

JOURNAL No. 69

VOL. IV, October 20, 1934

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/a8adefa76695/>

APERTURA DE LA SESION

Se abre la sesion a las 10:30 a.m., ocupando el estrado el Presidente, Hon. Claro M. Recto.

EL PRESIDENTE: Se abre la sesion

DISPENSACION DE LA LECTURA DE LA LISTA Y DEL ACTA

SR. GRAFILO: Senor Presidente.

EL PRESIDENTE: Senor Delegado.

SR. GRAFILO: Pido q.ue se dispense la lectura de la lista y del acta y que se de esta por aprobada.

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

CONTINUACION DE LA DISCUSION SOBRE SISTEMA UNICAMERAL O BICAMERAL

EL PRESIDENTE: Esta en orden la continuacion de la discusion sobre la proposicion relativa al sistema unicameral o bicameral.

MR. ARUEGO: Mr. President, I yield ten minutes to the Gentleman from Batangas.

DISCURSO DEL SR. BARRION A FAVOR DEL SISTEMA BICAMERAL

SR. BARRION: Senor Presidente y Caballeros.de la Convencion: Me he permitido solicitar el privilegio de usar de la palabra por unos minutos ante esta respetable Asamblea siquiera para explicar con anticipacion mi voto a favor del sistema bicameral. Y si en este corto discurso repitiese algun argumento ya expuesto sean, sin embargo, indulgentes conmigo por tal repeticion hecha en este momento, cuando ya habeis oido las mejores razones a favor de una u otra proposicion, y cuando pronto hemos de votar y decidir esta importante cuestion; sirva siquiera para refrescar nuestra memoria, para inculcar en nuestro animo el hecho de que es de suma necesidad el que dispongamos en nuestra Constitucion el sistema bica-meral en el ramo legislativo. Ya no voy a ocuparme, Senores, en una disertacion academica y teorica sobre esta cuestion sino que voy a limitarme simplemente a expresar algunos puntos de vista practicos.

Senor Presidente: quiero expresar la opinion de muchos de que la Contitucion que hemos de redactor tiene que ser lo mas proxima possible a la Constitucion de los Estados Unidos de America. Creo que debemos adopter en nuestra Constitucion todo precepto o disposicion de la Constitucion americana que pueda ser adaptable a nuestras costumbres. Muchas rezones, senores, hay a favor de esta asercion: primera, porque ya vemos que la Constitucion americana se ha puesto a prueba por espacio casi de ciento cincuenta anos; segunda, para que no haya ningun trastorno en nuestra Constitucion, en nuestra jurisprudencia, porque, como sabemos, por mas de treinta anos esta se ha inspirado y se ha basado en las doctrinas y leyes americanas; tercera, para que sea una especie de reconocimiento de nuestra parte de la solidez de la composicion del Gobierno Americano sobre la base de esa

Constitucion; y, por ultimo, para que sea una expresion muda de nuestro aprecio y gratitud a ese pueblo por su labor constructiva de muchos anos en este pais, por su altruismo y por cuya obra y gracia estamos hoy reunidos aqui para redactor la ley fundamental de nuestra nacion.

Con esta idea en la mente, Senor Presidente, no me cabe la menor duda de que si adaptamos en nuestra Constitucion el sistema bicameral, eso influira en sumo grado para su aceptacion por el Presidente de los Estados Unidos; por el contrario, si le presentamos una Consti-tution donde se provee el sistema unicameral, ¿no creeis que esa parte de nuestra Constitucion pudiera provocar cierto escrupulo o suspicacia en el animo del Presidente de los Estados Unidos, contrariado por habernos desviado de una disposicion fundamental de la Constitucion americana? El Presidente de los Estados Unidos podria dirigirse a nosotros con estas preguntas: ¿no quereis, acaso, el sistema adoptado por el pueblo americano, que hasta ahora sigue intacto a pesar de los ciento cincuenta anos de vida transcurridos y que le ha conducido a su estado actual de progreso y estabilidad? ¿No reconocéis, acaso, el exito del sistema bicameral implantado en vuestro pais hace veintisiete anos, ¿Por que desear el cambio? ¿Por que aventurarse a los peligros de un experimento? Estas preguntas, Senor Presidente, serian para nosotros muy embarazosas. Necesitaríamos todos los argumentos de los partidarios del sistema unicameral aducidos ante esta Asamblea para poder contestarle al Presidente de los Estados Unidos, y por mas brillantes que fueran esos argumentos, yo estoy casi seguro de que no le convenceríamos al Presidente de los Estados Unidos porque, para mi, es casi imposible convencerle de la bondad de un sisteraa distinto del implantado en su pais y en el cual tienen una fe ilimitada los americanos.

