

R.C.C. NO. 22

VOL. I, July 02, 1986

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/a653915ac863/>

Wednesday, July 2, 1986

OPENING OF SESSION

At 5:11 p.m., the President, the Honorable Cecilia Muñoz Palma, opened the session.

THE PRESIDENT: The session is called to order.

NATIONAL ANTHEM

THE PRESIDENT: Everybody will please rise to sing the National Anthem.

Everybody rose to sing the National Anthem.

THE PRESIDENT: Everybody will please remain standing for the Prayer to be led by the Honorable Christian S. Monsod.

Everybody remained standing for the Prayer.

PRAYER

MR. MONSOD: Almighty Father, four weeks ago, You brought us together — Commissioners, staff and employees — to participate in the writing of the Constitution. It was an honor to be chosen. How many are asked to be a part of such a historic document?

Since that time, we have come to realize the enormity of our task and our own limitations. But we have also come to recognize the talents and the goodness in one another. We have realized that, coming as we do from different backgrounds and places, with different interests and even biases, there is one thing we hold in common. We all love this country even if we express it in different ways.

As we move ahead, we also know that we can only accomplish our work, if we continue to depend on one another and learn to trust one another even more than we do now.

Merciful Father, be gentle with us when we fail. Give us the grace of an open mind, of compassion, of enthusiasm and the will to prevail. Above all, hold us together — Commissioners, staff and employees — in the palm of Your hand always.

This we ask of You through Jesus Christ, Your Son our Lord, who lives and reigns with You, now and forever Amen.

ROLL CALL

THE PRESIDENT: The Secretary-General will call the roll.

THE SECRETARY-GENERAL, reading:

Abubakar Present Natividad Present

Alonto Present [*] Nieva Present

Aquino Present Nollado Present

Azcuna Present Ople Present

Bacani

Present Padilla Present

Bengzon Present Quesada Present

Bennagen Present Rama Present

Bernas Present Regalado Present

Rosario Braid Present Reyes de los Present

Brocka Present Rigos Present

Calderon Present Rodrigo Present

Castro de Present Romulo Present

Colayco Present Rosales Absent

Concepcion Present Sarmiento Present

Davide Present Suarez Present

Foz Present Sumulong Present

Garcia

Present Tadeo Present

Gascon Present Tan Present

Guingona Present Tingson Present

Jamir Present Treñas Absent

Laurel Present Uka Present

Lerum Present Villacorta Present

Maambong Present Villegas Present

Monsod Present

The President is present.

The roll call shows 45 Members responded to the call.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair declares the presence of a quorum.

MR. CALDERON: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Assistant Floor Leader is recognized .

MR. CALDERON: I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal of the previous session.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any objection? (Silence) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

APPROVAL OF JOURNAL

MR. CALDERON: Madam President, I move that we approve the Journal of the previous session.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any objection? (Silence) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

MR. CALDERON: Madam President, I move that we proceed to the Reference of Business.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any objection? (Silence) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Secretary-General will read the Reference of Business.

REFERENCE OF BUSINESS

The Secretary-General read the following Proposed Resolutions on First Reading and Communications, the President making the corresponding references:

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS ON FIRST READING

Proposed Resolution No. 358, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO INCORPORATE IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION A PROVISION THAT NO PARTY OR CANDIDATE SHALL HAVE MEMBERSHIP IN THE REGISTRATION BOARDS, BOARD OF ELECTION INSPECTORS, AND BOARD OF CANVASSERS BUT SHALL BE ENTITLED TO APPOINT WATCHERS.

Introduced by Hon. Davide, Jr.

To the Committee on Constitutional Commissions and Agencies.

Proposed Resolution No. 359, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO INCLUDE IN THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION SECTION 4 (1) OF ARTICLE IV OF THE 1973 CONSTITUTION WITH MODIFICATION SO AS TO FURTHER STRENGTHEN THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO PRIVACY OF COMMUNICATION AND CORRESPONDENCE.

Introduced by Hon. Treñas.

To the Committee on Citizenship, Bill of Rights, Political Rights and Obligations and Human Rights.

Proposed Resolution No. 360, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO INCLUDE IN THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION SECTION SIX OF ARTICLE IV OF THE 1973 CONSTITUTION WITH MODIFICATIONS SO AS TO STRENGTHEN AND MAKE MANDATORY THE RIGHT THEREIN GRANTED TO THE PEOPLE TO INFORMATION ON MATTERS OF PUBLIC CONCERN.

Introduced by Hon. Treñas.

To the Committee on Citizenship, Bill of Rights, Political Rights and Obligations and Human Rights.

Proposed Resolution No. 361, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO INCLUDE IN THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION A NEW PROVISION EMPOWERING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO LEVY AND COLLECT TAXES UNIQUE, DISTINCT AND EXCLUSIVE TO THEM AND TO SPEND THE REVENUES RAISED THEREFROM IN ORDER TO

MAKE LOCAL AUTONOMY REALLY MEANINGFUL AND EFFECTIVE.

Introduced by Hon. Treñas.

To the Committee on Local Governments.

Proposed Resolution No. 362, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO INCLUDE A PROVISION IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION DECLARING THAT IT SHALL SUPERSEDE ALL PREVIOUS CONSTITUTIONS.

Introduced by Hon. Suarez and Jamir.

To the Committee on Amendments and Transitory Provisions.

Proposed Resolution No. 363, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO INCORPORATE IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION AN ARTICLE VESTING ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERVISION OF INFERIOR COURTS IN THE MINISTRY/DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Introduced by Hon. Guingona, Abubakar, Bennagen, Rigos, Suarez, Tingson, Uka, Villacorta and Villegas.

To the Committee on the Judiciary.

Proposed Resolution No. 364, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO INCORPORATE IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION AN ARTICLE ON THE TERM OF THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Introduced by Hon. Guingona.

To the Committee on the Legislative.

