

Variations on the Metro Manila Reform Theme*

ARTURO G. PACHO *

MANILA in the lyrical prose of Quijano de Manila is "the city of my affection."¹ To a technocrat, Manila is "a small city that has outgrown itself."² Secretary Melchor is more candid than the poet because he knows how the city has expanded in terms of population size and how it has also failed in many ways. Dismally enough but true, Manila and its environs are unable to respond to the demands of people for more and quality services such as flowing drinking water, efficient garbage collection, good roads, flood control, and other mundane needs.

The rapid urban growth in Manila under the same structure, facilities and services has brought about the yearly crises of waterless summers, flooded streets, traffic snarled streets, and other endless dilemmas to urban planners and administrators. In sum, the basic consideration in this urban growth phenomenon is the spatial dimension or

the overspill of growth in a much wider area from the original Manila core. The net effect of such an overspill is that the use of limited resources and technology is not maximized to their full potentials while failing at the same time to respond effectively to the people's needs. The metropolitan space is fragmentary since it is composed of several autonomous local government units — cities, provinces and municipalities, and barrios — each governed by various laws, administered by different officials who perceive community problems differently, and guided by priorities or programs often at cross-purposes.

The only solution in sight appears to be integration, consolidation or unification either of the political units or the vital services of common concern to the people in the local governments. There are at least a dozen proponents as of this writing providing suggestions as to how to cope with the increasing demands for quality services. The various proposals center on the political, administrative or planning approach to metropolitan integration (See Table 1 on the summary of the structure and coverage of such proposals). The following are the main proposals:

Metro Authority. The most common proposal is the creation of a Met-

* Researcher, U.P.-Local Government Center. The author acknowledges the assistance of Mr. Rolando Martir, LGC research assistant.

¹ Quijano de Manila, "The Week's Jottings," *Asia Philippines Leader*, Vol. I, No. 12 (June 25, 1971), p. 7. He writes: "What the tranvia was in the past, the jeepney is today. The very sound and smell of Manila, this city of my affection."

² Statement of Executive Secretary Alejandro Melchor on December 18, 1972 during a briefing on Metropolitan Manila at the DBP, Makati, Rizal.

ropolitan Manila Authority which is supra layer imposed on the existing local government units. The authority is a quasi-corporate body to administer area-wide services, implement development projects affecting the metro area, and provide guidelines and strategies for metropolitan planning. Among the proponents of such an authority are: U.P. Institute of Environmental Planning (1969); Delegates Feliciano J. Ledesma (Resolution No. 5248), Oscar Leviste and Antonio Velasco (Resolution No. 4564) of the 1971 Constitutional Convention; the Inter-Agency Committee on Metropolitan Manila (1973) chaired by Dean Carlos P. Ramos of the U.P. Philippine Executive Academy;³ U.P. President Salvador P. Lopez (1973);⁴ and the U.P. Local Government Center headed by its former Director, Dr. Raul P. de Guzman (1973);⁵ and the Development Academy of the Philippines Panel of Consultants on Metropolitan Manila (1974). Earlier, the Joint Local Government Reform Commission (1971) proposed a "Manila Metropolitan Complex" to resolve such problems as pollution, education, waterworks, etc.⁶

Metro Council. The council approach recognizes the prerogatives of the local executives and councilors in the local

governments to govern themselves and provide a coordinating mechanism for administering common services. The proponents of such an approach are the Metropolitan Mayors Coordinating Council, the Metro Manila Councilors Assembly, Institute of Philippine Culture⁷ and the Department of Public Works, Transportation and Communications.⁸ The latter submitted such a recommendation as an option to the various feasible ways of integrating metropolitan Manila.

National Capital District. Another approach towards a Metro Manila structure is the formation of the area into a national capital district. The metro area will either be declared as a part of the national government department (under either the Office of the President, Office of the Secretary of Local Government and Community Development or the National Economic and Development Authority) or be formed into a separate department itself. The proponents of this approach are Aprodicio A. Laquian (1973),⁹ the U.P. Institute of Environmental Planning and the Quezon City Government.

³ Inter-Agency Committee on Metropolitan Manila, *Metropolitan Manila Authority: A Development and Reform Strategy Proposal* (Manila: Government Printing Office, 1973).

⁴ Salvador P. Lopez, "Quezon City: Cinderella Among the National Capitals," speech before the Quezon City Rotary Club, October 29, 1973.

