

JOURNAL NO. 25

VOL. I, July 08, 1986

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/e6e4904c0f48/>

Tuesday, July 8, 1986

CALL TO ORDER

At 2:50 p.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. Teodulo C. Natividad, to wit:

Amang makapangyarihan sa lahat, itunghay mo ang Iyong liwanag at ilagak ang Iyong mabiyayang tangkilik sa bulwagang ito na pinagtitipunan ng Iyong mga anak na inatangan nang mabigat at maselang tungkuling ang nakataya ay bukas, buhay at kapalaran ng aming lahi;

Pangingasin Mo, Ama, ang mga diwa at isip ng bawa't isa sa amin at nang sa gayon, ang talsik ng talino mula sa Iyong paglingap ay maging kasangkapan sa pagbuo ng Saligang Batas ng aming lahi, isang Saligang Batas na maka-Diyos at tunay na makatao;

Ilingap Mo, Ama, ang Iyong basbas sa kapulungang ito upang maging sulo namin sa pusikit na karimlan ng aming pakikipagtunggali sa masalimuot at mapanganib na kalagayan, hindi lamang ng aming bayan, kundi ng buong daigdig at ituro Mo sa amin ang tumpak na landas na aming daraanan upang makasapit sa dalampasigan ng tagumpay;

Itulot Mo rin, Mahal na Bathala, na ang mabalangkas namin ay ang Saligang Batas na tunay na tutugon sa adhikain, pangarap at simulain ng aming lahi;

Panginoon, wala kaming magagawa kung sa aming sarili lamang, nguni't sa patnubay Mo, Bathalang Makapangyarihan, wala kaming pagkabigo;

Panginoon, sa panahong ito na marami pang kaguluhan, kagalitan at himagsikan, tiklop-tuhod naming hinihiling sa Iyo na nawa, aming matugunan ang hamong nasa aming harap at maging tunay kaming kasangkapan ng pagkakaisa at pagkakasundo ng sambayanang Pilipino;

Isinasamo namin, Panginoon, na itulot Mong mawaksi ang imbot at sariling kapakanan sa puso ng bawa't isa sa amin at nang sa gayon ang mapag-ukulan lamang namin ng pansin ay ang tunay na kapakanan ng aming bayan. Marapatin Mo po sana na matapos namin ang saligang Batas sa takdang panahon;

At kung matapos na naming sulatin ang bagong Saligang Batas, marapatin Mo po sana na ito ay pagtibayin ng sambayamang Pilipino at nang sa gayon ay maghari ang kapayapaan, kaisahan, kasaganaan at maihatid namin ang aming bansa sa lalong higit na magandang kinabukasan.

Siya Nawa.

ROLL CALL

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

Abubakar, Y. R. Natividad, T. C.
Aquino, F. S. Nieva, M. T. F.
Azcuna, A. S. Nollado, J. N.
Bacani, T. C. Ople, B. F.
Bengzon, J. F. S. Padilla, A. B.
Bennagen, P. L. Muñoz Palma, C.
Bernas, J. G. Regalado, F. D.
Rosario Braid, F. De los Reyes, R. F.
Brocka, L. O. Rigos, C. A.
De Castro, C. M. Rodrigo, F. A.
Colayco, J. C. Romulo, R. J.
Davide, H. G. Sarmiento, R. V.
Foz, V. B. Suarez, J. E.
Garcia, E. G. Sumulong, L. M.
Gascon, J. L. M. C. Tadeo, J. S. L.
Guingona, S. V. C. Tan, C.
Jamir, A. M. K. Treñas, E. B.
Laurel, J. B. Uka, L. L.
Maambong, R. E. Villacorta, W. V.
Monsod, C. S. Villegas, B. M.

With 40 Members present, the Chair declared the presence of a quorum.

The following Members appeared after the Roll Call:

Alonto, A. D.
Lerum, E. R.
Calderon, J. D.
Quesada, M. L. M.
Concepcion, R. R. Rama, N. G.

Messrs. Rosales and Tingson were absent.

READING AND APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL

On motion of Ms. Aquino, 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 Ms. Aquino, there being no objection, the Body proceeded to the Reference of Business.

REFERRAL TO COMMITTEES OF RESOLUTIONS

Upon direction of the Chair, the Secretary-General read, on First Reading, the titles of the following proposed Resolutions which were, in turn, referred by the Chair to the Committees hereunder indicated:

Proposed Resolution No. 429, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO INCORPORATE IN THE ARTICLE ON TRANSITORY PROVISIONS A PROVISION FOR THE EXPROPRIATION OF ALL AGRICULTURAL AND NON-AGRICULTURAL LANDS FRAUDULENTLY ACQUIRED BY GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND THEIR CRONIES AND IMMEDIATE SUBJECTION OF THE SAME TO URBAN AND RURAL LAND REFORM

Introduced by Honorable Suarez, Tadeo and Sarmiento

TO THE COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL JUSTICE

Proposed Resolution No. 430, entitled:

RESOLUTION TERMINATING THE MILITARY BASES AGREEMENT BY 1991

Introduced by Honorable Ople, Maambong, Natividad, De los Reyes, Jr., Bengzon, Jr., Romulo, Calderon, Rigos, Treñas, Uka, Jamir and Lerum

TO THE COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PROVISIONS

Proposed Resolution No. 431, entitled:

RESOLUTION PROVIDING IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION IN THE NEW ARTICLE ON SOCIAL JUSTICE THAT AS A RESTITUTION, THE VICTIMS OF CRIMES BE GIVEN A SHARE OF FINES PAID IN COURT BY CONVICTED CRIMINALS

Introduced by Honorable Natividad, Ople, Maambong and De los Reyes, Jr.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL JUSTICE

Proposed Resolution No. 432, entitled:

RESOLUTION LIMITING THE PRACTICE OF ANY PROFESSION TO FILIPINO CITIZENS SAVE IN CASES OF RECIPROCITY TO ALIENS OF ANOTHER COUNTRY UNDER CONDITIONS PRESCRIBED BY LAW

