

JOURNAL No. 36

VOL. II, September 11, 1934

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/9cd29ff9f7f2/>

APERTURA DE LA SESIÓN

Se abre la sesión a las 5:07 p.m., bajo la presidencia del Presidente, Hon. Claro M. Recto.

EL PRESIDENTE: Se abre la sesión.

DISPENSACION DE LA LECTURA DE LA LISTA

SR. ABORDO: Señor Presidente.

EL PRESIDENTE: Señor Delegado.

SR. ABORDO: Pido que se dispense la lectura de la lista, presumiendo la presencia de un quorum.

EL PRESIDENTE: ¿Hay alguna objeción a la mocion? (Silencio.) La Mesa no oye ninguna. Queda aprobada.

¿Se dispensa la lectura de la lista, presumiendo la presencia de un quorum.

DISPENSACION DE LA LECTURA DEL ACTA

SR. ARTECHE: Señor Presidente.

EL PRESIDENTE: Señor Delegado.

SR. ARTECHE: Pido que se dispense la lectura del acta correspondiente a la sesión del día 10 de septiembre de 1934, dandose la misma por aprobada.

EL PRESIDENTE: ¿Hay alguna objeción a la mocion? (Silencio.) La Mesa no oye ninguna. Queda aprobada.

Se dispensa la lectura del acta, dandose la misma por aprobada.

DESPACHO DE LOS ASUNTOS QUE ESTÁN SOBRE LA MESA DEL PRESIDENTE

EL PRESIDENTE: Léanse los documentos recibidos..

El Secretario los lee

MR. REYES: Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Gentleman from Sorsogon.

MR. REYES: Mr. President, I yield the balance of the time of the affirmative side to the Delegate from La Union.

MR. OSIAS: Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Gentleman from La Union has the floor.

SPEECH OF MR. OSIAS

MR. OSIAS: Mr. President, and Gentlemen of the Convention: Privileged to make use of the remaining minutes of the ten hours allotted to the debate by agreement of both sides, I beg leave to request my colleagues to allow me, my time being limited, to make a connected statement.

Mr. President, it must be a source of gratification to all Members of this Convention to have witnessed this long debate carried on in a nonpartisan spirit. All participated in discussing the question at issue calmly, dispassionately, and on a high plane. These facts have commended themselves to public opinion meriting editorial comments. Furthermore, this augurs well if continued into the future work to be undertaken by this Body, and together, I believe they constitute a veritable asset to this Convention. This debate has also served to dissipate much of the confusion, that originally existed. It has compelled thinking and study on the part of the Members of this Convention. It has crystalized opinions in this Body with respect to the nature and scope of the constitution that we should approve, all these, in my humble judgment, have deepened the confidence of the public in this august Body and constituted the country's gain.

I wish to address myself for a few brief moments to the main arguments advanced against the pending resolution. The first is a legalistic consideration having to do with the question as to whether or not the Constitutional Convention is clothed with the power to draft a constitution both for the Commonwealth and the period that shall ensue after expiration of the period of transition.

Many of our legal luminaries whose names and fame in the Bar of this country are secure have expressed themselves at variance with one another. It is pleasing to note—certainly it is to me—that the very ones who opposed the resolution are men who hold to the belief and conviction that this Constitutional Convention is clothed with powers to approve a constitution not only for the Philippine Commonwealth but also for the government that shall supersede the Commonwealth once the period of transition has expired. None who opposed the resolution cited an opinion or a provision of the law prohibiting us from approving or formulating a constitution for both the Commonwealth and the Republic. On the other hand, those who believe that we do have that power cited several sections of the Act and several precedents to show that we do have the power to approve a constitution that shall extend beyond the ten-year period of transition, and that this constitution we are to draft and formulate shall be not merely provisional in nature but relatively permanent as human beings are permanent.