⁵ Metro Manila Research Team, *Restructuring Government in Metropolitan Manila* (Manila: Local Government Center, U.P., 1973).

⁶ *Manila Chronicle*, April 26, 1971, p. 12.

⁷ Jose V. Abueva, et al., *Metro Manila Today and Tomorrow* (Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, 1972).

⁸ Department of Public Works, Transportation and Communications, Manila Bay Metropolitan Region Strategic Plan, *Integrated Development of the Manila Bay Region* (Manila, April, 1973).

⁹ Aprodicio A. Laquian, *A National Capital District for the Philippines*, Report on an Urban Development Consultancy for the National Economic and Development Authority (Manila, August 31, 1973).

Metro Government. The establishment of a single metropolitan government thereby abolishing the various segmental local units in the area has been the most radical recommendation. The proponents include Delegates Pacifico A. Ortiz (Resolution No. 599) and Feliciano J. Ledesma (Resolution No. 5249) of the Constitutional Convention, the U.P. Local Government Center, and the Inter-Agency Committee on Metropolitan Manila.

All told the five cities and twenty-two municipalities located in the provinces of Rizal, Laguna, and Bulacan¹⁰ expect any one of these proposals to be decided upon by the national government. However, the prospect of the metro government approach is rather dim because of a constitutional mandate. The present charter states that "Local government units may group themselves, or consolidate or coordinate their efforts, services and resources for purposes commonly beneficial to them."¹¹ The original draft of the Constitution as drafted by the members of the Constitutional Convention included a provision to establish metropolitan or regional governments.¹² Nowhere does the new Constitution authorize a

metropolitan government. In addition, the abolition of the local governments will raise a tremendous outcry from the local officials and the defenders of local autonomy in the country. The possible establishment of a huge and powerful government in the metro area will both reduce the face-to-face contact and personal style of local officials to meet the problems of the citizenry which is still a necessary ingredient in this critical urban area.¹³ The proposal also appears to be a potential challenge to the national government if not a formidable competition in the exercise of political power and authority by the President.

The only time a metro Manila government was set up was during World War II when President Quezon issued an executive order placing seven local governments in the area under one government with Executive Secretary Jorge Vargas as the metro mayor.¹⁴ The recommendation was made because of the emergency situation and the need for closer internal security.

The likelihood is that the other three alternatives will be closely examined for possible implementation. The first three proposals may be received briefly to identify the specific organization recommended, its functions and

¹⁰ "Manila Metropolitan Area," *Journal of Philippine Statistics*, Vol. XXIV, No. 3 (Third Quarter, 1973), pp. IX-X. The BCS criteria used were: the inclusion of areas with a population density of at least 1,000 persons per square kilometer; and those areas contiguous to Manila and Suburbs having strong links with Manila.

¹¹ Article XI, Sec. 4(2) of the 1973 Philippine Constitution.

¹² See Local Governments, Sec. 2(2) of the draft Philippine Constitution, *Manila Times*, April 11, 1972, p. 13.

¹³ See Milton Kotler, *Neighborhood Government: The Local Foundations of Political Life* (New York: Bobbs-Merill Co., 1969). The book stresses on the need for smaller scale of local governments in the metropolis.

¹⁴ *Metro Mail*, Vol. IV, Nos. 12-13, July 23 and 29, 1973.

responsibilities, and its financing.¹⁵ The various proposals may also be compared with the similar recommendations. In the case of the proposed Metropolitan Manila Authority, at least two versions may be compared: namely, the Inter-Agency Committee on Metro Manila and the Development Academy of the Philippines (DAP) commissioned study on Metro Manila.¹⁶ Other proponents suggest a combination of the four proposals following a phased implementation of the integration strategy, for example, the UPLGC proposing a metro planning authority leading to a metro government in the future.

The Inter-Agency Committee which was formed in November 1972 submitted a report in January 1973 recommending the Authority. The latter was proposed to manage and coordinate common services of metropolitan character which are to be fully or partially integrated; to formulate guidelines in metro planning; and to undertake development programs. It will be headed by a Metro Manager and two deputy managers to be appointed by the President. The Authority shall report and be responsible to the President. Its managers shall manage and direct a fully integrated Police Force, a Fire Control Operations Center, a Department of Traffic and Transit, an Office

for Flood Control and Drainage, an Office for Water Supply and Sewerage, a Garbage Operations Center, a Land Management Office and an Office for Social Services. A Council of Mayors representing the four member cities and thirteen municipalities shall serve as an advisory body. The funding of the authority shall come from the national government (P2.5 million to be appropriated yearly) and from the share of the local governments equivalent to 18 per cent of their total general fund to finance the integrated Metropolitan Police Force.