Proposed Resolution No. 365, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO INCORPORATE IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION PROVISIONS ON THE NATIONAL POLICE COMMISSION, THE NATIONAL POLLUTION CONTROL COMMISSION, THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION, THE COMMISSION ON GOOD GOVERNMENT, AND THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS AS ADDITIONAL INDEPENDENT CONSTITUTIONAL COMMISSIONS.

Introduced by Hon. Garcia and Sarmiento.

To the Committee on Constitutional Commissions and Agencies.

Proposed Resolution No. 366, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION THAT ALL KINDS OF IDLE OR ABANDONED LANDS NOT PUT TO APPROPRIATE USE AS DEFINED BY LAW WITHIN FIVE YEARS FROM RATIFICATION OF THE NEW CONSTITUTION SHALL BE FORFEITED IN FAVOR OF THE STATE TO BE DISTRIBUTED TO BENEFICIARIES OF LAND REFORM

Introduced by Hon. Nollado.

To the Committee on Social Justice.

Proposed Resolution No. 367, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION THAT THE DEATH PENALTY IMPOSED

ON AN ACCUSED MUST BE RESOLVED BY THE SUPREME COURT WITHIN TWO YEARS FROM DATE OF JUDGMENT OTHERWISE THE SAME SHALL BE REDUCED TO LIFE IMPRISONMENT EXCEPT IF THE ACCUSED BY WRITTEN MANIFESTATION INSISTS ON THE RESOLUTION OF HIS PLEA OF INNOCENCE.

Introduced by Hon. Nolleto.

To the Committee on the Judiciary.

Proposed Resolution No. 368, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO INCORPORATE IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION A PROVISION THAT THE STATE SHALL ADOPT A TRADE POLICY THAT WILL GIVE PRIORITY TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DOMESTIC OVER THE EXPORT SECTOR.

Introduced by Hon. Suarez, Jamir and Tadeo.

To the Committee on the National Economy and Patrimony.

Proposed Resolution No. 369, entitled:

RESOLUTION PROPOSING TO GRANT SPECIAL CORPORATIONS THE RIGHT TO ACQUIRE IN OWNERSHIP LANDS OF PUBLIC DOMAIN.

Introduced by Hon. Tingson.

To the Committee on the National Economy and Patrimony.

Proposed Resolution No. 370, entitled:

RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING THE RIGHT OF A CITIZEN TO BOYCOTT AN ELECTION.

Introduced by Hon. Sarmiento.

To the Committee on Citizenship, Bill of Rights, Political Rights and Obligations and Human Rights.

Proposed Resolution No. 371, entitled:

RESOLUTION MODIFYING THE PROHIBITIONS IN SECTION 3, ARTICLE XII A OF THE 1973 CONSTITUTION AGAINST MEMBERS OF CONSTITUTIONAL COMMISSIONS BY ALLOWING THEM TO TEACH OUTSIDE OFFICE HOURS AND BY INCLUDING SUBSIDIARIES OF CORPORATIONS AS AMONG THOSE IN WHOSE TRANSACTIONS THEY ARE DISQUALIFIED TO DEAL WITH OR FINANCIALLY INTERESTED IN.

Introduced by Hon. Foz.

To the Committee on Constitutional Commissions and Agencies.

Proposed Resolution No. 372, entitled:

RESOLUTION STATING THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES WHICH SHALL GUIDE THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES IN ITS RELATIONS WITH ITSELF, ITS CITIZENS AND OTHER NATIONS.

Introduced by Hon. Calderon, Rigos, Davide, Jr., Treñas and Tingson.

To the Committee on Preamble, National Territory, and Declaration of Principles.

Proposed Resolution No. 373, entitled:

RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR TAX EXEMPTION TO NONPROFIT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS
OR THOSE WHICH WILL LIMIT DIVIDENDS.

Introduced by Hon. Villacorta, Villegas, Treñas and Bernas.

To the Committee on the Legislative.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letter of Mr. Pedro O. Valdez, former Constitutional Convention delegate, proposing a parliamentary form of government, welfare state provisions, profit-sharing, free vocational education and election of the President and Vice-President by electoral votes.

(Communication No. 94 — Constitutional Commission of 1986)

To the Steering Committee.

Letter from Dr. Dulce R. Agoaoili of 20th Avenue, Quezon City, proposing a provision for religious instruction in schools, public and private.

(Communication No. 95 — Constitutional Commission of 1986)

To the Committee on Human Resources.

Letter from Mr. Ramon Enerio of Pegasus Street, Moonwalk Village, Las Piñas, Metro Manila, submitting two papers: New Constitution — a Crucial Curative Measure and Toward a Just Society.

(Communication No. 96 — Constitutional Commission of 1986)

To the Committee on Social Justice.

Letter from International Civil Liberties Council signed by Mr. J. S. Beltran, suggesting, among others, provisions on print and broadcast media.

(Communication No. 97 — Constitutional Commission of 1986)

To the Committee on Citizenship, Bill of Rights, Political Rights and Obligations and Human Rights.

Letter from Mr. Romeo P. Alejandro of Pag-asa, Airport, Iloilo City, suggesting a mandatory provision to ensure access to official records, documents and papers pertaining to official acts, transactions and decisions.

(Communication No. 98 — Constitutional Commission of 1986)

To the Committee on Citizenship, Bill of Rights, Political Rights and Obligations and Human Rights.

Letter from Mr. Vicente P. Molar of Bayaoas, Urdaneta, Pangasinan, suggesting a change of name of the Commission on Audit to Philippine General Accounting Office.

(Communication No. 99 — Constitutional Commission of 1986)

To the Committee on Constitutional Commissions and Agencies.

Letter from Mr. Fausto C. Marilao of Acacia St., Pinagbuhatan, Pasig, Metro Manila, proposing, among others, the establishment of well-equipped free technical/vocational schools.