The next question that was harped upon was that this resolution is unnecessary. Yet I would say that the divergence of opinion existing among those who rose to speak against the resolution is positive proof of the necessity of taking definite action. I contend, Mr. President, with those who have spoken in favor of the resolution that definite action upon it is necessary.

We want to know what guide we shall have in the labors of our respective committees and of the Convention as a whole. We are now busy at work in the Committee on Sponsorship deliberating upon the preamble of the constitution. I cite this to prove the necessity of action upon this resolution because a phrase found in the preamble submitted by the committee headed by the distinguished Delegate, Mr. Romualdez, used these words: "to secure the blessings of liberty and democracy to ourselves and our posterity." Unless the constitution that we are to draft and formulate is to continue or be more or less permanent, there will be redundancy in the use of the word "posterity." If we should desire to adopt a constitution only for the Commonwealth, then we should say we are approving a constitution to secure for ourselves for ten years the blessings of liberty and democracy. I repeat, we need a definite guide for our decision—a decision that shall be self-imposed and not imposed from without.

The other point is that if we approve a constitution for both the Commonwealth and the Republic we would be binding the hands of future generations; we would be closing the avenue to those who will come after us, and

tying the hands of the youth. The answer, Mr. President, is that all constitutions are made for the future, never for the past and never for the present. What is the difference between formulating a constitution for ten years and another for ten years and one month, or eleven years?

If we respect the dignity of a Body such as this, as well as the mandate binding our own election to come here, then we should not shirk our responsibility in framing a constitution for all time if need be because in so doing, we are not binding the hands of the future for I take it that every well-ordered constitution shall provide the means for amending it, either in toto or in part. Anent the argument that we are binding the hands of the youth who will be affected, my answer is that far from tying their hands, we are unloosening the bonds that tie them to a future of dependency and affecting the instrument for their own liberation.

The argument that merits serious attention is the one adduced by two or three Gentlemen respected in this Convention and in our country, among them the Delegate from Tayabas, Mr. Reyes; namely, that we should not place a check upon our sovereignty, that we should not allow the President of the United States to have a check on an act which should be purely sovereign by giving him a hand to pass judgment upon the constitution for a future republic.

I admit that this observation is meritorious of our serious attention; their side, presented ably, merits our study, thought and reflection. I simply place the other side of the picture. Is it not a source of pride and satisfaction? Should it not be a source of satisfaction to the Filipino people that even under a state of dependency, with the Stars and Stripes still waving over us, we are permitted to deliberate upon a constitution not only for the Commonwealth but also for the Republic? And when this constitution for both types of government shall cross the vast Pacific for the examination of the U.S. President, not for his disapproval but for this examination, if the President should see fit to place his sanction upon that instrument, then great would be the gain for our country because ours will have been the privilege of having drafted an instrument, a constitution that has merited the virtual sanction of the President of the United States, the country whose friendship we shall need for all time to come. (Applause.)

Mr. President, I will emphasize three or four points in the few minutes remaining. What have we been fighting for? We have not fought for a Commonwealth, we have not fought for this government for ten years. Our spokesmen—thanks to the blessings of the Filipino people thirteen million of them—were sent with the mandate that they should labor for independence; and now shall we refuse to draft an instrument for an independent government? We have fought for independence for what? To end in uncertainty, and now we are going to prolong that uncertainty and by our own choosing. If we approve a constitution—and this is my second point—not only for the Commonwealth but for the Republic, we shall be reasserting anew our determination not to be content with a type of government other than that which is free and independent.

Mr. President, we have announced to the world that independence is what we want. Now is our opportunity to announce in this Convention, to announce in this country, to announce to America, to announce to the world, that at our first opportunity we reaffirm our determination to be independent and free. (Applause.)

Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Members of this Convention to the only clear and unequivocal pronouncement of a Congressional Body on the purpose of the law. When the original Hare-Hawes-Cutting Bill was approved by the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs in its report, Report No. 781, page 3, 72nd Congress, analyzing the purpose of the Bill, we have this statement—I am quoting what it says: "In a general way, S. 3622 may be said to contain four major purposes as follows: (1) To provide for the drafting of a constitution for a free and independent government of the Philippine Islands."

Analyzing in detail the contents of the Bill, said report provides as follows: "In detail, the Bill (S.3622) provides

as follows: (1) That the Philippine Legislature shall elect delegates to a constitutional convention for the purpose of drafting a constitution for a free and independent government . . ." The words are clear, and no man can show me any document that is a reversal of that statement of the Congressional Committee.

Mr. President, in closing I want to plead for a constitution that is continuous and permanent. As the very opponents of this Resolution contend, in Section 2, paragraph (b) Sub-section (2) provision is made for the continuation of the officers—the constitutional officers elected under the Commonwealth—in the government that shall follow. If that continuity is accepted, then greater should be the acceptance of the proposition of the need not only of the continuation of officers, but of the constitution, the instrument under which these officers shall operate.

Mr. President, there is less excuse for us than there was for the Members of the American Convention to provide for a more or less permanent constitution. Those men who were brave and bold took a courageous stand; they did not have the precedents that we have. We have as precedents not only the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of different states of the Union but also those of modern republics and governments. We can and should draft a constitution not only for ten years but for the many years to follow. The degree of continuity and permanence of our work here is the measure of statesmanship of the Filipino people and their leaders. I plead that we go on record on the first opportunity to draft a constitution not merely provisional but permanent, and do something that will merit the respect of America, in keeping with the sacrifices of our people, and which shall be to the complete satisfaction of the Filipino people's patience, patriotism, sacrifices, and martyrdom. I thank you.

SR. KAPUNAN: Señor Presidente.

EL PRESIDENTE: Señor Delegado.

SR. KAPUNAN: Me parece que hemos consumido ya todo el tiempo que nos pertenecía y que vamos a entrar en el debate de diez minutos por cada orador, según el acuerdo adoptado. Por consiguiente, voy a hacer uso del privilegio de los diez minutos, hablando el primero con el consentimiento de los compañeros.

EL PRESIDENTE: Tiene la palabra Su Señoría.

DISCURSO DEL SR. KAPUNAN CERRANDO EL DEBATE EN CONTRA DE LA RESOLUCION

SR. KAPUNAN: Señor Presidente y Caballeros de la Convencion: Como siempre he dicho, soy gran admirador del Comisionado Osias. Su discurso arrebatador es un titulo mas para que continúe siendo su admirador. Yo no poseo la oratoria de que el siempre ha hecho gala, y, naturalmente, tengo que valerme de otros recursos para inculcar a los oyentes mis ideas.

No me acuerdo en estos momentos quien fue el autor de la fabula de la zorra. Creo que si no fue Samaniego, lo fue Iriarte. La cuestion es que, cuando la zorra vio unas uvas, le gustaron tanto que quiso saltar para cogerlas, pero, como éstaban tan altas, se cansó y no pudo conseguir nada, y dijo para su propia satisfaccion: son demasiado verdes. Creo que lo mismo pasa ahora; que para mi son demasiado verdes los razonamientos del caballero de La Union. El dice que hay necesidad de que expresemos nuestro sentir, que hagamos una expresion de la actitud que debemos adoptar para formular la Constitucion. Pero si el Caballero de la Union ésta convencido, como yo lo estoy, de que la Ley Tydings-McDuffie es clara, es concisa sobre este punto; claridad y concision que, según el mismo, han comprendido los del Comité de Preamble al decir, al formular en el preambulo que la Constitucion no solamente ha de durar, no solamente ha de requerir el bienestar para la presente generacion, sino tambien para el porvenir; entiendo, caballeros, que ésta misma frase "para el porvenir" indica ya de por si el caracter que debe tener nuestra Constitucion. En otros terminos, en el mismo Preamble consta la

