

JOURNAL NO. 79

VOL. II, September 11, 1986

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/bd5c88e4b3df/>

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

CALL TO ORDER

At 9:52 a.m., the President of the Constitutional Commission, the Honorable Cecilia Muñoz Palma, called the session to order.

NATIONAL ANTHEM AND PRAYER

The National Anthem was sung followed by a prayer led by Mr. Napoleon G. Rama, to wit:

"Lord Almighty, Who are the first Lawmaker, Who fashioned the fundamental laws for nature and for man, which nature may not disobey — an insurgent atom could touch off a doomsday disaster — and which under Your scheme only man with his gift of free will may accept or not accept at his own risk, touch us with a spark of Your wisdom in the making of laws so that we may shape the' fundamental law of our land true to the aspirations of the people and the common good, and acceptable to them.

You wanted remembered and celebrated and acknowledged by all as special the event of Your decreeing the Ten Commandments as a milestone in the history of mankind. It wasn't with out a dash of drama. You sent Your servant Moses to Mt. Sinai before You handed him, amid thunder and lightning, the commandments inscribed in tablets of stone. Moses descended godlike from the summit, exploding in anger at an ungrateful, idolatrous people, smashing the tablets into small pieces — a scene the world will not likely forget. In a few weeks, we, too, will deliver the Constitutional commandments to the people.

To Moses who led Your people out of the land of tyranny to the edge of the' land of milk and honey, You gave the gift of leadership, wisdom, courage and anger. We need all of these gifts, Lord, and a little more. For our mission is wider, our responsibility greater, than that of Moses, as lawgiver.

Moses came down the mountain to decree upon the people the laws he did not write. Your Constitutional' Commissioners will come down the Batasang Pambansa to render upon our people the fundamental law that we ourselves have written.

This we ask through Christ, Your Son.

Amen."

ROLL CALL

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

Bengzon, J. F. S.

Quesada, M. L. M.

Bennagen, P. L.
Rama, N. G.
Rosario Braid, F.
Rigos, C. A.
De Castro, C. M.
Rodrigo, F. A.
Colayco, J. C.
Romulo, R. J.
Concepcion, R. R.
Sarmiento, R. V.
Davide, H. G.
Suarez, J. E.
Foz, V. B.
Sumulong, L. M.
Guingona, S. V
Tadeo, J. S. L.
Jamir, A. M. K.
Tan, C.
Laurel, J. B.
Tingson, G. J.
Monsod, C. S.
Treñas, E. B.
Nieva, M. T. F.
Uka, L. L.
Padilla, A. B.
Villacorta, W. V.
Muñoz Palma, C.
Villegas, B. M.

With 30 Members present, the Chair declared the presence of a quorum.

The following Members appeared after the Roll Call:

A.M.

Abubakar, Y. R.

Gascon, J. L. M. C.

Alonto, A. D.

Lerum, E. R.

Aquino, F. S.

Maambong, R. E.

Azcuna, A. S.

Natividad, T. C.

Bacani T C.

Nolledo, J. N.

Bernas, J. G.

Ople, B. F.

Calderon, J. D.

Regalado, F. D.

Garcia, E. G.

De Los Reyes, R. F.

Mr. Rosales was sick.

READING AND APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL

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

REFERENCE OF BUSINESS

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

REFERRAL TO COMMITTEES OF COMMUNICATIONS

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

Communication No. 800 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Ms. Felicidad Q. Lagarde, submitting Resolutions No. 24 and No. 25 of the Senior Citizens Association, Tacloban City Chapter, P. Paterno St., Tacloban City, seeking, respectively, inclusion in the Constitution of a provision on the right of the elderly poor and aging persons to enjoy their right to social and material relief, free medical services, old age financial grants and other related terminal services; and a provision on the right of the potential elderly persons with knowledge, skills, experience, and expertise, as reservoir of human resource, for involvement in cultural enrichment, social development, instead of being

alienated, deprived, and downgraded

TO THE COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL JUSTICE

Communication No. 801 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Mr. Maimpok N. Ongchangco, 17 Osmeña Industrial Valley Subdivision, Marikina, Metro Manila, expressing doubts whether the new Constitution will be ratified because of the inclusion of controversial and divisive issues

TO THE COMMITTEE ON AMENDMENTS AND TRANSITORY PROVISIONS

Communication No. 802 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Communication signed by twelve physicians from U.S.T. Hospital, expressing objection against the retention of the U.S. military bases in the Philippines

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

Communication No. 803 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Telegram from BAYAB PCCC Kamkem ACT Ozamiz, requesting for redeliberation of a provision on national economy and urging the Constitutional Commission to adopt a nationalist constitution to protect Filipino business industries against foreign competition

TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL ECONOMY AND PATRIMONY

Communication No. 804 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Communication from Rev. Homer A. Clavecilla of Union Theological Seminary, Palapala, Dasmariñas, Cavite, opposing vigorously the proposed compulsory religious instruction in public schools, supporting instead, the retention of the old constitutional provision on optional religious instruction

TO THE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

Communication No. 805 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Ms. Amherstia Paez of the Institute of Public Health Student Council, University of the Philippines Manila, Ermita, Manila, containing specific recommendations for the proposed Article on Education, Science, Technology, Sports, Arts and Culture

TO THE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

Communication No. 806 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Mrs. Ramona Rodriguez Tan, Associate Professor, University of the Philippines, and Mrs. Pura Tianco Badoy, President, PWU College of Education Alumnae Association, expressing support for a provision providing free and compulsory education up to the secondary level

TO THE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

Communication No. 807 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Mr. Enrique L. Victoriano of 4427 Int. Old Sta. Mesa, Manila, submitting proposals which are believed to provide sufficient interpellations in the discussions to at least pave the way for modifications of the educational system by legislation

TO THE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

Communication No. 808 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Communication from the Provincial Fiscal of Bohol, Enrique B Inting, Tagbilaran City, containing comments as well as recommendations on Section 3 of the proposed Article on the Bill of Rights

TO THE COMMITTEE ON CITIZENSHIP, BILL OF RIGHTS, POLITICAL RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Communication No. 809 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from the Philippine Medical Association of Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Inc., 10210 Norton Road, Potomac, Maryland, U.S.A. signed by It's President, Dr. Cresenciano C. Lopez and fifteen (15) other officers and members, endorsing the resolution adopted by the Association of Philippine Physicians in America, Inc., seeking inclusion in the Constitution of a provision, that would allow a natural-born citizen of the Philippines who has lost his/her Philippine citizenship eligible to be transferee of private lands

TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL ECONOMY AND PATRIMONY

Communications Nos. 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820 and 821 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

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

- Rev. Ruth Barnard
Christian Rendezvous, San Jose Street
Dumaguete City
- Rev. Jose M. Artajo and one hundred one
other signatories, Faith Tabernacle (Charismatic Center) Bayawan, Negros Oriental
- Rev. Hermes Guiritan and thirty-six other
signatories, Foursquare Gospel Church,
Tiguib, Ayungon, Negros Oriental
- Pasto Francis P. Anthony
c/o Kabulusan Baptist Church
Kabulusan, Pakil, Laguna
- Rev. Dioscoro P. Sales
Faith Island Mission, Inc.
P.O. Box 2, Bais City
Negros Oriental
- Mr. Bonifacio Portugal, Jr. and three other
signatories, Corpus Christi Community
Foundation, Inc., P.O. Box AC-65, Quezon
City
- Rev. Ernie P. Lao
Davao Baptist Church
Araullo Street, Tionko Subdivision
Davao City

- Rev. Gideon B. Caselan and two hundred fifty-four other signatories, Lagao Alliance Church, Lagao, General Santos City
- Mr. Efraim M. Tendero and two hundred forty-seven other signatories, Kamuning Bible Christian Fellowship, No. 4, 11th Jamboree, Kamuning, Quezon City
- Ms. Antonia T. Corda and five hundred fifty-six other signatories, Phil. General Council of the Assemblies of God, P.O. Box 49, Valenzuela, Metro Manila
- Mr. Edgar delos Santos and twenty-seven other signatories, First Kalinga Alliance Church, Bulanao, Tabuk, Kalinga-Apayao
- Mr. William Su, Baptist Conference Church of Bacolod, P.O. Box 494, Bacolod City

TO THE COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PROVISIONS

Communications Nos. 822, 823, 824, 825 and 286 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letters seeking to incorporate in the new Constitution a provision obliging the State to protect the life of the unborn from the moment of conception, from:

- Mr. Eugenio S. Rosales and sixty-seven other signatories of Metro Cebu
- Ms. Amparo Pamela Fabe
University of the Philippines
Diliman, Quezon City
- One thousand two hundred forty-two concerned citizens of Bacolod, Negros Occidental
- Ms. Judy Razal and seventy other signatories of Legaspi City
- Mr. Ricardo M. Ravacio and one thousand forty-eight other signatories of Oroquieta City

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: COMMITTEE REPORT NO. 29 ON PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON THE ARTICLE ON EDUCATION, SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ARTS AND CULTURE

On motion of Mr. Rama, there being no objection, the Body resumed consideration, on Second Reading, of the Proposed Resolution on the Article on Education, Science, Technology, Arts and Culture (Committee Report No. 29), entitled:

Resolution to incorporate in the Constitution an Article on Education, Science, Technology, Arts and Culture.

Thereupon, the Chair recognized the Chairman and members of the Committee on Human Resources.

At this juncture, Mr. Rama invited attention to the reservation of Mr. Foz to present a motion for reconsideration of the approval of the amendment on the provision on Sports.

Thereupon, Mr. Foz restated the provision of Section 2(d) which had been approved in the previous session, to wit:

“The State shall promote physical education and encourage sports programs to foster the values of self-discipline, teamwork and excellence, and for the total development of a healthy and alert citizenry.”

AMENDMENT OF MR. FOZ

Mr. Foz then proposed the following amendment, to wit:

THE STATE SHALL PROMOTE PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND ENCOURAGE SPORTS PROGRAMS, LEAGUE COMPETITIONS AND AMATEUR SPORTS, INCLUDING TRAINING FOR THE INTERNATIONAL AND OLYMPIC COMPETITIONS, TO FOSTER SELF-DISCIPLINE, TEAMWORK AND EXCELLENCE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A HEALTHY AND ALERT CITIZENRY.

Mr. Villacorta suggested deletion of the words “and olympic”, which Mr. Foz accepted.

Thereafter, Mr. Foz restated his amendment, as modified, to wit:

THE STATE SHALL PROMOTE PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND ENCOURAGE SPORTS PROGRAMS, LEAGUE COMPETITIONS AND AMATEUR SPORTS INCLUDING TRAINING FOR THE INTERNATIONAL COMPETITIONS, TO FOSTER SELF-DISCIPLINE, TEAMWORK AND EXCELLENCE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A HEALTHY AND ALERT CITIZENRY.

