

The

**LANGUAGE
PROVISION**

of the 1987 Constitution
of the Republic of the Philippines

ANDREW GONZALEZ, FSC

AND

WILFRIDO V. VILLACORTA

UP MAIN LIBRARY



00075363

Linguistic Society of the Philippines
Manila
2001

THE LANGUAGE PROVISION
OF THE 1987 CONSTITUTION
OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Andrew Gonzalez, FSC
and
Wilfrido V. Villacorta

Manila
Linguistic Society of the Philippines
2001

Published in 2001
by The Linguistic Society of the Philippines
2401 Taft Avenue, Manila, Philippines

Copyright © Andrew Gonzalez, FSC and Wilfrido V. Villacorta

All rights reserved.
No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted,
in any form or by any means—
electronic, mechanical, photocopying,
recording, or otherwise—without permission
in writing from the publisher.

Printed by De La Salle University Press, Inc.
2504 Leon Guinto St., Malate, Manila, Philippines

ISBN 971-780-008-1

DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF

LEOPOLDO Y. YABES

PROFESSOR, SCHOLAR, LIFELONG STUDENT OF

NATIONAL LANGUAGE ISSUES

PREFACE

This faithful record of, and excellent commentary on, the proceedings of the 1986 Constitutional Commission in the adoption of Filipino as the national language and the role of other languages in the Philippines depict the conflicting ideas and difficulties of a people composed of many ethnolinguistic groups in building a national language out of their many languages, both native and borrowed.

The personal struggle of one person in search of recognition and identity in a community is difficult enough. The struggle becomes much more difficult when ethnic groups of varying statuses compete for recognition and equality towards collective, national identity. The process often calls for compromise and reconciliation; in the Philippine case it calls for the shedding off of some deep-rooted and often conflicting ethnic loyalties and interests, a process of deethnicization that must transcend ethnicity. The 'aches and pains' of the process are vividly reflected in the proceedings of the 1986 Constitutional Commission recorded in this volume. The extensive communications by many groups on what should be included in the constitutional provision on language show the deep concern of people from various walks of life on the language question.

It will be recalled that in the 1973 Constitution the Philippines 'lost' its national language when Pilipino (spelled with a P) was recognized as an official language but not as the national language. The 1973 Constitution declared that steps shall be taken to evolve a national language to be called Filipino (spelled with a capital F) out of the many Philippine languages. Pilipino (spelled with a capital P) was viewed by many, including the late Professor Leopoldo Y. Yabes, to whose memory this volume is dedicated, as representing only Tagalogs. This view was not exactly wrong because of the erroneous view held by the originators of the *balarila*, the 'official' grammar of the early national language,

that Philippine languages did not have the sound 'f'. Those who advocated Filipino (spelled with a capital F) felt that the letter F included speakers of all Philippine languages, thus reinforcing the idea that a Philippine national language should represent all Filipinos. One of the most debated topics in the 1986 constitutional commission was whether the proper steps had already been taken to develop Filipino and whether that language had already evolved.

The deliberations of the Constitutional Commission clearly demonstrate the extreme difficulty of one phase of language planning, that of selection, which includes matters of language replacement and language shift.

The account of the formal discussions by the commissioners, characterized by divergent views often subtly surfacing in the guise of sharp verbal exchanges bordering on acrimonious debate, is characteristic of the debates on the language question in the 1934 and 1971 constitutional conventions. This debate will continue as various groups of men and women struggle in the building of Filipino.

In writing this book, Andrew B. Gonzalez, FSC, sociolinguist and language history scholar, and Wilfrido Villacorta, political scientist, make an important contribution to the history of a people in their search not only for a symbol of national unity and identity but even more important, the search for an adequate working tool – because language must be viewed as a tool for personal and national advancement.

With the arguments finally put to rest as to what the national language of the Philippines is, it now remains for Filipinos to cultivate and elevate Filipino from that of a national lingua franca to that of an intellectualized language mainly through writing in all areas of human knowledge, so that it may effectively function as the working language in all the important domains of language: government administration, legislation, the judiciary, science and technology, commerce and industry, communication, education at all levels, and the professions.

The main responsibility of intellectualizing Filipino must squarely rest upon the lead population – those in academe, the scholar-writers and lecturers in the professions and the leaders in the various domains of language mentioned above. The work on intellectualization may take a very long time and will require a great amount of money, effort and brains, but it can be done.

Those who invoke patriotism and nationalism as integral components of the Filipino's thinking must include this volume in their list of readings. I recommend that the book be included in reading lists of liberal education courses of colleges and universities.

BONIFACIO P. SIBAYAN

March 31, 2000

Parañaque, Metro Manila

CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iii
PREFACE	v
INTRODUCTION	1
PART ONE	
1.1 The Language Provision of the 1987 Constitution	5
and its Significance	
1.1.1 Filipino	6
1.1.2 Extending the Domain of Filipino	14
1.1.3 Official Languages	16
1.1.4 Languages of Promulgation	19
1.1.5 National Language Commission	20
1.2 Historical Antecedents	22
1.3 The Process	27
1.3.1 The Preparatory Phase	27
1.3.2 The Writing Phase	29
1.3.3 The Deliberation Phase	31
1.3.4 The Voting Phase	37
1.4 Reflections	39

PART TWO

DOCUMENTATION	45
2.1 Other Voices: Position Papers/Letters/	45
Communications Addressed to the Committee on Human Resources	
APOLINAR, CRISPIN G. Concerned Muslim -	45
Christian Citizens	
BROKESHIRE COLLEGE OF NURSING	48
(Davao City)	
CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF	51
THE PHILIPPINES	
CONFEDERACION NACIONAL DE PROFESORES	53
DE ESPAÑOL Resolution to make Spanish one of the official languages of the Philippines in the Constitution together with Filipino and English as provided for in the 1935 Constitution.	
CONFEDERACION NACIONAL DE PROFESORES	57
DE ESPAÑOL Resolution (September 29, 1986) to delete the optional provision on Spanish in the Draft of the Constitution.	
CONSTANTINO, ERNESTO A Note on the Filipino	58
Language	

CONSTANTINO, ERNESTO, CONSUELO J. PAZ,.....	60
ROSARIO TORRES-YU, JESUS FER RAMOS Proposal para sa ConCom: Probisyon para sa pambansang wika (Proposals to the ConCom: Provisions for the national language)	
DAVAO CITY ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS,	82
PARENTS AND STUDENTS Resolution to include Spanish as one of the official languages	
FILIPINO WORKERS AND STUDENTS IN MADRID	84
Petition for the continued inclusion of Spanish as one of our official languages in the new Philippine Constitution	
FRANCISCO, JUAN R. On the bilingual education	87
policy: A critique	
KAPATIRAN NG MGA KAWAL NA MANUNULAT	90
SA PILIPINO (KAKAMPI) [Soldier-Writers Association of the Philippines]. A Resolution recommending to the Constitutional Commission (ConCom) to adopt Pilipino as official national language of the Philippines as well as English and local dialects as auxiliary languages	
KAPISANAN SA PAGPAPALAGANAP NG PILIPINO	93
(KAPAGPIL) [A Resolution for the creation of a National Language Commission]	

LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF THE PHILIPPINES	97
On the National Language	
MULTI-ETHNIC CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR	98
CON-COM RES. NO. 286 National Language	
Proclamation Pre-Mature–Must We Continue to	
Have Second-Class Citizens? English as	
International Language	
SANGGUNIANG PANGWIKA SA EDUKASYON	104
NG PILIPINAS [Language Education Council	
of the Philippines]. Paninindigang Pangwika	
[Stand on Language] Resolution requesting	
the members of the Constitutional Commission	
that the projected Philippine Constitution	
be written and promulgated in the National	
Language	
SIN, JAIME CARDINAL Letter of September 4, 1986	117
requesting for the retention of the Spanish language	
as one of our official languages	
SURIAN NG WIKANG PAMBANSA Mungkahing	119
Teksto Tungkol sa Wikang Pambansa ng Sinusulat	
na Saligang - Batas ng Republika [Suggested Text	
on the National Language in the New Constitution]	
SURIAN NG WIKANG PAMBANSA, MGA KAWANI NG ..	123
[Position on Pilipino as the nucleus of Filipino]	

TENGONCIANG, SALUSTIANO G. Pilipino bilang.....	125
wika ng agham [Filipino as a language of science]	
2.2 Minutes of the Committee on Human Resources	132
Meetings	
June 18, 1986 Meeting with Resource Persons	
June 25, 1986 Meeting on the First Draft of	
the Sections on Language	
July 15, 1986 Committee Report No. 29	
2.3 Records of Plenary Sessions of the	180
Constitutional Commission	
September 1, 1986	
September 9, 1986	
September 10, 1986	
REFERENCES	378
APPENDIX	380
Language Provision of Philippine Constitutions	
and Laws	
Biak-na-Bato Constitution (1896)	
Malolos Constitution (1899)	
Commonwealth Constitution (1935)	
Laurel Constitution (1943)	
Marcos Constitution (1973)	

Freedom Constitution (1986)

Aquino Constitution (1987)

Laws on the National Language

The National Language Law

(Commonwealth Act No. 184, 1936)

The Commission on National Language

(Republic Act No. 7104, 1991)

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this monograph is to present a detailed account of the deliberations of the 1986 Constitutional Commission (2 June 1986 to 15 October 1986) on the National Language Provision (Article IV, Sections 6-9) of the 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines.

Following the dramatic events of 22-25 February 1986, under the Freedom Constitution of Corazon C. Aquino, a Commission of forty-eight leaders representing different sectors of Philippine society was appointed after a nationwide call for nominations to draft a new Constitution to replace the questionably ratified Constitution of 1973 under Ferdinand E. Marcos (see Villacorta 1987 for an account of the dynamics and process of the writing of the Constitution).

Once appointed, the forty-eight Commissioners divided themselves into fourteen Committees on substantive content (excluding functional committees for finance, rules, privileges, public hearings, public information, sponsorship and style) among which was the Committee on Human Resources chaired by Wilfrido V. Villacorta and Lugum Uka as Vice-Chairman. The other members of this Committee were:

Teodoro Bacani
Ponciano Bennagen
Florangel Braid
Lino Brocka
Jose Luis Gascon
Serafin Guingona
Minda Luz Quesada
Cirilo Rigos
Christine Tan
Efrain Toñas

To the Committee was entrusted the responsibility of drafting the constitutional articles on education, culture, sports, science and technology, and language.

This monograph attempts to record for posterity the deliberations which eventually led to the provision on language. In the words of Blas Ople, one of the Commissioners, '[The designation of Filipino as the national language] is the settlement of a long, pending and nagging issue on the historical agenda of the Filipino people' (Constitutional Commission 1987a 4:491). Because of this important historical fact, not only the final version but the background materials, discussions, inputs from public hearings held, and position papers, have been gathered together in one volume to provide the context in which the final legislation was made.

The monograph thus attempts to do what the late Professor Leopoldo Y. Yabes did for the Constitutional provision on language in the 1973 Constitution in his monograph *Let's Study the New Constitution. The Language Provision* (1973), since for historical purposes the 1987 Constitution is the first basic charter of the Republic which has finally *selected* a national language, previous constitutions (the 1899 Malolos Constitution, the 1935 Commonwealth Constitution, the 1973 Marcos Constitution), except for the 1943 Laurel Constitution which affirmed the 1937 National Language Institute selection of Tagalog as 'the basis of the National Language'), having been noncommittal as to which language would be the national language. Instead, a programmatic statement, 'Congress shall take steps towards the formation of a common national language...' had been made.

A survey of the language provision of previous constitutions of the Philippines reveals that the Constitution of the Biak-na-Bato Republic of 1896 chose Tagalog as the national language; the Constitution of the Malolos Republic of 1899 was noncommittal about a national language; after 1899, except for the short-lived and controversial Laurel

Constitution of 1943, which confirmed Tagalog as the basis of the national language resulting from its choice by the National Language Institute in 1937, the other two Constitutions (the 1935 Commonwealth Constitution and the 1973 Marcos Constitution) were programmatic in their orientation towards the national language. They mandated the Legislature (the National Assembly of the Congress) to take steps towards the formation of a common national language and made no affirmation about the national language itself.

What was unique, therefore, about the 1987 Constitution was its affirmation of one language as the national language, assuming one language as the national language, assuming and not mandating its existence. Given this specific development, which is the subject of the monograph, the historic significance of such an event demands detailed documentation for historic and nationalistic purposes.

Wilfrido V. Villacorta as Chairman of the Committee on Human Resources presided over many of the deliberative sessions and acted as spokesman of the Committee during the plenary sessions for approving the pertinent articles of the Constitution (which had to go through three readings). He was likewise the recipient of numerous communications (position papers, studies, letters and telegrams) voicing various sentiments on the issue of language, which seems to stir both the eloquence and emotions of the average Filipino. Because of this, he is in a unique position to co-author this monograph documenting the steps which led towards the final version of the article in the Constitution.

Andrew Gonzalez, FSC, as Executive Secretary of the Linguistic Society of the Philippines and as a publishing scholar in the field of national language development, has approached the subject from the point of view of a sociolinguist and a historian of national language development; the study thus complements his earlier work on the development of the national language entitled *Language and Nationalism: The Philippine Experience Thus Far* (1980).

The viewpoints and approaches thus complement each other: a socio-political and legal approach coupled with a historico-linguistic approach.

The monograph begins with the end product of the process, the provision itself, and then renders an account of the deliberations leading to the final version, situating these deliberations within the larger context of the debate on the national language. The dynamics of the process which eventually led to the final provision are described and their implications for language development and nationalism explored, including their theoretical ramifications for the theory of language planning. The second part of the monograph reproduces the pertinent and most important documents and background materials of the deliberations. The appendices reproduce for the scholar of Philippine language development the pertinent constitutional sections on the nation's national language and the laws enacted subsequent to some of these constitutional provisions.

Manila
March 31, 2001

Andrew Gonzalez, FSC
and
Wilfrido V. Villacorta

Part One

1.1. The language provision of the 1987 Constitution and its significance

The approval of a national language will be remembered down the corridors of history in the coming centuries as one of the real and enduring achievements of this Commission (Blas Ople, in Constitutional Commission, 1987a.4.480).

May I just take issue with some of the members of the committee who have tended to underrate the significance of the decision already taken by the Committee and the Commission declaring Filipino as the national language of the Philippines. There is a sense in which having made this decision the rest follows. I do not want the committee to denigrate its own achievement in putting forward this historic proposal which the Commission has approved. It is not empty rhetoric; it is the settlement of a long, pending and nagging issue on the historical agenda of the Filipino people. I think we should not deny the committee and the Commission the credit for that. (Blas Ople, in Constitutional Commission 1987a4:491).

The provisions on language of the 1987 Constitution are found in Article IV, Sections 6 to 9, of the charter. They read as follows:

Sec. 6. The national language of the Philippines is Filipino. As it evolves, it shall be further developed and enriched on the basis of existing Philippine and other languages.

Subject to provisions of law and as the 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 in the educational system.

Sec. 7. For purposes of communication and instruction, the official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and, until otherwise provided by law, English. The regional languages are the auxiliary official languages in the regions and shall serve as auxiliary media of instruction therein.

Spanish and Arabic shall be promoted on a voluntary and optional basis.

Sec. 8. This Constitution shall be promulgated in Filipino and English and shall be translated into major regional languages, Arabic, and Spanish.

Sec. 9. The Congress shall establish a national language commission composed of representatives of various regions and disciplines which shall undertake, coordinate, and promote researches for the development, propagation, and preservation of Filipino and other languages.

1.1.1. Filipino

The key provision in this subset of sections of Article IV of which Commissioner Blas Ople remarked, ‘There is a sense in which having made this decision the rest follows’, is Sec. 6 on the affirmation of Filipino as the national language. The key word in the sentence is the verb *is*: ‘The national language of the Philippines *is* Filipino’ (emphasis ours). Unlike the earlier articles on language

in the 1935 Constitution and the 1973 Constitution, which were stated in the desiderative future tense, this statement is in the declarative present and assumes that there is already such a language. This is a major breakthrough, for in the 1935 Constitution, the provision mandated the National Assembly to take steps towards the formation of a common national language based on one of the existing Philippine languages; the 1973 Constitution charged the National Assembly to take steps towards the formation of a common national language to be called Filipino which is to be based on all the existing Philippine languages. In 1987, some progress had apparently been made, so that there was no mandate to form a common national language but to recognize one already existing and called Filipino.

Commissioner Hilario Davide, during the constitutional commission meetings on the language provision on September 9 and 10, 1986, questioned this provision purely as a point of fact. Between 1973 and 1986 (the year of the deliberations, before the ratification of the charter a year later), had there been steps taken to justify the assumption that there was now a national language called Filipino? As a matter of fact, between 1973 and 1986, neither in the 1978 Interim Batasang Pambansa established by the Martial Law Government nor in the 1984 elective Batasang Pambansa, had there been any act passed creating a National Language Commission. How then could any legal status be assumed for Filipino?

The Committee on Human Resources, which had unanimously passed the sections on national language presented initially by the Subcommittee on Language headed by Commissioner Cirilo Rigos (Transcription of the Committee Meeting on June 25, 1986; see Committee on Human Resources), averred through its Chairman that although no legal provision had been enacted to establish a National Language Commission or

to establish Filipino as the national language of the Philippines, a language called Filipino antedated even the 1973 Constitution.

As explained by Commissioner Villacorta (Constitutional Commission, 17b. 1045), Filipino is the national lingua franca in use throughout the Philippines, the language used as a common medium of communication between a native Cebuano and a native Ilocano, for example. Because of its historical roots in the greater Manila area, its features resembled Tagalog more than any other Philippine language, but as it developed and as it was enriched by Philippine and other languages in its vocabulary and its idioms and even collocations, it would evolve into a language that was no longer dominated in its features by Tagalog but would manifest features of different Philippine and other languages.

In a *Philippine Studies* article, Gonzalez (1974) described Filipino in the 1973 Constitution as a legal fiction arrived at as a compromise formula acceptable to the different ethnic groups represented in the 1972-73 constitutional convention. As he remarked then, Filipino was a term with a sense (a composite or amalgam of Philippine languages) but without a reference (the language did not yet exist and was still to be formed). He also doubted its viability (whether or not such a concocted language could find speakers).

An account of the designation of Filipino as a compromise formula is given by Gonzalez (1980), based on the documentation provided by Yabes (1973). It would seem, based on the hearings of the committee, that what finally convinced the constitutional convention members was the opinion of the late Cecilio Lopez, dean of Philippine linguists, who stated that such a 'universal approach' was possible. The exponent of this 'universal approach' (later called 'universalist approach') has been Ernesto Constantino (1982), whose own program of lexicographic research at present is

attempting to develop a 'universal dictionary' of Philippine formatives including as many expressions of the same concept as these expressions are found in the languages of the Philippines.

Earlier discussions of this approach explained that in addition to extensive lexicographic or vocabulary inclusion into Filipino, it was likewise possible to include grammatical elements of other languages into the structure of Filipino. A linguistic model for this was proposed by Constantino (1965) based on Chomsky (1965), whereby the deep structure of sentences in the Philippine languages was universal or common among the Philippine languages, the surface differentiations arising from transformational rules. Under this view, Filipino would thus be free to incorporate transformational rules from other Philippine languages in addition to the rules presently found in Tagalog.

Later discussions of Filipino, however, seem to have shelved this ambition in favor of exclusively lexicographic inclusions. Based on the discussions of Filipino at the 1986 Constitutional Commission meetings, and the answers of the commissioners when queried about the features of Filipino, the consensus seems to have been that the basic structure (grammar) of Tagalog would be retained, with freedom to include loanwords and even calques and collocations (idioms and expressions) from 'Philippine languages' as well as influencing languages such as Spanish, English, and Arabic, and future world languages which may influence culture and civilization in this part of the world.

Moreover, the door is open even to the inclusion in the future of grammatical features (morphemes or affixes of nouns and verbs) which are part not only of the lexicon but likewise of the grammar so that even the aspectual inflection of verbs can undergo evolution by incorporating aspectual markers or formatives from other Philippine languages.

It should be noted that the constitutional commissioners were not linguists, although they diligently consulted linguists and read up on linguistic materials, especially the Chairman, Wilfrido Villacorta. Technical questions on grammatical structure could not be answered by such lawmakers since such questions would be beyond their areas of competence. Thus, it would seem that in the minds of charter legislators, the incorporation of features from other Philippine languages was primarily one of lexicon or vocabulary. However, once vocabulary is allowed, if these non-native vocabulary items include phonemes which do not belong to the inventory of the base language, then the phonology or sound system is modified (as Tagalog has been modified) for example by the inclusion from Spanish of vowels /e/ and /o/ and by the consonants /f/, /v/. Moreover, with the inclusion of grammatical morphemes as borrowings, even the surface structure of sentences would begin to look different and hence there would be grammatical modification, although when questioned directly, the formula of 'lexical enrichment from all Philippine languages' based on a Tagalog grammatical base was accepted by the committee members.

However, when asked to give examples of what would be considered Filipino, based on examples cited by the Chairman, it was clear that a wide leeway was envisaged by the committee on what was meant by inclusion or incorporation of other vocabulary, as found in the following examples which are considered Filipino:

PILIPINO Si Bb. Jane Reyes, na isang guro sa pamantasan, ay pumasok sa silid-aralan na may hawak na aklat, kuwaderno at yeso, at isinulat niya sa pisara ang araling-bahay para sa pagsusulat bukas.

FILIPINO Si Miss Jane Reyes, na isang titser sa universidad, ay pumasok sa klasrum na may hawak na libro, notbuk at tsok, at sinulat niya sa blakbord ang homework para sa test bukas.

‘Miss Jane Reyes, a teacher in the university, entered the classroom holding a book, notebook and some chalk, and wrote on the blackboard the materials for home study for the test tomorrow.’

PILIPINO Mas makisig nga ang asawa kong kastila sa asawa mong kano.

FILIPINO Mas guwapo g’yud ang bana kong kastila sa bana mong kano.

‘Indeed my Spanish husband is handsomer than your American husband.’

PILIPINO Maganda daw ang kaniyang kaibigan.

FILIPINO Guwapa kuno ang kaniyang amiga. (?Cebuano)
‘According to him/her, his/her friend is pretty.’

PILIPINO Demonyo, magnanakaw pala ang binata.

FILIPINO Yawa, kawaton pala ang soltero. (?Hiligaynon)
‘Zounds! I didn’t realize that the young (unmarried) man is a thief.’

PILIPINO Huwag ka nga namang tumakbo.

FILIPINO ‘Wag ka man magtakbo ngarud.
‘Indeed (I agree with somebody), please don’t run.

PILIPINO Meron pa ba?

FILIPINO Meron pa ngani? (?Hiligaynon)
‘Do you have some more?’

PILIPINO Hindi na. Wala'na.

FILIPINO Hindi na. Wala na.

'Never mind. There is no more.'

Samples and annotations
in parentheses are
taken from the files of
Wilfrido Villacorta

One cannot help but conclude that what is meant by Filipino based on the examples above is really a language mixture (using the technical term 'pidgin' because of its low-level connotations would probably not be acceptable) which can then be gradually creolized (i.e. used as a first language by children learning the language as native speakers) across generations as it undergoes evolution. In fact, the nature of this language mixture seems to be mooted by Constantino (1986, reproduced in this volume) when he remarked at a hearing that eventually the differences between Filipino and Tagalog will be as great as those between Chavacano and Spanish, Chavacano being a Central Tagalic-Spanish mixture.

The basis of Filipino is a matter of controversy.

The first position is that Filipino is really Tagalog-based Pilipino which has been and will continue to be enriched by vocabulary from Philippine and other languages. This is the position taken by the Language Education Council (LEDCO) headed in 1986 by Alfonso Santiago. In this position, LEDCO took a view similar to that of the Institute of National Language (1986), which in its position paper stated that Filipino should be the language enriched with Tagalog-based Pilipino as its 'nucleus'. The Institute of National Language took pains to point out that contrary to the perceptions of many, Pilipino has never been puristic.

The second position is that Filipino is not Tagalog-based but has been a mixture from the beginning, being the lingua franca of Metro Manila and spreading throughout the country especially in urban centers. As it spread, it has been enriched in vocabulary by others languages. To our recollection, the name FILIPINO as applied to this Manila Lingua Franca was first used by the late Geruncio Lacuesta, the founder of the Modernizing the Language Movement (MOLAM), in 1967. The name was subsequently and most likely independently taken up by Constantino when he referred to the local language prevalent at UP as 'UP Filipino', a term he later dropped in favor of just 'Filipino' because of the perception of some that the term was chauvinistically in favor of UP. This Manila Lingua Franca or (UP) Filipino is a living language and has been in use for some time; it makes extensive use of borrowings especially from English when it discusses modern topics in academia. (Not all linguists, however, accept the contention that it is not Tagalog-based. For these linguists, it is one variety of vernacular or colloquial or informal Tagalog with extensive borrowings from English and Spanish.)

The third position is that Filipino is a language yet to be formed, an amalgamation of the Philippine languages; this was the interpretation of the term by the 1973 Constitutional Convention members. Based on their discussions, one is led to conclude that the amalgamation envisaged was not only one of lexicon but even of grammatical features or structures, so that in effect what one would have would be a Philippine Esperanto or Language Mixture. It would seem that it is this concept that is still in the back of the minds of Cebuanos such as former Governor Emilio Osmeña, Jr., who contended in 1989 and in 1990 that what was being propagated in the educational system was Tagalog-based Pilipino and that Filipino was still to be formed by the

National Language Commission. Based on the minutes of the discussions of the Constitutional Commission of 1986-87, however, this interpretation is now questionable.

Our own position is that Filipino is based on Tagalog (already enriched with loanwords from Arabic and Sanskrit and Kapampangan) and enriched with loanwords from Spanish and English; it was renamed Pilipino in 1959 by the Secretary of Education (Jose Romero); it is being further enriched by loanwords from Philippine and other languages. Lexically, therefore, like other modern languages (for example, English), Filipino is multi-based and is a language mixture; its grammatical base and therefore structures are still Tagalog, however. The possibility is that as these structures evolve, from the influences of other Philippine languages, further modifications of grammatical morphemes through borrowing may enter the language and may lead to grammatical restructuring or at least the modification of subsystems within the system (for example, verb inflection and derivation).

1.1.2. Extending the Domains of Filipino

Unlike previous sections in earlier Constitutions, the language sections of the 1987 charter make it explicit that Filipino will not only be a medium of official communication (an official language) but likewise (and here is the new element) a language of instruction in the educational system.

The Constitutional Commissioners thus gave recognition to the on-going bilingual scheme of the Department of Education, Culture and Sports, initiated in 1974, evaluated in 1985, and restated (with slight modifications) in 1987 (see Gonzalez and Sibayan 1988).

The use of two languages (Filipino and English) has been accepted to a large extent by parents, teachers (with some reservations by teachers of English and some administrators), administrators of GO's and NGO's, and students. There is agreement likewise that Filipino should be used at the elementary level, less agreement on its use at the secondary level, widespread reservations about its wide use at the tertiary level. The latter two levels are perceived as presenting problems of viability because of the relative underdevelopment of Filipino thus far for academic use and scholarly work. Moreover, by an overwhelming majority, parents, teachers, students refuse to identify nationalism and patriotism on the one hand with preference for the use of Filipino in schools or even the knowledge of and mastery of Filipino on the other hand. Based on a nationwide survey (the 1985 evaluation of the bilingual scheme, commissioned by DECS and carried out by the Linguistic Society of the Philippines under the direction of Andrew Gonzalez, FSC and Bonifacio P. Sibayan), there is acceptance of the use of two or more languages in the system; the desirability of having a symbol of linguistic unity and national identity (a national language); acceptance of Tagalog-based Pilipino/Filipino as the national language (except among some Cebuanos). But the persistent and widespread objection to the notion of identifying nationalism with monolingualism becomes vocal not only among Cebuanos but among all sectors from different ethnic groups as may be witnessed by the heated reactions against Executive Order Number 335 issued on August 25, 1988 enjoining the more frequent use of Filipino as an official language in government. The latter was mistaken to be a policy of monolingualism in Filipino in schools and elicited verbally violent reactions (see Gonzalez 1989 for an account and its significance).

What *this* paragraph in section 6 of Article IV of the charter does is *open* the way for the gradual or speedy spread of the domains of Filipino in the curriculum and in the future a modification of the bilingual education scheme as it now stands (Filipino for all other subjects except for Mathematics, Science, and English Communication Arts, which will continue to be taught in English). The official extension of domain will be subject to 'provisions of law' and 'as the Congress may deem appropriate' and therefore the subject of future legislative action on specific details.

This latter concept is very important in the intellectualization of Filipino. It is the opinion of many experts that the main task in the intellectualization of a language must be in its written form. Until intellectual matters are available in writing, Filipino will always be secondary to English.

The increase of domains of Filipino will have to take into account the four language skills, i.e. the oral or spoken form even in teaching English is accepted in practically all domains; however, the written form (therefore also reading) is not yet an accepted skill, which it should be.

1.1.3. Official Languages

The official languages in the Philippines were Spanish in the Malolos Constitution; English in the 1935 Commonwealth Constitution; the National Language (Pambansang Wika) was declared an official language in 1946 based on an Act of Congress in 1940; the 1943 Laurel Constitution was silent on official languages although it proclaimed Tagalog to be the national language based on its earlier selection by the Institute of National Language. The 1973 Constitution declared Pilipino and English as official languages; a presidential decree (155) under the Martial

law Government of Ferdinand E. Marcos made Spanish an official language because of some laws promulgated in Spanish still in force. The 1987 Constitution made Filipino and English the official languages, that is to say, languages for carrying on the transactions of government, including legislation and the judiciary and official ceremonial functions.

However, unwittingly, the Constitutional Commissioners modified the meaning of 'official languages' by specifying what the domains of official languages are: 'for purposes of communication and instruction'. Thus, in the minds of the commissioners, instruction or the medium of instruction in the educational system is one domain of the official languages of the Philippines.

Quite evident in the minds of the commissioners is a decision on the diminishing role of English, for the official status of English for '(official) communication and instruction' is provisional, 'until otherwise provided by law'. Thus a congressional act in the future can change the status of English.

The regional languages are given new status in the charter for the first time, for they are declared 'auxiliary official languages' for their respective regions. More important, the charter restores the DECS policy on the use of vernaculars as auxiliary media of instruction (from 1957 to 1974); the provision gives this use official sanction in the Constitution.

The 'regional' languages are not only the *linguae francae* for regions of the Philippines (Ilokano for the North, Tagalog for Central Luzon and parts of Southern Luzon, Cebuano for the Visayas and parts of Mindanao) but the vernaculars themselves, since judging from the deliberations of the Committee on Human Resources (1986 a, b) and the plenary sessions of the Constitutional Commission itself (1986 a,b), regional languages were considered synonymous with vernacular languages.

The 1899 Malolos Constitution, besides recognizing Spanish temporarily as the only viable official language, mandated that the local language continue and be developed; the 1987 provision is thus a return to the importance given to the vernaculars by the 1899 Malolos Constitution, a restoration of their status by being declared official languages for government communication and instruction in their respective regions, however, as auxiliary and not principal languages.

The 1987 DECS Policy on Bilingual Education gives the vernaculars the same importance for initial literacy and suggests that they be used as initial media of instruction for transition to Filipino and English.

Spanish and Arabic, because of their importance for Philippine history and the past and present, are given special notice by a statement that they shall be promoted 'on a voluntary and optional basis'.

The voluntary nature of the promotion of Spanish, thus automatically abolishing the till-then existing congressional law on the mandatory teaching of Spanish in college, was enacted by the majority of the commissioners for reasons of nationalism and as a declaration of independence from a former colonial power, without thereby minimizing the importance of Spanish for cultural and historical reasons.

A persistent and powerful Spanish lobby, led by the crusader, Miguel Cuenco, re-enforced by the Confederación de Profesores de Español, led by the late Rosario Valdes-Lamug, attempted to maintain the official status of Spanish and by implication the continuation of its mandatory teaching in schools. The lobby was able to solicit the support of Jaime Cardinal Sin, who wrote the Committee on Human Resources endorsing the continuation of Spanish as an official language; letters from students in the South (Ateneo de Davao University and Brokenshire College of Nursing

also in Davao City) likewise attempted to persuade the commissioners to maintain the status quo in Spanish. Even after third reading, Rosario Valdes–Lamug attempted to amend the provision by maintaining the official status of Spanish or at least deleting the article on its promotion on a voluntary and optional basis (if this provision had not been included, the status quo would have continued based on existing laws). The majority of the Constitutional Commissioners however were not persuaded, in spite of eloquent endorsement from Commissioner Ambrosio Padilla, who delivered a speech in Spanish endorsing the continuation of its official status because of the need for Spanish in the study of law, and from such Hispanophiles as Commissioners Gregorio Tingson, Hilario G. Davide, and Napoleon G. Rama.

Arabic was included explicitly upon the representation of the Muslim commissioners, especially Commissioners Lugum Uka and Abubakar R. Yusup.

It thus took a constitutional convention to eventually remove the onerous provisions in education on the mandatory teaching of Spanish, the result of a congressional act, so powerful was the Spanish lobby in the past, aided by some elements of the Roman Catholic Church.

A less persistent lobby for the maintenance of English in the educational system was the Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines (CEAP), often represented in person by Luz Emmanuel, RA; the CEAP position was for the indefinite continuation of the current DECS policy on bilingual education.

1.1.4. Languages of Promulgation

Section 8 states that the Constitution shall be promulgated in Filipino and in English; earlier attempts to promulgate the charter

likewise in Arabic and Spanish were amended to include translation into major regional languages, Arabic and Spanish, thus downgrading Arabic and Spanish and placing them on par with other major regional languages.

Whereas previous language provisions in the charters of the republic stated explicitly which version should prevail (English), the charter is noncommittal on which version (Filipino or English) should prevail in case of questions and doubts. The move was a diplomatic one to prevent divisiveness and so as not to lower the status of Filipino vis-à-vis a non-local language, English.

From the view point of practicality, however, as Commissioner Francisco Rodrigo (Constitutional Commission 1986 a.4. 516) observed, since all deliberations of the Convention were in English, should questions arise in the future, the interpretations based on the English text would hold more weight than the interpretations based on the Filipino text.

1.1.5. National Language Commission

The implementing agency of the 'development, propagation, and preservation of Filipino and other languages' is a National Language Commission which unlike the old *Linangan ng mga Wika sa Pilipinas* (Institute of Philippine Languages), the new name for the former *Surian ng Wikang Pambansa* (Institute of National Language), would not be under the Department of Education, Culture and Sports but would be an independent body presumably under the Office of the President.

Unlike other similar implementing language bodies mandated (by the 1935 and 1973 Constitution), the agency was charged not only with the development, propagation, and preservation of Filipino but also other Philippine languages. More properly,

preservation pertained to the other languages rather than Filipino since development and propagation would preclude the need for preservation.¹ Less clear is the mandate whether the other languages should also be developed and propagated or localized in their respective regions. The tenor of the deliberations would lend themselves to the latter interpretation.

The composition of the national language commission was likewise explicit (it was not in previous charters, the composition being dictated more by a later law, the Romualdez National Language Act of 1936). The commission would be composed of representatives of various regions (and therefore of various regional languages or vernaculars) and disciplines (subject matter specializations, therefore, experts, who would be charged with the supervision of the development of special registers of Filipino or what we would now call Filipino for Specific Purposes (for Medicine, Law, Computer Science, Science, Mathematics, Social Sciences, Literature, etc.) analogous to English for Specific Purposes).

The importance of research was highlighted, for the commission was charged with undertaking, coordinating and promoting research for language development. The research character of the commission was thus emphasized more than its merely promotional mission.

The degree of specificity about the composition and functions of this commission was reminiscent of the National Language Law (the Romualdez Commonwealth Act of 1936) more than the Constitutional provision of previous charters. Perhaps, learning

¹An interesting question arises on the status of English. Since a local variety of English called 'Filipino English' or 'Philippine English' has arisen and has by now been given recognition by consensus, is this variety of English then a 'Philippine language' and therefore deserving not only of preservation but likewise propagation and development?

from the past and the lack of progress in this area, the commissioners wanted to ensure details of implementation even in such a basic and general document as the fundamental law of the land.

1.2. Historical Antecedents

The sociolinguist Einar Haugen (1966) described four phases of national language development, phases which do not however have to be necessarily in sequence but which may overlap and even occur simultaneously. When a society makes a decision to adopt a national language, it *selects* the basis of this national language (which could be and usually is a local language), codifies the language (through the writing of a standard grammar and dictionary and guidelines for usage), disseminates or propagates the language, and cultivates the language (through register-building for its use in domains of the language, usually beginning with literature and ending with science).²

The selection of the basis of the national language can be a matter of legislation or merely one of consensus during crucial events of the state-becoming-a-nation's history. One remembers the dramatic 1929 meeting in Indonesia when Malay was chosen as the basis of the Indonesian National Language (see Alisjahbana 1967). More often, the selection is recorded in the basic or fundamental law of the land.

What is interesting about the Philippine case is that in its successive constitutions and its different republics, there has been

²The notion of codification is seminal, for standardization must be extended beyond grammar, dictionary and usage as the special registers under cultivation are built up and the conventions of each register are established by the practice of specialists.

an ambivalence about the choice or selection of the basis of the national language (the basis for development); to someone familiar with Philippine history, society, and culture, this ambivalence is indicative of the 'uncrystallized' condition (see Kikuchi 1990) of Philippine culture, to use a more neutral term than James Fallows' (1988) 'damaged culture'.

The 1896 Biak-na-Bato Republic stated that Tagalog was the national language, but the 1899 Malolos Republic, which was more representative of the different ethnic groups, made no commitment on the national language but decided to continue Spanish as the official language and to consider the use of languages spoken in the Philippines as 'optional', the domains of use not being made explicit.

Actually, the first document was drawn up by two ilustrados; for the Malolos Constitutional Assemblymen, which debated issues and articles crucial at the time, national language issues were secondary to the more supervenient issue of establishing a republic in the face of the American onslaught.

The national language issue became a real issue only in the 1934-35 Constitutional Assembly, when regional loyalties surfaced and no consensus could be found other than to state that 'the Congress shall take steps towards the development and adoption of a common national language based on one of the existing national languages'. Yabes (1973) makes the observation that the original wording voted on made no mention of 'one'; he makes the assertion that the Style Committee (for reasons not quite fully explained but commonly attributed to Quezon's influence) changed the proposition into a more realistic one by making the basis 'one of the existing national languages'.

By 1936, the National Language Law (Commonwealth Act Number 184) authored by Norberto Romualdez, had been passed;

in 1937, the National language Institute had been established and by December of that same year, after discussion and consultation with Cebuanos (who proved the most resistant), Tagalog was chosen as the basis of the national language and in future books and textbooks was referred to as the National Language or *Wikang Pambansa*. Its official promulgation as the national language came two years later, in 1939, after the grammar of Lope K. Santos and a bilingual vocabulary list (accepted as the beginnings of a dictionary), two requirements imposed by the national language law, had been submitted. It was mandated to be taught to future teachers in their pre-service curriculum and as a subject in fourth year high school beginning in School Year 1940-1941. In 1941 Congress passed a law making the national language an official language upon the granting of independence in 1946. The Laurel Constitution of 1943 confirmed the 1937 selection of Tagalog by stating that 'the government shall take steps towards the development and propagating of Tagalog as the national language'.

When the Constitutional Convention was called in 1972-1973, in spite of efforts of the renamed Institute of National Language between 1937 and 1972 to standardize (codify), propagate, and cultivate Tagalog or *Wikang Pambansa*, renamed by Education Secretary Jose Romero as *Pilipino* in 1959 for better acceptability, the divisiveness that characterized the 1934-35 Constitutional Assembly reappeared, and in 1972-73, there was even less consensus, in spite of hearings from experts and in spite of the work that had been accomplished on behalf of national language development by the Institute of National Language. In effect the INL was repudiated. The only compromise formula arrived at, this time without the heavy hand of the style committee making substantive changes, was

for the Batasang Pambansa to 'take steps towards the development and formal adoption of a common national language to be known as Filipino' based on all the Philippine and other languages (see Gonzalez 1980 for an account of these events).

It is interesting to note that between 1973 when the Constitution was ratified by the barangays through a questionable procedure of non-secret voting and the 1986 Constitutional Commission deliberations, no action was taken either by the Martial Law Government of Ferdinand E. Marcos or the Interim Batasang Pambansa (National Legislative Assembly) of 1978 or the elective Batasang Pambansa of 1984 to implement the Constitutional mandate on the national language, although there were bills presented (at least two) in committee which were never reported out.³ One surmises that language during those critical years was once more not a supervenient issue; one guesses, likewise, that its divisive nature would merely add fuel to regionalism rather than unify the country.

After the change in government on February 25, 1986, the provisional Freedom Constitution prior to the 1986 Constitutional Commission made no changes in the wording of the 1973 Constitution as far as language was concerned. When 48 Constitutional Commissioners were named by Corazon C. Aquino on the basis of the plenary powers she assumed on February 25, 1986, students of language development expected the language issue to be divisive once more, and in the climate of the new freedom, an issue that would be discussed vocally and vociferously.

³ Marcos issued a statement that the Filipino shall be competent in both English and Filipino during National Language Week in 1973.

To everyone's surprise, however, contrary to earlier expectations, to put it in the words of Wilfrido Villacorta, the *de facto* existence of Filipino as a national lingua franca was merely given *de jure* recognition initially by the Committee on Human Resources upon submission of the initial draft by Cirilo Rigos, Chairperson of the Subcommittee on Language. The Committee unanimously reported it out, and when presented to the Constitutional Commission in plenary session for discussion, with the exception of some changes in wording and a clarification that Filipino would incorporate lexical items from Philippine and other languages, the non-Tagalog constitutional commissioners (including the Cebuanos Hilario Davide, Napoleon Rama, and Regalado Maambong) consented to the formula and passed each sentence/paragraph of the sections on national language with an overwhelming vote, in many cases, unanimously (see Committee on Human Resources 1986 for the minutes).

One must sense the temper of the times in late 1986 and the euphoria that followed the events of EDSA and the unity that prevailed in the country to understand why at that time the choice of a symbol of linguistic unity and national identity as well as a determined program of dissemination and propagation through the controlling domains of government and education (ultimately leading to the replacement of English as the primary language of government and education) was not a divisive issue. For the moment, at least, nationalism expressed in language prevailed.

This prevalence of nationalism, without perhaps realizing its full implications for language policy, programming and implementation, was confirmed by the overwhelming vote of yes for the new Constitution during the referendum of 1987.

1.3. The Process

1.3.1. The Preparatory Phase

In preparing the sections on national language under the article on education, the Committee on Human Resources, with its members chaired by Wilfrido Villacorta, made special efforts to review the national language issue before drafting the paragraphs.

In the personal files of the Chairman, numerous statements and position papers on the national language problem, the language of instruction, language issues in education, the current state of Filipino use in government and other domains as well as education, the status and use of English, were painstakingly compiled and read. The Chairman's staff prepared précis and summaries of these studies and assisted in presenting issues (with their pro's and con's).

In addition, various language-related societies presented position papers (see Appendix 2.1.):

Linguistic Society of the Philippines

Language Education Council of the Philippines

(Sangguniang Pangwika sa Edukasyon ng Pilipinas)

Pambansang Samahan ng Linggwistikang Pilipino

Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines

Multi-Ethnic Citizens' Committee for Concon

Confederación Nacional de Profesores de Español

Miguel Cuenco

Ernesto Constantino, Consuelo J. Paz, Rosario-Torres Yu,

and Jesus Fer Ramos

Ernesto Constantino

Salustiano G. Tengonciang

Felipe Ma. Locsin

Kapatiran ng mga Kawal na Manunulat sa Pilipino (KAKAMPI)
 Kapatiran sa Pagpapalaganap ng Pilipino (KAPAGPIL),
 Lipa, Batangas (Sulpicio Frago)
 Surian ng Wikang Pambansa
 Concerned Muslim-Christian Citizens, Davao City
 (Crispin G. Apolinar)

In addition, public hearings were held both at the Batasang Pambansa hearing rooms and at various assemblies organized by private organizations, which invited the Chairman to address the group on the issues. Together with other Chairpersons of the Commission and as many members as could participate, the Chairman of the Committee on Human Resources traveled outside Manila on week-ends to listen to different sectors and groups give their opinions on the issues pertaining to his Committee, including language. Endorsements for Filipino naturally came from Tagalog-speaking regions, but even in non-Tagalog speaking regions, it was the observation of the Chairman that a variety of Filipino was understood and used and that an acceptable variety of this lingua franca was evident: 'We had public hearings in Legaspi City and Sorsogon, for instance; the participants endorsed Filipino as national language' (Villacorta in Davao 1986: 8). A final public hearing of experts took place on June 18, 1986 (Committee on Human Resources 1986a) at the Batasang Pambansa Complex in Quezon City.

A consensus was reached from the hearings and meetings with resource persons in national language; the consensus included the following major points:

Pilipino is the de facto nucleus of the national lingua franca, it being widely understood throughout the country.

Research shows that Pilipino can be easily learned by non-Tagalogs.

A national language will strengthen the Filipino national identity and character and contribute to the acceleration of the political development of the country because it will hasten the process of national integration. Efforts therefore should be made to develop the national language.

The development of the national language should adopt an open-minded non-puristic approach by welcoming the contributions of the other languages of the country and by integrating the relevant words and concepts into the development of the Filipino language.

However, efforts should not be abandoned in developing the other languages of the country. Moreover, the languages of the different regions, their *linguae francae*, should be recognized and further developed. This policy is in line with popular democracy and a recognition of the value of pluralism in Philippine society.

The Government should fully support the propagation of the use of the national language in various intellectual and scientific domains in school and in government. State support for the development of the national language is therefore an imperative.

1.3.2. The Writing Phase

Cirilo Rigos, Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Language, presented the following initial draft to the Committee on Human Resources on June 25, 1986 (Committee on Human Resources 1986 b:15):

Draft 1

A resolution to provide in the Constitution of 1986 for the development and formal adoption of a common national language to be known as Filipino, the creation of an eleven-member commission of national language and international language and prescribing the official language

- Section 1. The National Assembly shall take steps towards the development and formal adoption of a common national language to be known as Filipino, with Pilipino-Tagalog as the nucleus. Towards this end, the National Assembly shall create an eleven-member commission on National Language with the following as members: A Tagalog, a Cebuano, an Ilocano, a Hiligaynon, a Bicolano, a Waray, a Pampango, a Pangasinense, a Maranaw, a Maguindanao, and the eleventh to be drawn from one of the existing dialectal groups in the country. The chairman of the Commission shall be a Tagalog and its Vice-Chairman a Cebuano.
- Section 2. Until such time that the common national language, to be known as Filipino, shall have been developed and formally adopted, English and Pilipino shall be the official languages.
- Section 3. The Constitution shall be written in English and in Pilipino and translated into each language or dialect spoken by over three hundred thousand people. After the adoption of the common national language, the Pilipino text shall be replaced by Filipino which shall then be the principal text.

1.3.3. The Deliberation Phase

The initial draft essentially repeats the 1973 article on language in the Constitution with the provision for contributions from other languages; it is future-oriented and does not recognize the existence of Filipino as yet. Its major difference is that it accepts Pilipino-Tagalog as the nucleus of Filipino, the INL position.

After the discussion and amendments of the Committee, however, the draft was simplified as:

Draft 2

- Section 1. The national language of the Philippines is Filipino.
- Section 2. Steps shall be taken by the government towards the further development and enrichment of the national language and its use as a medium of communication in all branches of government and of instruction and research at all levels of the educational system.
- Section 3. The official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and English until otherwise provided by law.
- Section 4. The Constitution shall be promulgated in Filipino and in English.

The second draft constituted what Blas Ople later called ‘one of the real and enduring achievements of the Commission’ and what the chairman of the Committee himself called ‘making history’ by settling the issue of Filipino as an existing, not a programmatic, language. The second section was entirely new – the expansion of use of Filipino in all branches of government and at all levels of the educational system for instruction and research (its intellectualization).

The four short sections were once more reduced to 2 (1 & 2, 3 & 4) when the Committee submitted its report (Report No. 29) to the President of the Commission on July 15, 1986; this was the draft submitted to the Commission in plenary session on August 29, 1986:

Draft 3

- Section 1. The national language of the Philippines is Filipino. The national language shall be further developed as the basis of Philippine and other languages. Steps shall be taken by the government to further develop, enrich and use it as a medium of communication in all branches of government and as the language of instruction at all levels of the educational system.
- 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. The Constitution shall be promulgated in Filipino and English and shall be translated into the regional languages.

The conflation of four sections into two is not substantive. What is substantive is the explicit source or base of development (Philippine and other languages) and the importance of the regional languages both as auxiliary official languages in their respective regions and the translation of the charter into these regional languages. For the educational domain, the use of Filipino for research has been dropped.

Hilario G. Davide, Jr., as the unofficial spokesman of the Cebuanos, submitted omnibus amendments to the entire article on education, science, technology, arts and culture. Unlike more chauvinistic Cebuanos, Davide by that time seemed to have accepted Filipino 'based on existing native languages' as existing. He however stipulated its formal adoption after the establishment of a Commission on National Language. In the second section, he included Spanish as a third official language, together with Pilipino and English. Although he earlier submitted the first sentence 'The national language of the Philippines is Filipino', later discussion suggests that he did not yet accept Filipino at this time as already existing, a seeming contradiction of his earlier sentence. He also included the possible use of 'the regional native languages/ dialects' in their respective regions as subjects or as media of instruction at the elementary level 'as may be provided by law'. The charter is to be promulgated in Pilipino, English and Spanish and is to be translated into Arabic and the native languages spoken by at least one hundred thousand. In case of conflict, the English text shall prevail (see Davide 1986).

When the Commission met in plenary session to consider Draft 3, Davide presented once more his reservations about Filipino (see Constitutional Commission 1987 a. 4.154-6). According to Davide, the 1973 Constitution mandated the development of Filipino as a common national language based on the existing Philippine languages. A Commission on National Language was supposed to have been established by the National Assembly. After the Commission had worked on the language, it was supposed to have been formally adopted. However, since Filipino had not undergone any of these steps, how could the committee then claim that Filipino already existed? Citing Constantino et al.'s Filipino, he stated that there was more Spanish

in his proposal then any other language (besides Tagalog) and no Cebuano. The defenders of Filipino pointed to the national lingua franca antedating 1973 as Filipino and to the evolving nature of Filipino so that in the future it would include more words in Cebuano and other Philippine languages and fewer words in Spanish.

The Commissioner from Cebu was unconvinced and stated that he was going to submit his amendments at a future date.

During the plenary session of the Commission on September 9, 1986 (see Constitutional Commission 1987a. 4.462), Commissioner Davide queried the Committee about the draft presented for discussion and voting, which was now modified to include four sections once more. Cirilo Rigos, Chairman of the Sub-committee on Language, explained that the committee met the night before and decided to submit the modified draft of four sections for discussion instead of the earlier one. This modified version became the basis of the voting subsequently.

Draft 4

Section 1. The national language of the Philippines is Filipino which shall be further developed on the basis of Philippine and other languages. Steps shall be taken by the government to use it as a medium of communication in all branches of government and as the language of instruction at all levels of the education system. THE REGIONAL LANGUAGES SHALL SERVE AS AUXILIARY MEDIA OF INSTRUCTION IN THEIR RESPECTIVE REGIONS. ENGLISH SHALL BE MAINTAINED AS A SECOND LANGUAGE AND AS AN

ALTERNATIVE MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION,
UNTIL OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY LAW.

- 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. FOR HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL REASONS, SPANISH SHALL BE ACCORDED THE STATUS OF SPECIAL OFFICIAL LANGUAGE.
- Section 3. The Constitution shall be promulgated in Filipino and English and shall be translated into the regional languages. [In case of conflict, let the courts resolve the conflict by using whichever text they wish to use.]
- Section 4. There shall be established a Commission on Languages composed of language experts that shall undertake, coordinate and promote researches on Filipino and other languages in connection with the development, propagation and preservation of the national language and the regional languages.

Draft 4, drawn up to forestall objections from non-Tagalog commissioners, adds the regional languages as auxiliary media of instruction in their respective regions and moves this sentence to Section 1. The maintenance of English as a second language and as an alternative medium of instruction is likewise added to this section, most likely in response to the English lobby.

The second section adds Spanish as a special official language.

For the first time, too, a Commission on Language is mandated by a constitutional provision for the development, propagation and preservation of the national language and the regional languages.

In spite of these attempts to please as many commissioners as possible, heated discussions arose, with the pro-Cebuano block represented by Hilario Davide, Jr., Abraham Sarmiento, and Napoleon Rama, and the pro-Filipino bloc represented by Wilfrido Villacorta, Ponciano Bennagen, and Blas Ople. The point of the disagreement was still the concept of Filipino as a language yet to be formed.

The session was recessed and resumed on September 10 (see Constitutional Commission 1987 a. 4 475-520).

In the discussions during this session, the concept of Filipino as explained by the Chairman of the Committee on Human Resources was clarified further:

- ‘ . . . There is a lingua franca which we can call Filipino’ (478)
 ‘Filipino is not based on Tagalog or Pilipino alone, but it has incorporated the contributions of other Philippine languages and dialects, as well as Spanish and English’ (478)
 ‘ . . . Filipino is a lingua franca that has evolved through the decades – spoken, especially by non-Tagalogs when they speak with their countrymen who are from other regions or language groups’ (478)
 ‘[Filipino] is an existent national language and the nucleus is Pilipino with a “P”...’

There is an existent, broadened, expanded language called Filipino and its formalization has to be done in the educational system and others but it does not mean that since it is not yet formalized, it is non-existent’ (481)

As an example of Filipino, the Chairman cited the following:

Filipino	Tagalog
<i>Sain kayo maglakad tapos dini?</i>	<i>Saan kayo magtutungo Pagkatapos dito?</i>
<i>Mas guapo guid ang bana ko sa bana mo</i>	<i>Mas guwapo ang asawa ko kesa sa asawa mo</i>
<i>Guapa kuno ang kanyang amiga</i>	<i>Maganda raw ang kanyang kaibigan</i>
<i>Yawa! Kawaton pala ang soltero</i>	<i>Naku! Magnanakaw pala yung binata</i>
<i>Huwag ka man magtakbo</i>	<i>Huwag ka ngang tumakbo ngarud</i>
<i>Mayron pa ngani</i>	<i>Meron pa nga</i>

From the examples, what is intended is clearly a language mixture; in fact, the Chairman cited the example of Masbateño, ‘a mixture of different dialects, like Bicol, Samar, Visaya, Cebuano, Ilonggo, Tagalog and some other languages’ (481). The integration would be natural, ‘not contrived’ and ‘the future will consist of an evolution of the national language that will incorporate the different words of our languages’ (481).

1.3.4. The Voting Phase

Commissioner Davide accepted the amendment of Commissioner Napoleon Rama on Draft 4, which thus paved the

way for further amendments, until the fifth draft consisted of the following:

Draft 5

- Section 1. The national language of the Philippines is Filipino and as it evolves, it shall be further developed and enriched on the basis of existing Philippine and other languages.
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 in the educational system.
- Section 2. For purposes of communication and instruction, the official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and, until otherwise provided by law, English.
The regional languages are the auxiliary official languages in their regions and shall serve as auxiliary media of instruction therein. Spanish and Arabic shall be promoted on a voluntary and optional basis.
- Section 3. This Constitution shall be promulgated in Filipino and English and shall be translated into major regional languages, Arabic and Spanish.
- Section 4. 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.

The votes for each section show that after much discussion and several amendments for each section, agreement was unanimous for all sections except for the item on Spanish and Arabic being voluntary. In this two-day session which in effect concluded with the draft of the first reading, the advocate for English and its explicit mention as an official language was Commissioner Christian Monsod, while the advocates for Spanish were many, although it was clear that Spanish would be voluntary and optional but still the subject of special attention in Section 2 and 3 (Commissioners Rodrigo, Tingson, Alonto [who added Arabic], Rama, Maambong, and in the discussions, Ople).

Later, on September 29, 1986, the Confederacion Nacional de Profesores de Español had attempted to have the last proposal of Section 2 on Spanish deleted – but without success.

