

# philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University · Loyola Heights, Quezon City · 1108 Philippines

---

## **Current Expense Appropriations for Public Elementary Education, 1881-1896**

Henry Frederick Fox

*Philippine Studies* vol. 2, no. 4 (1954): 341–359

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

---

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at [philstudies@admu.edu.ph](mailto:philstudies@admu.edu.ph).

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>

# Current Expense Appropriations For Public Elementary Education, 1881-1896

---

HENRY FREDERICK FOX

The proper education of children on a broad scale has always and everywhere been expensive. This is true irrespective of whether the enterprise is private or public. Adequate buildings, equipment, and personnel by the very nature of the lofty purpose which they serve, are costly. And, of course, the wider the coverage and the more excellent the quality desired, the higher the price will rise. For an economically underdeveloped nation like the Philippines, needless to add, the burden was, in Spanish times as now, particularly heavy.

Financial support for government-conducted education encounters, over and above the universal and basic problem of available wealth, numerous other more complex obstacles in the shape of public apathy, prestige seeking, political patronage, factional contests for control, and interservice competition. Genuine need as the norm for public-fund allocation not infrequently gives way to "special interest" power. Money, for example, which on the basis of "the greatest good for the greatest number" principle, should be allotted to the elementary schools in the provinces, is, in fact, spent upon the government university in the capital city. There thus results the utterly incongruous spectacle of countless municipal and barrio schools housed

in huts while the national or state universities bask in large luxurious buildings on enormous campuses.<sup>1</sup>

But perhaps the gravest evil with which government school financing must contend is the long-standing practice of professional promoters and public school pressure groups to demand an educational organization and program clearly beyond the resources of the country to support. To this calculated insistence, unfortunately, political officials have often capitulated, thereby violating the simple but inexorable economic principle that a nation which enjoys only a modest income can only afford an instructional system of modest scope and proportions.

Both Spain in the last years of her occupancy and the United States during hers were inclined to indulge in this corrupting practice of planning educationally quite beyond available income. Hence rises the painful necessity for the student of Philippine public-school history to scrutinize critically the nature and adequacy of all the *means* provided by these respective administrations to implement their grandiose programs. In practice, since money constitutes the chief means whereby governments secure buildings, equipment, and personnel, this scrutiny largely takes the form of an inquiry into the amounts and distribution of the budgetary allotments actually made for public instruction.

The article here submitted represents a summarized account of just such an investigation. The grants examined were those actually assigned by the Spanish-Philippine government, particularly by the municipalities, in favor of the *operational* costs of the public elementary school system over the fifteen-year period, 1881-1896. Sums awarded for educational purposes other than *operation* are not discussed in this report; nor are secondary school appropriations included except those assigned to the official government teacher-training establishments.

#### SCOPE OF THE REPORT

Modern public school accounting classifies expenditures into three principal types: (1) *Capital Outlay*, (2) *Debt*

*Service*, (3) *Current Expense*. The first includes such items as building construction, site, and equipment. The second comprises chiefly long-term bond and interest payments. With neither of these two kinds of disbursement is the present discussion concerned. *Current Expense* allocations are the sole explicit object of our attention. This class of expenditure covers the six major operational services: (1) *General Administration*, (2) *Instruction*, (3) *Auxiliary Activities*, (4) *Plant Operation*, (5) *Plant Maintenance*, (6) *Fixed Charges*. Under the heading of *Instruction* the accountants place all the salary and supply costs of the teaching staff and the principals' offices. *General Administration*, on the other hand, takes care of the salary and supply expenses of all management above the individual school level. Disbursements for electric light and power, telephone communication, and janitorial service fall under *Plant Operation*, while those for building and equipment repair and replacement are charged to *Plant Maintenance*. *Auxiliary Activities* are services related to, but not directly a component of, the basic school function of youth development. Adult Education is an auxiliary activity. Under *Fixed Charges*, finally, come all expenses like rentals, insurance premiums, and pension payments.

Unhappily for the historian of education, neither the Spanish-Philippine nor any other government of the contemporary world followed this carefully constructed and comparatively simple system. One will, for example, search in vain for distinct appropriations for *Plant Operation* or *Plant Maintenance*. Either no funds at all were assigned these services (which would not be too surprising in that less departmentalized era, when even today in the modern Philippines the two receive practically nothing<sup>2</sup>) or they appear under other headings. *Rental* allocations mix educational housing with jails and town halls. And again, because school management at the national and provincial levels was conducted by civil officials, amounts spent for *General Administration* are quite incalculable. There thus remain, as the reader will observe, but three out of the standard six operational services which admit of any-

thing like explicit or accurate treatment. Since, however, these three consume perhaps 80 per cent of the normal public school *Current Expense* peso, the findings of this report are still highly significant.