(Communication No. 100 — Constitutional Commission of 1986)

To the Committee on Human Resources.

Letter from Mr. Cecilio R. Mangubat, Sr. of Digos, Davao del Sur, proposing, among others, provisions for the removal of elective or appointive government officials who fail to declare their assets and liabilities and those found guilty of immorality; the disqualification of gamblers and immoral persons from running for public office and other electoral reforms.

(Communication No. 101 — Constitutional Commission of 1986)

To the Committee on Constitutional Commissions and Agencies.

Letter from the Philippine Institute of Civil Engineers, Inc., signed by Mr. Aber P. Canlas, proposing the retention of the Professional Regulation Commission and its elevation to a constitutional commission.

(Communication No. 102 — Constitutional Commission of 1986)

To the Committee on Constitutional Commissions and Agencies.

MR. CALDERON: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Assistant Floor Leader is recognized.

MR. CALDERON: I request that Commissioner Nollado be given the floor for the continuation of the discussion on the National Territory.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Nollado is recognized. He is requested to come forward.

MR. NOLLEDO: Yes, we are now in the period of amendments, Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

MR. NOLLEDO: I would like to manifest that the Members who intend to present their amendments would like to meet together and possibly consolidate all our amendments in order to abbreviate the proceedings. Therefore, I move for a suspension of session.

THE PRESIDENT: The session is suspended for a few minutes.

It was 5:28 p. m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 6:24 p.m., the session was resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: The session is resumed.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, we ask that Commissioner Azcuna be recognized.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Azcuna is recognized.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 263

(Article on National Territory)

Continuation

PERIOD OF AMENDMENTS

MR. AZCUNA: Thank you, Madam President.

Honorable sponsor, I would like to propose the following amendment to the committee report. Article I, Section 1

on National Territory should read as follows: "The national territory comprises the Philippine archipelago, with all the islands and waters embraced therein, and all the other territories NOW OR HEREAFTER belonging to the Philippines by SOVEREIGN right or legal title, CONSISTING OF the TERRESTRIAL, FLUVIAL AND AERIAL DOMAINS, including the territorial sea, the seabed, the subsoil, the insular shelves and other submarine areas over which the Philippines has sovereignty or jurisdiction. The waters around, between and connecting the islands of the archipelago, irrespective of their breadth and dimensions, form part of the internal waters of the Philippines."

That is all. We would like to omit the last sentence.

MR. NOLLEDO: Before I state whether I accept the amendment or not, may we ask the Commissioner to please explain his amendment?

MR. AZCUNA: Thank you.

The changes here include, first, the words "NOW OR HEREAFTER belonging" so as to cover possible future changes in our territory. There might be an island that will suddenly sprout from within our waters — that should belong to us by accession; or we might purchase a small island — that should also belong to us. So this is to cover very clearly the possibility of expanding our territory although we do not have any intentions. Besides, a constitution should last for years in order to cover the future. Anyway, the national territory should belong to us by sovereign right or legal title.

The other change is, instead of "historic right or legal title," I would like it to read "SOVEREIGN right or legal title." The reason for this is that I believe the more proper term is "sovereign right" because "historic right" has been interpreted to mean other than what it means in international law. Therefore, I would like to substitute the word SOVEREIGN — which necessarily includes the exercise of sovereignty in the past and, at the same time, would clearly denote in international law the basis for the right; namely, our sovereignty.

The other changes would put our territory in logical sequence. The territories of a state would consist of the following: terrestrial domain, its land territory; the fluvial domain, its water territory; and the aerial domain, the air territory.

The terrestrial domain includes all surfaces of land above the sea that belong to the Philippines. These are the ones included within the base lines of the archipelago.

The fluvial domain includes the inland waters: bays and rivers, streams, as well as internal waters or the waters of the sea, landwards from the base lines.

The aerial domain of the Philippines includes the air directly above its terrestrial and fluvial domains. All the air that lies above our land territory and our water territory belongs to us, all the way up to outer space where there is no more air (because air is a mixture of gases, and where there is only one gas — helium — there is no air). The aerial domain extends up to where outer space begins, directly over our land and water territories.

Then we specify that our national territory includes the territorial sea, the seabed, the subsoil — again, we rearranged the sequence here. The territorial sea comes first — this is the margin or belt of maritime waters adjacent to our base lines up to the extent of 12 nautical miles. It is a belt surrounding our base lines seaward. Whether we like it or not, international law imposes a territorial sea in every country that has waters. Under the territorial sea is the seabed which belongs to us — the seabed is the top portion of the submarine area. This is followed by the subsoil or the land under the seabed, which also belongs to us. And then, the insular shelves or the continental shelf, meaning the submarine area that is directly under the water beyond the territorial sea, up to the

edge of the continental margin, regardless of the depth of the superjacent waters. Under international law, the continental shelf; namely, the seabed and subsoil of the submarine area, belongs to us. This includes not only the continental shelf of individual islands but the archipelagic shelves and the other submarine areas over which the Philippines has sovereignty or jurisdiction — this is true in the old provision. This was intended to cover any other areas that also belong to us, such as the continental slope or the continental margin, over which we have jurisdiction or sovereignty. So, my proposal is that we just rearrange the sequence there. With regard to the additional sentence on the straits, I would like to remove it because the straits connecting the territorial waters with the economic zone are part of our internal waters and, therefore, there is no need to specify that. Our sovereignty or jurisdiction extends over them.

FR. BERNAS: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Bernas is recognized.

FR. BERNAS: Madam President, the amendment proposed by Commissioner Azcuna is a rather complicated amendment. It could be a minor nightmare even for international lawyers. But for us who are not international lawyers, it could be a major nightmare and a cause of insomnia for several nights.

So, I propose that before we begin to consider this — and it is rather a complicated substitution of what has been presented by the Commission — I would like the body to be supplied with a copy of this so that we can follow the discussion more intelligently.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair would suggest to Commissioner Azcuna to please write it down and then, maybe, we can have it reproduced right away.