Submitted to a vote, and with 30 Members voting in favor and one against, the amendment was approved by the Body.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF MR. DE CASTRO

Mr. de Castro proposed to add the following paragraphs after Mr. Foz' proposal, to wit:

ALL SCHOOLS, COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE, SHALL UNDERTAKE REGULAR SPORTS ACTIVITIES, ATHLETIC COMPETITIONS IN ORGANIZED LEAGUES FROM BARANGAY, MUNICIPAL, PROVINCIAL, REGIONAL, NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL SPORTS PROGRAMS IN COOPERATION WITH ATHLETIC CLUBS AND OTHER SECTORS.

THE PROMOTION OF AMATEUR SPORTS AS DISTINGUISHED FROM PROFESSIONAL PLAYERS SHALL BE PROVIDED BY LAW INCLUDING THE TRAINING OF NATIONAL ATHLETES FOR OLYMPIC GAMES.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

On motion of Mr. de Castro, the Chair suspended the session.

It was 10:16 a.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 10:20 a.m., the session was resumed.

Upon resumption of session, Mr. Rama, explaining the parliamentary situation, stated that Mr Foz would present a

motion for reconsideration relative to Mr. de Castro's proposal.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE DELETION OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH OF THE SECTION ON SPORTS

Mr. Foz moved for reconsideration of the deletion of the second paragraph of the Section on Sports which reads:

"All schools, colleges and universities, public and private, shall undertake regular Sports activities, athletic competitions in organized leagues, from barangay, municipal, provincial to regional to national sports programs in co-operation with other sectors."

Mr. Foz stated that he wanted to reinstate this deleted paragraph as part of the provisions on sports.

Mr. de los Reyes proposed an amendment to the amendment by deleting the words "from barangay municipal, provincial and national level" and to substitute the words THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY. He also manifested for the record that the meaning of "throughout the country" would include the promotion of activities and athletic competitions in organized leagues in barangay, municipal, provincial and national level.

At this juncture, Mr. Bernas stated that the Body had not yet voted on the motion for reconsideration and it would be premature to propose amendments.

APPROVAL OF THE MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Submitted to a vote, and with 25 Members voting in favor, 1 against and 2 abstentions, the motion for reconsideration was approved by the Body.

REMARKS OF MR. OPLE

Mr. Ople voted in favor of the motion for reconsideration, but expressed the hope that the reconsideration would not establish a precedent for the sake of stability of voting in the Commission.

AMENDMENT OF MR. FOZ

Mr. Foz then proposed the reinstatement of the second paragraph with the amendment of Mr. de los Reyes incorporated therein, to read as follows:

ALL SCHOOLS, COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE, SHALL UNDERTAKE REGULAR SPORTS ACTIVITIES THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY IN COOPERATION WITH ATHLETIC CLUBS AND OTHER SECTORS.

Mr. Gascon proposed the deletion of the words "schools, colleges and universities" and suggested in lieu thereof the phrase ALL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

Mr. Guingona proposed the deletion of the words "in organized leagues", to which Mr. Foz replied that they are part of the first sentence and not his amendment.

On Mr. Guingona's query on the meaning of the words "athletic clubs and other sectors", Mr. Foz explained that this would refer to private or public organizations like the Rotary Club, the Jaycees and even the local government units which could be asked to support sports competitions in their respective localities.

As amended, Mr. Foz restated his proposed amendment, as amended, to wit:

ALL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS SHALL UNDERTAKE REGULAR SPORTS ACTIVITIES THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY IN COOPERATION WITH ATHLETIC CLUBS AND OTHER

SECTORS.

The Committee accepted the amendment, as amended.

Submitted to a vote and with 28 Members voting in favor, none against and one abstention, the Body approved Mr. Foz' amendment, as amended.

Mr. Foz manifested for the record that his two amendments were coauthored by Mr. Suarez, Mrs. Nieva, Messrs. Monsod, de Castro and Padilla.

Mr. Villacorta likewise manifested for the record that the amendments were based on the Committee proposal

PROVISIONS ON LANGUAGE

Mr. Rama stated that the next item for consideration would be the Provisions on Language with Mr. Tadeo as the first speaker.

REMARKS OF MR. TADEO

Mr. Tadeo spoke in support of Pilipino as the national language. He quoted Rizal who said in Pilipino: "Ang hindi marunong magmahal sa sariling wika ay higit pa sa mabaho at malansang isda". He said that this love of the national language was also reflected in Rizal's *El Filibusterismo* when he said:

"You ask for equal rights, the Hispanization of your customs and you don't see that what you are begging for is suicide, the destruction of your nationality, the annihilation of your fatherland, the consecration of tyranny! What will you be in the future? A people without character, a nation without liberty — everything you have will be borrowed, even your defects! What are you going to do with Castilian, the few of you who will speak it? Kill off your own originality, subordinate your thoughts to other brains and instead of freeing yourself, make yourselves slaves indeed! Nine-tenths of those of you who pretend to be enlightened are renegades to your country! He among you who talks that language neglects his own."

Mr. Tadeo stated that what Rizal said about Spanish has been proven to be equally true for English.

Further justifying the need for a national language, Mr. Tadeo quoted Najib Saleeby, a Muslim scholar, who, deploring the attempt to impose English as the medium of instruction, said:

"The relation the Tagalog holds to the Bisaya or to the Sulu is very much like or closer than that of the Spanish to the Italians. An educated Tagalog from Batangas and an educated Bisayan from Cebu can learn to understand each other in a short space of time and without much effort. A Cebuano student living in Manila can acquire practical use and good understanding of Tagalog in less than three months. The relation between Tagalog and Malay is very much the same as that of Spanish and French."

Mr. Tadeo stated that this was said forty years ago when Tagalog movies, periodicals and radio programs had not yet attained the popularity that they enjoy at present all over the country.

Mr. Tadeo also adverted to an article by Renato Constantino entitled *The Miseducation of the Filipino People*, to wit:

"The first and perhaps the master stroke in the plan to use education as an instrument of colonial policy was the decision to use English as the medium of instruction. English became the wedge that separated the Filipinos from their past, and later was to separate educated Filipinos from the masses of their countrymen. English introduced the Filipinos to a strange new world. With American textbooks, Filipinos started learning not only a new language but also a new way of life — alien to the tradition and yet a caricature of their model. This was

the beginning of their education, at the same time, it was the beginning of their miseducation for they learned no longer as Filipinos but as colonials.

"English has created a barrier between the monopolies of power and the people. English has become a status symbol while the native tongues are looked down upon. English has given rise to a divisive society of fairly educated men and the masses who are easily swayed by them.

"A foreign language is an impediment to instruction. Instead of learning directly through the native tongue, a child has first to master a foreign tongue — memorize its vocabulary, get accustomed to its sound, intonations, accent — just to discard the language later when he is out of school. This does not mean that foreign languages should not be taught. Foreign languages should be taught and can be more taught easily after one has mastered his own tongue. Language is a tool of the thinking process. Through language, thought develops and the development of thought leads to the further development of language. But when a language becomes a barrier to thought, the thinking process is impeded or retarded and we have the resultant cultural stagnation. Creative thinking, analytical thinking, abstract thinking are not fostered because the foreign language makes a student prone to memorization."

Commenting on Mr. Davide's statements during the previous session when he said that it was only the University of the Philippines which offers the teaching of Filipino, Mr. Tadeo urged everyone to accept the reality that the University of the Philippines is an institution and nobody can deny that those who graduated from said university, be they Filipinos or foreigners, have progressed in their lives.

Mr. Tadeo further read a letter he received, entitled "Barrier to Effective Teaching of Science and Math Identified", to wit:

"The effective teaching of science and mathematics in the country hinged on the recognition of at least three major factors, according to a researcher from the Institute for Science and Mathematics Education Development. These factors, said Dr. Jasmin Acuña, are the bilingual educational policy, the learning capabilities of Filipino children, and the importance of non-linguistic communication.

"Dr. Acuña implied these factors are identified basically with communications processes. The bilingual education policy, for example, has to be clarified from the standpoint of science education. Dr. Acuña said that the use of English for science instruction may preclude the development of thinking processes that could be most useful for our population. An earlier survey done by Dr. Acuña showed that not only students but teachers as well find teaching physical sciences in English difficult. As a result, the barrier to effective communication is doubled."

Mr. Tadeo pointed out that the barrier adverted to in the survey had contributed much to the decline of students taking up science courses and resulted in the deterioration of the status of science and technology in the country. He stated that this was further confirmed by an article written by UP President Edgardo Angara who deplored the state of science and technology in the country and recommended Pilipino as the medium of instruction to make it easier for Filipino students to learn them.

Mr. Tadeo stated that as the national leader of farmers, he had visited all places of the country during which he was applauded when he spoke in Pilipino which was understood by many.

He urged acceptance of the truth that Pilipino is the language spoken by all, rich or poor. He stressed the importance of the Committee amendment on national language and he opined that if more peasants, the urban poor and masses, were made members of the Commission, they should be contributing to perfecting the amendment that would be easier to approve than the one on which the Body is having difficulty to approve. He stressed that would be easier to approve than the one on which the Body is having difficulty to approve. He stressed that the country needs a national language that would reflect the national spirit.

Finally, Mr. Tadeo stated that the development of a national language could only be achieved if this is used in the three branches of government and as the medium of instruction. He said he echoes the Sentiments of the masses whose voices are never heard or heard only when they rise up in arms.

REMARKS OF MR. NATIVIDAD

Corollary to what Mr. Tadeo said, Mr. Natividad stated that he would just add a few peaceful words. He adverted to the story of the Tower of Babel in the Holy Bible when, he said, the people, wanting to surpass God, built a tower but were punished by God by making them speak different languages. He stated that the Filipinos have been praying in English that God might have thought that it was the American who were praying so that, with all the graces and blessings they received, the Americans continue to prosper while the Filipinos become poorer and poorer.

Mr. Natividad stated that he would consider it one of the greatest achievements of the Commission if it is able to proclaim nationwide that the country has already a national language. He recalled that during his days in the old Congress, whenever he spoke in Pilipino, his colleagues threatened to walk out, which indicates how divided the nation is on the issue of national language. He bewailed the fact that in international conferences, Filipino delegates spoke in English, leaving the impression that the Philippines is still under the Americans. He recalled that at one time, while attending an International Labor Organization Conference, Mr. Ople spoke in Pilipino for which the other delegates congratulated him because only then did they know that the Philippines has a national language, although they thought that he spoke in Spanish.

REPLY OF MR. VILLACORTA

On behalf of the Committee, Mr. Villacorta expressed support for the sentiments of Messrs. Tadeo and Natividad, stating that it is only the Filipinos who are ashamed to use the national language in their everyday activities. Specifically, he pointed out that even the American observer in the gallery noticed the disagreements among Members of the Commission because of the lack of common language in the deliberations.

In reply to the queries in the previous session, he underscored the Committee's contention that there is a living lingua franca which can be called Filipino, which is not only based on Tagalog or Pilipino but on other Philippine dialects and languages as well as foreign languages like English and Spanish.

He also pointed out that even Mr. Ponciano Pineda of the Surian ng Wikang Pambansa, who has been championing the Pilipino national language, has expressed support for Filipino as the national language in his letter dated August 29, 1986, copies of which were distributed to the members of the Commission.