The sections on national language went through the usual stipulated three readings, but there were no real substantive changes after the first reading.

Hence, the subsequent readings were more to comply with the requirement of the procedures for the Constitutional Commission than to introduce substantive changes into the text itself.

1.4. Reflections

In looking at the events of 1986-87 insofar as the national language provision of the latest Philippine Constitution is considered and at later developments, notably those following the unexpected negative reactions to Executive Order No. 335 on August 25, 1988 [reminding government officials to make use of Filipino in official communications] and the present legal debate going on in Cebu on the status of Filipino and the nature of Filipino, various reflections suggest themselves on larger issues

concerning national language development based on the Philippine experience.

To begin with, while Cebu province represents perhaps the last real stronghold of opposition to Filipino and therefore may be considered *terra irredenta*, the situation of the Philippines is symptomatic of deeper divisions within the society (legally an independent state since 1946) which find expression, among other ways, through linguistic regionalism (see Gonzalez 1991) for a more detailed study of the ethnic rivalry between Cebuanos and Tagalogs).

The situation in the Philippines as far as Cebu and Manila are concerned presents a condition where Cebuanos charge the Tagalogs and MetroManila with a new kind of intra-country or regional imperialism. Because of policy differences on economic development, Cebu's rate of growth annually the past few years has been surpassing the national average. The pace of industrialization, tourism, business is accelerating in Cebu; the complaint of Cebuanos is that for every P1.00 they pay to the national government in taxes, only P.10 returns to Cebu province in the form of infrastructures and services.

Perhaps this development the past few years has been one among other motivators to bring up the issue of language once more, manifested in a desire to use Cebuano for announcements on planes (Senator John Osmeña, a cousin of the Governor, Emilio Osmeña, Jr.), the reinterpretation of a bilingual scheme of education as English and Cebuano, not Filipino, since Filipino is interpreted as still in the process of formation and since the 'Filipino' being used in the public schools at present is perceived as nothing more than Tagalog in disguise (hence, this is a totally different interpretation of the name as this monograph has attempted to explain); the singing of the national anthem; the

holding of all official public deliberations at the city and provincial councils in English and Cebuano, not Tagalog (actually, it is more English than Cebuano).

On a deeper level, the problem plaguing the Philippine national language boils down to a disagreement on the problem of selection, the choice of Tagalog over Cebuano and the consequent advantages accruing to Tagalogs and the disadvantages for non-Tagalogs because of this choice.

What the Philippine case dramatizes is that legislation can be voided, even after many years, if it is forced, as it seems to have been in the 1935 Constitution. Moreover, even when laws are enacted, they are not necessarily implemented either by not providing adequate financial means for implementation or by an indifference towards implementation among those charged with executing these laws. This seems to have happened in the educational sector in Cebuano-speaking provinces (see Gonzalez 1978 for a report on what was happening to the 1974 Bilingual Education Policy after four years, in Cebu).

Actually, it will not be Cebuano that will provide the formidable stumbling block to the speedy implementation of Filipino language policy but English in this new century. Here, the choice is between economic advantage and nationalism (Gonzalez 1988). The sociolinguistic trends indicate a restriction of the domains of English and a social stratification based on language, with the elites maintaining English but with English no longer available to the less affluent as Filipino is used more and more in government schools and in less affluent private schools and as the competence of English teachers in the country diminishes. One predicts, however, that as long as English is economically rewarding (through better jobs, greater mobility, possibilities of employment abroad) and as long as English

continues to be the language of worldwide communication, then its prestige will continue and its mastery by the elites can be expected.

What will eventually spell the difference will be social forces pushing one language over another because of the sheer weight of numbers. Here time is on Filipino's side and no matter what legislation is passed and what policies are made, the trend is very clear: Filipino will expand its domains and English will restrict its domains. There will come a time when English, instead of being a second language, will become a foreign language available only to the elites, or remaining as a second language, will be a second language only among the privileged, as Spanish was among the Filipino ilustrados of the nineteenth century and as French was among the Russian aristocracy of the same century.

What will actually retard the use and growth of Filipino is the lack of speed by which it is intellectualized through writing. As long as there is nothing substantial to read (and write), Filipino will not prevail. The story of an intellectualized and truly accepted 'national language' rises and falls on the basis of its written corpus and its use in oral discourse for mediate level and advanced study.

What has legitimized Tagalog-based Pilipino now evolving into Filipino, more than legal enactments, is its acceptance as a *lingua franca* (even by Cebuanos, who accept it as a *lingua franca* without accepting it as a national language). Common use is thus the great disseminator and legitimizer.

Common use must be viewed in terms of speaking, reading, writing and listening. Sibayan (1985) was right when he said that the written form is primary in learning a second language. Whether first or second language, the written form is primary especially in the controlling domains of language use.

Intervention will be needed however for the standardization and cultivation, especially for instructional purposes at the higher educational levels, of Filipino. The agency for this will be the National Language Commission which will accomplish its task because it will be composed not only of language speakers but subject specialists who will coordinate and promote research and the creation of special registers of Filipino for cultivation.

The crucial role of research for language cultivation has been recognized; this is a conceptual breakthrough. Moreover, the definition of cultivation as development by representatives of disciplines implies the creation of registers of Filipino for different fields of specialization, again a conceptual breakthrough rarely found in a charter. Obviously, in the Philippines, sociolinguists have been able to contribute their inputs into the legislative process and have been successful in their campaign to get their ideas accepted by nonlinguist lawmakers.

With the renewed respect for the conservation and even continuing use of the regional languages/vernaculars as auxiliary official languages in the regions and as auxiliary media of instruction (as well as the objects of research efforts for their development, propagation and maintenance), one hopes for even more stability among the regional languages, a situation already prevailing for major languages such as Cebuano, Ilocano, and Hiligaynon.

One will thus arrive at a situation in the Philippines closer to India's trilingual policy: local vernacular, national language, English (the latter restricted to the elites).

In 1985, the findings of a nationwide survey evaluating bilingual education (Gonzalez and Sibayan 1988) included data on attitudes. The overwhelming opinion in 1985 among parents, students, government officials, teachers (except for teachers of

Pilipino) was that one could be a genuine Filipino without knowing Pilipino very well, that one's patriotism and love of country and nationalism cannot be measured by competence in the national language, least of all, by one's adherence to a monolingual scheme of education in Filipino.

One hopes that in the future, there will be an identification of Filipino with patriotism, and competence in it with nationalism. The realization of this desideratum is a task for language planners in the area of status planning.

When Filipinos vote with their feet for a system of education dominated by Filipino at all levels (with English learned only as a language of international communication like other languages of international communication in other regions), then Filipino will indeed have arrived and the 1987 provisions on the national language in the Philippine Constitution a fact more than a desire.... At this juncture, the timetable for such realization is as yet indeterminable.

Part Two

DOCUMENTATION*

2.1. Other Voices

17 July 1986

The Honorable
Commissioner WILFRIDO VILLACORTA
Chairman, Committee on Education
Constitutional Commission of 1986
National Government Center
Quezon City

Sir:

Here are some reasons why the Pilipino language is not acceptable by the majority of Filipinos. Allow us to present them for your perusal before a definite draft is submitted in a plebiscite.

To be acceptable as a national language, it must include all the dialects in the Philippines. When we speak of the Visayan tools like

*For better readability, we have edited the texts to correct spelling, grammatical errors, and punctuation and where necessary have added missing words, in brackets, and italicized Filipino elements when the speakers code-switched to Filipino. Otherwise, the texts are reproduced as presented including the use of double quotation marks instead of our own single quotation marks in the first part of the study.

LAGARAO, SUNDANG, SANGGOT, call them in the Filipino national language as such, not ITAK, nor GULOK. Adopt the Moro words MALONG and KRIS, not SAYA nor BOLO. Specify the Lozano sledge as PASAGAD, the Tagalong-made KARETA, the Visayan-model BALSA, in order to be specific and concise. For the words: possible, realizable, inevitable, may happen – we can translate them as MAARI, MABALIN, MAHIMO, MAPAKAY as synonyms. We can use BAKET for an old woman, LAKAY an old man, NATAER for handsome, if there are no specific native words available from other dialects. Short DI for no or not, as majority of our native tongues take it. Synonyms like: score, bill, point, account, number 20, etc. – as DUAPULO, BILANG, IHAP, PUNTOS, CUENTA, atbp. The verb structures or conjugations can be basically Tagalog to simplify the grammatical foundation, but viable [open] to idioms and figures of speech from all dialects in order to enrich the real Filipino language.

The present national language is not an efficient medium of communication, because it is not open to embrace terms of science, mathematical, technical and legal terminologies. Vocabulary should be adopted as named by their inventors or originators like: helicopter, square root, etc. The universally acceptable English language uses Latin scientific and legal dead vocabulary, French bourgeois, German blitzkrieg, Eskimo igloo, Japanese geisha, Filipino carabao, Israeli kibbutz, Russian nyet, and many if not all languages this space cannot contain. Can we not do the same so that our own national language could be popular even in our own native land alone?

The present Wikang Pambansa is ridiculous, because our names cannot be spelled by our alphabet. Corazon Aquino, Ferdinand Marcos, Juan Cacho, Davao, Nueva Vizcaya, etc. have some of their letters missing in the abakada. We can't change the spelling of such names, but we can return the missing letters and include them in our abakada, to make our national language consistent, not foolish. This is like a case of

eating while avoiding the use of a spoon, merely because it is not native, though unsanitary or unethical.

Let us not allow the selfish imposition of one dialect to monopolize and force its divisive effects upon this already disintegrated nation. Our language should be utilized as a medium of unifying the whole Filipino nation, and solidifying the national mentality and sovereignty. Let us develop the efficiency of our language by enhancing its viability [openness] to other languages and dialects, discarding the false pride of egoistic purism. Let us dump as garbage that arrogant sectionalism to crystalize a unified and solid republic.

Above all, our new Constitution should mandate a worthy Filipino national language, compatible with our recently earned worldwide glory. The nation shall be grateful in posterity.

Very truly yours,

CONCERNED MUSLIM-CHRISTIAN CITIZENS

By:

CRISPIN G. APOLINAR
107 Mars, GSIS Heights
Davao City

Brokenshire College of Nursing
Madapo Hill
Davao City

August 26, 1986

TO OTHER CON-COM:

We the students of Brokenshire College of Nursing are concerned about the plight of the Spanish Language. We have read and heard about some sectors trying to erase it from the curriculum. We have all the reasons to be thankful for its inclusion until now. Our race is a mixed race and the majority of our influences comes from our Spanish ancestors. All these influences have been already part of our being Filipinos. We are enjoying that identification of being hispanized as a country. So, may we request the Honorable Members to retain the teaching of the Spanish language in our curriculum for posterity reasons?

- | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Hannah Hassan | 13. Joyce Afuel |
| 2. Josel Bersamen | 14. Maricel A. Romero |
| 3. Rhodora Tabungar | 15. Remedios C. Rejuco |
| 4. Jacquilin Pascua | 16. Aredita M. Recullar |
| 5. Geraldine Leysa | 17. Mary Ellen S. Monday |
| 6. Mariefe Bolante | 18. Gloria Lim |
| 7. Leyneth Lamanas | 19. Evelyn Rallos |
| 8. Monalyn Loriza | 20. Corazon Lim |
| 9. Eunice de los Reyes | 21. Raquel Angeles |
| 10. Ana Sagabaen | 22. Josephine Balo |
| 11. Estrella Solijon | 23. Lorey Barrios |
| 12. Mary Jane R. Alcantara | 24. Joel Gumaguaiag |

- | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 25. Ruth G. Oclarit | 34. Liza Carreon |
| 26. Lynine Hava | 35. Ma. Teresa Templanza |
| 27. Eunice Faune | 36. Rosalina J. Jurilla |
| 28. Jo Anne S. Banzuelo | 37. Luisa Marie Bartolome |
| 29. Luz V. Luiba | 38. Jovie Sherla Garfin |
| 30. Maylin M. Velasco | 39. Marlita P. Haluylog |
| 31. Mitzi A. Llamas | 40. Jun D. Villanueva |
| 32. Marilou Dascalgo | 41. Althea Campilan |
| 33. Elena Damondon | 42. Shiddy A. Candelo |

We the Ateneo students of Davao City request the Honorable Members of the Con-Com to retain the teaching of the Spanish language in our curriculum for posterity reasons. We are thankful for our identity as a hispanized country which we have been used to for the past years. So, we hope for its retention.

Karen Cua	Ma. Rhiza Malgar
Jose Ruel R. Colon	Dolores Dangoy
Christopher C. Panuda	Vivan Amar
Jeve Castora	Rolina Polistico
Rosana Bascul	Marina Vertucio III
Angelic Andama	Victor S. Ganados, Jr.
Cris-Anne Uy Dacuycoy	Jenette Galaura
Lourdes O. Canonigo	Annalyn J. Matoy
Gladys del Carmen	Jocelyn S. Elizalde
Lira Marie G. Cruz	Dario A. Divino
Aveline H. Abian	Rolly Mancio
Christine Abenoja	Mary Ann Estante
Nilda Gayanilo	Marilyn Battulayan
Mary Anthonette Adal	Aida P. Banic
Josefa Quilla	Reizl Bauzon

Judith Tanjay	Ana Liza Kuan Tu
Cecilia Sow	Marife Tejano
Christine Granada	Mary Jean Pahl
Ma. Victoria Manguilimatan	Rosanna Pasco
Daisy Ardiente	Castor V. Dorado, Jr.
Vivian Lementillo	Gil Templado
Albert April L. Oriano	Nonilon Malaluan
Jacquiline G. Smith	Fulbert Cyril Taculin
Grover Orcillo, Jr.	Robert M. Montenegro
Stella Puyat	Lalaine de la Cruz
Mary Grace Santos	Imelda R. Ventura
Alona Jardinel	Katherine Vergara
Norbert M. Gonzales	Evelyn Esquivel
Jeng Jeng Barba	May Aurora Tidoy
Alain R. Aloyon	Ma. Rachel Siaotong
Paul M. Asistido	Jasmin Villanueva
Editha Alger	Constantine Mirasol
Mary Jean Francisco	Eric Paz
Benjie Salvana	Niclo A. Japay
Nolly P. Pariz	Emmanuel Galicia, Jr.
Ruby V. Abeto	Vicente Venice

CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PHILIPPINES (CEAP)

CEAP POSITION ON THE MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION

Background Information

The Linguistic Society of the Philippines evaluated the implementation and impact on learning outcomes of the Bilingual Education Policy (BEP) of 1974. The Project Evaluation Team consisted of members of the Linguistic Society of the Philippines aided by two statistical and computer consultants.

Data gathering took place during the first quarter of 1985 with the aid of the Center for Educational Measurement (CEM) for testing and individual accreditors contracted through the Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges and Universities (PAASCU) for institutional profiles.

The findings and their implications

1. A good majority of the teachers (78.9%) agreed with the statement that it is possible to be a genuine Filipino regardless of the medium of instruction used for one's education. 27.9% also agreed that to be a genuine Filipino, one had to be educated entirely in Pilipino. However, 40.5% agreed that one could be a genuine Filipino even if one were educated entirely in English. 85.8% agreed with the basic feature of the BEP [Bilingual Education Policy], namely, that English should be used in teaching certain subjects while Pilipino should be used in others.
2. Since most agree that some subjects should be taught in Pilipino and some in English, while in general having an unfavorable

attitude towards the expanded use of Pilipino, reservations about the BEP may be managed through a modification of the existing mix, not the abolition of the program.

3. For most teachers and administrators, nationalism is not equated with the use of Pilipino as medium of instruction. The sooner this is realized and taken into account for policy making in the language of instruction, the better. Resistance to Pilipino is not against the language as an official language or as national *lingua franca* or even as a national language but its *enforced expanded use* in schools as a medium of instruction. The school is not the only agency for language dissemination, nor is it even the most effective one.
4. The search for a measure of Filipino bilingualism should be continued to lead towards an ideal multi-dimensional index indicating a common set of skills for language and language use.

Recommendation

Since Pilipino does not detract from learning content but enhances learning, at least for Tagalogs and NCR students, and since English contributes to learning not only content in Science and Mathematics but also Pilipino and Araling Panlipunan, the use of Pilipino alone as a medium of instruction should not be sought in the enhancement of nationalism.

Improving the educational system should not be through language policy alone but more through remediation of conditions which have caused present low achievements.

Our suggestion is that the medium of instruction is properly a MECS [Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports] matter and should not be taken up in the ConCom [Constitutional Commission].

CONFEDERACION NACIONAL DE PROFESORES DE ESPAÑOL

**RESOLUTION TO MAKE SPANISH ONE OF THE OFFICIAL
LANGUAGES OF THE PHILIPPINES IN THE CONSTITUTION
TOGETHER WITH FILIPINO AND ENGLISH AS PROVIDED
FOR IN THE 1935 CONSTITUTION**

**Respectfully Submitted to the Honorable Members of the
CONSTITUTIONAL COMMISSION**

WHEREAS, Spanish is a substantial part of our national heritage and patrimony, for much of Philippine civilization and culture is basically Spanish in origin and derivation;

WHEREAS, knowledge of the Spanish language links us with over 400 million Spanish-speaking peoples of Spain and Latin American countries including several states of the United States of America;

WHEREAS, the Philippines as a member of the United Nations will still need the votes of over twenty Spanish-speaking member nations;

WHEREAS, the Latin American countries offer vast employment opportunities to Filipinos in both skilled and unskilled labor as we have more engineers, architects, accountants, etc. than all the South American countries combined and Spain has over 200,000 Filipino workers in her employ;

WHEREAS, the Philippines could be the main geographical and economic contact point between Asia and the Latin Americans with 300 million inhabitants;

WHEREAS, Canada, Australia and the United States are potential markets for teachers of Spanish given the fact that our teachers are also well-versed in English;

WHEREAS, Spanish is one of the official languages of the world and one of the languages used in the United Nations Organization;

WHEREAS, the Philippines voted for the adoption of Spanish as one of the official languages of the United Nations Organization;

WHEREAS, of the 30,000 root words of present-day "Pilipino," at least 6,000 are Spanish words, although some with orthographic changes;

WHEREAS, due to its influence on our native languages, the teaching and learning of Spanish favors the progress of our Tagalog-based National Language;

WHEREAS, our youth, by cultivating the Spanish language, can gain direct familiarity with much of our history and, as future leaders of the country, they can also avail of one of the principal languages of world diplomacy;

WHEREAS, a great portion of Spanish is Arabic in origin;

WHEREAS, the study of Spanish is gaining ground in other Asian countries, notably in Japan, China, Taiwan, and Korea;

WHEREAS, the fact that the First Congress of Spanish Studies was held last August, 1985, in Seoul, Korea, attended by Hispanists from Japan, Malaysia, Thailand, Hong Kong, Sri Lanka, India, Taiwan and our own country, provides proof of vitality of the Spanish language in Asia;

WHEREAS, the Segundo Congreso Asiatico de Hispanistas will be held in Manila in 1988, and whereas this will be attended by delegates from Southeast Asian countries and by European and American Hispanists;

WHEREAS, according to statistical projection, in the year 2000 there will be close to 500 million Spanish speakers, which will make Spanish more widely spoken than English;

WHEREAS, the Philippine National Anthem was originally written and published in Spanish by one of our foremost poets, Jose Palma;

WHEREAS, now, more than ever, we have to inculcate the spirit of nationalism and foster discipline for the benefit of our society;

WHEREAS, the teaching of the above attitudes is included in Spanish studies as provided for in the official program of studies;

WHEREAS, we have reached an era of development in industry, production and tourism;

WHEREAS, Spain is leading the European countries in formulating ways and means to improve the economic and trade relations between the Philippines and European countries;

WHEREAS, our own heroes from Rizal, Mabini, Marcelo H. del Pilar, and our foremost statesmen like Quezon, Recto, Epifanio de los Santos and others, expressed their deepest feelings and profoundest thoughts in Spanish;

WHEREAS, Spanish has its cultural, social and economic advantages;

WHEREFORE, we the officers and members of the Confederacion Nacional de Profesores de Español, Inc., do appeal to the Honorable Members of the Constitutional Commission to preserve the Hispanic element in our culture and traditions.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, AS IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED, THAT SPANISH BE PRESERVED AS ONE OF OUR OFFICIAL LANGUAGES IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION BEING DRAFTED UNDER THE PRESENT AQUINO-LAUREL ADMINISTRATION.

Rosario Valdes-Lamug
Guillermo Gomez Rivera
Teresa Salazar
Maria Lourdes Carballo
Eutiquia Sarra del Adolfo
Angelita N. San Agustin

Marcus Faigal
Ophelia V. Diaz
Melita S. Cajucom
Encarnita Ramirez
Adelaida R. Canon
Nilo Fulgencia Fermin
Maria Luz M. Soresca
Expectacion Siquig
Ophelia V. Diaz

RESOLUTION TO MAKE SPANISH ONE OF THE OFFICIAL
LANGUAGES OF THE PHILIPPINES IN THE CONSTITUTION
TOGETHER WITH FILIPINO AND ENGLISH AS PROVIDED
FOR IN THE 1935 CONSTITUTION.

CONFEDERACION NACIONAL DE PROFESORES DE ESPAÑOL (CONAPE, INC.)

September 29, 1986

RESOLUTION

Respectfully Submitted to the Honorable
Members of the CONSTITUTIONAL COMMISSION

WHEREAS, the phrase “on a voluntary and optional basis” with respect to Spanish and Arabic is a violation of due process because it amends unilaterally the existing Spanish law;

WHEREAS, the amendment of this specific Spanish law should be left to Congress to resolve;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, AS IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED, THAT THE AFOREMENTIONED PHRASE BE DELETED FROM THE CONSTITUTION BEING DRAFTED UNDER THE PRESENT AQUINO-LAUREL ADMINISTRATION.

ROSARIO VALDES-LAMUG

President

For the Officers and Members of the CONAPE, Inc.

Attested by:

TERESA SALAZAR

Secretary

A NOTE ON THE FILIPINO LANGUAGE

by

Ernesto Constantino, Ph.D.
Professor of Linguistics
University of the Philippines

The term “Filipino” refers to the Philippine national lingua franca, i.e. the language used all over the country as a medium of communication. Filipino is thus the language that functions as the actual Philippine national language.

At present, Filipino is a language used typically by two (or more) persons whose native languages are not the same. For example, when a Sebuano and an Ilocano meet, say in Manila, Baguio, Zamboanga or Davao, they will most likely or most often speak to each other in Filipino.

The term Filipino was first used to refer to the national lingua franca in the 1971 Constitutional Convention which adopted the UP national language proposal, called the “universal approach.” The UP started using this language as a medium of instruction as early as in 1971. In 1973, the UP Department of Pilipino and Philippine Languages was renamed Department of Filipino and Philippine Languages.

Filipino is different from Pilipino which in accordance with the 1935 Constitution is based on only one language, Tagalog. Filipino, on the other hand, is based on the language usage, similarities and peculiarities of the different Philippine ethnic groups.

Furthermore, by virtue of Commonwealth Act 184, the vocabulary of Pilipino was “cleansed” or “purified” of many borrowed words which were replaced by obsolete, archaic or very seldom used Tagalog words, or by “coined” terms based on “pure” Tagalog elements. As a result,

Pilipino not only became “purer” than Tagalog but it also became a somewhat artificial or “hothouse” language which was developed almost exclusively by the so-called Tagalistas.

On the other hand, Filipino is based on the natural use of the spreading lingua franca by Filipinos belonging to the different Philippine ethnic groups. Filipino is enriched not by “pure” Tagalog words or “coined” terms, but by words coming from foreign contact languages, like Spanish and English, and all the different Philippine languages. Unlike Pilipino, which is based almost exclusively on the speech of the Tagalog, Filipino is based on the speech of the various Philippine ethnic groups.

At this stage of the development of Filipino, this language bears more similarities with Tagalog than with any of the other Philippine languages. One can see that at the present time the similarities between Filipino and Tagalog are greater than the similarities between, say, Sebuano and Hiligaynon. However, as Filipino continues to develop further, its similarities with Tagalog will decrease as its similarities with the other Philippine languages continue to increase. In short, Filipino and Tagalog will continue to develop as separate languages in the same way that Sebuano and Hiligaynon, or Chavacano and Spanish, have developed as separate and distinct languages.

At present, Filipino is used almost exclusively as a lingua franca throughout the entire archipelago. But as a natural and a living language, it can be made to perform all the functions that a natural living language, like English, French, German and Japanese, can be made to perform, like as a medium of instruction, research, science and technology, and as a literary language. As a matter of fact, Filipino started some time ago to perform these functions. For example, in the UP, Filipino has been used as a medium of instruction in all subjects and as language of research, science and technology since 1971.

PROPOSAL PARA SA CONCOM: PROBIYON PARA SA PAMBANSANG WIKA

Ang wikang pambansa, karaniwan, ang siyang midyum ng komunikasyon ng lahat ng mamamayan ng isang bansa para sa alinmang domeyn (domain) ng wika. Ito ang wikang ginagamit sa pang-araw-araw na pamumuhay, pribado man o publiko, ng lahat ng tao. Kung kaya't dapat lamang mapaloob sa naturang termino ang mga konseptong tulad ng opisyal na wika at wikang panturo. Dahil sa labis na epekto ng ating kolonyal na karanasan, lalo na sa edukasyon, kultura at gobyerno, at gayundin ng komplikadong sitwasyong pangwika dala ng higit na sandaang wika, nararapat lamang na bigyan ng malaking pansin ang mga konseptong ito sa binabalangkas na konstitusyon upang masiguro ang dekolonisasyon ng pag-iisip ng ating mamamayan at mapatingkad lalo ang sariling kakanyahan ng ating pagkabansa.

Mga Pangkalahatang Prinsipyo

Upang matagumpay na maiproklama ang isang tunay na nagsasarili at malayang estado, dapat taglayin ng wikang pambansa ang mga katangiang makabayan, di-elitista, makamasa, mapagbuklod at siyentipiko.

Upang mataglay ang makabayang karakter nito, dapat lamang na ito'y isang wika sa Pilipinas, kundi man, isang wikang batay sa mga wika natin. Walang dayuhang wika ang makatutugon sa prinsipyong ito.

Sa pagpapalano ng isang wikang pambansa ang higit na nakararaming mamamayan at di lamang ang grupong nakahihigit sa pribilihiyo ang dapat isaisip. Ang wikang pambansa na may ganitong katangian ang sisiguro sa mabilis na pagpapalaganap ng mga impormasyon at sa mas malawakang partisipasyon ng bawat mamamayan

para sa anumang pambansang aspirasyon at gawain. Kaya nga't ang tunay na makamasang wika ng komunikasyon ay dapat na madaling matutunan di man umasa sa yaman at kapangyarihan.

Mula sa siyentipikong pagtingin, masasabing magkakapareho sa istruktura ang mga wika sa Pilipinas gaya ng konstruksyon ng mga pangungusap at paglalapi. Nagtataglay din ang mga ito ng maraming salitang identikal o magkakasintunog at magkakasingkahulugan. Anupat madaling matuto ang sinumang Pilipino ng anumang wika sa Pilipinas bukod sa kanyang sinasalita na. Bunga nito, nadebelop ang isang wikang komon na madaling matutunan at mapag-aralan ng halos lahat nga mga Pilipino na sa ngayon ay ginagamit nang wika sa pambansang komunikasyon.

Lahat halos ng mga Pilipino ay nakapagsasalita ng 1) isang katutubong wika na siyang unang wikang kanilang natutunan gaya ng Tagalog, Sebuano, Kalinga o Tausug; 2) isang rehiyunal na wika gaya ng Ilokano na sinasalita sa Norte ng Luzon, ng Tagalog sa Sentral at Timog Luzon at ng Sebuano at Ilonggo sa Bisaya at Mindanaw; at 3) isang pambansang lingua franca o wikang komon na ginagamit ng mga Pilipino kapag nakikipag-usap sila sa iba pang Pilipinong hindi nakapagsasalita ng kanilang katutubong wika o ng rehiyunal na wika nila.

Likas sa wika, sa pangkalahatan, ang magbago at umunlad dahil sa paggamit nito at sa impluwensya ng kapaligiran at iba pang wika na nakatatagpo nito. Ang pambansang lingua franca na laganap ang gamit sa ngayon ang nukleus ng maituturing na wikang pambansa o Filipino. Ang pag-unlad ng wikang ito ay madalas na naiimpluwensiyahan ng mga wikang nagkakaroon ng kontak dito – ang mga wika ng iba't ibang etnikong grupo sa bansa at gayundin ng mga banyagang wika gaya ng Ingles, Kastila at Tsino. Sa gayon nadedebelop ito tungo sa isang wikang maaaring ipagmalaki't pagkakilanlanan ng mga Pilipinong kabilang sa iba't ibang etnikong grupo.

Ang lingua francang ito ay nagiging instrumento ng pagkakaisa sapagkat pinapalaganap nito ang komunikasyon ng mga miyembro ng maraming etno-lingguwistikong grupo sa bansa. Halimbawa, ang isang Bikolano ay makikipag-usap sa wikang Sebuano kung nasa ilang lugar siya ng Kabisayaan pero siguradong magsasalita siya sa Filipino kapag nasa Ilokos siya at hindi siya marunong ng Ilokano, at sa Palawan kapag hindi siya marunong magsalita ng alinmang wikang sinasalita doon.

Historikal na Perspektiba

Upang lalong makita ang kabuluhan ng proposal na inirerekomenda dito at maisama sa binabalangkas na konstitusyon, mahalagang tingnan ang historikal na perspektiba ng mga isyu tungkol sa wikang pambansa. Tatlong pangunahing punto ang lagi nang nangingibabaw kaugnay nito: ang pangalang itatawag dito, ang nature (o kalikasan), ang basehan nito, at ang mga gamit o silbi ng wikang pambansa.

Pangalan ng Wikang Pambansa - Ang kontrobersiya o balitaktakan tungkol sa pagtawag dito ng Pilipino o Filipino ay unti-unti nang kumakalma. Ang Filipino ay iprinopos sa 1971 kumbensiyong konstitusyonal bilang reaksiyon sa Pilipino na sinasabing walang pagkakaiba sa purong Tagalog. Ang mga tumutol naman sa Filipino ay naniniwala na sapagkat sinasabi ng 1973 konstitusyon na ito'y isang wikang idedebelop pa, ay wala pa raw ang wikang ito o isang ilusyon lamang.

Kalikasan ng Wikang Pambansa - Itinatadhana ng 1935 at 1943 konstitusyon na ang wikang pambansa ay dapat ibase sa isang wika sa Pilipinas. Hindi tahasang sinasabi ng 1935 bersyon kung aling wika ito pero sa 1943 bersyon tiniyak na Tagalog ang siyang wikang pambansa. Ang 1973 bersyon sa kabilang dako, ay walang sinasabi sa kalikasan ng wikang pambansa at sa halip, ipinahahayag na lamang na ang Batasang

Pambansa ay dapat gumawa ng hakbang sa pagdedebelop at pormal na pag-aadap ng isang komong wikang pambansa na tatawaging Filipino.

Ang kalikasan ng wikang pambansa ay problemang sobrang maemosyonal o resulta ng katapatan ng maraming Pilipino sa kani-kanilang wika at sa pangambang baka tuluyang mawala ang katutubong wikang wika. May pangamba ring baka maging dominante ang isang lingguwistikong grupo na nagsasalita ng wikang mapipiling basehan ng wikang pambansa.

Dahil sa progresibong paglaganap ng nasyonalism lalo na noong huling taon ng dekada sesenta at ng papakonting bilang ng mga gumagamit ng Ingles, mabilis na lumalaganap ang Filipino.

Gamit ng Wikang Pambansa. Sa mga nakaraang taon, ang mga palisi sa wika ng edukasyon at gobyerno ay repleksyon ng mga probisyon tungkol sa pambansang wika ng mga naunang konstitusyon. Tiningnan ng 1935, 1943 at 1973 konstitusyon na isang wikang bubuuin pa lamang sa hinaharap ang wikang pambansa, kaya nga't ito raw ay dapat na palaganapin at saka pa lamang iaadap pagkatapos. Ipinapakita dito ang kawalan ng tunay na intensiyon ng mga gumawa ng palisi na kilalanin ang kahusayan o kakayahan ng alin man sa maraming wika nating bilang wikang pambansa o kaya'y tanggapin ang katotohanang may isa nang wika sa Pilipinas na ginagamit bilang midyum sa inter-etnikong komunikasyon. Bilang suporta sa atityud na ito, itinadhana ng mga naunang konstitusyon ang mga banyagang wika – ang Ingles at Kastila – upang gamiting mga opisyal na wika ng gobyerno. Dapat na ring banggitin na karamihan sa mga batas, kasunduan, mga administratibong sirkular at mga dokumento ay nasusulat sa mga wikang ito kaya tuloy ginagamit itong dahilan sa pagpapatuloy daw ng paggamit nito bilang mga opisyal na wika. Dapat ding ipagdiin na hanggat ang mga wikang ito ay patuloy na magiging mga wikang opisyal, siguradong walang katapusan ang pagsulat dito ng mga mahalagang dokumento. Tutungo

ito sa problem ng pagiging palaasa o pagdedepende natin sa mga banyaga. Kung ganoon, paano tayo ganap na makapagsasarili?

Hindi man lantad, ang pagdedepende natin sa mga banyagang gobyerno, at ang bunga nitong pagkabalisa natin para sa kanilang pagsang-ayon at suporta ay lalo pang nadaragdagan sa paggamit natin sa kanilang wika. Sa tuwirang sabi, ang pakikialam ng Estados Unidos sa ating pamumuhay ay pinadadali sa paggamit ng Ingles bilang opisyal na wika ng ating gobyerno. Dahil dito, nagagawa nilang direktang mag-usap at makipag-ugnayan sa ating mga elit na marunong mag-Ingles na kadalasan nang iniisip ang pansariling interes, samantalang napapabayaan at napipinsala naman ang karamihan sa mga mamamayan na hindi bihasa sa pagsasalita ng Ingles para manindigan at ipaglaban ang kanilang mga karapatang pang-ekonomiko at pulitikal. Maging ang 1973 Konstitusyon na iprinoklama ng isang gobyerno na di-umano'y nagsasarili at malaya ay nagsasabi na "hanggat hindi pinapawalang-bisa ng batas, ang Ingles at Pilipino ang mga opisyal na wika." Mapapansin ang posibilidad ng pagpapatibay ng isang batas na kumakansela sa alinman sa mga wikang ito. 'Mapapansin din na dahil sa naunang binanggit, ang Ingles ay napangingibabaw.

May probisyon sa 1935 at 1973 Konstitusyon tungkol sa wikang/ mga wikang gagamitin sa pagpoproklama ng tsarter. Sa isang sitwasyon liban sa isang kolonyal/neo-kolonyal na siyang kalagayan ng ating bansa, ang ganitong probisyon ay hindi na kailangan. Dagdag dito, dahil sa ang mismong mga dokumentong pinagtatalunan ay nagpapanukala lamang tungkol sa wikang pambansa at dahil sa ang nangingibabaw na wika ay isang banyagang wika na di kilala ng karamihan, nangangailangan pa tuloy na magkaroon ng probisyon sa mga konstitusyong nabanggit. Sa kasalukuyan, dahil patuloy na nagdedepende tayo at umaasa sa kanilang tulong pang-ekonomiya at pulitikal, ang pangamba na ang binabalangkas na konstitusyon ay masulat lamang sa Ingles ay posibleng mangyari.

Parehong pinapanatili, kung gayon, ng 1935 at 1973 Konstitusyon ang mga kolonyal na atityud gaya ng makikita sa paraan ng pakikitungo sa wikang pambansa sa pamamagitan ng pagtutuon sa hinaharap. Napatagal tuloy ang dapat sanang maging mga desisyon sa pagpapaunlad nito at sa halip binibigyan ng diin at pinangingibabaw ang isang banyagang wika: “Sakaling magkaroon ng pagtatalo, mangingibabaw ang teksto sa Ingles.”

Rekomendasyon

Ang mga probisyong ipinopropos dito ay nagsasaalang-alang sa mga prinsipyo na dapat gumabay sa wikang pambansa at dapat na magpabilis sa pag-usbong ng isang tunay na nagsasarili at malayang estado. Ang wikang ito’y mailalarawang isang siyentipiko, makabayan, hindi elitista, makamasa at mapagbuklod.

1. Ang konstitusyong ito ay opisyal na ipoproklama sa Filipino at isasalin sa mga rehiyunal na wika ng Pilipinas, sa Ingles at sa Arabik. Sakaling may pagtatalo, ang teksto sa Filipino ang mangingibabaw.

Kadahilanan – Ang 1973 Konstitusyon ang nagbigay ng pangalang Filipino upang ipagdiin ang pagsasama ng mga unibersal na katangian ng iba’t ibang mga wika sa Pilipinas. Pinahahalagahan nito ang mga pagkakatulad ng mga wika – mga tunog, panlapi, mga salita, at paraan ng pagbuo ng mga pangungusap – at upang isaalang-alang ang katotohanang ang mga wika ay nagbabago at umuunlad dahil sa pangangailangan ng mga gumagamit at siempre pa sa impluwensya ng mga wikang nakakatagpo nito. Nakalulungkot na marami sa mga gumagawa ng palisi ang nag-iinterpret: sa konsepto ng unibersalidad bilang pagsasamasama lamang ng parehong dami ng mga salita sa bokabularyo ng Filipino, isang interpretasyong walang

batayang panglingguwistiko. Nagpapabagal ito sa lubusang pagtanggap sa Filipino, na dahilan na rin ng implikasyon ng probisyon na ang wikang ito ay lilikhain pa lamang at sa gayon ay wala pa at di pa umiiral.

Mula noong 1973, parami nang parami ang bilang ng mamamayang gumagamit ng pambansang lingua franca, ayon sa isang reserts tungkol sa lingua franca na isinagawa ng mga miyembro ng Departamento ng Lingguwistika at Departamento ng Filipino sa Unibersidad ng Pilipinas para sa komunikasyon ng mga taong nagsasalita ng magkakaibang wikang katutubo o rehiyunal at gayundin para sa pambansang komunikasyon. Bunga nito, ang mga nagsasalita ng Filipino ang nagpabago at progresibong inilayo ng mga ito ang Filipino mula sa Tagalog, ang wikang halos pinakapareho nito. Ito rin ang dahilan kung bakit ito, higit sa ngayon ang tinatanggap at laganap bagamat dahil nakaugalian na, kadalasan tinatawag pa rin itong Tagalog o Pilipino.

Ang mga rehiyunal na wika ay tumutukoy sa wikang karaniwang sinasalita sa mga rehiyon sa Pilipinas. Halimbawa ang isang Ibanag ay makikipag-usap sa isang Kalinga sa wikang Ilokano, na rehiyunal na wika sa Hilagang Luzon. Ang isang hindi tagaroon ay kakausapin sa Ilokano, subalit kung hindi nakakaintindi nito ay kakausapin sa Filipino. Ganito rin ang paggamit ng Sebuano sa mga lugar sa Bisaya at Mindanaw.

Ang mga edukadong elit na nasa minoridad lalo na sa mga kanayunan at kalunsuran ay gumagamit ng isang kakaibang klase ng Ingles sa mga gawaing pampubliko. Subalit kakaunti sa kanila ang gumagamit ng wikang ito sa pribadong pamumuhay.

Itinakda ng 1935 Konstitusyon ang pagsasalin ng dokumento sa Ingles at sa Kastila samantalang itinatadhana naman ng 1973 Konstitusyon ang pagsasalin ng dokumento sa mga dayalekto ng Pilipinas (i.e. wika) na sinasalita ng mahigit na 50,000 tao at sa Ingles at Arabik. Hindi na kailangan ang pagsasalin pa sa iba't ibang wika sa Pilipinas.

Ito'y impraktikal sapagkat mayroon nang isang wikang komon na umiiral at laganap upang magamit para sa ganitong layunin.

Kaugnay ng pagsasalin ng mga dokumento sa Kastila nakapagtataakang isipin kung para kanino talaga nakalaan ang probisyong ito. May kahirapan yatang makahanap ng isang grupong nakakaintindi lamang ng Kastila. At hanggang di napapatunayan na ang Arabik ay ginagamit na nga sa lahat ng pagkakataon bukod sa mga gawaing may kinalaman sa Islam, sa gayon ginagamit ito bilang rehiyunal na wika, ang pagsasalin sa wikang ito ay hindi kailangan.

Alternatibong probisyon - Ang konstitusyong ito ay opisyal na ipoproklama sa malaganap na wikang pambansa, ang Pilipinon, at isasalin sa mga rehiyunal na wika sa Pilipinas, at sa Ingles. Sakaling may pagtatalo, ang teksto sa Pilipinon ang dapat mangibabaw.

Paliwanag - Bunga ng probisyon sa 1973 Konstitusyon na nagsasabing ang Filipino ay dapat pang idebelop, anupat iniisip (tuloy) ng ilan na wala pa nga ang wikang ito, at dahil sa paniniwala ng iba na hindi kayang bigkasin ng maraming Pilipino ang tunog na *f*, ang pagtawag ng Filipino sa wikang pambansa ay maaari pa ring tutulan.

Sa maraming wika sa Pilipinas, may matatagpuang mga panlapi na nangangahulugang wika o lenggwahe. Ito ay *on* sa mga wika sa Timog, hal. Hiligaynon, Surigaonon, etc., *in* naman ito sa mga wika sa Hilaga gaya ng Kinalingga, Initbayaten. Batay sa realidad na ito, ang terminong Pilipinon ay maaaring tanggapin ng mga Bisaya at gayundin ng mga naninirahan sa Mindanaw. Bukod sa madali itong bigkasin ng mga tao na walang tunog na *f* sa kanilang wika, ang terminong ito ay sagot sa mga reklamo ng ilan na ang pagtawag ng Pilipino sa wikang pambansa ay pumapabor sa mga Tagalog. Kapag tinanggap ang proposal na ito, ang Pilipino ay pantawag lamang sa mga tao samantalang ang Pilipinon ay pantukoy sa wikang pambansa.

2. Ang Filipino, na pambansang lingua franca, ang magiging opisyal na wika kasama ng mga rehiyunal na wika bilang mga wikang pantulong. Hanggat di pinawawalang-bisa ng batas, pantulong na wika pa rin ang Ingles.

Paliwanag. Bagamat ang bersyong 1973 ay nagtatadhana na pareho ngang opisyal na wika ang Ingles at Pilipino pero bihira namang gamitin ang Pilipino liban sa mga layuning panseremonya. Ipinapalagay pa ng probisyong ito na halos lahat ng Pilipino ay marunong ng Ingles. Malayo ito sa katotohanan. Tanging ang mga elit na edukado na wala pa ngang 10% ng kabuuang populasyon ang marunong bumasa at sumulat sa wikang ito kaya tuloy sa grupong ito karaniwang nanggagaling ang mga namamahala sa bansa.

Ang probisyong ipinopropos dito ay kumikilala sa kakayahan ng mga rehiyunal na wika bilang epektibong instrumento na sisiguro sa tunay na demokrasya sa pamamagitan ng malawakang partisipasyon ng mga mamamayan anuman ang kanilang katutubong wika. Ito'y dahil sa mga palisi ng gobyerno at ang mga gawain sa lehislatura at sa korte ay ipoproklama at isasagawa sa wikang naiintindihan ng higit na nakakaraming bilang ng mga tao.

Ang proposal na ito ay umaasa sa posibilidad ng mga autonomous ng gobyerno na kung saan ang mga rehiyunal na wika ang gagamiting opisyal na wika ng mga ito samantalang ang Filipino/Pilipinon ang wikang magbubuklod sa pambansang gobyerno.

Mananatiling wikang pantulong ang Ingles hanggat ang mga batas, kasunduan, administratibong sirkular at mga kautusan ay hindi pa naisasalin sa opisyal na wikang pambansa. Ang praseng "hanggat hindi itinatadhana ng batas" sa ipinopropos na probisyong ito ay isang pag-asam sa pagdating ng araw na hindi na kailangan ang Ingles bilang opisyal na wika.

3. Ang Komisyon ng Wikang Pambansa ay itatatag at bubuuin ng mga eksperto sa wika: titser ng wika, linggwist at mga manunulat, para idebelop at palaganapin ang Filipino na base sa pambansang lingua franca at sa mga wika sa Pilipinas na siyang nagbubuklod at nakapagbibigay ng kapangyarihan sa sambayanan.

Sa kasalukuyan, ang mga batang nagsisimula pa lamang pumasok sa eskwela ay kailangan munang makipagbuno sa Ingles, isang wikang banyaga, bago pa man matutunan nila ang mga dapat sanang napag-aralan. Kadalasan pa nga tumitigil na sa pag-aaral hindi pa man lamang sila nagsisimulang matuto ng mga bagong konsepto at, siguradong mahihirapan, hindi na sila matuto pang bumasa't sumulat sa buong buhay nila kahit na nga nakakapagsalita sila ng dalawa o tatlong wika.

Ang pagpapatupad ng bilinggwal na palisi ay pagkilala sa kabiguan ng Ingles bilang wikang panturo para sa mas (higit na) nakararami na dahil sa kahirapan ay di kayang makapag-aral sa mga eskwelahang mahusay-husay ang pagtuturo ng wikang Ingles at ni hindi natutunan ito bago pa man tumuntong sa mga eskwelahan. Anupat wala silang panahong matutunan ang wikang ito. Ang karunungan ay di natatamo sa wikang di maintindihan. Kayat dapat lamang na ang batang nagsisimulang mag-aral ay turuan sa wikang alam niya o kaya'y sa wikang naririnig niyang alam na alam gamitin ng bata ang siya lamang nararapat na wikang panturo sapagkat mahirap matamo ang kasanayan sa pagbasa at pagsulat sa wikang hindi siya bihasa.

Ang palising bilinggwal ay nagpapahiwatig din ng kawalan ng kakayahan ng karamihan sa mga titser na maging epektibo sa Ingles. May mga nakatak dang subjek na dapat ituro lamang sa Pilipino samantalang ang ilan ay sa Ingles naman. Hindi nito nalulutas ang problema ng mga titser na hindi epektibo sa alinman sa dalawang wika. Upang maging kapaki-pakinabang hinayaan na lamang sana na ang titser ay makapamilya kung sa aling wika sila epektibong makapagtuturo. At dapat sana'y itinuring na transisyunal lamang ang palisi tungo sa monolinggwalismo. Ipinatupad sana ito para magkaroon lamang ng sapat na

panahon ang maraming titser na makapagsanay at makapaghanda ng mga babasahin at materyales sa pagtuturo sa Filipino.

Ang pagpapalaganap ng pambansang wika ay isang kabuuang tungkulin ng mga eskwelahan. Kinikilala ang pagkakatulad ng napakaraming wika sa Pilipinas, kaya ang sumusunod na proposal ay masasabing suportang sa probisyon tungkol sa wikang panturong ipinopropos dito.

Greyd 1-4 – bernakular o rehiyunal na wika ang magiging wikang panturo katuwang ang Filipino bilang wikang pantulong. Ang wikang Ingles ay maaaring ipakilala bilang subjek sa Greyd 3.

Greyd 5-haiskul – ang Filipino ang magiging wikang panturo kasama ang Ingles bilang subjek.

Unibersidad – ang bilinggwala na palisi ay ipatutupad ayon sa kagustuhan ng titser upang epektibo siyang makakapagturo.

Ang pagtuturo ng wikang Ingles sa lahat ng lebel ng pag-aaral ay makakabawas sa pangambang baka mawala ang kakayahang makipagkomunika sa buong daigdig.

DR. ERNESTO CONSTANTINO
Ph.D. in Linguistics, UP

DR. CONSUELO J. PAZ
Ph.D. in Linguistics, UP

PROF. ROSARIO TORRES-YU
Chairman, UP Department of
Filipino and Philippine Literature

PROF. JESUS FER. RAMOS
President, Pambansang Samahan
sa Wika (PSW)

Proposals to the Con-Com: Provisions for the National Language

Ordinarily a national language would mean the medium of communication used by all citizens of a country for all language domains, that is, the language used in the daily life, private and public, of a people. Hence the term should cover such concepts as official language and medium of instruction. But because of the impact of our colonial experience, most especially on education, culture and government, and our complex linguistic situation involving over a hundred languages, it has become necessary to highlight these concepts in the proposed Constitution in order to ensure the decolonialization of our minds and to strengthen the identifying features of our nation.

General Principles

To successfully express a truly self-reliant sovereign state, the national language should be characterized as a nationalist, non-elitist, pro-people, unifying, scientific language.

In conceptualizing the national language, the majority of the people and not only a privileged segment should be kept in mind. A national language of this nature ensures the adequate spread of information and the broad participation of everyone in national endeavors, hence, a truly pro-people medium of communication easily acquired and non-dependent on wealth or power.

From a scientific viewpoint one can say that Philippine languages have very similar structures such as sentence constructions and affixation. They have a large stock of words which have identical or similar sounds and meanings. Therefore any Filipino can easily learn another Philippine language. Consequently, a common language has evolved which has

been easily acquired and learnt by most Filipinos and which is now used in communicating on the national level.

Most Filipinos speak: 1) a native language which is the first language they learn, such as Tagalog, Cebuano, Kalinga or Tausug, 2) a regional language such as Ilocano spoken in Northern Philippines, Tagalog in Central and Southern Luzon and Cebuano and Ilongo in the Visayas and Mindanao, and 3) a national lingua franca or common language which Filipinos use when they wish to communicate with other Filipinos who do not speak their native or regional language.

The nature of language in general is such that – through use and influenced by environment and other languages with which it comes in contact – it is in constant change and development. The national lingua franca now in use is the nucleus of what can be labeled as the national language or Filipino. This language is constantly and progressively influenced by languages with which it has come into contact – the languages of the different ethnic groups in the country and foreign languages such as English, Spanish, and Chinese – thereby developing into a language with which Filipinos from different ethnic groups can identify.

This lingua franca serves as unifying force since it promotes communication between members of the numerous linguistic groups in the country. For example, a Bikolano will be able to communicate in Cebuano in parts of the Visayas but will have to use Filipino in the Ilocos if he does not know Ilocano and in Palawan if he does not know any of the languages spoken there.

Historical Perspective

To appreciate the proposals which are recommended to be included in the Constitution which is presently being drafted, a historical perspective of the issue on the national language is necessary. Three

major points repeatedly crop up in discussions on this topic: the name, nature or basis and functions of the national language.

Name. The controversy on whether the national language should be called Pilipino or Filipino has only recently abated. Filipino was proposed in the 1971 Constitutional Convention as a reaction against Pilipino which had become synonymous with puristic Tagalog. Those who refused to accept Filipino argued that since it was a language still to be developed as stipulated in the 1973 constitution, Filipino was still non-existent, a fictitious language.

Nature. The 1935 and 1943 constitutions provide that the national language should be based on one Philippine language. The 1935 version did not state which Philippine language it was to be while the 1943 version stipulated Tagalog as the national language. The 1973 version, on the other hand, was silent on the nature of the national language and simply stated that “the Batasang Pambansa shall take steps towards the development and formal adoption of a common national language to be known as Filipino.”

The nature of the national language is a highly emotional problem brought on by the language loyalties and the fear that the native languages would be eradicated. There is also the fear of the eventual dominance of the linguistic group which speaks the language chosen as the basis of the national language.

Because of the progressive spread of nationalistic tendencies especially since the late sixties and the diminishing need for the use of English, Filipino has spread rapidly.

Functions. Through the years, the language policies of education and government were necessarily reflections of the provisions on the national language in the previous constitutions. The 1935, 1943 and

1973 constitutions referred to the national language in prospective, so that it was to be developed or to be propagated, then adopted. This showed the lack of true intent on the part of policy makers to recognize the competence of any of our numerous languages to function as a national language or accept the fact that a Philippine language was actually in use for inter-ethnic group communication. In support of this attitude all the past constitutions provided that foreign languages – English and Spanish – were to be used as official languages of government. It should also be pointed out that the majority of statutes, treaties, administrative circulars and other documents were written in these languages and therefore as long as these languages continue as official languages there will be no end to the number of important documents written in them. This leads us to the problem of dependence.

Though not very evident, dependence on foreign governments and consequently concern for their approval and support was enhanced by the use of their language. In more direct terms, the interference of the United States in our affairs was facilitated by the use of English as the official language of our government. This allowed them to communicate directly with the elite who knew English and who usually had vested interests, to the exclusion and disadvantage of the majority who did not know the language well enough to stand up for or safeguard their economic and political rights. Even the 1973 constitution which was promulgated by a government that was supposedly independent stipulated: “Until otherwise provided by law, English and Pilipino shall be the official languages.” Note the possibility of enforcing a law which cancels out either of these languages, that is, even Pilipino. Note too that being mentioned first, English was given prominence.

The constitutions of 1935 and 1973 contained a provision on the language/languages in which the charter was to be promulgated. In a situation other than the colonial/neocolonial one which our country is presently in, this provision would not be necessary. Then, too, because

the very documents in question merely speculate on the national language and because the prevailing language was a foreign one unknown to the majority, it was necessary to include such a provision in these constitutions. At present, because of continuing economic and political dependence, the fear of the possibility that the proposed constitution might be written only in English is not far-fetched.

Both the 1935 and 1973 versions therefore perpetuated a neocolonial attitude by dealing with the national language in terms of the future, postponing what could have been decisions on its propagation and giving emphasis and prominence to a foreign language: “In case of conflict the English text shall prevail.”

Recommendations

The provisions proposed here aim to reflect the principles which should underlie the national language and which should hasten the emergence of a truly self-reliant sovereign state. This language would be characterized as scientific, nationalist, non-elitist, pro-people and unifying.

1. This constitution shall be officially promulgated in Filipino and translated into the regional languages of the Philippines, English and Arabic. In case of conflict, the Filipino text shall prevail.

Justification. The 1973 constitution provided the name Filipino which was meant to emphasize the inclusion of the universal features of the different Philippine languages, that is, the basic and underlying similarities between these languages – sounds, affixes, words and the way sentences are put together – and to reflect the fact that languages change and develop through the needs of their users and the influence of other languages with which they come into contact. It is unfortunate

that quite a few policy makers have interpreted universality to mean that each Philippine language was to contribute an equal number of words to the vocabulary of Filipino, an interpretation which is not linguistically sound. This caused the delay in the full acceptance of Filipino, which was also partly caused by the implication in the provision that this language was still to be created and therefore non-existing.

Since 1973, the national lingua franca has gained more and more users. According to an investigation into the lingua franca conducted by members of the departments of Linguistics and of Filipino at the University of the Philippines, it was established that it was spoken all over the Philippines for communication between those who spoke different native or regional languages and for communication on the national level. As a result, users of Filipino have caused it to progressively move away from Tagalog, the language it is most similar to, by contributing features from their own languages. Consequently, Filipino has gained wide acceptance and use, although by force of habit, it is sometimes still called Tagalog or Pilipino.

Regional languages refer to the common language spoken within the regions in the Philippines. To illustrate, an Ibanag will communicate with a Kalinga in Ilokano, the regional language of Northern Luzon. A stranger in this region will be addressed in Ilokano and Filipino will be resorted to if not understood. Sebuano will operate in the same way in parts of the Visayas and Mindanao.

The educated elite which is definitely in the minority especially in rural and semi-urban areas, resort to a variety of English in public affairs although a few of them use this language in private life.

The 1935 version stipulates the translation of the document into the regional languages and into English and Spanish while the 1973 version stipulates the translation into Philippine dialects (i.e. languages) spoken by over 50,000 people and into English and Arabic. Translation into numerous Philippine languages will be unnecessary, besides being

impractical, precisely because there is a common language existing, one which will serve the purpose.

As to translating the document into Spanish, one wonders whom this provision is intended for. Surely one would be hard put to find a group who can understand only Spanish. And unless it can be proven that Arabic is actually used outside of practicing Islam, that is, used as a regional language, a translation into this language is not realistic.

Alternative Provision. This constitution shall be officially promulgated in the common national language, Pilipinon, and translated into the regional languages of the Philippines, and English. In case of conflict the Pilipinon text shall prevail.

Justification: Due to the provision in the 1973 constitution which implies that Filipino is still to be developed and therefore believed by a few to be non-existent, and because others believe that the *f* sound cannot be pronounced by many Filipinos, naming the national language Filipino might still meet resistance.