Otra razon por la cual debemos seguir con nuestro actual sistema bicameral es que yo creo que, si adoptamos el sistema de una sola Camara popular al igual que nuestra Camara de Representantes, cuyos miembros son elegidos por una pequena region o un pequeno distrito compuesto por unos diez u ocho pueblos, dificilmente podriamos ya tener en el servicio de nuestra Legislatura a nuestros mejores hombres, que ya cuentan con larga experiencia en el Gobierno, lo mismo en el ramo legisla sido Representantes y gobernadores provinciales; ya han ocupado altos cargos, importantes cargos tivo que en el ramo ejecutivo asi como en otras instituciones gubernamentales. Muchos de nuestros mejores hombres que, por su edad, por su experiencia, estan ala.altura de los. que. hoy .componen nuestro Senado o de los que han compuesto siempre nuestro Senado, no querran aventurarse en una eleccion dentro de una pequena comunidad, luchar con algun joven, con algun jefe de facil palabra, con algun jefe de Kapatiran, exponiendose a perder la eleccion, al ridiculo, que por suposicion social y por su norma de vida, no lo merecia, y simplemente, porque el contrincante, en una forma u otra y por medios populacheros, ha podido conseguir la simpatia de la gente de los barrios o incitar el espiritu de regionalismo de los electores. Solamente podremos conseguir arrastrar a esos hombres a la lucha en el terreno de la politica, haciendoles luchar con su igual y dentro de un territorio mas grande, dentro de un distrito, como, por ejemplo, nuestro actual distrito senatorial donde dificilmente puede prevalecer la populacheria y donde se tienen en cuenta la capacidad del candidato, su experiencia y su caracter.

En la Camara de Representantes, los miembros, por lo general, son jovenes y nuevos en la tarea y, naturalmente, les costara tiempo, quiza unos dos anos, para poderse enterar bien de los procedimientos y practicas parlamentarias y acostumbrarse a los trabajos legislativos; en cambio, en el Senado, como en el actual sistema, por de pronto la mitad ya ha ganado tres anos de ex-periencia y tienen otros tres anos durante los cuales podran emprender trabajos constructivos de legislacion. Ademas, generalmente, los que van al Senado ya han en el Gobierno o son figuras destacadas en la sociedad, en el comercio, en la agricultura. Por estas razones, estoy firmemente convencido de la necesidad de que tengamos un Senado compuesto de hombres ya maduros, de experiencia, integridad y prudencia ya reconocidas y en cuyas manos, por tanto, podamos fiar la suerte el destino de nuestro pais.

Se arguye, Senor Presidente, por los partidarios del otro sistema, que el sistema bicameral es algo complicado. Tienen razon, porque realmente no es tan facil convencer a dos como a uno; pero creo que cuanto mas complicado sea el procedimiento para la confeccion y aprobacion de nuestras leyes, quiza sea mejor. Por de pronto, si un proyecto de ley es de por si bueno, no seria con tal sistema dificil su aprobacion. Lo aprobarian facilmente; pero, como regla general, no debemos dar muchas facilidades a la confeccion de nuestras leyes. Ya tenemos leyes suficientes que aseguran el funcionamiento normal de nuestro gobierno; que aseguran la proteccion de nuestras vidas, de nuestra libertad y de nuestras propiedades. Cuantas menos leyes promulguemos, mejor para nosotros, y acaso hagamos una obra de caridad a los abogados, a los tribunales de justicia y a los estudiantes de Derecho. Lo que pasa muchas veces es que cuando un joven, antes de su eleccion a Representante y durante su ejercicio como tal, en algun asunto administrativo o judicial tropieza con alguna disposicion de la ley que no le parece buena y le ha perjudicado, porque era precisamente contraria a los intereses que sostenia, a la primera oportunidad, presenta un proyecto de ley enmendando tal disposicion delCodigo Administrativo, delCodigo Civil o delCodigo de Precedimientos, sin tener en cuenta que lo que contiene nuestro cuerpo legal no en vano ha sido materia de estudio por muchos anos de los mejores juristas. No debe, por tanto, Senor Presidente y Caballeros de la Convencion, arredrarnos el sistema complicado para la confeccion de nuestras leyes, porque solamente de esa manera aseguraremos la promulgacion de buenas aunque pocas leyes.