MR. AZCUNA: Madam President, we will do that. I have it written here, and we can request the Secretariat to have it copied and distributed to the Members.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

THE PRESIDENT: The session is suspended for a few minutes.

It was 6:33 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 6:39 p.m., the session was resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: The session is resumed.

The Acting Floor Leader is recognized.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, we ask that Commissioner Sarmiento be recognized. He is rising on a question of parliamentary inquiry.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Sarmiento is recognized.

MR. SARMIENTO: Thank you, Madam President.

It is the humble submission of this Commissioner that before we discuss the amendments, we have to settle first a very prejudicial issue.

THE PRESIDENT: What is the prejudicial issue referred to by the Commissioner?

MR. SARMIENTO: The issue is whether or not this body will retain or delete or reject that provision on National Territory. If we reject or delete that provision, then we need not discuss the amendments. We have to settle first

that matter of deletion or retention of the provision on National Territory.

THE PRESIDENT: Is the Commissioner presenting a motion or not?

MR. SARMIENTO: Madam President, I am submitting an amendment by deletion.

MR. MAAMBONG: Madam President, may I be recognized.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Maambong is recognized.

MR. MAAMBONG: This brings me to a point where I have to ask the Chair as to the clear parliamentary status that we are in.

Madam President, I would like to know if we are in the period of individual amendments. If we are, then we are through with the period of committee amendments and, therefore, I would take it to mean that there are no committee amendments.

THE PRESIDENT: May we inquire from the sponsor if there are any committee amendments.

MR. NOLLEDO: May I state, Madam President, that there are no committee amendments. The amendment presented by Commissioner Azcuna is actually a consolidation of amendments submitted to him by various Commissioners.

THE PRESIDENT: There being no committee amendments, then we are now open for individual amendments.

MR. MAAMBONG: Madam President, whatever we call it, whether consolidation of an amendment or not, that is still considered under parliamentary procedure as an individual amendment. Therefore, I would like to suggest that if the intention of the Honorable Sarmiento is to make an amendment by deletion, then I suppose that his motion is for an individual amendment by deletion.

Thank you, Madam President.

MR. SARMIENTO: May I proceed, Madam President?

THE PRESIDENT: There is a pending amendment that was submitted by Commissioner Azcuna, and we suspended the session to give him time to write down the proposed amendments.

May we know if Commissioner Azcuna is withdrawing for the time being or deferring consideration of his proposed amendment, so that we can give way to the proposed amendment of Commissioner Sarmiento?

MR. AZCUNA: Madam President, may I know what is the nature of the proposed amendment?

MR. SARMIENTO: The proposed amendment is an anterior or prior amendment; that is, the deletion of a provision on National Territory.

MR. AZCUNA: The whole thing?

MR. SARMIENTO: Yes.

MR. AZCUNA: I am willing to withdraw my amendment for the time being.

MR. DE LOS REYES: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner de los Reyes is recognized.

MR. DE LOS REYES: Is it not that the amendment by deletion which is actually an amendment by substitution should come last after we have perfected the individual amendments? Therefore, the amendment by deletion

should come last after we have perfected the amendments.

MR. SARMIENTO: Madam President, the anterior amendment is a prejudicial issue because if we decide that we delete the provision on National Territory, then we need not discuss the amendments — it is moot and academic. I think it should be given first priority before discussing all amendments.

MR. DE LOS REYES: As I understand the Rules, Madam President, we first perfect the amendment, because after perfecting the amendments, there may be no more reason for deleting the provision. It is only after perfecting the amendments and with the proponent of the deletion not being satisfied with the amendments that the amendment by deletion shall follow next.

MR. SARMIENTO: Madam President, this Commissioner will not be very happy with any amendment to perfect an amendment. I am for the total abolition or deletion of that provision.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair rules that the body has to decide first, on the motion of Commissioner Sarmiento.

MR. GUINGONA: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Guingona is recognized.

MR. GUINGONA: Before we vote on the motion of Commissioner Sarmiento, may we ask him to kindly elaborate so that we may know the reason for his motion.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Sarmiento is recognized.

MR. SARMIENTO: I think the body has first to resolve whether my motion for an anterior amendment is approved before I discuss or elaborate my reasons for making an amendment by abolition.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair believes that the body is entitled to know why the Gentleman is asking for the deletion of the entire provision on National Territory.

MR. GUINGONA: Thank you, Madam President.

MR. SARMIENTO: Madam President, this Commissioner deeply appreciates the painstaking effort of Professor Nollado and the members of the Committee on Preamble and National Territory. We have discussed the provision on National Territory for a number of days, and Professor Nollado intelligently defended the inclusion of a provision on National Territory. However, Madam President, with all due respect to Commissioner Nollado and the members of the Committee on Preamble and National Territory, I move for an amendment by deletion of the provision on National Territory for a number of reasons:

First, the non-inclusion of that provision on National Territory will not, in any way, diminish, alter and affect our sovereignty on any portion of Philippine territory.

Second, a constitutional definition of territory has no effect of legitimizing a territorial claim on anything not based on solid evidence or legal right.

Third, the non-inclusion of a provision on National Territory will not strain our diplomatic relations with other countries in the concert of nations; and

Fourth, there is a trend in the family of nations today for the non inclusion of a provision on National Territory. We made a survey of 81 constitutions, 52 of these constitutions have no provision on national territory.

May. I mention a few of these countries? These include capitalist and non-capitalist countries, big and small countries: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brunei, Bulgaria, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Italy,

Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Cameroon, Chad, People's Republic of China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran and many others. So that it is the position of this humble Commissioner that the provision on National Territory be deleted. Father Bernas will make a few additions.

MR. RODRIGO: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Rodrigo is recognized.

MR. RODRIGO: I would like to comment on this suggestions.