Mr. Villacorta further explained that Filipino as the lingua franca has evolved through the centuries through the use of the different Philippine dialects which have been understood by most people. He disclosed that according to a certain linguist, all Philippine languages have the same etymological roots, grammar and syntax such that it is easier for the Filipino to learn any Philippine dialect than to learn a foreign language.

Additionally, he stated that even the Committee on Human Resources is composed of Members from different regions, and that consultations with non-Tagalogs have not been wanting in the process of consolidating the Committee's proposals on the national language.

Finally, he noted that the discussion on the national language should take into account the significant changes that have taken place in the development of language in the Philippines.

REMARKS OF MR. BENNAGEN

Mr. Bennagen stressed the need to have a national language in line with the provision approved by the Body mandating the State to foster nationalism, creative and critical thinking; to broaden scientific and technological knowledge; to develop a self-reliant and independent economy through industrialization and agricultural development; to promote a consultative government; and protect the right of people's organizations to participate more fully in the democratic process.

He pointed out that various linguistic groups and literatures have advocated the use of Filipino as an expanded version of Pilipino. He adverted to the continuing studies thereon, among others, the 1974 study which shows that by using 90% of their mastery level, pupils could master only 1% of the non-technical English words used in science lessons; a 1983 study which reveals that average students have less than 50% mastery level in English, Science, Mathematics, and Social Studies but have a mastery level of 53% in Pilipino; and a 1985 study which concludes that a child learns faster in a language familiar to him and that a foreign language deters his learning.

Finally, he stated that the Philippines should learn from Malaysia and Indonesia, both of which were able to adopt within twenty-five years a national language that had been used as a medium of instructions up to the tertiary level, and in government, commerce and industry. He opined that if said countries have the political will to do it, the Philippines could as well make it.

REJOINDER OF MR. OPLE

Mr. Ople affirmed what Mr. Natividad narrated earlier about an incident in the International Labor Organization Conference where he delivered a speech in Pilipino but was congratulated for speaking brilliantly in Spanish.

He stated that he had to explain that his speech was not in Spanish but in Pilipino, which, as described by Fr. Chirino 400 years ago, was more romantic than the French language, stronger than English and German, more precise than Latin, and as glorious as Greek.

Mr. Ople stressed that, together with Messrs. Tadeo, Natividad and Bennagen, he would encourage the development of what would be the major nexus between language and democracy and economic development.

Moreover, he also recalled an incident 15 years ago when he asked three Japanese ambassadors about their assessment of the future of the Philippines, to which they replied that although the country has the talent, knowledge and rich natural and human resources, it would only achieve depth in national cohesion, industrialization and sustained economic growth if it develops a national language. He affirmed that unless a more liberalized and open-ended language is developed, the social and political structure would remain skewed that the country has to depend on English-speaking people who would stand between the masses and the government to interpret what each sector is doing.

He stressed that the interests of economic growth, equity and justice require that the Committee act upon this effort to develop a common national language.

REMARKS OF MRS. ROSARIO BRAID

Mrs. Rosario Braid, likewise, pointed out the need to have a medium of communication for economics, and public and business administration.

She stated that about 10% to 20% of the elite speak a different language which widens the disparity between the culture of the elite and that of the majority to the extent that even economic and business policies are polarized. She also attributed the problems and differences during the deliberations on the Article on National Economy and

Patrimony to the Members' inability to translate the issues into a language understood by the majority of the people.

She stated that the children in Japan, Russia and Australia learn science and technology at an early age because of the common language they use.

Finally, she quoted Gunnar Myrdal who said, "No real emotional integration of the new nations and, therefore, no secure consolidation is possible as long as the members of the tiny upper class in charge of administration, law enforcement, and modernized business and industry communicate in European tongue and the masses speak only in their native tongue." She underscored the importance of moving towards a national language in public, business and economic transactions.

INQUIRY OF MR. BACANI

Before seeking clarification on certain questions, Mr. Bacani stated that he was in favor of providing a common national language.

In reply to his query on whether the language used by Mr. Tadeo in his remarks could be considered Filipino, Mr. Villacorta explained that Mr. Tadeo spoke in Pilipino which would be a component of the proposed Filipino national language, the other components being the Visayan, Cebuano, Ilonggo, Ilocano, Bicolano and other words used by the non-Tagalogs which could be popularly understood.

On Mr. Bacani's observation that Filipino is a language still to be developed, Mr. Villacorta reiterated that its nucleus would be Filipino with a mixture of words from other dialects, and that said language has already been existing as the lingua franca.

In this connection, Mr. Bennagen clarified that language does not come fully-bloomed at a particular point in time but it is something dynamic and ever growing. He pointed out that in Malaysia, the national language called Bahasa Malaysia was proposed in 1957 but was used as a medium of instruction up to the tertiary level only in 1973.

He affirmed that Filipino should be developed on the basis of different languages that could be understood in all parts of the country in order to facilitate the economic growth.

INQUIRY OF MR. COLAYCO

In reply to Mr. Colayco's query on the difference between Pilipino and Filipino, Mr. Villacorta explained that Filipino is an expansion of Pilipino, and it is the lingua franca that has naturally evolved throughout the country based on Tagalog and other Philippine dialects and foreign languages.

Mr. Villacorta agreed with Mr. Colayco that Filipino would be more appropriate because it historically came from the word "Filipinas" which, in turn, was derived from "Felipe".

Mr. Colayco suggested that the Body substitute "Pilipino" with "Filipino", to which Messrs. Villacorta and Bennagen agreed since the latter term was the one retained by the Committee.

Mr. Bennagen explained that the Committee opted for Filipino with an "F", because it officially evolved through the improvement of Tagalog which has no letter "f", a fact which reflects the liberal move towards the adoption of other dialects into the emerging lingua franca. He stated that the Executive Council of the Language Educational Council of the Philippines, an association made up of twelve organizations of language scholars, fully supports the adoption of Filipino as the national language and as a medium of instruction.

In reply to the Chair's query whether the Body would vote on the new formulation of the first part of Section 1 proposed by Mr. Davide in the previous session, Mr. Rigos explained that during the Committee meeting, it was the consensus among the Members to stick to the Committee recommendation.

REMARKS OF MS. AQUINO

Ms. Aquino manifested that although she supports the Committee recommendation on the adoption of Filipino as the national language, she disagrees with Mr. Tadeo's perception and analysis on the underdevelopment of Filipino as a national language.

She opined that the reason given by Mr. Tadeo that Filipino, as a national language, was under-developed because of the government's indecision to adopt a policy to use it as a medium of instruction is not so much as the undercurrence of the historical baggage which was decisively and definitely imposed by the Spanish colonial masters. She pointed out that the Spaniards had implemented a divide-and-rule policy which they pursued by allowing the use of the dialects rather than teaching Filipinos Spanish. She urged that the government adopt a definite policy on the use of Filipino as a medium of instruction rather than wait for the Institute of National Language to come up with a pronouncement that it has devised a language that is best suited to the temper and aspirations of the Filipinos. She stressed that adaptation and growth through a developmental process is the law of language.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF MR. RAMA

At this juncture, Mr. Rama proposed, as an amendment to Mr. Davide's proposal, to reword Section 1 as follows: THE NATIONAL LANGUAGE OF THE PHILIPPINES IS FILIPINO. IT SHALL EVOLVE AND BE FURTHER DEVELOPED AND ENRICHED ON THE BASIS OF THE EXISTING PHILIPPINE AND OTHER LANGUAGES.

In reply to Mr. Davide's query whether the Committee, which had accepted his proposal during the previous session, has changed its position and decided to pursue its original proposal, Mr. Rigos replied in the affirmative. In addition, Mr. Villacorta explained that Mr. Rama's proposal merely broke into two sentences the Committee recommendation.

In reply to Mr. Davide's query, Mr. Rama affirmed that existing Philippine languages refer to the native regional languages while "other languages" may refer to foreign languages.

Mr. Davide accepted the amendment.

Mr. Villacorta also accepted the amendment. However, he rejected the proposal to delete the rest Of the sentences in the section. He requested for voting on Mr. Rama's proposal and asked that the Committee be allowed to submit for voting the rest Of the sentences in Section 1.

REMARKS OF MR. RODRIGO

Speaking in favor of Mr. Rama's proposal, Mr. Rodrigo stated that Filipino is not a new language but one based on Pilipino which, in turn, was the result of the 1935 Constitutional provision mandating Congress to develop a national language based on one of the native languages. He explained that Pilipino elicited resistance because the Surian ng Wikang Pambansa, headed by the late Lope K. Santos, opted for "purism" in language rather than allowed the use of about 10,000 words based on Spanish like libro, sapatos, pantalon and bintana. He stated that because of the policy of "purism", Surian invented new words like balarila, talatinigan, talasalitaan and salumpuwit which could have been more easily understood in their original form gramatika, diksionaryo,

bokabularyo and silya. He pointed out, however, that the word salumpuwit did not come from Mr. Santos but from others.

Mr. Rodrigo also stated that Pilipino removed some letters of the alphabet like f, j, q, v and z and changed c with K with some funny and somewhat embarrassing results in view of which it was substituted with Filipino. For these reasons, he reiterated support for Filipino as the national language.

At this juncture, Mr. Rama explained that he proposed the deletion of the rest of the sentences in Section 1, the national language issue being a very emotional one. He then stated the premises for his proposed amendment, namely, 1) the country must have a national language which is Filipino; and 2) there are many Filipinos who do not know how to speak Filipino and its immediate use as the medium of instruction would place non-Filipino speaking students at a handicap as against those who speak Tagalog. He added that although Cebuanos contend that there are more Filipinos who speak Cebuano, it cannot be the national language because of the 50 year head start for Filipino. He underscored that national unity is more important than the language issue.

In addition, Mr. Tingson stated that language should unite rather than divide the country. He expressed support for the formulation of Filipino as a national language and as a mixture of all the other dialects and for the deletion of the rest of the sentences in Section 1.

Reacting thereto, Mr. Villacorta manifested that the Committee had already accepted Mr. Rama's proposal but that it should also be given a chance to present the rest of its recommendation on Section 1.

Mr. Rama explained that although he proposed the deletion of the rest of Section 1, the Committee could still argue for its retention. He pointed out, however, that the objectives set forth in Section 1 could be gradually achieved in the future.

Mr. Monsod pressed for a vote on the two proposed sentences stating that the issues had been joined.

Speaking against the deletion, Ms. Aquino stated that language is a process of growth and its development even under the best and most ideal circumstances takes time. She stressed that no time should be wasted in adopting and using one language as the medium of instruction, whatever its imperfections, otherwise, all hypocrisy must stop with the adoption of English as the medium of instruction.

AMENDMENT OF MR. RAMA

Mr. Rama read his proposed amendment as modified by Mr. Bernas, as follows:

THE NATIONAL LANGUAGE OF THE PHILIPPINES IS FILIPINO. IT SHALL BE ALLOWED TO EVOLVE AND BE FURTHER DEVELOPED AND ENRICHED ON THE BASIS OF THE EXISTING PHILIPPINE AND OTHER LANGUAGES.