In many Philippine languages, an affix giving the meaning “language” is found – *on* in languages in the South, ex. Hiligaynon, Surigaonon, etc. and an infix *in* in northern languages as Kinalingga, Initbayaten. The term Pilipinon therefore should be acceptable to Visayans and people from Mindanao. Besides this, it should be easier to pronounce by people who do not have an *f* in their languages. Then, too, this term will be a response to the complaint that naming the national language Pilipino favors Tagalog. If this alternative proposal is adopted, Pilipino will refer to the people and Pilipinon to the national language.

2. Filipino, the national lingua franca, shall be the official language, with the regional languages as auxiliary languages; until otherwise provided by law, English shall also be an auxiliary language.

Justification. The 1973 version provides that both English and Pilipino shall be the official languages, yet Pilipino has hardly been used except for ceremonial purposes. This provision implies that most Filipinos know English. This is far from the truth. Practically only the educated elite who constitute a mere 10% of the population are literate in this language and therefore it is from this group that those who eventually govern emanate.

The proposed provision recognizes the reality of regional languages as the effective media which can ensure true democracy by enhancing greater participation from all citizens regardless of native language. This is because government policies, legislature and court proceedings will be promulgated and conducted in languages understood by the greater number of people.

This proposal anticipates semi-autonomous regional governments where the regional languages will be the official languages of the regional governments and Filipino/Pilipino the unifying language of the national government.

English will have to remain as an auxiliary language until all the statutes, treaties, administrative circulars and orders shall have been translated into the official national language. The phrase “until otherwise provided by law” in the proposed provision is in anticipation of the time when English will no longer be needed as an official language.

3. A National Language Commission shall be established consisting of language experts – language teachers, linguists, and writers – to develop and propagate Filipino, based on the national lingua franca and other Philippine languages, that shall unite and empower the people.

The tasks of this body will include:

a) Selecting and establishing the language norm – The variety of that language which is actually used all over the country should be determined to establish the norm of the national language.

b) Writing a new grammar of the selected norm and compiling a dictionary for this grammar.

c) Compiling a book of rhetoric in the national language for guidance of teachers, writers and students.

d) Establishing a section on translation in the commission to undertake massive translation work on important documents and works written in various Philippine and world languages. Scholars in the different disciplines and writers in the different Philippine languages, schools and universities will have to be consulted on the selection and prioritization of the works to be translated.

e) Launching a comprehensive information drive on the new norm to propagate its use in government, business and media.

4. Filipino shall be the medium of instruction in all schools. The regional languages and, until necessary, English, shall be auxiliary languages.

Justification. The fact that there are over a hundred groups speaking their own mother tongue and that Filipino is not as yet “intellectualized” [sic] are the reasons often given to support the continued use of English as the medium of schools. But the more basic issue is dependence – economic and cultural – which is perpetuated by the use of English in learning. Being educated via English necessarily has set the minds of Filipinos in the ways of western culture so much so that their very aspirations have become westernized and will remain so as long as this neo-colonial instrument which has directed educational and economic thrusts remains as a tool for learning. For this reason it is necessary to include in the new constitution a provision on medium of instruction, a question unresolved to this day.

Presently students starting school have to struggle with English, a foreign language, before they can internalize what they should be

learning, oftentimes dropping out of school before the process of learning new concepts can even start and almost certainly remaining illiterate for the rest of their lives despite the fact that they can speak two or three languages.

The implementation of the bilingual policy was a recognition of the failure of English as a medium of instruction for the majority who, because of poverty, were not able to afford the schools where English was taught well and who did not acquire English before they started school. Therefore they hardly had time to learn the language at all. Obviously, knowledge cannot be acquired by means of a language one does not understand. Therefore a child starting school has to be taught in the language he knows or he is at least exposed to even outside of school. Aside from this, the medium of instruction should be the language the student knows well enough to speak because literacy cannot be attained in a language one cannot speak well.

This policy also implies the inability of most teachers to be effective in English. Subjects were assigned to be taught in Filipino and others in English. This was no solution for the teacher who was ineffective in either one of the languages. To have been useful, the teacher should have been allowed to teach in the language he was most effective in. Besides this, the policy should be considered only as a transition to a monolingual policy. It should have been enforced only to give time for more teachers to be trained and more teaching materials produced in Filipino. The propagation of the national language is almost wholly the responsibility of the schools. Keeping in mind what has been said earlier about the similarities of Philippine languages, the following is a proposal which will be supportive of the constitutional provision suggested here:

Grade 1-4 – The vernacular/regional language shall be the medium of instruction with Filipino as an auxiliary medium and subject. English shall be introduced as a subject in grade 3.

Grade 5-high school – Filipino shall be the medium of instruction with English as a subject.

University – A bilingual policy shall be followed according to the languages the teachers feel more effective in.

The teaching of English at all levels should assuage any fear of losing the ability to communicate internationally.

DR. ERNESTO CONSTANTINO
Ph.D., Linguistics, UP

DR. CONSUELO J. PAZ
Ph.D., Linguistics, UP

PROF. ROSARIO TORRES-YU
Chairman, UP Department of
Filipino and Philippine Literature

PROF. JESUS FER. RAMOS
President, Pambansang
Samahan sa Wika (PSW)

June 11, 1986

PETITION

WHEREAS, Spanish has been our unifying official language since 1521;

WHEREAS, the Constitution of the first Philippine Republic recognized Spanish as our official language;

WHEREAS, the 1935 Constitution continued recognizing Spanish as one of our official languages with equal footing with English;

WHEREAS, the 1973 Constitution approved Spanish as one of our official languages, but when the draft of the Constitution was sent to Malacanang at the same time that Martial Law was declared and imposed, Spanish was removed from the original draft of that 1973 Constitution. However, due to international pressure coming from thirty-six (36) Hispanic countries including those that speak Portuguese, then President Marcos returned Spanish as one of our official languages in the 1973 Constitution by P.D. 155 dated March 15, 1973;

WHEREAS, the new Aquino-Laurel government has established economic and geo-political relations with Spain and other Hispanic countries to the extent of asking Spain, as declared by Ambassador Rosario Manalo, of representing Filipino products in the EEC for our economic interest, aside from a loan asked by Vice-President Laurel recently, the discontinuation of Spanish as one of our official languages will not redound to the welfare and national interest of the Filipino people:

NOW, THEREFORE, the undersigned respectfully petition the Honorable Members of the 1986 Constitutional Commission to include Spanish as one of the official languages.

Davao City Association of Teachers,
Parents and Students

Signatures

Leonardo Yabes

Leticia Celeste

Mamerto Castillo

Rosalie Eda

Julia Ayuban

Virginia Hernandez

Noemi Tecson

Nonito Delgado

Pauline Bandolen

Enrique Yu

Carmencita Jardin

Kim Peter Yabes

Veronica Cane

Peter Ortiz

Johnny Dumalodgod

Justiniano R. Yap

PETITION FOR THE CONTINUED INCLUSION OF SPANISH AS ONE OF OUR OFFICIAL LANGUAGES IN THE NEW PHILIPPINE CONSTITUTION

HER EXCELLENCY CORAZON C. AQUINO, President of the
PHILIPPINES

HIS EXCELLENCY SALVADOR LAUREL, Vice-President of the
PHILIPPINES and concurrently PRIME MINISTER and FOREIGN
AFFAIRS MINISTER

THE HONORABLE MINISTERS, MEMBERS OF THE
CABINET OF PRESIDENT AQUINO AND ALL THE
HONORABLE DRAFTERS OF THE NEW CONSTITUTION

WE, THE FILIPINO WORKERS AND STUDENTS NOW IN
MADRID, SPAIN, NUMBERING 53,000 IN ALL, DO HEREBY
REQUEST OF YOU THAT THE SPANISH LANGUAGE BE KEPT
AS ONE OF OUR OFFICIAL LANGUAGES IN THAT NEW
CONSTITUTION BEING WRITTEN UNDER THE AEGIS OF
THE AQUINO GOVERNMENT.

THE REASONS BEHIND THIS PETITION ARE THE
FOLLOWING:

1. SPANISH has been the official language of our country since 1571 with the founding of Manila, by Spain, as our country is the seat of Government in substitution of the several, independent and tribal governments our pre-Hispanic ancestors had, each with a

different native dialect, an autonomous system of government and culture.

2. SPANISH continued to be, in fact, one of our official languages until the treacherous Marcos Government and Regime removed it as such and even reduced the original 24 units for its teaching because the MECS Ministers of Ferdinand and his crony institutions of education spawned the diploma mill syndrome among most of our schools, colleges and universities converting them into money-making apparatuses instead of true centers of learning and Filipino culture that includes, as part of the FILIPINO IDEAL, the Spanish language.
3. In SPANISH is written what we know as our original and national FILIPINO Literature as distinguished from that Literature written in regional languages or, later, written in English.
4. FILIPINOS working in SPAIN and in LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES, as well as in the USA, where 30 million US Citizens are Hispanics, have the pride to say that SPANISH is also one of their official languages along with English and Tagalog, thereby opening for them a lot of goodwill and friendship from peoples who would otherwise be hostile, indifferent or unfriendly.
5. THERE ARE MANY OTHER REASONS for the retention of SPANISH as one of our Official Languages and as a subject in High School, which the Marcos minions in MECS gradually annulled, and in college, where bad Filipinos, posing as educators, have been trying to eliminate Spanish so irresponsibly out of plain ignorance and discrimination.

PETITION FOR THE CONTINUED INCLUSION OF SPANISH AS ONE OF THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES IN THE NEW PHILIPPINE CONSTITUTION

Ma. Paz Hidalgo
Leonarda Yber
Perla I. B. Primicias
Sixta Roodettes Reyes
Jose Emilio de Veyra
Leonardo Mangurit
Dominga Lague
Catalina Bilar
Rosita Romero
Peggy Nelson
Remedios Costoso
Thelma Lloren
Rosmito M. Galam
Rossini Rivera
James Valdez

Anna Maria Castelo
Minerva A. Nieto
Eugene Sycip
Marie Antoinette Evangelista
Miguel Romero
Rosita Bamanco
Nicanor Hidalgo
Guido Argosino
Angelito Medina
Ester Calvo
Finita Jocson
Salvador Malig, Jr.
Theresa Vargas
Jesus Enrico Nunga
Virgilio Autencio

ON THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION POLICY: A CRITIQUE

Juan R. Francisco

Philippine-American Education Foundation/
University of the Philippines

Offhand, there are at least two significant issues that are crucial to the full understanding of the bilingual education policy. The first is *the issue of ethnicity orland the ethnolinguistic problem*. It must be recognized within the broad view of the Policy that there are *ethnic* and *linguistic identities* of each of the groupings in the country, and these ethnicities contributed to much of the *divisive attitudes* of the Filipinos according to these identities, if oftentimes very much stereotyped. This is understood in the distinctions brought about by the language spoken by each group, and the emphasis has been primarily on the level of differences, rather than on the level of commonalities. The intelligibility of Philippine languages ranges from 35% to about 70% on a very conservative estimate. This, therefore, emphasizes the commonalities that underlie these languages. They all belong to the great Austronesian (formerly called Malayo-Polynesian) family of languages. The range of intelligibility of these languages within the great family is 24% to 65%. Historically, before the intrusion of the western world into the Austronesian world, the range of intelligibility was higher.

This leads us to the *second issue*. That is, *the issue of equity*. The Bilingual Education Policy gives undue advantage to the person who grew up with *Pilipino* (read *Tagalog*) over the one who grew up with Iloko, Sugbuhanon, Waray, Hiligaynon, Maranaw, Maguindanaw or Tausug and others. This undue advantage certainly violates the principle of equity.

To resolve these two issues, which I believe are inherent in the Policy, I would like to propose the following mechanisms or methodologies. In the light of the very high level of intelligibility of Philippine languages, an *intensified conscious effort to develop a common vocabulary from the languages of the various ethnic groups must be a declared national policy. This will eventually reduce the divergences in perceptions, perspectives and value orientations leading to the creation of the most acceptable national language and national literature*, that is Filipino. This will also result in *the development of national community and national consciousness*. This is illustrated by the development of Bahasa Indonesia and Bahasa Malaysia, which, while developing their vocabularies drawn from all the languages in Malaysia and Indonesia, have created a national consciousness and pride without submerging the identities of their minority languages.

With *Filipino* developing as the *lingua Filipina*, possibly *Tagalog* as its grammatical base, *a common vocabulary must be developed from all the languages spoken in the Philippines*. However, there should be *no attempt to obliterate the various ethnic languages*. Rather, they should be *allowed to develop* and continue creating their individual literature. They should even be *encouraged with government support to publish their literatures* to make the population literate not only in the *lingua Filipina*, but in *their ethnic languages as well*.

Because the policy apparently does not necessarily encourage the other ethnic languages to develop their literatures, it is recommended that it must be re-examined in terms of its being developed into a three-language formula or policy — that is, every Filipino must study *English* and *Pilipino* (read *Tagalog*), if *Pilipino* were to be made into the national language; native *Pilipino* speakers must learn any one of the major languages spoken in the country. This formula will induce the development of the literature of these other languages, which otherwise will be left to their own devices; or to their potential neglect if the

bilingual policy is encouraged. The three-language formula will certainly give meaning to the principle of equity (see Francisco 1966 and 1980).*

Makati, Metro Manila
16 July 1986

*This is a revised version of an earlier statement made on September 30, 1981.

A RESOLUTION OF THE
KAPATIRAN NG MGA KAWAL NA
MANUNULAT SA PILIPINO (KAKAMPI)

[Soldier-Writers Association in Pilipino]

RECOMMENDING TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL
COMMISSION (CONCOM) TO ADOPT PILIPINO AS
OFFICIAL NATIONAL LANGUAGE OF THE PHILIPPINES AS
WELL AS ENGLISH AND LOCAL DIALECTS AS AUXILIARY
LANGUAGES

WHEREAS, the Philippines is a ridiculous country for its government uses a foreign language (English) and the people their national language (Pilipino) and the local dialects;

WHEREAS, such linguistic absurdity results in a serious communication gap between government and people, alienating in the process the latter from the former, obstructing an otherwise easy dissemination of information and knowledge among the people, thus keeping the citizenry ignorant and disunited, hampering national security, development and progress;

WHEREAS, it is high time that the government should awaken to the false notion that English is the key to Filipino unity, patriotism, learning, security, development and progress, for the incontrovertible fact proves that, while the Filipinos boast of their country, the Philippines, as the third largest English-speaking country in the world, it is shamefully left behind in national development and unity by some equally poor, non-English speaking countries in the Third World;

WHEREAS, the government should learn a lesson from our own history that the Katipunan, the Sakdal, the Hukbalahap, student activism and at present the CPP-NDF-NPA were successful in easily and

effectively uniting the people in concerted efforts and action towards the attainment of their respective goals;

WHEREAS, the government is apparently losing to the CPP-NDF-NPA in the propaganda war for no other reason than the former uses a foreign language in communicating with the people while the latter in the Pilipino national language and local dialects;

WHEREAS, the people are the main national resource that makes a nation great and it is incumbent upon the government to facilitate first their development through easy communication, dissemination of information and knowledge, moulding of national values, character, behavior and idealism according to the goals of society by using the national language if the country is to really become well-developed and progressive.

WHEREAS, world history proves no nation has ever become great with its government and armed forces using a national language different from that of the people which is indigenous and umbilically linked with the nation's seat of government and center of political, economic, social and military life.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED as it is hereby resolved that the Constitutional Commission be requested to include a provision in the Philippine Constitution adopting PILIPINO as the official national language of the nation to be used as medium of instruction in schools on all levels, in all forms of communications and media, with English and other Philippine dialects as auxiliary languages.

RESOLVED FURTHER, that the original copy of this resolution be presented to the Honorable Con-Com President and mimeographed copies be furnished to all Constitutional Commissioners.

RESOLVED FURTHERMORE, that a duplicate copy of this resolution be furnished Her Excellency, President Corazon C. Aquino, and cabinet members, ranking public officials and the media with mimeographed copies.

DONE in Quezon City on the 14th day of August, 1986.

Lt. Colonel VICENTE S. SANTOS, JR. PA
Founding National President

Col. GUILLERMO T. DOMONDON PC
President, General Headquarters Chapter

Cap. MAURO L. PLATON PAF
President, Philippine Air Force Chapter

Lt. Col. VENANCIO N. TUMIBAY PN
Director, Philippine Navy Chapter

Col. AGRIPINO R. DE GUZMAN PA
Director, Philippine Army Chapter

Col. PEDRO P. TOLENTINO, JR. PC
President, Philippine Constabulary/INP Chapter

Major UBALDO U. TEODOSIO PC
Treasurer

Captain DIVINA V. INLAO WAC
Secretary

Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. MALANA
Adviser, NAFP KAKAMPI

Editor ANACLETO I. DIZON
Founding Adviser

KAPISANAN SA PAGPAPALAGANAP NG PILIPINO
(KAPAGPIL)
Lunsod ng Batangas

Ika-12 ng Hulyo, 1986

Kgg. WILFRIDO VILLACORTA
Tagapangulo, Lupon ng Mapagkukunang Pantao
(Committee on Human Resources)
Komisyong Pansaligang-Batas
Gusali ng Batasang Pambansa
Lunsod ng Quezon

Mahal na Komisyonado:

Pagkatawan po sa Kapisanan sa pagpapalaganap ng Pilipino at ng Tinig ng Bayan Tinig ng Diyos, magalang po naming hinihiling, kaugnay ng inyong pinagtibay na “Filipino bilang Wikang Pambansa,” ang pagkakaroon ng sadyang tadhana sa ating bubuuing Saligang-Batas para sa isang KOMISYON NG WIKANG PAMBANSA.

Kalakip po nito ang sipi ng aming paninindigan at panukala para sa Komisyon ng Wikang Pambansa na iniharap namin kina

Komisyonado Francisco Rodrigo at Ricardo Romulo sa isang hayagang pagdinig ukol sa Konstitusyon na idinaos ngayon dito sa Lunsod ng Lipa. Sayang. Sana narito rin kayo!

Umaasa po sa maagap at paborable ninyong pag-aksyon.

Matapat na sumasainyo,

SULPICIO T. FRAGO

Pangulo, Kapisanan sa Pag-
papalaganap ng Pilipino
(KAPAGPIL) at Kagawad, Lupong
Pamunuan, Tinig ng Bayan Tinig
ng Diyos

(KOMISYON NG WIKANG PAMBANSA, sa bubuuing Saligang Batas, ipinanukala ng KAPISANAN SA PAGPAPALAGANAP NG PILIPINO (KAPAGPIL) at ng TINIG NG BAYAN TINIG NG DIYOS, Batangas, sa pamamagitan ni G. SULPICIO F. FRAGO, sa hayagang pagdinig ng CONCOM na idinaos sa La Salle auditorium, Lunsod ng Lipa nuong ika-12 ng Hulyo, 1986.)

Dapat magkaroon ng sadyang tadhana sa ating bubuuing Konstitusyon para sa isang KOMISYON NG WIKANG PAMBANSA. Tungkulin at pananagutan ng Komisyong ito ang paglinang, pagpapaunlad at pagpapalaganap ng Wikang Pambansa (Filipino) hanggang sa ito ay maging bahagi na ng pang-araw-araw na buhay ng lahat at bawa't mamamayang Pilipino. Kasama rito ang pagkakaroon ng tiyak at maipagkakaparing Panitikang Pilipino batay sa ating makulay na kasaysayan, kultura, paniwala, karanasan, salawikain, mga buhay at sinulat ng mga dakilang anak ng ating lahi, at iba pang kaugnay. Ang hindi nagawa at naisakatuparan ng Saligang-Batas ng 1935 at ng Saligang-Batas ng 1973 ukol sa Wikang Pambansa ay kailangang magkaroon na ng katuparan sa ilalim ng bubuuing Saligang-Batas ng 1986.

Ang Komisyon ng Wikang Pambansa ay mabisang kasangkapan sa ikapagkakaroon ng pambansang pagkakaisa at bunga ito ng isipan at adhikaing Pilipino. Kaganapan din ito ng mga sinabi ng mga sumusunod na dakilang Pilipino:

Jose Rizal: “Bawa't bayan ay may sariling wika gaya ng pagkakaroon ng sariling pag-iisip. Ang wika ay siyang kaluluwa ng lahi.”

Manuel Quezon: “Hindi makaiiral ang isang diwang pambansaroon sa walang wikang panlahat. Hindi tayo kailanman magkakaroon ng tunay na pagkilala sa ating karangalan bilang isang bansa hangga't wala tayong sariling wika.”

Jose P. Laurel: “Walang magmamahal sa Pilipino na hihigit pa sa mga Pilipino.”

Batay rito, naninindigan ang KAPAGPIL at ang TINIG na walang maaaring magmalasakit at maghangad ng tiyakang pagkakaroon ng Wikang Pambansa maliban sa ating mga Pilipino. Ngayon na at hindi kung kailan pa! Kung hindi tayo ang kikilos, sino?

SULPICIO E. FRAGO

Pangulo, Kapisanan sa Pagpapalaganap
ng Pilipino (KAPAGPIL) at Kagawad,
Lupong Pamunuan ng Tinig ng
Bayan Tinig ng Diyos – Batangas

June 1986

POSITION OF THE LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF THE PHILIPPINES
ON THE NATIONAL LANGUAGE

1. The official languages of the Philippines are Pilipino and English.
2. The national language of the Philippines is Pilipino. Steps shall be taken by the Institute of National Language to modernize Pilipino through enrichment of lexical items from other Philippine languages and to cultivate Pilipino as a language for the domains of higher education, government administration, legislation and judicial processes.
3. The Constitution shall be promulgated in Pilipino and in English.

Position presented by:

BONIFACIO P. SIBAYAN
President

ANDREW GONZALEZ, FSC,
Executive Secretary

NATIONAL LANGUAGE PROCLAMATION PREMATURE

It is premature to declare Pilipino/Tagalog as the common national language because the majority of our people cannot yet speak it. There are those who claim, however, that 70% of our people can already speak the language. Even granting, without admitting, that this were so, it would mean that 30% or at least 16.5 million Filipinos cannot speak Pilipino/Tagalog. 16.5 million are still a lot of people. In fact, 122 out of some 164 nations in the world (World Almanac, 1983) have less than 16.5 million people. To mention a few, we have Israel, Austria, Switzerland, Belgium, Singapore, Costa Rica, Libya, Denmark, Finland, Norway, even Australia, and many others which have less than 16.5 million people.

To impose Pilipino/Tagalog as national language would be unfair, cruel, and divisive. The proposal to declare Pilipino as national language now and enrich it with words from the other dialects later is something that non-Tagalogs cannot accept considering what has happened in the last 51 years, since the 1935 constitutional convention. Despite the specific provision that one of the native languages was going to be only the basis and not the national language, Pilipino/Tagalog has been institutionalized and developed as the national language. It is much fairer that adoption be made only after the language has become acceptable to all Filipinos.

It is quite clear that the 48-member constitutional commission does not have equitable regional representation. But being fair-minded men and women imbued with positive dynamic nationalism, it is expected that they will come out with a national language provision that will be fair and acceptable to all Filipinos. It is hoped that they will

rise above their own regional and ethnic biases and act as though they were elected to represent all Filipinos.

Sometimes, unfavorable things happen because of the apathy of those who will be adversely affected. The Multi-Ethnic Citizens' Committee for Constitutional Commission Resolution No. 286 (MECC 286) is appealing to all those who believe that it is not yet time to declare the existence of a common national language to write to the newspapers and to the commissioners of the constitutional commission to express their views.

MULTI-ETHNIC CITIZENS' COMMITTEE
FOR CON-COM RES. NO. 286
(MECC 286)

By:

DEMETRIO A. QUIRINO, JR.
Chairman

MUST WE CONTINUE TO HAVE SECOND-CLASS CITIZENS?

When a Filipino student goes to Japan and studies there, he does not have equal opportunity as the Japanese. And so he is given plenty of time to study the Japanese language so that he can take up whatever course he wants to take up. When a non-Tagalog-speaking Filipino goes to school with Tagalog-speaking Filipinos where the medium of instruction is Pilipino/Tagalog, he does not have equal opportunity to learn the subject. HE HAS ABSOLUTELY NO CHANCE WHATSOEVER TO PERFORM ON A PAR WITH HIS TAGALOG-SPEAKING COUNTRYMEN. THIS MAKES HIM A SECOND-CLASS CITIZEN CRUELLY OPPRESSED AND DISCRIMINATED AGAINST BY UNFEELING EDUCATIONAL LEADERS WHO HAVE SWORN TO DO JUSTICE TO EVERY MAN.

This has been going on since 1974. At that time, more than 60% of our population could not speak Pilipino/Tagalog. Now, more than 50% still cannot speak Pilipino/Tagalog. There are those who claim, however, that 70% of our people can now speak in Pilipino/Tagalog. Even granting, without admitting, that indeed 30% cannot speak Pilipino/Tagalog, the number would still reach a sizeable 16.5 million. This is more than the population of 122 out of some 164 nations in the world (World Almanac, 1983).

In view of this, we should stop making Pilipino/Tagalog as the medium of instruction in some subjects until such time as we have developed and formally adopted a common national language acceptable to all Filipinos. It is all right to make English temporarily as the medium of instruction because, with this language, everyone has an equal opportunity and no one will be a second-class citizen in his own country.

It is important that a Commission on National Language and International Language be set up as soon as possible with the following membership: a Tagalog, a Cebuano, an Ilocano, a Hiligaynon, a Bicolano, a Waray, a Pampango, a Pangasinense, a Maranao, and a Maguindanao, and one other to represent the 77 other dialectal groups.

The Tagalog representative should be the chairman of the commission since Pilipino/Tagalog will be the nucleus of the national language. The Cebuano who represents the biggest dialectal group comprising 24.6% or more than 13 million of our population, should be given recognition by making him the vice-chairman of the commission.

If we do this, in 5 years' time, we will have a language that is acceptable to all Filipinos and in another 5 years, we will be ready to use it as medium of instruction. Let us not put the cart before the horse.

MULTI-ETHNIC CITIZENS' COMMITTEE
FOR CON-COM RES. NO. 286 (MECC 286)

By:

DEMETRIO A. QUIRINO, JR.
Chairman

ENGLISH AS INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE

English is the language that united the 1934 and the 1971-1972 Constitutional Conventions as well as the 1986 Constitutional Commission. It is remarkable that in these three respectable bodies, English was used in at least 95% of the deliberations. This was so because English is the only language that all the delegates could effectively debate in. In fact, in almost all seminars, forums, conferences, and other social and political interactions in our country, English has always served to unite and bind our people who have diverse tongues and cultures.

We are indeed a lucky people. Without our asking for it we have acquired a substantial knowledge of English which is undoubtedly the lingua franca of the world. Advances in science and technology are transferred from one country to another mainly through scientific papers, technical magazines, journals, books, and other media. More than 80 per cent of all scientific papers worldwide are published first in English (Newsweek, 25 November 1983). English is the dominant language of medicine, electronics, and space technology, of aviation, computers, trade, industry, and diplomacy. Even such technologically advanced countries like West Germany, Japan, Denmark, and the Soviet Union rely heavily on scientific literature in English to further enhance their own technology. In international conferences, English is the language usually used or is at least translated into. Proficiency in this language therefore is an essential factor for the progress of an individual or of a nation.

Yet, one will be surprised to know that there is a lot of resentment and antipathy towards the language to the point that the Committee on Human Resources would like to cast it aside if one were to interpret Committee Resolution No. 29, Section 22. The said resolution provides in part that "...Filipino shall be used as the language of instruction on

all levels of the educational system.” This would mean that we will slowly but surely lose our proficiency in English as well as our competitive edge in the international labor market.

In a fast shrinking world, we must not lose our competitive edge in English. By all means, let us have a common national language but let us have English, too. Con-com Resolution No. 286 calls for the creation of a Commission on National Language and International Language so that we can likewise formally adopt a national language to be known as Filipino and likewise formally adopt English as our international language.

MULTI-ETHNIC CITIZENS’ COMMITTEE
FOR CON-COM RES. NO. 286 (MECC 286)

By:

DEMETRIO A. QUIRINO, JR.
Chairman

SANGGUNIANG PANGWIKA SA EDUKASYON NG PILIPINAS LANGUAGE EDUCATION COUNCIL OF THE PHILIPPINES

PANININDIGANG PANGWIKA

KAMI, na bumubuo ng Lupong Tagapagpatupad ng Sangguniang Pangwika sa Edukasyon ng Pilipinas, Ink. na bawat isa sa amin ay kumakatawan sa isang samahang pangwika sa Pilipino o sa Ingles, ay matatag na nagpapahayag ng aming paninindigan sa mga isyung pangwika kaugnay ng kasalukuyang binubuong Saligang-Batas ng Pilipinas, na gaya ng mga sumusunod:

1. NA, and bubuuing Saligang-Batas na kapalooban ng mga mithiin at adhikain ng sambayanang Pilipino ay dapat sulatin at opisyal na ihayag sa ating wikang pambansa upang ito'y higit na maunawaan, tanggapin, at angkinin ng karaniwang mamamayang Pilipino;

2. NA, dapat ding magkaroon ng opisyal na bersyon sa Ingles at kung kinakailangan ay sa iba pang wikang katutubo o dayuhan, subalit sakaling may hidwaan sa interpretasyon sa alinmang bahagi o probisyon nito, ang mangingibabaw ay ang tekstong nasusulat sa wikang pambansa;

3. NA, tinatanggap namin na ang ating wikang pambansa ay tawaging *Filipino*, sa halip na *Pilipino*, sa kahulugang ang *Filipino* ay ang yumayaman at lumalaganap na *Pilipino*, sapagkat siya lamang talagang nangyayari sa kasalukuyan sa paglilinang at pagpapaunlad ng ating wikang pambansa;

4. NA, bagama't mahigpit naming kinakalaban ang purismo o kahit ang pagkiling lamang sa purismo, sa kabilang dako'y hindi rin naman kami naniniwala sa teorya ng amalgamasyon o ang paniniwalang mabubuo ang wikang Filipino sa pamamagitan ng paghahalu-halo ng mga katutubong wika sa Pilipinas sapagkat ang gayo'y artipisyal at hindi naaayon sa lohika at sa kasaysayan ng ebolusyon ng alinmang wika sa daigdig, bukod sa problemang malilikha na bago ito magamit ng isang mamamayang Pilipino ay kakailanganing maunawaan muna niya ang iba't ibang wika sa Pilipinas;

5. NA, kung Pilipino ang magiging *de facto nucleus* ng Filipino, ang wikang pambansa ay hindi magiging konseptwal kundi natural na wika na agad na may matatag na gramatika at literatura na payayamanin na lamang nang lalong higit sa pamamagitan ng pagpapasok dito ng mga salita at iba pang sangkap buhat sa iba't ibang katutubong wika sa Pilipinas at sa iba pang nakaiimpluwensyang banyagang wika; sa gayon, hindi magagambala o maaabala ang pagtuturo at paggamit ng wikang pambansa sa mga paaralan;

6. NA, ang Filipino ay opisyal na katutubong wika ng Pilipinas at ang Ingles ay mananatiling opisyal na dayuhang wika hangga't ito'y kailangan ng bayan;

7. NA, kinikilala namin ang mahalagang papel na ginagampanan ng mga wikang rehiyonal, gayundin ang iba pang wikang katutubo o banyaga, sa buhay ng mga gumagamit ng mga ito, kaya't dapat ipagpatuloy ang mga pagsisikap na mapanatili at makandili ang mga ito.

BILANG PATUNAY sa aming inilahad na paninindigan, buong pagkakaisa kaming lumagda sa ibaba nito ngayong Hunyo 27, 1986, PCED Hostel, Universidad ng Pilipinas.

(Lgd.) ALFONSO O. SANTIAGO

Tagapangulo

(Kinatawan: Pambansang Samahan sa
Lingwistikang Pilipino, Ink.)

(Lgd.) FE T. OTANES

Pang. Tagapangulo

(Kinatawan: Linguistic Society of the Philippines)

(Lgd.) PATRICIA MELENDREZ-CRUZ

Kalihim

(Kinatawan: Pambansang Samahan sa Wika)

(Lgd.) MA. CLARA V. RAVINA

Ingat-Yaman

(Kinatawan: College English Teachers Association)

(Lgd.) EFREN R. ABUEG

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Kapisanan ng mga Propesor sa Pilipino)

(Lgd.) LILIA F. ANTONIO

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Pambansang Samahan sa Sikolohiyang Pilipino)

(Lgd.) LAMBERTO M. GABRIEL

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Pambansang Samahan ng mga Tagamasid sa Pilipino)

(Lgd.) CESARIO Y. TORRES

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Pandayan ng Literaturang Pilipino)

(Lgd.) ROSARIO E. MAMINTA

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Philippine Association for Language Teaching)

(Lgd.) PAMFILO D. CATACATACA

(Kinatawan: Surian ng Wikang Pambansa)

(Lgd.) LOUIE L. SEVILLA

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Kapatiran ng mga Alagad ng Wikang Pilipino)

(Lgd.) NICOL M. MIRAFLORES

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Reading Association of the Philippines)

(Lgd.) ROGELIO M. LOTA

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Pambansang Samahan sa Pagsasaling-Wika)

(Lgd.) LYDIA F. GONZALES

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Pambansang Pederasyon ng mga Samahan sa Wika at Kultura)

LT. COL. VICENTE S. SANTOS

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Kapatiran ng mga Kawal na Manunulat sa Pilipino)

Pinatitibayan:

CLEMENCIA C. ESPIRITU

Executive Director

SANGGUNIANG PANGWIKA
SA EDUKASYON NG PILIPINAS
LANGUAGE EDUCATION COUNCIL
OF THE PHILIPPINES

June 12, 1986

Honorable Commissioner
Constitutional Commission
Batasang Pambansa, Quezon City

I have the honor to submit herewith, for your kind consideration, a copy of the Resolution passed by the Executive Board of the Language Education Council of the Philippines, Inc. (LEDCO), which presents the stand of the organization on matters affecting language that the Constitutional Commission is likely to take up.

I hope the purpose of the Resolution will be made clearer by mentioning that the general objective of the LEDCO is that of “consolidating the resources of language educationists and scholars by providing the leadership to enhance their impact on nation-building through language education and research.” (LEDCO By-Laws, Article II)

In addition, some salient aims of the LEDCO may be stated as follows: (1) to work for the promotion and development of Pilipino and maintenance of English within the context of the existing bilingual education policy; (2) to provide a forum for the discussion of language policies in cooperation with other organizations and agencies; and (3) to identify areas of common interest concerning language education

problems that go beyond the specific interest of any particular association, discipline or profession.

It may also be worthy of mention that the LEDCO is a non-stock, non-profit corporation to which are affiliated at present fourteen (14) active major professional language organizations of the country which are English- and/or Pilipino-oriented. It was duly registered with the SEC on January 18, 1981.

As such, the LEDCO takes pleasure in offering its services in relation to the work of the Constitutional Commission that may involve the following activities and similar others:

1. If arrangement and accreditation could be made with the Commission Secretariat, the LEDCO can provide the linguists and translators possessing the needed expertise to work on the Pilipino version; and

2. Coordinate with the Committee on Language that may be formed by the Constitutional Commission, with regard to language research, hearings, and allied subjects.

With assurance of high esteem, I am

Very truly yours,

ALFONSO O. SANTIAGO, Ph.D.

SANGGUNIANG PANGWIKA SA
EDUKASYON NG PILIPINAS
LANGUAGE EDUCATION COUNCIL OF THE
PHILIPPINES

RESOLUTION NO. 86-06-02

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE MEMBERS OF THE
CONSTITUTIONAL COMMISSION THAT THE PROJECTED
PHILIPPINE CONSTITUTION BE WRITTEN AND
PROMULGATED IN THE NATIONAL LANGUAGE

WHEREAS, we the members of the Executive Board of the LANGUAGE EDUCATION COUNCIL OF THE PHILIPPINES, INC. (LEDCO), and as individual representatives of different language associations in English and Pilipino, sincerely believe that any self-respecting nation aspiring to achieve the true meaning – in thought, in word, and in deed – of its reacquired freedom will adopt a Constitution written in the national language;

WHEREAS, if our Philippine currency and postal stamps are being printed in the national language to signify to the family of nations that the national economy and communication of the Filipinos are no longer under the subjection of foreign domination or control, with greater reason should we Filipinos resolutely make manifest our being free by writing our Constitution, the fundamental law that embodies our own ideals and aspirations as Filipinos, in our national language;

WHEREAS, while we have to maintain the English language in the Philippines as an official second language, serving as tool especially in the field of education and diplomacy, nonetheless we Filipinos must also accept the reality that it is more effective for a people-oriented

government to use as medium the indigenous national language for the attainment of national unity and for nation-building, both domains of activity that call for the involvement and participation of the common citizen;

WHEREAS, even if the projected Philippine Constitution is written and promulgated in the national language, it will be without prejudice to other official versions, such as in English, in Arabic, in the major Philippine languages; and in other world languages and in minor Philippine languages, as may be found necessary;

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved as it is hereby resolved, to request the members of the Constitutional Commission that the projected Philippine Constitution be written and promulgated in the national language;

RESOLVED FURTHER, that aside from the members of the Constitutional Commission, copies of this resolution be sent also to the mass media (newspapers, radio and television stations) for the needed dissemination.

SIGNED in Manila, Philippines, this 12th day of June, Nineteen Hundred and Eighty Sixth Year of Our Lord.

EXECUTIVE BOARD

ALFONSO O. SANTIAGO
Chairman
(Representing: Pambansang
Samahan sa Linggwistikang
Pilipino)

FE T. OTANES
Vice-Chairman
(Representing: Linguistic
Society of the Philippines)

PATRICIA MELENDREZ-CRUZ

Secretary

(Representing: Pambansang
Samahan sa Wika)

MA. CLARA V. RAVINA

Treasurer

(Representing: College
English Teachers Association)

EFREN R. ABUEG

Board Member

(Representing: Kapisanan
ng mga Propesor sa Pilipino)

LILIA F. ANTONIO

Board Member

(Representing: Pambansang
Samahan sa Sikolohiyang
Pilipino)

LAMBERTO M. GABRIEL

Board Member

(Representing: Pambansang
Samahan ng mga Tagamasid
sa Pilipino)

VIRGILIO G. ENRIQUEZ

Board Member

(Representing: Samahang
Pilipino sa Sikolohiya)

SANGGUNIANG PANGWIKA SA
EDUKASYON NG PILIPINAS
LANGUAGE EDUCATION COUNCIL OF THE
PHILIPPINES

KAPASIAHAN BLG. 86-06-02

KAPASIAHANG HUMIHILING SA MGA MIYEMBRO NG
KOMISYONG KONSTITUSYONAL NA MANGYARING
SULATIN AT IHAYAG SA WIKANG PAMBANSA ANG
BUBUUNG SALIGANG-BATAS NG PILIPINAS

SAPAGKAT, kami na bumubuo ng Lupong Tagapagpaganap ng LANGUAGE EDUCATION COUNCIL OF THE PHILIPPINES, INC. (LEDCO), na bawat isa sa amin ay kumakatawan sa isang samahang pangwika sa Ingles o sa Pilipino, ay matapat na naniniwalang ang alinmang bansa na may paggalang sa sarili at naghahangad na makamit ang tunay na diwa – sa isip, sa salita, at sa gawa – ng nabawing kalayaan ay bubuo ng isang Saligang-Batas na nasusulat sa wikang pambansa;

SAPAGKAT, kung ang ating salapi at selyong pangkoreo ay inililimbag sa wikang pambansa upang mabatid sa iba't ibang bansa sa daigdig na ang ating pambansang ekonomiya at komunikasyon ay wala na sa kamay ng mga dayuhan, lalong higit na dapat nating ipakita ang katotohanan ng ating pagiging malaya sa pamamagitan ng pagsulat sa wikang pambansa ng ating Saligang -Batas na kapapalooban ng mga mithiin at adhikain ng sambayanang Pilipino;

SAPAGKAT, kung kailangan man nating panatilihin sa Pilipinas ang wikang Ingles bilang opisyal na pangalawang wika, na ating gamit lalo na sa larangan ng edukasyon at diplomasya, kailangan din namang tanggapin nating mga Pilipino ang di-mapasusubaling katotohanan na

higit na mabisang magagamit ng pamahalaang makasambayanan ang katutubong pambansang wika para sa pagbuo at pagpapaunlad ng bansa na nakabatay sa pakikiisa at pakikisangkot ng higit na nakakaraming karaniwang mamamayan;

SAPAGKAT, isulat man at ihayag nang opisyal sa ating wikang pambansa ang bubuuing Saligang-Batas ng Pilipinas, magkakaroon din naman ito ng katumbas na opisyal na bersyon sa Ingles, sa mga pangunahing wika ng Pilipinas, sa wikang Arabiko, at kung kinakailangan ay sa iba pang wika ng daigdig at sa mga minoryang wika ng Pilipinas;

DAHIL DITO'Y pinagtibay, gaya ng dito'y pinagtitibay, na hilingin sa mga miyembro ng Komisyong Konstitusyonal na mangyaring sulatin at ihayag sa wikang pambansa ang bubuuing Saligang-Batas ng Pilipinas.

PINAGTITIBAY PA RIN na bukod sa mga miyembro ng Komisyong Konstitusyonal ay padadalhan din ng sipi ng kapasayang ito ang mass media (pahayagan, radyo, at telebisyon) para sa kinakailangang diseminasyon.

NILAGDAAN sa Maynila, Pilipinas, ngayong ika-12 ng Hunyo, Labinsiyam Walumpu't Anim na taon ng Ating Panginoon.

LUPONG TAGAPAGPATUPAD

ALFONSO O. SANTIAGO
Tagapangulo
(Kinatawan: Pambansang
Samahan sa Linggwistikang
Pilipino)

FE T. OTANES
Pang. Tagapangulo
(Kinatawan: Linguistic
Society of the Philippines)

PATRICIA MELENDREZ-CRUZ
Kalihim
(Kinatawan: Kapisanan
ng mga Propesor sa Pilipino)

MA. CLARA V. RAVINA
Ingat-Yaman
(Kinatawan: College
English Teachers Association)

EFREN R. ABUEG

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Pambansang Samahan
ng mga Tagamasid sa Pilipino)

LILIA F. ANTONIO

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Pambansang
Samahan sa Sikolohiya
ng Wika)

LAMBERTO M. GABRIEL

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Pambansang Samahan
ng mga Tagamasid sa Pilipino)

VIRGILIO G. ENRIQUEZ

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Samahang
Pilipino sa Sikolohiya ng
Wika)

ROSARIO E. MAMINTA

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Philippine Association
for Language Teaching)

CESARIO Y. TORRES

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Pandayan ng
Literaturang Pilipino)

LOUIE L. SEVILLA

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Kapatiran ng mga
Alagad ng Wikang Pilipino)

PAMFILO D. CATACATACA

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Surian ng
Wikang Pambansa)

LYDIA F. GONZALES

Kagawad

(Kinatawan: Pambansang Pederasyon
ng mga Samahan sa Wika at Kultura)

ARZOBISPADO DE MANILA
1000 General Solano St.
P.O. Box 132
Manila, Philippines

September 4, 1995

Commissioner WILFRIDO V. VILLACORTA
Chairman of the Human Resources Committee
Constitutional Commission
Batasang Pambansa
Quezon City

Dear Commissioner Villacorta:

It was brought to my attention that there is a group in the Constitutional Commission that is proposing the elimination of the Spanish language from our list of official languages. If this is true, this exclusion will not be good for the geopolitical, economic, and cultural relations with our history and even with the rest of the 24 Spanish speaking nations.

I request you to work for the retention of the Spanish language as one of our official languages.

May you see all your beautiful dreams come true.

With very best wishes, I remain

Devotedly in Christ,

JAIME L. CARDINAL SIN
Archbishop of Manila

cc: Commissioner Cecilia Muñoz Palma
President, Constitutional Commission

All the Honorable Commissioners
Constitutional Commission

REPUBLIKA NG PILIPINAS
MINISTRI NG EDUKASYON, KULTURA AT ISPORTS
SURIAN NG WIKANG PAMBANSA

25 Hunyo 1986

Kgg. Komisyoner Wilfrido V. Villacorta
Tagapangulo, Committee on Human Resources
Komsyong Pansaligang-Batas
Gusali ng Batasang Pambansa
Constitution Hill, Lungsod Quezon

Mahal na Komisyoner Villacorta:

Ikinararangal kong iharap sa inyong pagpapasiya ang mungkahing teksto tungkol sa wikang pambansa ng sinusulat na Saligang Batas ng Republika. Ang tadhana'y maglalaman ng mga sumusunod:

1. PILIPINO ANG WIKANG PAMBANSA NG PILIPINAS.
2. PILIPINO AT INGLES ANG MGA WIKANG OPISYAL.
3. IHAHAYAG SA PILIPINO AT INGLES ANG SALIGANG BATAS NA ITO.
4. KINIKILALA ANG PAG-IRAL NG LAHAT NG IBA PANG MGA WIKANG KATUTUBO, AT PISISIGLAHIN ANG PAGPAPAUNLAD NG MGA ITO.

Katuwiran:

1. Ang Pilipino – na batay sa Wikang Tagalog – ay buhay at dinamikong wika.
2. Ang Pilipino ay pambansa at opisyal na wika ayon sa paglilinang na itinatadhana ng Saligang-Batas ng 1935.
3. Ang Pilipino ay itinakdang wikang opisyal sa Saligang Batas ng 1972 [1973].
4. Ang Pilipino ay wikang panturo at paksang aralin sa mga paaralan mula sa elementarya hanggang sa tersiyarya.
5. Ang Pilipino ay dokumentadong wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas sa mga literaturang internasyonal.
6. Ang Pilipino ay may matatag na bokabularyo at gramatika.
7. Ang Pilipino ay may malaking kalipunan ng maipagmamalaking panitikan.

Sa kabilang dako’y tinatanggihan ng Surian ang Filipino dahil sa mga sumusunod:

Katuwiran:

1. Ang Filipino ay wikang konseptuwal na nahahati sa dalawang paniniwala –
 - 1.1. Filipino na batay sa lahat ng mga wika sa Pilipinas (na ang porsiyento ng ambag ng bawat wikang etniko ay mababatay

sa bilang ng mga taong nagsasalita) – ang layunin ay amalgamation sa simula pa ng pagbubuo.

- 1.2. Filipino na batay sa maraming wika (multi-based) at nanghahawakan sa teorya ng universal approach, at gayundin sa tinatawag ng mga tagapagtaguyod na national lingua franca.
2. Ang Filipino ay bubuun pa lamang sa paraang walang kaseguruhan. Ito’y walang gramatika, walang sariling bokabularyo, at walang masasabing literatura sa pasalita o pasulat man.
3. Hindi magagamit karaka-raka bilang kasangkapan sa programa ng pagpapaunlad.

Gayunman, narito ang *alternative proposal*:

WIKANG PAMBANSA NG PILIPINAS ANG
FILIPINO-NA-PILIPINO ANG WIKANG UBOD
(FILIPINO WITH PILIPINO AS NUCLEUS)

Sa ganitong paraan, ang Filipino ay natural na wika agad. Ang lahat ng hinahangad ng mga maka-Filipino, na maganap sa talasalitaan at iba pang aspektong linggwistiko ng wika, ay matutupad. Sa ganito’y lalo pang bibilis ang elaborasyon at intelektwalisasyon ng Pilipino.

Ang pagtatakda na Filipino ang wikang opisyal kasama ng Ingles ay hindi magiging *off-beat* katulad ng probisyon ng Saligang-Batas ng 1972 [1973]. Gayundin, ang promulgasyon sa Filipino ng Saligang-Batas ay lilitaw na lohiko. At hindi pa maaabala ang pagtuturo at paggamit ng Pilipino sa mga paaralan.

Sa ibang pananalita, hinihiling namin na kung Filipino ang pipiliin ng Lupon, bigyan ito ng Lupon ng sariling depinisyon o katuturang batay sa pangngangatwirang inilahad sa unahan. Dapat itakwil ang depinisyon nina Constantino at Quirino kung nais ng Komisyon na maging katanggao-tanggap sa lalong marami ang susulating tadhana tungkol dito.

Matapat na sumasainyo,

PONCIANO B.P. PINEDA
Direktor

Republika ng Pilipinas
Ministri ng Edukasyon, Kultura at Sports
SURIAN NG WIKANG PAMBANSA

29 Agosto 1986

Komisyoner Wilfrido Villacorta
Tagapangulo, Committee on Human Resources
Komisyong Pansaligang-Batas
Constitution Hill, Lungsod Quezon

Mahal na Komisyoner Villacorta:

Kaming mga nakatakda na pawang mga kawani ng Surian ng Wikang Pambansa ay nagpapahayag ng buong-pusong pagsang-ayon sa iniharap ng inyong Lupon na panukala tungkol sa Wikang Pambansa na tadhanang ilalakup sa inaakdang Saligang-Batas ng Pilipinas. Kaisa ninyo kami sa *Filipino* na ang pinakabuod (nucleus) ay *Pilipino*.

Tunay na napakalaganap na ng wikang Pilipino sa buong bansa. Ito'y malaon nang panahong paksang-aralin sa mga paaralan, at ngayon ay wikang panturo na kasama ng Ingles. Pilipino ang nangingibabaw na wika ng 'entertainment'. Ginagamit din ng 'mass media'. May mga kursong Masteral at Doktoral na sa Pilipino.

Bukod dito, ang Pilipino ay nauunawaan at sinasalita sa amin-aming pook, at sa lahat ng dako ng bansa. Ang mga mamamayan, lalo na ang kabataan, ang mga nasa gulang na tatlumpu pababa, ay nakakausap na sa Pilipino.

Ang Pilipino ay angkin na ng Sambayanan, higit na ng masang Pilipino, at di dapat sayangin. Inaasahan naming isusulong ninyo nang

buong sigasig at katiningang-loob ang inyong panukala, at sa kabilang dako'y asahan naman ninyo ang aming lubusang tulong at taguyod sa lahat ng inyong mga pagpupunyaging makabansa.

Matapat na sumasainyo,

MGA KAWANI NG SURIAN NG WIKANG PAMBANSA

Genaro M. Aceron (Ivan, Batanes) - Ivatan

Nora G. Bangalan (Pamplona, Cagayan) - Ibanag

Norlina P. Mama-Paguio (Zamboanga City) - Tausug

PILIPINO BILANG WIKA NG AGHAM

Salustiano G. Tregonciang

Kung sabihin ko na dapat gamitin ang wika natin sa pagtuturo ng mga araling agham laging itatanong nila sa akin. Maari ba ito? Sa aking palagay ang saloobing ito ay bunga ng ating makakolonyang kaisipan at mababang pagtingin sa sariling atin. Sa palagay ng marami sa atin, mababang uri ang ating wika kaya hindi maaaring gamitin sa pagtalakay sa matataas na uring mga paksa tulad sa agham at matimatika. Lalo pa at pinatutunayan ito ng kawalan ng mga aklat sa mga paksang ito sa ating wika. Sinulat ni Prop. Renato Constantino: “Ang pinakamahalagang suliranin na sumira sa edukasyong Pilipino ay ang suliranin sa wika. May mga pagsubok pang ginagawa kung magiging higit na mabisa na ang paggamit ng katutubong wika. Ito’y talagang nakatatawa, sapagkat walang tao na higit pang nagiging palagay sa alin mang wika kaysa sariling kanya. Sa bawat nagsasariling bansa totoong likas ang paggamit ng sariling wika, kaya walang umiisip na ito’y hindi maaari. Ngunit sa atin totoong malaki ang ating pagkakalisya dahil sa malakolonyang edukasyon kaya ang paggamit ng sariling wika ay pinagtatalunan pa . . . Naniniwala ang mga Pilipino na hindi tayo mamamalagi kung wala ang Amerika, kaya sa edukasyon naniniwala tayo na hindi tunay ang pagkakatuto kung hindi ito batay sa kakayahan sa Ingglis . . . Ito ang isa sa mga ugat ng kanilang kawalan ng malasakit, ng damdaming pampook o makitid na kuro-kuro . . .” Wala tayong mga aklat sa agham sa wikang Pilipino, hindi sapagkat hindi ito maaaring gawin, kundi sapagkat hindi natin ito binibigyan ng ano mang pampasigla. Sino ang gagawa ng mga aklat na hindi gagamitin?

Ang dapat malaman ay tulad ang wika sa isang halaman. Sa matabang lupa kusang lalago ito kung may sapat na tubig at liwanag. Tulad din ito sa buto ng halaman na hindi maaaring artipisyal na gawin

at mamamatay kung matagal imbakin. Kusang lalago ang wika ng isang bansang matalino at matiyaga kung lagi itong gagamitin ng lahat ng mamamayan sa lahat ng pagkakataon at lalo pa sa kanyang mga paaralan.

Ngunit ang wika ay hindi tulad sa isang aklat na kailangang ihanda at limbagin bago magamit. Hindi ito maihahanda bago gamitin. Lumalago lamang ito sa panahon ng paggamit. Maling sabihing ihanda muna ang wika bago gamitin, matangi sa kung ang hangarin nga natin ay hadlangan ang pag-unlad nito. Hindi, samakatuwid, maaaring palitan ang Pilipino ng Filipino sa pagkakaroon ng batas. Hindi kasing dali ito nang pagpapalit ng P sa F. May batas man o wala mangyayari ito sa tamang pamamaraan sa loob ng mga panahong ang wika ay ginagamit. Kaya ba sinabi ng ating marurunong na paunlarin ang Wikang Pambansa na batay sa isa sa ating mga salita. Hindi maaaring makabuo ng Wikang Pambansa buhat sa wala. Sa pagbuo nito kailangan ang isang wikang gagamitin sa simula. Kung hindi ang Pilipino ay alin nga kaya.

Kung puspusang ituro ang Pilipino sa ating mga paaralan na hindi kasabay ang Ingglis, magkakaroon ng unti-unting pagsasanib ang Pilipino at iba't-ibang salita na tulad sa pagkabuo ngayon ng "Taglis." Sa kalautan, dahil sa malaking pagkakahawig ng ating mga salita at dahil din sa kadalian nang paglalakbay at pahatiran sa ating bansa, magkakaroon nang pag-iisa ang mga salita sa isang tunay na wikang pambansa. Ang Pilipino ang buklod na bubuo sa wika.

Ngunit tulad sa nangyayari ngayon, hindi matatamo ang hangaring ito kung isasabay ang Ingglis sa pagtuturo ng Pilipino. May palagay akong dalawa ang dahilan nito: Una, ang makakolonyang kaisipan natin at ikalawa, talagang mahirap na sapat matutuhang sabay ang dalawang wika. Di ba't upang masanay sa Kastila noon at sa Ingglis ngayon, binabawalan ng mga "elite" natin ang kanilang mga anak na gumamit ng Tagalog? Talagang napakahirap tamaan ang dalawang ibon sa isang pagbato lamang. Ang nangyayari ay walang ibong tinatamaan.

Kung isa mang maunlad na wika ang Ingglis ngayon, ay sapagkat pinabuti ito nang patuloy na paggamit. Ngunit ang Ingglis ay hindi umunlad na buo sa kanyang sarili lamang. Patuloy itong umaampon ng mga salita sa ibang wika. May mga salitang Pilipino na ngayon sa wikang Ingglis.

Ang Pilipino ay maganda sa kanyang kapayakan. Madali itong matutuhan sapagkat may dalawampung titik lamang sa kanyang abakada a,e,i,o,u; b,k,d,g,h,l,m,n,ng,p,r,s,t,w,y at may isang tunog lamang ang bawat titik. Tanging batay lamang sa tunog ng salita ang pagbaybay sa mga salitang Pilipino. Halimbawa:

Quiapo	Kiyapo
China	Tsina (Tsayna)
Maria	Marya (Mariya)
energy	enerdyi
automobil	awtomobil
combination	konbinasyon (kombinasyon)
fiesta	piyesta (pista)
million	milyon
air	eyr
temperature	temperetyur
ion	ayon
Piña	pinya
vitamin	baytamin

Batay sa aking karanasan, sapat ang mga titik na ito sa lahat ng ating pangangailangan sa wika. Mainam ang payak na wika sapagkat madali itong matutuhan.