Senor Presidente: Voy a terminar diciendo que si con este corto discurso he podido ayudar en algo a la causa que nosotros, los partidarios del sistema bicameral, sostenemos, habre conseguido mi proposito y me considerare feliz con la idea de haber cumplido con mi deber.

Ahora estoy dispuesto a contestar a las preguntas de los Companeros.

SR. ABELLA: Senor Presidente, para unas preguntas al orador.

EL PRESIDENTE: El delegado por Camarines Sur puede hacerlas.

SR. ABELLA: Su Senoria ha mencionado el Senado de los Estados Unidos y ha sacado la conclusion de que porque los Estados Unidos tienen un Senado, nosotros debemos tambien tenerlo.

SR. BARRION: No he dicho tal cosa, Caballero. Tampoco he mencionado al Senado de Estados Unidos. He mencionado nuestro Senado.

SR. ABELLA: ¿Como, si yo he apuntado eso precisamente?

SR. BARRION: Y la conclusion es que debemos tener un Senado compuesto de hombres ya con experiencia conocida. Esa es la conclusion mia.

SR. ABELLA: Vamos a cenirnos al Senado de Filipinas. Me acuerdo de que Su Senoria ha dicho que en el Senado hay mas hombres de talento que en la Camara de Representantes.

SR. BARRION: Tampoco he dicho eso.

SR. ABELLA: Pues me declare en quiebra,

SR. BARRION: Generalmente, digo, los que van al Senado son los hombres ya maduros, de experiencia, de habilidad, y que los que estan en la Camara de Representantes son en su mayoria, por regla general, jovenes y nuevos en la tarea.

SR. ABELLA: Naturalmente, porque hay mas Miembros en la Camara de Representantes, y no puede Su Senoria negar que muchos de los que estan en el Senado han venido de la Camara Baja.

SR. BARRION: Precisamente, por alli va mi argumento.

SR. ABELLA: Un momento, Companero. El argumento que quiero aducir es este, que tanto en la Camara Baja, relativamente, como en el Senado, hay hombres grandes.

SR. BARRION: No se niega eso, pero la mayoria son jovenes y nuevos.

SR. ABELLA: Como en el Gabinete hay dos miembros de la Camara Baja y otros dos del Senado, parece que eso prueba el hecho de que, por lo menos, ambas Camaras colegisladoras estan en pie de igualdad.

SR. BARRION: Quizas haya sido esa una politica, pero no puede Su Senoria deducir de eso que los que estan en la Camara de Renresentantes son hombres que tienen ya la experiencia de los que estan en el Senado.

SR. ABELLA: ¿Niega Su Senoria entonces habilidad y capacidad a los Secretaries que vienen de la Camara Baja?

SR. BARRION": En lo que respecta, generalmente, a los que forman nuestro Senado, estos tienen ya experiencia y son de capacidad reconocida, porque los que estan en nuestro Senado ahora ya han sido Representantes o gobernadores provinciales.

SR. ABELLA: ¿Cree Su Senoria que hombres de la talla del Speaker Paredes, del Speaker protempore Zulueta, del Representante Diokno y del ex-Speaker Roxas son menos que los mas brillantes senadores?

SR. BARRION: No, y podrian ser senadores. Estoy conforme.

SR. ABELLA: Muchas gracias.

(A las 10:58, el Presidente cede la presidencia al primer Vicepresidente, Sr. Montinola.)

MR. GRAFILO: Mr. President, will the Gentleman from Batangas yield to a question?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: The Gentleman from Batangas may yield if he so desires.

MR. GRAFILO: Do I understand from the short speech of the Gentleman from Batangas that the work-ing of the lower house, generally viewed from experience, is unsatisfactory if not a failure?

MR. BARRION: No, I want to simply stick to my statement that since the Lower House is young and new it will take time to learn.

MR. GRAFILO: Does not the Gentleman from Batangas imply that during the time of learning our Lower House has passed a stage of unsatisfactory working

MR. BARRION: Well, I think that is a question of fact. There have been many projects presented in the Lower House and not acted upon or were disapproved and so could not reach the Senate; also many projects that simply imply that those who presented them, were inexperienced.