naturaleza de ésta Constitucion, que ha de ser no solo para el periodo transitorio, sino tambien para cuando el pais sea declarado independiente. Yo, caballeros, francamente, como ya he dicho varias veces y aun lo voy a repetir, estoy en un todo conforme con los puntos de vista del Caballero de La Union, pero no veo la necesidad de que hagamos lo que se dice en la razon dada por el Caballero de La Union, razon que, segun el, descansa en las divergencias de opinion ex-presadas aqui por cada uno de los que han tomado parte en este debate. A mi modo de ver, señor Presidente y Caballeros de la Asamblea, la divergencia entre las opiniones expresadas aqui se debe exclusivamente a nuestra naturaleza humana; pues, como sabemos, donde hay dos hombres, siempre hay divergencia de opinion, cuanto mas en una Asamblea compuéstá de doscientos hombres, y esto no quiere decir que prueba la necesidad de que adoptemos esa Resolucion.

Señor Presidente y Caballeros de la Asamblea: para pintar la situacion, me permitiran que yo les cuente un caso que ocurrio en cierto juzgado de primera instancia de provincias que presidia un juez americano, quien, viniendo desde America,, sin pasar tal vez por Manila, fue a ocupar su puesto en dicha provincia, cuyo nombre no quiero recordar, y al inaugurar la sesión judicial, aplico al juzgado las practicas parlamentarias de America, tal vez. Se llama a vista una causa y comparece una mujer, de unos 45 años, y el juez se levanta de su asiento, alza la mano y recibe el juramento de la ofendida, y le dice; "Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are going to give in this case shall be the truth, all the truth and nothing but the truth?" El interprete, con la conformidad del juez, traduce en ésta forma el juramento: "¿Jura usted solemnemente que el carabao volo, unos dicen que si otros dicen que no?" Y la mujer dice: Si; y el Juez contesta: "So help you God."

De tal manera que en este caso se habia puesto de antemano en tela de juicio si el carabao volo; unos dicen que no, y otros dicen que si; ya desde entonces se manifesto la divergencia de opinion, por lo menos entre aquella mujer que asintio que el carabao volo y el Juzgado que recomendo a Dios que la ayudase en su asentimiento. Si sacamos de este cuento la moraleja, creo que podemos aplicarla a la Resolucion Osias, en estos terminos: si cualquiera de nosotros tuviera que escribir una pieza de historia natural, describiendo las particularidades del carabao, diria: "Es un animal vertebral de dos cuernos; patoso y representa la idiosincrasia del filipino en su manera de andar indolente. Y una particularidad mas: se solaza revolcandose en el cieno." Siguiendo el curso del razonamiento del Señor Osias, el historiador dira: Es un animal que no sabe volar.

¿Tendremos necesidad, Señor Presidente, de incluir entre las particularidades del animal la de que no sabe volar? Si ésta en la mente de todos y cada uno de nosotros que no tiene alas para volar; si la Ley Tydings-McDuffie nos dice claramente cual es la politica trazada en ésta Ley y que es la que exactamente debemos adoptar en la formulacion de nuestra Constitucion; si ya en el Preamble, que supongo va a ser aprobado por ésta Asamblea, se dice que la Constitucion tendera a buscar la felicidad no solamente de la presente generacion, sino tambien de las futuras generaciones; esto quiere decir, Señor Presidente, que este mismo hecho determina ya de un modo claro el caracter de nuestra Constitucion; porque, como bien ha dicho el Caballero de La Union, seria una incongruencia que se pusiese en el Preamble la expresion "para el porvenir" si nuestra Constitucion no abarcara mas que el periodo de transicion. Que nosotros tengamos nuestras maneras diferentes de ver los asuntos, no es nada extraño. El poeta ha dicho: "En este mundo traidor nada hay verdad ni mentira; todo es segun el color del cristal con que se mira." Si cada dia estamos viendo personas en sociedad con otras y que han estado cincuenta años durmiendo en un mismo lecho y bajo un mismo techo, y sin embargo, no hacen mas que divergir en sus opiniones: me refiero a los maridos y a sus mujeres; si entre los miembros que forman una sociedad nunca se llega a un acuerdo, ¿por que vamos a esperar este acuerdo de doscientos hombres? Si del marido y de la mujer, no obstante estos desacuerdos, se saca un buen provecho, que es la procreacion de los hijos para perpetuar la posteridad, ¿por que razon de ésta misma divergencia no sacamos el partido de obtener lo bueno que tenemos aqui, en gracia a ese desacuerdo? Una vez mas digo que es inutil, innecesaria la Resolucion. Si hicieramos lo que se desea que hagamos en ésta Resolucion, vendriamos a repetir aquello que hizo un pintor; pinto unas flores y abajo puso ésta leyenda: "Estás

