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AT 2:04 P.M. THE PRESIDING OFFICER, MS. PARALUMAN P. ZULUETA, OF THE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION (TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP), CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (MS. ZULUETA). Good afternoon everybody.

Welcome to the technical working group of the Architecture bill and the Civil Engineering bill.

Now, we have two bills filed before us, the Senate Bill No. 2081 and Senate Bill No. 1290. Are these identical? Are the two bills identical? No, not in all sections.

I would like you to manifest which between these two bills we will use as the working draft. So, we will confine in this Senate bill the amendments which we are going to use.

Before we start, may I acknowledge Architect Ed Florentino, Architect Angel Doria, Architect Henry Olonan, Architect Santos – sir, you are member of the board?

MR. SANTOS. Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, yeah. Architect Robert Sac, the president of the United Architects of the Philippines, Architect Gregorio Timbol,
Architect Timbol is the chairman of the AAF and Architect Nanette Segovia of UAP, also of AAF or Architecture Advocacy International Foundation, Inc.

And then on the part of the civil engineers, we have Engineer Efren Sison, Miss Nanette Villanueva, Engineer Roberto Bernardo…

MR. SISON. And also Engineer Eustaquito Coronel…

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Engineer Eustaquito Coronel…

MR. CORONEL. National treasurer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sir, may I know your name please?

MR. VITA. Elmor Vita.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Elmor Vita. Okay. Welcome to the technical working group.

So, sir, as I have mentioned, we have two bills here and I would like you to manifest which of the two bills we are going to use as the working draft.

May I hear from Architect Timbol please.

MR. TIMBOL. We would like to use 1835.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. No, for Senate bill…

MR. TIMBOL. I’m sorry, it’s 2081, 2081.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, we are going to use the 2081. Are we all agreed to use SB 2081 as the working draft?

MR. SANTOS. Yeah, we do.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So, we are all agreed.

May I hear first a preliminary statement from Architect Ed Florentino?
MR. FLORENTINO. Thank you, Madam Chair.

We are glad that you have manifested the fact that we will take up 2081 because this was the basis of our discussion in the last technical working group hearing. And because of this, four groups of the architects met to use this, to manifest their positions using this as the basis. And, therefore, the Board of Architecture, the foundation represented by Greg Timbol and the consulting architects and, of course, the United Architects of the Philippines, all sat together and agreed to a unified version. That is what we submitted to Senator Pimentel which already incorporates the position, incorporated the integrated position of all these institutions of the architects, Madam Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Thank you, Architect Florentino.

I recall that during the technical working group meeting, we already started from Section 1 and we finished on Section 13, I think. We have already here – in my notes, we have already amended some of the provisions from Section 2 up to Section 13. So, would you like to start all over again from Section 1 so that everybody can participate?

MR. TIMBOL. Madam Chairman, can we have a copy of that because we have it in our office but we did not bring it with us, I mean, as far as the foundation is concerned?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I'm sorry, but I have not effected the changes in my copy. It's already here so siguro we might as well start. We just go fast so that we'll not be wasting time.
MR. TIMBOL. It’s all right then.

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair, may I know if you have a copy of the unified position of the architects signed by all the four institutions that I mentioned? Because it will make it easier if you refer to this version and comparing it now with yours so that you can already appreciate the position, the unified position of the four institutions. May I know if you have…?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sir, is this the one, the March 19 by Architect Canchela?

MR. FLORENTINO. Again, that is not the one.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. This is not also the one. This is dated December 12. This one is… Ah yeah, I think it is this one dated January 9, 2003.

MR. FLORENTINO. Yes, yes, exactly.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, we have already here but for the benefit of the civil engineers, may I just know which provisions are you contemplating to make amendments? Since these are all – this is a finished product by the four groups of architects, so siguro ho we just want to know which provisions are you contemplating to make amendments.

MR. SISON. What we have is the SB No. 2081 that was introduced by Senator Magsaysay. And I understand from the president of UAP during our last meeting at PTC that they are going to amend this 2000 – Senate Bill 2081 and
replace it by another amendments. And it was during that time that we agreed that we could sit down under PTC so that we can harmonize their bill in our bill.

So, sa ngayon, ang hawak lang ho namin -- ang familiar kami is the 2081 which we have provided our comments...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The one which was originally filed in the Senate?

MR. SISON. Yeah, in the Senate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Iyon pa lang po ang hawak n’yo?

MR. SISON. Oo, iyan. Then we had our comments which we transmitted to Congress, some of the comments on some of the paragraphs which we feel that there are some overlap.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, I see.

Engineer Sison, we have already here the – under Annex B your Senate Bill 2081, Section 3, paragraph (a) replaced “with the principles of utility, strength and beauty.”

So, siguro po i-insert na lang natin since ito po ay gawa n’yo na. Wala na ho kayong disagreement dito sa -- iyong dated? This one is dated January 9. Sabi n’yo po ito’y ano n’yo concerted effort. So that we’ll not be staying long on the other provisions, ipasok na lang po natin iyong sa kanila.

MR. SISON. Hindi ho kami aware doon sa …

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, you are not aware iyong sa bago.

MR. SISON. … kuwan nila, eh which they integrated.

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY

ANTONIA P. BARROS
DIRECTOR III
LEG. RECORDS & ARCHIVES SVC.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. May I hear from Architect Sac.

MR. SAC. This is just to clarify with Engineer Sison.

During our last PTC board meeting, I furnished... /jss
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MR. SAC: ... I furnished them both of the copies of the original draft of SB 2081, as well as the proposed final draft, which was submitted to the Office of Senator Pimentel last January. So, I've furnished them these two copies last time.

MR. SISON. Madam, I would like to correct. Only the 2081 with all the signatures, but not the one you furnished Senator Pimentel. We had only one which is the...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Which one?

MR. SAC. Engineer, that's the one, the one you are holding.

MR. SISON. Ah, ito ba?

MR. SAC. Yes, yes.

MR. SISON. But this one is introduced by Senator Magsaysay.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. SAC. Yeah. But we submitted it to the office.

MR. SISON. Ah, is this the same as the one being introduced by Senator Pimentel?

MR. SAC. Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. No. There is no bill introduced by Senator Pimentel. The committee report which we are going to make now will be the one authored by Senator Pimentel. "Yon pong production natin..."
ngayon, 'yong output natin. that will be authored by Senator Magsaysay, Senator Osmena, and Senator Pimentel.

MR. SISON. So, anyway...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, sir, do you have any disagreement in this...

MR. SISON. Anyway, he has already clarified that during our last meeting at PTC, we were given this copy.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Opo.

MR. SISON. And it was also agreed during that meeting that we will sit down under PTC to reconcile. And I was surprised this morning that we were called to already discuss this on the technical group. That's why what we had submitted to you is our comment related to the...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The original.

MR. SISON. The original.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The original 2081.

MR. SISON. Yeah, 2081.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, parang this will become obsolete.

MR. SISON. Kasi ito ang usapan namin noon idi-discuss namin, uupuan namin, e, to relate it also with our proposed amendments.
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THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, what do we do now? We go section by section again for the benefit of the civil engineers or ito na lang?

MR. SISON. Ang suggestion ko, Ma’am, ay...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. For me, it will be easier if I just make this ‘yong sinabmit ninyo ng dated January 9, as the substitute bill. ‘Yon na lang po ang gagawin kong committee report. Pero since the civil engineers said that they are not aware, ganon po ba?

MR. SISON. Now, we have an agreement that because they are going to amend—to replace this by this one, so, we agreed during that meeting that civil engineers and...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Will sit together.

MR. SISON. ...will sit together and we will discuss one by one each section, so that then when we come here to the committee level, then it will run smoothly.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Smoothly. So, what is the pleasure...

MR. SAC. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Architect Sach.

MR. SAC. Basically, Madam Chair, I manifested this very clearly during this morning public hearing with Senator Pimentel that there is indeed a scheduled meeting in the PTC on the 2nd Tuesday of June. But that’s precisely...
the senator did not accept. And in fact, he encouraged us to sit down this afternoon instead because he can not wait that long.

I do understand the situation now of the civil engineers, but this is the instruction coming from the good senator that we should work in a shorter period rather than wait for this scheduled meeting of PTC.

MR. SISON. Ma'am.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, what's the pleasure of the group?

MR. SISON. Well, I understand that it was the senator's objective to finish it as early as possible. But it was also very unfortunate that we were not called this morning because we were here because of only of the civil engineering bill and we did not know that there is also this architectural bill to be discussed which we are not invited. It so happened that when we discussed the civil engineering law, we manifest some of our apprehensions on some of the provisions of the architectural law. That's why we are invited also to be here.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information, sir. I was the one who scheduled this meeting. And I know that there is somehow an overlapping in the bills of the architecture and civil engineering. So, I scheduled these bills simultaneously. That's why you're also here. Actually,
COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND GOV'T. REORGANIZATION (TWG)
caturla II-1 May 19, 2003 2:14 p.m. 5

the civil engineers should not be heard simultaneous with the architecture.
Kaya lang po noong binasa ko, I saw the need for you to be here also.

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair.

MR. TIMBOL. Yes. Alam niyo, ‘no, the gentleman over there—ano nga ang pangalan niyo pala?

MR. SISON. Mr. Sison.

MR. TIMBOL. Mr. Dizon. Sison


MR. SISON. Wala namang problema, e.

MR. TIMBOL. Oo.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, okay. So, what’s the pleasure of the group? Ang parang ano lang ho natin is, are we going to start from Section 1 of the original bill 2081 section by section?

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. And then may sinabmit naman po kayong ano ‘yong dated January 9, i-incorporate ko na lang ’yon.

MR. FLORENTINO. Yes. Madam Chair, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.
MR. FLORENTINO. May I suggest that we use as basis that we read the one—the January version. This is the one now agreed by the architects to read it in front of the engineers because it already embodies the position of the architects. So that, if they have objections in any of the sections as is read, they can now express their sentiment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the civil engineers? Are you agreeable to that?

MR. SISON. Okay.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That we read the dated January 9 substitute bill?

MR. SISON. Is this the bill they are referring to?

MR. FLORENTINO. Yes.

MR. SISON. Okay. okay.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sir, I might find technicality here. Kasi we are prohibited from reading the bills which are not originally filed. So, in the substitute bill na lang po, sir, ilagay ko na lang po ‘yong inyong amendment.

MR. FLORENTINO. I think...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Kasi baka ho ma-technical ako, if I read your substituted bill.
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MR. FLORENTINO. Ah, ganon.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oho. So, sige po. I will just read and then I will just take care of your amendments. Okay.

We start now. Let us go to Section 1. “Title. This act shall be known as the amended architecture act of 2002.” So, 2003 na po ito. Okay. 2003.

Do we have to include the word “amended”? Kasi “as amended.” Ito na pala.

Ito na pala. May I recognize ano, Atty. Almelor.

MR. ALMELO. I am proposing for the repeal, not amended because it involves more than seven or eight provisions that are amendable and you might as well...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. That is another one. Here in the Senate, it is our policy that if there are more than ten amendments, we might as well repeal the bill all together. So, this will not become amending, this will be repealing. “Thereby repealing 545.” So, magigig repealing na po ito.

MR. TIMBOL. We are not agreeable with repealing the whole bill, kasi 50 taon na po ito, e. Nakikinabang kami lahat sa bill na ito. Puwede hong ma-amend, pero huwag ma-repeal. Kaya kung sakali sobra ang aming amendment, bawasan na lang natin, ‘no. Pero okay na.
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THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Kasi po almost every section mayroong ano tayo dito, e, ang dami naka all caps.

MR. TIMBOL. 'Yon pong grammar, 'yong grammar...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, may I hear from Atty. Almelor.

MR. ALMELOR. We would like to find out whether the version in the House of Representatives as passed in the Third Reading has been forwarded to this body?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, we received already the copy, the Third Reading copy.

MR. ALMELOR. The copy. May we know what is the title, is it a repeal or an amendment of Republic Act 545? So that we will not find difficulty during the Bicameral Conference Committee meeting or meetings as the case maybe.

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sandali lang po, because the House version is-- I'm still ano, getting from ano, my table.

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair, may I express – an opinion.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Florentino.

MR. FLORENTINO. May I appeal...
MR. FLORENTINO. .... appeal to Architect Timbol not to object anymore to the explanation of the Chair. You know, this is a matter of -- what we are after is the substance of the law. It really doesn't matter to us whether it's repeal or amendment as long as the position of the architects, as embodied in our position paper, is there. Actually, let us not split hair on that 'no. I think we can go to the substance of the law. Whether it's repeal or amendments, it's really immaterial, immaterial. The rule of law, the Rule of the House rather, is for it to be called a repeal because it embodies more than 10 amendments. We have no objection to that, as long as what we are after, the substantive changes are there, that's all right.

MR. ALMELO. Madam Chair, I agree with his viewpoint, however, we have, once and for all at the very outset, resolved that it is for repeal. Because, you know, we have an experience as regards the other professional regulatory laws. From the start, it was a proposal for an amendment and later on, eventually, the amendment was converted into a repeal. It is for your own good because if it will be for amendments, I don't know if the same could be deliberated upon more fast, considering that if it is an amendment, there will be no replacement of the present law which was enacted in 19 ... many, many years ago. So, this is our proposal. It's up to you. But we are only giving our opinion.
based upon our experiences, as far as other professional regulatory laws that have been enacted are concerned.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Atty. Almelor is correct because that is the trend now in the PRC. They are repealing all their bills in order to be in keeping with the new PRC law and the CHED law.

MR. TIMBOL. Inaatras ko na ho 'yong sinabi ko kanina.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay, sir. Thank you.

MR. TIMBOL. Salamat po.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Let us go to Section 2, Statement of Policy.

This is an additional 'no. So, do you have disagreement with this? Is this okay?

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, is this Section 2? Madam Chair,...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Section 2.

MR. ALMELOR: ... what will now be the short title under Section 1?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under Section 1, what will be the ano, the short title? It will not be the amended architecture but the ...

MR. ALMELOR. No, if we can have The Architectural Act of Year 2003, that's all. That will be sufficient.

MR. FLORENTINO. No objection.

So, Section 2, Statement of Policy, "The State recognizes the importance of architects in national building and development, hence, it shall develop and nurture competent, virtuous, productive and well-rounded -- so this is well-rounded -- "professional architects whose standards" -- spelling of "whose" -- "of practice and service shall be excellent, qualitative, world-class and globally-competitive through· inviolable, honest, effective and credible licensure examinations and through regulatory measures, programs and activities that foster their professional growth and development."