Madam President, we are drafting a proposed constitution; the ones who will ratify or recheck this proposed Constitution are the Filipino people. Maybe some of us here understand that a provision on National Territory in the Constitution is not binding on other countries; that even if we place in our Constitution that Guam is a part of the Philippines, it is not binding. However, we had a provision on National Territory in our 1935 Constitution. We had and we have a provision on National Territory in our 1973 Constitution. Our people know this. And all of a sudden, we will delete any provision on National Territory. Will our people understand this? We will have to do a lot of explaining to our people. Even some lawyers will not understand it. Maybe some of us understand it, but let us remember it is a constitution we are drafting and we are not the ones approving this Constitution. We are drafting it for and in behalf of more than 25 million voters in the Philippines-as a matter of fact, all the Filipino people represented by the voters who will cast their ballots in the coming plebiscite. So, this is my comment. I do not think our people will understand why we are deleting the provision on National Territory which has been in the 1935 and 1973 Constitutions.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Acting Floor Leader is recognized.

MS. AQUINO: To set order in the floor deliberations, we would like to request the Commissioners who would like to introduce amendments to first register with us and to please be conscious of the time limitation of five minutes.

We would ask for the recognition of Commissioner Bernas.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Bernas is recognized.

FR. BERNAS: Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, the problem presented by the Article on National Territory is both a legal problem and a diplomatic problem. Therefore, whatever solution we may offer for these two sets of problems should answer both the legal problem and the diplomatic problem. I support the deletion of the entire Article on National Territory because the deletion will satisfy both our legal needs and our diplomatic needs. Let me explain.

If we delete this Article on National Territory, will we lose any portion of our territory? No, we will not. Will it prevent us from claiming any other territory which we may wish to claim because we have a right to claim it in the future? It will not because we recognize the generally accepted principles of international law which do recognize various modes of acquisition of territory and various modes of establishing a right to territory. If we delete this entire thing, that general principle of international law remains.

Diplomatically, if we delete this, then we avoid waving before any nation in the world anything which may be irritating or offensive to them and which may harm our friendship especially with our neighbors. If we retain this,

we do not gain anything legally but we run the danger of losing in the diplomatic struggle. Already there are rather negative reactions coming from Malaysia because of inevitable implications that we are thinking in terms of Sabah. So, I would suggest that the deletion of this provision would best serve both our legal needs and our diplomatic needs. Suppose the people ask us now: "Why did you do this? " This is a matter we will have to explain. It is a challenge for us. It can be done. I think our people are intelligent. They will understand if we explain to them. Our Constitution will contain concepts and structures which will need explanation. All of those, we will have to explain. We are also engaged here in an education process and I think we have to be confident that our people, no matter how simple they are, can understand even the most complicated concepts, if things are properly explained to them.

So, for these reasons, I think we can simplify things if we drop the entire Article on National Territory.

Thank you.

MR. PADILLA: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Vice-President is recognized.

MR. PADILLA: I understand that the basic reason for this late motion for the deletion of Article I in National Territory was expressed in previous hearings and sessions to the effect that the provision on national territory is only a municipal law and cannot bind the other foreign countries.

I find that statement rather unusual because everything, including the Constitution, is municipal law. Every sovereign state has a right to enact laws only effective within its territorial limits for there is no such rule as an extraterritorial law.

The rules on private international law permit, for the sake of the ultimate objective of justice especially in the solution of private rights, the recognition and enforcement of a foreign law and the theory is that it becomes temporarily a part of municipal law. Municipal law really means the law of the nation, the law of the state. And everything we do, including the work of this Commission in drafting a new constitution, is municipal law. It cannot necessarily bind other nations because this is our own, we might say, unilateral act. But there is always the mutual respect, perhaps courtesy, that is accorded by one state to other states.

It is said that unless we have evidence of "historical right or legal title," said phrase would be useless or something to that effect. But even the ordinary or rudimentary procedural law requires that before one can present evidence, he must first make his allegation, *alegata et probata*. So, we cannot be required to just present solid, conclusive evidence through international documents before we state or reassert the boundaries of our national territory.

The observation of Commissioner Rodrigo is pertinent. We have this provision in the 1935 Constitution. It was rephrased in the 1973 Constitution. We have the report of the Committee which has been, in a way, improved by the amendment by substitution. I cannot understand why at this late stage we will consider a motion for the entire deletion of the whole Article I on National Territory.

The Acting Floor Leader is calling my attention that I am exceeding the minutes, so thank you, Madam President.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, we ask that Commissioner Nollado be recognized.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Nollado is recognized.

MR. NOLLEDO: Madam President, thank you.

The arguments of Father Bernas and Commissioner Sarmiento echoed the arguments of the late Voltaire Garcia

when he filed a motion to delete the definition of the national territory in the 1971 Constitutional Convention. In that Convention, I was the one who vigorously objected to the deletion. Now it seems to me that based on the statements of Father Bernas that international law will take care of everything, that we can delete the definition of the national territory, then international law may necessarily include the Law of the Sea of 1982 which contains provisions which are not advantageous to our archipelago, to the Republic of the Philippines. That is why if we delete the definition of the national territory, then the reservations of Senator Tolentino made before signing the Law of the Sea would be negated. I think we should be careful about this. Permit me, Madam President, to read some portions — only short paragraphs — of my speech when I stood up in the Constitutional Convention of 1971, vigorously objecting to the deletion of the definition of the national territory. I said that:

I am particularly concerned about the Philippine waters.

The case of Sulu Sea, Mr. President, may well be the case of the Mindanao Sea, the Sibuyan Sea and the Basilan Channel. The case of the Palawan waters may well be the case of the waters that surround Panay Island, Negros, Bohol, Leyte, Samar, and Romblon. I trust that we will, in this Convention, reaffirm our sovereign rights over our territorial and internal waters to obviate the fearful possibility of our country, now contemplated as a compact territory, being dismembered by varying areas of open seas, creating a definite and continuing threat to our national and integral security and diminishing, to a great degree, our national unity.