He explained that Mr. Bernas inserted BE ALLOWED TO between "shall" and "evolve".

Retracting from his previous stand, Mr. Sarmiento expressed support for the Committee's formulation to use "is" instead of "shall be", which he proposed in the previous session.

Mr. Rigos reiterated Mr. Monsod's suggestion to vote first on the two proposed sentences as amended by Mr. Bernas without prejudice to further discussions on lines 3 to 10.

Mr. Villacorta, speaking on behalf of the Committee, did not accept the amendment on the ground that the modification of Mr. Bernas would water down the intention.

Reacting thereto, Mr. Bernas clarified that his proposal would delete "evolve" because evolution is not legislated.

Mr. Ople, however, argued that the term recognizes the fact that the people themselves have the right to shape their own language outside the frame work of the Constitution or law. He stressed that it is the role of law to further develop these languages.

Mr. Villacorta reiterated that the Committee favors the phrase IT SHALL EVOLVE and objects to IT SHALL BE ALLOWED TO EVOLVE, to which Mr. Ople expressed support, and to which Mr. Rama acceded.

Upon suggestion of Mr. Sarmiento, and there being no objection, the Body decided to vote on the two proposed sentences separately.

Thereupon, the first sentence was submitted to a vote, and with 43 Members voting in favor, and none against, the same was approved by the Body.

Mr. Rama read his second proposed sentence as follows:

AS IT SHALL EVOLVE AND BE FURTHER DEVELOPED AND ENRICHED ON THE BASIS OF THE EXISTING PHILIPPINE AND OTHER LANGUAGES.

Mr. Azcuna proposed AS IT EVOLVES in lieu of "it shall evolve", which Mr. Rama and the Committee accepted.

In reply to Mr. Suarez' query on the significance and thrust of the term "evolve" in relation to "develop" and "enrich", Mr. Ople, as the author thereof, explained that it is an acknowledgment of the historical fact that languages evolve according to the people's preferences, independent of what the lawmakers may legislate.

Mr. Suarez observed that the first sentence is a declarative positive statement declaring Filipino as the national language for which he would like to be clarified.

Reacting thereto, Mr. Bennagen stated that Filipino as a national language is still growing, to which Mr. Ople agreed.

Mr. Rama read his proposed sentence as modified by Mr. Azcuna, to wit:

AS IT EVOLVES, IT SHALL BE FURTHER DEVELOPED AND ENRICHED ON THE BASIS OF EXISTING PHILIPPINE AND OTHER LANGUAGES.

Submitted to a vote and with 44 Members voting in favor and none against, the same was approved by the Body.

REMARKS OF MR. VILLACORTA

Mr. Villacorta, on behalf of the Committee, supported the position of Ms. Aquino that the approach in the development of the national language should not be hermaphroditic. He stated that experiences here and abroad have shown that a national language is useless if it is not used as the medium of instruction and official communication. He stated that the people remain semi-literate and ignorant about scientific concepts, skills and principles because science and technology are usually written and transmitted in the English language.

On the fate of the English language, Mr. Villacorta stated that it shall be maintained as a second language because it is a bridge to the outside world, and that it shall be an alternate medium of instruction.

On the regional languages, he stated that they shall serve as auxiliary media of instruction in recognition of their historical and literary significance. He stated that this would serve as a guideline for the MECS to formulate a scheme for regional languages to be used extensively by lower levels of education.

At this juncture, the Chair suggested Consideration of the different sentences separately. However Mr. Rama

stated that there was an anterior amendment to delete all the words starting with "step on line 3 up to "law" on line 10.

Mrs. Quesada stated that lines, 1, 2 and 3 are important because they contain the intention to concretize the adoption and use of a national language as the medium of instruction and official communication. She stressed that past Constitutions included the same provision but ended up as plain rhetorics since it was not used in the day-to-day affairs of the people. She appealed to the Body not to put an end to this noble intention by voting against it because it will destroy the spirit of the Committee's pronouncements.

Mr. Bernas pointed out an apparent contradiction between Section 2 and lines 3, 4 and 5 of Section 3 stating that the former already declares Filipino as the official language while the latter provide that steps be taken to make it an official language.

Mr. Villacorta took note of the observation stating that the Committee is open to suggestions.

REMARKS OF MR. BERNAS

Mr. Bernas stated that he supports the deletion of lines 3 to 10. He suggested that each sentence be considered one after the other because of the many concepts included therein.

Commenting on the remarks of Mr. Bernas, Mr. Bennagen stated that Section 2 merely underscores the status of Filipino and English as official languages. He reiterated the observations made by Mrs. Quesada.

Mr. Ople stated that the draft provision is not an empty rhetoric because it would settle the long nagging problem of the Filipino people, for which the Committee deserves credit.

Mr. Ople suggested the clause **AS MAY BE APPROPRIATE AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAW, STEPS SHALL BE TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT TO USE IT AS A MEDIUM OF COMMUNICATION IN ALL BRANCHES OF THE GOVERNMENT AND THE LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION AT ALL LEVELS OF THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM** to ease the doubts of those who want to delete lines 3-10. He reasoned that this would be a mandate, the implementation of which Congress would have to determine.

Mr. Villacorta, in reply, noted that the phrase "as may be appropriate and in accordance with law" would be a surplusage inasmuch as it is implicit in the Committee proposal that Congress and other government agencies shall take the necessary steps.

Reacting thereto, Mr. Ople stated that he has no difficulty in accepting the Committee formulation but would defer to the reservations of some Members.

REMARKS OF MR. VILLACORTA

Mr. Villacorta observed that Section 3, Article XIV of the 1935 Constitution stated, "The Congress shall, take steps towards the development and adoption of a common national language based on one of the existing native languages" although the steps taken to develop Filipino as the medium of instruction were not adequate. He noted that Section 3(2), Article XV of the 1973 Constitution stated: "The National Assembly shall take steps towards the development and formal adoption of a common national language to be known as "Filipino" although hardly anything significant was done by the government to develop Filipino.

He noted that the Committee formulation used "steps shall be taken" which is more forthright in the sense that the Committee does not merely talk of steps to be taken in developing the national language but in using it to reinforce that language as a medium of instruction and communication. He underscored that the development of a

national language becomes empty unless it is used as a medium of instruction as borne out by the experiences of Malaysia and Indonesia. He informed that the national language became meaningful in these two countries when they developed Bahasa Malaysia in Malaysia and Bahasa Indonesia in Indonesia which languages were used in comedies, shows, newspapers, the school system and government.

REMARKS OF MR. OPLE

Apropos the statement of Mr. Villacorta, Mr. Ople noted that he was right in pointing out to the relatively successful approaches in these two countries which have followed a course which was adapted to their own unique historical circumstances. In the case of Malaysia, he observed that there was no problem inasmuch as the Malay language was common and universal to almost all of the Malayan states that later on were joined by Sabah and Sarawak in the Malaysia Federation of 1963. The historical equivalent in the Philippines, he noted, would be if Filipinos spoke Tagalog from north to south. Mr. Ople recalled that in the case of Malaysia, when Sukarno launched the Independence Movement in 1927, one of the main items in his platform for Indonesian independence was the designation of Malay as the core Language which evolved as the Bahasa Indonesia. In 1945, Mr. Ople noted, the Philippines and Indonesia had exactly opposite experiences. He stated that at that time the Dutch rule in Indonesia was ending and the Dutch language, as an official language in Indonesia, had lost importance while in the Philippines, English was just rising to the fore as the lingua franca. He noted that the burden on the Filipinos for developing a national language was a hundred fold greater than in the case of the Indonesians and Malaysians. He maintained that the evolution of the national language should not be deplored inasmuch as the policy thereon has not been a failure and that past governments should be given some credit for having brought the Filipinos this far in their search for a national language. Thereupon, he reiterated his proposal to insert the clause "as may be appropriate and in accordance with law" to satisfy the concerns of Members who would seek to delete the succeeding sentences on the ground that the first sentence of Section 1 already accomplishes the aim of the Commission.

REMARKS OF MR. MONSOD

In support of the motion to delete and as one of the proponents thereof, Mr. Monsod stated that the big difference between the 1973 Constitution and the Constitution being framed is that the former provides for "steps to adopt a common national language to be known as Pilipino" while the latter is adopting it. He informed that the proponents sought the deletion because the sentences seem to make a distinction between a primary and secondary medium of instruction and communication whereas Section 2 speaks of Filipino and English as official languages, thus the inconsistency. He noted that the implications of adopting a national language are already understood and that the implications of Section 2 are all encompassing. He added that in the latter Section; there is no distinction between primary and supplementary language because both are needed and it would be to the advantage of the Filipinos to be bilingual.

REMARKS OF MR. SUAREZ

Mr. Suarez opposed the motion to delete lines 3 to 10 and observed that five gut issues involving national language are contained therein, namely: 1) determining the medium of communication; 2) the language of instruction; 3) auxiliary media of instruction; 4) a second language; and 5) an alternative medium of instruction. He stated that the issues should be ventilated and debated upon instead of being deleted. He noted that although the point raised by Mr. Monsod that lines 3 to 10 are already covered by Section 1 is understood, it would still be a matter of appreciation on the part of the Members.

In reply, the Chair stated that the Body is in fact discussing the merits of the Committee report, specifically

whether or not to delete the particular sentences and that the Members have been, allowed to speak for and against it.

REMARKS OF MR. BENNAGEN

Mr. Bennagen manifested that the Committee would insist on retaining the specific provisions that steps shall be taken by the government to implement the essence of the first sentence. He noted that it is in the same spirit that the Committee accepted the more concrete proposal of Mr. Ople, et al on the amendment with respect to teachers.

He argued that the first sentence of Section 1 provides the essence of the provision but in view of the sad experience in the development and use of the national language, the Committee felt it necessary to incorporate the subsequent sentences to emphasize the intent and put more flesh in the first sentence.

Thereupon, he adverted to one of the studies given to the Committee by the "Multi-Ethnic Citizens Committee for CON-COM Resolution No. 286" which lists down what the Institute of National Language has done to develop the national language, to wit:

1)

In 1940, after five years of the 1935 Constitution, the Institute of National Language(INL) published the "The National Language — English Vocabulary", using pure Tagalog;

2)

In 1950, 15 years after the 1935 Constitution he said publication had its fourth printing but did not contain any non-Tagalog dialectal word;

3)

In 1960, 25 years after the 1935 Constitution, 13,000 copies of the English-Tagalog Dictionary was published but did not contain any other language;

4)

In 1977, 42 years after the 1935 Constitution and 4 years after the 1973 Constitution, the "Talahulugang Pilipino-English" was released by the Bureau of Printing. In the same year, the English-Tagalog Dictionary by Fr. Ingles had its first printing and was approved for use in public and private schools;

5)

In 1985, 50 years after the 1935 Constitution and 12 years after the 1973 Constitution, the English-Tagalog Dictionary by Fr. Ingles had its ninth printing and the INL gave him a citation for excellence.

