One rule found in the 1973 Constitution that is not present in the 1987 Constitution is the provision for the establishment of a parliamentary form of government.

The 1973 Constitution established a parliamentary system with a Prime Minister as the head of government and a President as the head of state. This system centralized executive power in the Prime Minister and the Cabinet, who were accountable to the legislature.

However, in the 1987 Constitution, the Philippines shifted back to a presidential system of government, similar to the system in the United States. Under this system, the President serves as both the head of state and the head of government, with executive power vested in the President and a separate legislative branch. Therefore, the provision for a parliamentary form of government present in the 1973 Constitution is no longer found in the 1987 Constitution.

Unlike the 1973 Constitution, which had a provision for a parliamentary system of government, the 1987 Philippine Constitution noticeably lacks that same provision. This modification is a reflection of the profound changes in the political and historical landscape of the nation during that time. Following years of martial law and Ferdinand Marcos's autocratic dictatorship, Filipinos were ready for a more responsible and equitable form of government. As a result, the choice was taken to go back to a presidential system akin to the US one. The purpose of this action was to prevent the concentration of power in the hands of one person or political party and to create checks and balances between the several branches of government.

Moreover, the 1987 Constitution's decision to implement a presidential system was motivated by the aim to demolish the old regime's concentrated power structure. A parliamentary system carries the risk of becoming dominated by one political party or leader, even while it places accountability on the Prime Minister and Cabinet. The writers of the 1987 Constitution aimed to establish a stronger system of checks and balances by choosing a presidential system. By allowing the legislative, executive, and judicial departments to function freely, this system protects the rule of law and democratic ideals. Therefore, the decision to leave out the clause referring to a parliamentary system of government indicates a conscious attempt to create a governance structure that is consistent with the goals for for transparency, accountability, and stability.