Introduced by Honorable Maambong, Ople, Natividad and De los Reyes, Jr.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL ECONOMY AND PATRIMONY

Proposed Resolution No. 433, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO LIMIT THE TERM OF THE PRESIDENT TO SIX (6) YEARS WITHOUT

REELECTION

Introduced by Honorable Rama

TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE EXECUTIVE

Proposed Resolution No. 434, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO INCORPORATE IN THE ARTICLE ON SOCIAL JUSTICE A PROVISION PROVIDING BASIC CONSUMER RIGHTS TO ALL CITIZENS

Introduced by Honorable Rigos

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

Proposed Resolution No. 436, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO INCORPORATE IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION A PROVISION ON THE NATIONAL NAME, ANTHEM AND SEAL

Introduced by Honorable Rosario Braid, Maambong, Uka and Rigos

TO THE COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PROVISIONS

Proposed Resolution No. 437, entitled:

RESOLUTION PROPOSING FOR THE INCLUSION OF A PROVISION ON THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES AND STATE POLICIES IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION

Introduced by Honorable Tingson

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

Proposed Resolution No. 438, entitled:

RESOLUTION INCORPORATING IN THE CONSTITUTION PROVISIONS ENSURING REMEDIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF RIGHTS

Introduced by Honorable Aquino

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

Proposed Resolution No. 439, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO FURTHER STRENGTHEN THE BILL OF RIGHTS BY INCORPORATING IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION A PROVISION PROHIBITING THE INFLICTION OF TORTURE AND THE IMPOSITION OF OTHER CRUEL OR INHUMAN TREATMENT ON CONVICTS

Introduced by Honorable Davide, Jr.

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

Proposed Resolution No. 442, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO INCORPORATE IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION AN ARTICLE, ENTITLED

"EDUCATION, ARTS AND CULTURE, COMMUNICATION, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY"

Introduced by Honorable Guingona

TO THE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

Proposed Resolution No. 443, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO INCORPORATE IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION AN ARTICLE ALLOWING FOR THE REELECTION OF THE INCUMBENT PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT BUT DISALLOWING THEM TO SERVE FOR MORE THAN EIGHT CONSECUTIVE YEARS

introduced by Honorable Guingona

TO THE COMMITTEE ON AMENDMENTS AND TRANSITORY PROVISIONS

Proposed Resolution No. 444, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO INCORPORATE IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION PROVISIONS THAT WOULD DISALLOW DUAL CITIZENSHIP IN CERTAIN CASES

Introduced by Honorable Guingona

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

COMMUNICATIONS

Communication No. 136 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from the Consumers Groups signed by Ms. Zenaida S. Reyes, forwarding two resolutions providing for consumer protection

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

Communication No. 137 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Resolution No. ECVII-86-12 of the Executive Committee of the Integrated Bar of the Philippines, proposing the creation of an independent Commission of Justice

TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Communication No. 138 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Concerned Churches for Christian Liberty signed by Bro. Joseph L. Genato, submitting a resolution proposing a provision recognizing the fundamental right, responsibility and authority of the home and the church in the education of our children

TO THE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

Communication No. 139 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Mr. Paterno D. Menzon of Labor Advisory Consultative Council (LAAC), submitting a resolution proposing to make the teaching of work ethic, philosophy and labor unionism compulsory in all levels of the educational system

TO THE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

Communication No. 140 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Investment and Management Corporation signed by Mr. Luis F. Sison submitting a proposed provision in the Bill of Rights of the Constitution on the right of self-defense

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

Communication No. 141 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Mr. N.B. Imperial of the Department of Comparative and International Education, University of London, enclosing proposed provisions on local governments and education, among others

TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE

Communication No. 142 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Concerned Parishioners of Sacred Heart Parish, Quezon City, signed by Mrs. Ester V. Salvosa and twenty-seven others, proposing the inclusion of provisions on the stability of the Filipino family

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

Communication No. 143 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Communication from Mr. Cayetano Palma proposing transitory provisions on the term of the incumbent President and Vice-President, the Batasan Members elected in 1984, and on local elections

TO THE COMMITTEE ON AMENDMENTS AND TRANSITORY PROVISIONS

Communication No. 144 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from the National Secretariat of Social Action, Justice and Peace of the Catholic Bishops' Conference of the Philippines signed by Monsignor Antonio T. Fortich presenting its position on the US military bases in the Philippines, land reform, and rights of indigenous peoples

TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE

Communication No. 145 — Constitutional Commission of 1986

Letter from Mr. Abolais Batuas Deca of the Society of Educators for Educational Development, Marawi City, requesting the consideration of the Muslims' demand for local autonomy

TO THE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Committee Report No. 13 on Proposed Resolution No. 440, prepared by the Committee on the Executive, entitled:

RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT, HIS TERM OF OFFICE, THE CANVASSING OF VOTES BY THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY AND THE PROCLAMATION OF THE ELECTED WINNER,

recommending its approval in substitution of Proposed Resolution No. 198.

Sponsors: Hon. Sumulong and Maambong

TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE

Committee Report No. 14 on Proposed Resolution No. 441, prepared by the Committee on the Executive, entitled:

RESOLUTION INCORPORATING INTO THE NEW CONSTITUTION A PROVISION REQUIRING THE CONCURRENCE OF A COMMISSION ON APPOINTMENTS TO HIGH RANKING POSITIONS IN THE GOVERNMENT,

recommending its approval in substitution of Proposed Resolution No. 197.

Sponsors: Hon. Sumulong and Sarmiento

TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE

Committee Report No. 15 on Proposed Resolution No. 445, prepared by the Committee on General Provisions, entitled:

RESOLUTION TO RETAIN IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION ARTICLE XV, SECTION 1 OF THE 1973 CONSTITUTION,

recommending its approval in substitution of Proposed Resolution No. 97.

