMUCENO (R.): Is the gentleman willing to admit in the Constitution that our existing solidarity is not strong?

MR. PELAYO: As I have stated, from the economic point of view there is no solidarity among the Filipinos.

MR. BOCAR: Mr. President, will the gentleman yield?

THE PRESIDENT: Will the gentleman from Davao yield to the gentleman from Samar?

MR. PELAYO: With pleasure, Mr. President.

MR. BOCAR: From the gentleman's economic point of view, if we approved this amendment now, does he think the Filipinos will patronize Filipino business-men?

MR. PELAYO: I will answer that question by citing the different constitutional precepts presented. One of them is that only Filipinos can engage in retail business; another is that the development of natural resources should be limited to Filipinos only.

MR. BOCAR: If we accept this amendment, will it provide the remedy that will encourage our people to regain the retail business from foreign hands?

MR. PELAYO: We can encourage them to regain the retail business now if we approve the constitutional precept

requiring Filipinos only to engage in the retail business. There is no other way except to buy from Filipino stores. Those are my fundamental reasons for supporting this amendment of the gentleman from Palawan.

MR. REYES (J.): Mr. President, will the gentleman yield ?

THE PRESIDENT: Is the gentleman from Davao willing to yield?

MR. PELAYO: Yes, Mr. President, I yield.

MR. REYES (J.): Suposing that in the Philippine Islands there exists a satisfactory solidarity at this time. Does the gentleman mean that such solidarity cannot be improved and strengthened ?

MR. PELAYO: As I have stated, there exists no satisfactory solidarity today in the economic life of our country.

MR. REYES (J.): Assuming that it exists, is it such a perfect solidarity that it cannot be improved anymore ?

MR. PELAYO: That is out of the discussion, Mr. President. The argument is that there is no actual solidarity at present, economically speaking.

MR. REYES (J.): Does the gentleman believe that there is any nation in the world today with a perfect state of natural solidarity and union such that it cannot place in its constitution the aim and desire to strengthen that solidarity?

MR. PELAYO: If perfect solidarity has been reached, then "there is no need to strengthen that solidarity.

MR. REYES (J.): Precisely, does the gentleman believe that there is such a nation today that has readied perfect solidarity so that it cannot be strengthened ?

MR. PELAYO: There is no need of strengthening what is already a perfect solidarity.

SR. ABELLA: Senor Presidente.

EL PRESIDENTE: Senor Delegado.

SR. ABELLA: Propongo que se someta esta cuestion al Comité de Estilo.

EL PRESIDENTE: La Mesa desea llamar la atencion de la Convencion al hecho de que la enmienda del Delegado, senor Abordo, consiste en realidad en substituir la palabra "maintain" por "strengthen" y la palabra "unity" por "solidarity." De manera que solamente es cuestion de estilo. De acuerdo con lo recientemente acordado por la Asamblea, no necesita la Asamblea votar ni continuar discutiendo este asunto, en la inteligencia de que esta enmienda, con las otras de igual naturaleza, pasaran al Comité de Estilo. La en-mienda del Delegado Binag consiste en sustituir las palabras "Divine Providence" por las palabras "Almighty God." De acuerdo con lo acordado por la Asamblea, esto pasara al Comité de Estilo.

SR. OSIAS: Ø¿Puedo hablar, senor Presidente?

EL PRESIDENTE: Ø¿Sobre que?

SR. OSIAS: Acaba de decir la Mesa que estas enmiendas del Senor Binag...

EL PRESIDENTE: La primera enmienda.

SR. OSIAS: Creo que no es solamente cuestion de estilo. Siento tener que disentir de la Mesa.

EL PRESIDENTE: Es una cuestion de lenguaje y la Mesa ya ha dado su decision, y si Su Senoria no, esta conforme, puede apelar de ella a la Asamblea.

SR. OSIAS: Senores, apelo a la Convencion contra la decision del Presidente de considerar que es cuestion de estilo la sustitucion de las palabras "Divine Providence" por las palabras "Almighty God," Dios Todopoderoso.

