

Krisis sa Edukasyon

DR. DEMETRIO QUIRINO (Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities / PACU): Private educational institutions take care of 80 percent of the total college enrollment and 45 percent of secondary enrollment. It costs much to give quality education. That is why the budgetary appropriations for state colleges and universities for the year 1989 is 4.25 billion pesos. With enrollment of 120 thousand in state colleges and universities, the government spends an average of 12,500 pesos for every student. The tuition being charged by non-exclusive private schools ranges only from 3,200 pesos to 4,000 pesos per school year. This is roughly one-fourth to one-third of that being spent by the government per student in state institutions.

We in the private schools are greatly disheartened by the accusation that we are greedy operators. We are doing our best, under very trying circumstances, to give good education to those who choose to enrol in our schools. Education is supposed to be the function of the government and here we are doing this function at very much less the price for quality education. Yet we are practically everyone's favorite whipping boy.

The problem of peace and order in schools is a very grave one. Year in and year out, we see activist students who compose a minority of the student population using unlawful means to disturb the peaceful conduct of classes, even resorting to intimidation and threats of the use of force. Students who wish to attend their classes are denied this right because of the unlawful tactics of a handful of students who do not mind their studies at all. To cite an example, in the Technological Institute of the Philippines where we have some 25 thousand students, a small group of not more than 100 students were able to keep 24,900 other students from going to their classes by putting up barricades and



using threats. We were ready to serve the students; the faculty were waiting in their classrooms but the students were intimidated from attending their classes. This was the situation in other schools such as Feati University, Central Colleges of the Philippines, PATS Aeronautical School, NCBA, University of the East, National Teachers College, Adamson University, Far Eastern University, University of Baguio, St. Louis University and other schools. In the meantime, threats of some kind of unlawful mass action in other schools in Metro Manila were being made. The faculty decided to suspend classes on 14 July 1989 in order to protect the life and limb of students and other members of the community and properties of the schools. After a series of meetings with the Department of Education, Culture and Sports (DECS), Maj. Alexander Aguirre, and Metro Manila Governor Efrain Cruz, we were assured that the law will be enforced. The PACU, in its General Assembly on 17 July, decided to lift the suspension of classes on 19 July.

We cannot understand how the government operates. First, there was a 25-peso per day increase in the minimum wage. After several meetings with DECS and the Congress, it was agreed that an increase of 12 pesos per unit would be enough to cover the 25 pesos per day increase. Despite the fact that the ceiling has been imposed, we were still required to consult with the students, the faculty, the parents, and the alumni association. It was required after we had already enrolled students and after DECS Order No. 55, which did not require consultation, was issued.

The intent of Republic Act 6728 must be interpreted to mean that consultation is not required in schools not charging a tuition increase of more than 12 pesos per unit. Sections 5-A and 9-A do not mention consultation; only Sections 5-B and 9-C do. Section 5-B says that schools charging over 1,500 pesos may not increase tuition without prior consultation. Section 10 states that in any proposed tuition increase, there should be appropriate consultations conducted by the school administration with the duly organized association of parents, teachers and faculty with respect to the secondary schools. With respect to colleges, audited financial statements should be made available to authorized representatives of the associations mentioned. Every effort shall be exerted to reconcile possible differences. In case of a disagreement, the alumni association of the school or any impartial body of their choice shall act as arbitrator.

What schools need is the atmosphere of free enterprise in which they will be allowed to determine their own tuition rates so they can give the kind of quality education that is expected from them. The schools should not be told how to spend their income because that is putting them in a straight jacket.

RA 6728 recognizes the policy of the state of promoting quality education and making it accessible to all. It recognizes the complementarity of public and private educational institutions. It



acknowledges the contributions of private schools to the country's educational system. The latter intent of the law must be emphasized.

MR. ALDRIN DULIG (University of the East / UE): The state recognizes the vital role of the youth in nation building. It seeks to inculcate patriotism and nationalism in the youth and encourage them to become involved in public civic affairs. The Constitution proclaims as a matter of state policy the priority of education, specifically science and technology, the arts, culture and sports. Thus, the state is supposed to give highest budgetary priority to education. The mandate is for the state to protect and promote the right of all citizens to quality education at all levels and shall take appropriate steps to make such education accessible to all.