Several versions of this proposal cropped up such as the draft decree prepared by the then Assistant Executive Secretary for Political Affairs, Flores-Bayot, just before he became a commissioner in the Commission on Elections in preparation for the June 1973 referendum. The other version was prepared by the DAP Panel of Consultants. This version followed the new census definition of Metro Manila, designated only one deputy manager, excluded the police service under its coverage, and established a Metro Consultative Council made up of national government officials and local officials who are appointed by the President to the Council. Formulation of development plans including monitoring and coordination was given to the Authority. It has funding from national government appropriations, new metro taxes accruing to it, and from users changes emanating from the local governments. The new metro taxes

¹⁵ See also Juliet C. Abad, "The Various Proposals on Metropolitan Reform: a Comparison," *MMCA Newsletter* (November 15, 1973). The National Economic and Development Authority likewise prepared a comparative table summarizing the various proposals.

¹⁶ Panel of Consultants on Metropolitan Manila report dated April 19, 1974.

proposed were on telephone subscriptions, anti-pollution, and on luxury or non-essential items.

The Metropolitan Mayors Coordinating Council (MMCC) which is composed of fourteen local executives in the metro Manila area seeks to assess common problems and evolve common solutions. When the report of the Inter-Agency Committee on Metro Manila broke into the newspapers in the early part of 1973, the MMCC began to discuss a counter-proposal for submission to the President.¹⁷ It mobilized a study group composed of the technical assistants of the mayors and outside consultants. Basically, the MMCC proposal was a Metropolitan Manila Council which shall a) enact metro ordinances, resolutions and other rules; b) integrate, coordinate and administer in cooperation with the national government particular metro services (e.g., peace and order, traffic and transport, fire control, garbage disposal, pollution control and drainage); c) undertake development planning and monitor the preparation of a comprehensive plan; and d) promote maximum cooperation between and among the member local governments and with the national government.

A Metro Manager to be appointed by the President shall serve as the executive of the council. An executive council staff shall be formed from the representatives of the member mayors whose function will be to provide

guidelines to the Metro Manager. A Metro Treasurer to be appointed by the Secretary of Finance shall hold and disburse metro funds and collect fees, charges and other grants. The finances of the Council shall accrue from fixed contributions in the amount of one half of one per cent of the total revenues of the member cities and municipalities, proceeds of the fixed or privilege tax on occupation, proceeds of metro charges, contributions, donations and grants-in-aid. With respect to the fixed share from each local government, a ceiling of less than ₱20,000 but not more than ₱250,000 was agreed upon as contribution and that municipalities shall be allowed to deduct their annual fixed contributions to their mother provinces and allocate such deductions as their share to the Metro Council.¹⁸ Presently municipalities (for example, Makati or San Juan of Rizal province) are mandated to contribute yearly fixed percentages of their general fund income to provincial services (5 per cent to public health, 5 per cent to agriculture, and 3 per cent to hospitals).

The association of the metro councilors also presented its own versions when the MMCC draft proposal appeared. The main feature of the Metro Manila Councilors Assembly (MMCA) proposal is the inclusion of all vice mayors in the metro area in the council and representative councilors from the cities and municipalities. Manila would have 4 councilors in the council; Que-

¹⁷ Mayor Nemesio Yabut, "Metro Council for Development in Manila," *Local Government Bulletin*, Vol. . . , No. . . (May-June 1973), p. 1.

¹⁸ See the MMCC proposal submitted June 1973.

zon. City, 3 councilors; while the rest would have 2 councilors each as representatives. The MMCA proposal gave the Executive Board of the Council the power to implement metro ordinances and resolutions through the metro manager. A Metro Development Planning Department was strongly recommended to prepare a five-year metro development plan and provide technical support in planning to the MMCA. To give the Council ample funds for development programs and projects, the MMCA recommended fixed contributions from member local units in the amount of 5 per cent of their annual budgetary outlays.

The Metropolitan Manila Council as suggested by the Institute of Philippine Culture (IPC) has precisely the same stance taken by the MMCC. The council is envisioned to be a two-tiered government in the metro area which will "link horizontally metropolitan-wide functions and services and connect vertically the separate local governments in the metropolis with the national government."¹⁹ The council shall exercise the power to assess and levy metro taxes and obtain funds or grants-in-aid from the national government, private sector and international agencies. It shall plan and provide metro services and invest or use its resources for metro development or to projects of component local governments. The IPC proposal will formally recognize by law the establishment of the consultative and the loose

organization called the Metropolitan Mayors Coordinating Council.