I'm reading from the original 2081 as filed. Okay. So, wala na pong ano diyan, improvement you want to make? Architect Sac.

MR. FUAP. The "nation" -- "national" should be changed to "nation," "nation-building."

VOICE. O, yeah.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. "Rounded," then "whose."

Okay. Section 3, Definition of Terms. "As used in this Act, the following terms and their definitions shall apply." The "following" kulang ng letter (g).
Okay. "Architecture is the art, science or profession of planning, designing and constructing buildings in their totality together with their environment, in accordance with the principles of utility, strength and beauty."

I think there's an objection from the civil engineering there, Section 3, paragraph (a).

MR. CORONEL. Well, it was the way the architecture is defined. Because in the other provisions of this, when we read about it, especially Article XV, it says that it is an -- as if it is an exclusive kuwan of the architect with respect to all aspects of engineering, including civil, mechanical and electrical. Because the way it was defined, it engulfs almost everything. So, I would say while in the XV you can say "architectural plans and etcetera," it only meant it will go back to the definition of architect here wherein they have all the kuwan of it which is so exclusive wherein -- kami po walang objection masyado sa -- ang ayaw lang namin po 'yong in the Building Code, the architect and the civil engineers are co-equal in it. As if here, they are eliminated in the civil engineers and just putting it under architectural all of these. That is our objection.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, in letter (a), sir, in the definition of architecture, what word are you in disagreement?

MR. CORONEL: Well,...
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. What word or what sentence would you like to add?

MR. CORONEL. No, we are not adding anything.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. CORONEL. It engulfed all the design of buildings that includes structural, electrical, mechanical, etcetera. Because it says "on all utility, strength, and beauty," where I would say architectural should be on part — it can be some part of utility and beauty but not on strength.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, would you like to delete the word "strength?" Because in your position paper, you are asking us to delete the word "strength."

MR. SISON. Yeah, Madam Chair, in our position paper, we are requesting or recommending to replace that particular sentence by just deleting the word "strength."

MR. SANTOS. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Santos.

MR. SANTOS. Yes. It is regarding the description from the civil engineers that the practice of architecture is very encompassing. I would say that is true because the practice of the profession of architecture is a multi-disciplined profession. But with regards to your contention on the aspect of
strength, we are architects and we want to build buildings very structurally safe in consultation with you, with the engineers. We are not going to design structural computations. We will get structural engineers, designers to do it for us. But to take out that word “of strength and utility,” we will not be designing buildings or residences which are not functional, which cannot be utilized by the people to live in. So, you cannot take away that utility and at the same time beauty.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Strength.

MR. SANTOS. Yeah, aesthetics. That is architecture. Architecture is also an art. So, why do you have to take those things out?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay, Architect Segovia.

MS. SEGOVIA. Madam Chair, actually, it is not stated here that we are designing structurally. There is a word “in accordance with the principles of utility, strength and beauty.” “In accordance,” that’s clearly stated here. It is not stated that we are designing in accordance with the principles but in accordance with the -- of course, we already consulted with the structural engineer, with the mechanical...

MR. SISON. Madam Chair, I think by the definition itself, it means that you are designing. Because the definition states that arts, science or profession of planning, designing and constructing building in their totality. So, when you say that, that is already designing. It’s very...
MS. SEGOVIA: We just integrated it in accordance to the structural design.

MR. CORONEL: May I, although we are not yet on the 15th, I would like to read Section -- Article III, Section 14, -- Section 15, I would say, Registration of Architect .... /plm
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MR. CORONEL. ..."Registration of architect required. In order to safeguard life, health and property, no person shall practice architecture in this country or engage in preparing plans, specification or preliminary data for the erection or alteration of any building located within the boundaries of this country."

You know in the law, it says, "except civil engineers" you remove that because the definition of "A" before in Page 1, it only shows that the architect alone, no person. Remember, no person can do such architectural design when you define your architecture as such that it engulfs everything. Meaning to say, you are taking the privilege of any professional to do such. Lyon po ang controversial lang na sinasabi namin. Because when you define it at the beginning and use it on the other articles, you are actually telling when no person can do it, meaning to say, kayo lang ang pwede.

MR. SANTOS. Precisely, because in order to practice architecture, we have to be an architect.

MR. CORONEL. Well, we do not object to any of yours. Remember we have a Building Code which has been of use between us and the architect. We never say--we always respect the architect. We always respect you because you are the one that, from inception you do all the planning wherein all basis of design, structural, mechanical and sanitary are based from. We agree with that. We never contradict that particular provision. What we are contradicting now is...
your removing the duties and responsibilities of civil engineers and other professions for that matter. You are getting it all which I believe it should not be.

MR. SANTOS. Madam Chair, we are not getting it all. Okay.

For example, we have a project. The architect is the prime professional for every project from the start. So, the architect will not be signing structural design, would not be doing structural design and computation. We will not be signing mechanical plans, we will not be signing electrical plans. All of the corresponding professionals will be signing and responsible for the practice of their profession. That’s what we are saying. We are not saying that we will do your work.

MR. CORONEL. Precisely, that’s exactly what we think.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Excuse me, sir.

MR. SANTOS. Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I think this will be an endless debate, ano. Siguro ho we just ano, what is your pleasure, Engr. Coronel? How do you word this definition of architecture?

MR. CORONEL. I would say this much, Madam.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So that we will go fast because this will be an endless debate....

MR. CORONEL. I know, Ma’am, that’s why...
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. What harm will it do to you if we put the words "in accordance with the principles of utility, strength and beauty"

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay, Atty. Almelor.

MR. ALMELOR. You know, what is important is that there is no overlapping of the practice of one profession as against the other. You know, this is only a definition of architecture. But what is important is that the practice of architecture cannot be overlapped or intruded into by another profession. On the contrary, the practice of another profession like civil engineering must not being intruded or encroached upon by another profession. Because whether we will be talking about this as regards the propriety of using strength, because, you know, I may refer to strength as far as males are concerned, male architects; beauty as far as female architects are concerned. There's nothing wrong if we will be just trying to — because it was the strength to include the definition of the profession. And we cannot absolutely exactly, make that definition which will not be attracting the criticism, whether constructive or destructive, of another profession. I know that. I am not an architect, I am not a civil engineer but what is being argued upon is the strength of the structure. Now, if it is within the soul or exclusive ambit of the practice of one profession to the disregard of the others, then we have to really define. But for me, we have to be concerned with the
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scope of practice, the activities, the acts that must be carried out or exercised by an architecture.

Thank you.

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Thank you, sir.

So, Engineer Corpnel, do you think this is an encroachment of your jurisdiction, this definition of architecture?

MR. CORONEL. As I said, ma'am...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If it is an encroachment, how do you word this so we will go fast?

MR. SISON. Madam Chair

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Engr. Sison.

MR. SISON. I think I agree with Atty. Almelor because whatever we define, as long as the interpretation will not tend to inject an element of an exclusivity, I think we will agree.

So, I think the point of Engr. Coronel is when he read Section 15 —when you read Section 15, it sometimes—we interpreted it as something that inject an element of exclusivity. Why? Because in the previous law, of Architect's Law, there is an exception. “Except in this last case when he is a duly registered civil engineer.”
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Now in this law, they are trying to delete this, to remove this. Now, if this will not be removed, then there is no point of arguing.

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair, Madam Chair, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Engineer Florentino and then Architect Santos.

MR. FLORENTINO. Yeah. Please, let us just concentrate first on this article we are dealing with. Please, I hope we do not jump to Section 15.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. To Section 15, yes, we'll go there. We'll reach that point, oo.

MR. FLORENTINO. Dito lang, ano ha. Let me just state, Madam Chair, that this use of the three principles of function, beauty and youth and strength is a general principle that has been accepted by our...since I was a student, you know, this is how architecture was defined. It is the only profession which incorporates three principles: Function, beauty and strength. In fact, without structure, there is no architecture. Without structure there is no architecture. So, in other words, I don't think that we should, you know, concentrate too much our objection on this definition because there's nothing wrong really with this.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. And besides--So, letter (a) will stay. And besides, this will be deliberated upon in the session hall by the senators. Doon na lang po tayo mag-ano...
MR. CORONEL. Ma'am, we do not object to that definition as long as we put a question mark on it so that when we go to Section 15, that's the time we will - we only jumped into it because we never would like to question this definition. We agree with what they're saying. But there seems to be within it that makes them exclusive practice of such. That's the only objection. As in their law, it's there about civil engineering, they removed that. What is the purpose of removing that particular part for civil engineers, exclusive of civil engineers. They should not have removed such.

MR. FLORENTINO. May we suggest. If indeed they are not objection to any other article except Section 15, may we just concentrate, therefore, on Section 15.

MR. CORONEL. Okay.

MR. FLORENTINO. Agreed.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So that we will not be staying long in this provision. Okay, we go now. So, this letter (a) will stay.

Okay, we go to letter (b). Architect means an individual registered and licensed under this act to practice as an architect and to engage in the general practice of architecture.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Atty. Almelor.
MR. ALMELOR. Could we make some improvement on this description of an architect considering that we might as well shorten or limit the number of words that will be descriptive of an architect. Because here, this act to practice of an architect and the succeeding phrase; “to engage in the general practice of architecture.” We can just make it under this act, to practice any of the acts enumerated hereunder. But, you know, we are moving for the deletion of this one to three, considering that this can be incorporated in the implementing rules and regulations. Yeah, whether these are definitions or not, this can be setforth or embodied in the JRR if these terms are not regularly found in the body of this law.
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MR. ALMELOR. ... in the body of this law. This is only a recommendation in order that what we are after is not only the beauty, the form but of course, the substance and the strength of this law shall prevail.

Thank you.

MR. SANTOS. Yeah. Madam Chair, in response to Atty. Almerol's request, as Architect Florentino has said on the outset of this meeting that this bill has been approved by the four associations of architects, ano, various associations. So, we are satisfied with it. And Architect Florentino is mentioning a while ago if there are particular sections which the civil engineers are in question, maybe we can proceed to those sections and let go all the other sections so that we can save time and we can deliberate more on their questions.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is this not architect of record versus architect in charge controversial?

MR. SANTOS. No. For us, for the architects –

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I think I recall that there's a question of liability between the two architects – architect of record and architect in charge.

MR. ALMELOR. Honorable Chair, if there are violations of the provisions of the law, then this can be backed up by the technical terms that:
are being used by the architects. From the very start, I can avow that I am not an architect although it was my ambition to become one. We’re just trying to see to it — if you believe the dispensation or the doing away with the provisions in this bill would be redounding to a more brief and/or substantive provisions in a law, then why can’t we do that?

Anyway, you have nothing to worry because the Board of Architecture has the quasi-legislative or the policy-making power or the rule-making power to promulgate rules and regulations once that body is in place. This is only a suggestion. But if you believe this is very important in order to guide those who will be reading the law, then naturally, I cannot object thereto. But, let’s find out whether these provisions are intermittently at least or not regularly found in the body of the law. Because it is very important to guide the board in the interpretation and the application and the enforcement of the provisions of the law.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, we will — the three, number 1 up to number 3 will stay.

MR. SANTOS. Yeah, will stay.

Attorney, we have discussed this lengthily with the other associations, ‘no?’

MR. ALMELOR. Of course, of course. But if the very purpose of this technical working group meeting is to focus only the matters that are being...
under question by the other profession, then I believe that's not appropriate. I will be – You know, I am just a representative of the commissioner, of course, of the Board of Architecture, but for the good of what will be useful and dispensable to the practitioners, I cannot really restrain myself and contributing something for the good of this law.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Engr. Sison, do you have any –

MR. SISON. I have only clarification on the civil liability. Because I don’t know whether this will be –

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Where is that – what line is that, what number? Number 3?

MR. SISON. B(1)

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. B(1).

MR. SISON. Because under the Civil Code, criminal and civil liability is either architect or civil engineer. It depends on who will be preparing the plans. But since -- As we pointed out that the definition of architecture is encompassing, my clarification is that who will assume the criminal liability in case something happens with the structure?

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, I don't know if there are other lawyers here, but we have been hearing this malpractice. What is this malpractice? This is gross negligence, gross incompetence resulting to the -- as far as the health professions are concerned, to the death or injury of the patient.\v
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Now, in the practice of your profession, it would be resulting also to the
death, danger of the patient to the damage of the property. We call this
administrative malpractice if the grounds or causes are embodied in this
Professional Regulatory Law. But when it comes to these offenses found in
the Revised Penal Code, we call this criminal or civil malpractice.

That's why, if an offended party can take resort with the board through
administrative malpractice, it cannot be proscribed or prohibited by resorting
to the courts pursuant to the offense violated under the Revised Penal Code –
reckless imprudence, etcetera. So, you have nothing to worry when it comes
to what liability will be borne by a registered architect. It's either administrative
or criminal and/or civil liability. But the term here is referring only to civil
liability.

That's why these matters can be interpreted, can be applied by the
board through resort of other laws. And of course, we can just lay down these
things in the implementing rules and regulations.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. You have –

MR. SISON. Madam, since this is indicated in the proposed
amendment that they will only assume civil liability, so, is there any conflict
with the other law if, let's say, there will be a criminal? Because if this
approved and it is indicated in the law that it's only a civil liability, so what will
happen?√
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MR. ALMELOR. Excuse me, because there are other laws. Although it is only indicated here as civil liability, the offended or private complainant or the plaintiff cannot be barred from resorting to the courts.

That's why I am very insistent in not including anymore this definition, these terms in this law because this can be embodied or incorporated or reflected in the IRR to be promulgated by the Board of Architecture. That is, if you want what I'm trying to suggest.

MR. SISON. So, we agree with your suggestion.

MR. ALMELOR. Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Engr. Sison is right in pointing out that the criminal liability is not stated here. It's only the civil liability. So, the suggestion of Atty. Almelor is just to put this in the IRR so that when the time comes that this will be deliberated upon at the session hall, hindi magkakaroon ng mahabang argument.

So, what is your pleasure? Do you want to just put this in the IRR or to the define this here explicitly?

MR. TIMBOL. Madam Chair, kung gusto ho ng mga structural engineers, sa kanila 'yong criminal liability, wala kaming objection.