EL PRESIDENTE: No es debatible la apelacion, por lo tanto, la Mesa sometera a votacion su decision:

Los que esten conformes con la decision de la Mesa, que digan si (Varios Delegados: Si.) Los que no lo esten que digan no. (Varios Delegados: No.) Hay una mayoria de Delegados que han votado a favor, por tanto, se mantiene la decision de la Mesa.

Ø¿Que dice el Delegado, señor Binag?

MR. BINAG: Last night the first amendment of the Delegate from Palawan was taken up to the effect that this phrase should not have a place in the preamble of the Constitution. I, therefore, wish to withdraw my amendment.

EL PRESIDENTE: Ø¿Hay alguna objecion por parte de la Asamblea?(Silencio.) La Mesa no oye ninguna. Queda aprobada.

MR. OSIAS: Mr. President, for a parliamentary inquiry. Previous to the presentation of a motion, the Chair has been appointing Comites de Estilo for certain purposes regarding the preamble. May the Chair please inform us if we have Comites de Estilo for the entire Constitution—one in English and another in Spanish?

THE PRESIDENT: We have not yet appointed this committee.

MR. OSIAS: Will it be in order to present a motion to that effect.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair understands that the committee will be appointed after we have finished the whole debate.

MR. OSIAS: But it has been shown in the consideration of the preamble that much time could be saved if such committees—one in English, another in Spanish,—could be appointed now, the Chair could save time, so I move that the Chair be empowered to appoint committees for this purpose, one in English and another in Spanish. Each committee must be composed of five members.

SR. CONEJERO: Para algunas preguntas al orador, Senor Presidente.

EL PRESIDENTE: El orador puede contestar, si le place.

SR. OSIAS: Si, señor; con mucho gusto.

SR. CONEJERO: Deseariamos saber en relacion con esos Comites que se van a nombrar ahora y van a tratar del estilo, si los asuntos tratados por dichos Comites son despues traídos a la Asamblea Ø¿seran otra vez discutidos aqui?

SR. OSIAS: Yo ereo que la Convencion viene a ser la Corte Suprema, digamoslo asi y naturalmente, tiene amplios poderes para discutir cualquier asunto tratado por cualquier comite.

SR. CONEJERO: Ø¿Quiere decir Su Senoria. entonces, que, despues de sometidos los proyectos a los Comites de Estilo, volveremos a discutir, palabra por palabra, lo que esos Comites hayan dictaminado?

SR. OSIAS: La Asamblea Constituyente. como ya tengo dicho, vene a ser la Corte Suprema, puede des-autorzar a cualquier Comite.

SR. CONEJERO: Si es asi, mucho me temo que no podamos ahorrar tiempo como desariamos.

SR. OSIAS: Pero creo que los miembros de esta Convencion respetaran la opinion informada por esos Comites;

asi es que creo que el ahorro apetecido sera una realidad.

SR. CONEJERO: Ese seria el punto que yo quisiera ver.

Muchas gracias.

EL PRESIDENTE: La Mesa entiende que debemos seguir en este punto la practica observada en el Senado y la Camara de Representantes, de enviar los proyectos a ese Comit  de Estilo cuando la discusion y aprobacion del proyecto se haya terminado para no perder tiempo, y que no debemos iniciar la practica de enviar, parte por parte, la Constitucion a ese Comit  de Estilo, sino esperar que termine la consideracion de todo el proyecto constitucional para referir de una sola vez al Comit  de Estilo; es decir, a los dos Comites de Estilo, tanto el texto en castellano como el texto en ingles. Creo que esto es lo que debemos adoptar.

SR. CONFESOR: Senor Presidente, para una cuestion de orden sobre la mocion del delegado por La Union. Nuestro Reglamento dispone que el Comit  de Estilo se componga de once miembros....

EL PRESIDENTE: Ø Cual es la funcion de ese Comit  de Estilo? Ø Quiere leerlo Su Senoria?

MR. CONFESOR: "Committee on Style—to consist of eleven members: to it shall be referred for correction the Journal and other documents to be printed in accordance with these rules or by resolution of the Convention."