The final proposal within the feasible options of the national government was put forward by Dr. Aprodicio A. Laquian for the National Economic and Development Authority.²⁰ The proposal calls for the creation of a National Capital District (NCD) within the inner core of the metropolis and declaration of a National Capital Region covering a radius of 50 kilometers from Manila. The NCD shall be governed by a General Manager to be appointed by the President and assisted by two deputy managers for planning and for operations. The General Manager shall have a cabinet rank. He will be guided in decision-making by a Commission to be composed of representatives from the local government, national government departments and the private sector. The proposal also suggests a *Barangay* Council (*Sanggunian ng mga Barangay*) composed of *barangay* heads (*Kabesas de Barangay*) sitting in the *Barangay* assembly. The *Barangay* Council shall advise the National Capital District Authority in policy formulation and program implementation. The Commission mentioned earlier is a transitional organization until such time as when the term of office of existing elective local officials would expire. After the end of their elective term, the national government shall have jurisdiction over the entire capi-

²⁰ Aprodicio A. Laquian, *op. cit.* See also the *UP CPA Newsletter* (September 1973) which reported the first public forum to discuss metro Manila held in August 1973.

¹⁹ Jose V. Abueva, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

tal district, thereby, abolishing the various local governments.

Financing the Capital District shall come from the following sources: raising of real estate tax rates; improvement of assessment and imposition of new changes; imposition of a tax on idle land; legalization and taxing of gambling casinos, dog racing, and other forms of gambling; franchises, licenses and taxes on gross incomes of bars, night clubs, salons, massage clinics, sauna baths and other amusements; users charges, and borrowings.

Prospects for the Various Proposals

In 1973, the discussions on restructuring Metropolitan Manila reached fever high when various committees, institutes and national agencies prepared their own measures for consideration. The MMCA was banded primarily as a reaction to the MMCC draft proposal which excluded the vice mayors and councilors from the proposed Metro Manila Council. Dr. Aprodicio A. Laquian of the IDRC (Canada) was commissioned by NEDA to submit a proposal on Metro Manila which turned out to be the National Capital District (See for example Washington, D.C. of U.S.A.; Canberra of Australia; or Brasilia of Brazil). A prominent British financier — of Rothchilds fame — came to visit the President in March 1973 and gave the President serious interests in metropolitan and new towns development in the Manila region. The World Bank team also came in July-August 1973

which included a panel on urban development. The panel itself recommended the integration of Manila into a Metropolitan structure. The DAP fielded its own Task Force on Human Settlements and came up with a report to the President in December.²¹ Meanwhile, the Department of Public Works, Transportation and Communications - Institute of Planning - United Nations assisted project on the planning of the Manila Bay Region was nearing its target date to complete preliminary studies. The "old man" of Philippine planning — Mr. Walter Faithfull of the United Nations — left for Australia in December 1973.

The Metro Manila reform was almost a *fait accompli* in 1973 during the first year of martial law administration. Practical realities then led to the waning of the enthusiasm for the metro proposals. In an interview, the President himself stated in October 1973 "The idea (of a Metro Manila) is under study. There is merit to this proposal, but it will require some time to put it together into a workable program; it will also require time to implement it. We do not intend to move in this area until we have completely weighed every pertinent factor."²²

The immediate role of the local governments in the metro area in 1973 was one of the practical realities that fizzled down the metro reform discus-

²¹ DAP, Task Force on Human Settlements, *Emerging Concepts and Issues, Situation Report 1* (December 1973).

²² *Times Journal*, October 21, 1973.

sions. Local governments and the barangay network were active participants in conducting the referendums in January and June 1973, in distribution of rice and gasoline coupons during the two crises of that year, in community surveillance for police characters, and in the Clean and Beautification Campaign. The local governments were the ultimate direct link of the President in maintaining stability and carrying out developmental programs and projects.

Meanwhile, the police and fire services were integrated into one metro command in March 1974.²³ The police service was integrated under the control and supervision of the Metropolitan Command (Metrocom) of the Philippine Constabulary following initially the recommendations of the Inter-Agency Committee on Metropolitan Manila report.²⁴ The basis made in integrating the service was Article IV, Sec. 12 of the 1973 Constitution which called for a National Police.