Sponsors: Hon. Rosario Braid, Rigos and Maambong

TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

At this juncture, the Chair suspended the session.

It was 3:06 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 3:08 p.m., the session was resumed with the Honorable Rustico F. de los Reyes, Jr. presiding.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: COMMITTEE REPORT NO. 4 ON PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 7

On motion of Ms. Aquino, there being no objection, the Body proceeded to the continuation of consideration, on Second Reading (period of amendments), of Committee Report No. 4 on Proposed Resolution No. 7, entitled:

Thereupon, the Chair recognized Mr. Bernas, sponsor of the measure, to continue with the individual amendments.

AMENDMENT OF MR. OPLE

Mr. Ople proposed an amendment to insert a new Section to proposed Resolution No. 7, to wit:

DUAL ALLEGIANCE IS INIMICAL TO CITIZENSHIP AND SHALL BE DEALT WITH ACCORDING TO LAW.

At the outset, Mr. Ople explained that dual allegiance is not the same as dual citizenship in that dual allegiance has larger, more threatening and insidious implications than dual citizenship which is seldom intentional and is usually but a function of the accident of mixed marriages or of birth on foreign soil. Thus, while he would not raise a question on double citizenship, Mr. Ople stated that by his amendment, he would like the Commission to

take cognizance of the problem of dual citizenship.

Specifically referring to the Filipino-Chinese community, Mr. Ople adverted to the unsettled kind of allegiance among the Chinese, who, although already Filipino citizens, by their acts, may be said to be bound by a second allegiance either to Peking or Taiwan. He pointed out that the Filipino-Chinese community is represented in the Legislative Yuan of the Republic of China and until recently in the Associate Legislative Council for Overseas Chinese in Mainland China.

Mr. Ople also adverted to the concern expressed on the lack of guarantees for assimilation in relation to the danger that dual allegiance may siphon off scarce national resources to other Asian countries which could mean a tragic capital outflow from a country which faces capital famine, economic stagnation, worsening unemployment and social unrest.

Responding to the proposal, Mr. Bernas agreed that dual allegiance is a concept distinct from citizenship. He stated, however, that the Committee did not have the opportunity to discuss whether or not a provision on dual allegiance should be explicitly incorporated in the Constitution although, personally, he expressed the view that matters like these could be dealt with by ordinary legislation. He also expressed confidence that the Committee on the Legislative would be able to formulate a provision creating a legislative body that would be as patriotic and nationalistic as the Commission and, therefore, capable of dealing with the problem.

He stated that he was submitting the matter a vote by the Body.

INQUIRY OF MR. NOLLEDO

In reply to the query of Mr. Nollado, Mr. Ople affirmed that his proposed amendment may cover the situation contemplated by Mr. Villacorta on the assimilation of naturalized citizens into the mainstream of Filipino culture, because then the mandate of the Constitution would bind future legislatures into helping arrest the tide towards a second allegiance among the overseas Chinese who are already enjoying Filipino citizenship.

On the distinction between citizenship and allegiance, Mr. Ople stated that, normally, dual citizenship does not reflect on the motives of citizens enjoying such dual citizenship because it is often largely a function of accident of mixed marriage or place of birth.

Mr. Ople stated that "dual allegiance" refers for instance, to a situation where the Chinese who had already been naturalized, continue to manifest an extra allegiance either to Peking or Taipeh.

On whether the words "shall be dealt with by law" would contemplate a prohibition or regulation, Mr. Ople stated that dual allegiance, although a relatively unexplored problem as far as legal and sociological researchers are concerned, has been perceived by many people as a major problem which should require the attention of the Constitutional Commission.

On Mr. Nollado's suggestion to reword the amendment to read THE LEGISLATURE SHALL BY LAW PROHIBIT OR REGULATE DUAL ALLEGIANCE, Mr. Ople stated that he would prefer the original formulation so as to reflect the seriousness of the problem as perceived by many people.

INQUIRY OF MR. SARMIENTO

In reply to the query of Mr. Sarmiento, Mr. Ople affirmed that his proposed amendment was animated by his desire to protect the national interest considering that dual allegiance is inconsistent with or repugnant to national interest.

On Mr. Sarmiento's suggestion to use the words "obnoxious to national interest" in lieu of "obnoxious to citizenship," Mr. Ople stated that he would have no objection to the suggestion.

REMARKS OF MR. BERNAS

At this juncture, Mr. Bernas reiterated his stand that the matter on dual allegiance could be better left to ordinary legislation under Section 3 and under the general police power of the legislature not just on citizenship but also on matters of allegiance apart from citizenship.

RESTATEMENT OF THE AMENDMENT, AS AMENDED

Thereupon, Mr. Ople restated his proposed amendment, as amended by Messrs. Sarmiento and Nollado, to read: DUAL ALLEGIANCE IS OBNOXIOUS TO THE NATIONAL INTEREST AND SHALL BE DEALT WITH ACCORDING TO LAW.

INQUIRY OF MR. MAAMBONG

At this juncture, in reply to Mr. Maambong's query whether the Sponsor would abide by the vote of the Body despite his admission that he had not consulted the Committee, Mr. Bernas stated that the vote of the Body would bind the Committee.

INQUIRY OF MS. AQUINO

On Ms. Aquino's query on the specific operative acts amounting to dual allegiance that would merit a provision in the draft Constitution, Mr. Ople cited the fact that on the occasion of the Double Ten Anniversary Celebration each year, a considerable number of delegations of Filipino-Chinese participate in the oath-taking and pledge of allegiance to Taipeh. He stated that until recently, in the Overseas Chinese Council, a legislative body in Peking, the Filipino-Chinese, together with Chinese overseas communities in Southeast Asia, were represented. These instances, he stated, raised the question of dual allegiance because, despite being naturalized, these groups of Filipino-Chinese pledge allegiance to countries other than the Philippines.