#### DATA SOURCES

Basic data have been drawn from the documents themselves of available Spanish-Philippine governmental budgets. Of such documents there are four kinds: (1) the *Presupuesto general* of the Central or Insular government, (2) the *Presupuesto provincial* of the provincial governments, (3) the *Presupuesto municipal* of the municipalities, and (4) the *Presupuesto de Fondos Locales*, a combination of the preceding two. The Central budget was subject to the supervision and control of the Ministerio de Ultramar in Madrid and was published there. The other three operated under the superintendence of the *Dirección general de Administración Civil* in Manila. Each province and municipality had its own budget drawn up according to a standard form. All four types, insofar as the writer can learn, covered a fiscal year of twelve months.

Through an analysis of samples taken from each of the four budget families, it is the author's intent to trace out a sketch of Spanish-Philippine public school finance as it functioned between 1881 and 1896. Specifically, the problem will be treated under three aspects: 1) The general pattern of responsibility distribution, 2) The size and purpose of the appropriations actually made, and 3) Education grants compared with those awarded for other public services. The initiated student of Philippine school history will find the emergent picture quite remarkable.

#### THE GENERAL SCHOOL FINANCE PATTERN

Article 7 of the organic educational *decreto* of December 20, 1863 lays down the guiding features of the finance

arrangement to be observed by the Spanish-Philippine Administration relative to public primary instruction. The article reads:

Teachers shall receive the salaries and other emoluments prescribed by the *Reglamento*. This fixed amount together with the expenditures necessary to put the school into operation, the purchase and care of teaching materials, and rental [for a private building] where no public one is available, shall constitute a compulsory obligation upon the respective local budget.<sup>3</sup>

By law, therefore, the chief operational costs of public elementary education fell upon the "local" governments. The term "local" here evidently applied to all levels below the Insular or Central unit. And the burden, it will be noted, lay not upon local governments as a group, but upon each separately. Every individual province or municipality was to take care of its own primary schools. This basic plan, although modified somewhat from time to time by the transfer of items from one governmental level to another, appears to have been substantially followed by the Spanish-Philippine administration up to the termination of Spanish sovereignty in 1899.

#### ROLE OF THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

In general, the preeminent responsibility of the Central or Manila government relative to public instruction finance seems to have been the support of those institutions which served the Archipelago as a whole. Such establishments, usually of secondary level, were the so-called special or vocational schools like the Nautical Academy. A glance at Section 8 of the *Presupuesto general* for the fiscal year 1895-1896 reveals the following institutions to be the recipients of national funds:

1. The Vocational Schools of Arts and Trades
2. The Nautical Academy
3. The Schools of Painting, Drawing, and Sculpture
4. The Higher Normal School for Women

In chapter 2 of the same Section 8, one will find certain additional small subsidy awards to two very old semi-public schools in Manila, Letran and Santa Isabel, both of which had been giving elementary instruction free or practically free for a hundred years.

Nevertheless, although all of the above-listed beneficiaries of national funds were public or quasi-public institutions, only one of them, strictly speaking, comprised an integral part of the elementary school system with which alone this paper is expressly concerned. That was the Higher Normal School for Women. This establishment in the fiscal year 1895-1896 was assigned for operational expenses no less than ₱14,900. At that time, it is useful to observe, the school counted 123 student teachers and a staff of 13, a large proportion of whom were educated in Spain.

The direct maintenance of this single teacher-training establishment, however, did not represent the total contribution of the Central government to the support of primary instruction. Indirectly, the National unit at Manila bore the entire cost of the system's general administration. The arrangement was this. Since the *decreto* of 1863 provided for no executive organization separate from the already functioning civil and ecclesiastical bodies, the management of the schools simply became in that year an added responsibility of the civil and ecclesiastical officers. Thus the Governor General served as the National Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the provincial governors as Provincial Superintendents. There was no superintendent at the municipal level. The parish priest acted as a *supervisor*, without command authority, over the schools in his parish. The salaries of all these officials appear to have been paid from the National treasury.