MR. CORONEL. Talaga naman pong amin 'yan. We are removing strength from your kuwan because of that. In your definition, strength is included so you must be criminally liable for it.
On the part of the civil engineer, it's a part of the law. We are criminally liable if we are, we did the structural design of a building. That's exactly what we're saying in the definition of the word "architect" — "architecture".

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, the issue now is whether to put this in the IRR as suggested by Atty. Almelor or will this stay here. Kaya lang pagdating sa session hall, tama si Engr. Sison, 'yong criminal liability will be pointed out at baka dito pa magkaroon ng mahabang discussion.

Yes, Arch. Sac.

MR. SAC. I conferred with the representatives of the different associations of architects. We agree, this will be deleted, 1, 2, 3.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, deleted. Okay.

MR. ALMELOR. Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sa IRR na lang po ito. Okay, let's proceed. Let's go to letter (c) — (off-mike) "... specifying, supervising and giving general administration, a responsible direction, the erection, enlargement or alterations of buildings and building environments and architectural design of engineering structures or any part thereof." And then delete comma. "The scientific, aesthetic and orderly coordination of all the processes which enter into the production of a complete building or structure performed through the unbiased preliminary studies of plans, consultations, specifications and conferences, evaluations, investigations, contract, documents and oral advice and directions regardless of whether the persons"
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ... "... in such practice are residents of the Philippines or have their principal office or place of business in this or another country, and regardless of whether such persons are performing one or all these duties, or whether such duties are performed in person or as the directing head of an office or organization performing them."

So, do you have any...?

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Atty. Almelor.

MR. ALMELOR. Again, I am not an architect but for the purpose of attaining beauty that can be enjoyed by this law, we might as well define the scope of the practice of architecture. Let's not say general practice. I know that any profession has branches, has fields but let's state herein "Scope of the practice of architecture." Then we have to lay down the activities that are to be exercised by a registered architect.

MR. SANTOS. Madam Chair.

Attorney, that general practice of architecture, that was taken from the original law and I think it is very important that it's there because it's from the general practice of architecture where you can pick it up, the scope that should be practiced by an architect.

MR. ALMELOR. Thank you for that observation but we might as well simplify the provisions and the law by stating only - because we can adopt what is being observed by the other professional regulatory laws. Now, I know that
your profession is unique, no, no, unique, different, I know that. But what is important is this. Anybody can easily recognize what is being practiced by a registered architect. To say, general, special, there is nothing wrong if we can just state therein, these are the acts to be practiced by a registered architect. Although later on, if you want also to have these branches, these fields of architecture, like, for example, the practice of medicine, there are more than eighty specialty and sub-specialties according to the PMA, so that’s the time. Kasi ang importante, we can determine whether the act being practiced by a person who is a registered architect is actually within the scope of the practice of this law. Or we can determine whether a person who is not a registered architect is practicing any of the acts herein, otherwise that would be constitutive of illegal practice and this person can be criminally held liable.

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Excuse me.

In my experience, as the one who’s making the laws for the professional board, this general practice of architecture I think – this is only a suggestion – we can make this as another section, general scope of practice, under the scope of practice provision para, standard po sa ibang professional board.

So, I think we have to remove this from the definition of terms. Ilagay natin ito as another provision.

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Florentino.
MR. FLORENTINO. I think this is a very important provision that has been there even in the original law. Even in the original law it has been there from the beginning. Notice, Madam Chair, that besides defining the general practice of architecture, it has in letter (d) the scope of practice of architecture. In other words, we deal with it separately. The general practice of architecture should be defined while also specifying the scope of the general practice. But if you take this off, you will entirely ano – mawala iyong original. This was the heart of the law of architecture, this is the heart of the law of architecture. Now, if you take this off, my God.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Architect Florentino, we will not take this off. Ilalagay lang po natin siya sa isang provision na nakalagay is “Scope of Work.” Iyon po ang title para to emphasize the scope of work.

MR. SANTOS. Madam, meron pong specific section para sa scope of the practice.

MR. ALMELOR. Meron ba sa scope of work?

MR. SANTOS. Merong specific, scope of the practice.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, meron ba? So, that is another?

MR. SANTOS. Yeah, it’s another.

MR. ALMELOR. Where can we find that kuwan, Architect Santos?

MR. SANTOŠ. Alam mo attorney, masaya na kami, iyong apat na asesasyon ng arsitekto, dito sa nagawa namin na ito. So, siguro kung procedural lang o ano, huwag nating alisin kasi kung hindi mag-uusap na naman kami, lalong
matatagalan tayo. Baka magmukhang – itong batas namin, eh hindi na batas ng arkitekto -- baka maging IBP na ito.

MR. ALMELO. Hindi, hindi. Let's not use insulting words, Architect Santos.

MR. SANTOS. Joke lang.

MR. ALMELO. Hindi, hindi. Although it's a joke -- because you know...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Architect Santos, we're just standardizing this with the other professions. Kasi po ang lahat po ng professions nag-i-specify n'ung kanilang scope of work parang Section 3 or Section 4. So, if you want, I will remove this from the definition of terms and ilagay natin as one provision.

MR. SANTOS. Madam Chair, precisely, iyong nakita nga namin doon sa House bill ganyan, eh, ni-reformat na and everything because of reformatting. That's why itong sa Senate naging amendment. For us, iniisip namin if it would be an amendment. It would be a fast process to do with the amendment rather than i-repeal mo.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Hindi ho, mas mabilis po ang repeal kasi kahit ano puwede mo nang i-insert doon. Ang amended po, iyong amendment, lahat ng word-for-word from the old law must be reflected in this law. Kaya mas mahirap ho ang amend. So, ang repeal ho, mas madali ang repeal kasi puwede mong alisin na kahit na aling hindi mo gusto.
So, ito ho, ano po ito, gusto po n’yo ilagay natin sa scope of work, another article or remain as is?

MR. SANTOS. As it is na.


MR. SANTOS. Hindi nga ho. Kaya magkasunod iyan, the definition, general practice tapos iyon scope of work. Kaya pinagsunod po namin.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, in fact, there are terms here which cannot be properly or appropriately reflected in this law unless such term can be met or encountered when someone would be reading the entire, entire scope of the law. That’s why we have this board, a delegated authority/power by Congress to prescribe, promulgate rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the law because not every detail can be incorporated in this law, otherwise this will be like our present Constitution, very kilometric.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So, what is the pleasure of the group as regards letter (c), shall it stay or we’ll put this -- as suggested by Atty. Almelor – put this in another provision as scope of work?
MR. FLORENTINO. The architects’ position remains.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So, we proceed to letter (d).

You have another comment?

MR. SISON. Yeah. I agree with Atty. Almelor that we should be very specific on our scope of work because this is where the problem lies because sometimes if it is too general it’s very difficult to determine whether there are overlapping scope of services.

Now, I also do agree that this is part of the previous law of the architectural law but we just notice one particular item that was added to this general practice of architecture wherein they included “and building environments.” In my own understanding when you include “building environments” it is again encompassing.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Encompassing or encroaching?

MR. SISON. No, when you say encompassing, it’s all…

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Encompassing, all, the totality of architecture.

MR. SISON. … and the totality. So, it will encroach against the different allied professions.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, Atty. Almelor, what do you say? This is an amendment. This is an addition.

MR. ALMELOR. Excuse me.
For the information of the body, we can refer to the latest passed Landscape Architecture and the Interior Design so that we cannot be deviating substantially from the standardized provisions.

Now, I agree with you that you love naturally Republic Act 545 but we are trying to see to it so that the Professional Regulation Commission that has administrative control and supervision over the Professional Regulatory Board cannot find it hard considering that the policies of Republic Act 8981 should, more or less, be reflected in the professional regulatory laws. But we are after the suggestion of the presiding chairman that this definition... /ss
MR. ALMELOR. ... that this definition might as well be considered as includible in the scope of practice according to her work because you are working architects or practicing architects. So, let’s find out if this provision can be transferred to another appropriate section of the law. You have nothing to worry. What is important is that the activities, the acts that you are going to practice must be reflected in the law. As a matter of fact, the trend is this. The acts to be practiced by architects shall not be limited to those included herein. In short, the Board of Architecture can be including new or latest acts of practice so that Congress can no longer be bothered on this. Imagine, maganda ang kwana niyan. It is a power that has been vested with the Board of Mechanical Engineering, electrical engineering and the other professional regulatory boards. It is for your own good. At anytime through the group, the board, the association, and other sectors will be joining together so that suggestions regarding the addition of a new activity or practice could be incorporated in the IRR.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, what is this ano, what are these words, “and building environments?” Does the phrase encroach other professions, like interior design, ‘yong addition po na “and building environment?”
MR. FLORENTINO. May I react to that. May I.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is this— they are saying this is encompassing. What other field or what other profession does this encroach?

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Florentino.

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair, we do not deny that some of the activities that are stated here may be done also by other disciplines, right? But it does not mean that we are taking exclusive right to that. When an architect designs a building, he considers the whole environment in that building. He considers the light, the ventilation, the structure, everything in that building, and you call that holistically environment. And that is the reason why we use the term—it is a building environment. The architect is concerned with that. It is the only profession who is concerned with that. The electrical engineer is not concerned with that. The structural engineer is not concerned with that. It's only the architects who are concerned with the environment of that building. That is the reason why we stated it there.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. "Environment of the building."

Yes, Engineer Coronel.

MR. CORONEL. Well, I think maybe by practice nowadays, if the architect will agree, you know who are the bosses in construction, they are the
developers. They hire architect separately. They hire electrical, mechanical, structural, sanitary, environmental, interior design directly through them, which, before in the '50s and in the '60s, it was really the architect that is being hired by the developer to get all of these together. I think that's what they are actually pushing through right now. But it is unbelievable today that all of these are being done by—nobody says about it, but it is the developer that do it then they just put them together. That's why in the problem of construction year in and year out, the problems of construction and building it's almost the same, it never change because there has never been a ready, a coordinated effort by an architect or a prime professional regarding this matter because of such kind of practice of most of the developer. I don't say all of them, but even Ayala is doing it, the different Chinese dragons are doing it. That's why I am hoping after this law, we can do such that it can really be followed that without the kwan of the different developers that are undertaking it. Ito po sinabi ko lang po ito para everybody will be aware of it. Now, while you try to get the whole scope of it, the others are actually dividing it into fractions, item for item getting all of these one by one and they just put together to erect a building for that matter. Pagdating po naman ng environmental, when you say environmental, you are talking about sanitary, road system, so many of it, and there are environmental engineers now, as
there are interior designer or site development engineers or architect that are doing it on their own. In fact, they are also trying to claim in one of their conventions that they are the prime professionals. That’s why there is really controversy. I would say that PTC should take hold of this. This is the organization of all of our professions. Nagkakagulo-gulo po ang mga professionals ngayon because of this particular practice.

That’s only for your information, Ma’am, because we are discussing so much, but actually, pagdating po sa labas iba po ‘yong nangyayari. Even nowadays, it is now being practiced that way.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, because we are legislating law, your professional regulatory law, so, I do not know if this phrase “and building environments” would hurt other profession. Makakasakit po ba ito sa iba, like doon sa environmental planning engineers, sanitary engineers?

MR. CORONEL. Sanitary engineers.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sa mga ano. Kasi marami pong environment. So, will this not hurt? Baka makakasakit po kayo ng loob ng iba or you might step on the toes of other profession.

MR. SANTOS. It will not. Madam Chair. I just want to explain to you. Okay.
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If I was consulted by a big developer to design the whole project, okay, I would design everything and I would get consultants from them. Why would they be hurt? When, in fact, I am hiring them, I am paying them to do or to practice their profession since I am the prime professional. So, what harm could be done? There is no harm to be done as long as the architect does not practice or sign as a sanitary engineer, as long as the architect does not do notary public, that the lawyers will be angry. So, we just want to practice the holistic view of the architectural profession.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ang concern ko lang po dito when we come to the deliberation of this in the ano, in the floor of the Senate, you have to be there para i-defend niyo si Senator Pimentel to explain these things.

MR. SANTOS. It is really very hard. It takes to be an architect to understand the whole thing.

MR. VILLAROSA. Ma'am.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, this will stay and then—so that we can proceed with the other. E, bahala na po sila pagdating, sir, sa ano, doon sa floor.

MR. SISON. Mayroon lang akoong sasabihin. I think I have heard about being prime professional. And I know that the standard practice is that we are all co-equal. So, if you can be a prime professional, the civil engineer...
or other allied profession can also be a prime professional. So, in our opinion, if this law will pass considering that they have been prime professional, it will also deprive other profession of being a prime professional.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. We have not dwell on matters that will ano.

Okay. May I recognize Architect Yolanda Reyes. Ma'am, what is CCOS?

MS. REYES. That's Chancellor College of Fellows of the United Architects of the Philippines.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Chancellor College...

MS. REYES. Of Fellows.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Of Fellows. Okay. You are recognized, Ma'am.

MS. REYES. Yeah. Magandang hapon po.

Well, first, I would like to correct that. I don't think it was understood well that we were calling ourselves—no, because I am an architect, as prime. The word may probably be the lead professional. Because, first, we have to design the whole structure. Okay. We will have to identify where the lobby is, where the toilets are, where the lightings are, where the bedrooms are, for whatever reason, 'no, these things, 'no, and then 'yong mga kitchen, ganyan.
So, we will design everything, as they should be according to the functional principles, okay, of designing. And then the other professionals now will come in, the structural, ibibigay namin sa kanila 'yong plano and then they will design the strength of that structure. Ibibigay namin 'yong plano sa mga sanitary engineers; and they will come up with a design on the technical aspect of the systems in plumbing and sanitary. And then we will give it also to the electrical engineer to do the same. So, kaya 'yon ho, 'yong lead professional not the prime professional. We can not claim to be better than any of them. We are just saying that as far as the designing is concerned in buildings and planning, we will be doing that because we have studied on that.

I am also in the academe for a long time, and I have studied, and I have made comparisons on the
MS. REYES. ... made comparisons on the curriculum of the architects, of the architecture curriculum and engineering on the different branches of engineering and they do not have any functional subject or courses. But that does not make us better than them. It's just that that's our realm of practice and they have their own. It's technical and it's also as important as what we have delivered.

And I just want to emphasize that building environments here means the building and -- for example, the driveway, kailangan idi-design namin 'yong driveway non, kung saan 'yong parking, saan 'yong entrance. Tapos, papasok din naman sila on the strength of the roads, on where the -- after we have indicated the light post, kung saan illalagay 'yong mga light post. Dito naman papasok ang mga electrical engineers for the systems. So, it's actually -- there is actually no conflict. There is no conflict. It's just a -- it's a clear identification of our own specialized profession.