EL PRESIDENTE: La Mesa cree que el que esta fuera de orden es el delegado por Iloilo, porque no se trata del Diario de Sesiones,

SR. CONFESOR: Pero en el documento se dice: "To be granted."

EL PRESIDENTE: Se desestima la cuestion de orden suscitada por el delegado por Iloilo.

MR. MARAMARA: Mr. President, will the gentleman from La Union yield to a question? Do I understand that he is proposing to create a special committee or a regular committee?

MR. OSIAS: My motion had in view the appointment of two special committees, one in English and another in Spanish.

EL PRESIDENTE: Podemos seguir adelante con la consideracion de las enmiendas. La Mesa nota aqui que hay enmiendas sobre cuestion del lenguaje.

MR. CINCO: Mr. President, inasmuch as five amendments presented here will be referred to the Committee on Style, I think this one should also be referred to that committee.

EL PRESIDENTE: Esta en orden la consideracion de la tercera enmienda. Esta es una adicion, y, por consiguiente, puede ser considerada por la Asamblea. La tercera enmienda del delegado Ribo consiste en la insercion de las palabras "adopt a national language." Ø Que dice el Comit ?

MR. SOTTO (F.): Very sorry, but we accept that amendment.

MR. RIBO: Mr. President, as I proceed to give my views in favor of these amendments, I find myself laboring under circumstances very prejudicial to an ordinary member proposing an amendment to the Preamble approved and supported by the Committee on Sponsorship. The Committee on Sponsorship is composed of distinguished, brilliant, selected minds of this Convention. Nevertheless, it is not only my privilege but also my duty to say something on the principle now subject of the discussion, because it is only by making ourselves heard that we can make others think and agree with us.

SR. VILLANUEVA : Senor Presidente.

EL PRESIDENTE: Señor Delegado.

SR. VILLANUEVA : Para una cuestion de orden. Yo quisiera saber solamente si la enmienda del companero viene despues de la mia o si la mia debe tratarse antes que la de el.

EL PRESIDENTE: Ø¿Cual es la enmienda de Su Senoria?

SR. VILLANUEVA: Mi enmienda, si se me permite exponer, deberta ser insertada en la linea cuatro, entre las palabras "paz" y "proveer."

EL PRESIDENTE: Ø¿Tiene inconveniente el delegado Señor Ribo en permitir que se considere primeramente la enmienda del delegado Villanueva?

MR. RIBO: If it is ahead in the calendar I give way.

EL PRESIDENTE: Puede proponer su enmienda el delegado Villanueva.

ENMIENDA VILLANUEVA

SR. VILLANUEVA : Mi enmienda consiste en introducir en la linea cuatro, entre las palabras "paz" y "proveer", las siguientes palabras," cultivar la amistad y armonia con los otros paises", de tal manera que si la Asamblea acepta esta enmienda, el Preamble se leera como sigue: "establecer la justicia, afianzar la paz y culti-var la amistad y la armonia con los otros paises, preservar la defensa national", etcetera.

EL PRESIDENTE: Ø¿Que dice el Comité?

SR. SOTTO (F.): El Comité no acepta.

MR. RIBO: Mr. Chairman, I ask that I be allowed to proceed inasmuch as my amendment and his amendment have not been admitted by the Committee on Sponsorship.

EL PRESIDENTE: La enmienda del Delegado por Negros Oriental es anterior.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Señor Presidente, el Comité se opone a la enmienda, y desearia saber primeramente sus razones.

SR. SOTTO (F.): Su Senoria es el que tiene que razonar.

SR. VILLANUEVA: La Asamblea ahorraria tiempo en no oirme. Si las sugstiones del Comité son mejores que las mias, no tendria inconveniente en retirar mi enmienda.

Señor Presidente, me he permitido sugerir esta enmienda, porque la considero completamente inofensiva, que no puede hacer dano ni al Preamble, ni a nuestro pais. Todo lo contrario. Esta Constitucion sera el mejor testamento que podemos legar a la posteridad y debemos procurar desde ahora que nuestros sucesores, hasta donde les sea posible, conserven la amistad y la armonia con los otros paises.

SR. RAFOLS: Para un turno en contra.