Two further features of this administrative disposition should perhaps be mentioned here because whatever funds were necessary for their maintenance were furnished by the Central government. First, there were created from the start (1863) Boards of Education at both the national

and provincial levels to advise the executive political officers in matters educational. Secondly, an entirely new division called the Office of Education (*Sección de Fomento*) was added in Manila, at the same time, to the *Dirección general de Administración Civil*. This office handled all the national routine work for the public elementary instruction system as the agent of the Governor General and the Director of the department.

### PROVINCIAL OBLIGATIONS

From 1863 until approximately 1881, the operational expenses of public primary instruction were paid almost entirely by the provincial treasuries. As a group, they supported two official teacher-training establishments, while as individual provinces they supplied the funds for their own neighborhood elementary schools. A change in this arrangement occurred sometime about the beginning of the eighth decade (1880) when the municipalities took over the financial responsibility for the latter institutions. The provinces continued to maintain the two normal schools, the Men's Normal School in Manila and the Colegio de Santa Isabel for women in Naga.

The first named of these two institutions was legally founded by the organic educational decree of 1863 and actually commenced operation under the management of the Jesuits in January 1865. Twenty years later, the enrollment list counted 443.<sup>4</sup> That same year there were 300 registered in the attached training department. Between 1881 and 1896 the institution annually graduated approximately 40 fully certified and 10 assistant-teachers.<sup>5</sup>

Tuition fees provided no aid to the provinces in their task of financing this school. Instruction was entirely free—a striking contrast to the situation obtaining in our own two present national teacher-training institutions which so pride themselves on their "democracy".<sup>6</sup> The Philippine Normal College charges P60.00 a year, while the College of Education at the University of the Philip-

piners demands no less than P280.00.<sup>7</sup> Under current conditions of average individual income in the Philippines, it is hard to see how the talented but poor youth for whose benefit these two institutions were primarily established, can afford such fees.<sup>8</sup>

The second professional teacher-preparing foundation which received provincial funds was the Colegio de Santa Isabel in Naga, Camarines Sur. This establishment although begun as a girls' academy in 1868, became a formally functioning official government-supported normal school for women in 1875. According to the *Guia oficial de Filipinas* for 1892, Santa Isabel then counted a student body of 165. This number did not include 130 in the training department. Between 1875 and 1896 the school appears to have graduated each year about 10 fully accredited *maestras*.

Such was the size and general achievement of the provinces' two major public elementary educational responsibilities. Toward the proper fulfilment of their high task what actual financial provisions were made? Table 1 exhibits the sums assigned them by three separate budgets in three different fiscal years.

TABLE 1  
CURRENT EXPENSE ALLOCATIONS FOR TWO PUBLIC  
NORMAL SCHOOLS, 1881-1896

Fiscal Year	Amount	Budget
1881-1882	P22,280 <sup>a</sup>	Provincial
1890-	23,622 <sup>b</sup>	Provincial
1895-1896	28,363 <sup>c</sup>	Fondos Locales

Sources:

<sup>a</sup> *Presupuesto general de gastos é ingresos provinciales para el ejercicio del año económico de 1881-1882. Resumen de gastos. Ch. 2.*

<sup>b</sup> *Presupuesto general de gastos é ingresos provinciales*: 1890. *Resumen de gastos*. Letra A, ch. 2, arts. 1-3, (p. 8).  
<sup>c</sup> *Gaceta de Manila*, July 11, 1895.

The grants allotted show a slow though steady increase, reaching in the fifteenth year an approximate percentage increment of 27. It should be pointed out that the amounts listed do not cover the operating costs of the training departments attached to each of the institutions. These additions for practice teaching and exhibition purposes served officially as the public elementary school of the neighborhood either for the boys or for the girls, as the case might be, and hence were financed in precisely the same way as all other similar establishments throughout the country.

#### MUNICIPAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Between 1880 and 1893, as has been indicated, financing the operating costs of the primary school system was largely a municipal responsibility. Each municipality, of which there were at this period about 735, took care of its own institutions, the grants usually appearing in the budgets under the headings of *Instrucción pública* and *Arrendamientos*.

Before proceeding to an analysis of the specifically educational purposes listed as receiving funds in the municipal budgets during the years under study, it is wise to glance first at the total job of public service the municipalities were then expected to perform. Education, after all, although of great importance, nevertheless represents only *one* of man's needs. He also needs health aid, fire and police protection. He needs roads and bridges. He needs electric power and light, and an ample water supply. Accordingly, public monies cannot be allotted to one service alone, but must be shared by all in due proportion.