Sa kabilang dako higit na masulit ang wikang Ingglis. Higit na marami ang titik nito, gayon man, may mga titik na magkakapareho ang tunog at may mga titik namang paiba-iba ang tunog. At upang

paguluhin pang lalo ang wika may mga titik sa mga salita na hindi pinapatunog.

Mangyari pa na sa paggamit ng ating wika na wika ng agham, aampon tayo ng mga salita sa ibang wika na walang katumbas sa atin (inuulit ko na walang katumbas sa atin). Sa pag-ampong ito, sikapin na mapanatili ang magandang payak na katangian ng wika natin!

Idinidiin ko ang katagang “walang katumbas sa atin” sapagkat may lumalagong kaugalian na palitan ng mga salitang Ingglis ang ating karaniwang salita. Halimbawa, sinasabi ang “maleleyt na ako” o “nagpromis kami sa iyo” o “ikaw ang gib nang gib at teyk nang teyk naman ako” samantalang madali namang sabihing “mahuhuli na ako” o “nangako kami sa iyo” o “ikaw ang utos nang utos at sunod nang sunod naman ako.” Mangyari pang ang isa sa mga dahilan nito ay ang mapilit nating hangad na matuto ang mga kabataan ng Ingglis na higit pa sa kanilang wika. Ngunit hindi nila matanggap na buong itakwil ang sariling wika kaya napipilitan silang gumamit ng “Taglis.”

Mali ang paniniwalang hindi na kailangan ituro pa ang Pilipino sa ating mga kabataan sapagkat matututuhan nila ito sa lansangan lamang. Ito ang isa pang patunay na mababa ang ating pagtingin sa sariling atin. Ito rin and dahilan kung kaya marami sa atin ang hindi makagamit ng Pilipino na hihigit pa sa ginagamit sa karaniwang pag-uusap. Tunay na alam mo ang iyong wika kung mabuting nagagamit mo ito sa lahat ng pangangailangan sa wika, lalong-lalo na sa paglalagay sa panulat ng mga iniisip, damdamin at adhika.

Hindi dapat gamitin ang “Taglis” lalo na sa pagsulat. Ang pagpapalago sa “Taglis” ay lilikha ng dalawang uring Pilipino, isa para sa pagsasalita at isa para sa pagsulat. Dalawang sama ang idudulot nito: Una, hahadlangan ang pag-unlad ng wikang pambansa at ikalawa, pahihirapan nito ang pag-aaral ng mga kabataan, sapagkat ibang Pilipino ang matututuhan nila sa lansangan at iba naman ang kailangan nila sa paaralan. Di ba’t hindi natin gusto na kakausapin nang pagagong

pananalita ang ating mga sanggol. Maraming kabataan natin ngayon ang nahihirapang umintindi sa matwid na Pilipino o kahit Inggelis man.

Mangyari pang magagamit na wika ng agham ang Pilipino, ngunit kailangan ang patunay dito. Ito ang dahilan kung bakit isinulat ko ang *Kemistri, Pisika, at Pisikal na Agham sa wikang ito*.

“Mabibigat at napakaraming nakasasamang bisa ang paggamit ng Inggles sa pagtuturo.” Hinahadlangan nito ang pag-unlad ng Wikang Pambansa. Nagkakaisa ang karamihan sa mga dalubhasang guro natin na kailangan ng bansang ito na mapalago ang Wikang Pambansa para sa pagkakaisa at kaunlaran ng bayan. Ang Wikang Pambansa ay ang wikang ginagamit ng lahat ng mamamayan, nag-aral man o hindi, mahirap o mayaman, upang ipahayag ang kanilang iniisip, adhika at damdamin. Uunlad at magiging kapakipakinabang ang wikang ito kung laging gagamitin ng lahat ng mamamayan sa lahat ng pagkakataon lalong-lalo na sa mga paaralan ng bansa. Halata na ang pagtuturo ng ilang aralin sa Wikang Inggelis at ang iba sa Pilipino ay hadlang sa pag-unlad ng Wikang Pambansa. Tulad sa dinanas natin ngayon, ang pagtuturong sabay sa dalawang wika ay magbubunga ng kabiguan ng mga mag-aaral na mabuting masanay sa alin mang wika. Sapagkat wika ang pangunahing kasangkapang sa pag-aaral, sa kabiguang matuto ng wika ay kabiguan sa pagkakatuto.

Walang dayuhang wika kahit gaanong kaunlad, ang buong makapapalit sa katutubong wika ng isang lahi. Samakatuwid walang pag-asang maging Wikang Pambansa ang Inggelis. Kung gayon, ang nagpupumilit na ituro ang Inggelis ay hindi lamang maaksaya, di-mabisa at naglalayo sa atin sa pagkakaroon ng Wikang Pambansa, kundi nagdadagdag pa sa ating pagkakahati-hati. Hindi lamang tayo nahahati ngayon sa mga pook na iba-iba ang salita, kundi ang lalong masama ay nahahati pa rin tayo sa maliit na pangkat ng mga “elite” na mamamayan na dalubhasa sa Inggelis ngunit hindi gaanong nakagagamit ng sariling wika, at pangkat ng nakararaming mamamayan na hindi nakaiintindi ng Inggelis. Ang bayang nahahati ng patlang sa wika ay hindi magkakaisa

at hindi makapagtatayo ng isang tunay na demokrasya. Hindi nito maipagtatanggol ang sarili sa pakikialam ng iba.

Ang pinakamalaking balakid ng mga kabataang Pilipino sa pagkakatuto ng mga araling agham ay ang bagay ng kailangan pag-aralan niya ito sa wikang dayuhan. Walang malayang bansa ang gumagawa nito. Sa pag-aaral ng agham ang dapat sanang mangyari ay sanay muna sa wika ang mag-aaral bago siya mag-aral ng agham. Ngunit, dahil sa mga likas na dahilan marami sa kanila ang hindi natututo ng Ingglis. Ang tunay na nangyayari ay pinag-aaralan nila ang agham samantalang nagsasanay pa lamang sila sa Ingglis.

Sinabi ni Prop. Letizia R. Constantino: “Hindi nila nakikita ang mga bilyong nasasayang taon-taon samantalang milyon ng ating mga kabataan ay nagsasakit sa pag-intindi sa mga araling nakasulat sa wikang hindi nila nauunawaan. Ang kanilang tanging magagawa ay pag-aaral na parang makina, magsaulo ng mga pangunahing salita, paliwanag, at mag-isa-isa ng mga paksa, upa lamang maisalin ito sa papel pagsusulit. At alalahanin ang mga pag-iisip na hindi maipamahagi ang kanilang iniisip o hindi makatalakay o makatwiran sa klase dahil sa ginagawa silang parang mga pipe nang kakulangan nang kasanayan sa Ingglis.”

“Ang paggamit sa Ingglis sa pagtuturo ng matimatika at agham ay nagpapalalim lamang sa makakolonyang saloobin tungkol sa wikang iyon. . . . ang totoo ay aralin para sa kinabukasan ang matimatika at agham at susi ito sa mabuting mga gawain na ang kasanayan sa mga ito ay magbibigay lakas sa saloobing ang Ingglis ang higit na mahalagang wika.”

Ang bunga nito ay ilan lamang sa mga mag-aaral na nagkapalad na natuto ng sapat na Ingglis ang nagkakaroon nang pagkakataong masasanay sa agham. Ang ilang ito ay buhat sa pangkat ng mga ‘elite’ ng ating lipunan. Inihayag ni Minister Laya: Palaging ipinakikita ng resulta ng NCEE na ang mga nakakukuha ng mga kataasang ‘iskor’ ay ang mga nagtatapos sa Kapital na Pook at ilang ibang lungsod, iyong mga nakaririvasang angkan at yaong ang mga magulang na rin ay

nagtapos sa dalubhasaan. Kakaunti kung mayroon man nang mga natapos sa mga 'barangay high school' ang nakapapasa sa 'NCEE'. Maliwanag na ang mga 'elite' lamang na kabataan ang may pagkakataong makapag-aral sa dalubhasaan at ang karamihan pa rin sa kanila ay kinukuha ang tinawag ni Minister Laya na mga 'white collar professions.'

Nakapagtataka ba na paunti nang paunti ang nagkakahilig na magpakadalubhasa at magturo ng mga araling agham? At idagdag pa natin ang pangkalahatang napakababang pagtingin sa mga guro natin. Nakapagtataka ba na pasama ang kalagayan ng agham at teknolodyi sa ating bansa? Isinulat ni President E. Angara: "Para bang ang kulturang agham ay malayo sa pag-uugat sa kaluluwa ng ating bansa. Kung pag-aaralan ang ating pambansang kilos mapapansin na bilanggo pa rin tayo ng mga karaniwang pamahiin at mga maling haka-haka."

Di dapat ipagtaka na mahilig sa paggamit ng Ingglis ang ilan sa atin, sapagkat dito tayo sinanay, at dito samakatwid batay ang ating kakayahan. Ngunit magkakasiya na ba lamang tayo sa pagsunod sa kamalian dahil sa namali ng daan ang ilan? O pipilitin nating ituwid ang pagkakamaling ito kahit alam nating ang ilan ay masasaktan, alang-alang sa kinabukasan ng ating lahi?

Sa aking palagay, magkakaroon ng kalutasan ang maraming suliranin natin, kung gagamitin ang Pilipino sa pagtuturo lalong-lalo na sa pagtuturo ng agham, sapagkat ang pagkakatuto ng mga aralin agham ang pinakamahalagang bahagi ng mga araling dapat matutuhan ng lahat ng kabataan. Habang ipinagpapaliban natin ang paglutas sa suliranin sa wika, ang kalagayan naman ng sistema ng ating edukasyon ay palubha nang palubha. Sinabi ni Rizal: "Ipakita mo sa amin ang mga paaralan ng isang lahi at ipakikita namin kung anong lahi iyon. Kung wala ang edukasyon at kalayaan, ang lupa at araw ng sangkatauhan, ang ano mang nais na pagpapabuti ay hindi maaari."

Di ba tama lamang na gumawa tayo nang paninindigan tungkol dito sapagkat nakataya dito ang kapalaran sa kinabukasan ng ating bansa.

2.2. MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES MEETINGS

2.2.1. Meeting with Resource Persons

Republic of the Philippines
1986 CONSTITUTIONAL COMMISSION
Quezon City, Metro Manila

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES CONSTITUTIONAL COMMISSION OF 1986, HELD AT THE CONFERENCE ROOM H, BATASAN PAMBANSA COMPLEX, QUEZON CITY, METRO MANILA ON JUNE 18, 1986.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Hon. Wilfrido V. Villacorta	- Chairman
Hon. Lugum L. Uka	- Vice-Chairman
Hon. Serafin V.C. Guingona	- Member
Hon. Lino O. Brocka	- “
Hon. Minda Luz M. Quesada	- “
Hon. Ponciano L. Bennagen	- “
Hon. Cirilo A. Rigos	- “
Hon. Florangel Rosario Braid	- “
Hon. Jose Luis Martin L. Gascon	- “
Hon. Efrain B. Trenas	- “

MEMBER ABSENT:

Hon. Christine Tan

RESOURCE PERSONS:

Director Ponciano Pineda
Institute of National Language

Dr. Bonifacio Sibayan
President, Linguistic Society of the Philippines

Dr. Andrew Gonzalez
Secretary, Linguistic Society of the Philippines

Dr. Alfonso Santiago
President, Language Education Council

Dr. Ernesto Constantino
Linguistics Department, UP

Dr. Consuelo Paz
Linguistics Department, UP

Prof. Efren Abueg
President, Kapisanan ng mga Profesor ng Pilipino

Prof. Jesus Ramos
President, Pambansang Samahan ng Wika

Dr. Demetrio Quirino, Jr.
Philippine Association for Technological Education

Prof. Teresita G. Maceda
Department of Filipino, UP

Prof. Priscelina Legasto
Department of English, UP

Dr. Panfilo D. Catacataca
Surian ng Wikang Pambansa

Ms. Aurora E. Batnag
Surian ng Wikang Pambansa

Prof. Eufracio C. Abaya
Department of Anthropology, UP

1. CALL TO ORDER

There being a quorum, the Chairman called the meeting to order at 2:21 P.M.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the previous meeting on June 17, 1986 were approved.

3. DISCUSSION OF THE NATIONAL LANGUAGE ISSUE

The Committee discussed thoroughly the national language issue, with the resource persons expressing their views and sharing the results of their research studies.

View/Comments/Positions

- a) Director Ponciano Pineda of the Institute of National Language proposed that Pilipino, with an “F”, should be written into the Constitution as the national language of the Republic. He said that since 1940 to 1986, Pilipino has dominated the scene as the national “lingua franca”, a language of government, a language of media, and a language of society. And whenever you go throughout the country now, Pilipino, with a “P”, is already the medium of communication of the people. Besides, he said, so much time, money, talent, etc. have already been spent for and invested in the development and propagation of Pilipino.

- b) Dr. Demetrio Quirino, Jr. of the Philippine Association for Technological Education apprised the Committee that he was one of the principal authors of the 1973 provision of the Constitution and said that the national language to be developed was to be Filipino, “F”, to distinguish it from the language at the time which was Pilipino, “P”. But the 1971 convention repudiated that national language supposed to be. That is why the provision was that: “The National Assembly shall take steps towards the development and formal adoption of the common national language to be known as Filipino,” “F”, to distinguish it from the alleged national language at that time to be

Pilipino, “P”. And as a concession, the convention put subsection 3 (3) as “xxx” until otherwise provided by law, English and Pilipino will be the official languages.”

c) Dr. Bonifacio Sibayan, President of the Linguistic Society of the Philippines, read before the Body their position on the language issue, to wit:

1. The official languages of the Philippines are Pilipino and English.
2. The national language of the Philippines is Pilipino. Steps shall be taken by the Institute of National Language to modernize Pilipino through enrichment of lexical items from other Philippine languages and to cultivate Pilipino as a language for the domains of higher education, government administration, legislation, and judicial processes.
3. The Constitution shall be promulgated in Pilipino and in English.

He explained that national language, as differentiated from an official language, is a language that must unify the people and must be a language of identity. He said that English is an official language, but it cannot be a language of identity except in very restricted areas.

As a language of identity, he said, that language must cut across the various Philippine native or ethnic languages. He explained further that there is also a language outside the home which is called the “lingua franca” or the common language. Before it was English, but now it is Pilipino, he said.

He explained further that Pilipino is quite different from Tagalog as Pilipino has borrowed from English and from many other languages.

- d) Dr. Ernesto Constantino of the Linguistics Department of U.P. submitted the following proposed constitutional provisions on the national language issue:
1. The Constitution shall be officially promulgated in Filipino and translated into the regional languages of the Philippines, English and Arabic. In case of conflict, the Filipino text shall prevail. It was explained that Filipino was meant to include the universal features of the different Philippine languages, while Pilipino is based on Tagalog which excludes other Philippine languages.
 2. Filipino shall be the official language, with the regional languages and, unless otherwise provided by law, English as auxiliary language.
 3. A National Language Commission shall be established consisting of language experts, language teachers, linguists, and writers, to develop and propagate the national language based on the national lingua franca and other Philippine languages.
 4. Filipino shall be the medium of instruction in all schools. The regional languages and, until necessary, English shall be auxiliary languages.
- e) Dr. Alfonso Santiago, President of the Language Education Council (LEDCO), submitted a resolution requesting the members of the Constitutional Commission that the projected Philippine Constitution be written and promulgated in the national language.

It was stated that “while we have to maintain the English language in the Philippines as an official second language, serving as tool especially in the field of education and diplomacy, nonetheless we Filipinos must also accept the reality that it is more effective for a people-oriented government to use as medium the indigenous national language for the attainment of national unity calls for involvement and participation of the common citizen.”

The resolution further said that “even if the projected Philippine Constitution is written and promulgated in the national language, it will be without prejudice to other official versions, such as in English, in Arabic, in the minor Philippine languages and in other world languages, as may be found necessary.”

- f) Commissioner Braid brought up the idea of having simultaneous translators who can produce simultaneous translations of the proceedings in the CON-COM both in Pilipino and English. She proposed that there should be simultaneous reporting of the sessions both in Pilipino and English.

In this connection, Director Pineda volunteered the services of the Surian ng Wikang Pambansa, with the cooperation of LEDCO, Linguistic Society, U.P. Linguistics [Department], KAPPIL and the Pambansang Samahan sa Wika.

The Committee created an ad hoc committee, headed by Commissioner Braid, with Commissioners Gascon and Quesada as members, to get clearance from the CON-COM President because the group has to occupy certain offices, etc.

- g) Dr. Sibayan apprised the Committee that they did some research for the Ministry of Education on the evaluation

of bilingual education in the Philippines. Commissioner Bennagen requested a copy of a brief report of their study which can be cited during the deliberations in defense of the adoption of a national language. Dr. Sibayan said they are writing it now and [that it] will be available sometime in July.

- h) Asked by the Chairman about the reaction of his group to the findings of Dr. Sibayan's research group, Dr. Constantino said there is no doubt that Filipinos can understand the national language much better than English. But the use of questionnaires and similar research instruments does not usually yield reliable results, he said.
- i) Dr. Quirino said he has no quarrel about having a national language, and there is still a sizeable number of Filipinos who cannot speak Tagalog or Pilipino. He asked that we do not override them because if we do that, instead of uniting our people we will be dividing them. He said we will lose nothing by going a little bit more slowly.
- j) Commissioner Gascon said he supports the proposal of the U.P. Linguistics Department that 'Filipino should be the official language with the regional languages and unless otherwise provided by law, English, as auxiliary language'. He said this should be incorporated into the new Constitution, a recognition that there are regional languages. However, he said, he does not oppose [the statement] that Pilipino is our national language but the context is, it is a developing national language.

4. CONSENSUS DURING THE HEARING

The Chairman enumerated the following consensus during the hearing:

- a) Pilipino is widely understood throughout the country and is de facto nucleus of the national lingua franca.
- b) According to research findings, Pilipino can be easily learned by non-Tagalogs.
- c) There is a need for one national language that will strengthen our national identity and national character.
- d) The national language should not be developed in a purist way. It should welcome the contribution of all the languages of the country.
- e) There is a need to develop also the different languages of our people and the regional lingua francas, as a recognition of the value of pluralism and in line with popular democracy.
- f) The Constitution should be written in English and the national language.
- g) The government should support fully the propagation of the use of the national language in the various intellectual and scientific domains in both schools and government.
- h) There should be simultaneous reporting of the sessions both in Pilipino and English. Voluntary service will be provided by the Surian with the cooperation of LEDCO, Linguistic Society, U.P. Linguistics [Department], KAPPIL and the Pambansang Samahan sa Wika.
- i) Support in other sectors of society should be given the national language to ensure that it is given its proper place in law, government and the professions.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no more matters to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 5:12 P.M.

I hereby certify to the correctness of the foregoing.

AGUSTIN C. FRIAS
Committee Secretary

2.2.2. Meeting on the First Draft of the Sections on Language*

Transcription of the Committee Meeting, dated June 25, 1986, p. 15.

MR. UKA: ...In order to unite our people therefore, the authors are proposing the following resolution to be the national language provision in the Constitution of 1986. And, again, may I read the draft resolution.

*In reproducing the actual printed transcripts here, we have tried to replicate the wordings of the deliberation, with the usual hesitations and mistakes and even wrong grammar in spontaneous speech. Where there has been a misspelling (the limitation of the transcribers and/or typists), we have corrected the spellings. Moreover, where words are missing, we have included the missing words or sometimes the interpretation for a questionable phraseology in brackets. Where the sentence is incoherent, we have tried to find the sense and render it comprehensible without changing the word order even if fragmentary and not well phrased.

“A RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE IN THE CONSTITUTION OF 1986 FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND FORMAL ADOPTION OF A COMMON NATIONAL LANGUAGE TO BE KNOWN AS FILIPINO, THE CREATION OF AN ELEVEN-MEMBER COMMISSION OF NATIONAL LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE AND PRESCRIBING THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE.

SECTION 1. The National Assembly shall take steps toward the development and formal adoption of a common national language to be known as Filipino, with Pilipino-Tagalog as the nucleus. Towards this end, the National Assembly shall create an eleven member commission on National Language with the following as members: a Tagalog, a Cebuano, an Ilocano, a Hiligaynon, a Bicolano, a Waray, a Pampango, a Pangasinense, a Maranaw, a Maguindanao and the eleventh to be drawn from one of the other existing dialectal groups in the country. The chairman of the Commission shall be a Tagalog and its Vice-President a Cebuano.

SECTION 2. Until such time that the common national language, to be known as Filipino, shall have been developed and formally adopted, English and Pilipino shall be the official languages.

After the adoption of the common national language, Filipino and English will be the official languages.

SECTION 3. The Constitution shall be written in English and in Pilipino and translated into each language or dialect spoken by over 3 hundred thousand people. After the adoption of the common national language, the Pilipino text shall be replaced by Filipino which shall then be the principal text.”

THE CHAIRMAN [W. Villacorta]: Thank you, Commissioner, I think that we could probably resolve this issue. I don't

think there is really any problem.

You are agreed, Commissioner, that the lingua franca of the Philippines now is Pilipino.

MR. UKA: Uhuh.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it accepted that the Pilipino now is the lingua franca of the Philippines now? Let's not call it national language, it is the lingua franca.

MR. UKA: Yeah.

THE CHAIRMAN: And it is the nucleus of an evolving national language.

MR. UKA: National Language.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would it make things better, from your perspective, if we – I'm not yet proposing this, I'm just throwing this, no, as a wild idea – not really wild because it has been suggested before. If we say that the national language of the Philippines is Filipino, with an "F", would that assuage the non-Tagalogs?

MR. UKA: I don't think so, because we are still – if its with the "F", then that would involve the different dialects and we have 87 major languages in the Philippines.

THE CHAIRMAN: How would you react to this if you reworded the proposed provision in Subcommittee, "The national language of the Philippines is Filipino, with Pilipino as nucleus. Steps shall be taken by the government to modernize the national language, etc..."

MR. UKA: That is the recommendation of the Committee, no?

THE CHAIRMAN: So, that reconciles the two points of view and I think, you know, in the name of national unity, probably we could agree on that. Is that all right for the whole committee? Would Commissioner Uka yield to that? Or the Chairman of the Subcommittee?

MR. RIGOS: Yes, I think so. First, I think we have to make it clear, we distinguish between an official language and the national language. The official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and English. All right, that accommodates the concerns of commissioner Uka.

MR. UKA: “F”.

MR. RIGOS: “The national language of the Philippines is Filipino,” and then, “with Pilipino as the nucleus”, because there has to be a nucleus. We cannot start from scratch, no? “With Pilipino as the nucleus. Steps shall be taken by the government to modernize the national language”. Or even – not “modernize”, to “develop” the national language.

THE CHAIRMAN: Although, you know, that might be taken to mean that it is not at all developed.

MR. UKA: We are still developing, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, so, “to further develop” maybe.

MR. RIGOS: “...To further develop the national language through enrichment of lexical items from the different Philippine languages”.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, “...and to cultivate Filipino”, with an “F”...

MR. RIGOS: “...and to cultivate it...” referring to the national language, “as a language for the

domain of higher education, government administration, legislation and judicial processes”.

MR. BROCKA: Excuse me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Brocka.

MR. BROCKA: That’s – “as a language for the domain of higher education”, why don’t we just – I think this is referring to the use of the language as the medium of instruction.

MR. RIGOS: Yeah.

MR. BROCKA: This is rather vague for me when you say “as a language for the domains of higher education”. You know, why don’t we just say directly what we really want to say? Because that is the whole point.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see, as a domain of communication.

MR. BROCKA: No, because this was – If I remember right, when we discussed this, there was the proposal to, by the experts, to use – the way to develop it is to use it as a medium of instruction. Now, up to what level, we are not very clear yet, because it would depend on the development of the language to be effectively used as a medium of instruction particularly on the higher levels of education. No, ang sinasabi ko lang kasi dito masyadong malabo, masyadong euphemistic itong ...as a language kasi ito.

MR. RIGOS: We can put a period after ...so it will read: “Steps shall be taken by the government to further develop the national language through enrichment of lexical items from other different languages” (period).

MR. UKA: Yes, that would be all right.

MR. GUINGONA: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Commissioner Guingona.

MR. GUINGONA: Sister Tan and I were wondering exactly what's the meaning of the word "lexical".

THE CHAIRMAN: Lexical, yeah, what is the meaning of that, Commissioner?

MR. RIGOS: It was explained by Brother Andrew. It simply means words that you find in the dictionaries of the other dialects. The other ethnic groups.

MR. GUINGONA: Because I was thinking if we could use a simpler word because they say that a Constitution is written for the people to understand. And I'm afraid a lot of people will not understand what is the meaning of "lexical". I cannot understand it well.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you cannot understand it, we should change it. What is the substitute?... "national language through enrichment from different Philippine languages".

MR. UKA: ..."Enrichment from other Philippine languages".

THE CHAIRMAN: Period. Wala na iyong higher education, government... magkakagalit pa iyon.

VOICE: We are changing Pilipino to "F", Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Commissioner. So, it will be similar to the 1973 Constitution.

MR. QUESADA: Because the feeling really from Mindanao is that Pilipino is so much associated with Tagalog and they feel that we are really dominated by the Tagalog-speaking, that is why they would like something that will not be associated with that kind of dominance.

THE CHAIRMAN: In Sorsogon that was the feeling of the people, they prefer “F”.

MR. RIGOS: So, number 2 will read: “The national language of the Philippines is Filipino”.

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, “With Pilipino as the nucleus”.

MR. RIGOS: Uh, yes. “Steps shall be taken by the government to further develop the national language through enrichment from the different Philippine languages (Period)”.

Now it’s in number 3 where...

MR. GUINGONA: Excuse me, Commissioner. So after Philippine languages, wala na?

MR. RIGOS: Period. Oho, oho. And then number 3, “The Constitution shall be promulgated in English and in Pilipino”.

VOICE: With “P”.

THE CHAIRMAN: With “F” na lang. And we understand it to be Pilipino. Dahil pag-aawayan na naman yan.

MR. UKA: That’s better.

THE CHAIRMAN: ... “shall be promulgated in Filipino and in English”. And that means na hindi purist. We say “Constitution” rather Saligang Batas. Or we can say “provision” rather than, I don’t know what is the Tagalog for “provision”. Mas naiintindihan.

PRES. MUNOZ-PALMA: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Madame President.

CONCOM PRES. PALMA: May I just be clarified. You said that there’s a sentence there with Pilipino as what?

THE CHAIRMAN: As the nucleus.

THE PRESIDENT: Can the people already understand that there is a distinction between “Filipino” and “Pilipino”?

- Hindi ba pare-pareho yan. Nag-iba lamang ang first letter. But how do they really know what we mean by Pilipino? P-i-l-i-p-i-n-o?
- MS. QUESADA: Yeah. Because Pilipino is not yet ready. I mean with “Tagalog” as the nucleus.
- MR. UKA: That’s better.
- THE PRESIDENT: There will really be a distinction.
- THE CHAIRMAN: Although, Ma’am, when we listened to the experts all of them were agreed that the lingua franca is not Tagalog but something a little bit different, an expanded Tagalog which is Pilipino which includes words from other vernacular languages.
- THE PRESIDENT: What I mean, other people will say, ano ba ito? Baka nagkakamali lamang ang spelling.
- THE CHAIRMAN: With Tagalog.
- THE PRESIDENT: Mabuti pa yan. I mean it’s more logical. It’s more understandable. After all what you mean with Filipino is really Tagalog already expanded or modified.
- THE CHAIRMAN: With Tagalog.
- MR. RIGOS: Will Commissioner Uka agree to that instead of Filipino – Tagalog – as the nucleus?
- MR. UKA: I think that is all right. That is more honest. More understandable.
- THE CHAIRMAN: Instead of Filipino – with Tagalog as the nucleus...
- MR. RIGOS: “Steps shall be taken by the government to further develop the national language through enrichment from the different Philippine languages”.
- MR. BENNAGEN: “The government shall take steps toward the further development...”

- THE CHAIRMAN: The point was that people might get confused when they read it. They might think it might be misspelling lang.
- MR. BENNAGEN: No, I think it's the function of explanation.
- MR. UKA: Suppose, Pons, we put after "Pilipino" "(enclose in quotation) Tagalog".
- THE CHAIRMAN: But the thing is, Pilipino is not Tagalog according to the experts, no? Pilipino daw includes the non-Tagalog words like "pera", "datung", "gurang", or even Taglish language.
- MS. TAN: Yeah, I agree with Pons, because I think it's a step backward. If we do not...we cannot distinguish between Tagalog and Filipino, it's just us because we are older. The children who go to school, they all say Pilipino,...they don't say Tagalog.
- THE CHAIRMAN: So, what is the pleasure of the body?
- THE PRESIDENT: Maybe, Mr. Chairman, we will just...to distinguish. I mean, because you see your sentence: "The national language of the Philippines is Filipino". Then, "with Pilipino as the nucleus", I mean ... to show we are...something that is existing now that is called Pilipino.
- MR. UKA: Can you read the whole thing?
- MR. CHAIRMAN: "The national language of the Philippines is Filipino, with the existing national lingua franca, Pilipino, as the nucleus. Steps shall be..."
- VOICE: No, with Tagalog na lang.
- MR. UKA: Suppose we do it this way, Mr. Chairman. "With Tagalized Filipino as the nucleus..." (laughter).

MR. BROCKA: I think that was agreed upon in the meeting with the language experts. That precisely what was brought up by Commissioner Bennagen and Sister Tan was that it is now accepted, the more or less purist Tagalog. Because Pilipino has been accepted now, the Pilipino with the “P” is accepted as a mixture, you know. It is a modernized version to put it that way ...whereas the Tagalong – as a matter of fact, an example pa nga was given about airplanes – salipawpaw, you know, which is not accepted.

MR. BENNAGEN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. BENNAGEN: Maybe for the second sentence, I don’t know how. It’s a matter of style. What I am saying is in the second sentence we should put in a statement defining Filipino. In the process of government undertaking to modernize Filipino which we include. I think this is already the definition, no, enrichment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Come again. Commissioner Bennagen.

MR. BENNAGEN: “The national language of the Philippines is Filipino.”

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. BENNAGEN: Okay. “Steps – this language shall be developed –” ah, no. The idea is to refer immediately to Filipino, no? And then for the government. What happened to lexical items?

THE CHAIRMAN: Wala na, wala na.

MR. BENNAGEN: “...through enrichment from the others.” Take away “different.” Let us say we are already

referring to all the other Philippine languages. Technically, when you speak of language, there are already distinctions, no? They are no longer mutually intelligible.

MR. RIGOS: From the other languages.

MR. BENNAGEN: Yes, yes.

MR. BENNAGEN: And then what happened and “to cultivate”? I am sorry, I was late. But we have visitors from...

THE CHAIRMAN: (inaudible several members are talking at the same time)

Commissioner Brocka.

MR. BROCKA: The only reason why I brought that out was because of that part there as a language for “the domains of higher education.” I felt that if you want to make it just as a medium of instruction, this is rather vague, you know, as “the language for the domains of higher education.” That if we want to make it the medium of instruction to further develop the language, that was what I was referring to.

THE CHAIRMAN: So, you would still want another sentence?

MR. BROCKA: Yes, because I don't think we should just stop with that particular sentence there of Com. Bennagen, no? “Steps should be taken to develop the language by either using it as a medium of instruction or...(interrupted).”

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you suggest the rewording of that last...(interrupted)?

MR. RIGOS: Ah, you want that restored, ha?

MR. BENNAGEN: Yes, because I think that was a crucial point that has been raised again and again by the Linguistics

groups, that unless the language is used in so-called higher domain in education, in government administration, legislation and judicial process, there is no way that it can be used as a prestige language, which is an important consideration in any development – in the development of any language. I mean it is not something that you offer to elementary, high school and college graduates and then have no use for it after they graduate. And that is also to harmonize its use in everyday language with its use in government, in legislation and in the judicial processes.

THE CHAIRMAN: So, what is your recommendation?

MR. BENNAGEN: To restore this.

MR. BROCKA: Commissioner Bennagen?

MR. BENNAGEN: Yes.

MR. BROCKA: The only thing that I was trying to correct was that “used as a language for the domains.” It’s rather vague. I mean, what exactly do you mean by that? Do you just allow it? I mean, I think we should be a little bit more direct and clear as far as that is concerned. Like for higher education, you use it as a medium of instruction and then for the higher domains of government administration...(interrupted)

MR. BENNAGEN: Yeah. That is just a technicality, anyway. The assumption is that there is a stratification of language. There’s a language for the home. There’s a language for the street. There’s a language for the school. There’s a language for

the government. But we can take that because it assumes that those who will use it elsewhere will be using it in a lower domain, no? It has a what? – a smug effect - when you use higher domain of language. I think, we can take that. That is just a language of the linguist, anyway.

MR. RIGOS:

So, how do we word it?

MR. BENNAGEN:

“and propagate it as a language... (interrupted)”

VOICE:

“And propagate it as a common language.”

MR. RIGOS:

“As the language of higher education.”

VOICE:

“As a medium of instruction.”

MR. BROCKA:

That is what I am referring to you. You identify it definitely, exactly what you want.

MR. BENNAGEN:

“As a medium of instruction.”

MS. BRAID:

(inaudible, speaker not using her microphone)

MR. BENNAGEN:

Okay, okay... “medium of instruction,” of research. Okay.

MR. RIGOS:

“As a means of communication.”

MR. BENNAGEN:

Let me just... “and to propagate it as medium of instruction and research and as a language of government administration, legislation and judicial processes.” Okay?

THE CHAIRMAN:

Commissioner Bennagen, the Committee Secretary would like to write this on the blackboard for everyone to see. So could you please repeat them?

MR. BENNAGEN:

You see, I just got in from a most intensive discussion of regional autonomy. That is why it takes me some time to correct my thoughts. Anyway, “The national language of the Philippines is Filipino. Steps shall be taken by

the government to further—” although to develop. Normally, what the linguists use is “modernize and intellectualize.” But among themselves, they debate that, no?

THE CHAIRMAN: “So, to further develop... (interrupted)”

MR. BENNAGEN: “...Filipino through enrichment from other Philippine languages.”

THE CHAIRMAN: How about from “different”, because “from other” parang Tagalog “and others.” And we would like to avoid that, eh.

MR. RIGOS: No, if we say, “The national language of the Philippines is Filipino,” we should not say anymore. We will say, “Steps should be taken by the government to further develop the national language.” Do not mention the other Philippine languages. Do not mention those.

MR. BENNAGEN: Okay. O siguro. Oo, because also English, Arabic, Chinese, (interrupted)

MR. RIGOS: Oo. Correct.

MR. BENNAGEN: That’s even simpler.

MR. RIGOS: Oo.

MR. BENNAGEN: Let us not delimit sources.

MR. RIGOS: “...to further develop the national language.”

MR. BENNAGEN: Yes.

MS. BRAID: May I make...to that?

THE CHAIRMAN: “The government shall further enrich the national language through use of, through integration.” You see “Steps shall be taken by the government,” if we can have something like “The government shall further enrich Filipino,” no, through the concept of melding, through – melding other

languages is through enrichment –. But you see, “the steps shall be taken,” no, if we can improve it. “The government’ shall further enrich Filipino.” Maybe we can use that.

MR. BENNAGEN: Yeah. “The government shall further develop” and then that’s the development left to the experts plus of course the users. Parang mas direct, mas straightforward.

“The government shall further develop the national language.. (interrupted)”

MR. RIGOS: “...and take steps to make it a medium of instruction and research...”

MR. BENNAGEN: No, no, “and propagate it as a medium of instruction and research and as a language of government administration, legislation and judicial processes.”

MS. BRAID: We have to repeat “language.”

THE CHAIRMAN: Papaano na iyong “Pilipino” as the nucleus? Are we abandoning that?

MR. RIGOS: We will abandon that?

VOICE: That’s already understood, eh.

MR. RIGOS: “Propagate,” Pons, connotes it’s already there, but it’s not yet there.

VOICE: You already have the nucleus.

MR. RIGOS: No, “as a medium of instruction and research.”

MS. BRAID: Commissioner Rigos is right, “as a medium of instruction.” It is not there yet, so we’ll have to adopt it first, before you can propagate.

MR. BROCKA: No, it’s already there. That was very clear during the discussion here. That is what the need was, a further development and further propagation by

being used as a medium of instruction. That was very clear.

MR. BENNAGEN: Yeah, in the position paper of Drs. Constantino, Paz, Sibayan....

MR. BROCKA: As a matter of fact, I remember why they said, that it's not the language that is at fault, it's the people who are using it.

MR. GUINGONA: Mr. Chairman, did not the word "develop" connote propagation. I think, in order to make the Constitution possible... the provision as brief as possible. Maybe if we make ourselves clear, the word "develop" already refers to propagation and we can go back to the former suggestion of Commissioner Uka that we stop after "development."

MS. QUESADA: Mr. Chairman. I think there's a little difference in the term "develop" and "propagation." We're talking of development here as the enrichment of the language itself, propagation is the action that the State will take so that it's used as medium of instruction, in the domains of government.

MR. GUINGONA: But that's the meaning that you...

MR. BENNAGEN: What we can do is, use "it" na lang, I mean as simple as that. That was the position in the LEDCO consultation which I attended. "And use it as a medium of instruction and research."

THE CHAIRMAN: The government will use it?

MR. BENNAGEN: Mamaya na lang, tingnan na lang natin yung ano, kasi may mga certain inconsistency ito, eh. We will just finish it. I think there's something wrong somewhere, I think we can check that immediately, no?

- VOICE: Continue
- MR. BENNAGEN: "... instruction and research, as a language of government administration," not just government stationery, "legislation and judicial processes."
- MS. QUESADA: Siguro we could use, Mr. Chairman, instead of just putting there "...its use as a medium," but bring back the word "propagate its use as medium," because then you will not be bogged down with the statement that the government, because it's the government which will propagate its use as a medium.
- MS. BRAID: Another is the term "institutionalize," "institutionalize it as a medium..." something like that too, if we don't want "...propagate its use..." The process of making it institutionalized as a medium of instruction. You want a bigger word, no?
- MR. RIGOS: Institutionalized? We are institutionalizing it by putting it in the Constitution.
- MS. BRAID: Yeah, but the government, after developing the national language, will further institutionalize it.
- MS. QUESADA: Well, then, there will have to be an explanation of what you mean by "institutionalize" because we said we will be as simple as we can be so that it's readily understood, when we say "use" I think "propagation" is also very clear, but "institutionalization" is some newly coined ano from "institute."
- MR. GUINGONA: But, Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the development of the national language. When do we propagate it, in the course of development or after its development?

- MS. QUESADA: In the process.
- MR. BENNAGEN: In the process, language growth, it's not something that you develop and then use. It develops as you use it.
- MR. GUINGONA: Yes, but the point is, I was saying that it should be the combination; maybe we can put a period and then speak of propagation as not in combination with development.
- MR. BROCKA: I think the two go together, you develop it by using it.
- MR. GUINGONA: No, because the "development" that Commissioner Quesada is thinking of, which was not my thinking, was "enrichment." You see, my own concept of development would include both enrichment and propagation. It's a matter of how you interpret a word, eh. Commissioner Quesada interprets it, construes the word to mean enrichment alone. My interpretation of the word "development" includes both "enrichment" and "propagation." Anyway, that's a matter of how we interpret it. If the Committee feels that "development" will refer only to "enrichment," then the following sentence would perhaps be called for. Otherwise, if you believe that "development" could include both "enrichment" and "propagation," then why include the last part?
- THE CHAIRMAN: Well, why don't we try it out and see what happens, because if we will say "develop," if we ourselves have different interpretations, then the users of the Constitution might also be confused about meaning.

- MR. GUINGONA: Well, since Commissioner Uka has said that he has a proposal, maybe he can let us know whether it conforms with this proposal.
- MR. RIGOS: I thought what we are doing now is come up with something that at the same time accommodates.
- MR. GUINGONA: That's what we want to find out, whether it has accommodated the Commissioner.
- MR. UKA: Yeah, "...further develop and enrich it."
- THE CHAIRMAN: He wants "and enrich" added.
- MR. RIGOS: To my mind, "enrich" is embraced by the idea of development.
- MR. CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Tan has a suggested wording. "The government shall take steps toward the further development of the national language and its adoption as a medium of communication in government administration, legislation and judicial processes, and as a medium of instruction at all levels of the educational system."
- MS. BRAID: Mr. Chairman.
- THE CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Braid.
- MS. BRAID: I suggested "adopt" earlier, but some of the committee members thought it had already been adopted. I earlier suggested the word "adopt" like Sister Tan, but the others felt that it's already adopted, it's a matter of propagating.
- THE CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Tan also suggested "adopted," and I suggested it, too, but they said it's already adopted. It's a matter of propagation.
- MR. BENNAGEN: Anyway, we will wait until she has finished it on the board.
- MR. GUINGONA: May I comment, Mr. Chairman?

- MR. GUINGONA: I was thinking that at least for us lawyers and those who have been exposed to public administration, the words “government administration” really include all the departments, and include the executive, the legislative and the judicial. And perhaps, you may not need to include legislative and the judicial. Because government administration really includes – all, [it’s] already inclusive. And the other one is that I think I would agree with Commissioner Tan that maybe we should still include the word “enrichment.” Because the enrichment would somehow reflect the feelings that she has expressed about the people from Cebu and what Commissioner Quesada wants. Because development may mean development from a single language while enrichment means you get from others, other sources.
- MR. RIGOS: So there will be “towards the further development and enrichment of the national language.” And its adoption as “a medium of communication in government administration.”
- MR. GUINGONA: In government na lang. Kasama na lahat yon.
- MR. RIGOS: And as a medium of instruction at all levels of the educational system.
- THE CHAIRMAN: So, is this wording acceptable to the entire committee?
- MR. RIGOS: Wait for the entire commission. (laughter)
- MS. BRAID: It’s a little, it’s a little ...(interrupted)
- THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Commissioner Braid.
- MS. BRAID: I think we can improve it a little bit further. I don’t know if we can...(interrupted)

MR. GUINGONA: *Style na lang po*. Why not give it to the Committee on Style?

MS. BRAID: Also,....(interrupted)

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Commissioner Braid.

MS. BRAID: There's a redundancy of medium of, no, I think, "The government shall take steps towards the further development and enrichment of the national language and its use as a medium of communication in government as well as – in government and in research – instruction and research at all levels of the educational system..." (interrupted).

MR. BENNAGEN: Ah, yes, that's right.

MR. BROCKA: No, there's a difference between using it as a medium of communication and using it as a medium of instruction on the educational level.

MR. RIGOS: It's very technical, no?

MR. BRAID: But we cannot – I think, it's true – but maybe – because we are saying instruction and research... (interrupted).

MS. TAN: Can I read it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Tan.

MS. TAN: "The government shall take steps towards the further development and enrichment of the national language and its use as a medium of communication in government instruction, research at all levels of the educational system."

MR. BROCKA: But, Sister Tan, precisely what I am trying to say is when you say medium of communication in government, it can be like when you write letters, no? or when you talk to each other. But the

differences there would be – it should be more specific insofar as education is concerned, used as a medium of instruction because schools can be used – they can use it in schools as a communication between departments, between supervisors and principals. We were talking about language now being used as a medium of instruction.

THE CHAIRMAN: Rather than just as a medium of communication in instruction.

MR. BROCKA: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Isn't medium of instruction the same as medium of communication in instruction?

MR. BROCKA: Yes, I know. But the thing about it is that...(interrupted).

THE CHAIRMAN: You want to emphasize it.

MR. BROCKA: Yes. When you speak of the educational system, you are talking about the language as a medium of instruction, not just a means of communication. I think we have to be clear...(interrupted).

MR. GUINGONA: If you want to save on words, you just say a medium of communication in government and of instruction and research. "Medium of" would be referring to both, both to communication... (interrupted).

THE CHAIRMAN: And of instruction. All right.

MS. BRAID: That's what I was saying.

THE CHAIRMAN: As a medium of communication in government and of instruction. Okay?

MR. TREÑAS: Mister Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Treñas.

MR. TREÑAS: But in the phrase “medium of communication in government,” I believe the word “government” is superfluous because you start with the word “government” already.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see. And its use as a medium of communication not just in government but even in private businesses and others.

MR. BENNAGEN: Mister Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Bennagen.

MR. BENNAGEN: I think there is a point in emphasizing that it be used by the government because the problem in the language development is that while it is actually being used, there is inadequate support by the government. For instance, in terms of allocation for translation of – for production of textbooks in Filipino, let alone translations of existing textbooks that can be used for Filipinos.

MS. QUESADA: Mister Chairman.

MS. QUESADA: Suppose we change the term “government” to “state.” Because in the suggestion of Commissioner Uka, he was saying that the involved councils that should be now convened as a result of the policy would not only be those in government, but also those in private sectors. “The state shall take steps...” so that you can still retain government.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just a reaction to that. Just this morning, I was studying the use of the words “state” and “government” in the different Constitutions. It

seems that the pattern is that when you are talking about protecting, cherishing, guaranteeing, you use “state.” But if you have more concrete verbs like steps, promulgating, etc. “the government.” Because I think it’s the government as an institution of the state that can take steps to actively – I don’t know. We have constitutionalists around. May we request the opinion of President Palma on this? So I think it’s appropriate to use the word “government” at this time.

MR. GUINGONA: Mister Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Guingona.

MR. GUINGONA: I also agree, as President Palma says, that the state would not be expected to take action in the way that we are contemplating. But regarding the remarks of Pons, of Commissioner Bennagen, I was thinking that there is no need to refer to government the second time because we are precisely mandating the government to take the steps. So the mandate there is [is] for government to take steps which would necessarily include government.

MR. GUINGONA: How is that – that is always the complaint. One reason why I am insistent on that, that is always the complaint of the Surian ng Wikang Pambansa, that is always the complaint of the teachers at the tertiary level who are convinced that there should be a medium of instruction other than English, which is to say, we should really have Filipino as a medium of instruction.

MR. GUINGONA: Mr. Chairman, I think it's not the fault of the provision in the Constitution, either in the 1973 or here.

You see, there was a research by an American Constitutional expert at one of the symposia sponsored by Thomas Jefferson. I think, where he says that the best Constitution in the world actually is the Russian Constitution, but the trouble is, it is not being implemented, it is a paper Constitution.

In other words, a provision may be good, but no matter how good our provisions are, if they are not implemented, then nothing is going to happen. And the fact that a provision is not implemented does not mean that the provision is no good. So I believe that the fault lies in the implementors and not in the provision of the Constitution itself.

THE CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Guingona and Bennagen, would it solve the issue if we will just say "as an official medium of communication"? Would that solve the question?

MR. BENNAGEN: No.

MR. GUINGONA: To me, I would accept that.

MR. BROCKA: But in this particular case, I think we have to take into consideration the thoughts and the opinions already expressed by the language experts, that, would it be superfluous to say that, "medium of communication in government"? Would it be superfluous to say that?

THE CHAIRMAN: That was the point of Commissioner Guingona.

MR. GUINGONA: Because of the suggestion of the Commission that we add the word “official,” then it would already, I believe, suffice to imply what Commissioner Bennagen wants to express in the provision.

What I am trying to say is that, in the first place it doesn't look nice, we have to be insisting the government will take steps for the government [to do something]. Maybe it will be better to speak of it as official action.

MR. BENNAGEN: No, I think it is not clear. What I am saying is that the government should remind itself once more of its responsibility to use Pilipino by itself, within its own system of government and not just in stationeries, as I said earlier, because like we said that it is an official language but it is limited to stationeries and to the names of government buildings. What I am saying is that, it ought to be an actual and living language of government.

MR. GUINGONA: But then, the trouble is, Mr. Chairman, we are actually limiting the effect of the provision because of the government, what about the private sector? Because, as far as the private sector is concerned, we are limiting it only to the education system. What about other activities of the private sector? There is no mention whatsoever. So, when you talk about your steps to be taken by the government, we are contemplating not only the involvement of government, but even the private sector.

MR. BENNAGEN: Then we can so state.

MR. GUINGONA: That's why, because if we just limit it to government, then government may not feel obligated to take steps to development or to use the national language as a medium of communication to encourage the use of your language outside of government.

MR. BENNAGEN: That can be so stated, but my view is that once it's adopted and used by the government and it's used as a medium of instruction and research, eventually, I think, the public sector will have to gear its language development through the changes within its own system, since we will be producing graduates who are already knowledgeable in Pilipino.

MS. QUESADA: And I think, Mr. Chairman, the word – we shorten the statement by cutting down [focusing] on specific areas of government – administration, legislation, judicial processes, because it was felt that it has to be given that much importance by the government itself through these particular areas of official transactions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could that be expressed in the addition of the phrase “in all agencies of government”?

MS. QUESADA: Well, I think, as long as the word “government” is retained, because it would refer to all these areas of transactions, because unless the books, the legislations, the processes are contained, then it will not be given that much importance.

THE CHAIRMAN: To end the discussion, would Commissioner Guingona yield to the...

MR. GUINGONA: I will yield to the consensus of the Committee...

THE CHAIRMAN: That we retain the words “in government” even if not stylistically perfect?

MR. GUINGONA: No, I was not really presenting an objection. I was just making an observation.

MS. QUESADA: Maybe we could put capital “G” for the first “government.”

THE CHAIRMAN: We, in the Style Committee, will take care of that. The capitalizations and ...Commissioner Rigos.

MR. RIGOS: Another item. Maybe minor, but in the present construction, the subject is “government.” I think we don’t really wish to emphasize that. I think what we want to emphasize is “steps – steps shall be taken by the government towards...etc.” The steps that the government must take towards the thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Commissioner Brocka, would you want to say something?

MR. BROCKA: I just wanted to go back to what Commissioner Guingona said about including the private. That was one of the points. So that, it’s not just government communication, medium of communication in government, but also [the] private [sector]. So how will you put that in?

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, I think Commissioner Bennagen has already explained. That will follow. Commissioner Braid?

MS. BRAID: Stylistically, no, I think a philosophy that it’s really pervasive in the government, in our Constitution, that the government shall have a facilitator, shall not do everything, and if we have always there the government and government, it may not – we

are going back to strong government that shall do everything. So, I was wondering if we could capture that as a medium of communication in public and private concerns, or something like that.

THE CHAIRMAN: In public and private consensus.

MS. BRAID: Yes, something like that.

VOICE: It's so vague.

MS. BRAID: It's really just stylistical. I hope the Style Committee will put emphasis on the strong role of government and this can be communicated through style, no?

THE CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Brocka.

MR. BROCKA: In this particular case, I think we have to take an exception, for the simple reason that this is a matter of legislation, this is where government has failed in precisely pushing for the use of the national language in the government as Commissioner Bennagen has brought up, trying to justify that when you say medium of communication in government, it ends up "agham ng sining," you know. It only comes out in the names of buildings, it only comes out in stationeries, but it is not being used as a living language of, I mean, living means of communication. So, I think that particular part there is straight to the point, and I don't think we should worry about government taking a very strong focus.

THE CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Bennagen.

MR. BENNAGEN: *Siguro, yung isang observation lang, hindi kasi*

kumikita 'yung gawain tungkol sa wika, eh, kaya hindi kinukuha 'yan ng private sector, kaya kahit papaano, may responsibilidad ang pamahalaan na tayo'y pamunuan. Siguro, pag maunlad na ang wika, gumagawa na tayo ng mga aklat sa Pilipino, doon na papasok yung private sector. Pero sa umpisa, kailangan talaga ang initiatory role ng gobierno.

MR. BROCKA: To beef up what Commissioner Bennagen stated, like in entertainment, it felt, we definitely use – that's a private sector, we definitely use the Filipino language, that is, Pilipino.

THE CHAIRMAN: In line with what you said, Commissioner Braid, that the government should not interfere in private matters, this is along our philosophy of deregulation, decentralization, the more reason probably that we should not include the private sector. So, would you yield to the suggestions of the two Commissioners?

MS. BRAID: Yes, although I am not comfortable yet with “as a medium of communication in government...,” “medium of communication in government”?

MS. QUESADA: Yes.

MR. RIGOS: As Commissioner Guingona mentioned a while ago, from a lawyer's point of view, it is redundant to say legislative, judicial and all those processes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Unless you would like to emphasize...all branches of government.

MS. BRAID: Yes, I would be more comfortable.

THE CHAIRMAN: That makes it even stronger. So finally we have come up with a section in less that two hours, rather.

MR. BENNAGEN: Do I take it that we still include “national language of...” and is there a provision for...

MR. RIGOS: Yes, I would like to insert that. We agreed that the official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and English. I would like to insert the word “until otherwise provided by law.” Because sometime in the future we would like Filipino to be the only official language of the Filipinos.

THE CHAIRMAN: “Unless otherwise provided by law.”

MR. RIGOS: “Until otherwise provided by law.” I am referring to the official languages, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I express strong misgivings on that, Commissioner Rigos.

Nowhere in any Constitution in the world do you find an expression or in the identification of the official languages that is followed by the phrase “until otherwise provided by law.” *Para bang hindi siguro yung lipunan kung ano ang lenguaehe nila.*

MR. RIGOS: But that is exactly what we had in the 1971 Constitution, in the draft proposal of the UP..

THE CHAIRMAN: I know, in our Constitution we always have that which reflects our uncertainty on what our language is. And I don’t think it looks good. We don’t feel good about it.

MR. RIGOS: In our case, it looks good. We are forced to say English and Filipino because the national language is not yet developed. But once that is developed we are authorizing Congress to pass a law that our official language will only be Pilipino or Filipino and not Filipino and English anymore. In our case it’s better.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could we express that more clearly, I...

MR. RIGOS: Then we will say “until otherwise provided by law, the official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and English.” I’m talking now of the official languages, not the national language.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know, I know that. Official languages. So you would want that “until otherwise provided by law.” Would that be the thinking of the entire committee?

VOICE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other suggestion for these three sections? Or probably the Chairman of the Subcommittee on National Language could recapitulate and read...

MR. RIGOS: This is the entire committee’s work.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, but you are taking the lead now.

MR. RIGOS: *Ikaw na. Ikaw ang Chairman of Committee.*

THE CHAIRMAN: *O, sige, kung gusto mo*, if you so desire. The first proposed section says: “The official languages of the Philippines...(interrupted)”

MR. RIGOS: *Hindi pa ngayon.* “Until otherwise provided by law” should come afterwards.

VOICE: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: “The official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and English. Steps shall be taken by the government towards the further development and enrichment of the national language and its use as a medium of communication in all branches of government and of instruction and research at all levels of the educational system.”

MR. BROCKA: Could we.. this is an amendment, instead of

starting with the official languages, why don't we start with the national language first, and then steps shall be taken, and then after that the last portion would be the official languages?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, okay.

MS. BRAID: Yeah, in providing also for the press that it starts with this, and then you put that, and then this is number 3, no? So that it will be clear also.

MR. BROCKA: No, I was thinking, Commissioner Braid, "the national language of the Philippines is Filipino." And then, "steps shall be taken by the government" in reference to the national language. So that the number 3 should be the national language...(interrupted)

MS. BRAID: So that this is number one...(interrupted).

MR. BROCKA: Yeah.

MS. BRAID: (continuing) number 2 and number 3.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't go by numbers because we are getting confused. Just repeat it according to the sequence of our recommending, Commissioner Rigos. The first sentence, all right.

MR. RIGOS: "The national language of the Philippines is Filipino."

THE CHAIRMAN: That's the first, okay. The second.

MR. RIGOS: "Steps shall be taken by the government to further develop and enrich..etc."

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Number 3.

MR. RIGOS: "The official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and English until otherwise provided by law."

THE CHAIRMAN: Number 4.

- MR. RIGOS: “The Constitution shall be promulgated in Filipino and English until otherwise provided by law.”
- MS. QUESADA: I think that’s simpler and more direct.
- THE CHAIRMAN: *Mas maayos*, concise. *Pakiulit* for Committee Secretary.
- MS. QUESADA: Mr. Chairman, could we, instead of “it,” use “Filipino”?
- THE CHAIRMAN: Oo, para more categorical.
- MR. RIGOS: *Hindi*. If you put that immediately after number 1 and 2, “it” refers to the national language.
- MS. QUESADA: So, second paragraph, *tanggalin na ‘yun*, immediately after.
- THE CHAIRMAN: All right. No more additions, objections? Have we come out with our committee report on the – our proposal for the national language? You have just made history. Thank you.