According to the Family Income and Expenditures Survey, households of five members earning an annual income of 3,500 pesos fall on the poverty level. According to the Center for Research and Communications, a family of five must earn at least six thousand pesos to live decently. Today, the average worker earns only about 1,680 pesos per month while many others earn much less. Rural agricultural workers, for instance, are paid as low as 10 pesos per day. Seventy percent of Filipino families live below the poverty line. Two years ago, the Child and Youth Welfare Council revealed that only 17 out of 100 students entering the grade school will be able to afford the high costs of college education. Families living below the poverty line cannot afford to send their children beyond elementary school. With this year's round of tuition increases, about 300 thousand students will not be able to enrol. For what purpose then is free public education in the primary and secondary levels if they cannot afford the high costs of tertiary education? It is, therefore, very ironic that the government makes primary and secondary education free but takes back this benefit by throwing the burden of college education on the students and their parents.

It is true that the state recognizes the complementarity of public and private education and allows private schools to make some reasonable profit by granting them the authority to increase tuition. The Constitution, however, mandates that the government must supervise and regulate all educational institutions.

The recent increase in tuition shows the trends towards the privatization of education. And when tuition is increased, enrollment falls. To fulfill the provisions of the Constitution, it is, therefore, necessary for tuition to be rolled back. How can there be quality education if there is no support from the government? Our call, therefore, is for the government to initially subsidize private education by rechanneling budgetary allocations for debt payments to education, and then to eventually nationalize private schools. Under the Constitution, education is a vocation, a right. But with the educational system being controlled by capitalists, education will remain a privilege. Unless and until private schools are nationalized, a repeat of the case of the Ortanez University in which DECS Secretary Quisumbing acted against the interest of students will occur. This explains why we are demanding the resignation of Sec. Quisumbing and the reconstitution of the DECS so that it will fully implement the Constitution and serve the people.

Batas Pambansa 232, otherwise known as the Education Act of 1982, allows capitalist educators to extort money from students and their parents and is a tool used by US imperialism to miseducate us. This is because, in the first place, the Ford Foundation lobbied for this law. We, therefore, demand the immediate repeal of this law and its replacement by one that is drafted in consultation with concerned sectors in the educational system.

MR. JAY FAMADOR (Ateneo de Manila University): Private capitalist institutions dominate the country's educational system. This is proof of the government's inability to uphold the people's right to education. But is free enterprise the solution to the crisis in our educational system? Contrary to Dr. Quirino's position, I believe that the operation of the laws of free enterprise in the schools is the root cause of the crisis in education. I would propose, instead, the application of the following principles in our school system: democratization, socialization, and nationalization.

Through socialization, access to quality education will be made available to rich and poor alike. Through democratization, authentic education will be fostered, enabling all sectors in the academe to participate in the formulation of all policies and programs affecting them. Through nationalization, the state will assume, as it should, the responsibility of upgrading the quality of our education. In developed countries, education is the primary concern of the state. If ever private schools are allowed to operate, their motive is not profit; they solicit support from alumni and other foundations.

The government, however, has chosen to negate all the above principles. Its budgetary allocation for education is negligible as compared to that for debt servicing. It has consistently demonstrated impatience towards students and teachers who bring their grievances to the streets in the absence of democratic institutions in schools. There is, therefore, valid cause for our resistance to tuition hikes, repression in school campuses, and the degradation of the teaching profession.

MS. CORRINTA BARRANCO (University of Santo Tomas / UST): UST is a Catholic university that has existed for 378 years. It has a population of 40 thousand students, 1,200 faculty members, 809 non-academic personnel, 500 hospital personnel, and 40 Dominican priests. The UST community is largely conservative and middle class.

The UST Faculty Union was established in 1981 but was certified only in 1983. At that time, the Father Rector was Fr. Fermin, an enlightened and efficient administrator. In 1982, however, Fr. Fermin was replaced by Fr. Norberto Castillo during whose term relations between the administration and our union soured. At the root of these bad relations would be the authoritarian methods of the rector and his advisers. Let me narrate the following incidents to show how bad the situation is in UST:

First, our initial series of negotiations for a collective bargaining agreement (CBA) began in September 1985 but was deadlocked after a series of fruitless meetings. We filed a notice of strike but, through the timely intervention of Fr. Fermin, our former rector, we decided to postpone it.

Second, the grievance machinery of our CBA bogged down when Fr. Castillo refused to honor the decision of an ad hoc committee that he himself appointed.