Table 2 shows how the Philippine municipalities distributed their income in the fiscal year 1884-1885. The pattern can be called typical of the era.

TABLE 2  
SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES IN THE CONSOLIDATED  
MUNICIPAL BUDGET OF 1884-1885

Budget Chapter	Service	Amount
1	Transfers to other budgets	.....
2	Municipal administration	₱139,456
3	Public instruction	290,645
4	Public worship and charity	18,114
5	Public Works	117,682
6	Police	46,134
7	Public utilities	5,097
8	Rentals	46,161
9	Pensions	1,881
10	Miscellaneous expenses	14,125
11	Public Domain	4,876
12	Cemeteries	3,846
13	Collection costs	75,793
14	Rebates	100
15	Accts. payable from prior budgets	37,287
<b>Total</b>		<b>₱801,197</b>

Source:

*Presupuesto general de gastos é ingresos municipales para el ejercicio del año económico de 1884-1885, p. 62.*

Of the fifteen budget services participating in the apportionment, Chapter 3 (Public Instruction), as is obvious, receives by far the largest single amount. Actually, the grant here constitutes not less than 36 per cent of the year's total expenditures. But this is not all. Education is the recipient of additional grants in both Chapter 5 (Public Works) and Chapter 8 (Rentals). The Public Works accounts in the annual budgets are not carefully itemized as to type of project executed; nevertheless we know from *Gaceta* notices that extensive school building repair costs were charged to Chapter 5.<sup>9</sup> The awards of Chapter 8 to the educational enterprise consist in rentals paid for teachers' homes and for schoolhouses.

Article 7 of the *Real Decreto* of December 1863, it will be recalled, required, among other things, that the local government rent a building for instructional purposes if no suitable public structure was available. Simultaneously, Article 23 of the accompanying *Reglamento para las escuelas* obliged the same governmental unit to provide, as a part of his total compensation over and above the salary, free living quarters for the teacher and his family. Such quarters might be located either in the school building itself or elsewhere.

During the fifteen-year span running between 1881 and 1896, happily, the municipalities appear to have been paying rentals for only three principal types of building: town halls, teachers' homes, and schoolhouses. As a result, funds allotted for the latter two purposes can be segregated and summed with a fair degree of accuracy. However, since a specific national total for any one fiscal year could not be reached except by an itemized count in Chapter 8 of each of some forty separate provincial budgets, we substituted estimates based on a carefully constructed ratio. The ratio was derived thus: First, a complete listing was made of every individual educational housing grant awarded in ten randomly chosen provinces from the Municipal Budget of 1890. The provinces selected were Zambales, Batangas, Camarines Sur, Nueva Ecija, Cavite, Tayabas, Pangasinan, Albay, Laguna, and Capiz. The product of these sums was then compared with the total *Rental* outlay in each province and thus reduced to a percentage index.

The fruit of our survey of sample provinces was this. As a group, the municipalities of the ten provinces assigned 91.1 per cent of all their rental appropriations to educational housing. On the assumption that this ratio of approximately 90 per cent represents a substantially true reflection of the rental allotment distribution in all of the municipalities of the Archipelago for the fiscal year of 1890 as well as for the entire fifteen-year period being examined, we arrived at the calculated data entered in column 3 of Table 3.

TABLE 3  
CALCULATED AMOUNTS ALLOCATED TO EDUCATIONAL HOUSING  
IN VARIOUS MUNICIPAL BUDGETS, 1881-1890

Fiscal Year	Total Amounts Allotted for Rentals ( <i>Arrendamientos</i> )	Calculated Amounts Allotted to Educational Housing
1881-1882	P37,481 <sup>a</sup>	P33,733
1884-1885	45,460 <sup>b</sup>	41,414
1887-1888	79,532 <sup>c</sup>	71,579
1890-	84,964 <sup>d</sup>	77,402

## Sources:

<sup>a</sup> *Presupuesto general de gastos é ingresos municipales para el ejercicio del año económico de 1881-1882. Resumen de gastos.* Ch. 8. (No pagination)

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid. de 1884-1885. Resumen de gastos.* Ch. 8 (p. 62)

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid. de 1887-1888. Resumen de gastos.* Ch. 8.