2.2.3. Committee Report No. 29

Republic of the Philippines
THE CONSTITUTIONAL COMMISSION OF 1986
Quezon City, Metro Manila

COMMITTEE REPORT NO. 29

Submitted by the Committee on Human Resources on July 15, 1986.

Re: EDUCATION

Proposed Resolution No. 77, 102, 104, 451 (Davide), 114, 276, 303, 471 (Quesada), 106, 130, 416, 441 (Guingona), 134, 162, 163, 206, 166, 387 (Braid), 168, 518, 519 (Sarmiento), 220, 335 (Villacorta), 252 (Tingson), 278 (Nolleda), 289 (Bacani), 311 (Gascon), 417, 418 (Tan), 327 (Suarez)

ARTS AND CULTURE

Proposed Resolution No. 71 (Brocka), 299 (Tingson)

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Proposed Resolution No. 177 (Braid), 222 (Quesada)

NATIONAL LANGUAGE

Proposed Resolution No. 286 (Uka)

CULTURAL COMMUNITIES

Proposed Resolution No. 298, 300, 301 (Tingson), 346, 465
(Bennagen)

Sponsors: Hon. Villacorta, Uka, Guingona, Quesada, Rigos, Brocka,
Bennagen, Tan, Braid, Gascon and Trefias

The Honorable
Cecilia Muñoz-Palma
President
Constitutional Commission of 1986

Madame President:

The committee on Human Resources to which were referred

Proposed Resolution No. 286, introduced by Hons. Uka, Alonto and Abubakar, entitled:

“RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION OF 1986 FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND FORMAL ADOPTION OF A COMMON NATIONAL LANGUAGE TO BE KNOWN AS FILIPINO; THE CREATION OF AN 11-MEMBER COMMISSION ON NATIONAL LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE; AND PRESCRIBING THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE.”

Proposed Resolution 289, introduced by Hon. Bacani, entitled:

“RESOLUTION PROVIDING IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION THE TEACHING OF RELIGION IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS.”

Proposed Resolution No 451, introduced by Hons. Davide, Jr., Maambong, Jamir, Uka, Abubakar and Rama, entitled:

“RESOLUTION TO INCORPORATE IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION PROVISIONS RELATIVE TO THE PROBLEM OF ENGLISH, SPANISH AND FILIPINO, OUR MOTHER TONGUES, NATIVE LANGUAGES AND DIALECTS, AND OTHER RELATED SUBJECTS.”

has considered the foregoing Proposed Resolutions and has the honor to report them back to the Constitutional Commission of 1986 with the recommendation that all of the listed Proposed Resolutions be approved as revised, amended or adopted by the Committee and as hereinafter described.

Each Proposed Resolution accepted by the committee was not considered and amended on a line by line basis. Rather the Committee adopted the basic concept or substance of the Proposed Resolution and embodied it in the attached draft of the Article on Education, Science, Technology and Arts and Culture – adopting Resolution No. 106 of Commissioner Serafin Guingona.

The Committee hereby gratefully acknowledges the valuable contributions of the various resource persons who either appeared in person or submitted position papers.

(Sgd.) WILFRIDO V. VILLACORTA

Chairman

Committee on Human Resources

Republic of the Philippines
THE CONSTITUTIONAL COMMISSION OF 1986
Quezon City, Metro Manila

RESOLUTION

TO INCORPORATE IN THE CONSTITUTION AND ARTICLE
ON EDUCATION, SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, SPORTS, ARTS
AND CULTURE

Be it resolved by the Constitutional Commission in session assembled. To incorporate in the Constitution the following provisions:

ARTICLE -----

EDUCATION, SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY,
SPORTS, ARTS AND CULTURE

Section 22. The national language of the Philippines is Filipino. Steps shall be taken by the government to further develop, enrich and use it as a medium of communication in all branches of government and as the language of instruction and research at all levels of the educational system.

Section 23. The official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and English, until otherwise provided by law.

The Constitution shall be promulgated in Filipino and English.

2.3.1 Records of Plenary Sessions of the Constitutional Commission - September 1, 1986

MR. SARMIENTO: Madam President, before we adjourn and proceed to a caucus, may I move that we tackle Language after Education. We have only three interpellators for this Section on Language.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there a need for a sponsorship speech to explain the rationale of Section 1, so that for the next session we can be prepared for the interpellation?

MR. VILLACORTA: There is no need for sponsorship.

MR. BENNAGEN: Madam President, there is no need for a sponsorship speech?

THE PRESIDENT: This is on Language. What does the committee say?

MR. SARMIENTO: May I ask that Commissioner Tingson be recognized.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Tingson is recognized.

MR. TINGSON: Madam President, I will try to be as brief as I can. First, I should like to ask a question regarding line 9 under Language, which reads: "The national language shall be further developed on the basis of Philippine and other languages." To what particular language or dialect does the word "Philippine" refer to?

MR. VILLACORTA: The chairman of the Subcommittee on National Language is Commissioner Rigos and he will answer that question.

REV. RIGOS: We have in mind the different dialects and languages of the Filipinos when we say "Philippine Language."

- MR. TINGSON: I see. The subcommittee did not have any particular language in mind.
- REV. RIGOS: Nothing in particular.
- MR. TINGSON: I am very glad to hear that because those of us who are not Tagalogs believe that we have just as many beautiful “malaming” words which need to be incorporated into our lingua franca – for example, the word “Inday” which means sweetheart, my love, my sunshine, my honey, my darling, all rolled into one. That should be incorporated in our national language.
- REV. RIGOS: The Gentleman is right. In fact, the word “Inday” is very popular in Metro Manila.
- MR. TINGSON: That is what I noticed, and the Ilonggo dialect is not too far behind Tagalog. For instance, the word “bana” refers to husband, and the word “asawa” refers to wife. So, these points truly justify the recommendation of the committee that our lingua franca should be developed on the basis of Philippine and other languages and I think this would be more acceptable. For example, in the Indonesian Republic, they were able to develop Bahasa Indonesia within one generation, literally. But I am bothered about the Philippines which is not well-known to many people around the world. One time, I sent a letter to my wife in the Philippines from Larnaka, Cyprus, and the post master of Larnaka, believe it or not, did not want to believe that there was a country known as the Philippines. When I was in Ohio, an American lady approached me and asked, “Excuse me, but

which part of the Philippines is Cuba?” That may sound almost ridiculous but our country is not too well-known and yet, I have an air-letter form in my possession, but it does not have the word “Philippines” at all, instead it contains the word “Pilipinas.” So, if the average American or European does not even know where the Philippines is, how will the world know that “Pilipinas” is Philippines? It is spelled with a “P,” but sometimes we write it with an “F,” this is why our tourists and our visitors are confused.

Could anybody in the committee please tell me if our Bureau of Posts was authorized to change the official name Philippines to “Pilipinas”?

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, “Pilipinas” is also an official name. If we may remind the body, the stamps of the Spanish-speaking countries have the name of their countries in Spanish. For example, the stamps of Spain say “España,” not Spain.

REV. RIGOS: And the fact that Commissioner Tingson received that letter indicates that the postmaster knew where to send it.

MR. TINGSON: No, this was an air letter, which we were supposed to send outside of the Philippines. I am bothered because I am not aware of any official act by the Congress mandating that our country could be called officially by any other name except “Philippines,” so I think the committee should look into that.

MR. GASCON: The Pilipino translation of Philippines is “Pilipinas.”

MR. BENNAGEN: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Bennagen is recognized.

MR. BENNAGEN: Let me express my appreciation for the remarks of Commissioner Tingson, because these are arguments for deciding that a national language is a national symbol. But in the proposal, we mean Filipino, not merely as a national symbol, not merely as an instrument for national identity and national unification, but also as an instrument for national growth and development. In due time, we will try to explain the connection of Filipino as a language with the efforts in the development in science and technology and even in trade and commerce. We feel that it is time we decide as a nation, the way Indonesia and Malaysia decided in their own due time, that they should have a Bahasa Indonesia and Bahasa Malaysia.

MR. GASCON: On the query of Commissioner Tingson whether there was any official act of changing the name Philippines to "Pilipinas" Commissioner Azcuna told me that the 1973 Constitution had a Filipino translation of Republic of the Philippines which was promulgated, and that is "Republika ng Pilipinas." So it has been officially promulgated; therefore it does not need any congressional act.

MR. TINGSON: What bothers me, Madam President, is the number of Americans and Europeans who do not know our language. We are calling our country a name which is known to us here in the Philippines.

- MR. GASCON: I think it is our prerogative as a sovereign nation. Besides, after the people's power revolution I do not think there is one single country in the world that does not know where the Philippines is.
- MR. TINGSON: I agree with the Commissioner and we are all proud about that. In the 1971 Constitutional Convention where I was a member, we suggested, among other things, that we could rename the Philippines. However, after deciding it, there were no further changes. Does the committee also consider this article?
- MR. GASCON: Madam President, that question will be considered in the General Provisions. This article is only on language. The changing of the name of the country is under the Article on General Provisions chaired by Commissioner Rosario Braid.
- REV. RIGOS: Would Commissioner Tingson entertain one very short story about the Philippines, when the Philippine issue was being discussed by the United States Congress at the turn of the century? Here it goes: During lunch break, two congressmen happened to be seated beside a chaplain and they asked him where the Philippines was. They did not know where the Philippines was. And the chaplain, who probably was not a Baptist like Commissioner Tingson, said: "Well, I do not know exactly where the Philippines is, but I remember Paul had a letter to the people of the Philippines."

MR. TINGSON: Madam President, my wife and I were in Philadelphia, and a beautiful young American excitedly told me and my wife that she had come from her honeymoon and that she spent it in beautiful, tropical Philippines. I was a little bit suspicious, I did not want to believe her, although I was honored with the thought. So I insisted to ask: "Where did you spend your honeymoon with your husband?" "Oh," she said, "out there at Waikiki beach."

But anyway, Madam President, I am glad that our country is better known now.

One more question, Madam President, and I shall be through. On page 15, lines 18 and 19 state: The Constitution shall be promulgated in Filipino and English and it shall be translated into the regional languages.

Madam President, I do not speak Spanish although we studied it, but I like the language. However, Spanish is being side-tracked by us, almost insulted to the extent that we have abolished it altogether. Cannot the committee, at least, entertain an amendment to include the translation of our work in Spanish, because copies of this will inevitably find their way to the libraries in Spain and Latin American countries? They would want to read it in Spanish. And besides, Madam President, many of our histories are written in Spanish – *El Filibusterismo* and *Noli Me Tangere* are written Spanish.

With the help of the President and my colleague here who speaks good Spanish, I tried to write something and we improved it.

Señora Presidenta, según nuestro compañero, Honorable Francisco Rodrigo, tenemos que hablar, tenemos que leer y tenemos que escribir más en Español en nuestro país para tener mas práctica. Se dice Señora Presidenta: "La práctica es la madre de la ciencia." Todavía, Señora Presidenta, hay algunas personas entre nosotros aquí en Filipinas que no saben Inglés mas que Español. Entonces, compañeros, hay necesidad de publicar tambien nuestra constitución en este lenguaje que ocupa segundo lugar en el mundo.

Muchas gracias, Señora Presidenta.

THE PRESIDENT: *Que dice el Señor Azcuna?*

MR. AZCUNA: Would the Commissioner please translate that?

MR. TINGSON: *Puedo también pero corto nada mas. Pero, Señora Presidenta, es claro que tenemos que publicar este trabajo en Español también.*

MR. GASCON: *Maraming salamat po sa inyong mungkahi.*

MR. TINGSON: But levity aside, Madam President, I would like to present an amendment on line 19 to read: "The Constitution shall be promulgated in Filipino, English and SPANISH and shall be translated into the regional languages." Let us be thankful to Spain for teaching us Spanish. Let us be grateful to America for teaching us English. We may speak Bamboo English but it is still English. Let us thank all these countries that have been good to us. I would like the body to know that I do not like

the idea of our not remembering sometimes those who have showered blessings upon us.

MR. VILLACORTA: Will the Honorable Tingson yield to some questions? Does he know the reason why in spite of almost 400 years of colonization under Spain, we still do not speak Spanish?

MR. TINGSON: *Porque tenemos que hablar más siempre en Español para tener práctica.* That is the trouble. We studied Spanish but we do not speak it.

MR. VILLACORTA: No, Madam President, my question is: In Latin American countries, those that were under Spain speak Spanish. How come we do not speak Spanish now? Is it because we are so dumb that we cannot learn Spanish?

MR. TINGSON: Is it because we are lazy to learn two languages, English and Spanish?

MR. VILLACORTA: No, the reason, Madam President, and this is historically proven, is that the Spaniards did not want us to learn Spanish during their time. And here we are, the Spaniards are gone and we want to learn Spanish and we want to enshrine it in our Constitution; whereas, when they were here, they themselves did not want us to learn Spanish. The reason, Madam President, and again it is in the records and even in the novels of Dr. Jose Rizal, is that the Spaniards felt we were too inferior like the Indians of Latin America to learn the language, *la lengua de los ángeles*. Does the Commissioner know what Spaniards call our language? It is *lengua de los caballos*, language of horses. I am not trying to muckrake here and

dig into the bitter past of Filipinos. The point that I am trying to put across is that we are already an independent country. The Spanish period is way back in the past and to try to redeem the so-called glory of our Spanish past is, I think, unnecessary especially because, as I have pointed out, when the Spaniards were here, they did not want us to learn their language, and why should we try to care for their language at this point in time?

MR. TINGSON: We are the loser, Madam President, if we refuse to learn a language which is second in the world today.

MR. GASCON: Madam President, we would consider any amendment later on, because we realize that Spanish is a beautiful language. However, first and foremost we have our own language. We have our own identity and we should encourage this. This speaks of our own language. Madam President, permit me to make a reaction to the Commissioner's proposal which is: "The Constitution shall be promulgated in Filipino, English and SPANISH." I feel that perhaps later on there will be some translations in Spanish which could be sent abroad. So I do not believe that the Constitution should be promulgated in Spanish. In fact, we should not even give priority to its being written in Spanish. This is the Constitution of our people.

MR. TINGSON: Madam President, I would settle for translating it also into Spanish.

MR. GASCON: That is right. But we should again give greater priority to its translation into the regional languages prior to its translation into Spanish because more people would benefit from its being translated into the regional languages than into English.

MR. TINGSON: But the Commissioner does not deny the fact that Dr. Jose Rizal, our national hero, spoke and wrote his novels in Spanish.

MR. GASCON: Not at all, Madam President.

MR. TINGSON: May I present an amendment to that effect later on, Madam President?

MR. GASCON: Yes, the Commissioner may during the period of amendments.

MR. TINGSON: Thank you very much.

MR. BENNAGEN: Madam President, I would just like to add that when we speak of Filipino and English as official languages and of promulgating the Constitution in Filipino and English, we do not preclude the other languages as courses to be taught in schools. The students are given the freedom to choose. And, also, the other languages can be taught via the literature of the other countries. I wish to inform the honorable Commissioner Tingson that this is already being done in a number of schools, particularly at the University of the Philippines, where the literature of other countries is taught in the proper languages, not through translations. So when we speak of Filipinizing ourselves, our consciousness, we speak of also incorporating other foreign influences which we feel are relevant

to the overall thrust of growing up as a nation. I think we pointed out earlier in our sponsorship speeches that when we speak of Filipinizing ourselves, our language in particular, we are not throwing away all other foreign influences. We are saying that we will now be more critical in terms of selecting those influences that will support our struggle for self-determination as a nation.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Padilla is recognized. It is also in Spanish?

MR. PADILLA: *Si, Señora, el lenguaje de Castellana, el Castellano o el Español. Yo no creo que durante la administración Española España no ha querido enseñar el lenguaje Castellano. De hecho nuestros héroes nacionales empezando con el Dr. José Rizal, escribió en Español no solamente sus dos novelas inmortales, el Noli Me Tangere y El Filibusterismo, sino que ha escrito versos que los escritos versos son excelentes, mucho mejor, mejores que los escritos por los Españoles mismos. Y no solamente Dr. Rizal mejorar la situación Filipina bajo la colonización de España, Marcelo H. del Pilar, Emilio Jacinto, y otros, y después de ellos hay muchos Filipinos que dominaban el lenguaje Español. Por ejemplo, Don Claro M. Recto y otros aprendieron el Castellano y dominaron ese lenguaje y tenemos que realizar que el Español es el idioma segundo en el mundo porque tenemos no solamente America que llaman Latina con la excepción de Brazil que habla Portugués, todos hablan el Español. No es verdad que los Filipinos no podían aprender*

el lenguaje Español. Mis padres hablaban el Español, yo hablaba el Español en la familia, pero desgraciadamente por la influencia Americana y otras influencias extranjeras, muchos de mis hijos ya no hablan el Español. Pero el no hablar el Español no es una virtud, me parece que es una desgracia del pueblo Filipino, y por eso que el inmortal poeta y héroe José Rizal, siempre decía en su El Filibusterismo que lo que necesitaba el pueblo Filipino era mas educación porque solamente por medio de la educación y con eso los idiomas no solamente Filipino o Tagalog, sino también el Español y ahora el Inglés, son muy importantes para el progreso del pueblo Filipino.

Es una desgracia, digo, que la generación futura no pueda hablar el lenguaje Español. Pero yo creo que debemos cultivar este lenguaje. A veces hablamos de extranjeros lenguajes. Alemán o Francés o Italiano, esos no tienen ninguna comparación con el lenguaje Español. Hemos tenido a España por más de tres o cuatro siglos y es una desvantaja el no haber tenido el deseo y el interés de preservar, de conservar, este idioma muy elegante de Madre España.

Como podemos nosotros, por ejemplo, sentir los sentimientos de nuestro héroe nacional especialmente en sus versos, si solamente tenemos que recurrir a translación, traducciones en vez de leer el original? Mi padre siempre me pedía que ponga de memoria los versos del Dr. Rizal, y muchas veces me imponía la obligación de recitar

estos versos ante el y muy bonitos, muy hermosos, mejores que los que han hecho los Españoles y los Mexicanos.

MR. VILLACORTA: *Señor Comisionado, solamente necesita usted leer los libros de los historiadores y tambien el capitulo en el Filibusterismo titulado, La Dificultades De Un Maestro, para saber la verdad de que los Españoles no querían enseñarnos la lengua Castellana. Y, Señor Comisionado Padilla, quisiera preguntarle a usted: Cuantas personas aquí entendía a usted cuando usted hablaba en Español?*

MR. PADILLA: *Eso es lo que yo digo, es una desgracia para esa generación que no puedan comprender siquiera el lenguaje Español.*

Yo convengo que España no quería educar mucho el pueblo Filipino porque la teoría era que era mas fácil colonizar y continuar el gobierno Español si la masa Filipina no está bien educada. Yo concuerdo con eso, de que no querían que se eleve la esfera educacional intelectual del pueblo Filipino, pero no necesariamente no enseñar al pueblo la lengua Española. Hay mucha diferencia. Yo concuerdo de que no querían educar al pueblo Filipino porque es más fácil dominar a un pueblo que sigue ignorante más bien que a un pueblo educado. Pero eso no quiere decir que no debemos conservar, ni mucho menos, no deberíamos haber aprendido la lengua Española.

MR. GUINGONA: *Señora Presidenta, podría dirigir una pregunta al Honorable Comisionado Padilla?*

MR. PADILLA: *Con mucho gusto.*

THE PRESIDENT: Just this one, and we will end this discourse in Spanish.

MR. GUINGONA: *Quisiera saber, Señor Comisionado, que es su deseo? Es su deseo que debemos incluir en nuestra Constitución la provisión de que esta Constitución se debe promulgar en Español, o, estaría usted satisfecho si podríamos decir solamente que nuestra Constitución sería traducida a nuestros dialectos y también en Español?*

MR. PADILLA: *No, yo concuerdo con la recomendación del Comisionado Tingson, que nuestra Constitución sea también traducida en Español.*

MR. GUINGONA: *Gracias.*

THE PRESIDENT: I think we have to cut short this discourse in Spanish much as we were, I suppose, enjoying it. Let us proceed, Mr. Floor Leader, to the next speaker.

MR. SARMIENTO: Yes, Madam President. After the exchange of the two colorful religious ministers, may I now call on another minister, Commissioner Ople.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Ople is recognized.

MR. OPLE: Thank you, Madam President. I, and several others too, wanted to raise a point of order because of the misfortune that we belong to a younger generation deprived of the opportunity to know Spanish, but, of course, a certain regression to the past will do no harm to the deliberations of this body.

Madam President, we are now on the subject national language. I congratulate the committee

for taking this overdue historic decision to recognize Filipino as the national language of the Philippines. And, of course, I think the record will have to indicate a few crucial points. Will the committee offer an explanation as to the difference between Filipino with a capital “F” and Pilipino with capital “P”?

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, we passed around a position paper, “A Note on the Filipino Language” authored by Dr. Ernesto Constantino of the Linguistics Department of the University of the Philippines and we concurred with his differentiation in that Filipino is different from Pilipino which is based on only one language, Tagalog. Filipino, on the other hand, is based on different Philippine languages. Also, Pilipino is based essentially on the language usage and peculiarities of the Tagalog group; while Filipino is based on the language usage, similarities and peculiarities of the different Philippine ethnic groups.

I think Commissioner Bennagen would also like to elaborate on this.

MR. BENNAGEN: Madam President, *noon pong 1971 Constitutional Convention napag-usapan na rin iyan at nabanggit nga na ang Pilipino ay batay sa Tagalog, pero dahil nga sa titol ang karamihang hindi Tagalog at sa pangangailangan din ng pagpapatatag ng isang wikang pambansa batay sa mga iba't ibang wika sa Pilipinas, ginawang Filipino dahil alam nating ang alpabeto ng Pilipino ay walang letra “F”*

samantalang may mga ibang wika sa Pilipinas na mayroong letra "F." So, may symbolic value rin ito. Ibig sabihin hindi lamang Tagalog ang batayan ng wikang pambansa kundi lahat ng wika sa Pilipinas. Ako po ay isang Ilokano.

MR. OPLE: Yes, Madam President, at the present stage of development of Filipino, especially, this is taught and actually utilized in the University of the Philippines. Filipino with its main features, that is to say, with a capital "F," is not yet really highly distinguishable from Pilipino with a capital "P." Will the committee agree to that construction?

MR. VILLACORTA: The qualification "highly distinguishable." So we agree with the Commissioner, Madam President.

MR. OPLE: Thank you. And the developments in grammar, syntax and the rules of language that have pertained to Pilipino with a capital "P," although amended become highly liberalized, will not be discarded because we are recognizing Filipino with capital "F" as the national language. Will that be correct?

MR. VILLACORTA: It is inevitable, Madam President, that the starting point would be Pilipino because that has already been developed in the past as an evolving national language, but then this does not mean that we should limit ourselves to the syntax or to the vocabulary of Pilipino which is based on Tagalog.

MR. OPLE: I agree with the Commissioner. I myself see Filipino as being different from Pilipino with a capital "P," in the sense that Filipino is a more malleable, more dynamic, more open-ended

national language, not only ready but also very eager to receive contributions from all other languages of the Philippines. Will that be the committee's position as well?

MR. VILLACORTA: Yes, Madam President. In fact, the linguists who were our resource persons in our different public hearings said that the language structures of all Philippine languages are similar to each other. So there will be no difficulty in incorporating words from different Philippine languages and dialects. Moreover, researchers showed that it is much easier for different ethnic and language groups to learn another Philippine language than to learn English or another foreign language.

MR. OPLE: That is very true, Madam President. It is not uncustomary for a Cebuano or a Bicolano in Manila to learn Tagalog in two months so that he or she becomes fluent in conversation.

MR. GASCON: Madam President, Commissioner Bennagen would like to add something.

MR. BENNAGEN: We would like to add that the provision on page 5, line 9, which states: "developed on the basis of Philippine and other languages" includes also non-Philippine languages, such as English and French languages. For example, if we say: "*Ipaxerox monga ito*," the word "xerox" will be standardized as part of Filipino.

MR. OPLE: So that means the language is open to all influences.

MR. BENNAGEN: That is right, but a major task would be, therefore, standardization.

MR. OPLE: Does the committee, however, believe that the enrichment, expansion and indefinite strengthening of the living language through assimilation will have to be done in the course of the evolution of this language, and that it is not the intention of the committee to prescribe certain quotas, according to quotas of assimilation from different languages, in accordance with a certain fiat of the government?

MR. BENNAGEN: No, Madam President, because we look at language as an organic thing which has its own logic of growth; therefore, we must follow that. But what we are saying is that government ought to be able to accelerate or speed up the development of that language, respecting its own logic of development.

MR. OPLE: Thank you for that clarification.

I now proceed to Section 2 which states:

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.

We have just witnessed, and some of us participated in what others thought was an anachronistic proceeding, an exchange of statements on the floor conducted in the Spanish language.

Spanish, let us admit it, is generally seen by the younger generation as an anachronism, if only because 100 years now part us from the last time that a substantial number of Filipinos spoke

Spanish. Spanish, together with Tagalog, was the language of the Malolos Republic. It was very difficult in 1898 and 1899, during the formation of Filipino nationality, to depart from Spanish. And some of the speakers remarked the fact that both the *Noli Me Tangere* and the *El Filibusterismo* were written in Spanish. But, of course, there have been a lot of changes in the world of the political system since 1898 and 1899 and Spanish has tended to recede, as English continued to emerge as a dominant lingua franca of mankind, especially of trade and commerce and of science and technology.

But may I submit, Madam President, that history is turning on its hinge again. Today, Spanish no longer seems to be an anachronism. Outside our own country, it is emerging as the world's number two language. It is the second language of the United States of America. It is the first language of 400 million Latin Americans, perhaps much more than that, if we include the entire Iberian civilization, which includes the Philippines. By the year 2000, according to all the economic think tanks, most of Latin American countries will become dynamic industrialized nations belonging to the OECD. And of course, Miami even now is emerging as the great nexus of a new dynamic trade between Latin America, North America and Western Europe, and there is no question that there will be repercussions across the Pacific of the emergence of the Iberian nations as newly

industrialized nations just a couple of decades from now. Therefore, I would like to find out whether the committee would be receptive at the appropriate time.

Spanish, as a valued historical legacy, is acknowledged in this section of the Constitution, not as compulsory subject to be taught in schools – I think that has been a complete failure – but as a language, to be taught on a voluntary basis and encouraged by the government and by policy, both in its development and propagation, with nothing compulsory about it. Everything will be voluntary. In that manner, we are not paying so much a homage to the past but looking forward to the future, in the very near term, when the economic interaction of the Philippines with the rest of the world can be vastly facilitated if we had a group of Filipinos capable of speaking and writing this language. What I have in mind is just an acknowledgment of this language in the Constitution without imposing it as a language of instruction or a compulsory subject to be taught in our schools.

I remember when Prince Juan Carlos came here a few years ago. He went to the Rizal Park and bowed his head in apology to Dr. Jose Rizal, and I thought that marked a turning point when we should start recovering from the Spanish trauma to which we are all heirs. But that is with respect to Spanish, and at the proper time I, in association with some Commissioners, would like

to propose an amendment with the committee's indulgence.

MR. VILLACORTA: Like other amendments, Madam President, we shall consider the Commissioner's amendment at the proper time.

MR. OPLE: Thank you very much, Madam President. And finally, with respect to the auxiliary official languages in their respective regions, will the committee consider again at the appropriate time an amendment that will also extend the aid and protection of the State to the development and propagation of these regional languages so that public funds may be lawfully spent on their development and propagation?

MR. VILLACORTA: We would welcome that amendment, Madam President.

MR. OPLE: Will the committee also consider an amendment so that it will be explicit in the Constitution that these regional languages may be taught as elective courses in state universities?

MR. VILLACORTA: Certainly, Madam President. I see other committee members nodding; so I think the Commissioner should leave everything to us.

MR. OPLE: That is a good augury for what is to come. Thank you very much, Madam President.

MR. VILLACORTA: I thank the Commissioner.

MR. BENNAGEN: Madam President, we just want to underscore that the general principle enunciated by Commissioner Ople on the voluntary learning of Spanish applies also to the other languages as they create their own demand; for instance, Japanese and

Mandarin are creating their own demand and people are learning these on a voluntary basis. I think on that basis we shall entertain the amendments.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, I just would like to announce the change of venue of the caucus among the members of the committee and those who have amendments after this evening's session to the South Lounge. So in particular, Commissioners Azcuna, Maambong, Davide, Tingson, Padilla, Monsod, Aquino, Ople and Bacani submitted their amendments.

MR. OPLE: Madam President, if we are not ready with our proposed amendments now, anyway they have been identified in their outline, can we present the complete proposed amendments tomorrow morning?

MR. VILLACORTA: The Commissioners can, Madam President.

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

MR. SARMIENTO: Madam President, may I ask that Commissioner Davide be recognized.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Davide is recognized.

MR. DAVIDE: Thank you, Madam President. I seek enlightenment on some of the proposals on language. In the proposal, it is now clearly stated that the national language of the Philippines is Filipino. As correctly pointed out by the committee earlier, in the 1971 Constitutional Convention provision, it is stated categorically that the Batasang Pambansa shall take steps towards the development and formal adoption of a

common national language to be known as Filipino. It is, therefore, our understanding that when the 1972 Constitution was allegedly ratified in 1973, the common national language to be known as Filipino was actually evolved and developed by any process by the Batasang Pambansa, for which reason in the 1986 Constitution we now would consider Filipino, which was supposed to be adopted and promulgated by the Batasang Pambansa, as the common national language?

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, we consulted many language experts on this matter, and they said that even before the 1973 Constitution was promulgated, there was already a language evolving which we can rightfully call Filipino – a lingua franca that incorporates different words from several Philippine languages.

MR. DAVIDE: I am sure, Madam President, that the 1971 Constitutional Convention conducted several public hearings and that several linguists were all invited. But what came out as a provision was that the Batasang Pambansa shall take steps to evolve and formally adopt a national language to be known as Filipino. It was clearly an indication that as of the adoption by the 1971 Constitutional Convention of that provision, there was no such language known as Filipino.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, a language is not legislated. It is not evolved primarily through legislation, although legislation can help expedite the development.

MR. DAVIDE: Yes, but the Batasang Pambansa was mandated precisely to take steps for the evolution and formal adoption of that language to be known as Filipino. So necessarily it is a fact that the Batasang Pambansa never did take any step.

MR. VILLACORTA: May I know from the Commissioner what would convince him that there is an existing language called Filipino. What would be the indicators or signs?

MR. DAVIDE: That is exactly what I am about to ask: What were the indicators that the committee took to now conclude that there is such a thing as a language known as Filipino?

MR. VILLACORTA: First of all, the assumption is that people do not necessarily call that *lingua franca* Filipino. In other words, we are not closely associating a living *lingua franca* with what people call it. They may be speaking it, but they may not be calling it Filipino. Am I right, Madam President?

MR. DAVIDE: Anyway, the point of reference is the provision of the 1973 Constitution. I now would ask for clarification: What was the *lingua franca* of the Philippines before the adoption of the 1973 Constitution?

MR. VILLACORTA: The *lingua franca* at that time was not fully evolved. This was the testimony of many language experts.

MR. DAVIDE: In other words, there was no *lingua franca* before the adoption of the 1973 Constitution.

MR. VILLACORTA: Commissioner Bennagen would like to say something.

MR. BENNAGEN: Madam President, there was already a *lingua franca* in the sense that when somebody from Batanes met somebody from Cebu, they would speak a kind of language, except that it was not yet popularly known as Filipino.

MR. DAVIDE: I will ask categorically the question: Was there a *lingua franca* before the adoption of the 1973 Constitution?

MR. BENNAGEN: There was, Madam President.

MR. DAVIDE: What was the name of that *lingua franca* ?

MR. BENNAGEN: It was either referred to by some linguists as Filipino, others as Pilipino and others just simply as national *lingua franca*.

MR. DAVIDE: So it was not really very categorically denominated as Filipino. Now, let me finish my question. Some Filipinos call it Pilipino and others call it Filipino. Is there any specific written authority to the effect that a *lingua franca* known as Filipino actually existed before the adoption of the 1973 Constitution?

MR. BENNAGEN: Does the Commissioner mean a legal document or act?

MR. DAVIDE: Not necessarily a legal document, but any book maintaining that Filipino was a *lingua franca* before the adoption of the 1973 Constitution.

MR. BENNAGEN: Yes, I can refer the Commissioner to some of the articles by Dr. Ernesto Constantino.

MR. DAVIDE: Does the Commissioner refer to Mr. Ernesto Constantino who submitted this afternoon this so-called note on the Filipino language?

MR. VILLACORTA: Yes, Madam President.

- MR. DAVIDE: Is he the same Mr. Constantino who, together with Dr. Consuelo Paz, Professor Rosario Torres Yu and Jesus P. Ramos, submitted to us this mimeographed sheet entitled: "Proposal Para sa CONCOM: Probisyon para sa Pambansang Wika"?
- MR. VILLACORTA: The language used is Filipino, with an "F." If the Commissioner will look at page 5, it states: "Ang mga probisyong ipino-propos dito..." That is not Tagalog or Pilipino; it is "universalistic."
- MR. DAVIDE: I am not really very familiar with Tagalog because I am a Cebuano, but I got the impression that the so-called Filipino is also based on Philippine languages which are really the native dialects. Is that not correct?
- MR. VILLACORTA: They are not dialects. We have been used to calling them "dialects," but they are languages on their own.
- MR. DAVIDE: Nevertheless, whatever it is, they are native languages, sometimes known as native dialects.
- MR. VILLACORTA: They are wrongly called native dialects.
- MR. DAVIDE: So definitely this Filipino language used in this proposal of Constantino et al. is based on the Philippine or native languages.
- MR. VILLACORTA: I have not read it carefully, but I would imagine that it has incorporated some native languages.
- MR. DAVIDE: Yes, Madam President, because I am going to show that perhaps there is really no basis yet for a common national language known as Filipino. I can challenge anyone that this language which the committee had admitted to be Filipino – I am

referring to the language of Constantino, et al. – is not really Filipino.

The committee admitted that Filipino has assimilated the words of Philippine or native languages. But the first paragraph of the proposal alone does not contain any definite Cebuano word. We notice here that there are more Spanish words like: *comunicacion, dominio, privado, publico, termino, concepto, oficial, efecto, colonial, educacion, cultura, gobierno, complicado, complicadong situacion, decolonizacion* and so on.

MR. GASCON:

Madam President, that is correct. As we asserted a while ago, the Filipino which we are recognizing now as the national language is still a developing language. And if the Commissioner will refer to “A Note on the Filipino Language,” it is even similarly asserted here that at this stage of the development of Filipino, this language bears more similarities with Tagalog than with any other Philippine language.

One can see that the similarities between Filipino and Tagalog are greater than the similarities between Filipino and, say, Cebuano or Hiligaynon. But this does not necessarily mean that the language which is continuing to be developed will not assimilate more words from other Philippine languages.

MR. DAVIDE:

That is correct; I have no quarrel with that. The only point is that the proposal of the committee would consider Filipino as the national language. Or, as correctly stated or even more emphatically

stated, that Filipino is the national language. But the fact of the matter is that there are no concrete findings; there are no definite studies pointing to the development of the language known as Filipino. It has never at all been developed as such.

The conclusion of the linguists, Madam President, in the light of the absence of any step taken by the government to evolve and formally adopt it would necessarily mean that it is on the basis of their own perceptions, not on the basis of the actual growth, the actual propagation, the actual evolution and the formal adoption of the language.

MS. BRAID:

Madam President, the evolution or the development of Filipino as a national language was hampered by the bilingual policy of the government. If we only discard this bilingual policy, and with this legal mandate now of making Filipino the official language, I think we will move ahead towards enriching the national language.

MR. DAVIDE:

I wish I would not be misconstrued as objecting to Filipino as a common national language. I am for it. It is only in the matter of a presumption that it is already the national language.

The point is that probably we should just adopt the provision in the 1973 Constitution that we shall develop a common national language to be known as Filipino, based on Philippine languages and, perhaps, with assimilation even of foreign languages, in like manner that Mr. Constantino

himself, who claims that his position paper is in Filipino, has adopted Spanish words.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, that would be slowing down the pace of the development of the national language, if we go back to the 1973 Constitution's provision. Let us look at what happened between 1973 and at present. There have been no resolute efforts on the part of the government to really develop the national language officially. What we are talking about is the living *lingua franca*. Madam President, we can provide the Commissioner with the research literature which will hopefully convince him that there is a living *lingua franca* called Filipino. But on the basis alone of the proposal in Filipino which the Commissioner has before him, I agree that it is not convincing enough. That is why we can provide the Commissioner with other evidences of the existence of Filipino.

MR. DAVIDE: I would be very glad, Madam President, to take time to be convinced, but the point is that, if the development of the common national language mandated by the 1973 Constitution was hampered, perhaps that is why I do not feel adequate in using it. I think the question of adequacy should also be considered.

MR. SUAREZ: What will happen to the poor Pampangueño lawyers who will attend trials in Cebu? Do they have to master Cebuano also?

MR. BENNAGEN: They have to master Filipino as a national language.

MR. SUAREZ: Thank you, Madam President. My last question is a little more difficult. I suppose the committee deliberately omitted the phrase which appears in the 1973 Constitution that in case of conflict, the English text shall prevail. So in the interpretation of this Constitution, which according to the Commissioner shall be promulgated in English and Filipino, which text would prevail?

MR. BENNAGEN: I would say Filipino. But since our deliberations this afternoon are in English, Spanish, assuming that was transcribed, and Filipino, then I would imagine all of these will have to be taken into account.

MR. SUAREZ: May we know the reason of the committee in dropping this particular provision appearing in the 1973 Constitution, Madam President?

MR. BENNAGEN: Our chairman wants to be recognized.

MR. VILLACORTA: We kept quiet about it because it is such a controversial question. We were divided in the committee on this issue and we thought that we should throw it to the floor and let the body decide.

MR. SUAREZ: Thank you, Madam President. We really need guidance as to what text will prevail in the interpretation of these constitutional provisions, especially because many of them may go up to the Supreme Court for review. I think we should really resolve that matter, Madam President.

MR. VILLACORTA: I thank the Commissioner.

MR. SARMIENTO: Madam President, I ask that Commissioner Maambong be recognized.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Maambong is recognized.

MR. MAAMBONG: Madam President, last August 5, 1986 I was with Don Miguel Cuenco. We were invited to appear before the committee and during that meeting, I suggested an amendment to Section 1 which was accepted upon the support of Commissioners Rigos, Brocka, who unfortunately, is no longer with us. The amendment to Section 1, which was accepted by the Committee, reads:

“In the development of the national language, due consideration should be given to dialects and languages of the Filipinos.”

However, this accepted amendment is no longer found here, instead I find this sentence which reads:

“The national language shall be further developed on the basis of Philippine and other languages.”

My question, Madam President, is: Is this present formulation now a reformulation of the one which was accepted by the committee?

MR. VILLACORTA: Yes, Madam President. In fact, it is stronger because what the Commissioner had proposed is only to give due consideration. Now it is categorical: “developed on the basis.” So it is not just giving consideration to Philippine languages but it also provides that the national language shall be further developed on the basis of Philippine dialects and other languages.

MR. MAAMBONG: In other words, the amendment which I proposed and which was accepted by the committee is actually captured by the present sentence which is now in Section 1.

MR. VILLACORTA: That is right, Madam President.

MR. MAAMBONG: Thank you very much.

May I go on for just one more question. I do not know whether or not this can be answered by the committee. I notice, Madam President, that in some past letters of instructions the schools were enjoined to implement integration of family planning in their curricula. I was wondering whether this is properly a function of educational institutions, considering that in the formulation of the provisions on education now we are giving educational institutions some leeway in the presentation of their instruction. Is this envisioned at all that implementation of family planning procedures will be handled by the schools, Madam President?

MR. VILLACORTA: We really did not take that up, Madam President, but I think this is directly related to the controversial issue of right to life.

MR. MAAMBONG: Precisely, Madam President.

MR. VILLACORTA: And I think in the General Provisions, as well as in the Article on Family Rights, this will be covered; until such time that we resolve that issue, probably it might be premature to include that in the Article on Education.

MR. MAAMBONG: Yes, I think so, but just for the advance information of those who are involved in this issue, may I read for the record LOI 47 which was issued on December 9, 1972 instructing the Education Secretary to inform all schools of medicine, nursing, midwifery, allied medical

professions and social work to prepare, plan and implement the integration of family planning in their curricula and to require from their graduates sufficient instruction in family planning as a prerequisite to qualify for the appropriate licensing examination. This was followed by LOI 47-A directing the Secretary of Public Information to help implement the programs of the Population Commission by disseminating information on family planning. Probably we can take this up at the proper time.

Thank you very much, Madam President.

MR. VILLACORTA: I thank the Commissioner.

MR. SARMIENTO: Madam President, with this kind indulgence of the body and our President, may I ask that the honorable Chief Justice Concepcion be recognized as the last interpellator?

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Concepcion is recognized.

MR. CONCEPCION: Señora Presidenta, do not be alarmed. That was meant merely to tickle your interest. We have been discussing about Filipino and Pilipino. We have been discussing Spanish, as distinguished from Filipino.

May I start by saying that Filipino, with a capital "F," is Spanish. Our chairman, Commissioner Villacorta, has rightly pointed out the fact that language is something that cannot be imposed. It is something that develops. As a matter of fact, the Spanish language was not the Spanish language in much the same way that what we now call Filipino is actually Tagalog.

We speak about the Roman language. It was not the language of Italy. It was the language of Rome, but Rome governed not only Italy but practically the entire Mediterranean. Also, it was the capital of Italy eventually, so the language of the capital prevailed. And that is true, I think, of the Spanish language. The Spanish language was the Castillian language. And Spain was divided into several feudal communities. The Castillian formed part of a region which was never occupied by foreigners. The Muslims or Moors ruled Southern Spain. Now as to whether or not the Filipino language existed before, I have been informed that as early as the '20s, when Filipinos met other Filipinos in the US, they did not address each other in English. But one of them would say a dirty word in Tagalog to determine whether the other was also a Filipino.

What I mean is that actually during the liberation, as Commissioner Ople stated, some patriots wanted to develop the Filipino language, but they were too purist in their translation. Let us take for instance the word "seat" to which others refer as "bangko" or "chair." We generally use the word "silya," but Lope K. Santos gave thereto the name "salumpuwit." Who would be encouraged by this kind of translation? A good many of the words used in the Filipino language are Spanish. The implication is this. There are a number of things in the past which were unpleasant then, like some of our unfortunate incidents in school. We had

unpleasant moments with some teachers. But those unpleasant moments are now pleasant memories. We remember the past with a feeling akin to a happy and stimulating feeling. So, too, we have had our own disagreements here. I am sure that 20 years from now, we will remember those disagreements with a smile. The speech in Spanish of Commissioner Tingson is something we will never forget. We will always remember it in the right spirit, with pleasure. Occasionally, abroad, people who speak Spanish, which used to be and is Castillian, including those from Latin America, are surprised to find that some Filipinos speak Spanish and ask: "How did the Filipinos learn to speak Spanish?" I answered: "That was before, but now the future of Spanish in my country is not so bright." Their reply is: "What a pity. Other people go to school to learn Spanish. You do not have to do that, but you want to shake it off." Now I do not look at Spanish as the Colonial imposition that it was. The colonial power that dominated the Philippines is gone and I realize the fact that the Spanish language made it possible for us to establish contact with the rest of the world. It enabled us to read foreign books like those on the French Revolution from which all of our heroes of the past have drawn inspiration and strength. But there are certain assets like the experience we gained from them that we should not discard; it is part of the enrichment of our

culture. It is part of our political maturity. We have it already. Why shake it off? It is in this respect that I feel I should express my view which means that I agree with the suggestion that the Constitution be translated into Spanish. And whether or not it should be maintained as an official language, that will be dependent upon the will of the majority. But I strongly suggest that whatever may have been our unpleasant experience with the aliens is also an asset for us in the future. Let us learn from the sufferings that we had in the past. Let us learn that democracy is something that should be fought for. It can never come on a silver platter. One of the most unpleasant memories of our school days is that we had to set it out, to learn from what little we know.

Thank you, Madam President.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Villacorta is recognized.

MR. VILLACORTA: May we request the Chair to authorize the body to propose and discuss amendments to Section 1 of the subsection on language?

THE PRESIDENT: Please proceed.

REV. RIGOS: Madam President, copies of the proposals have been distributed.

THE PRESIDENT: Was there any change made?

REV. RIGOS: As far as this new sheet is concerned, there is no change, Madam President. And so, the committee is now ready to accept any proposed amendments.

MR. VILLACORTA: Just for the record, Madam President. The chairman of the Subcommittee on Language is Commissionr Cirilo Rigos.

MR. RAMA: Madam President, may I ask that Commissioner Davide be recognized.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Davide is recognized.

MR. DAVIDE: Madam President, before doing that, I would like to find out what should be the basis for our proposed amendments. When the committee submitted its committee report, I introduced an omnibus amendment including language, arts and culture, science and technology. This afternoon, however, the committee submitted to us recommended provisions on language consisting now of four sections.

REV. RIGOS: May I answer that, Madam President? The committee had a meeting last night after our session and that one-paper document submitted to the Chair is the result of our meeting last night. That now takes the place of the two sections in the old draft. So, for the purpose of our discussion tonight, we are using that one-page document with four sections, Madam President.

MR. DAVIDE: So, the committee is now submitting that document as its own revised report on language.

REV. RIGOS: Yes.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, prejudicial questions.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Aquino is recognized.

MS. AQUINO: I think that the section on language presents a vague question which might trigger a long-winded debate.

Considering the lateness of the hour, I would like to suggest to the committee that we address ourselves to the less controversial provisions, for example, on science and technology, and reserve the debate on language for tomorrow.

MR. DAVIDE:

I second that particular suggestion precisely because earlier the committee, without leave of the Commission, submitted its own amended report on language. We were already prepared with the set of amendments to the original committee report on language. So it would be rather unfair to us if we will now begin immediately on amendments on the basis of the new committee version.

So, may I propose that we take up the provisions on language tomorrow in the interest of justice and fairness.

THE PRESIDENT:

Yes. But may we, at least, hear the committee on what are the salient provisions in this new committee report on language? May we have some remarks on this?

MR. VILLACORTA:

Madam President, actually this revised proposal sought to incorporate the different amendments either written or verbally articulated by the different Commissioners, and we have accommodated their suggestions. Hence, we would like to insist that we start discussing Section 1 at least of this section on language to save time. We are being accused of dragging our feet in our work in the Commission. The committee is ready with these four sections on language and we do

not see any reason why we should defer the discussion on this section.

THE PRESIDENT: May we have the salient points in Section 1, Mr. Chairman?

MR. VILLACORTA: The salient points, Madam President, include the name of the national language which is identified as Filipino with an F; the steps to be taken by the government in using it as a medium of communication and instruction are also stipulated. Another salient point is the use of the regional language as auxiliary medium of instruction. Lastly, English is stipulated as a second language and as an alternative medium of instruction.

We feel, Madam President, that these are not very controversial, and since the body has a copy of our proposal, we can straight away come up with amendments. And if there are further questions or there is need for clarification, we can provide that clarification tonight, Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Are there any comments for instance on lines 1, 2 and 3 – the national language of the Filipinos? Is there anyone who would like to speak for or against this particular sentence?

MR. SARMIENTO: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Sarmiento is recognized.

MR. SARMIENTO: May I briefly speak against this amendment?

THE PRESIDENT: Please proceed.

MR. SARMIENTO: I am against the committee's amendment that the national language of the Philippines is Filipino. I am for the retention of the phrase or the words

in the 1973 Constitution, which state that the national language of the Philippines shall be Filipino. From the interpellations made by Commissioner Davide, it was shown that no efforts were made by the Philippine government towards making Filipino our national language. An article was written by Professor Leopoldo Yabes, a well-known linguist and UP professor in Linguistics, that indeed no efforts were made by the government in order that Filipino, with emphasis on F, should be our national language. Therefore, "shall be," not "is," should be used in this first sentence.

MR. VILLACORTA: The position of the committee, Madam President, is that there is a living *lingua franca* which can be called Filipino. It is that *lingua franca* that is used by citizens of the Philippines who use different native languages or dialects. So, if a Cebuano and an Ilocano meet each other in any place of the Philippines, they would use this *lingua franca*, which we call Filipino. We call it Filipino and not Pilipino because Tagalog is a pure form. In fact, Pilipino according to linguists who attended our hearings, is even purer than Tagalog because it tries to coin words which are not really used. Therefore, it is not true that despite the fact that the government has not really taken resolute steps to develop the national language known as Filipino, there is no such language to speak of. It is a living *lingua franca*, according to the resource persons whom we invited to our public hearings.

MR. OPLE: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Ople is recognized.

MR. OPLE: I would like to speak briefly in support of the committee formulation on Section 1.

THE PRESIDENT: The Gentleman has three minutes.

MR. OPLE: “The national language of the Philippines is Filipino, which shall be further developed on the basis of Philippine and other languages.” For political reasons, Madam President, we have temporized as a nation with the issue of the national language since the 1935 Constitution. As a matter of fact, at the onset of the American occupation of the Philippines, I believe it was the Taft regime, the first civilian government in 1903, that prescribed in effect the use of English as the principal medium of communication in the Philippines. And for understandable reasons prior to that, some of the historical scholars in this hall will remember the argument against Philippine Independence emanating from American scholars themselves, including the infamous Dean C. Worcester who wrote two volumes of *The Philippines’ Past and Present* just to denigrate the Philippine Revolution of 1896 and the Philippine Republic of 1899. What did Worcester say about the Aguinaldo Republic, the Malolos Republic? He said that this was a Tagalog military oligarchy with some help from the Pampango and the Ilocano oligarchy, and the intention was very clear – to divide the people of Luzon and the people of the Visayas and Mindanao. And yet, who can

gainsay the fact that the Visayas and Mindanao took their own leading roles in the Philippine Revolution? There may be fewer monuments in the Visayas, but General Leo Kilat of Cebu deserves a monument there because he fought the American army in Cebu. There was a Negros Democratic Republic existing simultaneously with the Malolos Republic, at the same time acknowledging the primacy of the republic in Malolos at that time. They refused to be dissuaded by the Americans from believing that we had a central revolutionary government at that time. Gen. Juan Araneta, I think, was the leader of that republic in Negros.

The only reason I am bringing this up, Madam President, is that the languages have gone through a tortuous course. In 1898 and 1899, the language of the Malolos Republic was bilingual; it was both in Tagalog and in Spanish. But with the loss of the republic, it was inevitable that the Americans with their superior paraphernalia of culture and arms or arms and culture, had to insist on supplanting the native languages with their own tongue if only to symbolize most effectively the triumph of their colonial conquest, and perhaps to demean the Filipino people in their own eyes. There is a saying that, first, one has to believe in the superiority of an alien culture before he can be truly subjugated. And the outright suppression of the Philippine languages at that time was part of the scheme in order to

demonstrate the overwhelming cultural superiority of the newcomer, the new colonial power, over the native inhabitants. But in 1935, our ancestors did take that singular step of providing for a national language in the Constitution. In the Constitutional Convention of 1971, there were charges articulated to the effect that Quezon, Laurel and Recto confabulated in the Style Committee in order to change the formulation of the national language. Instead of saying it should be based on the existing native languages, according to those accusers, Quezon, Laurel and Recto changed this by saying that it should be based on one of the existing native languages. We do not have the proof of this accusation, Madam President.

At any rate, acting on the constitutional principle on a national language developed in 1935, the Institute of National Language was established in 1940. Please bear in mind that the majority of the people who sat in the board of the Institute of National Language, including the first director, Jaime de Veyra from Leyte, were preponderantly non-Tagalogs. Beginning in 1939, we have had this national language based on one of the existing native languages and later on a Visayan minister of education changed this word "Tagalog" into "Filipino." I think he was from Negros Occidental.

THE PRESIDENT: I am sorry to interrupt, but the time, I believe, has expired.

MR. OPLE:

May I wind up then? I was trying to request assistance to remember... yes, Minister Romero, the Secretary of Education, changed the word "Tagalog" into "Pilipino," and since that time this language has evolved. We are not happy about the restrictive manner, according to some, in which this has developed, but "Pilipino" here is just a proclamation of an already existing fact. "Pilipino" has been transformed into "Filipino" with a capital F. It is a code word for a highly liberalized Filipino, open-ended, not only ready but eager to accept contributions from Cebuano, Pampango, Ilocano, Hiligaynon, Tausog and all the other languages of this country. And, therefore, it is to be distinguished from Pilipino as a more static, already finished, product. This is a growing, living product, as I said, eager to embrace and assimilate all possible authentic contributions from the other languages of the Philippines.

And so, I support the committee in acknowledging now this reality. It is about time that we settle this. This is a rare opportunity when there is an upsurge of nationalism in our own land and a cry for unity, solidarity and peace based on justice. Therefore, I strongly urge, Madam President, that we support Section 1 as formulated by the committee.

Thank you.

MR. RAMA:

Madam President, I ask that Commissioner Davide be recognized to speak *en contra*.

THE PRESIDENT:

Commissioner Davide is recognized.

- MR. DAVIDE: Thank you, Madam President.
The question here is not whether or not we have a language known as Filipino. The question is the formulation because we easily notice in the formulation of the committee, Madam President, that what it describes now as Filipino with an F is actually “Pilipino” which is based on Tagalog. Section 2 now has deleted “Pilipino” as an official language. In the 1973 Constitution, the official languages are Pilipino with a P and English; the national language shall be known as “Filipino,” and the Batasang Pambansa was mandated to evolve that common national language to be known as Filipino.
- THE PRESIDENT: So where does the Gentleman differ really from the committee?
- MR. DAVIDE: The committee now in effect would want to enshrine Pilipino as the Filipino. That is why Section 1 now is written in such a way that the Pilipino before would now be called Filipino which is the common national language. This is the fact: The lingua franca in the Philippines is not Filipino, and I can challenge anyone on this. How could it be the lingua franca when only the University of the Philippines has offered the subject known as Filipino? In the entire educational system – I am referring to public and private educational systems – other than the University of the Philippines, the subject taught is Pilipino, not Filipino. And it would really be deception to consider now the official language known as Pilipino as the Filipino.

2.3.2. Records of Plenary Sessions of the Constitutional Commission - September 9, 1986

MR. RAMA: Madam President, I move that we proceed to consider the amendments to the provisions on Language. The first registered speaker is Commissioner Tadeo.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Tadeo is recognized.

MR. TADEO: *Ginang Pangulo, mga Kagalang-galang kong Kasama sa Constitutional Commission, sinikap kong ilagay ang aking sarili bilang pinakahuling tagapagsalita tungkol sa language dahil ako ang nagsasalita ng Pilipino sa kapulungang ito at malalagay ako sa alanganin sapagkat isa po akong taga-Bulacan. Iginiit ko ang wikang ito sapagkat ako ay Bulakeño at gusto kong mangusap dito bilang isang Pilipino, bilang anak ng aking bayan, bilang anak ng daigdig.*

Uumpisahan ko ito sa sinabi ni Jose Rizal: "Ang hindi magmahal sa sariling wika ay higit pa sa hayop at malansang isda." Bago namatay si Jose Rizal noong December 30, 1896, 90 taon na mula ngayon, ipinahayag niya ito sa El Filibusterismo. He foresaw the tragic effects of a colonial education. Hence, in his role as Simon 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 yourselves, 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.

What Rizal said about Spanish has been proven to be equally true for English.

Ang aking pangalawang katuwiran sa pagsuporta sa wikang Pilipino ay batay naman sa ginawang pagsasaliksik at pag-aaral ng Muslim scholar, si Najib Saleeby. In 1924, the eminent scholar, Najib Saleeby, wrote something on the language of education in the Philippines. He deplored the attempt to impose English as the medium of instruction. Saleeby, who was an expert on the Malayo-Polynesian languages, pointed out that Tagalog, Visayan, Ilocano and other Philippine dialects belong to the same linguistic tree. He 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 Italian. An educated Tagalog from Batangas and an educated Visayan 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.

This was said 42 years ago when Tagalog movies, periodicals and radio programs had not yet attained the popularity that they enjoy today all over the country.

Ang pangatlo kong batayan ay ang isinulat ni Renato Constantino na pinamagatang "The Miseducation of the Filipino People," which says:

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.