Third, the University has increased tuition four times since 1985. This year, for example, the tuition of college freshmen was increased by 100 percent. They originally paid 1,300 pesos as full payment but under the recent agreement for the re-structuring of fees, they shall not be allowed to take the final exam without first paying an additional 1,400 pesos. Sophomores would have to add 600 pesos; the juniors, 600 pesos; and seniors, 400 pesos. Notwithstanding these increases, we in the faculty have yet to receive our share thereof. (The administration announced last week that we will be given a 25-peso a day increase even though, they hasten to add, we are not entitled to it. If this is not implemented, there will be an absurd situation in which the salary of elevator operators will surpass that of professors.)

Fourth, the education and hospital benefits that we were enjoying under the terms of the 1985 CBA have been suspended.

Fifth, in August 1987, the faculty went on strike, the first in the university's history. In September 1987, Fr. Castillo filed a libel case against 45 professors in the College of Arts and Letters who asked him in writing to step out of his air-conditioned office and look into the case of their colleagues who were mauled inside the classroom by outsiders. Fr. Castillo also filed a libel suit against 18 union officers for allowing the publication of the letter in the union bulletin prior to the strike.

In September 1988, we had negotiations for another CBA. In February 1989, our negotiations were deadlocked and we filed a notice of strike. Labor Secretary Drilon, however, assumed jurisdiction and we decided not to go through with the strike.

Sixth, not once did Fr. Castillo hold a dialogue with the union. Neither has he given us an appointment for even one dialogue.

Seventh, on 23 June 1989, the 16 remaining officers and directors, including myself, of the faculty union were dismissed by the University Board of Trustees which is convened and presided by Fr. Castillo. The grounds cited for our dismissal were serious misconduct, serious disrespect for authority, and conduct unbecoming of faculty members. Sec. Drilon thrice ordered the reinstatement of these 16 under the terms and conditions prevailing before their dismissal. Only eight of us got our classes back, seven are still in limbo. The administration claimed that these seven have been terminated and that those who took their place are now permanent teachers. It then promised us continued payment and new but equivalent academic assignments. As a matter of principle, we refused their offer.



S/pat, 1988

Eighth, a few days ago, the University filed charges of illegal strike against the 700 to 800 teachers who went on mass leave for two weeks in protest of the dismissal of the 16 union officers and directors. Demoralization has set in the University and the turn-over rate has reached its peak.

At the root of all these troubles is the authoritarian methods of the administration. The administration is not willing to allow other sectors of the University to participate in the making of decisions; it brands all those who disagree with its policies as rebels or troublemakers. Greed, too, is the cause of all these problems -- that is, greed for power and money.

There is yet hope for us because Fr. Castillo's term will end in April next year. The problem, however, is that he can be re-elected.

MR. NATHANIEL SANTIAGO (League of Filipino Students): Sa proseso ng pakikipaglaban sa tuition hike, meron kaming nasilip na butas. Ayon sa aming imbestigasyon, ang pagtaas ng matrikula ay hindi lamang unjust o unconstitutional dahil nga nasa Constitution na dapat tiyakin ng estado na maging accessible ang education sa lahat. Nadiskubre namin na ang mga paaralan na nagtaas ng matrikula ay lumabag pati na rin sa subsidy act. Nakakita kami ng butas doon sa ginawa ng private schools sapagkat nakalagay sa subsidy act na kahit mayroong regulation ng tuition increase, dapat maglunsad ng democratic consultation ang mga paaralan bago magtaas ng matrikula. At ayon sa dato na nakuha namin, 69 out of 75 schools sa Metro Manila ang hindi nagkaroon ng democratic consultation. Karamihan sa nagtaas ng matrikula ay simpleng nagtapal ng poster o nagbigay ng letter na magtataas nga sila ng matrikula. Nilabag nila ang diwa ng konsultasyon. Iyong konsultasyon na sinasaad ng subsidy act ay hindi lamang simpleng konsultasyon. Ito ay sincere na interpretation base na rin sa gumawa ng batas. Ito ay iyong mag-uusap at mag-nenegotiate ang estudyante at teachers, magbigay ng mga counter-proposals at pagkatapos, kung hindi magkasundo, mayroong arbitration. In effect, hindi na sole prerogative ng DECS o administration ang pagpapasya sa pagtataas ng matrikula. Nang masilip namin iyan, nag-shift kami doon sa mga panawagan na absolute roll back ng lahat ng tuition increases, ang refund ng nangyari nang tuition increases, at ang pag-daos ng democratic consultations. In line ito sa paniniwala namin na hindi makatarungan ang pagtaas ng matrikula para sa nakakaraming mahihirap. Sa aming panawagang ito, ang sagot naman ng DECS sa pahayag ni Sec. Quisumbing sa Senado ay ang ipatupad ang batas na nagbabawal ng increase without prior consultation.