<sup>d</sup> *Ibid. de 1890. Resumen de gastos.* Ch. 9, art. 1 (p. 5)

The data of Table 3, although partially but estimates, are, in the writer's opinion, an entirely new fact in Philippine nineteenth century public school history. Their significance lies in this that, on the one hand, they help substantially to complete our picture of the era's educational finance, and on the other, that they shed much light on the hitherto seriously misunderstood problems of school buildings and teacher recompense.

Apropos of the building question, for example, a recently discovered educational housing report for the Province of Manila under date of January 1876 distinguishes clearly between teachers' homes and schoolhouses. In addition, it presents in precise numbers the proportion prevailing in that province between rented and non-rented school buildings. According to this document, the situation in 1876 was this: of 52 primary instruction establishments operated by the province, 5 were rented. The average annual rental paid was P91.00. During the same year 16 houses were rented as homes for teachers. Here the average annual cost per house was P73.50. In other words, in 1876

roughly 10 per cent of the schools in the province of Manila were conducted in rented structures. During the same period, buildings leased for classroom purposes cost on the average 24 per cent more than teachers' homes.

#### THE *Fondos Locales* AND EDUCATION

By a Royal Order of May 20, 1893 certain rather extensive changes in the structure and function of Philippine local government were ordained. How deeply the reform reached in actual practice it is difficult to judge, but the fact seems uncontested that one realized phase of the re-arrangement consisted in the merging of the provincial and the municipal budgets. The new single combined document was called the *Presupuesto de Fondos Locales*. Hence, for the fiscal year 1893-1894 and thereafter, *Current Expense* grants for the public elementary schools are to be sought for in this new member of the budget family and its subsequent annual reissues.

Thus in the *Fondos Locales* budget of 1895-1896 a summary of which was published in the *Gaceta de Manila* of July 11, 1895, we find Public Instruction listed as Chapter 1 of Part D. This Chapter contains nine articles, all except two of which appeared previously in either the provincial or the municipal budgets. Both the two new items are *General Administration* charges heretofore borne wholly by the Central government. Both sums are small and apply not to the executive organization but to the expenses of the National and the Provincial Boards of Education. Rental appropriations in this recently introduced combined budget are entered under Chapter 7, with educational housing grants carefully segregated into Articles 2 and 5.

#### SIZE AND PURPOSE OF THE ALLOCATIONS

With the sketch of the general Spanish-Philippine finance pattern concluded, we are in a position to examine more intelligently the size and the purposes of the funds

actually assigned the elementary schools from 1881 to 1896. Table 4 shows the amounts awarded to three of their operational services by various municipal budgets during that period.

TABLE 4  
CERTAIN CURRENT EXPENSE ALLOCATIONS MADE IN FAVOR OF  
PUBLIC ELEMENTARY EDUCATION BY VARIOUS  
MUNICIPAL BUDGETS, 1881-1896

Fiscal Year	Instruction and Adult Education	Education Housing	Total
1881-1882	₱286,973 <sup>a</sup>	₱33,733	₱320,706
1884-1885	290,645 <sup>a</sup>	41,414	332,059
1887-1888	304,278 <sup>a</sup>	71,579	375,857
1890-	359,504 <sup>a</sup>	77,402	436,906
1895-1896	606,041 <sup>b</sup>	90,332 <sup>b</sup>	696,373

Sources:

<sup>a</sup> See Table 3.

<sup>b</sup> *Gaceta de Manila*. July 11, 1895. (*Fondos Locales* budget)

The first fact to be noted from the data of Table 4 is the uninterrupted rise in school operating grants throughout the decade and a half. The sharpest increase occurred, significantly, between 1890 and 1895, partially no doubt due to the merging into one budget in 1893 of both the municipal and the provincial educational responsibilities. Aside, however, from the manifest steady enlargement in size, the meaning of the sums listed both here and elsewhere in the paper remain obscure unless we can relate them somehow to terms of known value. An adequate treatment of the problem would require a thorough discussion of the nineteenth century Philippines and its contemporary world; still, for a rough tentative appraisal, suppose we compare the present peso with that of the late 1890's, and the present per-pupil expenditures with their counterparts in that same era.