Learning – Impediment to Thought. 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 taught more 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.

Gusto kong ibahagi sa inyo ang karanasan naman ng paaralan na sinabi kahapon ni Commissioner Davide na ang nagpasimula lamang nito ay U.P. Tanggapin natin ang katotohanang ang Unibersidad ng Pilipinas ay isa nang institusyon sa pagtuturo. At ako bilang agriculturist o magsasaka ay hindi makapagkakailang sinasabi ng mga taga-ibang bansa na kaya sila maunlad ay sapagkat nagtapos sila sa University of the Philippines sa Los Baños. Kaya hindi natin pwedeng iwasan ang pagiging isang institusyon ng Unibersidad ng Pilipinas.

I just want to read a letter we have received, entitled: "Barrier to Effective Teaching of Science and Math Identified."

The effective teaching of Science and Mathematics in the country hinges on the recognition of at least three major factors to a researcher from the Institute of 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 communication 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.

Ang pinakamalaking balakid ng mga kabataang Pilipino sa pagkatuto ng mga araling agham ay dahil sa kailangang pag-aralan nila ito sa wikang dayuhan. Walang malayang bansa ang gumagawa nito. Sa pag-aaral ng agham, kailangan sanay muna sa wikang dayuhan ang isang mag-aaral. Ngunit dahil sa mga likas na dahilang marami sa kanila ang hindi natuto ng English, ang tunay na nangyayari ay pinag-aaralan nila ang agham samantalang nagsasanay pa lamang sila sa English. Nakapagtataka ba kung paunti nang paunti ang nagkakahilig magpakadalubhasa at magturo ng mga araling agham? Idagdag pa natin ang pangkalahatang napakababang pagtingin sa mga guro natin. Nakapagtataka ba na pasama nang pasama ang kalagayan ng agham at teknolohiya sa ating bansa? Isinulat ni President Edgardo Angara: "... parang ang kulturang agham ay malayo sa pag-uugat sa kaluluwa ng ating bansa." Kung pag-aaralan ang ating pambansang kilos mapapansin na bilango pa rin tayo ng mga karaniwang pamahiin at mga maling haka-haka. Sa aking palagay, magkakaroon ng kalutasan ang maraming suliranin natin kung gagamitin ang Pilipino sa pagtuturo, lalung-lalo na sa pagtuturo ng agham

sapagkat ang pagkatuto ng mga araling agham ang pinakamahalagang bahagi ng mga araling dapat matutuhan ng lahat ng kabataan.

Narito naman ang aking kongkretong karanasan bilang isang pambansang lider ng mga magbubukid. Ang nalalaman kong wika ay Pilipino na sinuso ko sa aking ina. Nagpunta ako ng Luzon, Bisaya at Mindanao. Nakarating ako sa Kinuskusan, Davao del Sur, sa Talomo at sa Kidapawan. Nakarating din ako sa Surigao, Agusan, Iloilo, Cebu, Samar, Daet, Sorsogon, Kalinga-Apayao, Isabela at sa Cagayan. Ang aking ginagamit na wika ay Pilipino. Gayon din naman sa lahat ng pagpunta ko rito, hindi lamang ako minsang pinalakpakan, bagkus maraming beses. Masasabi nating hindi sila puwedeng pumalampak nang hindi nila nauunawaan ang aking sinasabi. Sa lahat ng kumbensiyon ng regional chapter ng Kilusang Magbubukid ng Pilipinas, Pilipino ang aking ginagamit at nauunawaan nila ako. Nagkaroon kami ng kumbensiyon noong July 24, 25, 26 and 27, kung saan mula sa kinatawan ng Luzon, Bisaya at Mindanao ay ginamit namin ang wikang Pilipino at nagkaunawaan kami. Sa lahat ng regional council na pagpupulong namin, ang ginagamit na wika ay ang Pilipino.

Naiintindihan ko ang sinasabi ni Commissioner Davide na sa kaniyang pakikipag-usap ang ginagamit niyang salita ay wikang English. Tinatanggap ko iyan. Sa sampu, maaaring nangyayari ang isa o 10 porsiyento, pero sinasabi

ngang "The truth is the whole." Ang kabuuan ay ang katotohanan. Tanggapin nating ang wika ng masa, mga magsasaka, manggagawa, urban poor at mga kabataan ay ang wikang Pilipino. Ang Pilipino ay hindi lamang wika ng masa. Ito ay wika rin ng middle class at ng upper class. Diyan makikita nating ito ang ginagamit na salita. Hindi na dapat pagtalunan pa ang sinasabi nating pambansang lingua franca. Tanggapin nating ang sinabi ni Jose Rizal 90 taon na ang nakaraan at ito ang isinasaad: "Ang hindi magmahal sa sariling wika ay higit pa sa hayop at malansang isda." Simula noon sa 90 years na iyan, ang wikang Pilipino ay umunlad na. Umunlad na ito sapagkat naimpluwensiyahan nito ang kanyang kapaligiran. Nagkaroon na ito ng "contact" sa iba't-ibang wika. Sinasabing ang wikang Pilipino ay maka-masa, maka-bansa, siyentipiko, hindi elitista at mapagbuklod. Kaya para sa akin, itong nakasaad dito sa committee amendment ay totoong napakahalaga. Kung ako lamang ang tatanungin ninyo, itinatanong ko sa aking sarili: Kung ang bumubuo kaya ng kapulungang ito ay pawang mga magsasaka, mga manggagawa, mga urban poor at mga kabataan at kung ang pag-uusapan ay wikang pambansang nakalagay dito sa kanilang proposed amendment, pagbubutihin kaya nila? Hindi ito magiging madugong usapin at siguradong ang pangunahing wikang pambansa ay Pilipino sapagkat ito ang wika ng masa. Pero ang nakikita ko lamang na suliranin kapag ito ay

pinag-uusapan na at nakararami ang naghaharing uri, nagdadaan sa butas ng karayom ang wikang Pilipino. Ngunit gusto ko lamang banggitin sa inyo kung ano ang pamamaraan ni Kristo sa wika. Ito ang kanyang pamamaraan:

Jesus Christ took pains first to learn how to speak Aramaic, the lowly dialect of the poor and th backward people whom he came to live with and to teach. He adopted their idioms and their accent.

*Ang ating pinakamahalagang pinag-uusapan ngayon sa seksyon sa Language ay ito: Kailangan magkaroon na tayo ng pangunahing wika at pangalawa lamang ang wikang English kaya tama ang nakalagay dito sa kanilang panukalang Provision on Language. Sinasabi nating ang wika ang kaluluwa ng bansa. Kung ang wika ang kaluluwa ng isang bansa at English ang ating gagamitin, ano ang kaluluwa ng bansang Pilipinas? Mga kasama, siyamnapung taon na ang nakaraan, para umunlad ang wikang Pilipino; kailangang gamitin natin itong medium of communication sa three branches of government: sa judiciary, sa legislative at sa executive. Gamitin natin itong medium of instruction. **The Pilipino language is in the people and in their experiences.** Kaya ako ay naninikluhod sa inyo. Ang wikang ito ay hindi ko bibitawan, pero dahil ang pinag-uusapan ngayon ay ang wikang Pilipino, bibitiwan ko na. Ano ang sinasabi ng masa? “Kaming masa, kailan man ay hindi ninyo pakikinggan pero kapag may*

hawak na kaming baril ay saka pa lang ninyo kami pakikinggan.”

PRESIDENT:

Commissioner Natividad is recognized.

NATIVIDAD:

Madam President, can I add just a few peaceful words to the words of my provincemate? I will not exacerbate the situation.

Naaalala ko na maski na sa Banal na Kasulatan ay mayroong nakatitik diyan na noong panahon ang mga tao ay nakalimutan na ang Panginoong Diyos at itinayo nila ang Tore ng Babel. Nagkasundo ang mga taong iyon na kalimutan na ang Diyos sapagkat sila ay nagkakaisa-isa na at iisa ang wika nilang ginagamit. Kaya nang mapansin ng Panginoong Diyos na gusto na Siyang lagpasan pa noong mga gumagawa ng toreng napakataas, ang ginawa ng Panginoon ay binigyan sila ng iba't ibang wika upang matapos ang kanilang paglaban sa Panginoong Diyos. Nang hindi na sila magkaunawaan sapagkat iba't iba na ang kanilang wika, hindi na natuloy ang kanilang paglaban sa Panginoong Diyos.

Kaya raw hindi tayo umuunlad ay sapagkat ang mga Pilipino ay may iba't ibang wika sa pananalangin sa Panginoong Diyos. May nananalangin sa English at sa iba pang wika. Kaya kung dumarating sa Panginoon ang panalangin natin, ang akala ng Panginoong Diyos ay mga Amerikano ang nananalangin. Kaya kapag naghuhulog ng biyaya ang Panginoong Diyos, tumutuloy sa Amerika; ang naghihirap ay ang Pilipino. (Laughter) Kaya kung ako ay magdasal

dito sa kapulungang ito ay sa Pilipino upang makarating sa Panginoong Diyos at nang malaman Niya na ang mga Pilipino ang nananalangin at humihingi ng awa at biyaya para kung magbigay Siya ng biyaya, tiyak na sa Pilipinas ang lagpak. Kaya kung puro English ang ating panalangin, sa Amerika ito mapupunta, Madam President. Kaya ako ay nagpapasalamt. Ito ang itinuturing kong pinakamalaking nagawa ng ating Con-Com – na ipahayag sa buong sambayanang Pilipino na mayroon tayong wikang pambansa. Ang wikang iyan ay Pilipino. Naging “F” ang titik “P” sa salitang Pilipino. Itinuturing kong pinakamalaking tagumpay natin ito, Madam President, na kahit tayo ay hindi halal ng bayan, itong ating Komisyonang Pansaligang-Batas ang siyang nagpahayag na sa unang pagkakataon ay tiniyak natin na mayroon tayong wikang pambansa.

Naalala ko, Ginang Pangulo, noong kami ay nasa kongreso, kami ay halal ng bayan. Nanonood ang mga Amerikano sa galeriya noong kami ay mga Congressman. Natatandaan ko na tuwing ako ay tatayo at gusto kong ipahayag ang aking damdamin, adhikain at mga pithaya ng mga kapwa ko Pilipino ito ay sinasabi ko sa wikang Pilipino. Hindi tayo ang mga kinatawan ng mga Amerikano. Tuwing magsasalita ako noon gusto kong ginagamit ang wikang sinuso ko sa dibdib ng aking magulang. Sasabihin ng mga kapatid kong mga Kinatawan noon: “He will walk out if you will not stop

speaking in the national language or wikang Pilipino.” Indeed they walked out. That is how we were divided at that time. *Nanonood po noon ang mga Amerikano. Nakikita nila na umaalis ang ibang Kinatawan kapag ang mga halal ng taong bayan na katulad ko ay nagsasalita sa sariling wika. Kung tayo naman ay nasa international conference, and lahat ng Kinatawan ng bansang Pilipinas ay pawang English ang ginagamit. Ang akala tuloy ng iba ay nasa ilalim pa tayo ng Amerikano. Minsan, nagsalita si Minister Ople sa ILO sa wikang Pilipino. Nagpalakpakan ang mga tao. Tuwang-tuwa siya noong siya ay bumaba. Sinabi niya, “Sa wakas, nakikilala na ang bansang Pilipinas na may sariling wikang Pilipino.” Ngunit noong kamayan siya, ay may nagsabi sa kanya: “We congratulate you for speaking good Spanish.” (Laughter) Hindi pala tama ang “impression” ni Commissioner Ople. Kaya ito pong ating ginagawang panukala ay huwag na nating masyadong tutulan. Pagtibayin na nating kaagad ang panukalang ito at nang magkaroon tayo ng sariling wika sapagkat maraming Pilipino ang nagtuturing na ang wika natin ay may taglay na tamis ng pulot-pukyutan. Kung ang wikang ito ay ginagamit sa pagsungkit ng puso ng isang dilag, ang wikang Pilipino ay may bulong ng pusong lihim na umiibig. Ngunit kung ang wikang Pilipino naman ay ginagamit sa pagtatanggol ng ating karapatan, pagtataguyod ng ating kapakanan, ang wikang Pilipino ay may taglay na talim at kislap ng mga sundan ng ating*

mga magulang sa paghanap ng katarungan at magandang pag-asa para sa ating bayan.

Salamat po. (Applause)

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Villacorta is recognized.

MR. VILLACORTA: *Maaari po bang tumugon ang komite? Kami ay sumusuporta sa mga sinabi ng aming kasamang sina Commissioners Tadeo at Natividad. Tunay nga na tayo lamang ang bansa sa mundo na parang ikinahihiya ang wikang pambansa. Tayo ay nagdarasal, nag-iisip, nagsusulat, nag-aaral sa isang wikang banyaga. Kasama rito sa aking tugon ang aking paghingi ng paumanhin sa buong Constitutional Commission. Noong tayo ay nagtatalo rito at hindi nagkakasundo dahil sa pagtatalakay ng usapin tungkol sa wikang pambansa, ang ating magiting na "Big Brother" na laging sumusubaybay sa atin sa gallery ay napapangiti at napapatawa na parang nililibak ang hindi pagkakaisa ng bansang Pilipinas at iyan ay isang simbulo lamang ng ating kahinaan bilang isang bansa. Tayo ay nagkakaroon ng hidwaan, ng pagkakawatak-watak at ang isang dahilan nito ay sapagkat tayo ay hindi pinagbubuklod ng isang wikang pambansa.*

Kagabi po, Madam President, ay mayroong mga katanungan ang ating mga Kasama sa Komisyon at ako ay inatasan ng komite sa Edukasyon na sagutin ang ilang mga katanungan na kailangan linawin upang magkaroon tayo ng maayos at matalinong botohan tungkol sa usapin sa wikang pambansa.

First of all, the committee reiterates its stand that there is a living *lingua franca* which we can call Filipino. According to linguists (I think we should listen to them because not one of us here is a language expert) Filipino is not based on Tagalog or Pilipino alone, but it has incorporated the contributions of other Philippine languages and dialects, as well as Spanish and English. *At dahil po rito, ibig kong ipaalam kay Commissioners Tadeo at Natividad na ang kampeon ng Pilipino, with letter "P" na si Direktor Ponciano Pineda, on behalf of the Surian ng Wikang Pambansa, ay nakiisa na rin sa mga advocates ng Filipino with an "F." At ito ay ipinahayag niya sa kanyang sulat dated August 29, 1986 na ngayon ay ipinamahagi sa Constitutional Commission. Ang sabi ni Direktor Pineda ay nakikiisa ang Surian ng Wikang Pambansa at ang mga ibang tagapagtanggol ng Pilipino upang magkaisa ang kilusan para sa pagpapaunlad ng wikang pambansa. Ito ay nangyari noong "National Language Week" na ginanap noong nakaraang buwan sa Unibersidad ng Pilipinas.*

Madam President, the committee contends that Filipino is a *lingua franca* that has evolved through the decades – spoken, especially by non-Tagalogs when they speak with their countrymen who are from other regions or language groups.

English remains the favorite language of the elite, whether Tagalog or non-Tagalog, for obvious reasons. But we are referring to the masses of our

people – the ones we came in contact with in our public hearings. They are the ones who say, “*Sain kayo maglakad tapos dini?*” instead of the purist saying “*Saan kayo magtutungo pagkatapos dito?*” But we understand what they mean when they say, “*mas guapo guid and bana ko sa bana mo*” or “*guapa kuno ang kanyang amiga*” o “*yawa kawatan pala ang soltero*” or “*huwag ka man magtapon sa road*” or “*mayroon pa ngani.*” These speakers of the lingua franca throughout the country make themselves clearly understood because consciously or unconsciously, they use words that most Filipinos can comprehend.

According to the linguists we have consulted, all Philippine languages, without exception, have the same etymological roots, grammar and syntactical structures. It is much easier for any Filipino to learn another Philippine language than to learn English or other foreign languages.

The committee would also like to point out that the resource persons we consulted were not Tagalogs only but mostly non-Tagalogs; namely, Dr. Ernesto Constantino and Dr. Consuelo Paz, who are Ilocanos; English Professor Teresita Maceda, who is a Cebuana; Dr. Bonifacio Sibayan, an Ilocano; Dr. Andrew Gonzalez, a Pampagueño; Professor Jesus Ramos, a Bicolano; and Professor Anicia del Corro, a Pampagueña. As we said, the Surian ng Wikang Pambansa sent us a letter supporting the committee proposal. As we can see from the copy that we have, it was

signed by the leadership and staff of the Surian ng Wikang Pambansa who represent all major Philippine language groups.

Madam President, I would also like to mention that our committee is composed of an Ilocano, Commissioner Bennagen; three Ilonggos, Commissioners Treñas, Gascon and Guingona; one Kapampangan, Commissioner Tan; One Maguindanao, Commissioner Uka; a Cebuana-Tagala, Commissioner Quesada; a Pangasinense, Commissioner Rosario Braid; and two Tagalogs, Commissioner Rigos and this Representation.

What we are stressing here is that consultations with non-Tagalogs have not been wanting in the process of consolidating the committee's proposal on language. We exhort our fellow Commissioners not to go by the premises of prewar times.

We would like to point out that there has been dynamism in language development in our country and several significant changes have taken place. These significant dynamic changes are the ones that we should take into account in our deliberations.

Thank you very much, Madam President.

MR. BENNAGEN: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Bennagen is recognized.

MR. BENNAGEN: Thank you, Madam President.

I would like to support the other Commissioners who have spoken in favor of making Filipino a national language and a medium of instruction. I shall draw my arguments from the provisions

that have already been approved in the Constitution and I shall mention only a few but essential provisions. We are saying that the State shall foster nationalism and, therefore, we need to have a national language in the same manner that we need a national flag and some other things that we associate ourselves with in the pursuit of national identity and national unity. We are also saying that the State shall foster creative and critical thinking; broaden scientific and technological knowledge; and develop a self-reliant and independent economy to industrialization and agricultural development. We have also said earlier that we shall have a consultative government and that people's organizations shall be protected in terms of their right to participate more fully in the democratic processes. In all of these, we need to have a unifying tool for communication which is, of course, Filipino, defined by a group of language scholars and organizations as an expanding version of Pilipino. There is an increasing body of literature which argues very well for the use of Filipino and there are studies made by the Institute of Science and Mathematics Education Development, formerly the Science Education Center of the University of the Philippines. I will mention three studies which were done after the adoption of the bilingual policy in education in 1974.

One was a study of about 40,000 secondary pupils in three regions using 800 words which are non-

technical but are used in science lessons. In that study, it was found out that of 90 percent of these words used at the level of mastery, only 1 percent had been mastered. So, we cannot expect to have scientific thinking and scientific mastery using a foreign language. Proceeding from some technological inadequacies, a study was again conducted in 1983. This was a study involving 40 students and subjects like English, science, mathematics, social studies and Pilipino. Except for Pilipino, all the mastery levels were below 50 percent. English had the mastery level of 43.8 percent; science had 36.4 percent, mathematics had 43.4 percent and social studies had 40.5 percent; Pilipino had a mastery level of 53 percent. In 1985, another study was made. The conclusion was that there seems to be an agreement that the child learns faster in a language familiar to him and that the foreign language limits and even deters the learning process. In terms of the technical problems of developing Pilipino further, I think we must learn the lessons from Malaysia and Indonesia. Within the span of 25 years, they were able to move from the adoption of Bahasa Malaysia as an official and national language for its actual use in government, commerce and industry and as a medium of instruction up to the tertiary level. I think if Malaysia and Indonesia had the political will to do it, I do not see any reason why we cannot. It is high time that we should do it.

Thank you, Madam President.

MR. OPLE:

Madam President

THE PRESIDENT:

Commissioner Ople is recognized.

MR. OPLE:

May I just say my last few words on this subject before the committee takes action on the proposed amendments. I want to thank Commissioner Natividad for making reference to an event that happened some years ago which I have already forgotten, but the records of the Philippine government will show that as a delegate to the conference of the International Labor Organization and later on president of that distinguished body, I was the first national official of this country to speak entirely in Pilipino in that international conference, and indeed the ILO conference was probably the biggest of this type because the delegations were tripartite. Government's employers and workers of all countries sent their delegations here.

Also, I want to confirm what Commissioner Natividad said. After delivering my speech entirely in Pilipino, a certain delegate from the United States walked down to my place in the conference to congratulate me on my brilliant speech "in Spanish." Of course, I had to explain to him that the speech was not in Spanish, but it was in Pilipino. *Noong panahong iyon, sinabi ni Father Chirino, isang pari na tumira at nagsulat dito sa atin may 400 taon na ang nakaraan, na ang wikang Pilipino ay higit na malambing kaysa sa Pranses, higit na matipuno kaysa sa Ingles at*

Aleman at higit na malinaw kaysa sa Latin at mabunyi na katulad ng Griyego. Samakatuwid, iyan ang dahilan kaya ang wikang Pilipino ang aking ginamit.

Madam President, as earlier pursued in the interpellations of Commissioners Tadeo, Natividad and Bennagen, at this point I would like to develop very briefly what I consider to be the major nexus between language and democracy, and language and economic development.

For the benefit of the Commission, may I recall a very strange convergence of events over 15 years that I had served in the Cabinet. Three Japanese ambassadors made their call on me during that time. Over a space of 15 years, I once asked the departing Japanese ambassadors: "What do you think of us, of our future? Can we ever be a new Japan?" And as though on signal from some invisible foe, the three Japanese ambassadors, over that the period of time, did not differ in their evaluations of us. They said:

You have the talent; you have the literacy rate; you have the potentially first-rate human resources; you have the bounty of God, both above the ground and below the ground, in natural resources. You are more fortunate than we are in that sense. But each one of them said:

Until you develop a language of your own, you will never achieve that depth of national cohesion necessary for you to

achieve real industrialization and sustained economic growth.

I could never forget that.

My friends, there is indeed that nexus between economic development and social justice. Commissioner Tadeo is right. So long as we have not developed this national language to which we now give the code name "Filipino," this, being a more liberalized and open-ended language than what it replaces, "Pilipino" with a capital "P," then the structure of society and politics will remain so skewed that the rest of the country will have to depend on a narrow broker class of English-speaking people who would have to stand between the masses of the people and their government to interpret to the people what the government is doing and to raise to the attention of government what the people are doing. The possibilities of direct dialogues of the type that we hope to institute through the various provisions of this Constitution will not be achieved until such a common bond emerges.

Therefore, the interest of economic growth and the interest of equity and justice among our people require that we take action on this committee report. The approval of a national language will be remembered down the corridors of history in the coming centuries as one of the real and enduring achievements of this Commission.

Thank you, Madam President.

MS. BRAID:

Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Rosario Braid is recognized.

MS. BRAID: May I speak on why the committee feels that we should mandate in the Constitution a national language and why should there be a need to have a medium of communication for economics, for public and business administration? Of course, the more important objective is to forge national integration. As we know, about 10 to 20 percent of the elite speak in a different language and this has further widened the disparity between the culture of the elite and that of the majority. Since economics and business transactions are in English, this has polarized even economic policies. I remember we had this problem when we discussed the Article on National Economy and Patrimony because the issues were not translated into the national language, which the majority of the people can understand.

To reinforce Commissioner Ople's statement, the children in Japan learn science and technology in their own national language at an early age. This is true in the USSR and in Australia. They are, of course, advanced in terms of productivity.

Let me quote in fine what Gunnar Myrdal says in terms of his support on why we should have a language of communication in public administration. He says:

No real emotional integration of the new nations and, therefore, no secure national 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 a European tongue and the masses speak only in their native tongue.

An elected assembly must be narrowly selective on a class basis, rather than truly representative. As long as a law or custom decrees that the language of debate be foreign, the people cannot be brought to accept responsibility for their own local and provincial affairs and community cooperation.

That democratic planning is so essential for development unless they can deal with an administration that does its speaking and planning in their own language.

So, it is important that we begin to move towards having our own national language in public, business and economic transactions, if we have to forge a nation. It is about time that we mandate this now in our Constitution.

Thank you, Madam President.

MR. ROMULO: Madam President, may I ask that Commissioner Bacani be recognized?

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Bacani is recognized.

BISHOP BACANI: Thank you.

First of all, I agree with the Commissioner that we need a national language, but I would like to ask the committee two questions. First, regarding the language used by Commissioner Tadeo, would that be Filipino?

MR. VILLACORTA: That would be more Pilipino with a “P” because he, being from Bulacan, speaks beautiful and literary Tagalog.

BISHOP BACANI: Second, the Commissioner has mentioned some phrases which were obviously not Tagalog. Is that meant to be an example of Filipino?

MR. VILLACORTA: Yes.

BISHOP BACANI: The Commissioner has mentioned some words like “*dini*” or “*bana*.”

MR. VILLACORTA: I also mentioned “*Sain ka maglakad pagkatapos dini*.” That was actually said in the public hearing in Sorsogon. Someone asked the three of us, Commissioners Tingson, Tadeo and myself, who were present at that public hearing where we were going after our stay in Sorsogon. It was stated in such a manner. Commissioners Gascon, Sarmiento and I went to Masbate and we learned that Masbateño is actually a mixture of different dialects, like Bicol, Samar, Visayan, Cebuano, Ilonggo, Tagalog and some other languages. I remember I attended a mass there and the parish priest gave his sermon in Masbateño. I understood most of it because there were many words, not just Tagalog but other words, that could be popularly understood in most parts of Luzon and Visayas. I was then thinking probably this is the future Filipino, the integration, natural, not contrived, evolution of the national language that will incorporate the different words of our languages.

BISHOP BACANI: I notice that when the Commissioner was speaking, I could understand the words but I

could not easily get the sense. That is the reason I ask these two main questions: Is the language of Commissioner Tadeo Filipino? Were those phrases mentioned by Commissioner Villacorta meant to be Filipino? Let us have a national language which is Filipino. Thus, it will be either of these two. In other words, is Filipino not yet an existent national language? Is it a language that is still to be formed?

MR. VILLACORTA: It is an existent national language and the nucleus is Pilipino with "P." The contemplation of the committee is that the nucleus is still Pilipino because it is already a widespread existing language – Pilipino with a "P." We also said that there is an existent broadened, expanded language called Filipino and its formalization has to be done in the educational system and others, but it does not mean that since it is not yet formalized, it is non-existent. It is a *lingua franca*.

BISHOP BACANI: So when say the national language of the Philippines is Pilipino, are we not saying that the national language of the Philippines is the language spoken by Commissioner Tadeo?

MR. VILLACORTA: It is part of that national language. Commissioner Bennagen, who is an anthropologist, will be able to expound on this issue.

MR. BENNAGEN: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Bennagen is recognized.

MR. BENNAGEN: There seems to be an assumption that a language comes fully blown at a particular point in time. That is not the case. I think even we, who speak

our own native language, cannot pinpoint a specific period in history when it emerged full-blown. So we should look at language as a growing organism and that it grows in at least two identifiable ways: First, it is unplanned – that which is used in everyday life by people of all sorts with different first languages who come into contact with each other. Second, through a planned manner which we hope should be mandated by this Constitution. For instance, in 1957, the people of Malaysia decided to have Bahasa Malaysia as their national language. They undertook a great deal of studies. But it was only sometime in 1972 or around 1973 when they had to systematize the spelling. In 1973, it finally became the medium of instruction up to the tertiary level although it was already being used in government, in commerce and in industry. So we should look at Filipino as a growing language which partakes of the various languages, some of which are already being manifested in the discussions on the floor. For instance, if I go to Mindanao, as in fact I did in early April, a language that you would call Filipino would rely on Tagalog and partly on Cebuano and English. A language that one would speak in the North would partake of other languages and these have to be codified in a planned manner to accelerate and facilitate the growth of this emerging language. That is why we say that in the proposal it should be further developed on the basis of

Philippine and other languages and that steps shall be taken by the government, etcetera, to accelerate this law.

BISHOP BACANI: Thank you very much for the clarifications.

MR. COLAYCO: Madam President, may I ask the committee a question?

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Colayco is recognized.

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

I understand that the committee distinguishes the words Pilipino with a “P” and Filipino with an “F.” Is that correct?

MR. VILLACORTA: Yes, Madam President.

MR. COLAYCO: I am confused about the meaning of the two. What is “Pilipino” and what is “Filipino”?

MR. VILLACORTA: “Filipino” with an “F” is an expansion of Pilipino. It is the name for the *lingua franca* that has naturally evolved throughout the country. It is not purely based on Tagalog. It has incorporated words from other Philippine languages and dialects as well as from English and Spanish.

MR. BENNAGEN: Madam President.

MR. COLAYCO: May I finish, please?

The Commissioner’s own recommendation is that the language should evolve not only from Tagalog but also from all the rest of our spoken dialects.

MR. VILLACORTA: Yes, Madam President.

MR. COLAYCO: Does not the Commissioner think that it would be more historically correct to use “Filipino” because it comes from “Filipinas” which comes from “Felipe”?

MR. VILLACORTA: Exactly, we are for F.

- MR. COLAYCO: Precisely. So, I can not use the term “Pilipino” and just refer to our national language as “Filipino,” whether it is broken Tagalog or otherwise.
- MR. BENNAGEN: “Filipino,” yes.
- MR. VILLACORTA: That is our proposal, Madam President.
- MR. COLAYCO: My proposal is to use the term “Filipino” only because that is the correct term historically.
- MR. BENNAGEN: We are using “Filipino.”
- MR. VILLACORTA: With an “F,” Madam President.
- MR. COLAYCO: So, we are going to discard “Pilipino.”
- MR. BENNAGEN: Yes.
- MR. VILLACORTA: We are discarding “Pilipino.”
- MR. COLAYCO: It sounds “pilipit,” if we use “Pilipino.” So, we are now retaining “Filipino” officially.
- MR. BENNAGEN: Yes.
- MR. VILLACORTA: That is right, Madam President.
- MR. COLAYCO: Thank you.
- MR. BENNAGEN: Madam President, just a little footnote to the comment of Commissioner Colayco. There is one other reason why the shift was made from “P” to “F” because “Pilipino,” as officially evolved, was used to refer to an improvement of Tagalog; it is really Tagalog-based. Then, eventually, it said that Tagalog, of course, has no letter F, and to reflect this expansion, this liberal move towards the adoption of other languages into an emerging national lingua franca, maybe it should be “F” instead of “P.” That is really the immediate reason for this. Incidentally, I would like to quote from the

position paper sent to us by the executive council of the Language Education Council of the Philippines, which is made up of 12 organizations of language scholars.

We accept that the national language be called “Filipino” with an “F” instead of “Pilipino” with a “P” with the meaning that Filipino is the expanding and spreading Pilipino because that is what is really happening now in the elaboration and intellectualization of our national language especially from the other debates that have to do with intellectualization and elaboration.

I think that is a very strong support for the adoption of “Filipino” not only as a language of instruction. These are scholars that are indeed active in the advancement of Filipino as a national language.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chairman.

MR. VILLACORTA: Yes, Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Yesterday there was a new formulation of the first sentence, I believe, of Section 1. Is that still the statement that will be submitted to a vote? Is it the one that was read yesterday by Commissioner Davide?

MR. VILLACORTA: Commissioner Rigos will reply to that, Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Rigos is recognized.

REV. RIGOS: Madam President, last night, it was agreed that

we would sleep over this. After the session, the committee had a brief meeting. We felt that since there was really no substantial difference between the proposal of Commissioner Davide and the formulation of the committee, we would rather stick to the committee recommendation, copies of which were distributed earlier. So the committee is quite divided on the Davide proposal and, therefore, the consensus was that we would stick to the committee recommendation.

THE PRESIDENT: Is Commissioner Rigos referring to the committee report on this colored paper?

REV. RIGOS: Yes, Madam President.

MR. ROMULO: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Acting Floor Leader is recognized.

MR. ROMULO: I ask that Commissioner Aquino be recognized.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Aquino is recognized.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, I fully support the committee recommendation on the adoption of Filipino as the national language. However, I requested for this chance because I differ with the perception of Commissioner Tadeo when he presented an analysis on the underdevelopment of Filipino as a national language. He said that the reason for the underdevelopment of Filipino as a national language is the indecision of government to adopt a policy to use Filipino as the medium of instruction. I would submit that it is not so much that as it is actually the undercurrent of the historical baggage which was decisively and unjustly imposed upon us by the Spaniards who

in their policy of “divide and rule” thought that the Filipinos were not worthy of learning Spanish. In fact, the linguistic policy of the Spaniards is still very much felt today. We have the rare spectacle of the same people, the Tagalogs and the Pampangos, living within the Tambobong area near Baliwag, Bulacan, and divided only by a bamboo fence, speaking different and distinct dialects. This is the kind of policy that was pursued by the Spaniards. In fact, it was described by scholars as linguistic anarchy, which presented a problem for the spread of Catholicism. The Spaniards were confronted with a dilemma because the teaching of Catholicism required a certain measure of intellectuality and understanding of fundamental precepts which would require, likewise, a certain measure of literacy. So the Spaniards had to decide. Do we teach the Filipinos Spanish or do we allow them to use their own dialects? They decided on the latter option.

It was because here in the Philippines they were not confronted by the elaborate, sophisticated and dazzling cultures of the Aztecs and the Incas the way they were confronted in Latin America. Instead, what they saw here was the vestigial influences of the Shrivijaya and the Madjapahit Empire, a culture which was unable to imbed its influences on the Filipino psyche. What they saw was a Filipino people divided in terms of their cultural moorings and cultural traction. So, at

that moment, they did not see the need to teach Spanish to the Filipinos the way they saw it in Latin America. They did not feel threatened by a unified people bounded by one culture.

This is the kind of historical baggage that has to be addressed decisively and this is where the indecision of government policy in terms of correcting this historical injustice becomes an imperative. In the context of this perception, this is where we see the need for a policy that is not ambivalent and hermaphroditic, rather, a policy that addresses itself to the necessity of imposing Filipino as a medium of instruction. We cannot wait for the impossible day when the Institute of National Language, for example, will come up with a pronouncement that they have devised a language that will best suit the tempers and the aspirations of Filipinos. The development of the language is not the task of scholars and researchers. Language is a developmental process. We have to learn to accept that it takes years or even decades for language to see its full fruition in the way of Bahasa Indonesia. We cannot also wait for the impossible day when an institute or a university will tell us that they have already designed Filipino. It is not the function of a university or an institution because it does not have the means or the power to act as some kind of a midwife to a vibrant language. The law of language is the law of adaptation and growth. The law of growth can apply to English. English was

for a time severely restricted even before the scholars and the writers like Hume and Milton used it to express their profound thoughts; Japanese was severely restricted even before Admiral Perry brought to Japan the influence of the West; Bahasa Indonesia had the same problem before the Indonesians compelled themselves to adopt Bahasa Indonesia. If the same law of growth can apply to these languages, it can also apply to Filipino, but it requires a definitive and decisive policy on the matter.

MR. ROMULO: Madam President, I ask that Commissioner Rama be recognized for his amendment.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Rama is recognized.

MR. RAMA: Madam President, we are in the period of amendments and we have here which was formulated by several groups belonging to different linguistic areas. The amendment, strictly speaking, if we follow the Rules, would be an amendment to an amendment which was already presented by Commissioner Davide. The amendment simply says: "Section 1. The national language of the Philippines is Filipino, with an 'F'." And then we would like to delete the rest of the sentences from line 2 to line 10.

May I ask Commissioner Davide if he accepts the amendment to his amendment?

MR. DAVIDE: Madam President, may I hear first the proposed amendment? By the way, yesterday the committee had already accepted my proposed amendment as borne out by the Journal, but a few minutes

ago, Commissioner Rigos stated that the committee would stick to its original proposal. Does it mean that the committee has changed its position?

REV. RIGOS: Yes, Madam President.

MR. DAVIDE: So, I am ready to accommodate amendments to my proposal. May we hear further the proposal of Commissioner Rama?

MR. RAMA: The amendment simply reads: "Section 1. The national language of the Philippines is Filipino." And we request the rest of the section to be deleted.

THE PRESIDENT: But Commissioner Rama has additional words.

MR. RAMA: There are additional words but there is a request from the committee that first we vote.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, we would just like to point out that what the Rama proposal did was to break up the first sentence of the committee proposal into two sentences.

MR. RAMA: Yes. By the way, there is a second sentence, Madam President.

MR. DAVIDE: May I request Commissioner Rama to read the entire substitute proposal.

THE PRESIDENT: The entire Section 1, yes.

MR. RAMA: Madam President, I am sorry. The proposal reads: "Section 1. 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." That is the end of Section 1.

MR. DAVIDE: Before accepting or rejecting the proposal, I seek some clarification. When the Gentleman states “ON THE BASIS OF THE EXISTING PHILIPPINE AND OTHER LANGUAGES,” does he refer to the native or regional languages as the Philippine languages?

MR. RAMA: Yes, Madam President.

MR. DAVIDE: And other languages may refer to foreign languages?

MR. DAVIDE: If that is so, I am happy to accept the proposed amendment.

MR. RAMA: May I know what is the thinking of the committee with respect to this amendment?

MR. VILLACORTA: These first two sentences of Section 1 are acceptable to the committee. However, we do not approve the deletion of the rest of the sentences in the committee proposal, so we would like to request the proponent to ask for a voting only of these first two sentences in the Rama proposal and grant the committee the right to submit for voting the rest of the sentences in the committee’s Section 1.

THE PRESIDENT: We understand from lines 3 to 10.

MR. VILLACORTA: That is right, Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Would the committee keep those sentences there?

MR. VILLACORTA: Yes, Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Rodrigo is recognized.

MR. RODRIGO: *Ginang Pangulo, puwede po bang magsalita bilang pagkatig sa susog na ito ni Commissioner Rama? Nais kong ilagay sa Rekord and aking pagkaintindi sa salitang Filipino – “F” ang unang letra. Ang*

unang mahalagang malaman natin ay itong “Filipino” ay hindi isang bagong kinatha o kakathaing lenggwage. Ito ay batay sa “Pilipino.” Palalawakin lamang natin ang saklaw ng “Filipino.” Ang “Pilipino” naman, with a “P,” saan nanggagaling iyan? Noong 1935, sa ating Saligang Batas ay ipinag-utos:

The Congress shall take steps towards the development and adoption of a common national language based on one of the existing native languages.

Iyan ay nagkaroon ng implementasyon at ang pinagbabatayan ay ang Tagalog. Kaya nga’t ang “Pilipino” ay batay sa Tagalog at ang “Filipino” ay batay sa “Pilipino.” Kayat hindi natin buburahin ang mga nakamtan na nating mga developments sa “Pilipino.” Ngayon, ano ang nangyari roon sa “Pilipino”? Bakit tinalikdan iyang “Pilipino” at ginawang “Filipino”? Palagay ko, ang isang dahilan ay sapagkat noong nagkaroon ng Surian ng Wikang Pambansa na pinamunuan ng nasirang Lope K. Santos, sumalangit nawa siya, ang kanyang sinunod na patakaran ay yaong tinatawag na purismo. Mayroon tayong maraming salita sa wikang Tagalog, Cebuano, Hiligaynon, Ilokano, Bikolano na hango sa wikang Kastila. Mula sa 6,000 hanggang 10,000 mga salita ang hango sa wikang Kastila – libro, mikropono, sapatos, pantalon, bintana, silya – nguni’t ang ginawang patakaran ng Surian ay purismo. Umimbento ng mga bagong salita. Halimbawa, kapag sinabi mong “gramatika”

ay maiintindihan na ng lahat, maging ng mga Tagalog, Cebuano, Ilokano o Bikolano. Pero ang Surian ay kumatha o umimbento ng bagong salita – “balarila.” Iyong salitang “diksiyonaryo” ay alam na ng lahat ngunit muling kumatha ng bago – “talatinigan bokabularyo” – alam na ng lahat, pero kumatha ng “talasalitaan.” Kaya’t may nagsabi na iyon daw silya ay ginawang “salumpuwit.” Mga kaibigan, noong ako ay nasa Senado at araw ni Balagtas, Abril 2, ako ay nagtalumpati on a privilege speech at binatikos ko iyong purismo. Ang sabi ko ay hinirapan natin ang wikang Tagalog maging para sa Tagalog. Ako ay sumusulat sa Tagalog; tumutula pa ako kung minsan sa Tagalog. Ngunit alam ba ninyo na iyong aking mga apo ay natulungan ko sa homework nila sa arithmetic at history pero hindi ko matulungan sa wikang pambansa o national language? Napakaraming bagong mga salita na ni ako ay hindi ko naiintindihan. Kaya noong ako ay nagtalumpati, sinabi kong pati iyong “silya” ay gusto pang gawing “salumpuwit.” Nais kong liwanagin naman, Ginang Pangulo, na hindi galing kay Lope K. Santos iyan. Iyan ay katha ng ibang tao. Noong nag-recess kami sa Senado, lumapit sa akin si Don Claro Recto. Alam ninyo medyo pilyo iyang si Recto. Sabi sa akin, “Hoy, Soc, binabati kita. Mayroon lang akong itatanong sa iyo.” “Ano ho iyon?” wika ko. Ang sabi niya, “kung ‘yong ‘silya’ ay ‘salumpuwit,’ iyong ‘bra’ ng mga babae ay salong ano?” (Laughter)

Minsan naman, sinabi ni Raul Manglapus, “Hindi ba iyong telegrama ay gusto pang gawing ‘papatid-kawad?’” “Oo,” wika ko. Sabi niya, “Eh, iyong ‘wireless’ ay ano?” “Aba, eh, siyanga pala,” ang wika ko; sabi ni Raul, “Siguro iyon ay papatid-kawad-na-walang-kawad.” (Laughter)

Kaya nga naantala ang paglaganap ng ating wika. Natakot ang mga estudyante. Kahit ang mga Tagalog ay natakot. Kaya nga iyan ang isang dahilan kung bakit ginawang “Filipino.” Ako ay nagagalak sapagkat akalain ba ninyong inalis iyong napakaraming letra sa ating alphabet. Inalis ang letters “c,” “f,” “j,” “q,” “y” at “x.” Kawawa naman ako. Ako ay Francisco, nawala iyong “f,” iyong “c” ay magiging “k,” kaya ako ay “Prankisko.” (Laughter) May nagsabi pa sa akin, kung ang lahat ng “c” ay magiging “k,” iyong “Cecilio” ay ano? Di ‘Kekilyo,’ wika niya. (Laughter)

Kaya’t ako ay kumakatig na ang ating gawing wikang pambansa ay ang Filipino. Marami pong salamat at ako ay lumabis ng dalawang minuto sa tatlong minutong toka sa akin.

Salamat po.

THE PRESIDENT: *Salamat po.*

MR. RAMA: Madam President.

MR. TINGSON: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Tingson is recognized.

MR. TINGSON: May I speak as an Ilonggo, Madam President, to support the amendment using the word “Filipino.”

THE PRESIDENT: Please proceed.

MR. TINGSON: Commissioner Rama wants to speak first, and I cannot disobey his request. I yield to wait, Madam President.

MR. RAMA: Madam President, I think I owe the body an explanation as to why I am deleting the rest of the sentences. The reason for this is that the issue of language and the selection of the national language in a country like ours which has several languages is a very emotional one. I remember that there was almost bloodshed in the Constitutional Convention of 1971 because of this issue. In other countries this has triggered revolutions. It is really very emotional. My premises and the plea that I am making now are a plea for sobriety on a nationally charged issue. We have certain premises here for this amendment, Madam President. The first premise is that whether we like or not, a nation should have a national language. That is why we started with the premise that the national language of the Philippines is Filipino. There are other realities, Madam President. The other reality is that there are millions of Filipinos who cannot speak Filipino, whether we like it or not. The other premise is the headstart that Filipino has gained and the advantages that have been obtained by its cultivation as a language which was enshrined in the 1935 and 1973 Constitutions. Whether we like it or not, Filipino will be the only language in the future for the Philippines. Inexorable is the march of Filipino.

So, we must realize that.

On the other hand, there are realities which we cannot ignore – the reality of the difficulties that could be inflicted upon the people, if we rush this acceptance or this imposition of Filipino as the national language. For instance, if we require that the medium of instruction be Filipino, that would impose a constitutional handicap on non-Tagalog speaking students. They would need to cope with a language that they cannot understand in learning the basics of education. That would be a handicap to them, and it is unfair. My point is that this can be done later because it is a fact now that the Cebuanos are learning more and more Filipino or Tagalog for the simple reason that it is there already; it has a headstart of 50 years and the Cebuanos, I think, are reconciled to the fact that Cebuano, although we contend more Filipinos speak Cebuano, cannot at this stage become the Filipino language. But we are seeking understanding, and I thought that the unity of the Philippines or the Filipinos is more important than the language issue that we are now discussing.

MR. TINGSON: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Tingson is recognized.

MR. TINGSON: Likewise, may I add something positive for I also believe that the issue of language should not be divisive. It should really unite us. *Alam ninyo, mahal na Presidente, pinipilit po naming mga Ilonggo ngayon na mag-Tagalog o magsalita sa ating wikang pambansa.* Sometimes we hesitate to do that in

Manila because the purists laugh at us. But we are happy to hear here that we are now wanting to refer to Filipino *sa isang salita po, at halu-halo ang pinakamagandang palabra* from Tagalog, Ilonggo, Cebuano and Ilokano. And this is beautiful.

Alam ninyo, mahal na President, sa amin po ay mayroong palabra for "heart," which is more romantic than the Tagalog pure word. *Ang ginagamit po ninyo rito ay "puso"; sa amin po,* I would say "amen" to this. Let us use the more romantic word "*kasing-kasing*" which the wife of Commissioner Romulo, I am sure, must be using when she refers to her love for him, she being an Ilonggo. *Ang ibig po naming sabihin ay mukhang maganda yata if we express it like "irog ng buhay ko," "Inday na mahal ng buhay ko, iniibig kita sa tanan ko nga kasing-kasing."* It really would sound very romantic, Madam President. And I would support this particular amendment to the extent of deleting the other sentence which reads: "Steps shall be taken by the government to further develop, enrich and use it as a medium of communication in all branches of government and as the language of instruction at all levels of the educational system."

Madam President, I submit that it is already understood if we approve the first sentence which says that "the national language shall be maintained as a second language and as an alternative medium of instruction until otherwise provided by law."

I submit, Madam President, that those are all really understood if we will be doing this. And may I close by saying that we have a prayer in Ilonggo. But if I would put it in Filipino, it will be: *“Panginoon, bigyan ngayon may kailangan kay amo ining mga Filipinos ang aming bayan ngayon may kailangan nga sadsaran.”*

How beautiful that is, Madam President. That is Filipino.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Villacorta is recognized.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, just a reaction of the committee. First of all, we would like to express our appreciation to Commissioner Tingson. He has just demonstrated what Filipino is all about. But using his words: *“Nagahimo kami sa mga Commissioners na hinigugma ang katarungan.”* We want justice for the committee. I do not think there is this threat of bloodshed that we found in the 1971 Constitutional Convention. Basically, the Rama proposal is for the first two sentences of Section 1, which is the formulation of the committee. We will grant the credit to Commissioner Rama that this is his brainchild. Let the record show that. So, there is unity. What are we afraid of? Why do we want to delete these sentences of lines 3 to 10? If we must lose, let us lose honorably.

MR. RAMA: Yes.

MR. VILLACORTA: Give us the chance to argue this case, to have a vote on this and if we lose, we lose. *Pero bigyan*

ninyo naman kami ng esperanza. Hindi lamang iyong esperanza party ang may esperanza, para naman pagkatapos ng Constitution ay makatulong din kami sa pag-campaign for its ratification; hindi iyong masama ang loob namin dahil hindi ninyo kami binigyan ng esperanza na mapagbotohan iyong pinaghirapan namin sa loob ng ilang buwan. Pinag-aaralan din naman namin itong lines 3 to 10.

MR. RAMA:

I think the Gentleman is under the misimpression that just because I asked for a deletion of these words or sentences, he will not be allowed to argue. Precisely, he will have his full say about why he is in favor or why this should be retained. So may I wind up, as I meant to, before I was joyfully interrupted by Commissioner Tingson, that the point is that all these objectives and aims of the committee will be achieved in the future? I already see it in Cebu which is the most chauvinistic of our linguistic groups. The young people there are learning Filipino. These aims will be achieved, but we cannot rush this thing. And as to the concern of Commissioner Aquino, I would tell her that the objective is already being achieved and it is not necessary for us to court an upheaval regarding this language because we realize that there must be a Filipino language.

MR. MONSOD:

Madam President, parliamentary inquiry.

THE PRESIDENT:

Commissioner Monsod is recognized.

MR. MONSOD:

I believe the issues have been joined. The committee has already said that it would prefer

to vote on the first two sentences and then tackle the issue of the next three sentences. So, may we have the vote now on the first two sentences, Madam President?

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Aquino is recognized.

MS. AQUINO: Subject to the Chair's ruling on that motion, I would like to speak against the motion to delete lines 3 to 10, but I would submit to the ruling on the first motion.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Aquino may proceed on her argument.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President, I would like to speak against the deletion of lines 3 to 10. I think that the arguments being presented are very sensible. In fact, they have their own historical moorings, but for the moment they may already seem to be very superficial.

Language is the process of growth and its development, even under the best and the most ideal circumstances, takes time. It even takes decades. We have to learn to accept that truth and in accepting that truth, we should not lose time in adopting and using one language as the medium of instruction whatever are its imperfections; that is, if we are agreed that we want to adopt our own instead of eschewing our own and embracing something which is alien. Otherwise, if we cannot agree on that, we might as well cease all of these hypocrisies and adopt English as the medium of instruction. The only limitation to that, however, is that we have already lost time, and we will cut a

pathetic figure if at this moment we will make that atavistic move in adopting a foreign language instead of adopting Filipino.

MR. RAMA:

Madam President, may I now read my proposal which, as the committee has asked, is to be voted on: "Section 1. The national language of the Philippines is Filipino."

There is a small amendment presented by Commissioner Bernas which is a matter of form. Instead of "IT SHALL EVOLVE," it shall read: "IT SHALL BE ALLOWED TO EVOLVE AND BE FURTHER DEVELOPED AN ENRICHED ON THE BASIS OF THE EXISTING PHILIPPINE AND OTHER LANGUAGES."

MR. SARMIENTO: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Sarmiento is recognized.

MR. SARMIENTO: Before we vote, may I just say a few words? Asking the kind indulgence of the body last night, I objected to the committee's formulation. I insisted that we use the words "SHALL BE" instead of "IS." So, Madam President, may I retract my previous stand and support th committee's formulation. I did not elaborate my position; all the things were stated by my colleagues. All dynamic lingua francas are evolving and this is true of Filipino. So, I am supporting the committee's formulation.

REV. RIGOS: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Rigos is recognized.

REV. RIGOS: I think Commissioner Monsod was suggesting that we first vote on these first two sentences, as

amended by Commissioner Bernas, without prejudice to further discussion of lines 3 to 10 regarding the use of the language as a medium of instruction. So, the committee is prepared to vote on this.

THE PRESIDENT: This proposed amendment of Commission Rama and the others would actually be a substitution of the committee's formulation of Section 1.

REV. RIGOS: That is right, Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: In other words, this will just be the sentences to compose Section 1, according to Commissioner Rama. Is that not correct, Commissioner Rama?

MR. RAMA: And which was accepted by the committee.

THE PRESIDENT: No, can we just have this clarified because that will affect the voting? Is this only a substitution of the first sentence of Section 1?

MR. RAMA: The amendment in full will read: "Section 1. 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."

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, the committee is not accepting "IT SHALL BE EVOLVED" because that is watering down the intention. Who will allow the evolution? Why do we have to say "SHALL BE ALLOWED TO EVOLVE"?

FR. BERNAS: Madam President, actually my proposed amendment was to delete the word "EVOLVE" because one does not legislate evolution.

Evolution just happens. When one says “it shall evolve,” he is just making a statement that in the natural course of things it shall evolve. But what one really wants to do is more than just allowing it to evolve or more than just watch it in its natural evolution but rather help it in its evolution.

THE PRESIDENT: So, how is it to be formulated?

FR. BERNAS: My proposed amendment would be just to drop the word “EVOLVE.”

THE PRESIDENT: How is it?

FR. BERNAS: “IT SHALL BE FURTHER DEVELOPED...”

MR. OPLE: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Ople is recognized.

MR. OPLE: May I be allowed a brief comment concerning this? I think the word “EVOLVE” should be retained. It is a recognition of the fact that the people themselves have the right to shape their own language as they choose freely, outside any framework of law or a constitution; we merely acknowledge that by saying that “IT SHALL EVOLVE.”

But, then, there is a volitional content immediately after that which is “BE FURTHER DEVELOPED AND ENRICHED ON THE BASIS OF THE EXISTING PHILIPPINE AND OTHER LANGUAGES.” So, there is an acknowledgment of a historical fact that languages do evolve in what economists call “the free marketplace of ideas.” The transactions are not hindered but, at the same time, a law must be utilized to further develop these languages. That

is why, later on, we call for a language commission that will represent the use of state power in order to assist in the evolution and bring about the further development and enrichment of this language. So, may I support the retention of the word "EVOLVE" in its present form, which, in fairness to the formulation, does not detract from the original formulation of the committee. I do not want Chairman Villacorta to harbor any thought that the committee had been deprived of any credit. As restyled, this is essentially the same formulation as that of the committee.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, we were protesting the words "IT SHALL BE ALLOWED TO EVOLVE." We were in favor of "IT SHALL EVOLVE."

MR. OPLE: I also support the committee's position on that matter.

MR. RAMA: I accept the committee's position, so we delete the words "BE ALLOWED TO" which is the Bernas proposal. Therefore, I insist that we take a vote on this.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but I want a clarification, Mr. Chairman. The committee accepted the formulation of Commissioner Rama. Does the Chair understand that with the acceptance of this, the committee is foregoing lines 3 to 10?

MR. VILLACORTA: No, Madam President, on the contrary.

THE PRESIDENT: That is clear then.

MR. SARMIENTO: Madam President, may I make a humble suggestion. May I suggest that we vote on the first line before voting on the second line. We

have done this in the past. There are comments on the second sentence; like, for instance, I heard a comment that we should delete the word “EVOLVE” and adopt the original.

VOTING

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any objection? (Silence) The Chair hears none; we will proceed as suggested.

As many as are in favor of the first line of Section 1 of the Rama amendment, please raise their hand. (Several Members raise their hands.)

As many as are against, please raises their hand. (No Member raises his hand.)

The results show 43 votes in favor and none against; the first sentence is approved. (Applause)

MR. AZCUNA: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: May we request our guests at the gallery to please refrain from applauding or making any other demonstration.

MR. RAMA: Madam President, the second sentence reads: “IT SHALL EVOLVE AND BE FURTHER DEVELOPED AND ENRICHED ON THE BASIS OF THE EXISTING PHILIPPINE AND OTHER LANGUAGES.”

MR. AZCUNA: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Azcuna is recognized.

MR. AZCUNA: I propose that instead of “IT SHALL EVOLVE,” we use the words “AS IT EVOLVES, IT SHALL BE FURTHER DEVELOPED.”

THE PRESIDENT: How is that, Commissioner Rama?

MR. RAMA: I accept the amendment, Madam President.

MR. VILLACORTA: The committee accepts.

MR. AZCUNA: Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any objection?

MR. SUAREZ: Madam President, may we be recognized?

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Suarez is recognized.

MR. SUAREZ: Thank you.

May we clarify a point with the honorable Rama?

THE PRESIDENT: Please proceed.

MR. SUAREZ: Thank you, Madam President.

Commissioner Rama uses the word "EVOLVES" as distinguished from "DEVELOPED" and "ENRICHED." Can he tell the Commissioners the significance, the thrust and the meaning of the word "EVOLVES" as compared with the words "DEVELOPED" and "ENRICHED"?

MR. RAMA: I should like to answer Commissioner Suarez. I have my answer, but this word came from Commissioner Ople, and I would not like to preempt the explanation of Commissioner Ople.

MR. OPLE: Madam President, in the first place, I think Commissioner Rama has already accepted a proposed amendment of Commissioner Azcuna, and I believe the committee has similarly accepted this new proposal, so that instead of saying "IT SHALL EVOLVE," the new phrase is "AS IT EVOLVES." This is just an acknowledgment of the historical fact that languages do evolve independently of what lawmakers say. It is a kind of recognition of the point very often made by

others who do not believe in State intervention on the matter that a language is something organic that evolves according to the people's own preferences. But as now stated, I think any kind of controversial tinge is eliminated by the Azcuna amendment; and Father Bernas is himself accommodated in the sense that the amendment now reads: "AS IT EVOLVES, IT SHALL BE FURTHER DEVELOPED AND ENRICHED ON THE BASIS OF EXISTING PHILIPPINE AND OTHER LANGUAGES."