Kung talagang kailangang-kailangan nilang magtaas ng matrikula, sundin nila ang democratic consultation. At dito pwede i-assert ng mga estudyante sa local level na hindi justified ang increase o pwede rin silang pumasok sa isang compromise kung talagang masahol ang situation.

Ang naging patakaran ng pamahalaan sa edukasyon ay mas masahol pa sa nakaraang pamahalaan sapagkat hindi na nila dinagdagan ang pondo ng public schools, palalaksin pa ang kanilang profit-orientedness. Dahil dito, naging mas militante ang porma ng pakikibaka ng mga estudyante. Sa totoo lang, ang mga nakita ninyong batuhan sa campus ay hindi ginusto ng mga protestors o organizers. Nagsimula ang protesta noong Hunyo 13, mapayapa ito pero ito'y hinarapan ng dahas. Anim ng kaso ng mapayapang protesta ang nabuwag. Kaya dumating ang point na pati ang mga estudyante ay pinagtanggol ang kanilang lehitimong protesta. Sa mga protesta ang tinatanong ay hindi na kung handa ba sila sa barikada kundi kung meron pa silang bato. Hindi ko sila masisisi kung ganito na sila mag-isip. Ang protesta ng mga estudyante ngayon ay mas masaklaw, mas matagal (mahigit isang buwan na ito), at mas militante. Ang suporta na rin ng publiko at ng Senado ay lumalakas.

DR. JOSE V. ABUEVA (President, University of the Philippines / UP): Nais ko sanang umpisahan ang aking komentaryo sa paglalahad ng mga issues na, sa tingin ko, ay pumapalalim sa krisis ng edukasyon. Isang contradiction ay ang quality education vs. equity o access to education. Gusto natin ng mataas na uri ng antas ng ating edukasyon. At the same time, gusto rin natin na ang nakakarami ay makapasok sa eskuwela mula elementary hanggang sa university. Ang dalawang hangarin na ito ay contradictory dahil sa aking karanasan bilang professor at ngayon administrator ng pamantasan, there is no such thing as cheap and good education. Quality education is expensive anywhere in the world.

Ang pangalawang issue ay ang kakulangan ng vision tungkol sa edukasyon. Kung susuriin mo ang ating batas, maliwanag ang layunin ukol sa edukasyon. Ang problema nga lang ay maganda ang ating panaginip ngunit hindi tayo gumagawa na sapat ng hakbang para maabot ito.

Isa sa mga issues na nabanggit ay ang privatization of education. Ngunit sa elementary at high school, mukhang ang karamihan ng eskuwela ay public schools. Sa college level naman, karamihan ay private. Nabanggit ang nationalization ng mga eskuwela. Ano ba ang ibig sabihin nito? Papalitan ba ng state ang mga private schools? How do you nationalize private education?

Sa UP, sinasagawa namin ang isang socialized tuition program. So far, ito ang resulta: Meron kaming 36 thousand undergraduate students sa buong UP system. Forty-four percent nito or 11,459 ay hindi nagbayad ng tuition. Sila ang mga naggagaling sa lowest four income levels. Ang lowest income levels ay those with incomes lower than 30 thousand pesos or lower than 60 thousand pesos. Sa 11,459 na ito, mayroong 24 percent na hindi lamang libre sa tuition at miscellaneous fees, kundi may monthly allowance pa ranging from 250 pesos to one thousand pesos, at book allowance worth between 250 pesos to 500 pesos. Ang ibig sabihin nito, yung mga estudyante na nasa lowest income level na below 20 thousand pesos (or 25 thousand pesos sa rural areas) ay makakakuha ng sustento amounting to 19 to 21 thousand pesos. Sa mga estudyante na mahuhusay ang record sa secondary school at nakapasa sa UPCAT, dapat hindi na sila mangamba sapagkat kaya na nilang mag-aral dito sa UP. Ang isa pang reporma na sinasagawa namin ay ang tinatawag na UP Assessment on the State of the Nation. Ang mga iskolar sa iba't ibang discipline sa buong UP system ay magkakaroon ng multi-disciplinary assessment sa iba't ibang larangan ng bansa: sa economy, pulitika, kultura, at iba pa. Ito ang magiging alay namin sa ating bayan at sa mga pinuno para sa reporma ng ating lipunan.