If the boundaries, they ask, are already set forth in the Treaty of Paris, why do we need to provide for them in the Constitution? I say, Madam President, that if we adopt the report of our Committee and make it a part of our Constitution, the ratification by our people, the Filipino electorate numbering more than 25 million, will strengthen our stand on the extent of our jurisdiction over our internal and territorial waters. It is not true that constitutions of other nations of the world do not contain the definition of their national territory. Constitutions of great nations like Australia, Belgium, Federal Republic of Germany, Portugal, Switzerland, even Soviet Russia, India and Venezuela contain lengthy definitions of their territories.

I trust that this Commission will seriously take into account the arguments presented by the Vice-President and Senator Rodrigo. The people of Palawan will not ratify this Constitution because when I ran for delegate in the Constitutional Convention, they told me: "You know the Sulu Sea is being invaded by the Japanese vessels. Our navy is powerless."

So, I trust this body will seriously consider the arguments against the motion to delete.

Thank you, Madam President.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, we ask that Commissioner de los Reyes be recognized.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner de los Reyes is recognized.

MR. DE LOS REYES: Madam President, Commissioner Sarmiento mentioned several countries which do not include in their constitution a provision on National Territory. He failed to mention, however, whether in the constitution of these countries there was previously a provision on National Territory. I suppose, originally, those countries never included any provision on National Territory. But in our case, it is different. In 1935, we had to include a provision on National Territory because according to some authors, our intention was to bind the United States President not to claim Mindanao. In the 1971 Constitutional Convention, our purpose was to enshrine in the Constitution the archipelagic concept which should still be enshrined up to the present. Suppose we have a dispute of sovereignty on insular shelves or seabed or subsoil with a superpower or with any other country, then the case reaches the International Court of Justice. How shall we look before the International Court of Justice? We have no more provision on National Territory; whereas before we had a specific provision on National Territory

enshrining the archipelagic theory and including within our territory the territorial sea, the seabed, the subsoil, the insular shelves, etc. We will have no such provision anymore. Commissioner Bernas says that it will not affect us legally. But we cannot really tell how the International Court of Justice will react to it. Perhaps, the International Court of Justice may decide in favor of the adverse party with whom we shall litigate in the future, if we remove this provision on National Territory because it can be interpreted as a waiver on our part as if we are rejecting the concept of the archipelagic principle. On the diplomatic level, precisely, I was objecting to this prejudicial question because I said the objectionable feature which causes irritation with other nations has already been eliminated by changing "historic right" to "SOVEREIGN right." For this reason, I maintain that the provision on National Territory in our Constitution should remain.

Thank you, Madam President.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, I ask that Commissioner Ople be recognized.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Ople is recognized.

MR. OPLE: Thank you very much, Madam President.

If we were writing a constitution in 1935 or earlier still in 1898, I would immediately support the Sarmiento motion to amend this Article by substitution or by deletion. What Commissioners Rodrigo and de los Reyes had pointed out earlier was that in adopting this territorial provision of the 1935 Constitution, the framers in the 1973 Constitution, in effect, had contracted with the Filipino people that there is a vested interest in a territorial definition. This may be a municipal law and need not bind any other country or international community. But I think an inventory of that otherwise abstract notion of a country, all the components of that country whether below or above the ground, in the seas, the inland waters, or in the air space, constitute the national territory. This constitutes a kind of inventory in which all Filipinos, rich or poor, share. It gives them an impression of that notion of a country going to war and defending it with their lives if need be. It has, definitely, educational and inspirational value for the schoolchildren when they study the Constitution and are told by their teachers that this is the country where they grow up as citizens, where their rights and obligations are situated, and where the meaning of their lives is actually situated.

So, I will call the Commissioner's attention to the fact that the other day during the meeting of the Committee on the National Economy and Patrimony, many fishermen from the Manila Bay and the Laguna Lake complained about the poaching in our internal waters by Japanese and Taiwanese fishing vessels. I think it will help the Philippine government and even the countries of these poachers, if they know by this territorial definition our national territory. We appreciate Commissioner Sarmiento's pointing out that about 52 out of 82 nations which had been surveyed did not provide territorial definitions in their constitutions. Probably, they wrote their constitutions before the Law of the Sea came up and was approved, because if they were writing their constitutions today in the wake of this new covenant among nations, I am sure most of them would reconsider in favor of defining their national territories.

We will have to negotiate economic zones with our neighboring countries, some of which have a history of being predatory powers. I think it would be better if our territory be very definite, even if only from the standpoint of our own perception of what makes up our national territory, as when we negotiate with Taiwan. There is a portion in the economic zone where we overlap with Japan because Okinawa is not so far from us. And then, of course, we have to negotiate with Malaysia and Indonesia because our economic zones likewise overlap. It would help if there were some bearings that could be found in Article I of the Constitution concerning our own perception of the limits of the metes and bounds of our national territory.

I would have welcomed very much the previous Bernas amendment to the same territorial definition — I think it influenced the Committee — so that this Article be purged of any element that would be considered offensive to any of our neighboring countries. Therefore, I see no ground to fear this could create diplomatic problems in the future.

It is on these grounds, Madam President, that I wish to appeal to Commissioner Sarmiento to withdraw his proposed amendment by deletion.

Thank you.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, I ask that Commissioner Villacorta be recognized.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Villacorta is recognized.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, may I ask Commissioner Azcuna concerning his proposed amendment?

THE PRESIDENT: It is Commissioner Sarmiento's amendment which is now before the body.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, I ask that Commissioner Laurel be recognized.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Laurel is recognized.

MR. LAUREL: Madam President, the 1935 Constitution included a definition of our national territory to forestall the attempt as embodied in the notorious Bacon Bill, about which Father Bernas spoke last night.