Thank you.

MR. SUAREZ: Madam President, we are seeking clarification precisely because of the impression that the expression "EVOLVES" may convey, because the first sentence is a declarative positive statement. It already states here that the national language of the Philippines is Filipino. That means it has already evolved as a national language.

MR. BENNAGEN: Yes, but still growing.

MR. SUAREZ: So, I agree with the Gentleman that it is still in the process of evolution in the Darwinian concept.

MR. OPLE: Yes.

MR. SUAREZ: I would just like to clear up that matter.

MR. OPLE: Yes, it is a Darwinian concept – evolution, natural selection. And in the process, if the Pampango language succeeds in contributing a disproportionate volume of words into this evolving Filipino language, then that will be a tribute to the Pampangueños who, in any case, representing only three percent of the Philippine

population, are already disproportionately represented in the arts, letters, journalism and in all the creative branches.

THE PRESIDENT: Is Commissioner Suarez already satisfied?

MR. SUAREZ: Yes, I am satisfied. Thank you for the clarification.

MR. RAMA: May I read the sentence again, Madam President, as amended by Commissioner Azcuna and accepted by the Committee: "AS IT EVOLVES, IT SHALL BE FURTHER DEVELOPED AND ENRICHED ON THE BASIS OF EXISTING PHILIPPINE AND OTHER LANGUAGES."

VOTING

THE PRESIDENT: As many as are in favor of the second sentence, please raise their hand. (Several Members raise their hands.)

As many as are against, please raise their hand. (No Member raises his hand.)

Is Commissioner Davide voting Against? Just to clarify.

MR. DAVIDE: In favor.

THE PRESIDENT: The results show 44 votes in favor and none against; the sentence is approved.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, may we request a voting of the continuation of Section 1 from lines 3 to 10. May the committee support the position manifested by Commissioner Aquino that in the development of the national language, our approach must not be hermaphroditic, which was the case in the past. There was this half-hearted intention to develop

the national language. And as a result of that, we have a case of an arrested development of Pilipino and Filipino in the 1973 Constitution.

The reason, Madam President, the committee feels that steps should be taken by the government to use “Filipino” as a medium of official communication and as a language of instruction is that as borne out by the experiences of other countries, as well as of our own country, a national language is useless if it is not used as the language of instruction and a language of official communication. Moreover, as the materials that we distributed to the body show, a small percentage of our population has mastered the English language. Science and technology, which are usually transmitted in the English language, do not manage to reach the masses of our people who remain semiliterate and ignorant about scientific concepts, skills and principles, and this has adversely affected the economic and social development of our people.

That is why, Madam President, we thought that we should stipulate clearly in the Constitution that resolute steps shall be taken by the government. Anyway, this is stated in the future tense and it does not really require the government to immediately implement it. Moreover, for those who are worried about the status of English, it says here that English shall be maintained as a second language because we, in the committee, still acknowledge the fact that the English

language is our bridge to the outside world and it must not be shelved as a second language. And it also says here in our proposal that English shall remain as an alternative medium of instruction. In addition to English, regional languages shall serve as auxiliary media of instruction in their respective regions. This is in recognition of the importance of developing our regional languages which have their own historical and rich literature that is worth preserving. And we know also that the language that is closest to the heart of any individual is that which is most effective in transmitting knowledge.

That is why, Madam President, with this guideline, the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports can come up with a scheme in which the regional languages will be more extensively used in the lower levels of education.

FR. BERNAS: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: I would just like to propose a question to the committee. Will the committee agree that we take these different sentences separately? Let us say lines 3 to 6 or all of them would be taken as a whole.

MR. RAMA: Madam President, there is an anterior motion starting from line 3 – delete all the words beginning with “steps shall be taken” up to the end of this section which is on line 10. The motion to delete is the parliamentary situation.

MS. QUESADA: Madam President.

FR. BERNAS: Madam President.

MS. QUESADA:

Bago kami nagbotohan, ang pagkaintindi ng aming komite ay tatalakayin pa iyong mga susunod na pangungusap dahil batay doon sa mga paliwanag kangina malinaw na kinakailangan ang pagsasakatuparan ng ating mga paniniwala. Iyong line 1, 2 at 3 ay mga intention na hangga't hindi sinasa-kongkreto sa pamamagitan ng paggamit nito sa instruction at sa gobyerno ay talagang empty rhetorics na naman iyan dahil iyan ang istorya noong mga nakaraang taon. Narcon na iyon sa ating Konstitusyon, pero hangga't hindi isinasagawa ito sa ating ordinaryong araw-araw na buhay, sa loob ng gobyerno, sa administrasyon at saka sa ating edukasyon, sa palagay ko lahat ng iyan ay rhetorics na naman. Kaya ang appeal talaga namin sa body ngayon ay kung dadaanin na naman ito sa botohan, hindi na natin mailalaman ulit dito sa ating Konstitusyon sa section ng language and napakahalagang probisyon at hindi na natin mabibigyan ng kahulugan ang mga pronouncement natin sa pamamagitan ng pagboto sa lines 1 to 3 on national language. Kaya sa palagay natin, ang dami na ng mga nagpaliwanag tungkol sa kahalagahan ng pagbibigay natin ng ganitong probisyon. Tayo ay naging napaka-generous sa ibang provisions. Sa mga nakaraan, naging madetalye tayo sa sports, sa suweldo ng mga guro, pero bakit hindi natin detalyehin iyong kung ano ang isasagawa ngayon nating lahat dito sa ating bayan kung totoo nga ang ating paniniwalang may political will tayo, na gamitin na natin ang Pilipino

para ito ay madevelop further, hindi by mandate kundi iyong sa ating pagsasagawa ngayon sa ating gawain sa loob ng gobyerno at sa ating institusyon. So we hope that it will not just be an issue to be thrown to the body for voting because it is now being presented as an anterior proposal or amendment to the body.

FR. BERNAS: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Bernas is recognized.

FR. BERNAS: Madam President, I just wanted to pose some questions for clarification to help me decide on what is on the floor now because there seems to be a contradiction between Section 2 and lines 3 and 4. Lines 3 and 4 say that – steps shall be taken by the government to use it as a medium of communication in all branches of government. That, to me, is a definition of what an official language is. So, whereas in Section 2 we are saying that Filipino is an official language and yet in Section 3, lines 3, 4 and 5, we seem to be saying that steps will be taken to make it an official language, because an official language means the language of communication in government.

MR. VILLACORTA: That point is well taken. What we really meant here was to reinforce it. We are open to suggestions, Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Is Commissioner Bernas through?

FR. BERNAS: Madam President, I would just like to speak against the deletion. I think we should give this a chance to be discussed. There are several concepts here—official language, language of

instruction, auxiliary medium of instruction and all these. So, if at all we must have a deletion, let us move sentence by sentence rather than by one fell swoop, as they would say.

MS. ROSARIO BRAID: Madam President.

MR. BENNAGEN: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Bennagen is recognized.

MR. BENNAGEN: Let me just respond very briefly to the observation of Comissioner Bernas in the provision on Section 2 and the steps that shall be taken. I think the sentence in Section 2 merely underscores the status of Filipino and English as official languages, but our observation is that Filipino, as an official language, has been mostly practiced in stationeries and in government buildings as names and in titles as well as in posts of offices. We are saying from lines 3, 4, 5 and 6 down to line 10 that it should be actually utilized in government as well as in communications and at all levels of the educational system. When we go into the discussion of the sentences in detail, we will underscore the need for this by reference to other studies that already clearly show that unless we mandate government to implement this call for Filipino as a national language, it shall be nothing more than rhetoric.

MR. OPLE: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Ople is recognized.

MR. OPLE: May I just take issue with some of the members of the committee who have tended to underrate the significance of the decision already taken by

the committee and Commission declaring Filipino as the national language of the Philippines. There is a sense in which having made this decision the rest follows. I do not want the committee to denigrate its own achievement in putting forward this historic proposal which the Commission has approved. It is not empty rhetoric; it is the settlement of a long, pending and nagging issue on the historical agenda of the Filipino people. I think we should not deny the committee and the Commission the credit for that.

Proceeding to lines 3 to 10, the proposal is for the Commission to vote on these two sentences step to step and separately, but before we do that, may I just say I have not conferred with the proponents of the amendment to Section 1 and lines 8 to 10. I am using the committee amendment draft. But I think we should grant the sincerity of those who profess a great unease about these sentences which will, in effect, prescribe immediately that Filipino shall be the medium of communication in all branches of the government and the language of instruction at all levels of the educational system. Let us grant the Members of the Commission who have some doubts about the feasibility of this statement the sincerity and conviction that they undoubtedly possess. Having declared Filipino as the national language of the Philippines and that as it evolves, it shall be further developed on the basis of Filipino and other languages, I anticipate at this

point a later amendment constituting a language commission which, I think, nobody will reject. Then there is some doubt about the practicality of mandating this as something immediate. Will the insertion of just a phrase ease the burden on the minds of those who are for deletion? For example — “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.”

It is a mandate but, at the same time, we leave to Congress the practical task of determining how this mandate will be implemented.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, is that not implicit in the committee proposal that Congress as well as other agencies of government will take steps? So, would it not be a superfluity if we say “AS MAY BE APPROPRIATE AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAW”?

MR. OPLE: Actually, I have no difficulty at all in accepting the committee formulation, but I defer to the sensibilities of colleagues who feel that when we state that Filipino is already the national language — Filipino with a capital “F” — then the rest follows. But if we do incorporate some provision of this sort, that will leave a large margin of discretion to the future Congress to implement

the mandate of the Constitution. I do not know; I am merely projecting the idea that this sentence or the two sentences may be acted upon favorably by a good number of Commissioners who otherwise are plagued by doubt about the readiness of this Commission to act on this immediately. So that it can only say “AS MAY BE APPROPRIATE AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAW, the government shall take steps to use it as a medium of instruction.”

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, may I just point out that in the 1935 Constitution, Section 3 states that:

The Congress shall take steps towards the development and adoption of a common national language based on one of the existing native languages.

And we know that since then there were a few advances in the development of Filipino as the medium of instruction but from our point of view it was not; these steps were not adequate.

In the 1973 Constitution, Section 3 subparagraph 2 says that:

The National Assembly shall take steps towards the development and formal adoption of a common national language to be known as Filipino.

And as expressed in the deliberations of this body, it was agreed that hardly anything significant was done by the government to develop Filipino.

In our formulation, Madam President, we used the same expression — “steps shall be taken” —

but it is more forthright in the sense that we are not just talking about steps to be taken in developing the national language but in using it or reinforcing it as a medium of communication and as the language of instruction. As we have pointed out, the development of a national language becomes empty if we do not use it eventually as the medium of instruction. This was borne out by the experiences of Malaysia and Indonesia. It was only when these two countries developed Bahasa Malaysia in Malaysia and Bahasa Indonesia in Indonesia that the national language became very meaningful, because the national language was not used only in comedies, shows and in some newspapers, but it was used extensively throughout the school system and the government. Only at that point in time did the Bahasa language in these two countries become real as the national language.

MR. OPLE:

Apropos of that, may I just comment briefly on the statement of the committee.

Of course, I think the committee is right in pointing out the relatively successful approaches to the national language in our two ASEAN partners and kindred nations, Malaysia and Indonesia. They have followed a course which was adapted to their own unique historical circumstances. In the case of Malaysia, there was no problem because the Malay language was common and universal among almost all of the Malayan states that later on were joined by Sabah,

Sarawak in the Malaysia Federation of 1963. In other words, the historical equivalent would be if Filipinos spoke Tagalog already from north to south.

In the case of Indonesia, in 1927, when Sukarno launched the Independence Movement in Indonesia, one of the main items of his platform for Indonesian Independence was the designation of Malay as the core language or the Bahasa Indonesia of the future. And in 1945, we had exactly opposite experiences with Indonesia. In Indonesia, the Dutch rule was ending; the language of the Dutch as an international language and as an official language of Indonesia had lost such importance that it could be easily thrown into the Java Sea without any loss whatsoever in Indonesia. In our own case, English, the language of the United States and the Anglo-Saxon countries of the world, was just rising to the fore as the *lingua franca* of mankind. And so, the burden on the Filipinos for developing a national language was a hundredfold greater than in the case of the Indonesians and the Malaysians. I do not think we should deplore the way the national language has evolved because I do not call our national language policy a failure relative to Indonesia and Malaysia. I think the governments of the past since Quezon ought to be given some credit for having brought us this far in this search for a national language.

MR. MONSOD:

Madam President.

- MR. OPLE: I will terminate my intervention now simply by reiterating the insertion of this clause: "AS MAY BE APPROPRIATE AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAW," if this satisfies the concerns of those who otherwise would vote for the deletion of these sentences on the ground that fundamentally the mission of the Commission has already been accomplished in the first two sentences of Section 1.
- MR. MONSOD: Madam President.
- THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Monsod is recognized.
- MR. MONSOD: Madam President, I believe there is a motion to delete. I am one of the proponents. I just wanted to say that there is a big difference between the Constitution of 1973 and this one because in the former they were talking about steps to adopt a common national language to be known as Filipino. We are already adopting it here. The reason why we are asking for a deletion is that the following sentences seem to make a distinction between a primary and a secondary medium of instruction and communication, whereas Section 2 talks about official languages as both Filipino and English and, therefore, there is an inconsistency there. We are moving for deletion because the adoption of the national language in its full implications is already understood. Secondly, in Section 2 where the official languages are mentioned as Tagalog and English, again, the implication of that rule is all-encompassing but there is no distinction between primary and

secondary or primary and supplementary because in reality we need both and it is to our advantage to be bilingual. We are now moving for the deletion of those sentences from lines 3 to 10 under Section 1 as proposed by the committee in order to avoid confusion. Since that is on board, and I believe we have had so many speakers already that have spoken on both sides, is it possible to already have a vote?

MR. SUAREZ: Madam President.

MS. AQUINO: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Let us hear Commissioner Suarez first.

MR. SUAREZ: Thank you, Madam President.

May I speak briefly against the motion to delete lines 3 to 10, Madam President. I have read these three lines and I can detect five gut issues involving national language in these three sentences. The first is the matter of determining the medium of communication and this appears in line 4. The second is the matter of language of instruction and this appears in line 5. The third is the matter of auxiliary media of instruction and this appears in line 7; then the matter of a second language, and this appears in line 8. Finally, the matter of alternative medium of instruction, and this appears in line 9, Madam President.

These are all gut issues that we feel should be ventilated, debated upon and discussed thoroughly before this Constitutional Commission. And it is for this reason that we are appealing to the Members of the Commission to

allow a free debate and discussion on these five gut issues, without the formality of going into the deletion of these matters.

We realize the point raised by the Honorable Monsod that perhaps some of these points may already have been covered by the first sentence of Section 1 and the two sentences appearing in Section 2, but this is a matter of appreciation on the part of the Commission. So, we reiterate our appeal that these matters should be discussed and should not be deleted.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Suarez, what is going on now is that we are, in fact, discussing the merits of the committee report. I mean, in discussing whether we should delete or not, we are, in effect, discussing also the merits of the committee report. That is why we have been allowing speakers to speak for and against.

MR. BENNAGEN: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Bennagen is recognized.

MR. BENNAGEN: Thank you, Madam President, and I thank you also for the concern for more debate because, if we do not do that, this might become a missed opportunity.

I think we of the committee insist that we retain those specific provisions that steps shall be taken by the government to really implement the essence of the first section. We do this in the same sense that we gave in to the Ople et al.'s amendment with respect to teachers. For instance, in our own formulation in the committee, we said that the

State shall promote and protect the status and standards of the teaching profession. Teachers, researchers and nonteaching academic personnel shall enjoy the special care and protection of the State. That is the spirit that we wanted to be incorporated into the Constitution. But a more concrete proposal was that of Commissioner Ople et al., which says: “THE STATE MUST ASSIGN THE HIGHEST BUDGETARY PRIORITY TO EDUCATION AND ENSURE THAT TEACHING WILL ATTRACT AND RETAIN ITS RIGHTFUL SHARE OF THE BEST AVAILABLE TALENTS...”

What we are saying, in fact, is that the first sentence of Section 1 provides us the essence of the provision on the national language. But because of the rather sorry experience that we have had on the development of the national language and more importantly its actual use, we feel that the subsequent sentences are absolutely necessary to put flesh into the intent of the first section.

Let me quote one of the studies given to us by one group which calls itself “Multi-ethnic Citizens Committee for CON-COM Resolution No. 286” and it lists what the Institute of National Language as a body has done to develop the national language. In 1940, after five years of the 1935 Constitution, the INL published the *National Language – English Vocabulary*, and this is pure Tagalog. This was in 1940. Ten years

after that, in 1950, and 15 years after the 1935 Constitution, the *National Language – English Vocabulary* had its fourth printing. It still did not contain any non-Tagalog dialectal words. Ten years again after that, meaning 25 years after the 1935 Constitution, 13,000 copies of the *English-Tagalog Dictionary* were published – still no other languages but Tagalog.

In 1977, after 42 years of the 1935 Constitution and four years of the 1973 Constitution, the *Talahulugang Pilipino-English* was released by the Bureau of Printing. And then, at about the same year, the *English-Tagalog Dictionary* by Fr. English had its first printing, and it was approved for use in public and private schools.

In 1985, after 50 years of the 1935 Constitution and 12 years of the 1973 Constitution, the *English-Tagalog Dictionary* by Fr. English had its ninth printing, and the INL gave him a citation for excellence, meaning, in spite of all those proposals and intentions to develop a national language, not much was done. And let me quote what Dr. Bonifacio Sibayan, a linguist and former President of the Philippine Normal College, as well as former President of the Linguistic Society of the Philippines, said:

Filipinos can handle anything if they will put their minds to it. The trouble is, they really have not done so, for they have practically not invested any money into the development of the language.

We are saying, therefore, that with these sentences after the first sentence, we will be able to accelerate, without violating the laws of growth of a language, actual use in government, commerce and industry and in education of Filipino as a national language.

Thank you, Madam President.

MS. BRAID: Madam President.

MR. RODRIGO: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Rodrigo is recognized.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

MR. RODRIGO: I move for a suspension of the session considering the lateness of the hour.

THE PRESIDENT: The session is suspended for luncheon until two-thirty this afternoon.

(It was 12:41 p.m.)

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

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

THE PRESIDENT: The session is resumed.
Are we ready to continue with our very interesting debate?

The Acting Floor Leader is recognized.

MR. ROMULO: Madam President, there is a motion to delete parts of Section 1. However, may I request a short suspension because a compromise might be reached.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

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

(It was 3:06 p.m.)

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

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

THE PRESIDENT: The session is resumed.

MR. ROMULO: Madam President, I ask that Commissioner Monsod be recognized.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Monsod is recognized.

MR. MONSOD: Madam President, before we suspended the session, there was a pending motion to delete. We are happy to inform the Chair that in the meantime we believe we have arrived at a reasonable compromise provision; and I am, therefore, withdrawing the motion to delete.

THE PRESIDENT: May we have the new formulation?

MR. MONSOD: We would like to refer to the committee for the formulation.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Villacorta is recognized.

MR. VILLACORTA: After conferring with the different amenders, the committee came up with 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.”

Madam President, in addition to the committee members, the following contributed to this formulation: The Honorable Ople, Monsod, Colayco, Aquino, Romulo, Rama, Bengzon, Regalado, Tingson, Natividad and Abubakar.

MR. MONSOD: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Monsod is recognized.

MR. MONSOD: May I just inquire from the committee, as a clarification, if this formulation does not exclude the use of English as a medium of communication or as a language of instruction?

MR. OPLE: Madam President.

MR. MONSOD: May we ask the committee?

MR. VILLACORTA: The committee understands that English may be maintained as a second language.

MR. MONSOD: As in Section 2, since they are both official languages, can we just state that this does not preclude the use of English as a medium of communication and as a language of instruction?

MR. VILLACORTA: In the formulation?

MR. MONSOD: Yes. The formulation does not preclude or exclude the use of English.

MR. VILLACORTA: That is right: it does not preclude the use of English.

MR. MONSOD: Thank you.

MR. OPLE: Madam President.

MR. DE CASTRO: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Ople is recognized.

MR. OPLE: Yes, just a word concerning style. This is more a matter of style than anything else. Rather than leave it to Commissioner Rodrigo later, I think I would like to put forward a proposal actually originated by Commissioner Nollado, so that instead of "ITS USE," we use "FILIPINO." So that it will read: "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...."

MR. VILLACORTA: Does the Gentleman mean "SHALL TAKE STEPS TO INITIATE AND SUSTAIN FILIPINO AS A..."

MR. OPLE: "THE USE OF FILIPINO."

MR. VILLACORTA: Yes, Madam President, the committee accepts.

MR. OPLE: Thank you, Madam President.

MR. SARMIENTO: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner de Castro is recognized.

MR. DE CASTRO: May I suggest to the committee that instead of the words "LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION," we use "MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION" as proposed by Honorable Ople: Filipino as a medium, not as a language of instruction.

- MR. VILLACORTA: The reason we used the word “LANGUAGE” is that “MEDIUM” has been used before, but allow me to confer with the committee whether they would accept the use of “MEDIUM.”
- MR. DE CASTRO: So that there will be no double use of “MEDIUM.”
- MR. VILLACORTA: There will be a double use of “MEDIUM.”
- MR. DE CASTRO: If we can make certain arrangements in the first use of “MEDIUM”....
- MR. VILLACORTA: The committee feels that the Committee on Style can take care of that.
- MR. DE CASTRO: Thank you.
- MR. VILLACORTA: Thank you, Madam President.
- MR. SARMIENTO: Madam President.
- THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Sarmiento is recognized.
- MR. SARMIENTO: May I address a few questions to Commissioner Ople, who fathered the first two lines.
- MR. OPLE: I did not father the first two lines; I had a very modest contribution in the term “SUBJECT TO PROVISIONS OF LAW.”
- MR. SARMIENTO: May we know from the Gentleman the meaning of “SUBJECT TO PROVISIONS OF LAW AND AS CONGRESS MAY DEEM APPROPRIATE” because I think this is the new amendment to the committee’s formulation.
- MR. OPLE: Yes. I consider the mandate for the use of Filipino as the national language now categorical, both as a medium of official communication and as language of instruction. However, in order to be absolutely sure, the pace at which this mandate will be implemented, together with the budgetary

requirements, will be determined more carefully. And in the light of future consensus among the lawmakers, we shall just say that this is subject to provisions of law and as Congress may deem appropriate.

MR. SARMIENTO: If that is the intent, does not the Gentleman think the first line will suffice?

MR. OPLE: Yes. Those who conferred, including all the members of the committee, as well as the previous proponents of amendments of these lines, came to the conclusion that this is not really redundant at all. Besides, it helps to forge a compromise that will permit this Commission to vote hopefully as one on this amendment which the committee is now putting forward as the collective sense of those who have conferred on this matter.

MR. SARMIENTO: I have nothing against the first two lines. My only reservation is that as in the past, the first line would cover the two, leaving Congress to make appropriate budgetary measures.

MR. OPLE: Yes. Of course, we do not disregard existing laws, Madam President. They will continue to govern if they are consistent with this constitutional provision, until Congress in the future amends or changes or repeals some of these laws.

MR. DAVIDE: Madam President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Commissioner Davide is recognized.

MR. DAVIDE: May I be enlightened on some of the aspects of this proposed substitute amendment? The first is, does it follow from the wording that the regional languages shall serve as auxiliary media

of instruction and no law can prohibit their use as such? This means that “subject to provisions of law and as Congress may deem appropriate” would refer only to what are included in the first sentence. It will not apply to the second sentence relating to regional languages as auxiliary media of instruction.

MR. TREÑAS: That is correct. Precisely, there is a period after “educational system” and that is a new sentence.

MR. DAVIDE: As an auxiliary medium of instruction, it can actually be the primary medium, until Congress shall provide otherwise.

MR. TREÑAS: It shall be auxiliary.

MR. DAVIDE: But in the meantime that Congress shall not have deemed appropriate or that there is no provision of law relating to the use of Filipino as the medium of instruction, it can itself be the primary medium of instruction in the regions.

MR. TREÑAS: That is correct, because of the provision of the first sentence.

MR. DAVIDE: On the supposition that there is already a law that Congress has deemed it appropriate, the regional language shall go hand in hand with Filipino as a medium of instruction. It cannot be supplanted in any way by Filipino as the only medium of instruction in the regional level.

MR. TREÑAS: Yes.

MR. DAVIDE: Thank you for the information.

MR. TREÑAS: Because that is a constitutional mandate.

MR. MONSOD: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Monsod is recognized.

MR. MONSOD: I just want to clarify the statement of Commissioner Davide when he said “Filipino as the only” – I think we have already clarified that it will exist side by side. It does not preclude the use of English, but the regional languages will, in any case, be the auxiliary media of instruction.

MR. SUAREZ: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Suarez is recognized.

MR. SUAREZ: May we seek further clarification on the various statements provoked by the questions and inquiries of Commissioner Davide and Monsod? As it is now formulated, there will be practically three media of instruction: Filipino, English and Ilocano. Is what I have in mind the idea of the committee?

MR. BENNAGEN: No. May I answer that?

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Bennagen may proceed.

MR. BENNAGEN: Something like this can take place from Grade 1 up to probably Grade IV, which is equivalent to the primary level. The regional language may be the primary language and Filipino or English is the auxiliary medium, and at this point English can be taught as a subject in school. And then beyond that as the language develops, the national language can take over, with English still offered as a subject but with some variations. There might be possibilities also where Filipino already becomes the primary language with the regional language as auxiliary and English as a subject, until such time again as the capabilities of the regions or the schools change.

MR. SUAREZ: Madam President, but if that is the sense of the committee, that was not accurately reflected in the wordings of line 2 which reads: "The regional languages shall serve as auxiliary media of instruction." That means there is a principal language and also an auxiliary language; in this case the principal even on the primary level would have to be Filipino. But according to Commissioner Bennagen, it is theoretically possible that from Grades I to IV the principal language of instruction would be the regional language.

MR. BENNAGEN: That would be during the first few years pending the development of a fuller capability, both in terms of technical capability of teachers as well as the availability of instruction materials.

MR. SUAREZ: If that be the case, may we suggest a reformulation of the wording of this last line, because it may be opposed to the committee's thinking. And, secondly, I think it was Commissioner Treñas who said that this is practically self-executory in character. I am referring to the second line on the designation of regional languages as auxiliary media of instruction. Is my understanding correct in that regard or do they need legislation in order to make them auxiliary media of instruction? If we use the word "serve," that connotes something self-executory in character.

MR. TREÑAS: Precisely. Of course, I have not consulted the other members of the committee, but that is my interpretation.

MR. SUAREZ: So, will it be immediately enforced or does it need to be developed?

MR. TREÑAS: By law?

MR. SUAREZ: Yes, because the word “serve” connotes something immediately executory whereas the word “develop” does not give the same connotation. May we suggest that the committee review this phrasing? Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Ople is recognized.

MR. OPLE: Madam President, may I just say and speak only for myself in this respect? I think there is nothing here to permit any reading that this is not self-executory. We do not say that this will be subject to provisions of law, but we also know in the real world that we cannot just implement this without teachers, books, or the necessary budgets, to be provided at both the local and the State levels so that the regional language as an auxiliary language in that region can become meaningful as a medium of instruction.

I do not know how the committee will take this question, but even if we allow the provision on regional languages, like Cebuano, Ilocano, Waray or even Pampango, to be self-executory, we will need instruction materials and teachers before this can be implemented. I think that is the realistic view of the meaning of the clause ‘THE REGIONAL LANGUAGES shall serve as auxiliary media of instruction in their RESPECTIVE REGIONS.’

Thank you, Madam President.

MR. MONSOD: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Monsod is recognized.

MR. MONSOD: Madam President, I am a little disturbed by the interpretations now being given by the committee. I think the wording of the provision is very clear that Filipino will be developed fully as a medium of instruction and communication. And during the interpellation, it was clear that this will not supplant but coexist with English. The reason we are giving this mandate is that we do not want the experience repeated when Filipino was left behind and was never developed as a language. That is the reason we are giving this mandate. The second point is that I do not think there is anything in this provision that can be interpreted to mean that in its region, the regional language will ever become the primary medium of instruction or the medium of communication and instruction. It will always be an auxiliary to the two to Filipino and English. I do not think we should put a lot of interpretations that are not in the letter of the provision.

MR. TREÑAS: Madam President, it is precisely the stand of the committee that this should be interpreted as it is worded. In fact, we believe that it is simply worded.

PRESIDENT: Commissioner de los Reyes is recognized.

MR. DE LOS REYES: May I ask the committee some questions, Madam President?

As amended, the provision says that it is only the regional languages that shall not be subject to any

changes as provided by law, because it is a separate sentence which says: “THE REGIONAL LANGUAGES SHALL SERVE AS AUXILIARY MEDIA OF INSTRUCTION IN THEIR RESPECTIVE REGIONS.” There is no “as may be provided by law.” The third sentence reads as follows: “English shall be maintained as a second language and as....”

MR. TREÑAS: Madam President, that was already deleted.

MR. DE LOS REYES: I see. With regard to the first sentence which says: “SUBJECT TO PROVISIONS OF LAW AND AS CONGRESS MAY DEEM APPROPRIATE,” could we not change that to “SUBJECT TO WHAT CONGRESS MAY DEEM APPROPRIATE”? Let us eliminate the phrase “provisions of law” so that there will be no double statement of “law” and “Congress.”

MR. VILLACORTA: The first line, “SUBJECT TO PROVISIONS OF LAW,” would also refer to existing laws, rules and regulations, including those with the MECS.

MR. DE LOS REYES: Can we not say “SUBJECT TO SUCH CONDITIONS PRESCRIBED BY LAW”?

MR. OPLE: I have been listening carefully to the nuances of the legal language put forward by the legal luminaries to my left. And since Commissioners de los Reyes and Nolleto have not achieved a meeting of minds, I would prefer to stick by the committee language since the committee has assumed jurisdiction.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, may we ask for a vote on this

- proposal?
- MR. ROMULO: Madam President, we are ready to vote.
- MR. DAVIDE: Madam President.
- THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Davide is recognized.
- MR. DAVIDE: Before it is voted upon, may we request for final reading of the proposal?
- MR. VILLACORTA: The proposal reads as follows: "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 IN THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM. THE REGIONAL LANGUAGES SHALL SERVE AS AUXILIARY MEDIA OF INSTRUCTION...." We originally said "IN THEIR" but Commissioner Natividad suggested "IN THE" which the committee accepts. The last words, therefore are: "IN THE RESPECTIVE REGIONS."
- MR. DAVIDE: Madam President, just one clarification. Did I hear it correctly said as "AND AS A LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION"?
- MR. VILLACORTA: "AND AS LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION."
- MR. DAVIDE: And as medium of official communication.
- THE PRESIDENT: Is Commissioner Padilla seeking recognition?
- MR. PADILLA: Madam President, may I suggest that the vote be taken only on the first sentence, because the second sentence may take into consideration Section 2 of the committee report which says:

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.

MR. VILLACORTA: What is the proposal of the Gentleman?

MR. PADILLA: Since the proposed section consists of two sentences, we should first vote on the first sentence because the second sentence may have direct connection with Section 2 of the committee report.

MR. VILLACORTA: So, would the Gentleman want us to vote on the first sentence?

MR. PADILLA: Yes, because as clearly replied by the committee to the questions of Commissioner Suarez, there are three possible languages: First is Filipino but that does not exclude English; neither does it exclude the regional language. In the committee report, Section 2 speaks of Filipino, second English, and third regional languages.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, we accept the proposal to vote only on the first sentence at this time.

MR. DE CASTRO: Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner de Castro is recognized.

MR. DE CASTRO: Just a matter of clarification. On the first sentence, we use Filipino as an official medium of communication in all branches of government. Is that correct?

MR. VILLACORTA: Yes.

MR. DE CASTRO: And when we speak of Filipino, can it be a combination of Tagalog and the local dialect, and, therefore, can it be “Taglish”? Is that right?

MR. VILLACORTA: Not really “Taglish,” Madam President.

MR. BENNAGEN: It can be standard.

MR. DE CASTRO: Or the combination of the local language and Tagalog?

MR. VILLACORTA: As it naturally evolves.

MR. DE CASTRO: Suppose I am a Muslim official from Sulu and I will use Filipino in my communication. So I will write: “*Di makadiari ang iniisip mo.*” It is a combination of Tausog – “*di makadiari*” and Tagalog – “*ang iniisip mo.*” The one receiving in the main office may not understand the whole thing. I am just clarifying because when we use Filipino as a medium of official communication, there is a possibility that the message may not be understood when it reaches the central office or when it goes to another area.

MR. VILLACORTA: That is why the wording is, “The government shall take steps to initiate and sustain the use of Filipino.” And in Section 1, it says: “as it evolves, it shall be further developed and enriched,” the implication being that it will be standardized as a national language.

MR. DE CASTRO: Yes, but then in Section 2, we come out with Filipino as a medium of official communication. I am just giving an example that as an official communication, it may not be understood by the one at the receiving end, especially if one comes from the South, and whose message is received in the North or in the center. As I said, “*Di makadiari ang iniisip mo,*” is half Tausog and half Tagalog.

MR. VILLACORTA: Commissioner Bennagen, who is an expert on culture and minorities, will answer the question of the Gentleman.

MR. BENNAGEN: I think what we envision to happen would be for government agencies, as well as other non-governmental agencies involving this, to start immediately the work of standardization – expanding the vocabularies, standardizing the spelling and all appropriate measures that have to do with propagating Filipino.

MR. DE CASTRO: In short?

MR. BENNAGEN: The work will codify this national *lingua franca* as it is taking place and will be subjected to other development activities.

MR. OPLE: Madam President, may I say a word?

MR. DE CASTRO: In short, does the committee want us to understand that Section 2, even if ratified, will not as yet be effective because it is still subject to the provisions of law and as Congress may deem appropriate? So the medium of official communication among branches of government cannot as yet be Filipino until subject to provisions of law and as Congress may deem appropriate. Is that correct?

MR. OPLE: Madam President.

MR. DE CASTRO: No, I am asking the committee, please.

THE PRESIDENT: What is the answer of the committee?

MR. VILLACORTA: That is correct, Madam President.

MR. DE CASTRO: Thank you.

MR. OPLE: I just wanted to point out that when the words “official communication” are used, they must

satisfy the standards of accuracy, precision and, perhaps, clarity or lack of ambiguity; otherwise, it will not be communication. One can lose a war through imprecise communication in government and, therefore, I think the word “communication” should be understood in its correct light – that when one writes from Sulu, as in the example given by Commissioner de Castro, he has to consider the following: Is his communication clear? Is it unambiguous? Is it precise? I just want to point out that when we speak of official communication, these normal standards of good communication ought to be recognized as controlling, otherwise, the interest of public administration will be vitally affected.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: Shall we vote now on the first sentence?

MR. RODRIGO: I think it should be on the first two sentences.

THE PRESIDENT: There was a suggestion, and that was accepted by the committee, to vote on the first sentence.

MR. RODRIGO: Only on the first sentence? But there are two sentences.

THE PRESIDENT: No, that was already approved.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, may I ask for a vote now because this has been extensively discussed.

THE PRESIDENT: Will the Chairman read what is to be voted upon?

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, the first sentence reads: “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 IN THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.”

VOTING

THE PRESIDENT: As many as are in favor of the first sentence, please raise their hands. (Several members raise their hands.)

As many as are against, please raise their hand. (No member raises his hand.)

The results show 37 votes in favor and none against; the first sentence is approved.

MR. VILLACORTA: Shall we vote now on the next sentence, Madam President?

THE PRESIDENT: Will the Chair please read the next sentence.

MR. VILLACORTA: The next sentence, Madam President, reads: “THE REGIONAL LANGUAGES SHALL SERVE AS AUXILIARY MEDIA OF INSTRUCTION IN THE RESPECTIVE REGIONS.”

THE PRESIDENT: Commissioner Padilla is recognized before we proceed to vote.

MR. PADILLA: Section 2 of the committee report states:

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.

The second sentence in Section 2 of the committee report may be amended by that second

sentence which says: “THE REGIONAL LANGUAGES SHALL SERVE AS AUXILIARY MEDIA OF INSTRUCTION IN THE RESPECTIVE REGIONS.” I believe we should consider the first sentence of Section 2 and then say: “THE REGIONAL LANGUAGES SHALL SERVE AS AUXILIARY MEDIA OF INSTRUCTION IN THE RESPECTIVE REGIONS.” That is my proposal.

THE PRESIDENT: In other words, the Commissioner’s point is that this particular second sentence here should be transposed to Section 2 of the other committee report.

MR. PADILLA: Yes, Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT: What does the committee say?

REV. RIGOS: Madam President, perhaps if we approve the sentence, we can delete the second sentence in Section 2. Is that the idea?

MR. PADILLA: That is correct.

REV. RIGOS: Since we are talking about medium of instruction here, we would rather retain it in the first section.

MR. PADILLA: Madam President, but if no mention is made of English, it might be the impression contrary to what has already been agreed upon – that English may not be used as a medium of instruction. And it should be clear that the first preference is Filipino, the national language, without prejudice to the use of English and also the regional languages.

REV. RIGOS: Madam President, do we understand the Commissioner correctly that he would rather

delete that in the first section and amend the second sentence in Section 2?

MR. PADILLA: Yes, Madam President. That is the reason I suggested that the proposal be divided into two sentences. We approved the first sentence. The second sentence should be corrected to Section 2 of the committee report.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, the committee is divided; therefore, we would like the floor to decide on this matter.

MR. PADILLA: The only reason I am saying this is to make clear in the Constitution that the medium of communication and the language of instruction are not only Filipino as a national language, and that the medium of instruction is the regional language, otherwise, there would be no mention of English. I believe that we are all agreed that the first preference is the national language, Filipino, but it does not prevent the use of English and also of the regional languages.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, during the interpellation it was read into the record that the committee contemplates English to be maintained as a second language.

MR. PADILLA: That is correct, but if the first sentence of the section which we have approved is followed immediately with "regional languages," it may give the 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: We could not arrive at a consensus in the committee, Madam President, so could we put it to a vote?

MR. RODRIGO: May I ask for a recess, Madam President.

REV. RIGOS: We are still in Section 1, Madam President.

MR. PADILLA: Yes, I am referring now to Section 2 of the committee report, because it covers the same subject matter. I am suggesting that the second sentence of the amendment by substitution or by compromise should be taken together with Section 2 of the committee report.

THE PRESIDENT: So how would the Commissioner formulate [this suggestion]? Will he delete this and transfer it to Section 2?

MR. PADILLA: Yes, Madam President. In lieu of the second sentence of the committee report, "The regional languages are the auxiliary official languages in the respective regions," we can substitute that with the second sentence of the compromise amendment, which reads: "THE REGIONAL LANGUAGES SHALL SERVE AS AUXILIARY MEDIA OF INSTRUCTION IN THE RESPECTIVE REGIONS."

MR. TREÑAS: They are together; they are correlated.

MR. VILLACORTA: Madam President, may we ask for a vote on this matter.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

MR. RODRIGO: I am not ready to vote. May I ask for a suspension, Madam President?

THE PRESIDENT: The session is suspended.

(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.)

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The session is resumed.
The Acting Leader is recognized.

MR. ROMULO: Mr. Presiding Officer, I ask that Commissioner Monsod be recognized.

MR. MONSOD: Perhaps we should first ask the committee if they have already agreed to the transposition of that sentence.

MR. VILLACORTA: Yes, I was going to say that Section 2 will now read: "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." This was formulated in cooperation with Commissioners Suarez, Padilla and Maambong.

MR. MONSOD: Mr. Presiding Officer, may I propose an anterior amendment before we take up the entire section?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Please proceed.

MR. MONSOD: I would like to propose that in the first sentence we insert the words, "FOR PURPOSES OF COMMUNICATION AND INSTRUCTION"

between the words, "Philippines" and "are" so that it will now read: "The official languages of the Philippines, FOR PURPOSES OF COMMUNICATION AND INSTRUCTION, are Filipino and English, until otherwise provided by law." May I explain?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Please proceed.

MR. MONSOD: We are mentioning this in order to reflect the intent and answers of the committee in Section 1. Since we are now mentioning regional languages as auxiliary official languages and in the context of a medium of instruction, it is better to clarify that until otherwise provided by law both Filipino and English are recognized as media of instruction and communication, which is what the committee gave in answer to the clarificatory questions on Section 1.

MR. VILLACORTA: Mr. Presiding Officer, the committee regrets that it cannot accept the amendment and would like to ask for a vote on that proposed amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): What does Commissioner Monsod say?

MR. VILLACORTA: The reason the committee is not accepting it is that it actually delimits the concept of official language, and number two, it has already been made clear that English will continue to be a second language and there is no necessity for making it much clearer in the Constitution.

MR. MONSOD: As a matter of fact, the reason I am proposing this is precisely because there seems to have been some doubt as to the role of English until after

we had to clarify. Secondly, I do not know if there is any other purpose than communication and instruction. So, when we say “for purposes of communication and instruction,” then we are removing any confusion and doubt and anybody who reads our Constitution does not need to look into the Journal.

MR. VILLACORTA: Mr. Presiding Officer, the other reason we feel this is not necessary is that in our society now, what needs greater protection and more constitutionalization is not English but Filipino, which is in a very weak state right now. English can fend for itself. If I may quote from my favorite saint, San Francisco Rodrigo, in his poem, “*Daig sa Wikang Banyaga*”:

*Hindi tayo daig ng kanong banyaga sa isip,
talino, sa kuro, sa diwa. Daig lamang tayo
sa pagsasalita, sapagkat gamit natin ay
kanilang wika. Naging sanhi ito ng maling
akala na sila’y dakila at tayo ay aba.*

I think that poem of Senator Rodrigo reflects quite vividly and accurately the status of languages in our country today – *na ang aba at kawawa ay ang Filipino at ang higit na dakila ay ang Ingles*. Why will we further reenforce this colonial aspect of our society?

MR. MONSOD: Mr. Presiding Officer, I believe that is precisely why the whole of Section 1 is a very categorical adoption of Filipino and its fruition and development and the mandate that it be propagated. So, all of Section 1 is already a

reflection of the sentiment of this Commission. We just want to eliminate the doubt in Section 2 as to the role of both. That is all, Mr. Presiding Officer. We submit it for a vote.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Ople is recognized.

MR. OPLE: May I just find out from Commissioner Monsod whether in proposing this amendment he was making up for the loss of the sentence pertaining to English as a second language in the preceding section?

MR. MONSOD: Mr. Presiding Officer, I was for deleting that in the first section, because precisely we want to emphasize the adoption and development of Filipino.

MR. OPLE: My recollection was that the committee did not initiate the deletion of that sentence. The deletion was proposed by Commissioner Monsod himself.

MR. MONSOD: Yes, in order to concentrate on Filipino in the first section. But it is in the second section, which we know is a follow-up section, where we should remove the doubt as to the role of both Filipino and English.

MR. OPLE: What is the consequence of not acting on Commissioner Monsod's amendment so that Filipino and English are here acknowledged in this new section as the official languages, unless otherwise provided by law?

MR. MONSOD: The consequence is that there could be some doubt because of our strong endorsement in Section 1 on the role of English. When we also

follow it up with a sentence on regional languages as auxiliary media of instruction, somehow in the structure of the two sections, there is some loss as to the role of English. That is why I am trying to make this clearer.

MR. OPLE: So, the whole intention of the amendment is to make explicit what has been identified as the sense of the Commission with respect to the role of English as a second language, which was dropped in the first section.

MR. MONSOD: Yes.

MR. OPLE: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer, for the clarification.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): We will now proceed to vote.

MS. QUESADA: Not yet, Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Quesada is recognized.

MS. QUESADA: I think the position of the committee is really to stress the fact that English is going to be the alternative medium of instruction. That was the deleted provision. We believe that as long as we retain English as another medium of instruction, there will still be the possibility of utilizing materials which are written in English, and which will actually hinder the development of our own educational materials. So, we felt that the formulation that we have in Section 1 could be retained as is and reinforced in Section 2, citing that the official languages of the Philippines for purposes of communication and instruction be

still written down in this particular section.

MR. RODRIGO: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The Chair recognizes Commissioner Rodrigo.

MR. RODRIGO: Would Commissioner Monsod accept an amendment to his amendment so that Section 2 would 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: Yes, I accept, Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Monsod is recognized.

MR. MONSOD: I am a little confused as to the response of Commissioner Quesada because that is not the sense and the tenor of the answers of the committee earlier this afternoon. If I hear her correctly, she is saying that there should be a stoppage of the use of materials in English. That was not the answer of the committee earlier this morning, and perhaps it is better for us really to clarify it then in this section rather than have the different interpretations we are getting from the committee.

MS. QUESADA: I think I did not say that there will be a stoppage but that there will be the encouragement of the development of materials written in Filipino, if we are going to really use Filipino as the medium of instruction in our educational system. As long as we retain all these materials without developing the Filipino materials, then I think we will not

really progress.

MR. MONSOD: I am confused because we have just heard it said “as the medium of instruction”; I thought that we said as “language of instruction” without the word “the.” So, I am a little confused and perhaps that is the reason we need to clarify this point once and for all.

MR. RODRIGO: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Rodrigo is recognized.

MR. RODRIGO: I have an amendment to the amendment which was accepted by the proponent. I think it is a very simple amendment; I ask that we vote on that.

REV. RIGOS: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Rigos is recognized.

MR. MONSOD: Mr. Presiding Officer, may I just answer that? I think in Section 1, we are talking of Filipino as a medium of communication and language of instruction in the context of the steps that must be taken to initiate and sustain it. That is how we are mentioning it in Section 1. It is a mandate in effect to Congress to take steps to initiate and sustain it as a medium of communication, as language of instruction. Section 2 merely reiterates the coexisting role of both as media of communication and instruction.

MR. VILLACORTA: May we call for a vote, Mr. Presiding Officer?

MR. DAVIDE: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Davide is

recognized.

MR. DAVIDE: May I propound some questions on the basis of the amendment, as amended? As amended, it will read that the official languages are Filipino and English, both of which shall be the official languages of communication and the media of instruction in all the educational system. Am I correct?

MR. RODRIGO: No, both of which shall be media of instruction.

MR. DAVIDE: And the language of communication.

MR. RODRIGO: And Commissioner Monsod wants to add that both shall be media of communication and instruction, unless otherwise provided by law.

MR. DAVIDE: Would that not run counter to what has just been approved? I am referring to the Ople et al. amendment which reads: "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 IN THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM."

MR. MONSOD: Mr. Presiding Officer, may I answer that question? In reply to Commissioner Rigos, that clause "as provided by law and Congress may deem otherwise," refers to the government taking steps precisely because "Filipino" has been disadvantaged. So we are mandating Congress to take steps so that it can be initiated and sustained

as a medium of communication and as language of instruction. So there is no inconsistency, Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. DAVIDE: There is an obvious inconsistency because in the first we would only mandate Congress to take steps to initiate and sustain the use of Filipino as a language of official communication and as a medium of instruction. And then in the succeeding section, we immediately mandate that not only shall it serve as one of the two official languages but it shall also be the language of communication and medium of instruction.

MR. MONSOD: Yes, because the committee, in reply to questions on Section 1, precisely said that the steps to be taken do not preclude English as a medium of communication and as a language of instruction.

MR. DAVIDE: No, I am not talking about English. I am talking about Filipino because the official languages would be Filipino and English. But under the Gentleman's amendment, both Filipino and English, unless otherwise provided by law, shall be the languages of official communication and the media of instruction. Yet, in the preceding section, we only mandate the government to take steps to initiate and sustain the use of Filipino as a language of communication and as a medium of instruction. So insofar as Filipino is concerned, there is an obvious and apparent inconsistency.

MR. MONSOD: As I see it, the inconsistency arises from the use of "until otherwise provided by law" which was there in the first place. My amendment is only to

clarify the coexistent roles of the two. So if the Gentleman's objection is to the phrase "until otherwise provided by law," that is in the original formulation of the committee.

MR. DAVIDE: That is precisely the reason why if we merge English and Filipino, insofar as the latter is concerned, it would be inconsistent with what we have just approved. I am referring to the Ople amendment; probably we could limit it to English.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Ople is recognized.

MR. OPLE: I am in a quandary as to how to vote on this issue, Mr. Presiding Officer. So may I have the leave of an impatient Commission to ask just one more question before we take a vote?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The Commissioner is recognized.

MR. OPLE: What bothers me, and maybe a few others associated with the first amendment in Section 1, is that after giving Filipino the pride of place in the preceding section, are we now establishing a symmetry for Filipino and English in the subsequent section?

MR. MONSOD: No, Mr. Presiding Officer, I think the intent is quite clear. I was wondering whether Commissioner Romulo was suggesting a transposition in order to obviate the possible misinterpretation being raised by Commissioner Davide. We can say that the official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and English until otherwise provided by law. And then, we can have a second sentence which says:

“English shall be maintained as a medium of communication and instruction, until otherwise provided by law.” That will make it clearer so that English is the only language that is subject to the provision of law and not Filipino. Does that answer the Gentleman?

MR. OPLE: Mr. Presiding Officer, in that formulation, there is no symmetry because Filipino still ranks higher than English. Is that correct?

MR. MONSOD: Yes, because that is the intent and the letter of Section 1.

MR. OPLE: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Rodrigo is recognized.

MR. RODRIGO: Mr. Presiding Officer, I withdraw my amendment to the amendment to give way to that new amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Will Commissioner Monsod please restate the latest permutation to his amendment?

MR. MONSOD: My amendment now in Section 2 is to insert the sentence: “ENGLISH SHALL BE MAINTAINED AS A MEDIUM OF COMMUNICATION AND INSTRUCTION, UNTIL OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY LAW.”

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): What does the committee say?

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

MR. VILLACORTA: Mr. Presiding Officer, may we call for a two-

minute suspension for harmonization?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The session is suspended.

(It was 5:00 p.m.)

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

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

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The session is resumed.
Commissioner Monsod is recognized.

MR. MONSOD: There has been a suggestion for a determination and I still think that we should retain the committee formulation and add at the beginning: "FOR PURPOSES OF COMMUNICATION AND INSTRUCTION, THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES OF THE PHILIPPINES ARE FILIPINO AND ENGLISH, UNTIL OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY LAW." In other words, if we keep the original committee formulation and just add the phrase at the beginning, then the intent will remain the same.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): What does the committee say?

MR. VILLACORTA: Mr. Presiding Officer, there was during the recess a proposed formulation which the committee is going to adopt, based on the Azcuna proposal which reads: "FOR PURPOSES OF COMMUNICATION AND INSTRUCTION, THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES OF THE

PHILIPPINES ARE FILIPINO AND, UNTIL OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY LAW, ENGLISH.” I understand that Commissioner Monsod is agreeable to this proposal.

MR. DAVIDE: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Davide is recognized.

MR. DAVIDE: Mr. Presiding Officer, may I inquire about certain matters?

First, with regard to the phrase “for purposes of communication and instruction.” How does it relate to the preceding paragraph where we use the words, “language of official communication and instruction”?

MR. VILLACORTA: That reflects the intention of the first section.

MR. DAVIDE: So the intention would be practically the same as the previous. It will not solve the problem I raised; insofar as Filipino is concerned, it will still be inconsistent with the first.

MR. VILLACORTA: Could the Gentleman restate the problem that he raised?

MR. DAVIDE: The problem is, it would now appear that both Filipino and English are the languages of official communication and the media of instruction, but yet in the first, the Ople amendment, it will not be so – I am referring to Filipino – until Congress shall provide otherwise and deem appropriate, the government has taken steps to initiate and sustain the use of Filipino as such. That is the reason I suggested that we should split – the Monsod amendment should refer

more specifically to English. So I agreed with the formulation presented by Commissioner Ople by way of an amendment to the Rodrigo amendment which was withdrawn by virtue of the former.

MR. VILLACORTA: Commissioner Nolleddo would like to give his opinion on this matter.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Nolleddo is recognized.

MR. NOLLEDDO: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

I do not find any inconsistency, because if we look at the first and the second part, the first part also subjects the development of Filipino as national language to the existing provisions of the law or to the will of Congress. Here we are making it clear that we consider Filipino as an official language, but we cannot deny that at present English is still being used as a medium of instruction. That is why we separated English from Filipino, in the sense that we put the words "UNTIL OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY LAW, ENGLISH." So, there is some sort of transitional character but both sentences, Mr. Presiding Officer and Members of the committee, are consistent with each other.

MR. TREÑAS: Mr. Presiding Officer, we adopt and echo the arguments of Commissioner Nolleddo that there is no inconsistency between the formulation of Section 1, which we have approved, the the formulation of Section 2 as proposed by Commissioner Monsod.

MR. MONSOD: Which one, Mr. Presiding Officer?

MR. TREÑAS: The last as formulated by Commissioner Azcuna and stated just now by the chairman of our committee.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The committee has accepted, as counterproposal, Commissioner Monsod's proposed amendment 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." Is Commissioner Monsod agreeable to such counterproposal of the committee?

MR. MONSOD: The problem is that it does not sound like correct English, but may we leave it to the Committee on Style?

MR. VILLACORTA: Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): We can vote on that.

MR. VILLACORTA: Mr. Presiding Officer, may we ask for a vote on this matter because discussions are overextended?

MR. MONSOD: With the instruction to the Committee on Style, I am accepting the proposal of the committee.

VOTING

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): So, let us now vote on the amendment as proposed and accepted by the committee which reads: "FOR PURPOSES OF COMMUNICATION AND INSTRUCTION,

THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES OF THE PHILIPPINES ARE FILIPINO AND, UNTIL OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY LAW, ENGLISH.”

As many as are in favor of the proposal, please raise their hands. (Several members raise their hands.)

As many as are against, please raise their hands. (No member raises his hand.)

The results show 38 votes in favor and none against; the proposal is approved. It is hereby referred to the Committee on Style.

MR. ROMULO: Mr. Presiding Officer, we should now vote on the Padilla amendment which the committee has accepted, the second sentence of Section 2.

MR. VILLACORTA: May I read the formulation which was the contribution of Commissioners Suarez, Padilla and Maambong? This would be the second sentence of Section 2: ‘THE REGIONAL LANGUAGES ARE THE AUXILIARY OFFICIAL LANGUAGES IN THEIR RESPECTIVE REGIONS AND SHALL SERVE AS AUXILIARY MEDIA OF INSTRUCTION THEREIN.’

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Is there any objection to this amendment of Commissioner Padilla, which was accepted by the committee?

Commissioner Maambong is recognized.

MR. MAAMBONG: Mr. Presiding Officer, I thought the first line should read “IN THE REGIONS,” not “THEIR RESPECTIVE REGIONS.”

MR. VILLACORTA: "IN THE REGIONS" is accepted.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Is there any objection?

Shall we take a vote on this?

MR. VILLACORTA: There is no objection, Mr. Presiding Officer.

VOTING

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): As many as are in favor of the amendment, please raise their hands.

(Several members raise their hands.)

As many as are against, please raise their hands.

(No member raises his hand.)

The results show 37 votes in favor and none against; the amendment is approved.

MR. ROMULO: I ask that Commissioner Rodrigo be recognized.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Rodrigo is recognized.

MR. ROMULO: Mr. Presiding Officer, I submit this amendment on behalf of Commissioner Ople and myself: a third sentence to be added to Section 2, which will read: "THE GOVERNMENT SHALL PROMOTE SPANISH AS A HISTORICAL LEGACY ON A VOLUNTARY AND OPTIONAL BASIS."

MR. GUINGONA: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): May we ask the committee to comment first?

MR. GUINGONA: May I be allowed to ask a few questions?

Would this proposed amendment restrict or prohibit the government, Congress, the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports, any official,

agency, or body, to compel the teaching of Spanish in educational institutions?

MR. RODRIGO: No, it will not.

MR. GUINGONA: No, it will not prohibit?

MR. RODRIGO: It will not.