MR. AMANTE JIMENEZ (University of the Philippines / UP): Mayroong isang estudyante ng University of Manila (UM) na nag-kuwento tungkol sa kalagayaan nila doon. Meron silang isang preliminary examination na slated for August 13, 14, and 15. Biglang binago ito ng administrasyon at naging August 2, 3, and 4 ang schedule. Isang estudyante ang nanguna sa isang petition para ibalik ang dating schedule. Marami ang pumirma. Itong estudyante ngayon ay sinundan sa bahay, tinakol at tinanggal doon sa eskuwela.

Doon pa rin sa UM, ang mga estudyante, bago sila pumasok sa eskuwelahan, ay kailangang pumirma ng waiver na nagsasabi na hindi sila sasali sa anumang organisasyon o magtatayo ng anumang organisasyon o sasali sa kahit anong kilos protesta. Lahat ng mga nakalagay sa Magna Carta of Students' Rights ay pinagbabawalan.

Itong kalagayan sa UM ay na-uulit sa iba't ibang paaralan sa lahat ng parte ng bansa.

Dito naman sa UP, mayroong tinatawag na work ethics program. Sa tingin namin, itong program na ito ay isasagawa dahil gustong magtipid ang administrasyon sa pag-hire ng employees. Ang kanilang balak i-employ ngayon ay ang mga estudyante at walang bayad pa.

Nabanggit kangina ni Pres. Abueva na ang layunin ng socialized tuition program ay ang maabot ang mahihirap. Pero sa tingin ko hindi nito magagalaw ang kasalukuyang admissions system na may bias sa mga mayayamang estudyante na graduate ng private high schools. Sa tingin namin, ang tunay na layunin ay ang kumita ng 23 million pesos at ang lumikha ng bagong kamalayang nagsasabi na ang state university ay dapat self-reliant para makapagbigay ng quality education. Tutoong kailangan ang funds para sa quality education. Pero hindi nangangailangang ang pera ay manggagaling sa estudyante. Responsibility ito ng gobyerno to whom we pay taxes.

Ang proper approach sa krisis sa edukasyon should be one that begins with the premise that education is a right. Ang ibig sabihin nito, kailangang magsikap ang gobyerno na mabigyan ng libreng edukasyon ang kanyang mamamayan. Karapatdapat na i-expand ang public schools. Sinasabi naman nila na ang kakayahan ng estado ay limitado. Pero hindi naman namin inaasahang kaagad-agad magkaroon ng libreng edukasyon, bahay at iba pang social services. Ang hindi lamang namin maintindihan ay kung bakit, sa gitna ng gipit, pinili ng gobyernong magbayad ng mga utang na hindi naman nagbigay ng benepisyo sa tao.

NATHANIEL SANTIAGO: Gusto ko lang mag-comment doon sa mga issues na ni-raise ng panel. Iyong una ay ang issue ng nationalization of education. Sa aking paningin ang edukasyon ay isang social service. Ito ay nagiging commodity o subject ng free enterprise kung pinababayaan ang kanyang tungkuling mabigyan ng edukasyon ang mamamayan. Doon naman sa issue ng quality vs. equity, sa tingin ko ang quality ng education ay lalong bumababa sa ilalim ng free enterprise sapagkat nagiging diploma mill ang ating educational system; ang demand ng market for cheap and low-skilled labor ang siyang gustong tugunan nito. Hindi ibig sabihin na kapag widely accessible ang edukasyon, bababa ang quality nito. Sa pamamagitan ng malaking state subsidy, magiging mura ang education para sa mahihirap dahil ang bullo ng expenses ay papasanin ng estado. Ang quality ng edukasyon ay tataas dahil may pondo na para sa sahod ng mga guro, sa libraries, laboratories, etc.. Ang mas relevant na issue ay ang kakulangan ng political will ng estado o 'di kaya interes sa social service. Ang interes o vision ng gobyerno ay ang i-maintain ang status quo. Ang DECS ay instrumento lamang ng naghaharing interes sa estado at ng mga kapitalistang school administrators kaya hindi ito makagawa ng decisive action sa mga problema ng mga sector ng mag-aaral at guro.