The Metro Manila proposal was received in the first quarter of 1974 at the cabinet level. The National Economic and Development Authority initiated a cabinet level meeting and briefing on Metro Manila which was made by Dean Raul P. de Guzman of the U.P. College of Public Admin-

istration.²⁵ The briefing dealt on the need for metro reform, the types of structure possible, the boundary, the functions and financing of the structure. The encouraging result of this meeting was the common agreement of the cabinet members on the need to establish within the feasible time a metropolitan authority. Dean de Guzman suggested a Metropolitan Planning Authority as envisioned in the UP, LGC report. Secretary Roño sought the retention of local governments and the establishment of a structure following the Greater London Metropolitan Council while DAP President Corpuz favored a metropolitan government because it would have a charter of its own, thus, binding the metro executive to the provisions of such charter.

On the territorial jurisdiction of the metro area, the cabinet members and other participants suggested the 27 local governments as defined by the Census; the 8 provinces as identified by the DPWTC; 17 local units now covered by the MMCC and additional three municipalities; the ring concept to include only the areas which have common boundaries with the Manila core; and an elastic boundary to have flexibility of coverage as needed by the programs and services to be integrated. The final one was seriously considered because services and functions

²³ Presidential Decree No. 421 issued on March 21, 1974.

²⁴ See Panel 1 of the Report on Police, Inter-Agency Committee on Metro Manila, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-59.

²⁵ Those attending the March 20, 1974 meeting included NEDA Director-General Gerardo Sicat, Finance Secretary Cesar Virata, Public Works Secretary David Consunji, Local Governments Secretary Jose Roño, DAP President Onofre Corpuz, Asst. Executive Secretary Ramon Cardenas, and NTRC Director Angel Yoinco.

of the Metro structure would have varying geographical scope. The secretary of finance commented that earmarked funds for metro Manila as suggested by the various proposals would contravene a department policy of promoting a general fund concept. Thus, national taxes which would accrue to a special metro fund for the Metropolitan Manila Authority may not be feasible under the present fiscal policies.

DAP President Corpuz raised a fundamental issue while playing the role of an assertive "devil's advocate."²⁶ By establishing a national capital district and promoting its development, the NCD would become a "formidable competitor to countryside development." The idea will further widen the existing gap between the primate city and the rural areas of the country since more attention, funds and other resources will be poured into it. The metro concept will likewise accelerate rural to metro migration which might overload further the services and facilities of the metro area or negate whatever improvements in the delivery system of services that may be undertaken. Finally, President Corpuz stated that the National Capital District might weaken the political power of the President since the metro area would become an autonomous unit answerable only to the Parliament. It will be governed by special legislations emanating from the Parliament

²⁶ See the letter of DAP President Onofre D. Corpuz dated March 20, 1973.

and not by a general local government character or code.

The argument assumes that the metro area could fend for itself while the national government must give priority to the countryside which is a fact now and in past public policies.²⁷ Furthermore, this underlies a long bias against urban development: by letting the status quo take its deteriorating course, rural migrants will be repelled from drifting to the city. City residents may even find it more attractive if not illusory to return to their barrios. The thesis, however, does not take into account the emerging view that the primate city has a more important role in national development. In a developing country, Edwards contends that limited capital, managerial skills and other resources must be used optimally for the good of the nation and the people as a whole.²⁸ The area of critical concern, therefore, refers to the primate city which sustains development. It cannot be over-emphasized that by doing nothing, the counterproductive uses of land and resources in the metro area are continued to the disadvantage of the nation. The very purpose of managing effectively and planning ra-

²⁷ Cf. the views of Belinda A. Aquino, "Local Government and Community Development: The Indian and Philippine Experience," *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. IX Nos. 2-3 (April-July 1966); and Aprodicio A. Laquian, "The Need for a National Urban Strategy in the Philippines," *Philippine Planning Journal*, Vol. III, No. 2 (April 1972), pp. 11-22.