If you will notice, Madam Chair, after the -- we have been also indicating here that structural design means the act of conceiving ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is that letter (c) also? Under letter (c)?

MS. REYES. That's letter (c.1) Mayroong ano 'yan -- mayroon kaming idinisayn, inano. But I think I'm looking on the other ano. But we are just talking here of structural design as the act of conceiving, choosing and developing the
type of disposition, arrangement, and proportioning of the structural elements, which means there is no threat whatsoever, that we encompassing or overlapping the work of the engineers. Sila 'yong – ilalagay lang namin ang mga columns, bahala na silang mag-solve kung gaanong kalakas 'yon.

MR. SISON. Pero 'yong definition dito iba, eh. This is also our definition of structural design, eh. 'Yong proportion structural elements to resist vertical, any kind of loads, 'yong proportion, so we conceive also, we arrange also to meet – to resist all the loads acting on certain structures. This is also our definition, in due consideration of the safety...

MS. REYES. Exactly. But that does not mean that there is conflict, Engineer Sison.

MR. SISON. Hindi.

MS. REYES. We can talk. Isn't it, in practice, when I do my buildings, I lay out the columns. And if the civil engineer will tell me, "Architect, hindi ho puwede 'yan. Baka ho-puwede nating..." then we have to – there is some kind of compromise.

MR. SISON. I agree with you because that is our practice nowadays.

MS. REYES. That's why, exactly. That's why there is no conflict.

MR. SISON. But this is a law.
MS. REYES. That's right. But you cannot also remove this role—this function from the architects. We have to show also. We have to identify where to put and where not to put the columns.

MR. SISON. Yes. And maybe, we can redefine this. Ito lang 'yong—sinasabi ko lang, ang objection namin is because this kind of definition is more or less the same definition of our structural design.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sir, you are talking of what letter?

MR. SISON. 'Yong (C.1), 'yong (C.1).

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. (C.1)

MR. CORONEL. Madam Chair, let us remove the word "designing" because you said you are doing structural designing, eh. It is very clear in this that you are supposed to do structural designing. You should do structural system, maybe, but not designing.

MS. REYES. Hindi po. 'Yong system is — that one belongs to you actually because you...

MR. CORONEL. No, no.

MS. REYES. ...compute the loadings and all but you cannot remove from the architects the location of the column.

MR. CORONEL. Exactly.
MS. REYES. Eh, kung inilagay niyo 'yon sa gitna ng mga pinto o kaya sa mga ... namin 'yon.

MR. CORONEL. Hindi. Tama po 'yan. We agree with that. We agree.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Order please. Point of order.


MR. TIMBOL. 'May I request the gentleman from my left to please read to us that provision that was mentioned by them. Now, pareho raw rin dito. Pakibasa lang ninyo po para ma-clear na ito, 'yong engineers.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Engineer Coronel, what provision are you referring to?

MR. CORONEL. Itong napagdaanan na natin, mayroon ba roong susunod? The general practice of architecture means the act of planning architectural and structural designing, specifying supervision and giving general administration and responsible direction to the erection, enlargement of alterations of buildings. Structural designing. They say they don't design. There must be a substitute for the designing if they say theirs is to -- we agree. We will never disagree that they do -- before a structural engineer can make structural design, the architecture will give the columniation, grid lines, the distances, etcetera. It's up for the structural to design what is the foundation, what is the column, what are the beams, what are the slabs in order it can...
structurally be erected. That is part of designing. But it's in their part, it is a part of their job structural designing. There must be another word for such in order for them to define that they do such thing as determining kung ano kahaba yong cantilever na 'yan, ano 'yong -- what is the maximum -- if there are columns to be removed because you have so much span. I think it's really the work of an architect. And it will be on the hard part of the civil engineer to design structurally such kind of architectural design that has been made by them to make it structurally sound when you erect it. That is the difference.

VOICES. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Wait.

Engineer Coronel,...

MR. CORONEL. Okay.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ... you want to remove the words "and structural designing?"

MR. CORONEL. Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, ito lang ang matitira, "The act of planning architectural specifying -- the act of planning -- ano ito?"

MR. CORONEL. Madam Chair. Madam Chair, may I clarify.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. "Architectural design" na lang. Alisin na lang po 'yong "structural." So, you want to remove that? 
MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay, Architect Florentino.

MR. FLORENTINO. We vehemently object to that, Madam Chair. First, it was already embodied in the original law. The act of structural design in the original law, it was already there. Right? Now, what we are just trying to do here is to define what we in this law mean — when we mention the word “structural design,” what do we mean by it? And we try to define it in such a manner as to avoid the conflict between the civil engineers and that of the architect.

Now, structural designing, Madam Chair, it takes, at least, two processes: One is the conceptualization of the structure. That is what we call the qualitative aspect, the conceptualization of where the beams will be, what kind of structure will you use, will you use space frame, etcetera. That is what we call the conceptualization of the structure and that is the realm of the architect. Now, the computation of stresses, the putting of loads, the putting of bars, that is now more the expertise of the engineers.

Now, you will notice, Madam Chair, that we are — both of us are doing structural design. Both of us. However, it does not mean that we have to quarrel about it because we have a stage of the structural design in which architect should do it. We cannot possibly give up our prerogative to conceptualize the structure of the building.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Hayaan na lang po natin ito dito kasi nasa old law naman. Hayaan na po natin.

MR. CORONEL. Hindi, ma'am. Kaya lang namin nire-raise ito dahil we brought Article XV. You are saying wala pa naman tayo doon, eh. Pagdating po natin -- all of these that are being read, the way they were worded, if you go to Article XV, they have the exclusive, exclusive, the exclusivity. They are removing the kuwan of the civil engineers in structural designing.

MR. FLORENTINO. Kaya nga kung puwede, Madam Chair, dito na lang tayo sa 15, eh.

MR. CORONEL. Pumunta tayo sa -- let us go one-by-one. We are only bringing it out so that when we reach the 15th, you will find out, there we are trying to get the exclusivity.

MR. SANTOS. May we go to 15 already, Madam Chair.

MR. CORONEL. Okay, let us.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Let us visit Section 15. Let us visit Section 15, that is Registration of Architects Required, "In order to safeguard life, health and property, no person shall practice architecture in this country or engage in preparing..."

VOICE. Ano'ng page?
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Section 15, under the -- I'm reading the original law -- the original bill as filed. So, don't be confused with the other bills that have been amended. I am reading the original bill as filed.

Section 15, Registration of Architects Required. Okay. So, "In order to ..."
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ...So in order to safeguard life, health and property, no person shall practice architecture in this country or engage in preparing plans, specifications or preliminary data for the erection or alteration of any building located within the boundaries of this country" and then we delete this except in the last phrase, "when he is a registered civil engineer."

MR. SISON. Iyan ang pagkaka...iyan, inalis nila eh.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, so, iyon po ang nagiging ano...

MR. SISON. Yeah.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Dito nagkaroon ng controversy.

MR. SISON. Iyan ang controversy diyan.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. We deleted this phrase or use the....

MR. SISON. Kasi iyong...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Because, sir, they removed this because they are regulating their own profession.

MR. SISON. Their own law.

(Off-the-record)

MR. SISON. Kaya nagkaroon ng problema about the definition of structural designing eh. Because, the original law, we agreed that both architect and civil can do the structural designing but it is a non-exclusive. But if this will be push through, Section 15, it will be already exclusive — this architect, because you remove the exception.
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MR. FUAP. Precisely, because of the Architect's Law.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Precisely because they are crafting their own regulatory law. So, pagdating din po ninyo doon sa inyo, sa your own law, exclusive na rin po your own.

Sir, excuse me, ganyan po talaga ang trend ngayon. Like iyong sa physical therapy and occupational therapy. Before it used to be dahil kaunti lang ang physical therapy, so naging isang board sila. So, ngayon, they are now separating. So, nagkaroon sila ng exclusive functions different from the other sector. Pareho silang nagkaroon ng separare ambit of jurisdiction.

MR. SISON. And that's the reason why we are objecting because structural design is under the domain of the civil engineering. Paano maaalis?

MR. CORONEL. Ma'am, it should not be no person, "no architect". If you are talking of architect, huwag po nilang ilagay na "no person". When you say no person, generality, everybody - civil engineers, mechanical engineers, whatever engineers...

VOICE. Ilagay po nating nobody, nobody.

MR. VILLAROSA. Madam.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, may we recognize Architect Villarosa.

MR. VILLAROSA. Engineer Coronel, I think—by the way, good afternoon, Madam Chair. I'm sorry. I'm Architect Roger Villarosa, from the Philippine Institute of Architects. I'm the Chair of the Committee on Legislation.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Excuse me, Madam.

MR. CORONEL. That is the role of architecture, ma'am. As we stated in the first page, it engulfs everything. So, when you said an architecture practices definition of architecture.

Mr. VILLAROSA. Madam Chair, may I make a rejoinder to that?

Mr. VILLAROSA. Architect Vilarosa, proceed.

Mr. VILLAROSA. Architecture, being defined first of all, the definition of the word architecture, unfortunately means really, first profession or first technologies. The word, "arch" means number one and "ect" is technology. That means the first or the number one technology. That was the origin of the word "architecture".

However in the modern times, as we are doing it now, we cannot help but really encompass practically all professions including medicine. When we review...
or get the requirements of the owner, or even doctors like psychologist, because we have to find out what they want, how they live, how they act, their lifestyle. So, practically we’re like psychologist. When we do planning, we look at it on a holistic approach. Not only the immediate neighborhood for that matter. Even the effects on the community in its social, in its civic, in its practically everything. And so we cannot help but in the process affect, or rather be concerned, I would say, not affect, but be concerned with other professions like structural, electrical, plumbing, airconditioning, environment, sanitation and so forth— and so forth. Anything under the sun should be taught of by an architect. Otherwise, he’s not truly an architect if he will confine himself to the building alone. However, we respect all the professions that we are supposed to work with.

MS. REYES. Yes.

MR. VILLAROSA. And we cannot really work without them.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. You complement with each other, oo.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, I submit to the judgment of Atty. Almelor.

MR. ALMELOR. Ah, no, no. Naturally, I’ve to be impartial, to be fair, to be just, to the professions involved here.

Now, this Section 15 practically describes the acts to be practiced by a registered architect. Now in relation to the first section which we had been...
discussing prior to Section 15, I am again insisting that we must have that scope of work according to you but we can change that work, otherwise we will be under the Department of Labor and Employment. We may not be described as professionals. So, the scope of practice of architecture.

So, if we have one provision on this, together with the general practice of architecture, then we can enumerate that one can practice architecture as—any act as enumerated hereunder but we have to consider this act as not exclusive. So that the Board by exercising its quasi-legislative power or rule-making power can add a new act without disturbing anymore Congress. Otherwise, it will be taking a long time before another act can be incorporated in the scope of practice. It is like having new subjects and trend as regards the inclusion of subjects given in the licensure examination. The Board is being empowered to add new subjects—to delete existing subjects as the need arises.” So, similarly—because, Madam Chair, we can take experience or take note of the scope of practice of other latestly passed professional regulatory laws.

That’s why I agree with Architect Florentino, a former member of the Board of Architecture that we have to give too much value to Republic Act 545. However, we are just trying to see to it that when the scope of practice is involved, we have to be specifically expressly guided so that the other professions will not be saying, “Oh, we are being intruded upon or encroached upon.” That’s why it’s very important. As a matter of fact, when there was a
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meeting attended by various board members from the APOAs, the Board of Civil Engineering, the chairman thereof did not attend because according to the civil engineering profession, originally, there were only two military and civil engineering. Then, as time went by their profession has been eaten away by other professions. So, is this the reality? Of course, the reality. You know, we have this landscape of architecture. That's why this is a suggestion, Madam Chair, that we have to describe what are the acts constituting the scope of practice of an architect or an architecture. This will be resolving the problem between the civil engineering profession and the architecture profession.

Thank you.
MR. ALMELOR. ... Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That is precisely what I was suggesting — to have a separate provision for the scope of practice of architecture so that you can emphasize whatever the scopes are.

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair. Yes, I don't think we would really have no objection to placing it in another part of the law. In fact, that provision is already provided for in our position version. It's already there. After the general practice of architecture, we have specified the scope. Now, you can incorporate that in another part.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Atty. Almelor, we are using the Senate Bill 2081 as filed, the original bill. 'Yon po 'yong may ganito. 'Yon po 'yong may tatak na ganyan, 'yong receiving dito. Hindi ho 'yong may pirma, 'yong walang pirma. 'Yon hong may tatak dito na “received by the Senate.”

MR. ALMELOR. Ah, sige. Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Baka ho ma-technical tayo if I will be reading the one that has been amended.

MR. CORONEL. Alin ho ba?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Hindi po 'yan, sir, kaya pala naman an dami nating objections.

MR. ALMELOR. This was the one furnished by your office.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Hindi ho.

MR. SISON. Because according to the architects, this is the one –

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Hindi ho. Give them copies.

(informal discussion)

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I have been announcing and I have been declaring that we'll be using the 2081 as filed, not the one signed by the architects kasi pa baka ako ang ma-technical nyan.

MR. SISON. Anyway, Madam Chair, puwede ho ba?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Opo, sir. Okay.

MR. SISON. We appreciate very much the concern of Architect Villarosa regarding the practice of the different professions that it is not their intention to encroach the other practice of the – But however, because he told us that the architecture is encompassing that sometimes you will also try to encroach the practice of other professions.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. You cannot avoid that.

MR. SISON. My only concern under Section 15 is that if this will be approved, then it will deprive other professions to practice their own professional acts.

Now, my suggestion is that if they are not interested to delete, if they will push through to the deletion of a registered civil engineer, let us just clarify that this particular sentence be reworded as, “No person shall practice architecture in this country or engage in preparing architectural plans.” 

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY

ANTONIA P. BARROS
DIRECTOR III
LEG. RECORDS & ARCHIVES SVC.
Because when it is general term, "plans," it can be interpreted as plans, architect, engineering, and so and so forth. So, if we include architectural, so it is now specific.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, we just specify the word "architectural plans."

MR. SISON. Yeah. It is now specific.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. What is the pleasure of the architects?