son flores." ¿Que necesidad hay de que se haga esa declaracion, si nuestros ojos ven que la pintura representa unas flores? Si nuestra Constitucion abarca el periodo de transicion y ha de llegar con sus efectos hasta la independencia, ¿que necesidad hay de que digamos que esa es la Constitucion, que ese es el efecto? La Constitucion es lo que es. Aqui se han citado libros biblicos, y yo voy a repetir aqui lo que dijo Dios: "Soy lo que soy." La Constitucion es lo que es, no importa las definiciones que se le den.

MR. REYES (J.): Mr. President, the next speaker on the affirmative side will be the Delegate from Bohol, Mr. Buslon.

THE PRESIDENT: The Gentleman from Bohol

SPEECH OF DELEGATE BUSLON IN FAVOR OF THE RESOLUTION

MR. BUSLON: Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention: I must be frank with you. In the beginning, I really had thought that there was no necessity for this resolution. However, as the discussions went on through these few weeks that we have been hearing orations from the Delegates gathered in this Convention, I have come to the conclusion that this Convention, should it not define its stand as to the nature of the constitution that it will draft today, would run the risk of being blamed by the generations to come.

Gentlemen, I had thought that there was no danger in maintaining my position then as regard to this Constitution because the leader of the opponents, the Delegate from Leyte, maintains that there is really no necessity for the resolution. Nevertheless, when the Delegates from Manila and from Tayabas defined here the stand of the opponents of the resolution, I saw clearly that were I to remain as opponent of this resolution, I would be voting against my conviction knowingly, freely and with premeditation.

Mr. President, I want to touch only on a few of the main objections advanced here by the opponents of the resolution. First, that it would be ridiculous for a free nation—supposing that were free now, and the constitution was intended for a free Philippines—for us to submit our constitution to the approval or disapproval of another free nation like the United States.

Yes, I agree with the Gentleman from Tayabas that it would seem ridiculous, but let us examine what would be the contents of the constitution that this Convention would formulate and draft. What are those limitations? I think, Mr. President, that the only object of Congress in requiring that this constitution be submitted for the approval or disapproval of the President of the United States is to see to it that the limitations set forth in the Tydings-McDuffie Law are inserted in the constitution.

What are those limitations? We must establish here a government republican in form. If we were sovereign now or independent from the United States, who among us here would establish a monarchy, or even a dictatorship? I think you will agree with me that the logical conclusion of everyone is that we should establish a government, a republican institution like what we have had since the inception of American rule in the Philippines.

As to religion, there must be freedom of religion guaranteed in the constitution. Who among us here, were we fully sovereign today, would maintain that the state must be the dictator of the conscience of an individual? Who among us here, were we fully sovereign today, would say that the Church and the State must be united? Who would consent to repeat in this country the horrors of the inquisition?

As to foreign affairs, what required limitations must be inserted in the constitution? Are they not merely supervisory in nature? In fact, the Tydings-McDuffie Law says that during the transition period the Government of the United States continues to exercise supervision and control over foreign affairs. Supervision and control are only placed there as a matter of course, but the direction of foreign matters may be undertaken and exercised by

us directly.