Mr. Bennagen observed that in spite of all the intentions and proposals, not much was done to develop a national language. Thereafter, he quoted Dr. Bonifacio Sibayan, a linguist, former President of the Philippine Normal College and former President of the Philippine Linguistic Society who said: "Filipinos can handle anything if we will put our minds to it. The trouble is we really have not done so, for we have practically not invested any money in the development of the language." He underscored that the sentences in question would accelerate the use of a national language in government, commerce and industry and in education.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

The Chair suspended the session.

It was 12:41 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 3:05 p.m., the session was resumed.

Upon resumption of session, Mr. Romulo stated that the pending motion was to delete parts of Section 1. However, he again requested for a short suspension in anticipation of a compromise.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

Thereupon, the Chair suspended the session.

It was 3:06 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 3:18 p.m., the session was resumed.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION TO DELETE

Upon resumption, Mr. Monsod manifested that in view of the compromise provision arrived at, he was withdrawing his motion to delete parts of Section

PROPOSED COMPROMISE AMENDMENT

Thereupon, Mr. Villacorta presented the following formulation;

SUBJECT TO PROVISIONS OF LAW AND AS CONGRESS MAY DEEM APPROPRIATE, THE GOVERNMENT SHALL TAKE STEPS TO INITIATE AND SUSTAIN ITS USE AS A MEDIUM OF OFFICIAL COMMUNICATION AND AS LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION IN THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM. THE REGIONAL LANGUAGES SHALL SERVE AS AUXILIARY MEDIA OF INSTRUCTION IN THEIR RESPECTIVE REGIONS.

Mr. Villacorta stated that Messrs. Ople, Monsod, Colayco, Ms. Aquino, Messrs. Romulo, Rama, Bengzon, Regalado, Tingson, Natividad and Abubakar are coauthors of the amendment in addition to the Committee members.

In reply to Mr. Monsod's query, Mr. Villacorta agreed that the amendment would not preclude the use of English as a medium of instruction or as a language of communication.

MR. OPLE'S AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT

Mr. Ople proposed to change the words "its use" to THE USE OF FILIPINO, which Mr. Villacorta accepted.

MR. DE CASTRO'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT

Mr. de Castro likewise proposed to change the word "language" to MEDIUM, to which Mr. Villacorta replied that the Committee on Style could take care of it.

INQUIRY OF MR. SARMIENTO

In reply to Mr. Sarmiento's inquiry on the meaning of the phrase "subject to provisions of law and as Congress may deem appropriate", Mr. Ople stated that while the mandate for the use of Filipino as the national language may now be considered categorical, the phrase would make sure that the budgetary requirements and pace of implementation of this mandate are determined by the lawmakers more carefully in the future. He maintained that

the phrase would not constitute a redundancy but could help forge a compromise amendment for which the Commission would hopefully vote as one.

Mr. Sarmiento stated that he has nothing against the first two lines; however, the first line would cover both, so that Congress may be left to enact budgetary measures, in reply to which Mr. Ople stated that existing laws would continue to be effective as long as they are consistent with the constitutional provision.

INQUIRY OF MR. DAVIDE

In reply to Mr. Davide's query, Mr. Treñas agreed that the phrase “subject to provisions of law and as Congress may deem appropriate” would refer only to what are included in the first sentence and not to the second sentence on regional languages as auxiliary media of instruction. He, likewise, affirmed that regional languages, as auxiliary media of instruction, could actually be the primary media pending the enactment of a law on the use of Filipino as the medium of instruction and, in the event such law is enacted, the regional languages shall go hand in hand with Filipino as a medium of instruction. He stressed that regional languages cannot in any way be supplanted by Filipino as the only medium of instruction in the regional level.

REMARKS OF MR. MONSOD

At this juncture, Mr. Monsod clarified that Filipino would not preclude the use of English, and that regional languages would in any case be the auxiliary media of instruction.

INQUIRY OF MR. SUAREZ

In reply to Mr. Suarez' query, Mr. Villacorta affirmed that there would be three media of instruction, namely, 1) Filipino as the principal medium; 2) English as the second official language of instruction; and 3) regional languages as auxiliary media of instruction.

On the application of such formulation, Mr. Bennagen explained that from Grade I to Grade IV, the regional language may be the primary language with either Filipino or English as auxiliary languages, although at this point English could be taught as a subject in school. He stated that as the language develops, the national language could take over, with English still offered as a subject, although with some variations, giving rise to the possibility that Filipino would then become the primary language with the regional languages as auxiliary and English as a subject.

Mr. Suarez observed that the intent of the Committee was not accurately reflected in the wordings of line 2, in reply to which Mr. Bennagen stated that the first three years may be the period for developing full capability, in terms of technical capability of teachers as well as availability of instructional materials.

In view thereof, Mr. Suarez suggested a reformulation of the wordings of the last line along the intent of the Committee.

On whether the provision on regional languages as auxiliary media of instruction is self-executory, Mr. Treñas opined that it is.

Thereupon, Mr. Suarez suggested that the Committee review the phrasing of the provision.

REMARKS OF MR. OPLE

Mr. Ople opined that viewing it realistically, the provision could only be implemented if there are teachers, instructional materials and the necessary budgets provided at the local and national levels so that the regional language as an auxiliary language in that region could become meaningful as a medium of instruction.

REMARKS OF MR. MONSOD

Mr. Monsod expressed the view that the wording of the provision is clear that Filipino would be developed fully as a medium of instruction and official communication. He stated that in the interpellations, it was amply pointed out that Filipino would not supplant but would coexist with English. He stressed that the reason for this mandate is to prevent the repetition of the past experience when Filipino was left behind and was never developed.

Mr. Monsod further explained that nothing in the provision could be interpreted to mean that the regional language would become the primary medium of instruction or communication in the regions because it would always be an auxiliary to Filipino and English. He stressed that the mandate is clear and the Body should not put interpretations that are not in the letter of the provision.

Replying thereto, Mr. Treñas reiterated that precisely it is the stand of the Committee that the provision should be interpreted as worded.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF MR. DE LOS REYES

Relative to the first sentence thereof, Mr. de los Reyes proposed the deletion of the words "Subject to provisions of law and as Congress may provide" and to substitute the words SUBJECT TO WHAT CONGRESS MAY DEEM APPROPRIATE in order that there would be no double statement of law, to which Mr. Villacorta replied that the phrase "subject to provisions of law" would refer, to existing laws and rules and regulations issued by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports.

Mr. Ople stated that he would prefer the wording of the provision as already formulated by the Committee.

Mr. Villacorta asked that the Body vote on the proposal.

RESTATEMENT OF THE PROPOSAL

Upon request of Mr. Davide, Mr. Villacorta restated the final proposal, to wit:

SUBJECT TO PROVISIONS OF LAW AND AS CONGRESS MAY DEEM APPROPRIATE, THE GOVERNMENT SHALL TAKE STEPS TO INITIATE AND SUSTAIN THE USE OF FILIPINO AS A MEDIUM OF OFFICIAL COMMUNICATION AND AS LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION OF THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM. THE REGIONAL LANGUAGES SHALL SERVE AS AUXILIARY MEDIA OF INSTRUCTION IN THE RESPECTIVE REGIONS.

SUGGESTION OF MR. PADILLA

Mr. Padilla suggested that the Body vote on the first sentence because the second sentence may have direct connection with Section 2 of the Committee in Report in the light of the Committee's reply to Mr. Suarez' questions that there are three possible languages, namely, Filipino, English and the regional languages.

Mr. Villacorta agreed with the suggestion that the Body vote only on the first sentence.

INQUIRIES OF MR. DE CASTRO

On Mr. de Castro's initial query, Mr. Villacorta affirmed that under the first sentence, Filipino would be used as the official language of communication in all branches of government on the understanding that Filipino could naturally evolve as a combination of Tagalog and other local dialects.

Mr. de Castro stated that the interpretation may not be valid because of the possibility that an official language of communication in the South, for instance, may not be understood in the central office, because there could be local dialects combined with Tagalog which the receiving end may not be familiar with, to which Mr. Villacorta replied that precisely the provision implies that Filipino would be standardized as a national language.

Additionally, Mr. Bennagen explained that what is envisioned in the provision is that the government should immediately start working on the standardization, expanding the vocabulary, standardizing the spelling and all appropriate measures that have to do with propagating Filipino.

On the final query of Mr. de Castro, Mr Villacorta affirmed that Section 2, even if ratified would not as yet be effective because it would still be subject to the provisions of law and as Congress may deem appropriate.

POINT OF CLARIFICATION OF MR. OPLE

Relative to the example cited by Mr. de Castro Mr. Ople pointed out that whenever the term "official communication" is used, this must satisfy the standard of accuracy, precision and perhaps clarity or lack of ambiguity, because, otherwise, it would not be a communication and the interest of public administration would be vitally affected.

RESTATEMENT AND APPROVAL OF THE FIRST SENTENCE

Mr. Villacorta restated the first sentence, to wit:

SUBJECT TO PROVISIONS OF LAW AND AS CONGRESS MAY DEEM APPROPRIATE, THE GOVERNMENT SHALL TAKE STEPS TO INITIATE AND SUSTAIN THE USE OF FILIPINO AS A MEDIUM OF OFFICIAL COMMUNICATION AND AS LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION OF THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.

Submitted to a vote, and with 37 Members voting favor and none against, the Body approved the first sentence.

RESTATEMENT OF THE SECOND SENTENCE

Mr. Villacorta restated the second sentence, to wit: THE REGIONAL LANGUAGES SHALL SERVE AS AUXILIARY MEDIA OF INSTRUCTION IN THE RESPECTIVE REGIONS.

SUGGESTION OF MR. PADILLA

Mr. Padilla suggested that the second sentence read by the Committee follow the first sentence of Section 2.

Upon inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Padilla affirmed that the second sentence should be transposed to Section 2 of the Committee Report.

On Mr. Rigos' inquiry, Mr. Padilla affirmed that should the said second sentence be approved, the second sentence of Section 2 could be deleted.

Mr. Rigos expressed preference to retaining it in the first section because it refers to the medium of instruction.

Mr. Padilla pointed out that if no mention is made of English, it might give an impression contrary to what had already been agreed that English may not be used as a medium of instruction, although, it is clear that with the first sentence it should be Filipino without prejudice to the use of English and the regional languages.

Upon inquiry of Mr. Rigos, Mr. Padilla affirmed that he would rather delete the second sentence of the first Section and amend the second sentence of Section 2. He stated that he just wanted to make clear in the Constitution that Filipino is the first preference as the national language without preventing the use of English and the regional languages.

Mr. Villacorta pointed out that during the interpellations, it was clearly stated that the Committee intends to maintain English as a second language.

Mr. Padilla pointed out that the sequence of the Section might give the wrong impression contrary to the accepted views that English may also be used not only as a medium of communication but also as a language of instruction.