SR. ORENSE: Para un turno a favor.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Señor Presidente, precisamente, porque el Caballero de Cebu registra un turno en contra, me siento animado a pedir que en el cuerpo de nuestra Constitucion insertemos algo que traduzca los sentimientos pacifistas del pueblo filipino. Mientras no se atropelle el honor de nuestro pueblo y nuestra dignidad, debemos conservar, en cuanto sea posible, la paz y la armonia con los otros paises. Estas son las razones, companeros, por las que me he permitido someter a vuestra consideracion esta enmienda que considero completamente inofensiva

e inocente al propio tiempo. Pero estas palabras encierran algo importante y es el deseo del pueblo filipino de conservar la armonia y la amistad con los otros paises.

SR. LIM: Para unas preguntas al orador,

EL PRESIDENTE: El orador puede contestar, si le place.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Si, senor.

SR. LIM: ¿No cree Su Senoria que la frase "afianzar la paz" que aparece en el original, ya en si envuelve la idea que Su Senoria trata de proponer, o sea, la de cultivar la amistad y la armonia con las otras naciones?

SR. VILLANUEVA: Entiendo que no lleva consigo ese significado la frase "afianzar la paz" porque puede referirse solamente a la paz interior.

SR. LIM: La palabra "paz" puede significar, 'paz interior o "paz exterior."

SR. VILLANUEVA: No sabemos si los paises que viven al otro lado de los mares interpretaran de otra manera nuestros propositos. Si hay algo oscuro en esa frase, mi enmienda viene a aclararlo.

SR. SALAZAR (V.): Francamente, Senor Presidente, no estamos enterados de la naturaleza de la enmienda. ¿Que vamos a cultivar?

SR. VILLANUEVA: La amistad y la armonia con los otros paises.

EL PRESIDENTE: ¿Ha terminado el Caballero de Negros?

SR. VILLANUEVA: Parece que los companeros quieren hacer algunas preguntas.

SR. ENRIQUEZ: Para algunas preguntas al orador.

EL PRESIDENTE: El orador puede contestar, si le place.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Si, senor.

SR. ENRIQUEZ: Quisiera saber del Delegado por Negros Oriental si insertando en la Constitucion su propuesta enmienda, podria el pueblo filipino conseguir o cultivar la amistad con los otros paises.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Por lo menos es nuestro proposito el buscarla.

SR. ENRIQUEZ: De manera que la idea en la mente del Caballero de Negros Oriental es que, consignando eso en la Constitucion, nuestro pais conseguira cultivar la amistad con las otras naciones.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Es nuestro proposito consignar en la Constitucion nuestro deseo de mantener, hasta donde sea posible, la amistad y la armonia con los otros paises.

SR. ENRIQUEZ: ¿Que diria Su Senoria si le dijera que expresandose en el Preamble de la Constitucion todos los deseos que abrigamos para los otros paises u otros pueblos del mundo, este Preamble resultara mas largo que el cuerpo de la Constitucion?

SR. VILLANUEVA: He presentado mi enmienda, porque, en mi opinion, tiene relacion de los otros paises. Quiero decir que es un anuncio de nuestra parte, de que es nuestro proposito vivir sobre la superficie de la tierra, conservando la paz y la armonia con los otros paises.

SR. MAZA: Para una pregunta al orador.

EL PRESIDENTE: El orador puede contestar, si le place.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Si, señor.

SR. MAZA: ¿No cree Su Señoría que es más propio que se ponga esa enmienda o declaración en la Declaración de Principios?

SR. VILLANUEVA: No he leído hasta ahora la Declaración de Principios, pero creo que el mejor sitio para esta enmienda es el Preamble.

SR. OZAMIS: Para algunas preguntas al orador.

EL PRESIDENTE: El orador puede contestar, si le place.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Si, señor.

SR. OZAMIS: Añadiendo esa frase o esas palabras en el Preamble, en el caso de que más tarde se le ocurra a nuestra Legislatura legislar sobre tarifas, asunto que pudiera herir la amistad de otras naciones, ¿No cree que se tendría que declarar esa ley anticonstitucional. porque iría precisamente en contra de ese deseo de amistad y armonía con otras naciones?