Comment: Maraming mga konsepto na medyo loose ang paggamit. Katulad ng konseptong ang education is a right, hence the state should provide equal access to everybody. Sa palagay ko, it is knowledge that is a right while education is a process. And what the state or society should provide for is not a university education, but basic elementary and high school education. Ang problema natin sa universities, public or private, ay masyadong maraming estudyante. This is cultural. The University must not be seen as a sausage factory, subject to the patronage of the state. Parang hinihingi natin ay pera para huwag tayong mag-socialize ng tuition. Bigyan na lang tayo ng pera at papasukin lahat. This is such an absurd idea. A university is, first of all, a community of intellectuals. Second, it is the center of expertise. Ang suliranin ng UP, specifically sa panahong ito, is that we are not too kind to say that we cannot accept too many students without a proportional increase in the budget. The whole crisis of education, which is supposed to be the subject of this afternoon's discussion, appears to remain undefined. Ano ba ang me problema? Napaghalo-halo yata natin ang paggamit ng right at social service. Iyong notion ng proseso at struktura ng edukasyon pinaghalo-halo natin sa tertiary university education at basic o primary education.

DR. DEMETRIO QUIRINO: First, I would like to correct the impression that 300,000 students are being denied admission every year because of the increase in tuition. Despite the increase of tuition, the college population in 1987 was 1.3 million, 1.469 million in 1988, and about 1.6 million in 1989. So much has been said about the nationalization of schools. We in the private sector, especially in the PACU, have been amused by this. The return of investment in private schools is only 10 percent; that is all we are allowed to get out of the schools. That is the only profit we are allowed to earn. So where is the profit motive here?

By the way, if you nationalize all the private schools now, you will need an additional amount of not less than 20 billion pesos a year. The government is not in a position to do this. About two or three years ago, the UE wanted to sell to some entity but DECS stopped the sale although it was already consummated. There are many in the private sector who would like to give up. We are ashamed of the kind of education that we give in private schools. We are trying our best to give good education. But this costs a lot of money. What can you expect from schools that charge only from three thousand pesos to 3,200 pesos a year? From what schools do the best graduates come? From the schools that charge high tuition. The students of Ateneo, La Salle, UST, and UP are lavished with funds for their education on top of the tuition that they are paying. By the way, in priority courses, tuition was not actually increased, because the government will pick up the difference in the increase in tuition. That is, the 12 peso per unit increase is going to be subsidized by the government in the form of a voucher. I explained a while ago that we had several dialogues with congressional leaders and the DECS. We told them that, if they insist on the 25 peso-increase of the daily minimum wage, we cannot operate the schools unless we increase tuition. We asked a tuition increase of 15 to 19 pesos but we finally settled for a 12-peso-increase per unit. This increase was approved, why then do we need consultations with the students? These students have a number of schools to choose from anyway.

DR. JOSE V. ABUEVA: Many students believe that education is a right that extends to all levels. In advanced countries, however, only very few actually enter the universities to specialize.

There are many students who are sincere in their activism. There are some, however, who are progressive only in rhetoric. When it comes to reform that touch their pocket, they are as conservative or reactionary as most other people in or outside the university. Why do we have so much opposition to the socialized tuition scheme? Why was the opposition concentrated in UP Manila and Diliman? Simple, because 52 percent of students in UP Diliman, belong to a higher income bracket. Sixty percent in UP Manila belong to a higher income bracket. Among those 44 percent who benefitted from the scheme, there was very little opposition. Marx was right in saying that your economic situation shapes your opinion. Sending a student to UP directly costs about 11,000 pesos per year and this is the direct cost per student. But students who fall within the highest income bracket, some of whom are millionaires, pay only four thousand pesos per semester, with the remaining 1,500 peso-direct cost being subsidized by the government. As for those who come from families of very meager income, we can give them each a subsidy of about 30 thousand pesos a year.

NATHANIEL SANTIAGO: Doon sa issue kung ang tertiary education ay isang privilege or right, wala kaming ilusyon na dapat lahat ay pumasok sa kolehiyo. Ang sinasabi lang namin ay hindi dapat makasagabal ang simpleng kawalan ng pera ng isang estudyante na nanggagaling sa mga maliliit na pamilya para pagkaitan siya ng kanyang mga karapatan na makapasok ng tertiary school. Kaya sa amin, ang education, kahit sa tertiary, ay karapatan pa rin at hindi privilege ng may pera lamang.

Hindi ako sang-ayon sa total abolition ng private schools. They can exist as long they are really non-profit oriented.

AMANTE JIMENEZ: Medyo nalungkot ako doon sa binabanggit si Pres. Abueva hinggil sa katangian ng mga lider estudyante sa loob at labas ng UP. Sa palagay ko naman, ang kanilang pagtutol sa socialized scheme ay hindi dahil sila ay nanggagaling sa bracket nine kundi dahil sa nakikita nilang mali ang pundasyon na kinatatayuan ng socialized tuition program.