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, you know, this style of a provision, in order to safeguard life, health and property, you know, this is embodied in Article II, Section 5 – the Polices and Principles of the 1987 Philippine Constitution. This is the very basis of the power of Congress to enact laws that will be regulating practice of a profession, quarantine those who have SARS, etcetera. You know, this is a police power of the State – general welfare clause. That’s why, what is important is that we have to enumerate the specific acts constituting practice of architecture. Now, any person who will be practicing any of these acts shows that he is duly registered by the Baord of Architecture and by the Professional Regulation Commission. The others who are practicing any of these acts but who are not registered by the board and the commission naturally will be committing illegal practice.

So, in the case of the civil engineering profession, if they will be having a new law repealing Republic Act 544, you can also enumerate what are the
acts constituting practice of civil engineering. If any of the architects will be questioning such act because it will be intruding into the practice of architecture, so that is now the burden of the civil engineering sector to defend. Because you will be having a law, according to Engr. Sison, the PIC is intending to come out with its new Civil Engineering Law.

So, let's go on, proceed. Let's try first to give this opportunity to the architect profession, as long as it will not be drastically intruding into the scope of your practice. Kasi, sino ba ang father, ang civil engineers o an architects? Although I believe it must be –

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Siguro, that will be a long debate, Atty. Almelor. Let us proceed.

So, Section 15, 'yong deletion po ng ano will stay. I-anon natin, i-delete na po natin 'yon.

MR. ALMElor. Architectural lang.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oo, ilagay lang po natin, i-insert lang natin 'yong word na “architectural plan”. Pero i-delete na rin natin 'yong word na “civil engineer” kasi they are establishing their own exclusivity.

MR. SISON. Yeah. But once you specify architectural, it is only exclusive for architect.

MR. ALMELO. Madam Chair, may I reiterate our proposal for the creation of a separate provision on the scope of practice.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. That will be done, sir.

So, itong “and building environment” under letter (c) ano ito, sold na ba tayo dito na this will stay? Okay.

So, let’s proceed to letter (d) – “Architectural firm means sole proprietorship, registered with the Department of Trade and Industry, a partnership, a corporation, or a foundation registered with the board and with the Securities and Exchange Commission.”

Ang observation ko lang po dito is ito po’y siguro dapat sa IRR na lang kasi as we’re standardizing all professional board laws, wala pong nag-a-appear na mga – ito, architectural firms, walang mga firms, mga consulting firms sa law nila. Because this is solely for the regulation of their profession. Mga examination, ‘yong mga ano lang po ang coverage.

I think ito pong mga architectural firms, this is under the SEC already, under the Securities and Exchange Commission.

MR. ALMELO. Madam Chair, may I interrupt.

Anyway, there is a provision in the latter part of this law regarding this firm, architectural firm.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. We will come to that. /
So, ano po ito, alisin na natin dito? Ilagay na lang po natin ito sa IRR lahat ito.

Atty. Almelor, what do you think?

MR. ALMELOR. As long as it is inevitably indispensable that such definition has to be set forth in this law, I agree. However, we can just place these terms in the implementing rules and regulations that the board will be promulgating.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay, let's proceed. So ito po, IRR na lang ito, architectural firm.

Okay. Sa geodetic engineer po, inalis po lahat ito kasi this is under the jurisdiction of the SEC. 'Yong practicing corporations.

MR. ALMELOR. No, that is a different viewpoint, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, 'yong sa geodetic.

MR. ALMEROL. The geodetic engineering profession does not like to include corporation as a juridical person to be practicing geodetic engineering. But, this civil engineering profession, this architect profession, they are interested in allowing a corporation to practice their profession because of globalization, of competition, liberalization, etcetera.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, you mean to say, you are allowing this under this law? 
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MR. ALMELOR. Yeah, there is a provision. You know, actually, it's up to the profession concerned. We have nothing to do. We are just suggesting, guiding. We have made a research. Nine professional regulatory laws do have provisions on the practice .../mhu
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MR. ALMELOR. ... on the practice of corporation. Because when this law was enacted in 19 – what's this – corporation was allowed to practice, then later on it was amended that only partnership ... etcetera. Then this time, the architects would like corporation to be practicing as a juridical person.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So, letter (D) will be placed in the IRR. How about letter (E) "Architectural Association, joint venture or consortium, means the association of two or more architectural firms for the purpose of providing professional architectural services."

Yes, Madam Segovia.

MS. SEGOVIA. Madam Chairman, I suggest that – these are the definition of terms, 'no. And the reason why it's here it's because this is a provision proposed for the new scope of practice of architecture, the corporation, 'no. I want this as part of this law. Let's say, I don't have the IRR and I have only this list, I can easily understand that particular scope of work. You cannot remove the definition of terms here, the architectural firms.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Atty. Almelor.

MR. ALMELOR. That's why we are giving the discretion to the body considering that if there is a provision in this law regarding the practice of juridical persons we can – naturally, the board has the power to include the same in the implementing rules and regulations. The provisions in the law must be carried out by the board through the issuance of implementing rules and
regulations or a separate resolution that will be promulgating a policy or measure. Because whether the board likes it or not, any provision in this law must be carried out or implemented. It is not an undue delegation of legislative power of Congress. It is being conferred or bestowed upon the board so that this law can be efficiently, effectively and productively implemented or carried out. So, it's up to them. There is no problem whether we have to include this definition or not provided that we have a provision on allowing these juridical persons, architectural firms, single-proprietorship, partnership, association or a corporation. Considering that... Naturally, there must be guidelines on how these juridical firms will be carried out. So, IRR, according to Architect Santos.

Thank you.

MR. VILLAROSA. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Architect Villarosa.

MR. VILLAROSA. Madam Chair, I feel we cannot remove these terms because it has to be defined, because they appear in this law. And without the definition, then it is left hanging in the air. At the later part of the bill, these terms are mentioned.

MR. ALMELOR. So, we would like Architect Villarosa to point out such particular or specific provision that will be containing such term that is now being defined in the early part of the law.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I think that is Section 34 up to Section 40 –
MR. ALMELOR. Are we not referring Section 39?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So, let us proceed. This will stay, letter (D) and letter (E).

MR. ALMELOR. Sige, whatever.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, let's go to letter (F). Okay. Letter (F) “Accredited professional organization of Architects (APOA)” means the official national organization of all registered and licensed architects in the Philippines.”

Siguro po ito dapat dito official, integrated national organization.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, we can also provide this definition but if there is a provision in the later part of the law regarding the integration of the architects, then for me there is no need defining considering that the board and the commission have to accredit and/or recognize any organization, national integrated organization of architects, wherein all architects must be members thereof.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I think there is no provision here for the integration. Is there?

MR. ALMELOR. There must be a provision, otherwise they will be encounterings.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Meron po ba? Anum ang ano…?

MS. REYES. We are not interested.

MR. ALMELOR. No, I'm going to explain because later…
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MR. ALMELOR. A, Dindin, because it is now the trend.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the trend now.

MR. ALMELOR. These architectural landscape architects, interior designers...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Integration of national organization.

MR. ALMELOR. ... except these nurses under the new law, they don’t like to be integrated considering that who are fighting, the officers, the organizations. But we, lawyers, as long as our names appear in the role of attorneys, we shall ipso facto or automatically become members of the IBP. This is only a definition but we must have a provision. We can have a pattern of provision as reflected in the interior design or in the kuwan. You know, it will be for the good considering that what will now be... The problem to be encountered by the registered nurses is this. There can be no – yes, there is a renewal of the professional identification cards but there will be no issuance of the certificate of membership in good standing by the integrated organization. The new law of nursing has no provision on integration. That’s why any registered nurse can or cannot be a member of the Philippine Nurses Association, the other one ARNOLF, etcetera. But if you have an organization whether it will be the UAP or not as long as there must be a prior consultation with the PA and other organizations, then that will be good for the architects. And whenever an
architect has to renew his or her professional identification card, upon presentation of a certificate of membership issued by this integrated organization, then such renewal can be made considering it is a proof that the annual membership fees have been paid by that architect.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sir, let us ano… Would you not like this to be…? Would you not like to be integrated as one organization, national organization? Since you have this in letter (F), I suggest na we provide a one section for this and remove this under the definition of terms. Gawin na lang po natin ito na section, say, section – iyong before the foreign reciprocity. Ilagay po natin ito doon as one provision and then let us remove this from the definition of terms. Like sa iba pong ano, iyong sa ibang ano -- integration of membership to one national organization. “Upon registration with the board, the registered blank shall be integrated to one national organization similar to the rules of integration adopted by the Supreme Court in integrating the members of the Philippine Bar. The members shall receive the benefits and privileges appurtenant thereto. Those who have been registered with the board but not yet a member of accredited organization at the time of effectivity of this act shall be allowed to register as member of said organization within three years after the effectivity of this act.”

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, we suggest that such pattern be not observed, be not followed considering that, first of all, we, the architects, are not
like the lawyers. And the setup of the Supreme Court and the IBP in comparison with the setup of the Board of Architecture, Professional Regulation Commission and the organization, the setups are different.

And not only that, Madam Chair, these three years, within three years to be registered as members of the organization, we have to do away with that. As long as the name of a registered architect appears... /s
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MR. ALMELOR. ... appears in the registry book kept by the commission, then such registered architect shall ipso facto or automatically become a member of the organization. So, everybody must be a member. Otherwise, if we will have no professional integration not all can be compelled to become members. There is a saying that it is a violation of the Bill of Rights. No. In case of conflict between the provision under Section 5, Article 2 of the Philippine Constitution, in the provisions in the Bill of Rights, the provision of this police power of the state or general welfare clause under Section 5, Article 2 shall prevail considering that the interest of the few must be—must not prevail over the interest of the many. So, if there are only few who don't like this integration because it is mandated by this law pursuant to that Section 5 of the police power of the state provision of the Constitution, then such few members must give way, must yield to the interest of the many. Otherwise, okay, we have a UAP, whatever...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Atty. Almelor.

MR. ALMELOR. Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. There is another pattern here regarding integration. "Integrated national organization of professionals. All professionals shall be integrated under single organization recognized and accredited by the board and approved by the commission. A blank duly
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registered and licensed by the board and the commission shall automatically become a member of the integrated and accredited national organization and shall receive the benefits and privileges appurtenant thereto upon payment of the required fees and dues. Membership in the integrated organization shall not be a bar to membership in any other association of librarian."

Is this provision the same as this accredited professional organization of architects? Is this…

MR. VILLAROSA. Madam Chair, may I?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Villarosa.

MR. VILLAROSA. I am now making this statement as a representative or representing the Philippine Institute of Architects.

And for your information, Madam Chair, the Philippine Institute of Architects is now 70 years old. It means, it is the first architectural organization in the Philippines and probably the first in Asia.

Anyway, we have no objection to the integration of the architects. But it should not be an integration of the organization. It should be an integration of the individual architects. That’s why in this bill, we only added the word "WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO EXISTING PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION." Whatever sections that we introduce in the bill, we have
no objection provided the word "WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO EXISTING ORGANIZATION" is maintained.

MR. ALMELOR. I agree with the suggestion of Architect Villarosa that, if we have this integrated organization of architects, we must not prohibit the existing organization or the future organizations considering that the members of these affiliated organizations are also members of the umbrella integrated national organization of architects.

You know, I would like to inform you, it's up to your agreement. The Electrical Engineering Law has a provision on integration. But the then APO IEAA upon consultation with the other organization was accredited and recognized by the Board of Electrical Engineering subject to approval by the commission, the Philippine Society of Mechanical Engineers because there is a provision in the Mechanical Engineering Law, the professional teachers because there is a provision on integrations. They have been accredited and recognized by the board subject to approval by the commission. Now, the present UAP was only accredited by the commission, not by the board and the commission unlike if there is a provision in your law.

This is only a suggestion. You have nothing to worry Architect Villarosa, considering that your well-loved organization of 70 years will not be dissolved by the Securities and Exchange Commission as long as it is duly
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registered. Your members are also members of the integrated organization of architects. They are free to become members.

I, in fact, I am a member of the Integrated Bar, IBP, however, I am not a member of another organization. It’s my freedom to be, not to be a member of another organization.

So, thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. Architect Reyes.

MS. REYES. Thank you Madam Chair.

I would just like to inform this august body that in December of last year, PIA and UAP has agreed to include a provision which does not appear in the 2081 bill that you’re holding. And it reads: “The accredited professional organization refers to the National Professional Organization accredited by the Professional Regulation Commission.” The APO in this act refers to the existing official national organization of all architects of the Philippines in which all registered architects shall be members without prejudice to membership in other existing voluntary professional organization.

So, that was our agreement both by the PIA and the UAP. So, at this point because that has been agreed already by the membership of UAP and by the membership of the PIA, at this point, I don’t see any immediate need for any integration that is given for our profession. Because if you will
understand this very well, Atty. Almelor, is that all registered architects in the Philippines will be members of this national organization and without prejudice to membership in other existing voluntary professional association. This wordings came from the PIA and which we accepted very open handedly. So, I don’t think there is any need for any other move.

MR. ÁLMÉLOR. Our point is this, Honorable Chair, that there must be such provisions of professional regulatory laws that in one way or another standardize.

I agree with the substance of that provision except that we have to do away mentioning one organization the, UAP considering that...

MS. REYES. That’s not mentioned.

MR. ÁLMÉLOR. So, there must be no mention of UAP. Okay, thank you.

MS. REYES. Generic tayo, generic.

MR. ÁLMÉLOR. But there must be such accreditation or recognition not only by the commission because this was possible under PD 223, we have now Republic Act 8981, and we must have such provision that the accreditation and recognition must not be solely—must not be made solely by the commission, but first by the board subject to approval by the commission in line with Section 7, Par. c, of Republic Act 8981 which states therein as a
power of the commission to review, approve any resolution or policy issued by the Professional Regulatory Boards including the Board of Architecture. Therefore, a resolution has to be issued by the board subject to approval by the commission for and as regards the integration or accreditation of the organization.

Thank you.

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair. The discussion is being prolonged. And I don’t think there is any conflict whatsoever. There is no conflict.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The problem here is that, will this be removed from the definition of terms? Or, will this be restated in another provision? So, ‘yon lang po ang parang issue natin. We are not disagreeing with whatever words you use here, but ‘yon lang po, saan natin ito dapat ilalagay. Is it in the definition of terms or, is it another provision? Para ma-strengthen ‘yon integration niyo.