On whether he intends to classify dual allegiance as a mala in se, Mr. Ople stated that it is, adding that dual allegiance has not been sufficiently explored and investigated as a political and sociological problem. He stressed, however, that many have acknowledged that the problem exists and that, considering its implications on the sovereignty and security of the nation, the Committee should consider its inclusion as a separate section in the Article on Citizenship.

On the contention that the matter should properly be a subject under the domain of the legislature, Mr. Ople stated that the amendment would be a mandate on future legislatures to deal with the problem as they see fit

INQUIRY OF MR. VILLACORTA

In reply to Mr. Villacorta's query whether the proposed amendment is also addressed to natural-born Filipinos with dual allegiance, like those who espouse a statehood status for the Philippines, Mr. Ople stated that in the case of natural-born Filipinos espousing statehood, there should be a presumption of good faith especially so when they are in another domain which adheres to plurality of beliefs, freedom of speech or freedom of expression. He pointed out, however, that should future legislatures decide that such an act constitutes dual allegiance, then they would not be excluded from the ambit of dual allegiance.

Thereupon, Mr. Villacorta manifested his support for the proposed amendment.

INQUIRY OF MR. REGALADO

In reply to Mr. Regalado's query, Mr. Ople affirmed that the concept of dual allegiance has not been carefully considered either from the legal, sociological, psychological or psychiatric aspects to the extent that the importance of the problem deserves.

On the operative acts which should be studied to determine what constitutes a manifestation of loyalty to or preference for a particular country, Mr. Ople stated that precisely the proposed amendment would call upon future legislatures to study the problem further and to deal with it in accordance with national interest.

On the observation that the Commission is being asked to consider a Constitutional provision which the Members are not in a position to consider for lack of legislative criteria or empirical data, Mr. Ople stated that he had already cited several examples.

On whether he would consider in *pari materia* the case of Filipino-Americans who have shown extreme concern with major political events in the Philippines with those of the Filipino-Chinese who attend the Double Ten Anniversary in Taipei, Mr. Ople stated that any pledge of allegiance similar to what the Filipino-Chinese take in mass oath-taking in Taipei would be covered by the phrase "dual allegiance". He pointed out that his proposed amendment was inspired by the general perception in the country that some of these naturalized Chinese continue to show an unsettled kind of sentiment about the country and continue to manifest in several ways what appears to be a second allegiance to a country close to them by history and by consanguinity.

On the contention that the concept of dual citizenship is a manifestation of political allegiance rather than economic allegiance, Mr. Ople argued that political allegiance is broad enough to accommodate the economic aspect, the fact being that some of the commercial establishments in Taipei are owned by Filipinos of Chinese descent.

On the observation that the matter could be a proper subject of legislation because the legislature would have more facilities, time and data, Mr. Ople stated that his proposal would simply serve as a mandate for future legislatures to take cognizance of the problem.

On whether he would agree that a recommendation be made to future legislatures to consider dual allegiance as a sufficient ground for denaturalization, Mr. Ople replied that although he would not want to preempt the wisdom of future legislatures, the proposal would make the citizenship provision more meaningful.

SUGGESTION OF MR. GUINGONA

Mr. Guingona manifested his support of the posed amendment and suggested that the word "noxious" be changed to INIMICAL to which Ople agreed.

INQUIRY OF MR. RODRIGO

On the initial query of Mr. Rodrigo, Mr. Bernas affirmed that dual allegiance is undesirable, while on the other hand, Mr. Ople agreed that the matter should be treated by the legislature.

Mr. Rodrigo pointed out that the words "dealt with" means to study it and not to prohibit or penalize it. He then sought clarification if there was indeed a difference between the stand of the Sponsor and the proponent of the amendment.

In reply, Mr. Bernas maintained that the amendment on dual allegiance would not be necessary because with or without it, there is a mandate for the legislature to attend to the problem, for which reason, he expressed

preference for a vote of confidence for the Committee on the Legislative, trusting that it would be able to structure a legislature that would be as nationalistic and as patriotic as the Commission.

On the question whether or not allegiance should be linked with citizenship, Mr. Bernas stated that if there is a link, the Committee had already manifested that dual citizenship should be attended to by ordinary legislation, but if it is not linked with citizenship, it has no place in the Article on Citizenship.

For his part, Mr. Ople maintained that his proposed amendment is linked to citizenship and adverted to his original proposal which reads "Dual allegiance is obnoxious to citizenship". He opined that in order to understand its importance, it should be linked to citizenship on the ground that the subject refers to naturalized Filipinos who continue to manifest a double allegiance.

INQUIRY OF MR. MONSOD

On the initial query of Mr. Monsod, Mr. Ople affirmed that any act that promotes or manifests dual allegiance is obnoxious to citizenship.

On whether the presence of such provision would inhibit the government from pursuing its Balikbayan program, Mr. Ople disagreed and adverted to the position he had taken during the free wheeling discussion to make it as easy as possible for Filipinos who, out of necessity, adopted foreign citizenship to be repatriated as Filipino citizens.

Mr. Monsod stated that he did not refer to the act of reacquiring Filipino citizenship but to the act of implementing the government program of attraction for former Filipino citizens to reinvest or come back and renew their ties to the old country by certain acts that would show, in effect, dual allegiance.

He inquired whether Mr. Ople's proposal would not be more appropriate to include it in the Article on hinder the country from instituting such program on the ground that "we could not do on our own what we are trying to prevent when applied the other way around."

Mr. Ople observed that no dual allegiance, as interpreted in the proposed amendment, would be involved in said case.

INQUIRY OF MR. BACANI

In reply to Mr. Bacani's query, Mr. Ople affirmed that citizenship always includes allegiance but explained that allegiance has two levels, namely, formal level and the inner, deeper level which is the authentic sentiment of the citizen. He further explained that dual citizenship is a formality and there is nothing insidious in it that threatens national security or sovereignty, as it is often a function of an accident of a mixed marriage or birth in a foreign country.