²⁸ Gordon Edwards, *The City in the Third World* (Quezon City: Institute of Planning, University of the Philippines, 1971), p. 15.

tionally the metro area is to enhance national development itself.²⁹

Peripheral but significant to the issue of metropolitan reform are the following questions which have to be seriously considered. Would it be a political or administrative change or a combination of both? What will be its areal jurisdiction? What specific services or functions will be devolved to the metropolitan structure and retained by either the local and national governments? At present, the services now metropolitanized under the national government include flood control, rapid access roads, waterworks, gas, police, fire communications, disaster control, Rizal park, pollution control, housing, and others. What will be the relations of the metro structures with the existing provincial governments (Rizal, Laguna, Bulacan, and Cavite)? What can be done with the two regional development councils embracing the metropolitan area (Region III — Central Luzon and Region IV — Southern Tagalog)? Will there be a redefinition of the regional area coverage and changes in the regional centers previously pinpointed? Will the existing Laguna Lake Development Authority continue with its operations in the light of a new proposed metropolitan planning structure? How best can the metropolitan reform be implemented with the least political repercussions but with maximum popular assent?

²⁹ Arturo Pacho, *The Role of Government in the Development Process* (Nagoya: U.N. Centre for Regional Development, 1973), p. 69.

The most telling statement of DAP President Corpuz was that the policy-makers must guard against restructuring metro Manila "because it is required by the IBRD"* or the World Bank for that matter. The matter must be considered within the national interests and purposes rather than as the preconditions for receiving technical and financial supports from elsewhere. A thorough review of the four alternative actions may be made including a fifth option: not to take any action. In one respect, the Philippines is behind such countries as Japan, India, Pakistan, Indonesia, or Australia in the region for not taking any official measure in establishing a metropolitan structure. The experiences in these countries in metropolitan reform should be analyzed in the light of the needs and peculiar situations in the Philippines.

The most studied proposal to create a Metropolitan Manila Authority may find guidance from the Calcutta Metropolitan Development Authority (1970) and the Karachi Development Authority (1957).³⁰ The Philippine proposal has a similar concept and structure with that of the Calcutta experience.³¹ The problems of the Cal-

* International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

³⁰ See the Karachi Development Authority Act, President's Order No. 5 of 1957 as amended, courtesy of the Embassy of Pakistan, Philippines.

³¹ See the Calcutta Metropolitan Development Authority Act, No. 17 of 1970, as subsequently passed by the West Bengal legislature, Act XI of 1972, courtesy of the Republic of India Embassy, Philippines.

cutta Authority are to be expected: large composition of the members of the Authority and its advisory council, dealings with the fragmented existing local units, lack of enforcing powers in planning and land use controls, and inadequacy of finance. The Metro Manila Authority proponents can only look back to the past expe-

riences in managing regional development authorities established in the past, e.g., the Mindanao Development Authority or the Central Luzon-Cagayan Valley Development Authority. The development authorities did not live up to their expectations during the public flurry for their creation by the Philippine Congress.

TABLE 1.
SUMMARY OF THE VARIOUS PROPOSALS ON METRO MANILA

<i>Proponent</i>	<i>Type of Structure</i>	<i>Year Proposed</i>	<i>No. of Cities and Municipalities covered</i>	<i>Source of Financing</i>
1. Jose V. Abueva, Institute of Philippine Culture	Metro Manila Council	1972	10	Metro taxes National Government Grants Private Donations
2. Constitutional Convention Delegates	a. Metro Manila Government	1971	28	*
	b. Metro Manila Authority	1971	*	*
3. Development Academy of the Philippines	Metro Manila Authority	1974	27	Metro taxes National Government Grants
4. Inter-Agency Committee on Metropolitan Manila	a. Metropolitan Manila Authority	1973	17	National Government Grants
	b. Metro planning			Local Government Contributions
	c. Metro government			Metro fees
5. Institute of Environmental Planning, U.P.	Industrial and Urban Development Authority	1969	*	*
6. Joint Local Government Reform Commission	Manila Metropolitan Complex	1971	13	*
7. Aprodicio A. Laquan	National Capital District	1973	28	Metro taxes National Government

TABLE I (continued)

8. Local Government Center, U.P.	a. Metro Planning Authority b. Special Purpose Authorities c. Metro Government	1973	8	•
9. Salvador P. Lopez	National Capital Planning and Development Authority	1973	•	•
10. Manila Bay Metropolitan Region Strategic Plan Project (DPWTC)	a. Council of Local Governments b. General Purpose Metro/Regional Government c. Metropolitan Development Authority d. Regional Planning Office in the National Government	1971	40	•
11. Metro Manila Councilors Assembly	Metropolitan Manila Council	1973	28	Fixed local contributions Transfer of national taxes Foreign/local borrowings
12. Metro Mayors Coordinating Council	Metropolitan Manila Council	1973	14	Fixed local contributions Metro Charges National Government Grants Private Donations

* Not spelled out.