MR. GRAFILO: Just one more question. Is the Gentleman going to eliminate the upper chamber on the supposition that we ultimately adopt the unicameral system? Is there any possibility that the experienced members of the Upper House will also be members of the single chamber? these men to be candidates. On the other hand, a young man, whether a lawyer or a college man, sticks to that small area, and he is likely to be elected, more preferred, although having no experience.

MR. GRAFILO: Do we understand from the Gen-tleman that it would be impossible for a man with less experience, or that it would be harder for him, to carry a lighter load than a man with much experience?

MR. BARRION: That is a question of whether one has got a real taste for politics.

MR. ROMERO: Mr. President, I yield to a representative who is not young and new, one of the foremost

authorities on finance in this country, Delegate Marabut from Samar.

EL VICEPRESIDENTE: Tiene la palabra el Delegado por Samar, Senor Marabut.

SPEECH OF MR. MARABUT IN FAVOR OF UNICAMERAL LEGISLATURE

MR. MARABUT: Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention: At the present stage of this debate, very little, if any, could be added to the brilliant arguments already adduced by the distinguished Gentleman who preceded me in taking the floor. I have risen, nevertheless, as I would be recreant to my duty if I did not bring to your attention certain economic facts which we should not ignore in the consideration of the question before us, if we want to lay a lasting foundation for the new government that we are going to establish.

Mr. President, as I understand it, this Convention may be compared to an architect who is employed to draw up the plan of an edifice to be erected. Before the architect commences, before he decides on the style of architecture to be followed, the number of stories and rooms, and the kind of material to be used, he first ascertains the amount of money available for the project, as well as the degree of comfort that the means of the future occupants of the building will enable them to derive.

It is true that since 1907, we have been maintaining a bicameral legislature—the Philippine Assembly and the Philippine Commission until 1916, and the House of Representatives and the Philippine Senate from 1916 up to the present time. But we should bear in mind, Mr. President, that since the organization of the present bicameral legislature under the Jones Law, the maintenance of the two chambers has cost our people no less than the enormous sum of P30,309,304—P11,095,327 for the Senate and P19,215,977 for the House of Representatives. The following figures speak for themselves: in 1917, the year following the inauguration of the Philippine Senate, when the Insular Government realized a total revenue collection of P52,917,475, the Legislature spent for its own maintenance a total of P960,196, of which P350,412 was for the Senate and P609,784 for the House of Representatives; in 1922, the year following that in which the Insular Government reached the peak in revenue collections amounting to P94,148,373, the total expenditure for the Legislature came to the respectable sum of P2,298,699, of which P820,987 was for the Senate and P1,477,682 for the House of Representatives; and last year, with a total revenue collection of P58,047,374, the total expenditure for both houses amounted to P1,667,682, of which P602,047 was for the Senate and P1,065,635 for the House of Representatives. The average annual total expense of both houses for the last eighteen years is P1,683,850, of which P616,269 was for the Senate and P1,067,856 for the House of Representatives. This means Mr. President, that it cost our people P25,697 yearly for the support of each Senator and P11,120 for each Representative. It also means that each of the 2,324 laws enacted by the Legislature during the same period of time has cost our people an average of P13,042.

The advocates of bicameralism will say that since our country could afford to support a bicameral Legislature in the past, it should be able to do the same thing in the years to come. Mr. President, if up to this time we have been able to support the luxury of a bicameral legislature, we owe it to the bountiful revenue collection resulting from the material prosperity which our country has been enjoying on account of the free trade with the United States. What concerns us now is to determine whether or not the amount of our Government's income during the commonwealth period and during the first years of independence will permit the continuance of maintaining such an expensive legislative system as we are now having. But before we can answer this question, it is necessary that we first analyze the financial resources and economic possibilities of our future Government.

The bulk of the revenues of the Insular Government comes from customs duties and internal revenue taxes, the total of which depends on the purchasing power of the people. As that total depends to a large extent on the amount of our country's exports, it follows that the larger the amount of our exports the more revenue the Government can collect. The truth of this assertion is proven by the yearly fluctuation of the Insular

Government's revenues which closely follows that of our exports. In 1925, our exports amounted to P107,626.008, and in the following year, the revenues collections of the Insular Government amounted to P44,498,003; the annual exports gradually increased to P270,388,964 in 1918; and similarly the revenue collections increased to P77,593,133, in 1919; a decrease of the total export to P226,236,652 in 1919 was followed by a decrease in the government revenue collections to P76,277,991, in 1920; then the total export rose to the highest point of P302,247,711 in 1920, and this brought the peak in total revenue collections which reached P94,148,373 in 1921; since then, decreases or increases in the amounts of the country's exports have invariably been followed by corresponding decreases or increases in revenue collections.