MR. FIORENTINO. Madam Chair, the sentiment of the architects are embodied here, as read by our chancellor, which is very clear. And we are not really very...cpc
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MR. FLORENTINO. .... very clear. And we are not really very particular as to what part of the law it will be placed. We are after substance, Madam Chair. We leave it to the secretariat.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The substance will be the same.

MR. FLORENTINO. Yeah, yeah. It means to say ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. But ang concern lang po namin is saang provision 'yan dapat, saang part of the law.

MR. ALMELOR. This can be placed in the latter part of the law after, let's say, reciprocity or before. Because this is very important as far as every registered architect is concerned.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. It is our only concern where to place in this part of the law, this integration.

MR. ALMELOR. I-partner na lang po ninyo, Madam Chair, sa landscape architecture. 'Yon ang pinakahuli sa technical na law. Ang pinakahuli nursing.

MS. REYES. Madam Chair, but we just want to make it clear that we architects are not in conflict with anything, with each other anymore. And we would want for this law, as far as the accredited professional organization is concerned, to be worded as it is worded in this paper, with signature, Madam Chair. Kasi we have already agreed on this, where you want to put this or what heading you want to have it under, then it's up to you.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MS. REYES. But may we request that it be worded exactly as we have agreed among architects.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, exactly. I'll use the same word.

MS. REYES. Oo.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Because we are also standardizing. So, if it is not necessary to be in the definition of terms, so we are removing it and we are putting it somewhere in the law.

So, sige, no controversy in that letter (f)?

Authored defined, wala ring controversy?

Let's go to letter (h) board, wala rin?

Commission, no controversy?

DTI, okay lang;

Letter (k), Implementing rules and regulations - IRR, so wala ring controversy;

Letter (m);

Ano ito, letter (k);

Letter (l);

And letter (m), Service Agreement, means a written contract or equivalent public instrument stipulating the scope of services and guaranteeing
compensation of such services to be rendered by architect registered and licensed under this Act."

So, we go now to Article II, Organization.

MS. SEGOVIA. Madam Chairman, excuse me. Excuse me, for the letter (m).

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Ms. Segovia.

MS. SEGOVIA. The "service agreement" means a written contract duly notarized or equivalent public instrument, a written contract duly notarized. That was the correction previously done.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Service agreement means a written contract or equivalent public instrument stipulating the scope of services and guaranteeing compensation of such services to be rendered by architect registered and licensed under this Act." So, I'll just follow this definition.

MS. SEGOVIA. Because during our first committee hearing...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Duly?

MS. SEGOVIA. Yeah. ... it was agreed upon that "a written contract duly notarized." I noted it down during the first committee hearing.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. And so we add the words "duly notarized" before the word "written contract" -- no, after the word "contract." So, "duly notarized."
So, are you all in agreement with that word to be inserted "or duly notarized?"

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, we would like to find out whether this particular terminology is found in the body of this bill. If it is found, then we can include this, but there is an alternative. We can include this in the IRR, considering that the document can be a public or private document. If it is notarized, it becomes a public document in order to go against third person or third party. Because the agreement between two contracting parties can be valid, as far as they are concerned, as long as it is not contrary to law, public policy, public morals, etcetera under the Civil Code.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, is there a need or no need to put this?

MR. ALMELOR. Hindi. Is there a need to include this term? Or if there is a need, are we still going to describe this written contract as notarized? So, these are the questions to be resolved by the body.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. ALMELOR. Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, what is the pleasure of the group? Are we going to include this phrase, "or duly notarized?"

Yes, Madam Segovia.
MS. SEGOVIA: Actually, this is a safety net for the architects because, you know, we always have a problem with collection, especially for the big contracts ‘no, multinational contracts.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So, let’s include that word. Anyway, this doesn’t make any harm.

Okay. So, let’s go now to Article II, Organization, “Composition of the Board of Architecture – There is hereby created a Board of Architecture, a collegial body under the supervision and administrative control of the commission, to be composed of a chairman and two members appointed by the President of the Philippines upon endorsement by the commission which shall choose from the list of five nominees for each position as submitted by the accredited professional organization of architects. The board shall be organized not later than six months from the effectivity of this Act.”

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, we have a pattern regarding this, considering that this …

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. I will separate these into two provisions.

MR. ALMELOR. Ah, yes. This endorsement can be replaced with recommendation.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yeah.
MR. ALMELOR. And this accredited professional organization of architects is -- AGPAOA -- what is this?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. APOA.

MR. ALMELOR. APOA. I thought 'yong doctor... So, if you are architect, you are professional. We can just -- "integrated national organization of architects," that's short, that's very descriptive. Then, whether UAP later or not or PIA, what.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, siguro I will divide this into sections according to provisions and isasama po ito doon sa 'yong -- last part will be discussed under the integration. Doon po siya mapapasama. Kasi po doon po sa composition of the Board of the Architecture, parang hindi po siya doon. Hindi siya diyan sa lagay na 'yan, yong integration. It's not...

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, it is appropriate that the same be placed here because it is now the integrated national organization that shall be given that...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominees that will nominate.

MR. ALMELOR. Oh, yeah, responsibility to submit the nominees for every vacancy filed to the commission for the recommendation of three out of every five nominees to the President.
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THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sir, ito lang pong latest portion ito, “The board shall be organized not later than six months from the effectivity of this Act.”

MR. ALMELOR. This can be included therein because it is referring to the constitution, to the composition of the board within such period.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. ALMELOR. But although this cannot be considered as mandatory ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. I submit to the better judgment of Atty. Almelor.

MR. ALMELOR. It is only directory because whether we like it or not if there are no chairmen -- chairperson and members appointed by the President, how could we have constituted a board? So, it may take less than six months or more than six months.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So, no more problem with this Section 4.

So we go to now to Section 5. Power Vested In Board. Dapat po ito "powers."

MR. ALMELOR. Powers and functions.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Powers and functions. ‘Yong iba pong board, it’s powers, functions and duties.
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MR. ALMELOR. And responsibilities. Because there are general basic powers. Now what will be enumerated are the specific powers, functions, duties and responsibilities of the board. And we are recommending, Your Honor, that we have to enumerate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Enumeration.

MR. ALMELOR. Kasi ito, — alam mo ito, Architect Florentino, we really love your Republic Act 545, but we are trying to standardize, the provisions of other professional regulatories. This is also ... to civil engineers.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, okay lang ho ba — sir, okay lang po ba if we enumerate the powers and functions of the board?

MR. FLORENTINO. Yes, that's exactly...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. We will put this in enumeration form, not like this.

MR. FLORENTINO. Yes, that is exactly what we did.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oho.

MR. FLORENTINO. That is exactly what we did, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, yes, ito na po. Okay.

MR. FLORENTINO. Yes, that is exactly what we did.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, no problem with this.

MR. ALMELOR. Hindi, hindi po. Kasi ma ... technical ... /plm
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MR. ALMELOR. ...kasi ma-technical naman si honorable chairman of the kuwan kung if she will be...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Hindi ho, ito na. We will enumerate this. We will put this in enumeration, form.

MR. ALMELOR. Of course, thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ito lang po. May ano lang ako dito, iyong Number 8 under Section 5 - Powers. Ito pong "hear and try administrative cases". Usually ginagamit po namin dito eh, "hear and decide administrative cases". Decide na kaagad. Kasi, para iyong hear eh parang try na rin iyon eh. So, mag-decide na ho kaagad. So, we put this as "decide" hindi try and try. So, you decide also. Okay.

So, how about the civil engineers, do you have any problem with their powers and functions?

MR. CORONEL. No objection, Your Honor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Very good. So, let's skip all this. Let's go to Section 6 - Qualification of Board Members. Each member shall at the time of his appointment:

(1) Be citizen of the Philippines and a resident thereof;

(2) Hold the degree of B.S. Architecture, M.S. Architecture, Master in Architecture or the equivalent thereof conferred by an architectural school or college legally chartered and of good standing;
So, no problem with that. No. 3...

MS. SEGOVIA. Madam Chairman, Madam Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Segovia.

MS. SEGOVIA. Yes. Under the qualification of board officers, can we include also the gender issue here. Kasi it is only limited to his appointment. Can you include also “at the time of his or her appointment.”

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. What number is that?

MS. SEGOVIA. Sa gender issue lang.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ano pong number iyan?

MS. SEGOVIA. Section 6.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Section 6 – “Each member shall, at the time of his or “her” appointment.” Okay.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair. Because she is a lady, you know, in the Constitution, it does not state there “her” only “his” but we have how many presidents, lady presidents.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yeah.

MR. ALMELOR. But, there’s nothing wrong. We can.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Nothing wrong. Okay.

(3) “Be legally qualified to practice architecture for at least...ano po 10 years or ginawa ninyo nang “20 years— and in active practice on the date of his appointment.”
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MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Practice of what, architecture or practice of teaching architecture?

MS. SEGOVIA. Architecture.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Architecture.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, because in the other professional regulatory laws, it includes a certain number of years. Out of 10 less 3, 4, or 5 must have been spent with the academe. Kasi, you know, we are— the board members are not only regulators but also they are prepares of the questions. Unless later on the questions will be prepared not anymore by the board members but by a group or committee which will be inputted into the question data bank. If we can have 10,000 questions there, then there is no need for a board member. Anyway, the computer will be correcting the answers of the examinees. But we are trying to be proactive, trying to foresee what will be taking place in the future. But meantime, it is not appropriate for one to be appointed as a board member unless he or she has a background on teaching considering further that teaching is now one he acts or practices of architecture.

Thank you.

MR. FLORENTINO. Hindi ba puwedeng sa criteria na lang iyon...?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Atty. Almelor, may I invite you to No. 4. — “He or she must not be a member of the faculty of any school, college or
university where a regular course in architecture is taught nor have pecuniary interest in such institution. No former member of the faculty of any school, institute or university where architecture is taught can become a member of the board."

So, para pong contradictory po iyon sinasabi ninyong...

MR. ALMELOR. Hindi. It is not contradictory. Because this No. 4 qualification...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. This refers to whom?

MR. ALMELOR. Yeah, this refers to one who is being appointed without any connection with a college offering the course.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ibig ninyo hong sabihin nag-stop na siya.

MR. ALMELOR. Kasi, nakalagay dito, five years. For me, as long as he or she is no longer connected with that school, college, university offering the course or any review center, then we can allow him or her to be appointed to the board. However, the problem here is this pecuniary or financial interest. Okay. You are not a faculty of the institute where architecture is being offered. However, you are receiving such compensation from the same college or university. You are pecuniarily connected with this institution.

For me as far as I'm concerned, whether you are connected with the university or college as long as you are not teaching or you are not connected with the review school or centers, then you can be qualified. And there must be
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no—instead of this fuvers prior to the nomination. No, as long as you are no longer connected. Because we have computerized, fully computerized the licensure examination. What is being avoided here is the conflict of interest wherein a board member may be prejudicial to the interest of the graduates of the university or college where he was formerly connected. So, please think about the body here about this.

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Florentino.

MR. FLORENTINO. If I may make my input there.

I was a member of the board and yet, I have never taught in a school. Right. I do believe—I feel that these present times there are sometimes a crisis of qualified board members. There are many architects who are qualified as a board member but when they are invited, medyo inatrasan dahil sa—for various reasons, 'no. So, if you limit it very much to members of the academe, mali-limit na naman iyong field of choice. Kaya kung puwede lang, sa criteria or sa qualification na lang ng evaluation ng mga maire-recommend, na ire-recommend ng association, nasa kanila na lang iyong na page-evaluate kung sino ang qualified. Pero huwag na natin i-limit dahil mali-limit iyong field of choice.

MR. ALMELOR. Okay, that's a good suggestion. But I would like to find out from Architect Florentino and the others, are there a scarcity of available
architects for appointment as board members. Kasi, ako I was wondering when this bill, the New Nursing Law-- in lieu of five nominees according to this group, only three would be sufficient. I was amazed because there are now several thousands of registered nurses. Does it mean that there are only few who would like to become members of the Board of Nursing similarly? Does it mean that there are only few architects who would be aspiring to become chairperson and members of the board? Although, I agree now that we can do away with such requirement because it will be depending upon the organization, then the commission and the president. But we are trying to come out with quality members.

You know, I learned this from Secretary Roxas that there must be a combination of teaching and practice. Because if you have a background on teaching, you will be more qualified. Although we have to be foreseeing the situation when questions will no longer be prepared by a board member. So, we can do away with that qualification that only 10-year practice.

May I inform you that under Section 11 of Republic Act 1881, the PRC Modernization Act of Year 2000, there is a provision that “only holders of valid certificates of registration and valid professional license they have but cards now shall be allowed to teach subjects given in the licensure examination plus the requirement of the CHED. So in short, we have been advocating, proposing for the inclusion of teaching subjects as a practice of a profession......../ipp
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MR. ALMELOR. ... as a practice of a profession.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it is a practice of profession but we're talking here of the qualification of board members.

MR. ALMELOR. So, whether we would like the board member to have a background in the academe or not, as long as he or she meets the number of years, it's all right. But you know, we have to modify number four, Madam Chair. You know, why should we still require this five years?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, we have here in the last provision. "He/she had officially resigned from such an institution and had completely stopped teaching, advising or review activities for at least five years prior to the nomination."

So, what do you say to that?

Yes, Architect Gan.

MR. GAN. I think this provision is very good. I'm not saying that professors should be barred from being a board member. But five years is a good time because immediately after his or her teaching, the same question of style of putting question in the data bank will be just the same. So, for any examinee or student, it will easily be picked up from his style of teaching.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, no more problem with this, ano? So, kung anuman po 'yong nandito niyo, so I will just lift everything here. Okay.
Section 7 – Terms of Office. "The members of the board shall hold office for a term of three years after appointment or until their successors shall have been duly qualified and appointed. The members of the board first appointed under this Act shall hold office for the following terms: one member for one year, one member for two years and one member for three years. Each member of the board shall qualify by taking the proper oath prior to entering upon the performance of his duties."

So, magkakaroon lang po siguro tayo ng problem dito regarding the reckoning of the start of the day in office. Which should be followed, the date of appointment or the day the member took his or her oath? Kasi, nakalagay po dito, "shall qualify by taking the proper oath prior to entering upon the performance of his duties."