Mr. President, it has also been advanced here that if we framed a constitution not only for the Commonwealth but also for the Republic thereafter, we would be making one primarily American in nature and secondarily Filipino. That was maintained by the honorable Delegate from Cebu. I would like to remind the Gentlemen of this Convention that we would not have been convened in this Hall today had not the Filipino people, through the Philippine Legislature, accepted the Independence Law. Do we not share in the responsibility of that Law by having accepted it? Is it not true that the constitution we are to formulate and draft must be submitted first for approval by the Filipino people before it becomes operative over these Islands? If it were to be approved or disapproved by the American President, I would agree that such constitution be primarily American in nature. It is interesting, indeed, to note the divergent opinions advanced here. A Gentleman here said that should we formulate a constitution today intended to be in force during the Republic we would be depriving the future of its glory. But, I do not think, as a humble Member of this Convention from the third district of Bohol, that the question here is who should be glorious. I do not think that the question here is who should monopolize the glory of constitution making, if there is any. The question is, shall we do our duty? If we do our duty, then the future generations, passing judgment over the work of the Convention, will say the public and the future have been served by the Gentlemen gathered here today.

I thank you.

SR. KAPUNAN: Señor Presidente, cedo diez minutos al Delegado por Albay.

EL PRESIDENTE: Tiene la palabra el Delegado por Albay.

DISCURSO DEL DELEGADO PEREZ (T.)

MR. PEREZ (T.): Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention: In rising to oppose the Osias resolution I would prefer to quote pertinent statements made on our Independence Law by Congressional leaders upon whose wisdom and foresighted statesmanship depended in a large measure the passage of that Act. But I shall not take up your precious time nor burden you with useless repetitions of arguments already adduced by opponents of the resolution. You have heard enough of individual opinions coming from distinguished members of the Bench and the Bar, as well as veteran legislators in our Convention.

This afternoon, therefore, let me take you, by stretch of the imagination, to the American Congress, the very scene of our battle for liberty and gather there some statesmanlike pronouncements calculated to bring about our emancipation through the instrumentalities of peace. Mr. President, when a given statute or part thereof is ambiguous or is susceptible of two or more interpretations, we resort to the rules of statutory construction. Therefore, as in this case of the Tydings-McDuffie Law, where conflicting interpretations seem to arise, and there being no decision as yet rendered on the matter by the Judiciary, the invariable rule of statutory construction is that we resort to determine the legislative intent which may be ascertained by consulting the views of people who expressed their opinions through debates and speeches. I shall now quote Representative Hare, one of the staunch sponsors of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Law which is generally conceded to be the self-same Tydings-McDuffie Law that grants our independence and authorizes the holding of our Convention, with but slight modifications. Representative Hare, asking for unanimous consent to extend his remarks, as reported in the Congressional Record for Friday, April 8, 1932, Vol. 75, p. 7778, said:

“* * * The salient provisions of the bill may be summarized as follows:

"1. Provision is made for the adoption of a constitution and the establishment of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, all to exist pending complete independence."

It is significant, Mr. President, in speaking of the adoption of a constitution and the establishment of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, that Representative Hare used the words "all to exist pending complete independence." When he spoke of pending complete independence, he could not have referred to an independent Philippines but exclusively to the Philippine Commonwealth and to the transition period. His language is categorical and emphatic. There can be no room for doubt but that the constitution he intended us to draft and formulate today is exclusively for the Commonwealth Government.

Let me present to you the testimony of another gentleman from the same Chamber whose interest in Filipino welfare is unlimited. From him we might receive the beacon light that could guide and lead us clearly to our port of destination in spite of the rough seas and treacherous shoals that abound in our deliberations to solve the resolution confronting us. I refer to the Honorable Garber, whose opinion on the question of what constitution we are to formulate coincided with that of Representative Hare.