On the contention that citizenship includes allegiance and that denying dual allegiance amounts to a denial of dual citizenship which would foreclose an interpretation of Section 2, Mr. Ople stated that although the future legislature could address itself to the problem, he wanted to emphasize the fact that there is necessarily no correlation between dual allegiance and dual citizenship.

He further stated that dual allegiance could be an insidious threat to the country's sovereignty and security, but not dual citizenship, especially for those born in a foreign country.

On whether an inner allegiance could be regulated by law, Mr. Ople stressed that it may be treated as an exceptional case as in the case of a Filipino who was born in the United States and acquired dual citizenship by

virtue of jus soli but who may elect either Filipino or American citizenship upon reaching the age of majority.

On whether dual allegiance would refer to two contradictory or complimentary allegiances, Mr. Ople stressed that he was referring to that which is offensive to the national interest, although generally, it may refer to conflicting allegiances, and occasionally, to complimentary or sympathetic allegiances.

INQUIRY OF MR. VILLACORTA

In reply to Mr. Villacorta's query, Mr. Bernas, to whom the question was addressed, affirmed that the Article on Duties and Obligations of Citizens in the 1973 Constitution would fall under the purview of the Committee on Citizenship, Bill of Rights, Political Rights and Obligations and Human Rights.

On whether the proposed amendment would properly belong to the Article on Duties and Obligations of Citizens, Mr. Ople, while admitting that it may be pertinent to said Article, maintained that it is more appropriate to include it in the Article on Citizenship.

Mr. Villacorta, however, manifested that he found it frustrating to witness a lengthy debate on singular allegiance when it is naturally expected of every citizen to render allegiance to only one country.

MR. DAVIDE'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT

Thereafter, Mr. Davide proposed to insert the words OF CITIZENS after the word "allegiance"; to change the phrase "obnoxious to citizenship" to PROHIBITED; and between "with" and "by", to insert SEVERELY, so that the Section would read as follows:

DUAL ALLEGIANCE OF CITIZENS IS PROHIBITED AND SHALL BE DEALT WITH SEVERELY BY LAW.

Mr. Ople accepted the first part of Mr. Davide's proposal and declined the rest, stating that other amendments to the amendment would be displaced.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

At this juncture, the Chair suspended the session.

It was 4:01 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 4:02 p.m., the session was resumed.

RESTATEMENT AND APPROVAL OF MR. OPLE'S AMENDMENT, AS AMENDED

Thereupon, Mr. Ople restated his proposed amendment, as amended, to wit:

SECTION 5. DUAL ALLEGIANCE OF CITIZENS IS INIMICAL TO THE NATIONAL INTEREST AND SHALL BE DEALT WITH BY LAW.

The Sponsor reiterated his nonacceptance of the proposal on the ground that the matter could be better left to ordinary legislation and need not be provided for in the Constitution.

Submitted to a vote, and with 23 Members voting in favor and 12 against, the amendment, as amended, was approved by the Body.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF MR. BACANI

On the proposal of Mr. Bacani to incorporate a proviso which states that BOTH NATURALIZED AND NATURAL-BORN CITIZENS SHALL HAVE EQUAL RIGHTS BEFORE THE LAW, Mr. Bernas, speaking on behalf of the Committee, stated that the matter was thoroughly discussed and it was the Committee's position 1) that this is not necessary because existing jurisprudence has already established the equality of natural-born and naturalized citizens, except in cases where the Constitution itself makes the distinction, and 2) that it would be adequately covered by the equal protection clause in the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Bacani, however, opined that his proposal would do away with such distinctions, in reply to which, Mr. Bernas stated that if that is the intent, the matter could be discussed when distinctions are made in specific provisions, in order not to preempt the other Committees.

In view of the explanations, Mr. Bacani did not pursue his proposed amendment.

AMENDMENT OF MR. TREÑAS

Mr. Treñas then proposed to amend Section 3, to read as follows:

SECTION 3. THOSE BORN BEFORE JANUARY 17, 1973 WHOSE MOTHERS ARE CITIZENS OF THE PHILIPPINES AND UPON REACHING THE AGE OF MAJORITY ELECT PHILIPPINE CITIZENSHIP.

In reply to Mr. Nollado's query, Mr. Treñas affirmed that those who were born before January 17, 1973 but have not yet elected Philippine citizenship because they have not yet reached the age of majority would be considered natural-born citizens.

Thereupon, the Sponsor accepted the proposed amendment.

There being no objection, the proposed amendment was approved by the Body.

TERMINATION OF THE PERIOD OF AMENDMENTS

Thereafter, on motion of Ms. Aquino, there being no objection, the Body terminated the period of amendments.

RESTATEMENT OF THE ARTICLE ON CITIZENSHIP, AS AMENDED

On request of Ms. Aquino, Mr. Bernas restated Proposed Resolution No. 7, as amended, to wit:

ARTICLE _____

CITIZENSHIP

SECTION 1. - THE FOLLOWING ARE CITIZENS OF THE PHILIPPINES:

- 1) THOSE WHO ARE CITIZENS OF THE PHILIPPINES AT THE TIME OF THE ADOPTION OF THIS CONSTITUTION;
- 2) THOSE WHOSE FATHERS OR MOTHERS ARE CITIZENS OF THE PHILIPPINES;
- 3) THOSE BORN BEFORE JANUARY 17, 1973 OF FILIPINO MOTHERS, WHO UPON REACHING THE AGE OF MAJORITY ELECT PHILIPPINE CITIZENSHIP; AND
- 4) THOSE WHO ARE NATURALIZED IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAW.

SECTION 2. - CITIZENS OF THE PHILIPPINES WHO MARRY ALIENS SHALL RETAIN THEIR

CITIZENSHIP, UNLESS BY THEIR ACT OR OMISSION THEY ARE DEEMED, UNDER THE LAW, TO HAVE RENOUNCED THEIR CITIZENSHIP.