Since there exists today no carefully constructed cost-of-living index for the final two decades of the last century,

we substitute for our measure of the peso's purchasing power at that time, the price of the most stable and basic single Philippine commodity, *palay*. In 1897 a *cavan* of *palay* (76 liters) cost 6 or 7 *reales* in the rice producing areas.<sup>10</sup> A *real* was worth 12.5 centavos. Hence the price of a *cavan* then ranged equivalently between 75 and 88 centavos. Today, a *cavan* of *palay ordinario* costs approximately 9 pesos, or more than *ten times* as much as in 1897. The fundamental accuracy of this ratio is corroborated by the fact that whereas board and lodging in the Men's Normal School in Manila in 1895 cost ₱100.00 per year, the same services today at a University of the Philippines dormitory cost approximately ₱900.00.

If now we apply this ratio to the Spanish-Philippine public school appropriations, we arrive at some very surprising results. The City of Manila in 1890, for example, was paying its fully certified elementary school teachers an average of ₱228 per year.<sup>11</sup> This, multiplied by 10, equals ₱2,280; nor does this sum include the usual supplementary recompense of rent-free lodging. On September 1, 1948 the primary grades instructors in Manila were receiving, on the average, ₱1,714 per year.<sup>12</sup> In other words, one may genuinely doubt whether the financial position of the modern Manila public-school teacher is superior to that of his 1890 forebears.

One further application of the ratio will suggest how seriously the Spanish contribution to Philippine public education has been misinterpreted. According to Table 4 the sum of ₱696,373 was appropriated for the operation of the primary instruction system in 1895-1896. Multiply this by 10 and you have ₱6,963,730. Next divide this amount by the estimated number of pupils in that system in 1897 (200,000)<sup>13</sup> and you have an equivalent per-pupil *Current Expense* outlay of ₱34.81. Compare this with the per-enrolled-pupil allotment of ₱33.03 made by the Philippine National government to the primary schools of the Archipelago in the fiscal year 1949-1950.<sup>14</sup>

A second very popular present mode of evaluating

government grants to education is by the so-called "interest index," which essentially consists simply in calculating the ratio between the amount awarded education and the total awarded for all services. Column 4 of Table 5 shows with what success the municipalities performed when measured in this way.

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE RATIOS BETWEEN THE AMOUNTS ALLOTTED CERTAIN CURRENT EXPENSE SERVICES OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY EDUCATION AND TOTAL ALLOTMENTS FOR ALL SERVICES IN VARIOUS MUNICIPAL BUDGETS, 1881-1896

Fiscal Year	Am'ts. Allotted Public Elem. Education	Total Municipal Expenditures	Ratio betw. Cols. 2 & 3
1881-1882	₱320,706	₱748,230	42.8
1884-1885	332,059	801,210	41.4
1887-1888	375,857	896,101	43.0
1890-	436,906	1,487,983	29.4
1895-1896	696,373	2,076,410	34.7

Sources:

*See Tables 3 and 4.*

That there prevailed in the Philippines from 1881 to 1896 a singularly high level of interest in public elementary instruction seems to be a fully warranted inference from the list of ratios in Table 5. This record is all the more extraordinary when considered in the light of contemporary educational practice and the Archipelago's geographic distance from most of the then centers of world culture. Indeed, it may be questioned whether very many of even present day nations can show, over a similar period, a consistently higher degree of interest. Take the modern Philippines, for example. Since 1940 the National government has financed almost wholly the elementary schools of the country, in addition to maintaining the University of the Philippines and numerous vocational high schools and colleges. What is its "interest index" record over the de-

cade and a half between 1940 and 1955? Table 6 presents the answer. The reader can draw his own conclusions.

**TABLE 6**  
**PERCENTAGE RATIOS BETWEEN ALLOTMENTS FOR EDUCATION AND**  
**TOTAL EXPENDITURES IN VARIOUS PHILIPPINE**  
**NATIONAL BUDGETS, 1940-1955**

Fiscal Year	Total Expenditures (in millions)	Allotments for Education (in millions)	Percentage between Ratio Cols. 2 & 3
1940-1941	₱167.7 <sup>a</sup>	₱37.9	22.6
1947-1948	357.8 <sup>b</sup>	76.2	21.3
1954-1955	552.7 <sup>c</sup>	168.3	30.4

Sources:

<sup>a</sup> *Central Bank News Digest, IV* (1952) 33.

<sup>b</sup> *Report of the Economic Survey Mission to the Philippines* (Bell), p. 19, Table XIII.