Now, Mr. President, let us turn our attention to the outlook of our exports during the Commonwealth and the first years of our independence. Last year, the total value of our exports amounted to P211,542,105 36% of which, or P162,626,053 worth of products, was sent to the United States. Of the latter amount, P128,637,977 was for sugar, P1,134,689 for cordage, P5,951,960 for tobacco, P16,050,160 for coconut oil, P3,359,994 for desiccated coconut, P3,787,496 for embroideries and P541,304 for pearl buttons, or a total of P161,483,570 for the seven kinds of products I have mentioned, constituting 88% of the total exports to the United States. As we all know, during the first five years of the Commonwealth, our exports of sugar, coconut oil, and cordage to the United States will be limited to the quantities fixed in the Tydings-McDuffie Law, namely 850,000 long tons for sugar, 200,000 long tons for coconut oil, and 3,000,000 pounds for cordage. In 1933, we exported to the United States 1,078,596 long tons of sugar, and 6,861,967 pounds of cordage. It can be seen that from the very first year of the Commonwealth our exports of sugar and cordage to the United States will already suffer a substantial reduction. With regard to coconut oil, although the volume of our exports to the United States has not yet reached the maximum limit fixed by the Tydings-McDuffie Law, there is the excise tax of 3% per pound imposed by the revenue bill recently approved by Congress, which is even worse in its effects on the industry than the trade limitations under the Tydings-McDuffie Law. But the worst economic hardship of our country will manifest itself with full vigor during the second half of the Commonwealth when the export tax imposed by the Independence Law will be enforced. Mr. President, according to the analysis made by the Philippine Economic Association, our sugar, coconut oil, cordage, cigar, embroidery, desiccated coconut, and pearl button industries, which, as I have already shown, furnish 88% of our exports to the United States, will not be able to withstand the disastrous effects of the export tax. The analysis demonstrates with facts and figures that the export tax will stop our export to the United States of coconut oil and pearl buttons in the first year of its imposition or the sixth year of the Commonwealth; sugar, cordage and cigars in the second year; and embroideries and desiccated coconut in the third year. With the elimination of these seven principal items of our export to the United States, the aggregate of which constitutes 76% of all our exports, and with no substitute markets elsewhere in sight, it is easy to imagine the extent of the financial difficulties through which our future Government will have to undergo.

Mr. President, with the facts and figures which I have just cited, the most optimistic members of this Convention cannot help but agree with me that as soon as the trade limitations imposed on our country by the Independence Law are enforced, the probabilities are that our total export cannot reach beyond the P100,000,000 mark, an indication that we may have to return to the standard of public expenditures followed by the Insular Government prior to 1916 when its total yearly income was less than P40,000,000 and the average yearly expense for maintaining the Legislature was less than one-half of a million pesos.

It may be asked, Mr. President, why we cannot maintain a bicameral legislature with an appropriation of less than half a million pesos. The same plan submitted to this Convention by the committee on matters relative to the Legislature which, I understand, would preserve the same number of members in both houses, or a total of 130 Senators and Representatives to be paid at P4,000 per annum each, already gives the negative answer. Under the plan, the salaries of the Senators and Representatives alone will already amount to P480,000, and what about the

salaries of the numerous personnel of both houses and their sundry expenses which, last year, amounted to P906,762, of which P428,648 pertained to the Senate and P468,115 to the House of Representatives? No one will question that an adequate amount should be provided for the salaries of subordinate personnel of the Legislature as well as for the sundry expenses of the same, but I venture to say that very few of us here, if any at all, would want to see our Legislature spending during the Commonwealth and the first years of our Independence the same amount that it spends at present for its maintenance. Further, Mr. President, the experience of our Government during the last eighteen years has shown that it is not easy to reduce the expenditures of a bicameral legislature both of whose chambers are composed of elective members. According to the official record, before the establishment of the Philippine Senate, the former Philippine Assembly not only never exceeded what it spent in 1908, the year following that in which it was organized, but it operated with a much lower appropriation in the years that followed, and in 1910 its total expenditure amounted to only P274,559. Since its conversion into the present House of Representatives and the organization of the Philippine Senate, the expenditures of the former began to rise in proportion to the increase in the expenditures of the latter. Of course, this had to be so, because every increase in the appropriation of one chamber was a temptation to justify a corresponding increase in the appropriation of the other. And then, considering the political character of the organization, coupled by the workings of the so-called parliamentary courtesy whereby one chamber refrains from questioning the expenses that may be approved by both chambers, it is too much to expect a bicameral legislature to operate economically.