Mr. Villacorta asked that the matter be put to a vote.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF MR. PADILLA

Mr. Padilla proposed to substitute the second sentence which reads “The regional languages are the auxiliary official languages in the respective regions”, with the following: THE REGIONAL LANGUAGES SHALL SERVE AS AUXILIARY MEDIA OF INSTRUCTION IN THEIR RESPECTIVE REGIONS.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

Upon request of Mr. Rodrigo, the Chair suspended the session.
It was 3:58 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 4:39 p.m., the session was resumed with the Honorable Adolfo S. Azcuna presiding.

Upon resumption, Mr. Villacorta read Section 2 as reformulated, to wit:

SECTION 2. THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES OF THE PHILIPPINES ARE FILIPINO AND ENGLISH, UNTIL OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY LAW. THE REGIONAL LANGUAGES ARE THE AUXILIARY OFFICIAL LANGUAGES IN THEIR RESPECTIVE REGIONS AND SHALL SERVE AS AUXILIARY MEDIA OF INSTRUCTION THEREIN.

He manifested that the proposal was formulated in cooperation with Messrs. Suarez, Padilla and Maambong.

Thereupon, Mr. Monsod proposed to insert the phrase FOR PURPOSES OF COMMUNICATION AND INSTRUCTION between "Philippines" and "are". He stated that this would reflect and clarify the intent of the Committee in Section 1.

Mr. Villacorta did not accept the amendment on the ground that 1) it would delimit the concept of official language; and 2) it has already been made clear that English would continue to be a second language.

Mr. Monsod, however, maintained that his proposal would remove any confusion or doubt on the role of English without looking into the Journal.

Mr. Villacorta contended, however, that what needs Constitutional protection is not English but Filipino, to which Mr. Monsod replied that Section 1 already categorically states the adoption of Filipino, its development and

propagation.

In reply to Mr. Ople's query whether the proposal is intended to make up for the loss of the sentence pertaining to English as a second language in Section 1, Mr. Monsod replied that he proposed the deletion of English in Section 1 in order to emphasize Filipino and, as a follow-up, he was proposing the amendment to clarify the roles of English and Filipino. He maintained that without the phrase "for purposes of communication and instruction", the role of English would be vague. He stressed that the proposed amendment would make explicit the role of English as a second language.

At this juncture, Mrs. Quesada stated that it is the Committee's intention to stress that English would only be an alternative medium of instruction because, if it were retained as another medium of instruction, it is possible that all instruction materials would still be written in English thereby hampering the growth and development of Filipino.

Thereupon, Mr. Rodrigo proposed to amend Mr. Monsod's amendment by rewording Section 2 to read: THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES OF THE PHILIPPINES ARE FILIPINO AND ENGLISH, BOTH OF WHICH SHALL BE MEDIA OF INSTRUCTION, UNTIL OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY LAW.

Mr. Monsod accepted the amendment. He then pointed out that Mrs. Quesada's remarks on the discontinuance of the use of English materials contradicts the Committee's earlier position in reply to which, Mrs. Quesada explained that what she said was that the use and development of materials written in Filipino should be encouraged if it is going to be adopted as the medium of instruction.

Mr. Monsod stated that the matter should be clarified once and for all.

Mr. Rodrigo asked for a vote on his proposal.

At this juncture, Mr. Rigos pointed out that Mr. Monsod's proposal would repeat in Section 2 what had already been stated in Section 1.

Mr. Monsod maintained, however, that Section 1 is a mandate for Congress to take steps to initiate and sustain Filipino as a medium of instruction and communication whereas Section 2 merely reiterates the coexistent role of Filipino and English as media of communication and instruction

In reply to Mr. Davide's query whether the proposal would be inconsistent with the amendments proposed by Mr. Ople jointly with other Members, Mr. Monsod stated that there would be no inconsistency because the phrase "subject to provisions of law and as Congress may deem appropriate" refers to the government taking steps to initiate and sustain Filipino as a medium of instruction and communication.

Mr. Davide stated that there is, in fact, an inconsistency because Section 1 only mandates Congress to take steps to initiate and sustain the use of Filipino as the official language of communication and instruction whereas under the proposal, unless otherwise provided by law, both English and Filipino shall be the official languages of communication and instruction.

Mr. Monsod stated that his proposal was intended merely to clarify the coexistence of English and Filipino and that the phrase "unless otherwise provided by law" is in the Committee's original formulation.

At this juncture, Mr. Ople pointed out that after giving Filipino pride a place in Section 1 there would now be symmetry between it and English in Section 2, to which Mr. Monsod replied that perhaps it would become clearer if the first sentence should read: "The official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and English, until otherwise provided by law" and the second sentence to read: ENGLISH SHALL BE MAINTAINED AS A MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION, UNTIL OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY LAW.

Mr. Ople opined that the formulation would lose symmetry because then Filipino would rank higher than English.

Mr. Rodrigo withdrew his proposal.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

Upon request of Mr. Villacorta, the Chair suspended the session.

It was 5:00 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 5:05 p.m., the session was resumed.

Upon resumption of session, Mr. Monsod stated that the reformulation of the provision which retains the Committee's formulation adding at the beginning his proposed amendment reads: FOR PURPOSES OF COMMUNICATION AND INSTRUCTION, THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES OF THE PHILIPPINES ARE FILIPINO AND ENGLISH, UNTIL OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY LAW:

Mr. Villacorta stated that Mr. Azcuna's reformulation reads: THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES OF THE PHILIPPINES ARE FILIPINO AND UNTIL OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY LAW, ENGLISH.

Mr. Davide remarked that there would still be an inconsistency because both Filipino and English would be the official languages of communication and the medium of instruction, while under Mr Ople's amendment, Filipino would not be so, until Congress provides otherwise and the government takes steps to initiate and sustain its use as such.

He stated that it was for this reason that he agreed with the formulation presented by Mr. Ople by way of an amendment to the Rodrigo amendment.

Mr. Nollado pointed out that there is no income inconsistency since the first part subjects the development of Filipino as a national language to the existing provisions of the law or to the will of Congress while the second part expresses clearly that Filipino shall be an official language. He stated that it could not be denied that English is still used as the medium of instruction for which reason the phrase reads: UNTIL OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY LAW, ENGLISH

Mr. Treñas manifested that Mr. Nollado's arguments and the formulation of Mr. Azcuna were adopted by the Committee as modified by the amendment of Mr. Monsod to read as follows: FOR PURPOSES OF COMMUNICATION AND INSTRUCTION THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES OF THE PHILIPPINES ARE FILIPINO AND UNTIL OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY LAW, ENGLISH.

Mr. Monsod accepted the reformulation but remarked that the language does not sound like correct English. He suggested that the matter be referred to the Committee on Style.

Submitted to a vote, and with 38 Members voting in favor and none against, the Body approved Mr. Monsod's amendment, subject to restyling by the Committee on Style.

AMENDMENT OF MR. PADILLA

Mr. Romulo manifested that the Body vote on Mr. Padilla's amendment on the second sentence of Section 2 which was accepted by the Committee.

Mr. Villacorta restated the formulation co-authored by Messrs. Suarez, Padilla and Maambong as follows: THE

REGIONAL LANGUAGES ARE THE AUXILIARY OFFICIAL LANGUAGES IN THEIR RESPECTIVE REGIONS AND SHALL SERVE AS AUXILIARY MEDIA OF INSTRUCTION THEREIN.

Mr. Maambong invited Attention to the fact that the first line should read IN THE REGIONS and not "their respective regions", which Mr. Villacorta accepted.

Submitted to a vote, and with 37 Members voting in favor and none against, the Body approved the amendment of Messrs. Padilla, Suarez and Maambong.

AMENDMENT OF MESSRS. RODRIGO AND OPLE

Mr. Rodrigo, on his own and on behalf of Mr. Ople, proposed to add a third sentence in Section 2 to read: THE GOVERNMENT SHALL PROMOTE SPANISH AS A HISTORICAL LEGACY ON A VOLUNTARY AND OPTIONAL BASIS.

In reply to Mr. Guingona's query whether the proposal would restrict or prohibit the government from compelling the teaching of Spanish in educational institutions, Mr. Rodrigo answered in the negative.

In support of the proposed amendment, Mr. Tingson stated that the historical legacy of the country inextricably includes the Spanish language. He stated that Jose Rizal studied the Spanish language as the medium of instruction and that his works, *El Filibusterismo* and *Noli Me Tangere*, were originally written in Spanish. He stated that the country's history is mostly written in the Spanish language which is still an integral part of the national spirit.

Mr. Alonto proposed to amend Messrs. Rodrigo's and Ople's amendment to include Arabic and Malay, to which Mr. Rodrigo stated that he is not in a position to decide since he is not acquainted with Arabic and Malay.

Explaining his proposed amendment, Mr. Alonto stated that Malay is the basic language that has influenced the progress and culture of the Filipino people and is the language of the Malayo-Polynesian race to which the different sectors and tribes of the country belong.

On Arabic, Mr. Alonto stated that it was the first foreign language that found its way to Philippine shores and which greatly influenced the development of Philippine culture and civilization. He cited examples of such influence in the words *kuya* and *ate* which were derived from the Arabic words *akhuya* and *okhte* which mean elder brother and sister.

At this juncture, Mr. Ople stated that although he and Mr. Rodrigo accepted the merit of Mr. Alonto's proposal to recognize the historic importance and relevance of the Malay and Arabic languages, it should be located as a separate sentence in the other parts of the provision on languages. He then inquired whether Mr. Alonto would be amenable to incorporating the concept in another sentence so that the Body could provide for the promotion of the use of Arabic and Malay as optional languages in appropriate regions, to which Mr. Alonto replied that Arabic is also an accepted international language in the United Nations and, therefore, it should be classified at par with Spanish.

The Chair observed that the proposal is a third degree amendment, in view of which, it sought the reaction of the Committee on the matter, to which Mr. Villacorta replied that Arabic should be included because of its historic legacy but Malay could not be included because it is a foreign language.

On the Chair's query whether the Committee was accepting Mr. Rodrigo's amendment, Mr. Villacorta stated that the Committee was accepting the amendments of Messrs. Rodrigo, Ople and Alonto.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

Upon request of Mr. Ople, the Chair suspended the session.

It was 5:32 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 5:36 p.m., the session was resumed.

Mr. Villacorta informed that the Committee, after conferring with the main proponents, had accepted the reformulation of the second sentence of Section 2, to read: THE STATE SHALL PROMOTE SPANISH AND ARABIC ON A VOLUNTARY AND OPTIONAL BASIS.

REMARKS OF MS. AQUINO

Ms. Aquino took exception to Mr. Rodrigo's proposal for lack of basis. She noted that the proponent invoked historical legacy as the basis for a mandate to the State to promote Spanish. She opined, however, that the only historical legacy which can be derived from Spain is one of exploitation and oppression. She inquired why it should be provided in the Constitution when the Body is not prohibited from adopting Spanish as an optional course in schools.

