

DISCUSSION 9

MR. DAVID SYCIP: I agree with Dr. Silliman's main thesis that the Court of Agrarian Relations cannot really be the primary agent of change because the court merely interprets the laws, structures or decrees that are on the books. The thrust for change really comes from the executive. And it is futile to look at the court to bring about the change because it only enforces—and not even enforce if the plaintiff does not complain!—the law.

DR. AUGUSTO CAESAR ESPIRITU: As a matter of fact, I think there is a change now—from force to commission, or administrative settlement rather than legal adjudication.

DR. SIDNEY SILLIMAN: First, may I suggest that one of the changes that has reduced the importance of the Court of Agrarian Relations (CAR) even further is this transfer of mediation from the CAR to the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR). The lawyers of DAR's legal system process things at a different level. And this is a problem. In the first place, DAR is an advocate for the tenant; the landholder, obviously, will not like this type of arrangement.

Furthermore, there is a number of legal questions which do not become resolved in that sort of process; questions that really ought to be handled by the CAR.

On the other hand, however, it is my personal opinion that the CAR, is that instrument which, in a sense, has been most effective in bringing some changes to that area of land reform which has ironically bogged down. I am specifically speaking of the present agrarian land reform program. I think the CAR is much more successful in this area than the DAR. So, even though the CAR has been limited to implementing the laws that are established, still it is successful in certain dimension.

MR. DAVID SYCIP: The main cause for change has to come from the executives. The CAR can only facilitate the change, or it can retard it by the way it encourages the law.