Mr. President, circumstances beyond the control of our people demand that, for the success and security of the Commonwealth and our independent existence that will follow, we should set up for our country a government that is simple and economical. I have full confidence in the ability of this Convention to do so, and the adoption of a provision in the Constitution which will implant here a unicameral legislature is, I believe, the most logical step. I thank you.

SR. YSIP. Senor Presidente, para algunas preguntas al orador.

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

SR. MARABUT: Si, senor.

SR. YSIP: ¿Quiere Su Senoria informarnos sobre los gastos que registro el Senado el ano pasado?

SR. MARABUT: El Senado gasto el ano pasado P602.047.

SR. YSIP: Y de esa cantidad ¿cuanto correspondio a los sueldos de los Senadores?

SR. MARABUT: Deduciendo de esa cantidad la suma de P428,648, que correspondia a los gastos del personal subalterno y gastos varios del Senado, el resultado sera cerca de P200.000.

SR. YSIP. Segun tengo entendido, Su Senoria mas bien se apoya en la economia que podria producir la adopcion de una sola Camara. ¿No cree Su Senoria que se podria conseguir el mismo fin, economizando el Gobierno, manteniendo el mismo sistema, pero reduciendo los sueldos de los legisladores y eliminando a algunos empleados de la Legislatura?

SR. MARABUT: Ya ha dicho que aunque es el deseo de todos el que se reduzcan los gastos de las Camaras de la Legislatura, es imposible llevarlo a cabo por las razones que ya he mencionado y son, primera, porque el caracter de la organizacion es politico. Segunda, cada aumento de gastos en una Camara, justifica el aumento de gastos de la otra. Hay rivalidad en el aumento de gastos entre las dos Camaras, lo cual no ocurria cuando teniamos la Asamblea Filipina, porque la otra Camara estaba compuesta de miembros que no eran electivos. Se ha demostrado que cuando teniamos solamente la Asamblea Filipina, no solamente no se excedio el gasto del

primer ano, sino que ai contrario, se pudieron reducir todavia los gastos al extremo de que un ano llego a gastar nada mas que P274,000,00.

SR. YSIP: Entonces, ¿no tree Su Senoria que se podria economizar muchisimo, no solamente en el Senado, sino tambien en la Camara de Representantes, si se redujesen los sueldos de los legisladores, asi como tam-bien los de algunos empleados, y reduciendo su numero? ¿No cree Su Senoria que haciendo esto, no sola-mente podriamos ahorrar la cantidad de P602,000,000 que representa los gastos del Senado, sino quiza el doble de esta cantidad?

SR. MARABUT: La idea de Su Senoria creo que no es factible, porque aunque pudieramos fijar los sueldos de los miembros de la Legislatura en la Constitucion creo que no es conveniente que fijemos inclusive los sueldos de los mensajeros, mozos, y otros empleados de las Camaras legislativas; y aunque se redujese los sueldos de los miembros de la Legislatura, muy poca cosa se podria economizar. Como he demostrado, la ma-yor partida de gastos de la Legislatura no esta en los sueldos de los Legisladores, ni en los sueldos del personal subalterno.

SR. YSIP: Tengo mucha fe en los miembros que componen nuestra Legislatura, y creo que los miembros tanto de la Camara Baja como del Senado estan movidos por el mismo deseo de los Miembros de esta Asamblea, de adoptar la politica de reduccion de los sueldos de los legisladores. ¿No cree Su Senoria que tambien la Legislatura podria adoptar esto? Y tambien estoy seguro de que adoptaria la misma política en lo que se refiere a la reduccion de su personal subalterna y los sueldos de los mismos.

SR. MAR ABUT: Quiero asegurar a Su Senoria que, con respecto al deseo de reducir los gastos de las Camaras, ese deseo es grande, entre algunos miembros de las mismas; pero la dificultad esta en llevarlo a cabo, porque hay factores que imposibilitan la realizacion de esa buena intencion.

SR. YSIP: ¿Se podria saber cuales son esos factores que imposibilitan la realizacion de esa idea, que me parece muy partiotica?