May isa po kaming nag-crop up dito na problem like the veterinary medicine. He was appointed in November and then he took his oath in March. So, nagkaroon ng issue diyan kung ano ang susundin, 'yong reckoning day or his first day in office – is it the appointment date or is it the oath-taking date? Kasi po may nakalagay dito. So, what I did doon sa kanilang bill po, inalis ko po 'yong "taking the proper oath." Inalis ko po 'yong "prior to entering upon the performance of his duties." Para ang first day will be reckoned on the date of appointment.

So, what is your pleasure? Do we have to –

Atty. Almeor.
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MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, if we will be standardizing the provisions that has this term of office because you know, it does not state therein that after the expiry of the term, a board member can be immediately reappointed. So, in order that such uniformity could be maintained, we might as well pattern this from the existing or recently passed professional regulatory laws with such provision on the term of office. Because as a matter of fact, if we will be considering this bill, there is no need for this one member for one year, one member for two. We have to find out from the standardized provision.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sir, what we are discussing here is about the reckoning of the first day in office. Is it the appointment date or is it the oath taking date?

MR. ALMELOR. For me, it must be the appointment date if you will be considering the staggered. Let’s say – otherwise, it will be unfair to those who would be replacing the incumbent who has already resigned or whose term expired or has been accepted by St. Peter, the term of office will be shortened. That's why, we have to reckon the period, the term from the date of appointment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, I think if that will be the case, we have to remove here the phrase “after proper oath”. The phrase “prior to entering upon the performance of his duties,” -- “prior to entering.”
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MR. ALMELOR. We can still include that because like any government official or even – before you have to assume your office, you must take your oath.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Your oath.

MR. ALMELOR. Before a registered architect will be allowed to practice a profession, he or she has to take his or her oath before the board or any person authorized by law. That's the point. But the point only is to see to it that the term of office – Because you know, term and tenure are two different things. Tenure is embodied in the term. So, in order to avoid such time when, okay, there is no available board member or a board member has not been appointed by the President, it will take some time. We will be allowing hold-over. And this is not very sound if every time there is a member of the board despite the fact that his term or her term has expired, he or she will be allowed to still continue holding such office.

Thank you, Honorable Chair.

MS. SEGOVIA. Madam Chairman, I have another reaction, 'no?'

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Segovia.

MS. SEGOVIA. This is regarding when the board member will start his term. Suppose that there is an appointment being given or being released but the term of one board member has not expired yet, there might be conflict.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. But we have here a phrase which states that "until their successor shall have been duly qualified and appointed."
So, kahit ha, say, in-appoint ka ng November, kung hindi pa expired ang term mo, ... Yes, magkakaroon naman ng overlapping 'yon.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, maski expired na ang term, wala pang successor, then the incumbent, if he or she is still alive, can continue discharging his or her office. Of course, naman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Atty. Almelo, ang parang nagiging issue lang po namin dito is 'yon, say, you were appointed in November as in the case of the veterinary medicine. They're claiming that they were appointed in November of this year and then no'ng mag-take ng oath siya ay March na. So, nagkaroon po siya ng problem na the reckoning of the first day was naging 'yon pong oath-taking niya, March. So, nawalan siya ng how many months. So, I want to be clear, I want that to be clarified in this provision, para hindi magkakaroon ng ganong conflict, issue.

MR. ALMELOR. Opo. Madam Chair, maybe you are right. But what we are after is continuity. The board is a continuing body. The board may have, later on, different composition – the chairperson later on may be different from – So, what is important is that there must be a specific provision in the law that will be the reckoning time when the period or the term will be starting. Kasi, alam mo, we can just rely on the newly passed Professional Regulatory Law regarding this.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sige po, sir, we'll just pattern this to –

MR. SANTOS. (inaudible)
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That’s my bill also, landscape architecture. That’s mine. So, sige po.

MR. SANTOS. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Santos.

MR. SANTOS. Can we just go back to the qualification on number 2?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Section 6, number 2.

MR. SANTOS. Yeah. “Hold the degree of BS Architecture, Master in Science Architecture, Master in Architecture or the equivalent thereof conferred by an architectural school or college legally chartered and of good standing.”

For me, it is basic that we just require the minimum requirement – “Bachelor of Science in Architecture conferred by an architectural school or college legally chartered or of good standing period. Not within the others. Kasi, the way it is written –

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. It is very limiting na pagka may in-include ka pang iba. So, we just remove MS and M in Arch?

MR. SANTOS. Yes.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, it depends upon the quality of board members, of persons who will be appointed board members. This is different...
MR. ALMELOR. ... This is different from the qualification for examination. Naturally, you must only have Bachelor of Science in Architecture.

Now, if we can modify this provision in order that — not everybody can become a chairperson or member of the Board of Architecture. So, if you want this, I am just proposing hold the degree of Bachelor of Science in Architecture and Master of Science in Architecture, etcetera, ganon, upang hindi lang ka-level ng mga Bachelor of Science in Architecture holder, at least may master’s degree naman. Pero when it comes to qualification kinakailangan — Bachelor of Science in Architecture is sufficient. How do you find it? Kasi siyempre ang iba diyan will be challenged to take up master’s degree if they have such ambition to become a chairperson or a member of the Board of Architecture.

MR. SANTOS. Just Bachelor of Science, no need for the master.

MR. ALMELOR. Kaya nga. I am tossing this to you if you want. If you want such qualification in addition to Bachelor of Science in Architecture, we can require also such Master of Science. Hindi na nga doctorate.

MR. TIMBOL. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Reyes. O siga, before...

MR. TIMBOL. Sa AAIF simple lang ang gusto namin, wala nang pa-

master-master.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. ALMELOR. Kasi ito, we are trying to gain experience from the other professional regulatory laws. Okay. Sa akin, okay na iyon kasi may
master’s degree ka. Hindi ka naman mas okay na potential board member na ganon, so, okay, it’s all right.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Architect Reyes.

MS. REYES. I agree to that because, first of all, there are not as many masteral degree holders in the Philippines and there are enough schools offering the masteral program so that delimits our choices.

And the other thing that I would want to be removed here, if you may, is the equivalent, iyong equivalency, iyong “or the equivalent thereof.” So, wala na po iyon.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, “hold the degree of B.S. Architecture” is sufficient?

MS. REYES. “Conferred by an architectural…”

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So, from “M.S. Architecture to the word “thereof” so we delete. Okay.

MR. ALMELO. Madam Chair, if you are going to further improve this qualification, it is sufficient “duly recognized or accredited by the government.” Of course, we have to mention the Commission on Higher Education, one that is responsible for… And under number two…

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. In number two, “conferred by an architectural school or college…”

MR. ALMELO. “By school or college offering the course of architecture.”
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MS. REYES. “Duly recognized by CHED.”

MR. ALMELOR. By CHED because it is the governmental agency responsible for the issuance of the certificate of recognition.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. “Duly recognized by the CHED.” Okay. Tama, we never mention CHED here. Okay. Why we are modernizing? We have to be attuned to the policies of the CHED and the PRC, the new PRC law. So, ito lang po ang objective nitong mga bills na ito.

So, we now go to... So, iyong number four po okay na iyan, as is na iyan, tama na iyan.

Section 7 – Terms of office. Are we finished...?

Okay. Iyong Section 8, we go now to Section 8.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, let’s pattern this after the existing – the latest... Kasi mahirap naman na limited to one term lang. Halimbawa...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, oho, we have to standardize this with ano...

MR. ALMELOR. ... kung gusto ninyong maging reappointed immediately, eh walang kuwan dito. Mahirap iyan.

MR. TIMBOL. Madam Chair, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Architect Timbol.

MR. TIMBOL. As everybody knows, we started this morning, yes. Now, I want to know is this. Is everybody willing to stay here up to 10:00 o’clock tonight?
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, sir, we were going very slow. So, let's go fast. Okay.

So, Section 8.

MS. REYES. I think there's no problem in Section 8.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, you know, we have to modify this so that...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, we have patterns on this.

MR. ALMELOR. Okay, thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So, Section 9. Section 10 - Composition of the board. Okay. No vehement objection on this section? Section 10 - Compensation of the board. This is patterned again. We have already standard provision for this and this is patterned after the PRC Law.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, as regards Section 9, we have also a pattern because we don't like a secretary of the board to be excluded herein. The secretary of the board is not yours truly.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay, no problem.

MR. ALMELOR. Every board must have a secretary designated by the commission.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So, we go now to Section 11 - IRR.

MR. SISON. Madam Chair, ma'am.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Engr. Sison.
MR. SISON. From the civil engineer, nakakalimutan na kami.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, yeah. We’re now in Section 9.

MR. SISON. We have no objections to the… This is more between the PRC and the architects. I would just like to point out two provisions wherein the civil engineers are concerned…

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Affected. Okay.

MR. SISON. … so that we can then have our recess.

So, Madam Chair, under Section 28… Kasi wala na ho kaming objections doon sa mga susunod na section, eh. The same as our…

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sir, let’s first go to Section 22 to accommodate the civil engineers so they can…

MR. SISON. Twenty-eight, 28 ho.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-eight. Okay.

MR. SISON. So, second paragraph, iyong fourth line “shall accept or approve any plans” so, ganon din ho iyong amin “shall accept or approve any architectural plans or specifications” being specific.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. What line is that, fourth line, “… plans and specifications prepared by or under the direct supervision of a registered architect shall be stamped with said seal during the life of the registrants…”

MR. SISON. “Architectural plans and specification…” We just want to be specific. And also the second paragraph “shall accept or approve any architectural…”
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THE PRESIDING OFFICER. “Or approve any architectural…”

MR. SISON. Okay.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sir, what is this, is this an omnibus amendment that everytime we see the word “plan”…?

MR. SISON. Yeah, I think that will clarify.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Everytime we meet this word “plan” we have to insert the word “architecture.”

MR. SISON. Yeah, architectural.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, this is an omnibus amendment.

MR. SISON. And then the last.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sir, excuse me po, iyon pong sa first paragraph ng Section 28, I just want to be clarified. Saan nga po iyon, nasaan po iyon portion?

MR. SISON. Second paragraph.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Hindi, iyon sa first paragraph muna.

MR. SISON. Meron hong plans doon, “plans and specifications prepared by and under direct supervision of a registered architect, architectural plans and specification.”

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yeah, I was able to find that but iyon sa first paragraph po.

MR. SANTOS. Doon sa third line.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. "Specifications prepared by..." Ah, so, doon sa plans before the word "plans" "architectural plans and specifications."

Okay. So, iyon lang po, sir?

MR. SISON. Last na lang ho, last.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Aro pong section?

MR. SISON. Iyong Section...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-eight.

MR. SISON. Forty-six.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Section 46. Okay. May I invite the body to Section 46.

MR. SISON. Meron kasing a certain provision from the old architectural law that was deleted so we want it to be restored in this section and it states... /jss
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MR. SISON. ... and it states "Nor shall anything in this act prevent professional, civil, mechanical, electrical, mining, chemical engineer duly licensed or registered to practice their profession, provided, however, such persons do not use the designation architect." Nasa old law nila ito, e. Na-delete ho ito, e. So this will...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. This is exclusively for the architects. That's why they removed that phrase. This is exclusively for the architects.

MR. SISON. Kaya nga. Kasi kung mayroong...

THE PRESIDING. So, if we will put that back ay hindi na exclusive ito sa kanila.

MR. SISON. No. Ang ibig lang sabihin nito, kung mayroong provisions dito that would overlap or encroach 'yong practice ng ibang profession, it will not prevent this profession to practice also under their own law. Ang meaning nito like, for example, structural design, pumasa ito, pina-practice nila, and since this is also part of our law, it will not exclude us for practicing also this particular provision.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. What trouble will it bring if we include—if we'll delete that, ano, or visa-versa? What trouble will it bring to the architect if we retain that provision?
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MR. SISON: It will only— if we provide this provision, it will definitely, ‘no; ang mangyayari ‘yong mismong law ay will not inject some element of… We want just to be sure of the exclusivity. So, pagka mayroong law...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Exclusivity of whom?

MR. FLORNETINO. Of the architects.

MR. SISON. Kasi nga, di ba mayroon tayong—we are...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay...

MR. SISON. We have some observations of the definition. So, we are allowing it. Okay. Provided this is it. And we restore this provision.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Let us hear from Architect Sach.

MR. SAC. I think precisely we agree that we are accepting the word “architectural plans specification” precisely because we would not like really to touch on the other professions in the architectural law. But we have provided anyway that this act shall not be constituted to affect or prevent the practice of any other legally recognized profession. And since these are legally recognized professions, then they are. That is the point. The only thing we are trying to do is really to—in this law, it is intended for the practice of architecture. And so, we are not in a way, to affect or prevent the practice of any other legally recognized profession.
MR. SISON. Sabi ng mga boss ko rito puwede na raw. Di pumatayag na ako.

MS. REYES. Teka. Bago kayo umalis. Madam Chair, Madam Chair, before you leave this is very important.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Sir, before you leave, there is ano, a word from Architect Reyes. Okay.

MS. REYES. Okay. Mayroon kaming, well, of course, it is not supposed to be discussed now, but I wish si Aping is listening because there is—if you would want us to include the word “architectural” before the word “design,” then we would also ask you to put the word “engineering design” in their law, so that we will have a very distinct separation of...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, reciprocity.

MS. REYES. Yes, ‘yan. So, “engineering design” should also be—would appear.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. No, no, no. They have no bill filed as yet. Their only bill is about Section 24, ‘yong establishing multi-disciplinary consulting firm, is that right?

MR. SISON. Madam Chair. ‘Yong problema nila wala ho sa amin problema ‘yon, e. And I want also to inform you that part of our proposed
amendment to be sure that it is a non-exclusive civil engineering law ito ang ilalagay namin doon sa huli.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That is in your bill. Okay.

MR. SISON. "Provided further that nothing in this act would likewise limit the other professionals from practicing their own respective profession provided that such professional does not designate himself as civil engineer."

Klaro 'yan, a. Ilalagay namin 'yon.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I think no problem. Okay. You're now establishing your own independence.

MR. VILLAROSA. Madam Chair. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. You're independent from one another.

So, I think there is no problem with that.

MR. SISON. Kasi ho iba 'yong pagkaka-English niyo, iba 'yong amin, e.

MR. VILLAROSA. Madam Chair.

MR. TIMBOL. Puwede na ho sila mag miryenda ngayon.

Mr. VILLAROSA. Madam Chair.

MR. SISON. Madam Chair.

MS. REYES. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Villarosa.
MR. VILLAROSA. May pakiusap lang ho kami, isa. First, kung puwede pag-hearing po nung Civil Engineering Law invited din ho kami.