SECTION 3. - PHILIPPINE CITIZENSHIP MAY BE LOST OR REACQUIRED IN THE MANNER PROVIDED BY LAW.

SECTION 4. - NATURAL-BORN CITIZENS ARE THOSE WHO ARE CITIZENS OF THE PHILIPPINES FROM BIRTH WITHOUT HAVING TO PERFORM ANY ACT TO ACQUIRE OR PERFECT THEIR PHILIPPINE CITIZENSHIP: PROVIDED, THAT THOSE WHO ELECT PHILIPPINE CITIZENSHIP IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 1, PARAGRAPH 3 ABOVE SHALL ALSO BE DEEMED NATURAL-BORN CITIZENS.

SECTION 5. - DUAL ALLEGIANCE OF CITIZENS IS INIMICAL TO THE NATIONAL INTEREST AND SHALL BE DEALT WITH BY LAW.

APPROVAL ON SECOND READING OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 7, AS AMENDED

Submitted to a vote, and with 35 Members voting in favor and 3 against, Proposed Resolution No. 7, as amended, was approved by the Body.

CONSIDERATION, ON SECOND READING, OF COMMITTEE REPORT NO. 7 ON PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 322

Thereafter, on motion of Ms. Aquino, there being no objection, the Body proceeded to the consideration, on Second Reading, of Committee Report No. 7 on Proposed Resolution No. 322, entitled

Resolution to include in the new Constitution an Article providing the procedure for its amendments.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

At this juncture, the Chair suspended the session.

It was 4:14 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 4:31 p.m., the session was resumed.

Upon resumption of session, the Chair recognized Mr. Suarez for the sponsorship.

SPONSORSHIP REMARKS OF MR. SUAREZ

Thereupon, Mr. Suarez, sponsoring the measure on behalf of the Committee on Amendments and Transitory Provisions, read into the Record the text of Proposed Resolution No. 3521, to wit:

ARTICLE ____

AMENDMENTS OR REVISIONS

SECTION 1. - ANY AMENDMENT TO OR REVISION OF THIS CONSTITUTION MAY BE PROPOSED:

A) BY THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY UPON A VOTE OF THREE-FOURTHS OF ALL ITS MEMBERS;

B) BY A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION; OR

C) DIRECTLY BY THE PEOPLE THEMSELVES THROUGH INITIATIVE AS PROVIDED FOR IN ARTICLE ____ SECTION ____ OF THE CONSTITUTION.

SECTION 2. THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY MAY, BY A VOTE OF TWO-THIRDS OF ALL ITS MEMBERS, CALL A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION, OR BY A MAJORITY VOTE OF ALL ITS MEMBERS, SUBMIT THE QUESTION OF CALLING SUCH A CONVENTION TO THE ELECTORATE.

SECTION 3. - ANY AMENDMENT TO, OR REVISION OF THIS CONSTITUTION SHALL BE VALID WHEN RATIFIED BY A MAJORITY OF THE VOTES CAST IN A PLEBISCITE WHICH SHALL BE HELD NOT EARLIER THAN SIXTY DAYS AND NOT LATER THAN NINETY DAYS AFTER THE APPROVAL OF SUCH AMENDMENT OR REVISION.

Mr. Suarez stated that the proposal is a substantial adoption of the provision on amendment in the 1973 Constitution except for the addition of Section 1(c) on direct people initiative concept of amending the Constitution. In this connection, he invited attention to Proposed Resolution No. 161, governing the system of recall, initiative and referendum, filed by Mr. de los Reyes and under consideration in the Committee on Citizenship, Bill of Rights, Political Rights and Obligations and Human Rights, hence the inclusion of Section 1(c) on what final action said Committee would take on Proposed Resolution No. 161.

Mr. Suarez also stated that the Committee on Amendments and Transitory Provisions addressed the problem of frequency of amendments, particularly of the ones which took place during the martial law regime. He observed that there were only three substantial amendments to the 1973 Constitution ratified through the so-called citizen assemblies, referendum and plebiscite.

To prevent the too frequent calls for amendments, Mr. Suarez informed that the Committee had decided to introduce the provision that only the National Assembly, constituting itself as a constituent Body, could propose amendments to the Constitution upon a vote of three-fourths of all its Members, and that it may call a Constitutional Convention upon a vote of two-thirds of all its Members or by a majority vote of all its Members submit the question of calling such a convention to the electorate.

On the problem as to what word should be used relative to ratification, Mr. Suarez stated that the Committee agreed on "plebiscite" as the more appropriate word instead of "election" used in the 1935 Constitution or "referendum" which was a much abused word during the Marcos regime.

On the period for the conduct of the plebiscite, Mr. Suarez stated that the Committee agreed that it should not be earlier than 60 days nor later than 90 days after the approval of proposed amendments or revisions so as to give the people ample time to study and analyze them.

INQUIRY OF MR. RODRIGO

At this juncture, in reply to Mr. Rodrigo's inquiry, Mr. Suarez stated that he was using Proposed Resolution No. 322 as the basis for his sponsorship.

INQUIRY AND SUGGESTION OF MR. MAAMBONG

In reply to Mr. Maambong's query whether the Sponsor was already through with his sponsorship remarks, Mr. Suarez stated that he had only one more point.

The Chair stated that the Sponsor had agreed to be interpellated although he was not yet through with his sponsorship.

Thereupon, Mr. Maambong suggested that Mr. Suarez be allowed to finish his sponsorship, after which the interpellation could proceed.

MR. RODRIGO'S REJOINDER

Replying thereto, Mr. Rodrigo stated that a Member may at any time interpellate the Sponsor if the latter is willing to yield. He maintained that he was making timely interruption because he found himself at a loss as to what Resolution was being used as the basis of the sponsorship remarks which he was following.

Thereupon, the Chair requested the Sponsor to proceed.