She observed that the absence of Spanish culture in the Philippines militates against the facility with which the Filipinos could assimilate Spanish as a language and would be the single strongest obstacle for Spanish to capture popular imagination and consciousness. She added that the absence of such culture would deny a bedrock upon which Spanish could flourish. She maintained that the Body is not bound to address this problem or even apologize for it. She noted, moreover, that Spanish has been known as the language of exploitation and has been associated with the very rich and with the Filipino acolytes of the Spanish conquistadores during the Spanish colonial period.

REMARKS OF MR. PADILLA

Mr. Padilla, speaking in Spanish, expressed support for the Rodrigo-Ople amendment, which upon request of Mrs. Quesada, was translated into Filipino by Mr. Rodrigo.

Mr. Rodrigo stated that Mr. Padilla remarked that many benefits were derived from Spain such as the Civil Code and the Penal Code and that many heroes wrote in Spanish, among them our national hero, Dr. Jose Rizal, who wrote *Noli Me Tangere* and *El Filibusterismo*, and his poems in Spanish, *Mi Retiro* and *Ultimo Adios*. He noted that Mr. Padilla observed that being knowledgeable in Spanish would tremendously help lawyers understand Manresa's commentaries on the Civil Code and Viada's commentaries on the Penal Code which are written in Spanish.

REMARKS OF MR. OPLE

Commenting on the "powerful objections" of Ms. Aquino to the Rodrigo-Ople Amendment, Mr. Ople stated that nobody can deny that 350 years of Spanish colonialism in the Philippines was ruthless, oppressive and exploitative. He noted that a good part of the world went through the ordeal of colonialism and that the discrimination between Spanish and American colonialism would be open to question in the sense that both were colonialisms. He observed that in the case of the Spaniards, they denied the Filipinos the opportunity to learn the Spanish language which derives a lot from Arabic. He adverted to Rizal's famous letter to the women of Malolos congratulating them for establishing a school to teach Spanish over the objections of the local Spanish officials

and priests.

In the case of the Americans, he stated, they were more sophisticated and projected a sort of altruism. He stated that Mss Aquino criticized Spanish colonialism but apparently spared American colonialism.

Mr. Ople observed that the Philippines owes its territorial integrity to Spain and the United States by virtue of the 1898 Treaty of Paris, noting that prior to the treaty there was just a string of human settlements and that the most advanced structure then was in Jolo where a Sultanate existed. He also noted that a confederation of villages was just being set up in Manila.

Spanish, Mr. Ople stated, is an emerging world language and that by the year 2000 some 20 countries in Latin America shall rise to the level of OECD to become industrialized. He stated that there are some countries in Latin America on the Pacific reef with which the future generation can engage in mutually profitable and lucrative international trade and that knowledge of the Spanish language would help.

Mr. Ople noted that Arabic is likewise an emergent world language and is one of the official languages of the United Nations. He observed that at this time when permanent bonds of unity with Muslim Mindanao are being forged and considering that the Article on Local Governments has provided for autonomy for Muslim Mindanao, the appeal of Mr. Alonto could not be spurned.

REMARKS OF MR. RAMA

Mr. Rama stated that Ms. Aquino's simple and emotional arguments could not be left unanswered. He noted that Ms. Aquino's contention that Spain's legacy to the Philippines was one of oppression could also mean rejecting the Catholic religion which is a great Spanish legacy. He stressed that the negative aspects should be separated from the positive. He stated that Spanish ranks second among World languages and that even the nationalist Senator Recto urged the study of Spanish as a historical legacy.

REJOINDER OF MS. AQUINO

Ms. Aquino stated that she does not lay claim to being a self-proclaimed nationalist or the archangel of Filipino or Tagalog. She stated that she appreciates the salutary effects of El Filibusterismo and Noli Me Tangere but maintained that she does not have to learn foreign languages to know and understand the works of great writers. She noted that culture is an organic thing and that there could not be a reference to a Spanish culture in the Philippines. On the matter of discrimination against English, she noted that it would be unfair to judge her as having a double standard in looking at English and Spanish and their histories and cultures. She stressed that Filipinos do not know Spanish well enough to acquit themselves creditably. She noted that there is something wrong with trying to manifest intelligence in a foreign language which was deliberately denied the Filipinos by the Spaniards themselves.

EXPLANATION OF MR. VILLACORTA

Mr. Villacorta manifested the Committee's support of the amendment of Mr. Alonto. He stated the criteria for singling out the two languages, namely, 1) the historic value of the two languages; 2) the worldwide importance of the two languages given the country's close relations with Spain, the Latin American countries and the Arab countries.

On the first ground, Mr. Villacorta disagreed with the observation of Mr. Ople that Spain was responsible for the Philippines having been elevated to the status of a nation from a group or a string of settlements, pointing out that historians are agreed that had Spain not arrived in the Philippines or had its arrival been delayed by 25 years, the

Philippines would have been one solid and unified Muslim nation. He supported Mr. Bennagen's statement that it was the struggle of the people that made them one nation and not the colonization by a foreign country. However, he also disagreed with Ms. Aquino's contention that Spain had no significant impact on Philippine culture. He stated that the fact that most Filipinos carry Spanish names is proof that it did have an impact on the country's culture and identity and that cultural artifacts such as those found in churches, the architecture of Filipino homes in Christian lowland places, the languages as well as other examples would prove that Spain did have a significant influence, although not always positive. The same, he noted, would also hold true of Arabic.

INQUIRY OF MR. DAVIDE

Noting that an existing law provides that Spanish is one of the official languages until all the books in Spanish at the National Archives or National Library shall have been translated into the official Filipino or English language, Mr. Davide inquired what effect would the amendment, if approved, have on the law and whether Spanish would no longer be considered an official language.

Mr. Rodrigo replied that the amendment which reads "The government shall promote Spanish and Arabic" would not be inconsistent with that law and would not therefore repeal it. He added that Congress could repeal the law and make Spanish only optional. Mr. Rodrigo also affirmed that under the proposal, nothing can prevent Congress from continuing that law.

As to whether, under the proposal, nothing can prevent Congress from adopting Spanish as an official language even after it shall have repealed the existing law making Spanish an official language, Mr. Rodrigo replied that the constitutional provision is clear that English remains an official language, until otherwise provided by law. Furthermore, Mr. Rodrigo stated that the constitutional provision does not state that Spanish can be substituted for English. He noted that the constitutional provision would not be inconsistent with that law (a Presidential Decree) which shall continue to be enforced even after approval of the Constitution.

Upon inquiry, Mr. Davide affirmed that since the provision is not inconsistent with the Presidential Decree, Congress, even if it shall have repealed that Decree, may enact a law making Spanish an official language.

In relation with the autonomy provision which would allow the creation of a regional legislative body, Mr. Davide inquired whether the legislative body for Muslim Mindanao can mandate Arabic as a language of communication or medium of instruction within that region, making it regional language, mandatory in character. Mr. Rodrigo stated that it could, in addition to the official language provided in the Constitution.

As to whether it would not be in conflict with the proposed amendment promoting Arabic on a voluntary and optional basis, Mr. Rodrigo opined that it would be all right for the regional legislature to make Arabic compulsory in the same region.

Mr. Davide opined that it would not be all right because Arabic would only be optional and voluntary under the Article. To Mr. Rodrigo's remark that this would be nationwide, Mr. Davide pointed out that the Article on Autonomous Regions opens with a section which states that there shall be autonomous regions in Muslim Mindanao and in the Cordilleras, subject to the provisions of the 1986 Constitution and national law. He noted that all laws enacted by the autonomous region shall be subject to the provisions of the Constitution and that in view of the provisions making Arabic voluntary and optional, it would follow that the regional legislative body cannot mandate Arabic in Muslim Mindanao, as a compulsory language.

Mr. Alonto remarked that the legislative power granted to the autonomous region is specifically stated in the Constitution. He noted that the legislature of the autonomous region has no power to declare an official language for such region.

On Mr. Davide's further inquiry, Mr. Alonto stated that it was his understanding that the autonomous legislative body cannot enact a law making Arabic a compulsory language in Muslim Mindanao.

On the meaning of the phrase "voluntary and optional", Mr. Ople stated that the phrase does not preclude the Congress from repealing the compulsory teaching of Spanish as a general policy without prejudice to certain universities applying to the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports for such compulsory teaching with respect to subjects on which knowledge of Spanish is essential for the development of expertise as in the foreign service or law courses.

Mr. Ople agreed that insofar as the State is concerned, the use of a language is voluntary although an educational institution could make it compulsory in certain courses of study. He pointed out, however, that nothing would prevent the State from later setting up a Spanish academy, in which membership will be purely voluntary, which will propagate and develop Spanish in a systematic manner with or without State support. Mr. Ople also stated that there are many things that can be done on a voluntary and optional basis but the trauma of the Spanish past so eloquently depicted in the brief commentary of Ms. Aquino would probably be eliminated after lifting the burden on the students of having to learn Spanish by rote and compulsion, even if it has nothing to do with their plans for the rest of their lives.

In reply to Mr. Guingona's query, Mr. Ople stated that once the permission to offer specialized courses in Spanish is granted, compulsion could be imposed by both the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports and the school, assuming that the Ministry would have its own standards to govern cases of this nature.

Mr. Guingona, however, pointed out that educational institutions may offer elective courses for which, generally, a permit is not required from the Ministry. He then expressed confusion on the issue, stating that when he asked the cosponsor, Mr. Rodrigo, whether this particular provision would prohibit or restrict the government, through Congress or the Ministry, from imposing compulsory study of Spanish, the latter replied in the negative. In reply, Mr. Ople emphasized that the proponents of the amendment wanted to effectively promote Spanish rather than do it on a symbolic basis.

With respect to state colleges and universities, Mr. Ople stated that they would be governed by the same standards. He pointed out, however, that they could impose the compulsory teaching of Spanish as a subject based on existing and future laws. He further stated that the same would apply to private educational institutions although minimum standards would have to be maintained and enforced by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports.

AMENDMENT OF MR. MAAMBONG

Mr. Maambong proposed to substitute the phrase "The State shall promote Spanish and Arabic on a voluntary and optional basis" with **SPANISH AND ARABIC SHALL BE PROMOTED ON A VOLUNTARY AND OPTIONAL BASIS.**

Mr. Villacorta accepted the amendment.

Submitted to a vote, and with 31 Members voting in favor, 3 against and 2 abstentions, the amendment was approved by the Body.

At this juncture, Mr. Maambong manifested that there is a presidential decree recognizing Spanish as an official language pending the translation of documents in the Spanish language and, therefore, once said documents have been translated into the official Filipino and English languages, said presidential decree would be automatically repealed.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Thereafter, Mr. Villacorta moved to adjourn.

ADDITIONAL COAUTHORS

On motion of Mr. Rodrigo, Messrs. Rama, Laurel, Calderon, Jamir, Maambong, Monsod, Natividad, Tingson, Regalado and Bengzon were made co-authors of the original amendment.

MOTION OF MR. ROMULO

Thereupon, Mr. Romulo moved that the Body proceed to the next section.

The Chair, however, stated that the motion to adjourn takes precedence over any other motion. The Chair then submitted the motion for adjournment to a vote.