MR. GUINGONA: Therefore, the government can still require the compulsory teaching of Spanish?

MR. RODRIGO: Yes.

MR. GUINGONA: I see.

MR. TINGSON: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The Chair recognizes Commissioner Tingson.

MR. TINGSON: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

May I just say a word to add to the record or, at least if I will be allowed, to say something in favor of this amendment. Am I allowed, Mr. Presiding Officer?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Please proceed.

MR. TINGSON: Mr. Presiding Officer, I rise in defense of Spanish not because I prefer *la lengua Española* to our very own which we now call Filipino, nor would I subordinate our native tongue to English. After all, Filipino will always be the language of our hearts. But we cannot ignore, Mr. Presiding Officer, our historical legacy which inextricably includes the Spanish language. Jose Rizal was educated with Spanish as a medium of instruction. *El Filibusterismo* and *Noli Me Tangere* were originally penned in Spanish. Our historical accounts regarding our country and our people were written mostly in Spanish.

Mr. Presiding Officer, while it is true that Spanish as a language is no longer widely used, however, that Spanish is still very much an integral part of our national spirit. Our Constitution perforce must also be translated into Spanish because inevitably copies of our Charter will find their way into the libraries of Spanish-speaking nations, like Spain and the South American countries. Also, let us not forget that Spanish is number two among the living languages of the world.

Mr. Presiding Officer, let us not ignore Spanish completely. *Vamos a traducir a nuestra trabaja* – our new Constitution – into this beautiful language and, therefore, honor our historical legacy.

Thank you very much.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Alonto is recognized.

MR. ALONTO: Mr. Presiding Officer, I am in favor of the amendment, but I wonder if the distinguished proponent will accept an amendment to this amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): He may do so, if he so desires. Commissioner Rodrigo is the proponent.

MR. ALONTO: My amendment is very simple and it is only for the purpose of straightening out and correctly stating what must be the languages which can be considered a historical legacy of this country. Mr. Presiding Officer, I would like to amend the amendment to include Arabic and Malay, and I would like to request that I be granted the chance to explain why.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): What does Commissioner Rodrigo say?

MR. RODRIGO: Mr. Presiding Officer, I am not in a position to accept or to reject because I am not sufficiently acquainted with Arabic and Malay; or on how many regions speak these in the Philippines; or if we should consider them at par with other regional languages like Cebuano, Ilocan, Bicolano. Should we consider Arabic or Malay of a higher category? And so, I am not in a position to either accept or reject. So, I would like to leave it to the body after Commissioner Alonto shall have explained the reason for his amendment.

MR. ALONTO: Yes, thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Alonto has the floor.

MR. ALONTO: Mr. Presiding Officer, we are talking about languages which we would like to adopt as our historical legacy. I understand by this that we are trying to recognize and put on record those languages that have influenced not only the development of the local languages in this country, but also those that have influenced profoundly the development of culture and civilization of the Filipino people.

Mr. Presiding Officer, I would like to put on record that the basic language or the basic culture that has influenced the progress and culture of the Filipino people is Malay. Malay is a language of a group of people belonging to the Malayo-Polynesian race of which all the different sectors

and tribes of this country belong. The Malay language is utilized by Indonesia and Malaysia as the basis of their official languages and the basis of the official language which is now called Bahasa Indonesia and Bahasa Malaysia, because Malay, one of the hundreds of languages belonging to the Malayo-Polynesian race, is the most developed among all the different languages. This is reflected even in the languages of this country. For example, the word *nasi* in Pampango is a pure Malay word which means rice.

The first foreign language that came to the Philippine shores and which has greatly influenced the development not only of our languages, but even our civilization and culture, was Arabic. It came to the shores of this country more than 600 years ago. A proof of how the Arabic language has influenced the development of our culture and civilization is the use of the Tagalog words of respect *ate* and *kuya* – *ate* means an elder sister; *kuya* means an elder – both words are derivative of the Arabic words *okhte* and *akhuya* which mean “sister” and “brother,” respectively.

Of course, together with Arabic, Malay and Spanish, these are the three languages that have profoundly influenced not only the development of languages in this country but also the civilization and culture of this country. And so this is the reason I am trying to present this amendment to the amendment of the distinguished Commissioner.

MR. VILLACORTA: Mr. Presiding Officer, may the committee react?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Before we recognize the committee for its reaction, the Chair would like to ask Commissioner Ople what his pleasure is.

MR. OPLE: Mr. Presiding Officer, I suppose I now speak on behalf of Commissioner Rodrigo and myself. We do accept the merit of Commissioner Alonto's proposal to recognize the historic relevance of Arabic and Malay, though perhaps on a separate level of importance, to the Filipino people. The tendency of the proponents, however, is to counterpropose to Commissioner Alonto a separate sentence which can be located under Section 2 or under Section 3, and which will merely say that other languages of historic relevance to the Filipino people, such as Arabic and Malay, may be developed and promoted as optional languages in appropriate regions. I think the reason for this is very clear. Spanish is a national legacy, and although there are fewer people who speak it today than before, they are extensively distributed throughout the country. In the case of Malay, let us admit that this is one of the paramount languages in the so-called Malayo-Indonesian family of languages and a close kin to our own languages. I will, however, stop short of agreeing with Commissioner Alonto that Malay has reached the highest stage of development among the members of the so-called Austronesian or Malayo-Polynesian family of languages because our own national language can

aspire to that eminence now in the entire region. Will Commissioner Alonto, therefore, consider later on having this concept embodied in another sentence so that we can provide for it but on an optional basis, and to be promoted as optional language in appropriate regions?

MR. ALONTO: I understand that even the use of Spanish is to be on an optional basis. That is the reason why I amended it. If, for example, Spanish is to be imposed on a mandatory basis, I do not see the reason why we cannot also classify Arabic in the same manner, because Arabic, in the first place, is now an accepted international language in the United Nations.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The Chair finds this in the nature of a third degree proposed amendment; so before we go any further, the Chair would like to recognize the chairman for his reaction which may clarify these points.

MR. VILLACORTA: Mr. Presiding Officer, with respect to the proposal of the Honorable Alonto, the committee recognizes the importance of Arabic. Since we are talking here about historic legacy, we should really include Arabic for symmetry. However, the committee regrets that it cannot accept the inclusion of Malay which is a foreign language. It is true that our immediate neighbors have Malay as the national language, both in Bahasa Indonesia and Bahasa Malaysia, but at the same time, it might clutter the provision. We are willing to accept Arabic because Arabic has a very important

historic place in our country and in our culture. Spanish was the predominant language for so long during several centuries of colonization but, at the same time, Arabic remained paramount, particularly among the leaders of the unconquered sections of the country in Mindanao.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The Chair would like to inquire from the chairman of the committee whether the committee is accepting Commissioner Rodrigo's main amendment; otherwise, it will be in no position to accept amendments to the amendments thereto.

MR. VILLACORTA: Mr. Presiding Officer, the committee is accepting the Rodrigo and Ople amendments and at the same time the amendment of Commissioner Alonto with respect to the inclusion of Arabic for symmetry.

MR. ALONTO: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

MR. OPLE: I move that we suspend the session so that we can confer with the committee and with Commissioner Alonto.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The session is suspended.

(It was 5:32 p.m.)

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

(At 5:56 p.m., the session was resumed.)

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The session is resumed.

MR. VILLACORTA: The committee, after meeting with the main proponents, is accepting the following reformulation of the second sentence of Section 2: "THE STATE SHALL PROMOTE SPANISH AND ARABIC ON A VOLUNTARY AND OPTIONAL BASIS." This is acceptable to all the proponents.

May we have a vote on this provision, Mr. Presiding Officer?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Before we do that, the Chair would like to recognize Commissioner Aquino.

MS. AQUINO: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

With due respect to our esteemed colleague, Commissioner Rodrigo, I will have to take exception to the position of the proponent. And this time, I will invoke the hackneyed objection that we use in court, that the proposal lacks basis. In the original proposal, the proponent invoked historical legacy as the basis for a mandate for the State to promote Spanish. But what historical legacy do we speak of? To the best of my recollection, the only historical legacy that we can derive from the Spaniards is the history of exploitation and oppression. Do we have to dignify that by giving it an imprint of a constitutional fiat? We are not prohibited, in the first place, to adopt Spanish as a voluntary or optional course in schools, but must we provide for that in the Constitution?

In the second place, Mr. Presiding Officer, we do not speak of a Spanish culture in the Philippines. It may be our loss, but the fact is that the absence of a Spanish culture militates against the facility with which the Filipinos can assimilate Spanish as a language. And, in fact, it is the single strongest obstacle for Spanish capturing the popular imagination and the popular consciousness. We had been exposed to 24 units of Spanish and I, myself, had a great deal of difficulty in even conjugating the basic verbs in Spanish.

The absence of a Spanish culture necessarily denies Spanish the very bedrock on which it can flourish, and it is not up to us to answer that kind of a problem or to even apologize for that kind of a difficulty by providing for that in the Constitution.

There is another factor that militates against Spanish being imbibed in Filipino culture. Spanish has been known to be the language of exploitation. That is the single, the strongest mental block, that has become a powerful complex in the continued and subconscious resistance of the Filipinos to understanding and imbibing Spanish as a language.

Spanish has always been associated with the *amos* of the past or the *señores pastas* who live in the illusory sanctuary of Forbes Park. It was associated with the language of the Filipino acolytes of the Spanish *conquistadores* during the Spanish colonial period.

MR. PADILLA: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Padilla is recognized.

MR. PADILLA: Mr. Presiding Officer, *quisiera hablar a favor y en apoyo de las sugerencia enmienda de los Señores Rodrigo y Ople ya notiendo a las manifestaciones del Senor Tingson, de los escritos de nuestros padres, particularmente las novelas inmortales de nuestro héroe nacional, Noli Me Tangere y El Filibusterismo, y otras poestas de mucho valor patriótico como "Mi Ultimo Adios" y "Mi Retiro."*

Quisiera añadir, que de los legados históricos de nuestra Madre España, son nuestra Codigo Civil y Codigo Penal, que estan pasados en los codigos de España. Si nuestros estudiantes de derecho puedan leer y comprender la lengua Española y los escritos y comentarios de los autores Españoles como Manresa en Codigo Civil y Viada en Codigo Penal, nuestros abogados en derecho civil y derecho penal seran mejores preparados y por eso, pido que la Comision apoye la enmienda en favor de la lengua Española. Muchas gracias.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The Chair recognizes Commissioner Quesada.

MS. QUESADA: Mr. Presiding Officer, prejudicial question. Could we ask the Honorable Padilla to please translate in Filipino what he has just said, because there are many of us barbarians who did not understand at all a single word that he said? I think it is but right that we be privy to it in Filipino.

MR. RODRIGO: Mr. Presiding Officer, *ako na po ang magsasalin sa wikang Pilipino.*

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The Chair recognizes Commissioner Rodrigo, with the indulgence of Commissioner Quesada.

MR. RODRIGO: *Nais ba ng Komisyonado na ngayon o pagkatapos na ng sesyon ang pagsasalin ko sa wikang Pilipino?*

MS. QUESADA: Mr. Presiding Officer, because we feel alienated by the fact that a foreign tongue was used in our session.

MR. RODRIGO: *Opo, pagbibigyan ko si Komisyonado Quesada. Sinabi po ni Komisyonado Padilla na marami naman tayong mga benepisyo galing sa Espanya, halimbawa ang ating Kodigo Sibil at Kodigo Penal. At ang sabi niya, iyong mga sinulat ng ating mga bayani, and dalawang nobela ni Dr. Jose Rizal, Noli Me Tangere at El Filibusterismo, ay nasa wikang Kastila, pati na iyong "Mi Ultimo Adios" ni Jose Rizal at ang kanyang iba pang poesia.*

At sinabi rin niya na kung ang lahat ng mga abogado ay marunong ng Kastila, makatutulong ito ng malaki. Ang mga komentaryo sa Kodigo Sibil tulad ni Manresa at sa Kodigo Penal tulad ni Viada, ay nasa wikang Kastila rin. Kaya sinabi niya na siya ay kumakatig sa panukalang susog ni Komisyonado Ople at ng inyong lingkod at hinihiling niya na sana ay maaprubahan ng kapulungang ito.

MS. QUESADA: *Maraming salamat po, Komisyonado Rodrigo.*

MR. OPLE: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Ople is recognized.

MR. OPLE:

Thank you very much.

I just want to take the opportunity to comment briefly on the powerful objections of Commissioner Felicitas Aquino to the so-called “Rodrigo-Ople Amendment” on historical grounds.

I do not think anybody can deny, and no one intends to dispute, the allegation that the 350 years of Spanish colonialism over this territory now known as the Republic of the Philippines, were ruthless, oppressive and, in many ways, exploitative. At the same time, a good part of the world has gone through this ordeal of colonialism. I think discriminating between Spanish and American colonialisms is probably open to question, in the sense that both were colonialisms. But in one case, the Spaniards denied us deliberately the gift of their beautiful and powerful language which, incidentally, derives a lot from Arabic.

We will recall Rizal’s famous letter to the women of Malolos. Why did Rizal write to the women of Malolos? To congratulate them, because a group had the goal to establish a school to teach Spanish, over the objections of the local Spanish commanders and the priests. For Jose Rizal, the teaching of Spanish at that time was an act of courage and patriotism. That was the reason he wrote that letter to the women of Malolos.

In the case of the Americans, they were more sophisticated and, in some ways, projected a sort

of altruism that, save for the Spanish missionaries in the earlier part of the Spanish regime, our ancestors never experienced in the hands of Spain. But the padding on the chain was still there. And I could fault my good friend, Commissioner Aquino, for having lavished her bile on Spanish colonialism from any odium of history. Both are legacies.

But I think today, the tendency when we look back is to say that those were crimes of the times; they occurred long ago. There were certain trade-offs; we owe our territorial integrity to Spain and the United States by virtue of the 1898 Treaty of Paris. We were just a string of human settlements before. The most advanced social structure was in Jolo, where a sultanate existed. Even in Manila, we were trying at that time to set up a confederation of villages. So there are blessings to count as well. I think no one can deny that a good part of our historical archives is still in Spanish.

Mr. Presiding Officer, I do not have a drop of Spanish blood in my veins. I do not speak Spanish. I consider myself a pure Malay-type Filipino. My ancestors were oppressed by Spanish-speaking landlords in Bulacan. But why should I dwell on those? All I know is that, historically, we have been gifted with the Spanish language, although it is disappearing now. But it is also an emergent world language. By the year 2000 about 20 countries in Latin America will

rise to the level of the OECD to become industrialized. And when we speak of the Pacific century, there are some countries in Latin America, on the Pacific rim, with which the future generation can engage in mutually profitable and lucrative international trade, and knowledge of Spanish will help. Of Arabic, all I can say is that this is also an emergent world language and it is now one of the official languages of the United Nations. I think at this time we want to forge permanent bonds of unity with Muslim Mindanao and we have already enshrined the noble sentiment of our Muslim brothers by granting them regional autonomy in the Article on Local Governments. I think we cannot stop there and spurn the earnest appeal of Commissioner Alonto on behalf of our Muslim brothers. Once more, let us demonstrate that we are sensitive to their own historical development and their legacy, especially in terms of promoting Arabic. About Malay, I think we have agreed that there is no ground to include it in the bracket of Spanish and Arabic. So I just want to unburden myself of these feelings in reply to the points made by Commissioner Aquino.

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. RAMA: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The Floor Leader is recognized.

MR. RAMA: I think the argument of Commissioner Aquino should not be left unanswered in this

Commission. I believe that her argument against the Spanish language is emotional. She said, for instance, that Spanish is a legacy of the Spaniards during their oppressive regime. If we follow the argument of Commissioner Aquino, we should also reject the Catholic religion because that is the biggest legacy we got from the Spaniards. So I maintain that we should separate those Spanish rascals who oppressed us from the good things that the Spaniards brought here, like the Spanish language, which is a beautiful and neutral language, and it is now the second language in the world. I also recall that Senator Recto, who was more nationalist than Commissioner Aquino, was urging the study of Spanish as a historical legacy of the Philippines.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Aquino is given the chance to reply.

MS. AQUINO: I do not lay claim to being a self-proclaimed nationalist; neither do I lay claim to being a self-proclaimed archangel of Filipino or Tagalog. But just a brief rejoinder to Commissioner Padilla. I appreciate fully the lessons, the salutary effects of *El Filibusterismo* and *Noli Me Tangere*. But I do not have to speak Greek to be able to know and understand Homer or Sophocles; I do not have to speak Latin to be able to know and understand Virgil or Horace; I do not have to speak German to know and understand Thomas Mann; and I do not have to learn French to know and understand Camus or Proust. When I said that

we do not speak of a Spanish culture in the Philippines, I mean we cannot speak of symbols, we cannot speak of rhetoric, we cannot speak of a language that is able to capture the popular consciousness and the popular imagination for them to be able to accept it with facility and without recrimination. On the charge of discrimination against American or English, it is most unfair to accuse me of having a double standard of judging history. What I am saying is that Filipinos do not even know enough Spanish to be able to acquit themselves creditably. In fact, the halting and incoherent Spanish that we know makes the Spanish wonder and think that there is something wrong with the intelligence of Filipinos. There is nothing wrong with the intelligence of Filipinos, but there is everything wrong when we want to manifest our intelligence in a language that is not ours; in fact, in a language that was deliberately denied us by the Spanish masters themselves.

MR. VILLACORTA: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The committee chairman is recognized, with the indulgence of Commissioner Davide.

MR. VILLACORTA: The committee would like to explain its support for the proposal to the amendment of Commissioner Alonto. We feel that the criteria for singling out these two languages are as follows: the historic value of these two languages and the worldwide importance of these two languages

given our close relations with Latin American countries, Spain and the Arab countries.

First, let me explain with respect to historic and cultural value. I do not agree with Commissioner Ople when he said that Spain was responsible for our having been elevated to the status of a nation from a group or a string of settlements. Historians are agreed that had Spain not arrived in the Philippines or had its arrival been delayed for 25 years, we would have been one solid and unified Muslim nation. It was more, as Commissioner Bennagen emphasizes, the struggles of our people that made us one nation and not the colonization of one country. Nonetheless, we beg to disagree with Commissioner Aquino that Spain has no significant impact on Philippine culture. The fact that most of us here carry Spanish names is proof that Spain has had a deep impact on our culture and identity. The cultural artifacts of the Philippines, particularly those that are found in churches, the architecture of most Filipino homes in Christian lowland places, and even the languages of the Philippines, and there are numerous other examples that we can cite, prove that Spain did have a significant influence, although not always positive, but just the same significant, influence on Philippine culture. We can say the same thing about Arabic, and this need not be belabored. We thought we should mention this to explain our support for the amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Davide is now recognized.

MR. DAVIDE: Before we vote on the amendment, may I be allowed to ask some clarificatory questions?

The first question is: I understand that there is an existing law mandating Spanish as one of the official languages, and it shall remain so until all the books in Spanish at the National Archives or National Library shall have been translated into the official languages, Filipino or English. What would be the effect on this law the moment we approve the amendment? Would it mean that Spanish would no longer be such an official language?

MR. VILLACORTA: Is the Honorable Davide addressing the question to the committee?

MR. DAVIDE: To the committee or to the main proponents, Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. VILLACORTA: The committee prefers to throw the question to the proponent.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The proponent, Commissioner Rodrigo, is recognized.

MR. RODRIGO: The amendment reads: "THE GOVERNMENT SHALL PROMOTE SPANISH AND ARABIC." This is not inconsistent with the law, so this does not repeal that law. However, we hope that Congress will repeal that law and make it only optional.

MR. DAVIDE: Under the proposal, nothing can prevent Congress to continue that law.

MR. RODRIGO: No, this provision does not.

MR. DAVIDE: Under the proposal, especially tying it up with the previous section we approved on English and Filipino as media of instruction and as official languages of communication until English shall be phased out by law, English can also be replaced by Spanish as an official language. This means that 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. Am I correct, Mr. Presiding Officer?

MR. RODRIGO: The constitutional provision is very clear that English remains an official language, until otherwise provided by law. It does not state that Spanish can be substituted for English, although, as the Commissioner said, there is already a law, a presidential decree.

MR. DAVIDE: Yes, I think it is a presidential decree.

MR. RODRIGO: The constitutional provision is not inconsistent with that presidential decree, so it can continue in force even after the approval of the Constitution with this provision.

MR. DAVIDE: Since it is not inconsistent with that particular law, Congress, even if it shall have repealed that law, may promulgate a law making Spanish as an official language?

MR. RODRIGO: Yes, the Commissioner is correct.

MR. DAVIDE: Another point, Mr. Presiding Officer. We have granted Muslim Mindanao autonomy, and we will allow the creation of a regional legislative body with several powers and prerogatives. May the

legislative body for Muslim Mindanao mandate Arabic as a language of communication or medium of instruction within the region making it, therefore, a regional language but mandatory in character?

MR. RODRIGO: Yes, in addition to the official languages in the Constitution.

MR. DAVIDE: Would it not be in conflict with the proposed amendment when, insofar as Arabic is concerned, it should be promoted merely on a voluntary and optional basis?

MR. RODRIGO: As a regional language, if the legislature of that region wants to make it compulsory in that region, it is all right, Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. DAVIDE: It would not be all right because in the Article on Language, Arabic would only be optional and voluntary.

MR. RODRIGO: That is nationwide.

MR. DAVIDE: That is correct, but the Article on Autonomous Regions opens with a section to the effect that there shall be autonomous regions in Muslim Mindanao and in the Cordilleras, subject to the provisions of this Constitution and national law. But definitely the autonomous regions and all the laws enacted by the autonomous region shall be subject to the provisions of this Constitution. Necessarily, this is a provision of the Constitution making Arabic merely voluntary and optional. So it will follow that the regional legislative body cannot mandate Arabic as a compulsory language in Muslim Mindanao.

- MR. ALONTO: Mr. Presiding Officer, with the permission of the distinguished Commissioner, may I be recognized?
- THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): What is the pleasure of Commissioner Alonto?
- MR. ALONTO: Mr. Presiding Officer, may I answer the question posed by Commissioner Davide?
- THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Alonto is recognized.
- MR. ALONTO: The legislative power granted to the autonomous region is specifically stated in the Constitution.
- MR. DAVIDE: That is correct, Mr. Presiding Officer, but subject to the opening sentence of the first section.
- MR. ALONTO: But I do not believe there is such grant of a legislative power to the autonomous region to declare an official language within the region.
- MR. DAVIDE: In other words, is it the position of the Commissioner that the autonomous legislative body cannot prescribe a law making Arabic a compulsory language in Muslim Mindanao?
- MR. ALONTO: That is my understanding, Mr. Presiding Officer.
- MR. DAVIDE: Another point, Mr. Presiding Officer.
- MR. RAMA: Mr. Presiding Officer, the issue has already been belabored. May I ask that we take a vote?
- THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Davide has one more minute.
- MR. DAVIDE: Another point, Mr. Presiding Officer. What exactly is meant by "voluntary and optional"?
- MR. OPLE: Mr. Presiding Officer, may I volunteer a brief reply to that?
- THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Ople is recognized.

MR. OPLE: I think when we say “voluntary and optional basis,” we are not precluding the power of Congress to, let us say, repeal the compulsory teaching of Spanish as a general policy, but without prejudice to certain universities applying to the Ministry of Education and Culture for the compulsory teaching of Spanish with respect to certain definite subjects where a knowledge of Spanish is deemed by that University to be very essential to the development of expertise, for example, in foreign service or law courses. What is wrong if the students are made to take certain units in Spanish? Even specialists now and the great mass of the studentry are free from this onerous burden of having to learn Spanish for which there will be no application after graduation.

MR. DAVIDE: In other words, it is now very clear that insofar as the relation of the State and the language is concerned, it is voluntary, but an educational institution can make it compulsory in certain courses of study?

MR. OPLE: Yes, that is our interpretation, Mr. Presiding Officer. However, voluntary and optional propagation is not limited to that. For example, nothing will prevent the State from setting up a Spanish Academy later on, the membership of which will be purely voluntary but which will endeavor to propagate and develop our own Spanish in a systematic manner with or without State support. There are many things that can be done on a voluntary and optional basis, Mr. Presiding Officer, but I think that trauma of our

Spanish past so eloquently depicted by Commissioner Aquino in her brief commentary will probably be eliminated after we lift the burden on the backs of the students of having to learn Spanish by rote and by compulsion when this may have nothing to do with their own plans for the rest of their lives, unlike those in specialized subjects where Spanish can be very useful. Nothing in this provision will prevent a university from applying for permission to make such courses mandatory for definite subjects on a case-to-case basis for approval by the Ministry of Education and Culture.

MR. GUINGONA: Mr. Presiding Officer, may I ask some questions of the Honorable Commissioner Ople?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Guingona is recognized.

MR. OPLE: I thought we were ready to vote, but I will be very happy to oblige.

MR. GUINGONA: This is with regard to the matter of the educational institution asking permission from the ministry. Does this mean that the compulsion will be imposed by the ministry or by the school?

MR. OPLE: Both, Mr. Presiding Officer, because the Ministry of Education has to grant clearance to a request from the university, and I suppose the MECS will have its own standards to govern cases of this nature.

MR. GUINGONA: I ask, because educational institutions may offer courses as electives and they are generally not required to get a permit from the ministry.

- MR. OPLE: This is our interpretation, Mr. Presiding Officer.
- MR. GUINGONA: I am a little confused because a while ago, I asked Commissioner Rodrigo the same question as to whether or not this particular provision would prohibit or restrict the government, either Congress, the ministry or some other body, from imposing compulsory study of Spanish, and his answer was no.
- MR. OPLE: We have adjusted our views mutually. Mr. Presiding Officer, what I want to emphasize is that we want to strengthen the promotion of Spanish on an effective basis, not on a symbolic and inutile basis.
- MR. GUINGONA: What about state colleges and universities, Mr. Presiding Officer?
- MR. OPLE: They will be governed, I suppose, by the same standard.
- MR. GUINGONA: No, they do not have to ask permission from the ministry. Can they impose compulsory teaching of Spanish?
- MR. OPLE: Subject to existing and future laws. I believe in the largest degree of autonomy for state colleges and universities.
- MR. GUINGONA: What about private educational institutions, Mr. Presiding Officer?
- MR. OPLE: The same thing, but minimum standards shall be maintained and enforced by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports.
- MR. GUINGONA: I thank the Commissioner, Mr. Presiding Officer.
- MR. OPLE: I also thank Commissioner Guingona.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): What is the pleasure of Commissioner Maambong?

MR. MAAMBONG: Mr. Presiding Officer, I am listed as one of the proponents of this provision which we are about to vote on, but I notice that when we heard it now with historical legacy taken out, it appears: "THE STATE SHALL PROMOTE SPANISH AND ARABIC ON A VOLUNTARY AND OPTIONAL BASIS." I think it is a little bit awkward. I sought advice from President Muñoz Palma, who is beside my table, and based on our discussion, I was thinking that probably we could say: "SPANISH AND ARABIC LANGUAGES SHALL BE PROMOTED ON A VOLUNTARY AND OPTIONAL BASIS." How would that sound to the committee?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): What does the chairman of the committee say?

MR. VILLACORTA: The sense is the same, Mr. Presiding Officer, although I think it would be unnecessary to put "LANGUAGES." We just say "SPANISH AND ARABIC."

MR. MAAMBONG: "SPANISH AND ARABIC SHALL BE PROMOTED ON A VOLUNTARY AND OPTIONAL BASIS."

MR. VILLACORTA: That is acceptable, Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The committee has accepted the amendment.

MR. MAAMBONG: Just one point, Mr. Presiding Officer. I would just like to manifest that mention was made of Spanish as an official language by virtue of a presidential

decree. I would like to indicate for the record that it is an interim recognition as an official language, pending the translation of documents which are in the Spanish language. Actually, once we translate the Spanish documents into our official languages, like Filipino and English, this presidential decree will have a self-destruct mechanism.

Thank you.

MR. ROMULO: We are ready to vote, Mr. Presiding Officer.

VOTING

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): We are now ready to vote. The committee has accepted this particular proposed amendment of Commissioners Rodrigo, Ople, Alonto and Maambong, which reads: "SPANISH AND ARABIC SHALL BE PROMOTED ON A VOLUNTARY AND OPTIONAL BASIS."

As many as are in favor of this amendment, please raise their hands. (Several members raise their hands.)

As many as are against, please raise their hands. (A few members raise their hands.)

As many as are abstaining, please raise their hands. (Two members raise their hands.)

The results show 31 votes in favor, 3 against and 2 abstentions; the amendment is approved.

MR. VILLACORTA: Mr. Presiding Officer, the committee would like to request for an adjournment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Before we adjourn, Commissioner Rodrigo is recognized.

MR. RODRIGO: I would just want to make it of record that my fellow proponents of the original amendment before it was amended are Commissioners Rama, Laurel, Calderon, Jamir, Maambong, Monsod, Natividad, Tingson, Regalado and Bengzon.

MR. ROMULO: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The Acting Floor Leader is recognized.

MR. ROMULO: Mr. Presiding Officer, before we adjourn, there is one more section which I feel is not controversial.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): A motion to adjourn takes precedence over any other motion, so we must vote on it.

MR. SARMIENTO: Mr. Presiding Officer, Point of Information. It was not the Floor Leader who moved for the adjournment. It was an ordinary colleague, so the motion was not proper.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The Chair believes anybody can make a motion; besides, we are in the process of voting.

VOTING

As many as are in favor of the motion to adjourn, please raise their hand. (A few members raise their hands.)

As many as are against, please raise their hands. (Several members raise their hands.)

As many as are abstaining, please raise their hands.

(One member raises his hand.)

The results show 16 votes in favor, 20 against and 1 abstention; the motion to adjourn is lost.

The Acting Floor Leader is recognized.

MR. ROMULO: I ask that Commissioner Jamir be recognized.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Jamir is recognized.

MR. JAMIR: Mr. Presiding Officer, my amendment refers to line 17 of the committee draft. After the word “languages,” put a comma (,) and add the words “ARABIC AND SPANISH.”

MR. VILLACORTA: Will the Commissioner please read the entire section for the benefit of the entire body?

MR. JAMIR: Section 3 would now read: “The Constitution shall be promulgated in Filipino and English and shall be translated into the regional languages, ARABIC and SPANISH.”

MR. VILLACORTA: The committee accepts the amendment.

MR. JAMIR: I thank the Commissioner, Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. PADILLA: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Padilla is recognized.

MR. PADILLA: May I propose a formal amendment to read: “The Constitution shall be promulgated in Filipino and English and shall be translated into SPANISH, the regional languages AND ARABIC.” In other words, we put the word “SPANISH” after “translated.”

MR. VILLACORTA: We regret the committee cannot accept the proposed sequence because we feel that regional languages should take precedence over Spanish and Arabic.

MR. PADILLA: May I say just one word, Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The Commissioner may proceed.

MR. PADILLA: We have always considered, first, Filipino as national language, second, Spanish, and we recognize of course, the regional languages and now Arabic. However, Spanish seems to take precedence in the sense that it is one of the official languages after English.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Bengzon is recognized.

MR. BENGZON: May I call for a vote, Mr. Presiding Officer?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Before we proceed to a vote, Commissioner Natividad is recognized.

MR. NATIVIDAD: No, Mr. Presiding Officer. I was preparing myself for an amendment on Section 4 should the voting be over.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Davide is recognized.

MR. DAVIDE: I still have two amendments. The first would be after "regional languages," add the following: "SPOKEN BY MORE THAN FIFTY THOUSAND," thus, "regional languages SPOKEN BY MORE THAN FIFTY THOUSAND, ARABIC AND SPANISH."

MR. OPLE: Point of Information, Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Ople is recognized.

MR. OPLE: May I ask the committee to resolve the issue they will present. According to some language experts, a language to be called as such must be spoken by

at least a million people, otherwise, it is considered just a dialect. Commissioner Bennagen, I suppose, can shed some light on this.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Bennagen is recognized.

MR. BENNAGEN: The status of a language as a category does not rest on the basis of population but rather on the basis of its structure, lexicon and grammar. So, even if the language is spoken by 25 persons, if it cannot be understood by other groups, it acquires the status of a language. It is not mutually intelligible with other languages, although it is a language.

MR. DAVIDE: That is the reason I proposed the amendment. We might have several translations. It would be very, very expensive. So my proposal is to limit the translation to regional languages spoken by more than 50,000 peoples, just like the 1973 Constitutional provision.

MR. BENNAGEN: Can we not just say “MAJOR regional languages”? Not necessarily “MAJOR languages.”

MR. DAVIDE: Yes, “MAJOR regional languages.”

MR. BENNAGEN: But we understand that this should not preclude, of course, further translation into other languages.

MR. DAVIDE: Yes, it will not.

The other amendment is to substitute “The Constitution” with “THIS Constitution.”

MR. BENZON: May we call for a vote now, Mr. Presiding Officer?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The Chair would like to clarify the situation now.

Commissioner Jamir first stood up to propose the addition of “ARABIC AND SPANISH” at the end

of the sentence, which was accepted by the committee but not yet voted upon. Then, Commissioner Padilla stood up to propose that “SPANISH” be transferred before “regional languages.” It was not accepted by the committee. So the Chair would like to submit to a vote first the proposal of Commissioner Jamir, after which, if it is approved, we will vote on whether or not we transfer “SPANISH” before “regional languages.” Then, we will proceed to the amendment of Commissioner Davide.

VOTING

As many as are favor of the proposal of Commissioner Jamir, which is to add “ARABIC AND SPANISH” after “regional languages,” please raise their hands. (Several members raise their hands.)

As many as are against, please raise their hands. (A few members raise their hands.)

As many as are abstaining, please raise their hands. (A few members raise their hands.)

The results show 31 votes in favor, 2 against, and 1 abstention; the amendment is approved.

Commissioner Jamir is recognized.

MR. JAMIR:

May I just read for the record the names of my co-sponsors: Commissioner Rama, Laurel, Rodrigo, Calderon, Maambong, Monsod, Ople, Natividad, Tingson, Regalado and Bengzon.

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): We will now vote on the proposal of Commissioner Padilla to transfer “SPANISH” before “regional languages,” so that it will read: “translated into SPANISH, regional languages AND ARABIC.”

VOTING

As many as are favor of the amendment, please raise their hands. (A few members raise their hands.)

As many as are against, please raise their hands. (Several members raise their hands.)

As many as are abstaining, please raise their hands. (One member raises his hand.)

The results show 4 votes in favor, 28 against and 1 abstention; the amendment is lost.

We will now go to the proposal of Commissioner Davide, which is to change “The Constitution” to “THIS Constitution.

VOTING

As many as are in favor of the amendment, please raise their hands. (Several members raise their hands.)

As many as are against, please raise their hands. (No member raises his hand.)

The results show 34 votes in favor and none against; the amendment is approved.

The next amendment is to add “MAJOR” before “regional languages.”

VOTING

As many as are in favor of the amendment, please raise their hands. (Several members raise their hands.)

As many as are against, please raise their hands. (One member raises his hand.)

The results show 33 votes in favor and 1 against; the amendment is approved.

MR. NATIVIDAD: Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. BENGZON: We now vote on the entire section, Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Before we do that, the Honorable Natividad is recognized.

MR. NATIVIDAD: I have an amendment to Section 4, Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): We will vote first on the entire Section 3, as amended.

MR. SUAREZ: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The Honorable Suarez is recognized.

MR. SUAREZ: May I submit an amendment by addition to Section 3: "IN CASE OF CONFLICT, THE FILIPINO TEXT SHALL PREVAIL."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): What does the committee say?

MR. VILLACORTA: The committee accepts, Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Is there any objection?

MR. MONSOD: I object, Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. RODRIGO: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The Honorable Rodrigo is recognized.

MR. RODRIGO: I am a Tagalog from Bulacan, but if I were to follow my feelings, I would go for that. However, I want to use my head which is above my heart. All the debates here have been in English. There are terms which are almost impossible to translate into Tagalog, for example, “due process of law.” There is no exact translation of that in Tagalog and besides, “due process of law” is already interpreted by our Supreme Court and by courts all over the world. For example, the provision about “information and non-formal education” and “ecological consciousness.” I do not know how to translate those in Tagalog. So while my heart tells me that I should vote for this, my head tells me that it is impractical, it is unfair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Monsod is recognized.

MR. MONSOD: Mr. Presiding Officer, I cannot understand the situation where a translation will prevail over the original.

MR. OPLE: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Ople is recognized.

MR. OPLE : Can we just appeal to Commissioner Suarez not to insist on settling this issue here? Can we leave this to the evolution of the Constitution and of the events in our country so that maybe the courts will prefer to go by the English text in the immediate future? But who knows? Because of this Constitution, the national language may so progress spectacularly, that in 20 years the national

language will have achieved complete technical parity as a tool of the courts for jurisprudential purposes. So I think there is no burden for us to settle this issue now.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): What do Commissioner Suarez and the committee say?

MR. DE CASTRO: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner de Castro is recognized.

MR. DE CASTRO: I agree with the suggestions of Commissioner Ople and I plead with Commissioner Suarez to withdraw his amendment by addition.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Suarez is recognized.

MR. SUAREZ: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

We are not insensitive to the appeals addressed to this humble Representation. After listening to the explanation of the Honorable “Prankisko” Rodrigo, I am willing to withdraw my amendment.

MR. PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The proponent is withdrawing his amendment. Is the committee agreeable to accepting it?

MR. VILLACORTA: The withdrawal, as we understand it, Mr. Presiding Officer, means that we shall be silent about it. Am I correct?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Yes, the Commissioner is correct.

MR. VILLACORTA: Then the committee accepts, Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): So the amendment is then withdrawn.

We are now ready to vote on Section 3, as amended, unless there is any further amendment. It reads as follows: “This Constitution shall be promulgated in Filipino and English and shall be translated into MAJOR regional languages, ARABIC AND SPANISH.”

VOTING

As many as are in favor of the amendment, please raise their hands. (Several members raise their hands.)

As many as are against, please raise their hands. (No member raises his hand.)

The results show 34 votes in favor and none against; Section 3, as amended, is approved.

MR. NATIVIDAD: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The Honorable Natividad is recognized.

MR. NATIVIDAD: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I would like to propose an amendment in Section 4. After the word “established,” delete all the words up to line 22 and in lieu thereof insert the following: “A COMMISSION, COMPOSED OF MEMBERS REPRESENTING VARIOUS REGIONS, AS PROVIDED BY LAW, SHALL UNDERTAKE, COORDINATE AND PROMOTE RESEARCHES ON FILIPINO AND OTHER LANGUAGES FOR THEIR DEVELOPMENT, PROPAGATION AND PRESERVATION.”

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): What does the proponent say to the counter suggestion of the chairman?

MR. OPLE: Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. NATIVIDAD: I yield to Commissioner Ople, Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Ople is recognized.

MR. OPLE: I would like to support Commissioner Natividad precisely in retaining “MEMBERS REPRESENTING VARIOUS REGIONS” because the development of the national language may be too important to leave to the hands of experts. In the sense of specialists, I think Joaquin Ortega y Gasset put it very well when he said that specialists have their major limitations especially when their fields of competence must be related to the wider world and there is a sense in which the development of a language can be interdisciplinary. It can involve anthropology, sociology and even a grasp of politics in terms of what is attainable at a given moment. It can also involve a competence in history so that in the future the appointing power or Congress may have a wider margin of flexibility to choose the appropriate types of regional representatives to this body. I think Commissioner Natividad is right in proposing the words “MEMBERS FROM VARIOUS REGIONS” rather than “LANGUAGE EXPERTS.”

May I just cite an example. Suppose we want Demetrio Quirino to sit on this commission. He

is a school administrator, which is his specialty. He is not a language expert by any standards. By using "LANGUAGE EXPERTS," this provision will bar enthusiasts of the national language like Demetrio Quirino of Nueva Vizcaya.

MR. BENNAGEN: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Bennagen is recognized.

MR. BENNAGEN: Yes, we do recognize that and, as a matter of fact, we are combining the two criteria, interdisciplinary expertise and regional representation, so that we take these two into account.

MR. SARMIENTO: Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. NATIVIDAD: So what will be the position of the committee?

MR. BENNAGEN: It will read: "There shall be established A COMMISSION COMPOSED OF INTERDISCIPLINARY EXPERTS REPRESENTING VARIOUS REGIONS."

MR. NATIVIDAD: But then the choices will be limited to experts, Mr. Presiding Officer?

MR. BENNAGEN: Yes, but as pointed out and as shown by experience, we do have persons who have been involved in the propagation of Filipino, coming from the fields of medicine, physics, engineering, anthropology, political science, psychology and linguistics.

MR. SARMIENTO: Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. DE CASTRO: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Sarmiento is recognized, followed by Commissioner de Castro.

MR. SARMIENTO: May we propose amendments? Maybe we can resolve this impasse. These are proposed by this Representation, President Muñoz Palma and Commissioner Bengzon.

MR. DE CASTRO: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): With the indulgence of Commissioner de Castro, may we ask Commissioner Sarmiento to finish first.

MR. SARMIENTO: We propose that instead of "COMMISSION," we use "NATIONAL LANGUAGE COMMISSION." Before "and representative," and "LANGUAGE EXPERTS" to read: "composed of LANGUAGE EXPERTS and representatives." Mr. Presiding Officer, this is the proposal of these Commissioners, language experts from the University of the Philippines and members of the Pambansang Samahan sa Wika.

MR. DE CASTRO: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The Chair finds the addition of "LANGUAGE EXPERTS" similar to the position of the committee, which is not acceptable to the proponent. May we now hear Commissioner de Castro.

MR. DE CASTRO: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

When we talk of language experts, we are referring to the local language experts?

MR. BENNAGEN: Yes, Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. DE CASTRO: I do not know yet of anybody who is a recognized expert in Cebuano, in Tausug and in Ilocano.

MR. BENNAGEN: We do have experts in these, not necessarily coming from the regions.

MR. DE CASTRO: It would be a matter of choice or a matter of proof to say that one is an expert. But when Commissioner Natividad – I hope I am reading his mind – eliminated the word “EXPERT,” he leaves it to law or to the appointing authority to choose the right persons to compose this commission.

Perhaps, the expert we are referring to may be chosen by the appointing authority, but it will be difficult for us to add the words “LANGUAGE EXPERTS” here and limit the appointing authority from appointing the appropriate people he or she believes competent to form this commission. I, therefore, support the proposition of Commissioner Natividad.

MS. BRAID: Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. BENNAGEN: Mr. Presiding Officer, just one point. We have already broadened the area of choice from just “LANGUAGE EXPERTS” to “INTERDISCIPLINARY EXPERTS,” based on our own experiences that not only those who are language experts have been very active in the propagation of Filipino. We have been very active in the propagation of Filipino. We include also as experts, native speakers of the language.

MR. NATIVIDAD: The reason we use the word “MEMBERS” is to allow the experts and, at the same time, the interdisciplinary authorities, to come in as provided by law. So here we are giving all flexibility to this new commission in order to assure us that the perception should not be too narrow.

We have also experiences on these so-called experts, Mr. Presiding Officer, and they can be very inflexible and too narrow-minded. The commission will need fresh air in the form of interdisciplinary and intersectoral representatives to come in. That is why we placed “MEMBERS” and “AS PROVIDED BY LAW” so that Congress or the appointing authority can provide all the flexibility for a truly efficient commission for this matter.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Rosario Braid would like to say something.

MS. BRAID: Mr. Presiding Officer, I would like to harmonize the two views because I think there is a resistance against the word “EXPERTS.” So I propose the phrase “COMPOSED OF MEMBERS OF VARIOUS DISCIPLINES AND REGIONS,” which means that this would include experts, multidisciplinary teams from different sciences, as well as non-experts who may have a broad overview of needs of society but may not be experts in any particular area.

MR. NATIVIDAD: The amendment is accepted.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): So the amendment, as amended, should read: “A COMMISSION COMPOSED OF MEMBERS OF VARIOUS DISCIPLINES AND REGIONS.”

MR. TINGSON: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Tingson is recognized.

MR. TINGSON: I am just wondering if we incorporate the amendment as proposed by our President along

with Commissioner Sarmiento, whether or not the proponent, Commissioner Natividad, is willing to just delete “COMPOSED OF MEMBERS REPRESENTING” and the suggestions, because we are saying here: “THERE SHALL BE ESTABLISHED A NATIONAL LANGUAGE COMMISSION, AS PROVIDED BY LAW, THAT SHALL UNDERTAKE, COORDINATE AND PROMOTE RESEARCHES.” We are already providing, Mr. Presiding Officer, that this be provided by law. So we leave it to the Legislature. They will know better later on. We do not need to quibble here.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The amendment of the Honorable Natividad has been accepted by the committee, and the Chair believes we should vote on it. If it loses, than we can vote on the alternative wording proposed by Commissioner Sarmiento.

MR. NOLLEDO: Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Nolleddo is recognized.

MR. NOLLEDO: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. Before we vote on the proposed amendment, I would like to pose some inquiries to the committee. The present Institute of National Language does not enjoy the dignity and the stature it deserves. I seldom hear its accomplishments or activities.

Does the committee have in mind certain guidelines to Congress in the formation of this Commission on National Language? For example,

must the members be natural-born citizens? Can an alien, who is an expert in a particular discipline, be appointed to the commission, or should the commission be independent in the sense that it should be independent of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports? Should it be under that ministry?

May we know from the committee whether or not it has formulated certain guidelines to Congress in the formation of this transcendental body known as the Commission on National Language?

MR. VILLACORTA: The specific details that the Commissioner mentioned were not contemplated by the committee. We were mainly concerned with two specific guidelines; namely, that there should be representation from various regions.

MR. NOLLEDO: Will the Commissioner agree with me, Mr. Presiding Officer, that the members of the commission must be natural-born citizens and that no alien shall be appointed to the commission?

MR. VILLACORTA: Now that the Commissioner has mentioned it, the committee agrees with him, Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. BENNAGEN: Although there could be consultants who are non-Filipinos, Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. NOLLEDO: Will the Commissioner agree with me that the commission should be under the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports?

MR. BENNAGEN: No, it should be different.

MR. NOLLEDO: Should it be independent from the ministry?

MR. VILLACORTA: It should be independent.

MR. NOLLEDO: But we expect that the functions must be coordinated with the functions of the ministry.

MR. VILLACORTA: That is right, Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. NOLLEDO: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. DE CASTRO: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner de Castro is recognized.

MR. DE CASTRO: Are the suggestions of Commissioner Nolledo not covered by “AS PROVIDED BY LAW”? The law will certainly take care of all these things. It will be very, very difficult for us to be very concise in the formulation of our constitutional provisions, and yet we say “AS PROVIDED BY LAW,” leaving almost nothing to Congress to think about.

So I believe that the matter of appointing a natural-born citizen and an expert will be covered by the phrase “AS PROVIDED BY LAW.” This will give Congress a wide latitude to act on the matter.

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

MS. BRAID: Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. SARMIENTO: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The proposal is: “THERE SHALL BE ESTABLISHED A COMMISSION COMPOSED OF MEMBERS REPRESENTING VARIOUS REGIONS AND DISCIPLINES, AS PROVIDED BY LAW, THAT SHALL UNDERTAKE, COORDINATE AND PROMOTE RESEARCHES OF FILIPINO

AND OTHER LANGUAGES FOR THEIR DEVELOPMENT, PROPAGATION AND PRESERVATION.”

MR. DAVIDE: May I propose the following amendments, Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. SARMIENTO: Mr. Presiding Officer, before Commissioner Davide proposes amendments, I conferred with Commissioner Natividad and he accepted our amendment. May we know the position of the committee?

MR. BENNAGEN: The amendment is accepted.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The committee has already accepted the proposal of Commissioner Natividad. May we know from Commissioner Sarmiento what their amendment is?

MR. SARMIENTO: Instead of “COMMISSION,” we proposed “NATIONAL LANGUAGE COMMISSION” which was accepted by Commissioner Natividad. So may we know the stand of the committee?

MR. VILLACORTA: The committee accepts the amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The rest of the proposal remains the same.

MR. SARMIENTO: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Davide is recognized.

MR. DAVIDE: I have two proposals, Mr. Presiding Officer. The first is to substitute “THERE SHALL BE ESTABLISHED” with “CONGRESS SHALL ESTABLISH” and to delete “AS PROVIDED BY LAW.” So it will merely read: “CONGRESS SHALL ESTABLISH A NATIONAL

LANGUAGE COMMISSION COMPOSED OF MEMBERS REPRESENTING VARIOUS REGIONS AND DISCIPLINES WHICH SHALL UNDERTAKE..."

MR. VILLACORTA: It is accepted, Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. DE CASTRO: Mr. Presiding Officer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner de Castro is recognized.

MR. DE CASTRO: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. Will the honorable Davide agree to change the word "ESTABLISH" to "CREATE," so it will read: "CONGRESS SHALL CREATE"?

MR. DAVIDE: It may be all right, but we already have several articles in the Constitution where we always mandate Congress in this matter to establish, not to create. So for uniformity in the use of language, I decline, Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. DE CASTRO: Not necessarily, Mr. Presiding Officer. In the Article on the Constitutional Commissions, we stated that Congress shall "create" a Human Rights Commission, not "establish," if I remember right.

MR. VILLACORTA: Shall we leave that to the Committee on Style?

MR. DAVIDE: Yes, to the Style Committee.

MR. DE CASTRO: May we remind the Style Committee that "establish" and "create" are two words which have been discussed here.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): We are now ready to vote on these consolidated amendments of Commissioners Natividad, Sarmiento, Davide and others.

MR. VILLACORTA: May the committee read the formulation for the guidance of the body?

MR. PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): The committee will please proceed.

MR. VILLACORTA: The formulation reads: "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."

VOTING

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): As many as are in favor of the amendment, please raise their hands.
(Several members raise their hands.)

As many as are against, please raise their hands.
(No member raises his hand.)

The results show 30 votes in favor and none against; the amendment is approved.

MR. VILLACORTA: Mr. Presiding Officer, the committee requests the discussion of the Article on Science, Technology, Arts and Culture. (Laughter)

MR. NATIVIDAD: Mr. Presiding Officer.

MR. PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Commissioner Natividad is recognized.

MR. NATIVIDAD: Mr. Presiding Officer, before we go on, let me read the other coauthors of the just approved amendment: Commissioner Sarmiento, President Muñoz Palma, Commissioners Davide, Rama, Laurel, Rodrigo, Calderon, Jamir, Maambong, Monsod, Ople, Tingson, Regalado, Bengzon and de los Reyes.

Thank you very much.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Let it be so recorded.
The Floor Leader is recognized.

MR. RAMA: I move that we adjourn until tomorrow at nine-thirty in the morning.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Azcuna): Is there any objection?
(Silence) The Chair hears none; the session is adjourned until tomorrow at nine-thirty in the morning.

(It was 6:53 p.m.)

REFERENCES

- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- CONSTANTINO, ERNESTO. 1982. Ang 'universal approach' at ang wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas. In *Filipino o Pilipino*, ed. by Ernesto Constantino, et al. 17-23.
- _____. 1965. The sentence patterns of twenty-six Philippine languages. *Lingua* 15.71-124.
- FRANCISCO, JUAN R. 1980. National integration. In *Policy directions for 1980*. Quezon City: Philippine Center for Special Studies.
- _____. 1966. The language problem of India. *Philippine Journal of Language Teaching*, vol. 4.1-2.1-17.
- KURIAN, GEORGE THOMAS. 1983. *World data: The world almanac gazetteer*. New York: World Almanac Publication.
- GONZALEZ, ANDREW, FSC. 1991. Cebuano and Tagalog: Ethnic rivalry redivivus. In *Language and ethnicity: Focusschrift in honor of Joshua A. Fishman on the occasion of his 65th birthday, Volume II*, ed. by James R. Dow, 111-29. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- _____. 1989. The creolization of Philippine English: Evidence for English-as-a-first-language among Metro Manila children. In *Manila: History, people and culture: The proceedings of the Manila Studies Conference*, ed. by Wilfrido V. Villacorta, Isagani R. Cruz, and Ma. Lourdes Brillantes, 359-73. Manila: De La Salle University Press.
- _____. 1988. English and economic survival in the Philippines. *CDCE Journal* 1.2.16-18,6.
- _____. 1980. *Language and nationalism The Philippine experience thus far*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

- _____. 1978. Bilingual education four years after and beyond. *The Philippine Journal of Education* 57.6.286-8.
- _____. 1974. The 1973 Constitution and the bilingual education policy of the Department of Education and Culture. *Philippine Studies* 22.325-37.
- _____ and BONIFACIO SIBAYAN, eds. 1988. *Evaluating bilingual education in the Philippines (1974-1985)*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- HAUGEN, EINAR. 1966. *Language conflict and language planning: The case of modern Norwegian*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- KIKUCHI, YASUSHI. 1990. *A theory of Filipino organizational behavior in education: An anthropological view*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Manila: De La Salle University.
- SIBAYAN, BONIFACIO. 1985. Teaching for communicative competence in a second language. In *Communicative language teaching*, ed. by Bikram K. Das. RELC Anthology Series no. 14.106-19. Singapore: University of Singapore Press.
- YABES, LEOPOLDO. 1973. Let's study the new Constitution. *The Language Provision*. *Philippine Social Sciences and Humanities Review*. XXXVIII. NO. 1-2. March-June 1973. Quezon City: University of the Philippines.

APPENDIX**LANGUAGE PROVISIONS OF PHILIPPINE CONSTITUTIONS AND LAWS****1896 Biak-na-Bato Constitution****Article 8**

El tagalog sera la lengua official de la Republica.

1899 The Malolos Constitution**Article 93**

The use of the languages spoken in the Philippines is optional. It can be regulated by law, and solely as regards acts of public authorities and judicial affairs. For these acts, the Spanish language shall be used for the present.

1935 Commonwealth Constitution**Article 14 Section 3**

The Congress shall take steps toward the development and adoption of a common national language based on one of the existing native languages. Until otherwise provided by law, English and Spanish shall continue as official languages.

1943 Laurel Constitution**Article 9 Section 2**

The government shall take steps toward the development and propagation of Tagalog as the national language.

1973 Marcos Constitution

Article 15 Section 3

This Constitution shall be officially promulgated in English and in Pilipino, and translated into each dialect spoken by over fifty thousand people, and into Spanish and Arabic. In case of conflict, the English text shall prevail.

The Batasang Pambansa shall take steps toward the development and formal adoption of a common national language to be known as Pilipino.

Until otherwise provided by law, English and Pilipino shall be the official languages.

1986 Freedom Constitution

Article 14 Section 6

The national language of the Philippines is Filipino. As it evolves, it shall be further developed and enriched on the basis of existing Philippine and other languages.

Subject to provisions of law and as the 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 in the educational system.

Section 7

For purpose of communication and instruction, the official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and, until otherwise provided by law, English.

The regional languages are the auxiliary official languages in the regions and shall serve as auxiliary media of instruction therein.

Section 9

The Congress shall establish a national language commission composed of representatives of various and disciplines which shall undertake, coordinate, and promote researches for the development, propagation, and preservation of Filipino and other languages.

1987 **Aquino Constitution****Article 14 Section 6**

The national language of the Philippines is Filipino. As it evolves, it shall be further developed and enriched on the basis of existing Philippine and other languages.

Subject to provisions of law and as the 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 in the educational system.

Section 7

For purposes of communication and instruction, the official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and, until otherwise provided by law, English.

The regional languages are the auxiliary official languages in the regions and shall serve as auxiliary media of instruction therein. Spanish and Arabic shall be promoted on a voluntary and optional basis.

Section 9

The Congress shall establish a national language commission composed of representatives of various regions and disciplines

which shall undertake, coordinate, and promote researches for the development, propagation, and preservation of Filipino and other languages.

LAWS ON THE NATIONAL LANGUAGE

- 1936 The National Language Law (Commonwealth Act Number 184) authored by Norberto Romualdez had been passed in 1937. The National Language Institute had been established and by December of that same year, after discussion and consultation with Cebuanos (who proved the most resistant), Tagalog was chosen as the basis of the national language and in future books and textbooks was referred to as the National Language or Wikang Pambansa.
- 1991 The Congress established a Commission on National Language composed of representatives from different regions and disciplines who will work on, put together, and promote researches in Filipino and other local languages for their development, propagation and preservation.

Monograph Series No. 41



9 789717 800080

ISBN 971-780-008-1