In order to segregate Mindanao and Sulu from the rest of our archipelago, it was felt that by signing that charter, President Roosevelt will commit the United States to recognize the integrity of our territory and prevent its dismemberment during the American regime. I have reason to support the positions of Commissioners Sarmiento and Bernas because now that the threat of dismemberment is over, there is no more need for the definition of our national territory.

We claim our territorial sea by historic right and it is defined by the latitudes and longitudes specified in Article III of the Treaty of Paris of December 10, 1898, as has been recognized since the 16th century. Under this claim, our territorial sea extends at some points in our territory as far as 320 miles eastward and 160 miles westward. However, under the Jamaica Convention on the Law of the Sea, which we have already signed, the territorial sea of all states is limited to only 12 miles from the coast. How does that square with our historic right claim under our Constitution?

I maintain that the definition of our national territory serves no practical purpose and has no legal value whatsoever, as it will be no more than a unilateral and a self-serving declaration. It is not even a standard provision in most constitutions, as Commissioner Sarmiento has said. I have looked at most of the 165 Constitutions of member states of the United Nations, 126 of which are those of developing countries, and have not yet come across a constitution which defines the national territory except ours. Worse, it will be a legal liability because it will hamper us to dispose of parts of our territory, as circumstances may warrant. For example, we could not waive our claim to Sabah later if we so desire without violating or amending the Constitution, because although the word "Sabah" is not mentioned in our definition of national territory, it actually includes Sabah. However, if we do not specify the limits of our territory, we will have more leeway in dealing with it as our foreign policy may dictate and we will not be impeded by any constitutional limitation. So, I wish to announce that I vote yes to the Sarmiento motion.

Thank you.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, I ask that Commissioner Rodrigo be recognized.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Rodrigo is recognized.

MR. RODRIGO: This is the second time I rose. I am not going to deliver a speech but I just want to ask a few questions of Commissioner Bernas who spoke after me last night on this matter. Commissioner Bernas stated that the presence of the phrase "by historic right or legal title" in the present provision on National Territory would do us more harm than good.

FR. BERNAS: Yes.

MR. RODRIGO: The Commissioner also stated that this could be remedied by an amendment. In fact, last night he stated a proposed amendment, subject to improvement. My question is: Does the Commissioner have the proposed amendment?

FR. BERNAS: I did not participate in the formulation of an amendment. If the entire Article is not dropped, I will propose an amendment. But during the recess, it seemed to me there was an interminable discussion and we were not getting anywhere, so I thought the best way to solve the problem was to cut the Gordian Knot.

MR. RODRIGO: My question is that if the possible harm arising from this provision could be remedied by amendment, is it not better that we just amend instead of deleting the entire Article?

FR. BERNAS: The position I have taken is that since removing the Article will not do us any harm and retaining the Article will not do us much good either, it would be better to drop the entire thing because it would save us the trouble of debating on an amendment.

MR. RODRIGO: Yes, but the problem is how to explain that to our people.

FR. BERNAS: It is a problem for which we have to find solution.

MR. RODRIGO: My last question is: Is the proposed amendment of Commissioner Azcuna which says "NOW OR HEREAFTER BELONGING TO THE PHILIPPINES BY SOVEREIGN RIGHT OR LEGAL TITLE" different from the original provision? Does that remedy the possible harm mentioned by the Commissioner last night?

FR. BERNAS: I would prefer to treat that matter when we come to it. At the moment, we have the amendment of Commissioner Sarmiento on the floor.

MR. RODRIGO: So, is it the Commissioner's opinion that it is better to delete than to amend?

FR. BERNAS: Yes.

MR. RODRIGO: In other words, to amputate rather than to treat the malady?

FR. BERNAS: Yes.

MR. RODRIGO: Thank you.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, Commissioner Azcuna requests to be recognized.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Azcuna is recognized.

MR. AZCUNA: Thank you, Madam President.

I just would like to indicate that it is not true there is no harm, if we delete completely the Article because during the Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Philippines made reservations on our internal waters as defined in the Philippine Constitution in subscribing to this treaty. If we do not define our internal waters now, we will have

signed that treaty with no reservation, and as a result, we will be opening up our internal waters to foreign fishing.
Thank you.

MR. NOLLEDO: That is true.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, may I be recognized?

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Aquino is recognized.

MS. AQUINO: I would like to register my objection to the motion to delete the whole Article on National Territory.

The arguments presented by Commissioners Bernas and Sarmiento may be academically logical, theoretically feasible, but blatantly unhistorical.

Jurisdiction is understood in the context of authority and the sphere of the exercise of authority, such that it can only be meaningfully appreciated in the context of specific persons and a specific territory, which is the essence of dominium and imperium. I believe the deletion of an explicit provision on National Territory after we have previously enshrined it in the 1935 and the 1973 Constitutions will be a fatal blow to the assertion of our sovereign omnipotence.

I then move to terminate the deliberations on this prejudicial question and I move for a vote, Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair finds that the sponsor of the committee report does not accept the amendment of Commissioner Sarmiento; therefore, we have to put that to a vote.

Does Commissioner Sarmiento insist on a vote?

MR. SARMIENTO: Yes, Madam President.

FR. BERNAS: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT. Father Bernas is recognized.

FR. BERNAS: May I just say one line in response to what my colleague and classmate Commissioner Azcuna has said.

The contention is that this will invalidate the reservation made by former Senator Tolentino in the deliberations. The speech of former Senator Tolentino was a historical speech which made specific reference to a document that was in existence then, so that even if we delete these words, the reference of former Senator Tolentino to that document would still be subsisting.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, I restate my motion to proceed to the voting on the prejudicial question raised by Commissioner Sarmiento.

VIVA VOCE

THE PRESIDENT: As many as are in favor of the motion to delete the Article on National Territory proposed by Commissioner Sarmiento, say yea.

FEW MEMBERS: Yea.

THE PRESIDENT: As many as are against, say nay.

SEVERAL MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. DAVIDE: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Davide is recognized.