SR. VILLANUEVA: No, Señor Presidente, porque lo que determine la Legislatura será cuestión de vida o muerte para nuestro país, y no cuestión de quebrantar nuestra Constitución.

SR. OZAMIS: ¿No sería mejor quitar esas palabras, porque, precisamente, podría ser que nuestra legislación no fuese del agrado de otros países tratándose de algunas cosas, como la de querer proteger lo nuestro? Porque poniendo esas palabras, no podríamos adoptar las medidas que irían contra el sentimiento de las otras naciones, porque afectarían a sus negocios.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Es probable que nuestra Legislatura evite en todo lo posible zaherir a las otras naciones cuando no haya absoluta necesidad.

SR. RAMOS: Para algunas preguntas al orador, Señor Presidente.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Si, señor.

SR. RAMOS: ¿Cree Su Señoría que insertando en el Preamble esas palabras, no estarían en conflicto con algunas disposiciones constitucionales que aprobemos después?

SR. VILLANUEVA: Creo que no puede haber ningún conflicto. ¿Podría citarme el compañero algún caso en que nuestro país pudiera verse en conflicto con su Constitución?

SR. RAMOS: ¿No cree Su Señoría que podría ser que aprobemos ciertos preceptos constitucionales que precisamente no sean del agrado de otros países y que esos preceptos estuviesen precisamente en pugna con la propuesta enmienda de Su Señoría?

SR. VILLANUEVA: Si no es del agrado de otros países, no importa si es una cosa que hacemos porque la consideramos la más beneficiosa para nuestro país. No seríamos nosotros los que habríamos de infringir las relaciones de amistad y armonía con otros países. sino que serían ellos.

SR. RAMOS: Yo me refiero precisamente a los preceptos constitucionales que vamos a aprobar y que renirían con esta propuesta enmienda de Su Señoría al Preamble de que estamos tratando ahora.

SR. VILLANUEVA: No puede ocurrir eso creo yo, compañeros, respetando vuestra mejor opinión. porque esto no es más que el Preamble, las disposiciones vendrán después del Preamble, y serán las que regirán los actos de la Legislatura.

SR. RAMOS: Pues, precisamente, por la razon de que queremos conservar la armonia y amistad con otros paises, Øÿno cree Su Senoria que sera mejor quitar posibles impedimentos porque despues, al tratar de los preceptos constitucionales, y adoptar precisamente aquellos que sean ventajosos para nosotros, pero que, al propio tiempo, sean desventajosos para otros paises, podria esto ocasionar que en vez de conservar la amistad y la armonia con esos paises provocasemos precisamente su antipatia, lo cual no podriamos hacer si adoptasemos su enmienda?

SR. VILLANUEVA: Es todo lo contrario, Senor Presidente. Desde el momento que redactamos nuestra Constitucion, expresamos ya de una manera clara las bases sobre que ha de descansar nuestra amistad y armonia con otros paises.

SR. RAMOS: Precisamente haremos constar eso en el Preamble. Adoptando la enmienda propuesta por Su Senoria, si nosotros aprobaramos despues algunos preceptos que precisamente contradigan lo que deseamos que se incluya en el Preamble, Øÿno cree Su Senoria que seria un contra sentido?

SR. VILLANUEVA: No contradiriamos esta formula defendiendo el bien de nuestro pais.

SR. NIERE: Senor Presidente, para algunas preguntas al orador.

EL PRESIDENTE: El orador puede contestar, si le place.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Si, senor.

SR. NIERE: ØÿCuantas Constituciones conoce Su Senoria que contienen esta frase que Su Senoria quiere incluir en nuestro Preamble?

SR. VILLANUEVA: Senor Presidente, el hecho de que las Constituciones de otros paises no contengan estas palabras, no es culpa nuestra. Ademas, Senor Presidente, ampliando mi contestacion, dire Øÿpor que vamos a imitar las cosas de otros paises que no nos pueden beneficiar; por que no inventamos algo nuevo debajo del sol?

SR. NIERE: ØÿNo seria eso dar a entender que tenemos miedo de las otras naciones?