The Congressional Record for Saturday, April 9, 1932, Vol. 76, p. 7833. reported Representative Garberas saying in the course of a speech favoring Philippine Independence on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives:

"1. The Filipino people are authorized to adopt a constitution and institute the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, which will exist pending complete independence, Under such government they will enjoy complete autonomy as to domestic affairs, subject only to certain reservations to safeguard both the sovereignty and the responsibilities of the United States.

Mr. President, if this opinion of Representative Garber could be of any weight upon our problem today, I venture to state that once more the opponents of the resolution have found additional strong arguments in their favor. It is inconceivable how Congress could contemplate a constitution for the Commonwealth and the Republic of these Islands with guarantee of complete autonomy for our domestic affairs and still include certain provisions of reservation to safeguard the sovereignty and the responsibilities of the United States when we finally become free and independent. Yet that is exactly the situation the proponents of the resolution would have America assume today and in the future even after the lapse of ten years.

Last but not least, Mr. President, I shall present to you a statesman's pronouncement, one that inspires the opponents of the resolution, in the thought that even on the floor of Congress itself we had a friend of our own flesh and blood who, guided by the same light that illumines the path of those opposing the resolution in this Convention, understood and interpreted our basic law in terms of making our constitution operative only during the Commonwealth period. Aware of the current opinion among Congressional leaders to whom he has endeared himself and given all the opportunity and time to study, discuss, dissect, and digest the law, his opinion on this particular question should be enlightening, authoritative and conclusive. When I consider also the serious circumstance under which such utterance had been made together with his grave responsibility to his people whom he represented in Congress as Resident Commissioner, I am all the more convinced that no maturer judgment could ever be made on so vital a question as the Philippine constitution. Quoting this gentleman for whom I have the greatest admiration and adherence to the principles he espoused, amounting even to fanaticism on my part, let me repeat his own language as an argument against the pending resolution, and it is as follows:

"* * * It may not be amiss briefly to summarize the salient features of the bill. The first Section authorizes the Filipino people to hold a Constitutional Con-vention to formulate and draft a Constitution for the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines." Congressional Record Tuesday, April 5, 1932, Vol. 75, p. 4781.

The foregoing eloquent remarks, Mr. President, are the exact words of the distinguished Delegate from La Union delivered on the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States when he urged approval of the Hare Bill that he claims to be substantially the same independence act that now occupies us. As our legitimate

representative in Congress with authority to voice our sentiments, he had committed himself to a statement the transcendence of which we must now realize. We cannot very well as a people disown, nay, disauthorize our spokesman in whose ability and patriotism we have chosen to confide the destiny of our country when our battle for freedom was then being fought. Ours now is the duty to uphold and sustain his original and solemn interpretation of the constitutional aspect of the Law and thus convince the whole world that upon the subject of Philippine Independence we have unity of action, thought and sentiment. To approve the pending resolution would be to refute and even place at naught the brilliant qualities of our Resident Commissioner whose heroic exploits and adventures in Congress nearly bordered on, if not equalled, those of President Quezon. We cannot approve this resolution without the charge of inconsistency being leveled at us. Therefore, Mr. President, as long as we can help it, as long as the power still lies in our hands, so long must we not consent to be willfully misled. We shall disapprove this resolution because we want to carry out the legislative intent of Congress in passing this measure and because we want to reconcile Mr. Osias, the Delegate from La Union, with Mr. Osias, the Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands.

I thank you.

LEVANTAMIENTO DE LA SESIÓN

MR. SALUMBIDES: Mr. President, in view of the information received that the House of Representatives will meet here tonight, I move to adjourn the session.

EL PRESIDENTE: Si no hay objeción, se levanta la sesión hasta mañana a las cinco de la tarde. (No la hubo.)

Eran las 6:08 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.