SPONSORSHIP REMARKS OF MR. SUAREZ (Continuation)

On the terms "amendment" and "revision", Mr. Suarez explained that the Committee had decided on their use after Mr. Padilla called attention to the substantial difference between the two terms in that whereas a revision involves a rewriting of the whole Constitution, an amendment only envisages a change of specific provisions as a consequence of new conditions or the elimination of parts already considered obsolete or unresponsive to the needs of the times.

Mr. Suarez stated that since the 1973 Constitution was entirely different from the 1935 Constitution in the sense that the former embodied completely new political, social and economic concepts, the Committee decided to employ the two terms.

INTERPELLATION OF MR. RODRIGO

In reply to Mr. Rodrigo's information that, with reference to the proposed Section 1(c), the proposal in the Committee on the Legislative was confined to initiative of legislation and did not extend to constitutional amendments, Mr. Suarez stated that his Committee was not aware of the situation and was under the impression that the system of initiative covered the entire spectrum of the Constitution. However, he stated that on the basis of the information, he would make representations with the Committee on the Legislative to take up the proposed system of initiative for amendments to the Constitution.

On Mr. Rodrigo's query whether, on the basis that at least 10% of the registered voters in the last election is required to initiate the passage of simple legislation, a bigger percentage should be required to initiate constitutional amendments, Mr. Suarez stated that he could settle with 10% since it would mean 2.5 million signatures which would be no easy task to gather. However, since the Committee agreed in principle to make the system of amendment rather difficult, Mr. Suarez stated that he would be amenable to a higher percentage should the Body find the 10% inadequate.

On Mr. Rodrigo's suggestion to defer consideration of the provision for a more intelligent discussion after the corresponding article and section shall have been determined, Mr. Suarez agreed that consideration of the matter could be deferred. He stated that the system of recall, initiative and referendum was covered by proposed Resolution No. 161 which was referred to the Committee on Citizenship, Bill of Rights, Political Rights and Obligations and Human Rights.

INTERPELLATION OF MR. BERNAS

In reply to Mr. Bernas' queries, Mr. Suarez affirmed 1) that the only substantial difference between the proposal and the article on amendments in the 1973 Constitution is Section 1(c) in proposed Resolution No. 322; and 2) that in the light of Mr. Rodrigo's interpellations, consideration of Section 1(c) would be deferred until after a proper formula has been presented to the Body.

INTERPELLATION OF MR. REGALADO

In reply to Mr. Regalado's query, Mr. Suarez affirmed that the National Assembly shall meet as a constituent body under the mode of amendment or revision proposed in Section 1(a).

With respect to Section 1(b), Mr. Suarez affirmed that in relation to Section 2, there should be a law passed upon by at least two-thirds vote of the National Assembly calling a constitutional convention to propose amendments to the Constitution.

On Mr. Regalado's query on whether the clause "submit the question of such a convention to the electorate" contemplates a referendum for the purpose, Mr. Suarez stated that it could be in the nature of a referendum.

On the query on whether the Committee has prepared a contingency proposal in the event the Body adopts a bicameral legislature, Mr. Suarez stated that in that event the Committee would propose the inclusion of the words IN JOINT SESSION ASSEMBLED.

INTERPELLATION OF MS. AQUINO

In reply to Ms. Aquino's query on whether Section 1(c) has reference to the resolution on referendum and initiative discussed by the Committee on the Legislative, Mr. Suarez stated that he was referring to Proposed Resolution No. 161, although he was not certain whether it was the same Resolution referred to the Committee on the Legislative.

On whether he would pursue his proposal in Section 1(e) after Mr. Rodrigo is information that the Committee on the Legislative may consider only initiative in legislation, Mr. Suarez replied in the affirmative.

INTERPELLATION OF MR. DAVIDE

On Section 3, in reply to Mr. Davide's query on who may approve the amendment or revision mentioned therein, Mr. Suarez stated that it shall be approved by the National Assembly or by the Constitutional Convention and for this purpose, he would have no objection to restoring in Proposed Resolution No. 322 the words "by the National Assembly or by the Constitutional Convention" which we were found in the original Proposed Resolution No. 148.

On Mr. Davide's observation that in relation to the clause "submit the question of calling such a convention to the electorate" in Section 2, the 1935 Constitution used the word "election", Mr. Suarez explained that because of the proposal to install the system of initiative, recall and referendum, the Committee believes such election could be in the form of a referendum. However, he agreed that in the event the Body does not approve the system of initiative, it is necessary to restore the word "election".

On Mr. Davide's observation that there should be a mandate for the National Assembly to provide funding for the call to a constitutional convention or the submission of the question to the electorate, Mr. Suarez stated that the Committee would be amenable to an amendment to reflect his idea on the matter of appropriations.

Finally, on Mr. Davide's advice reiterating Mr. Rodrigo's information that the system of initiative considered by the Committee on the Legislative limited to initiative in legislation, Mr. Suarez proposed the inclusion of people initiative to propose amendments, in reply to which Mr. Davide opined that any such proposal properly belongs to the Committee on Transitory Provisions as an exception to what is provided for in the Article on the Legislative.

INTERPELLATION OF MR. BENGZON

In reply to Mr. Bengzon's query on whether Section 2 contemplates that the question to be submitted would have to wait for an election, Mr. Suarez, answering affirmatively, explained that the idea is to save the expenses for a referendum or plebiscite. He also agreed with Mr. Bengzon's observation that the proposed provision on the system of initiative would be complicated and difficult to implement because of the bigger percentage required. However, he stressed the necessity of providing a channel for expression of the people's desire and that Section 1, paragraphs (a) and (b) sufficiently provide such channel. Moreover, he stated, it is possible that despite the pressure the people may exert on the National Assembly either to constitute itself as a constituent assembly or to call a constitutional convention, it may not heed the people's desire, hence, the necessity of providing for a third avenue in what is popularly known as people's power.