SR. VILLANUEVA: No. companero, no; porque lo que queremos conservar es la paz; pero el que nosotros nos preparemos para la guerra, no quiere decir que no queremos la paz.

SR. NIERE: ØÿNo cree Su Senoria que adoptando esta clausula en nuestra Constitucion, seria dar a entender que se va a declarar una guerra?

SR. VILLANUEVA: No lo entiendo asi. La opinion de Su Senoria es muy ingenua. Yo la respeto, pero no concurro con ella.

SR. NIERE: Porque si vamos a declarar en nuestra Constitucion que debemos conservar la amistad y la armonia, y despues declarasemos la guerra, seria anticonstitucional.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Si es anticonstitucional el que defendamos nuestro suelo, entonces que venga abajo la Constitucion y defendamos nuestro pais.

SR. RAFOLS: Senor Presidente, para algunas preguntas al orador.

EL PRESIDENTE: El orador puede contestar, si le place.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Si, senor.

SR. RAFOLS: Concede toda la razon al caballero de Negros Oriental cuando dice que su enmienda es inofensiva; pero siento manifestar que es tambien innecesaria y redundante. Digo esto, Senor Presidente. porque, como parte del Preamble, aparece la siguiente frase: "afianzar la paz." Como dijo antes muy bien el Caballero de Manila, no

se puede afianzar la paz buscando guerra con las demas naciones. Pero hay una razon para mi fundamental contra la enmienda del Caballero de Negros Oriental, la de que no siempre es bueno y necesario cultivar la amistad de las naciones. En la guerra mundial, Senor Presidente, era peligroso para un pais cultivar la amistad de Alemania y Austria. Cultivar entonces la amistad de Alemania y Austria, era provocar a las demas naciones y correr el peligro de verse envuelto en la guerra. Pero la razon para mi fundamental contra esta enmienda es que si la insertamos en nuestra Constitucion, Senor Presidente, estariamos impedidos de declarar la guerra contra aquellas naciones que, fundandose en cualquier motivo, vinieran para humillarnos; para apoderarse de alguna parte de nuestro territorio o pisotear algunos derechos nuestros.

SR. VILLANUEVA: Senor Presidente, quisiera llamar la atencion del amigo y companero hacia esta frase que dice: "defensa nacional."

SR. RAFOLS: ØÿCree Su Senoria que si nos atropellaran, bastaria hacer uso de esa frase "defensa nacional?"

SR. VILLANUEVA: Es que no vamos a buscar la amistad de las naciones que vinieren para atropellarnos. No se puede buscar la amistad de uno que con infulas de nacion poderosa nos de una bofetada. fara quienes vinieren para agredirnos, Senor Presidente, la medida que debemos adoptar es la agresion tambien. Por mi parte, no contestaria con los brazos cruzados al que se acercara a mi y me quisiera pisotear.

Por este motive, creo que se impone la necesidad de la aprobacion de la enmienda. El Caballero podria proponer alguna otra enmienda en el sentido de que en vez de acudir a la guerra...

SR. RAFOLS: No, Senor; porque seria una inconsecuencia, seria una provocacion. No debemos provocar si queremos cultivar la amistad de los que nos quieren. La inclusion de la enmienda propuesta por el Delegado por Negros Oriental nos impediria, de acuerdo con la Constitucion, declarar la guerra a las naciones que vinieran o quieran destruirnos o trataran de perjudicarnos.

SR. RAMOS: Señor Presidente, para una cuestion de privilegio.

EL PRESIDENTE: Expongala Su Senoria.

SR. RAMOS: Tengo entendido que la Camara va a celebrar sesion a las siete de esta noche, y siendo ya las siete, propongo que se levante la sesion.

SR. ORENSE: Senor Presidente, para una cuestion de orden. Segun nuestro Reglamento, cuando un orador esta en el uso de la palabra, no se le puede interrumpir con una mocion.

LEVANTAMIENTO DE LA SESION

SR. RAMOS. Señor Presidente, pido que se levante la session.

EL PRESIDENTE: Si no hay objecion, so levantara la sesion. (No la hubo.)

Eran las 7:00 p.m.

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.