POINT OF INFORMATION

Mr. Sarmiento pointed out that it was not the Majority Floor Leader who moved for adjournment therefore, the motion was not in order, in reply to which the Chair stated that any Member could move for adjournment.

VOTING ON THE MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Thereafter, the Chair submitted the motion for adjournment to a vote, and with 16 Members voting in favor, 20 against and 1 abstention, the motion was lost.

AMENDMENT OF MR. JAMIR

On Section 3, Mr. Jamir proposed an amendment to add, after the word "languages", a comma (,) and the words ARABIC AND SPANISH.

Mr. Villacorta accepted the amendment.

Submitted to a vote, and with 31 Members voting in favor, 2 against and 1 abstention, the amendment was approved by the Body.

On motion of Mr. Jamir, Messrs. Rama, Laurel Rodrigo, Calderon, Maambong, Monsod, Ople Natividad, Tingson, Regalado and Bengzon were made cosponsors of the amendment.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF MR. PADILLA

Mr. Padilla proposed to transpose the word SPANISH before the words regional languages on the ground that Spanish, together with English, is one of the official languages.

Mr. Villacorta rejected the amendment on the ground that "regional languages" should take precedence over Spanish and Arabic.

Submitted to a vote, and with 4 Members voting in favor, 28 against and 1 abstention, the amendment was lost.

AMENDMENTS OF MR. DAVIDE

Mr. Davide proposed to insert the words SPOKEN BY MORE THAN FIFTY THOUSAND after the words "regional languages".

On a point of information, Mr. Ople stated that according to some language experts, a language could be considered as such if spoken by at least a million people.

Reacting thereto, Mr. Bennagen pointed out that the status of language as a category does not rest on the basis of population but on its structure, lexicon and grammar, so that even if the language is spoken by only 25 persons, if it could be understood by other groups, it has the status of a language.

Mr. Monsod suggested the insertion of the word MAJOR before "regional" and the deletion of the word "the".

Mr. Davide accepted the proposal, which the Committee, likewise, accepted on the understanding that this would not preclude further translation into other languages.

Submitted to a vote, and with 33 Members voting in favor and 1 against, the amendment was approved by the Body.

Likewise, Mr. Davide proposed to change the word "The" to THIS.

The Committee accepted the amendment.

Submitted to a vote, and with 34 Members voting in favor and none against, the amendment was approved by the Body.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF MR. SUAREZ

Mr. Suarez proposed to add the following sentence: IN CASE OF CONFLICT, THE FILIPINO TEXT SHALL PREVAIL.

Mr. Villacorta accepted the amendment.

Mr. Monsod, however, interposed an objection.

REMARKS OF MR. RODRIGO

Mr. Rodrigo stated that if he were to follow his feelings, he would vote in favor of the amendment however, his head is above his heart. He pointed out that all the debates in the deliberations have been in English and there are terms which are almost impossible to translate into Tagalog, in view of which, although his heart impelled him to vote for the amendment, his head told him that it was impractical.

As a rejoinder, Mr. Monsod stated that he could not understand why a translation would prevail over the original.

Thereupon, Mr. Ople asked Mr. Suarez to desist from pursuing his amendment by leaving the matter to the evolution of the Constitution and to the events in the country.

Mr. de Castro supported Mr. Ople's request for Mr. Suarez to withdraw his amendment.

In view thereof, Mr. Suarez withdrew his amendment.

Mr. Villacorta, likewise, accepted the withdrawal on the understanding that the provision would be silent about it.

APPROVAL OF SECTION 3, AS AMENDED

The Chair restated Section 3, as amended, to wit:

THIS CONSTITUTION SHALL BE PROMULGATED IN FILIPINO AND ENGLISH AND SHALL BE TRANSLATED INTO MAJOR REGIONAL LANGUAGES, ARABIC AND SPANISH.

Submitted to a vote, and with 34 Members voting in favor and none against, the Body approved Section 3, as amended.

AMENDMENT OF MR. NATIVIDAD

On Section 4, Mr. Natividad proposed the following amendment, to wit:

THERE SHALL BE ESTABLISHED A COMMISSION. COMPOSED OF MEMBERS REPRESENTING VARIOUS REGIONS, AS PROVIDED BY LAW, THAT SHALL UNDERTAKE, COORDINATE AND PROMOTE RESEARCHES ON FILIPINO AND OTHER LANGUAGES FOR THEIR DEVELOPMENT, PROPAGATION AND PRESERVATION.

Mr. Villacorta proposed to change the word "members" to LANGUAGE EXPERTS, on the ground that the development of language is a sensitive task that could not be left to nonexperts and to politicians.

Mr. Ople supported the amendment of Mr. Natividad .

Mr. Ople opined that the development of language could be interdisciplinary and may involve persons who are competent in various fields of knowledge. He stated that he was supporting Mr. Natividad's proposed amendment in order to give Congress and the appointing power a wider margin of flexibility to choose the appropriate types of regional representatives to the proposed commission.

Mr. Bennagen expressed agreement and proposed the combination of two criteria in terms of inter- disciplinary expertise and regional representation so that, as amended, it would read: THERE SHALL BE ESTABLISHED A COMMISSION COMPOSED OF INTER-DISCIPLINARY EXPERTS REPRESENTING VARIOUS REGIONS.

Mr. Bennagen also agreed to Mr. Natividad's observation that the choice should only be limited to experts. He observed that in the past, experts in various fields of knowledge were involved in the propagation of Filipino.

MR. SARMIENTO'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT

Mr. Sarmiento, jointly with Mrs. Muñoz Palma and Mr. Bengzon, proposed to change the words "Commission on National Language" to NATIONAL LANGUAGE COMMISSION and to insert the words LANGUAGE EXPERTS before "representatives". He likewise manifested that these proposals were submitted by the language experts of the University of the Philippines and members of the Pambansang Samahan sa Wika.

The Chair, however, noted that the proposal to insert LANGUAGE EXPERTS is similar to that of the Committee but it was not acceptable to Mr. Natividad.

INQUIRY OF MR. DE CASTRO

On Mr. de Castro's inquiry, Mr. Bennagen affirmed that the words "language experts" would refer to experts on local languages.

On Mr. de Castro's remark that he does not know anybody who is a recognized expert on local languages, Mr. Bennagen stated that there are experts on local languages although they do not necessarily come from regions, to which Mr. de Castro argued that it would just be a matter of proof.

Mr. de Castro observed that the intent behind Mr. Natividad's proposal to delete the word "expert" is to leave it to Congress or to the appointing authority to choose the right persons to constitute the Commission. It is for this reason, he stated, that he was in favor of Mr. Natividad's proposed amendment.

Mr. Bennagen stated that the area of choice had already broadened to include not only language experts but

interdisciplinary experts, the reason being that there are experts in other fields who in the past had been active in the propagation of Filipino.

REMARKS OF MR. NATIVIDAD

Mr. Natividad stressed that his amendment would give flexibility in allowing all experts, including interdisciplinary experts, to come in as provided by law, in order to ensure a truly efficient Commission.

MRS. ROSARIO BRAID'S AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT

Mrs. Rosario Braid proposed the rewording of the amendment to read as follows: COMPOSED OF MEMBERS OF VARIOUS DISCIPLINES AND REGIONS so that it would include multi-disciplinary teams from different sciences as well as non-experts who may have a broad overview of the needs of the society but who may not be experts in a particular field.

Mr. Natividad accepted Mrs. Rosario Braid's proposed amendment.

REMARKS OF MR. TINGSON

Mr. Tingson suggested that the Body adopt the proposed amendment of Mr. Sarmiento, the reason being that other details including the composition of the Commission could be provided by law.

The Chair stated that Mr. Natividad's proposed amendment had already been accepted by the Body and could be voted upon.

INQUIRY OF MR. NOLLEDO

Mr. Nollado stated that he never heard of any accomplishment or activity of the Institute of National Language. He inquired whether the Committee intends to provide certain guidelines for Congress on the formation of the Commission on National Language, for instance, whether the members shall be natural-born citizens or whether the Commission should be independent in the sense that it would not be under the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports.

Mr. Villacorta replied that the Committee did not consider the details since its only concern was that there should be experts from the different disciplines and regional representation. He affirmed, however that the Committee agreed that the Commission should be independent from the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports although their functions should be coordinated with the Ministry.

Mr. Bennagen stated that aliens may be hired as consultants.

REMARKS OF MR. DE CASTRO

Mr. de Castro pointed out that the details discussed in Mr. Nollado's interpellation would already be covered by the clause "as provided by law" which would give Congress wide latitude to act on the matter.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE AMENDMENT

At this juncture, Mr. Sarmiento manifested that he had conferred with Mr. Natividad who agreed that instead of "Commission on National Language", it should be NATIONAL LANGUAGE COMMISSION, which the Committee, in turn, accepted.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF MR. DAVIDE

Mr. Davide proposed to substitute the words "There shall be established" with the words CONGRESS SHALL ESTABLISH; and to delete the phrase "as provided by law".

Mr. de Castro suggested CREATE instead of "establish". Mr. Davide did not accept the proposal, stating that the word "establish" would establish uniformity in language.

Mr. de Castro, however, pointed out certain provisions like the creation of the Commission on Human Rights. Mr. Villacorta, in reply, suggested that this should be left to the Committee on Style.

Thereupon, Mr. de Castro invited the attention of the members of the Committee on Style to the discussion on the words "establish" and "create".

RESTATEMENT AND APPROVAL OF THE SECTION TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL LANGUAGE COMMISSION

Mr. Villacorta restated the provision creating the National Language Commission, as amended to wit:

CONGRESS SHALL ESTABLISH A NATIONAL LANGUAGE COMMISSION COMPOSED OF REPRESENTATIVES OF VARIOUS REGIONS AND DISCIPLINES WHICH SHALL UNDERTAKE, COORDINATE AND PROMOTE RESEARCHES ON FILIPINO AND OTHER LANGUAGES FOR THEIR DEVELOPMENT, PROPAGATION AND PRESERVATION.

Submitted to a vote, and with 30 Members voting in favor and none against, the amendment was approved by the Body.

MANIFESTATION OF MR. NATIVIDAD

Mr. Natividad manifested for the record that the amendment just approved was coauthored by Mr. Sarmiento, President Muñoz Palma, Messrs. Davide, Rama, Laurel, Rodrigo, Calderon, Jamir, Maambong, Monsod, Ople, Tingson, Regalado, Bengzon and de Los Reyes.

ADJOURNMENT OF SESSION

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

It was 6:53 p.m.

I hereby certify to the correctness of the foregoing.

(SGD.) FLERIDA RUTH P. ROMERO

Secretary-General

ATTESTED:

(SGD.) CECILIA MUÑOZ PALMA

President

Approved on September 11, 1986

ABOUT BATAS.ORG

Study smarter at BATAS.org

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

The complete Philippine law library - free for everyone.

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

Audio case-brief lectures.

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

Bar review built on the science of memory.

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

The full law-school curriculum.

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

Mock exams that tell you where you stand.

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

A study planner that keeps you on pace.

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

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

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

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

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