Finally, in reply to Mr. Bengzon's suggestion to confine the proposal to Section 1, paragraphs (a) and (b) and to delete paragraph (c), Mr. Suarez stated that he would leave it to the Body to decide.

INTERPELLATION OF MR. AZCUNA

In reply to Mr. Azcuna's query, Mr. Suarez affirmed that the power to propose amendments or revisions to the Constitution is a constituent power rather than a legislative power. Such being the case, Mr. Azcuna opined that the Article on Legislative Power is not the proper place to provide for initiative petitions. He suggested that instead of referring the matter to the Committee on the Legislative, it should already be defined under the provision on the exercise of constituent power.

In reply, Mr. Suarez stated that the Committee would consider the suggestion.

INTERPELLATION OF MR. OPLE

On the query of Mr. Ople on whether he could treat the proposals of Messrs. Azcuna and Davide as independent provisions in the Article on Amendments to obviate the necessity of waiting for the action of the Committee on the Legislative, Mr. Suarez agreed, stating that the matter would be taken up in the next meeting of the Committee.

Adverting to the comment earlier made by Mr. Bengzon that the proposal to amend the Constitution through initiative could be deleted on the ground that it has not been tested, has no historical precedence and may be taken as an exaggerated reaction to events in the past, Mr. Ople opined that this would be the right moment in history to introduce an innovative mode of amending the Constitution by vesting the people the right to formulate and propose amendments which would bind the government. He stressed that while such direct action by the people may not be frequently needed in the future, it would give assurance that the ultimate reserves of sovereign power rest on the people. He also adverted to the learned insights of Mr. Padilla on the distinction between an "amendment" which deals only with piecemeal changes in the Constitution and "revision" which may entail a number of amendments and even a revamp of the entire Constitution. He stated that under Section 1(c) of the Article, the people and their organizations may exercise the power to amend or revise the Constitution in accordance with certain standards and under such circumstances which would impel them to resort to that right without doing violence to the National Assembly's traditional prerogative to amend or revise the Constitution.

INTERPELLATION OF MR. GUINGONA

In reply to Mr. Guingona's query, in the light of the reply to Mr. Bengzon's query which postulated the possibility that the National Assembly may refuse to heed the people's initiative to propose constitutional amendments, if

indeed the National Assembly could frustrate the people's will by refusing to appropriate funds needed for a referendum, Mr. Suarez stated that although the mechanism has not been discussed in the Committee, the methods provided for in Section 1, paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) may be availed of individually or simultaneously and that the exercise of one method would not preclude the exercise of the others.

INTERPELLATION OF MR. MAAMBONG

Mr. Suarez affirmed Mr. Maambong's statement that the Committee used the word "plebiscite" in Section 3 in contradistinction with the word "election" used in the 1935 Constitution as "election" connotes a process whereby a body of qualified voters choose their public officials.

Mr. Suarez likewise affirmed that the word "plebiscite" means direct voting by qualified electors on an important public question, usually to ratify a proposed Constitution.

In reply to Mr. Maambong's query on the intent of the Committee, considering that the Section does not mention the word "election" or "plebiscite", Mr. Suarez replied that the plebiscite is supposed to coincide with the election. He affirmed that in the absence of an election, the question of calling a constitutional convention could not be submitted to the people in a special plebiscite.

Thereafter, Mr. Maambong proposed that Section 2 be amended to accommodate either an election or a plebiscite for the calling of a constitutional convention without waiting for an election, to which, Mr. Suarez replied that the Committee would be amenable to an amendment at the proper time.

On the possibility of submitting an amendment or a revision of the Constitution to the electorate during an election despite the use of the word "plebiscite" in this Article, Mr. Suarez stated that the provision would not preclude the holding of a plebiscite together with the election, as was done in the January 30, 1980 election-plebiscite, the plebiscite being on the retirement age of Supreme Court justices.

Mr. Suarez affirmed that the reasons for not using the word "referendum" for the amendment or revision process is because, as defined, it would only apply to the procedure of submitting measures already approved by the legislative body to the electorate for approval or disapproval.

Mr. Maambong called attention to the fact that the requirement for the ratification of an amendment to or a revision of the Constitution is always a majority of the votes cast by the electorate, while a 3/4 vote is required when the National Assembly constitutes itself into a constituent assembly to propose amendments to the Constitution.

In view thereof, Mr. Maambong suggested that appropriate steps be taken to bridge the gap by providing also for a 3/4 vote of qualified electors to amend or revise the Constitution.

COMMENTS OF MR. SARMIENTO

Commenting on the system of initiative as a reserve power of the sovereign people, Mr. Sarmiento maintained that it should not be limited to initiating legislation but extended to proposing amendments. In support of this stand, he adverted to the U.P. Law Constitution Project draft proposal which states that "the devices of recall, initiative and referendum are well established methods for asserting people sovereignty by way of shortening the terms of officials, elective or appointive and of initiating legislation or constitutional amendments or subjecting the acts of the legislature to the approval or disapproval of the people. In some jurisdictions, while the three processes are adopted in the Constitution, the details for their implementation are left to the enactment of legislation by the regular assemblies of the State."

In view thereof, he expressed support for Mr. Ople's proposal to retain the mode of initiative in the Article on Amendment and Revision.

MOTION TO CLOSE THE PERIOD OF SPONSORSHIP

Thereafter, Mr. Rama moved to close the period of sponsorship, at which point, Mr. Rodrigo inquired if the Body had deferred consideration of Section 1 paragraph (c).

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

The Chair suspended the session.

It was 5:41 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 5:49 p.m., the session was resumed.

MOTION OF MR. RAMA

At this juncture, Mr. Rama moved to defer further consideration of Committee Report No. 7 on Proposed Resolution No. 322 until the following day.

ADJOURNMENT OF SESSION

Thereafter, on motion of Mr. Rama, there being no objection, the Chair declared the session adjourned until two-thirty in the afternoon of the following day.

It was 5:50 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 July 9, 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.