SR. MARABUT: Uno de ellos es el que los miembros de la Legislatura son electivos, y su eleccion depende de la buena voluntad de las amistades que puedan contraer entre sus electores. Naturalmente, esta es la verdad, aunque es triste decirlo. Cada miembro de la Legisla-tura, si se le permitiese, tendra diez veces mas empleados de los que teine ahora.

MR. FLORES: Mr. President, will the Gentleman yield?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: The Gentleman may yield if he so desires.

MR. MARABUT: Willingly.

MR. FLORES: Does the theory of check and balance exist in our Legislature?

MR. MARABUT: Does the Gentleman mean check and balance between the Executive and the Legislature?

MR. FLORES: No; between the two legislative bo-dies.

MR. MARABUT: I do not deny that there is, but everything said about the check of one chamber on the work of the other is not all true. Many bills passed by both houses of the Legislature have been passed not because they were good but because their authors or their sponsors were determined to have them ap-proved. As proof of that, such bills were subsequently vetoed by the Governor-General because they were found to be bad or defective.

MR. FLORES: But at least one body served as a contradicting or a motivating power to the other body.

MR. MARABUT: To a certain extent, but if there is any such cheek, I think it can be done by an effect-ive Chief Executive who will veto defective bills ap-proved by a unicameral legislature.

MR. FLORES: So that in the absence of one body, say, the Senate, such a motivating or contradicting power of check will not exist?

MR. MARABUT: With the absence of a second chamber, whatever check there is can be assumed by the Chief Executive.

MR. FLORES: But is not the Gentleman aware that the veto power of the Chief Executive is different from the modifying power of a legislative body?

MR. MARABUT: Does the Gentleman mean that the Chief Executive may approve bills?

MR. FLORES: My point is that the veto power of the Chief Executive does not carry with it the modifying power of a legislative body, so that the scope of the power is different.

MR. MARABUT: Let us suppose that the Chief Executive vetoes a defective bill of a unicameral legislature. In the next session of the legislature, the same bill can be passed again, amending those parts objected to by the Chief Executive. If the measure is of urgent character, the Chief Executive can call a special session of the unicameral legislature.

MR. FLORES: But the defect may be absolute; the law may be modified, it may be changed, but not absolutely vetoed.

MR. MARABUT: But I believe that, even with a unicameral legislature, the amendment can be done, as I have already stated.

MR. FLORES: So that, to a certain extent, the two legislative bodies of our country now are partly successful are they not?

MR. MARABUT: To a certain extent, but the system is too expensive for our country, especially during the Commonwealth, the first step of our independence, and it will be absolutely impossible for our country to support an expensive legislature. I am ready to sacrifice luxury.

MR. FLORES: But the Gentleman will admit that even if the present Legislature remains, we can reduce our expenses.

MR. MARABUT: As I have already stated, there is nothing good done by a bicameral body, such as we have, that cannot be done by a unicameral legislature.

MR. ABORDO: Mr. President, will the Gentleman yield?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: The Gentleman from Samar may yield, if he so desires.

MR. MARABUT: With pleasure.

MR. ABORDO: The thing is that the present system of senatorial districts is not what the gentleman refers to, and he wants to create another system more equitable than the present one.

MR. MARABUT: Yes, but not necessarily that one province constitute one district.

MR. ABORDO: In the event that the bicameral form of legislature prevails in this Convention, will the Gentleman inform us whether he favors the present system of electing Senators, that is, by district?

MR. MARABUT: I do not admit that the bicameralists will win in the voting on the question, but in the event, in which I do not expect, that they win, I will advocate that the system of electing our senators be changed; I will propose that one district elect only one Senator, even if we have to increase the number of districts.

MR. ABORDO: In other words, there should be one Senator for each province.

MR. MARABUT: Not necessarily, because smaller provinces could be put together to form one senatorial district.

EL VICEPRESIDENTE: Ha expirado el tiempo del Caballero de Samar.

LEVANTAMIENTO DE LA SESION

SR. ROMERO: Senor Presidente en vista de que el Comite de Ponencias tiene que celebrar sesion esta manana, pido que se levante la sesion hasta el lunes a las cuatro de la tarde.

EL VICEPRESIDENTE: Si no hay objecion, se levanta la sesion hasta el lunes, a las cuatro de la tarde. (No la hubo.)

Eran las 11:43 A.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.