VOTING

MR. DAVIDE: I move for a division of the House.

THE PRESIDENT: As many as are in favor of the motion of Commissioner Sarmiento, please raise their hand.
(Few Members raised their hand.)

Those against may please do the same. (Several Members raised their hand.)

The results show 8 votes in favor and 25 against; so the motion is lost.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, we ask that the sponsor, Commissioner Nollado, be recognized.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Nollado is recognized.

MR. NOLLEDO: Madam President, I am pleased to inform Commissioner Azcuna that on behalf of the Committee I am accepting his amendment.

THE PRESIDENT: Let us proceed step by step. Commissioner Azcuna withdrew, so let him restate his proposed amendment first.

MR. AZCUNA: May I be recognized, Madam President?

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Azcuna is recognized.

MR. AZCUNA: I now reiterate my amendment by substitution, copies of which have already been distributed. This amendment is the result of the labors of many Commissioners.

THE PRESIDENT: Will Commissioner Azcuna please read his amendment.

MR. AZCUNA: Article I on the National Territory reads:

SECTION I. THE NATIONAL TERRITORY COMPRISES THE PHILIPPINE ARCHIPELAGO, WITH ALL THE ISLANDS AND WATERS EMBRACED THEREIN, AND ALL THE OTHER TERRITORIES NOW OR HEREAFTER BELONGING TO THE PHILIPPINES BY SOVEREIGN RIGHTS OR LEGAL TITLE, CONSISTING OF THE TERRESTRIAL, FLUVIAL AND AERIAL DOMAINS, INCLUDING THE TERRITORIAL SEA, THE SEABED, THE SUBSOIL, THE INSULAR SHELVES AND THE OTHER SUBMARINE AREAS OVER WHICH THE PHILIPPINES HAS SOVEREIGNTY OR JURISDICTION. THE WATERS AROUND, BETWEEN AND CONNECTING THE ISLANDS OF THE ARCHIPELAGO, IRRESPECTIVE OF THEIR BREADTH AND DIMENSIONS, FORM PART OF THE INTERNAL WATERS OF THE PHILIPPINES.

MR. DAVIDE: Madam President.

MR. NOLLEDO: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Nollado is recognized.

MR. NOLLEDO: Contrary to the opinion of Father Bernas, I consider the proposed amendment not complicated. Therefore, on behalf of the Committee, I accept the amendment.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The sponsor has accepted the amendment.

MR. DAVIDE: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Davide is recognized.

MR. DAVIDE: May we be allowed to introduce amendments to the amendment?

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Davide may proceed.

MR. DAVIDE: The first amendment is to delete the words "now or hereafter."

MR. AZCUNA: Point of order, Madam President. The proposal should not be an amendment to the amendment, but an amendment to the committee report since the Committee has accepted my amendment.

MR. DAVIDE: Yes, that would be an amendment to the Committee amendment.

THE PRESIDENT: The Commissioner may now proceed.

MR. DAVIDE: On line 3, I propose to delete "now or hereafter" between the words "territories" and "belonging." May I be allowed to explain?

THE PRESIDENT: The Commissioner may proceed.

MR. DAVIDE: As admitted by the sponsor, Commissioner Azcuna, the word "sovereign" would refer even to past sovereignties. If it would refer to past sovereignties, then that would be inconsistent with the words "now or hereafter." So, we should delete those words to give full meaning and significance to the statement of the original sponsor that the word "sovereign" would refer to the past or present sovereignty.

MR. NOLLEDO: May Commissioner Azcuna explain?

MR. MAAMBONG: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Maambong is recognized.

MR. MAAMBONG: Madam President, I am a little bit confused about the whole proceedings, so I rise on a point of parliamentary inquiry. Commissioner Azcuna said that what we are considering now is the committee report.

Earlier, I raised a point of parliamentary inquiry to find out whether we are now in the period of committee amendments. It is very clear on record that we are no longer in the period of committee amendments; we are in the period of individual amendments. However, it appears that the sponsor had accepted the amendment by substitution of Commissioner Azcuna as a committee amendment because it is now considered as part of the committee report. I just want this clarified, because this amendment by substitution which was accepted by the Committee, to my mind, is not really an amendment by substitution. When we talk of amendment by substitution, we practically overhaul the whole committee report. Here, we are only considering very few words to be inserted or deleted.

Between "territories" and "belonging," the proposal is to delete "now or hereafter"; on line 10, to change "historic" to SOVEREIGN and to insert TERRESTRIAL, FLUVIAL AND AERIAL DOMAINS.

To cut this parliamentary inquiry short, I would like to find out if we are really considering a committee amendment as accepted or are we considering this amendment of Commissioner Azcuna as an individual amendment which is now being subjected to further amendments by the Members of the Commission,

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

THE PRESIDENT: The session is suspended.

It was 7:33 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 7:43 p.m., the session was resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: The session is resumed.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, we ask that the sponsor, Commissioner Nollado, be recognized.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Nollado is recognized.

MR. NOLLEDO: Thank you, Madam President.

I would like to answer the parliamentary inquiry of Commissioner Maambong. The amendment presented by Commissioner Azcuna is an individual amendment. Is that the ruling of the Chair, Madam President?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, that is the ruling of the Chair.

MR. MAAMBONG: Thank you, Madam President, I am satisfied.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Acting Floor Leader is recognized.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, there being no other speakers, I move to adjourn until tomorrow at five o'clock in the afternoon.

MR. DAVIDE: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Davide is recognized.

MR. DAVIDE: Before we adjourn, is it to be understood that my amendment will be taken up tomorrow?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, it will be taken up tomorrow.

MR. DAVIDE: Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT OF SESSION

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, I move to adjourn the session until tomorrow at five o'clock in the afternoon.

THE PRESIDENT: The session is adjourned until tomorrow at five o'clock in the afternoon.

It was 7:44 p.m.

[*] Appeared after the roll call.

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.