<sup>c</sup> *Republic Act 1150. Allocation for the Bureau of Public Schools.*

A second inference of considerable moment suggested by the data of Table 5 is that the Spanish-Philippine municipalities could hardly have supported a larger number of children in the schools except by increasing the taxes: for to have assigned greater sums to education out of the then available income would have deprived the other public services of their due and necessary share. Would higher taxes have been acceptable to the people?

### RECAPITULATION

Spanish-Philippine public school finance is a misty and uncharted area in our history. One travels there with caution. This paper has striven to draft for it some definite boundaries and distinctive contours.

During the fifteen-year period (1881-1896) chosen for study the operating expenses of the public instructional system were borne, in general, thus: To the Central government in Manila were charged some four or five secondary-level vocational institutions of nation-wide utility. One of these was a normal school. In addition, the services of *General Administration* and *Plant Maintenance* for the Archipelago's neighborhood elementary schools were largely, although in an indistinct way, the financial responsibility of the Central unit. To the provinces two teacher training establishments together with a few other secondary institutions were confided. Finally, upon the municipalities whose people benefited by them most directly, there thus devolved the principal care of supporting each its own individual primary school.

Of the six standard services comprised in the operating function of public education, the Spanish-Philippine municipalities furnished explicit funds for *three*—Instruction, Adult Education, and Rental for school and teacher housing. The amounts awarded by various budgets for these purposes seem small to us; but if they are converted into their 1954 buying power equivalent, they compare very favorably with their counterpart allotments in our own recent budgets. This fact, indeed, seems so soundly established that one may soberly doubt that the financial provisions for elementary education today in the modern Philippines are, in actual service value, substantially higher than those made in 1895.

In its final phase, our paper introduced two comparisons as a medium for interpreting the statistics of the tables. Both of these emerged with some rather unexpected disclosures. In contrasting, for instance, the size of the annual appropriations for Education with those allotted other *single* municipal services, we found that *Instrucción pública* invariably received the largest individual award. Similarly, when we contrasted the amount of the annual appropriation for Education with the year's total expenditures for *all* services, we found that, on the average, the

Spanish-Philippine municipalities spent more than one-third of their income for public elementary education.

Those familiar with the history of public primary instruction in the nineteenth century will regard the record here brought forward as altogether noteworthy. Perhaps some of our hitherto prevalent views relative to the achievements of pre-1900 Philippine public education stand in need of substantial revision.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Philippines is a glaring, although by no means a unique, example. At the end of the fiscal year 1950, out of a total of 28,629 public school buildings, no fewer than 18,399 or close to 64 per cent were temporary, rented, or borrowed. *Forty-fifth Annual Report of the Director of Public Schools*, p. 59.

<sup>2</sup>The city of Cagayan de Oro in its budget for 1954-1955 allots the two services less than 1 per cent of its total appropriation for education.

<sup>3</sup>*Colección legislativa de España*, Vol. XC, Second Semester, 1863, No. 680. Madrid: Ministerio de Gracia y Justicia, 1864.

<sup>4</sup>Escuela Normal de Maestros. "Libro copiatorios", p. 240.

<sup>5</sup>Escuela Normal de Maestros. "Índice de maestros", pp. 85 ff.

<sup>6</sup>Report of the Philippine (Schurman) Commission, II, 228 (Washington 1900).

<sup>7</sup>As a matter of fact, the U. P. College of Education matriculation fee is just ₱20.00 less per semester than the tuition charged by the Liberal Arts College of the Ateneo de Manila.

<sup>8</sup>According to Rivera and MacMillan, 75 per cent of the Philippine people live in barrios. Non-agricultural workers in their study's sample barrios earned, on the average, ₱8.80 weekly. Farm workers earned even less. *Rural Philippines* (1952) p. 42.

<sup>9</sup>The *Gaceta de Manila* (No. 289) of 1881, for example, records that the Governor of Iloilo was authorized to charge the repair costs of the San Carlos school, amounting to ₱3,163, to article 4 of Chapter 5.

<sup>10</sup>*Guía oficial de Filipinas: 1897*, Part II, p. 212.

<sup>11</sup>*Presupuesto Municipal: 1890*, "Ayuntamiento de Manila."

<sup>12</sup>*Forty-fifth Annual Report of the Director of Public Schools*, p. 161.

<sup>13</sup>José Algué, *Archipiélago Filipino*, I, 341 (Washington 1900).

<sup>14</sup>*Forty-fifth Annual Report of the Director of Public Schools*, pp. 2 and 56.