THE PRESIDING OFFICE. Okay. That will be fine. The more the merrier.

MR. VILLAROSA. Para naman magkaroon naman ng reciprocity. Ilalagay ho namin ‘yong “architectural” kung ilalagay nila sa kanila ‘yong “engineering.”

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Babantayan din po ninyo. So, you have to be vigilant.

MS. REYES. Yes. Madam Chair, that’s why that is conditional.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Very vigilant, e.


MR. SISON. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oo.

MS. REYES. ‘Yong we will put the “architectural” word if they are going to put the “engineering” word before the word design.

MR. SISON. Madam Chair.

MS. REYES. In that case, I think it is very clear that we are functioning our own profession.
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THE PRESIDING OFFICER. After all, I am holding this position since 1995, and many professional laws have passed my hands, so, i-anon ko na lang po, babantayan na lang po.

MS. REYES. Ah, babantayan.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. I will see to it that you will be invited when the time comes that we hear their bill.

MR. SISON. Huwag ho sila mag-alala, Ma'am, kasi 'yon din nga ang gusto namin because that's the reason why when we wrote you our comments, we are requesting that we together with the architect, should sit down so that we can harmonize the two laws.

MR. VILLAROSA. Madam Chair, isang parting word lang po roon sa aming mga kaibigan engineers.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay, Architect Villarosa.

MR. VILLAROSA. I think it's a fact and if for that matter, we can produce the 'ika nga ho, the evidences that there are architectural plans that are signed by engineers, but hardly is there any structural signed by an architect at the moment. There are many architectural plans signed by the engineers. I can produce that on the next hearing, Madam Chair.
MR. SISON, No, no, no.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, we are not going to resolve that.

MR. SISON. Speaking in your name, sir. The Pic... only discussing about one provision and that is the one—

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. But in your Senate Bill 1560, you are...

be as lengthy as what the Senator is now doing.

also—s, no longer an amendment, but will be a referral because our bill will...

also receive among the bill introduced by Senator Gawadk, and this bill will...

introduced by Senator Percaya, so, we will also do the same act, we will...

MR. SISON. Yeah. If the Senator is revising or amending the bill...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If concerning only Section 24...

please.

MR. SISON. Madam Chair, we have the bill filed by Senator...

young constituent him, my constituent name, young constituent, Madam Chair, may I also ask, Madam Chair, some question or say...

MR. SISON. May I...

be an...

called, everything will be put in proper perspective. Do you think this will...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Anyway, sir, after this bill has been...
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, no more.

MR. SISON. The PIC...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, you'll be filing your own bill.

MR. SISON. Yeah. That...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. SISON. That amendment is included in the new version of our proposed amendment.


THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Sige, ho. Okay. And thank you very much for coming over.

MR. SISON. Thank you rin ho, thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Salamat po

MR. SISON. Salamat po.
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MR. CORONEL. Maybe I would like to have short comment ho doon
kay Architect Villarosa. Kanya po ganon siguro sa remote areas of the
Philippines because of the Building Code, it authorized...cpc
MR. CORONEL. .... authorized the architects and the civil engineers to sign architectural and structural plans. We are not commenting -- although there are architects who are also signing architectural plans. We could also show those cases kaya lang ho it is authorized through the Building Code. With these laws now, I think magkakaroon na po ng parang division and we are hoping it will come out that way.

Thank you very much po.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Okay. Noted, sir. (Speaking simultaneously)

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay, let us proceed.

MR. OOLONAN. Madam Chair, bago ho umalis 'yong PICA, gusto ko rin ho magbigay ng konting comment dahil sa nangyari, 'yong both parties will already now -- naintindihan na 'yong bawat isa.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oo, 'yong sentiment ng bawat isa.

MR. OOLONAN. Ang big sabihin ay 'yong kay Pedro, kay Pedro; 'yong kay Juan, kay Juan, so mag ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oo. Tama po 'yon, 'yong kay Pedro, kay Pedro; 'yong Kay Juan, kay Juan. Oo.

So, let us now continue. We are now in -- I think no problem until Section

13.  
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Okay. Let's go to Section 14, Certification and Registration. Wala namang problema ano ho?

O, Section 15, we have discussed that.

Section 16;

Section 17;

Section 18;

Deleted po 'yong Section 16, Exemption from Registration;


MR. ALMELOR. This is a prohibition or inhibition against anyone who will be practicing architecture. He must be duly registered.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. ALMELOR. You know, there are provisions here which must be included in the penal provision kasi scattered itong old law – this present law. Kasi doon sa penal provision, naturally, ang iba nga gusto any violation of this law or the rules and regulations promulgated but the board shall hold liable the violator for imprisonment and/or fine. So, anyway, we can retain this kasi mahirap kasi gaya ng Section ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Atty. Almelor, where is that? What section is this?

MR. ALMELOR. Section 16. Kasi if you...
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Section 16, if you want deleted, that's...

MR. ALMELOR. No.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That has been deleted. Exemption from Registration.

MR. ALMELOR. No, no. What I mean is Section 16, inhibition against the practice.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, 'yong inhibition.

MR. ALMELOR. Usually, this is a provision prohibiting or proscribing any person to practice a profession like architecture without having been issued a certificate of registration and a professional identification card.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, I would like to inform the body that this will be an omnibus amendment na every time we encounter the word "certificate of registration," we will include "and professional identification card."

MR. ALMELOR. Alin po 'yan, Honorable Chair, itong Section 16, kasi exemption...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Section 16 po, 'yong mayroong certificate of registration. That every time we encounter this word, we will place "and professional identification card."

MR. ALMELOR. And so, if the architects don't like anymore this provision, it's okay, considering why should we still include these provisions?
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Which one?

MR. ALMELOR. Kaya Section 16, according to the Chairman, this can be deleted. Why should we still retain?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. May inhibition?

MR. ALMELOR. Oo.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. You want this Section 16?

MR. ALMELOR. Ang original Section 16, ngayon, ini-exclude na.

VOICE. It is deleted.

MR. ALMELOR. Deleted na.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, i-exclude na natin ito. Okay. Ito po 'yong inhibition, i-exclude na natin ito, i-delete na. Okay.

MR. ALMELOR. Kasi ito, nandoon naman ito sa kuwan, sa penal provision kung ikukuwan na natin.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sige po. Okay.

Okay, Section 18, Examination Required.

MR. ALMELOR. Okay ito. Wala namang ....

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Section 18, Examination Required, wala ng problema.

Section 19, no problem. Ito po, itong ano.
MR. ALMELOR. Honorable Chair, we can do away with this. We have to simplify. Why still include this,...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sa age requirement?

MR. ALMELOR. .... "Any person applying for examination and for a certificate of registration... Mahaba na ito. Basta ang "qualification for examination" na lang.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oho.

MR. ALMELOR. Kasi alam mo, may pattern sana tayo kasi nakakuwan. So, ito ngayon, we have to ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Simplify.

MR. ALMELOR. Are you amenable to the inclusion of this "21 years of age?" Kasi we have been beset with this problem. If one is a graduate, let's say, who is only 18-19, he may -- he or she may be allowed to take the examination but he or she cannot be registered because of this "21 years of age."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. ALMELOR. Now, the age of majority is 18 years old but if we have to -- may opinion nga ang Department of Justice regarding this so we can provide you -- where is Architect Santos? -- with that opinion of the Department of Justice. So, ang kuwan dito, ang age of majority ngayon ay 21 na. So, our suggestion is to do away with this 21 years of age or you can include this kasi...
ang sabi raw 'yong capacity to engage in business or practice of profession, one must be 18 years old.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Reyes.

MS. REYES. Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair.

We still want this provision or requirement to be included. Because in the practice of architecture, one has to be really matured if you are going to compare it to a person who will engage in business where you can be 18 years old or below 21 years old.

So, we are in agreement, the architects are in agreement that we maintain the 21 years old.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. After all, this is your bill.

So, how about 'yong letter (c), "completed the high school course in architecture" – he has completed high school course? May architecture ba sa high school?

MR. ALMELOR. Tama. We can do away with this requirement, high school. Bakit naman 'yon tertiary? You cannot proceed to college unless you are exempted siguro from graduating. Ito nga, dapat makuwan na ito.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. "... in architecture, conferred by school, college, academy, or institute duly recognized and/or accredited by the CHED and in addition has a specific record of at least two years or 3,840 for..." Naku
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naka-precise 'no – ... 3,840 hours equivalent of diversified architectural experience: Provided, however, That an applicant holding a masters degree in architecture from a school, college, university or institute recognized by the Government shall be credited one year in his/her practical experience."

So, okay na po sa inyo ito, itong linyang ito.

VOICE. Yeah, okay.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. How about 'yong pong letter (d), okay na 'yon?

VOICE. Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Convicted of any criminal.

MR. ALMELOR. Sandali. May degree ba dito sa kuwan, sa qualification?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Mayroon na po silang ginawa, sir, na ano, na proposal.

MR. ALMELOR. Idinagdag lang, proposal.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Proposal, yes. It's already here. I'm reading from this.

MR. ALMELOR. So, pero wala ng "or its equivalent" upang uniform na talaga.

MR. ALMELOR. "As recognized and/or accredited by the Commission on Higher Education."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, sir. It's already here.

So, Section 20, Fraudulent.


MR. ALMELOR. Wala.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Section 22, Subject of Examination.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, we must not have this provision twice a year. At least, once a year. Kasi halimbawa, later on, there are only few graduates who will be taking the licensure examination, the board may decide that only once a year; — at least, once a year upang — halimbawa, puwedeng gawin ninyo na five times or four times, three times.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, 'yong Thursdays, Fridays, and Sundays, which you mentioned in your amended version.

MR. ALMELOR. Oo. Kasi alam mo, may pattern sana ito, eh. Ikaw ang expert sa landscape architecture. At saka kung mayroon nang proposal sila — hindi ko kasi nakikita. It is still invisible.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. At least once a year, once a year. Ang twice a year lang po is 'yong mga teachers.
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MR. ALMELOR. Hindi naman. Sila nga twice a year din. Pero halimbawa, who knows later on the board would decide holding an examination only...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sir, do we have to legislate the number of ano?

MR. ALMELOR. Oo.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Do we still have to legislate that number of examination .... /plm
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THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ...that number of examination?

MR. ALMEJOR. Ah, it is important at least kasi, baka sabihin na there will be no examination anymore. So, everybody can practice without examination. This is my joke.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Pero, this is, at least, ilagay na lang natin po, "Shall be given at least once a year. So, puwedé pa rin ang dalawa.

MR. ALMEJOR. At saka ito, huwag nang sabihin "in the City of Manila and other"... basta it is understood that the board can give the examination in Manila and we have regional offices now. It's a reality, Architect Santos, and the Honorable Chair.

MR. SANTOS. Excuse me, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Santos.

MR SANTOS. The reason why this number of times of examination are given because in the original law, that is what has been, in the original law. Okay. I'm just telling you the background. Okay.

You keep mentioning the landscape architecture. Landscape architecture is just an specialty board of architecture and their law was precisely derived from the law of 545 before. Okay.

MR. ALMEJOR. Madam Chair, what I'm trying to point out that we can have as a pattern, the Law of Architecture because it is...

MR. SANTOS. The latest.
MR. ALMELOR. Yeah, the latest.

MR. SANTOS. Okay.

MR. ALMELOR. I am not saying that provisions therein which are not adoptable as far as this law is concerned would be included herein. That's not my point.

MR. SANTOS. Okay.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. We will only follow the pattern.

MR. SANTOS. Yeah. Actually there are two versions of this bill eh. Ang lumalabas ngayon, the House version which we agreed also with the other organization is coming up to be that version eh, iyong reformattting and everything parang iyon din eh. Parang iyon din ang kalalabasan ngayon because of the repeal iyong version natin ng House bill. I think, if you would reformat—pati nga napansin na nga namin ditto, Attorney, iyong sequence eh. Iyon registration, maun pa iyon registration kaysa examination.

MR. ALMELOR. Kaya nga, hindi maganda.

MR. SANTOS. Yeah, hindi nga maganda. So, iyong House version, iyong una namin na sinabmit rin sa House naka-repeal na siya na ang ganda ng formatting, which is exactly nakikita ko na ngayon, na iyon ang kalalabasan.

(Informal discussion)
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THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Let's go first to the title. The title will be repealing. If you want to follow the title of the House version, it is "AN ACT PROVIDING FOR A MORE RESPONSIVE AND COMPREHENSIVE REGULATION FOR THE REGISTRATION, LICENSING AND PRACTICE OF ARCHITECTURE, REPEALING FOR THE PURPOSE REPUBLIC ACT NO. 545, AS AMENDED."

So, ito na lang po, repealing.

MR. ALMELOR. Repealing.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. At saka hindi na puwedeng ano ito, amended kasi halos lahat eh pinalitan na.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So, unless we still have ano...
Atty. Almelor.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, this Section 22 – Subject...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay, let's go to Section 22.

MR. ALMELOR. "We have to vest upon the board such power to modify, to add or to delete any subject herein as need arises."

We have a pattern here as regards, kasi upang ang board will not be restricted from including...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Mayroon na po dito, sir.
"The board subject to the approval by the Commission may revise or exclude...

(Informal discussion)

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Atty. Almelor, we are now on Page 11 of the amended version.

MR. ALMELOR. Sige.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Atty. Almelor, ito po iyong kanilang revision.

MR. ALMELOR. O sige.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The board, subject to the approval by the commission, may revise or exclude any of the subjects and their syllabi and add new ones as the need arises to conform to the technological changes brought about by continuing trends in the profession.

MR. ALMELOR. Okay, I will agree now but I have found out that the rating is included under this section, this subject. We have to separate...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Nandito rin po. Rating in the—To continue. "Rating in the licensure examination to be qualified as having passed the licensure examination for architects, a candidate must obtain a weighted general average of 70 percent with no grades lower than 50 percent in any given subject." So okay na po.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, we have to create another provision...
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Section.

MR. ALMELOR. ...another section for this rating, kasi isinama doon sa kuwan.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oho. So, this will become another provision – Ratings.

MR. ALMELOR. Opo. Okay.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

(informal discussion)

MR. ALMELOR. O sige, let's continue.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Section 25 – Fees for examination and Registration. For purpose of defraying the expenses of...ah, ito po'y jurisdiction ng PRC.

MR. ALMELOR. Alin po?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Iyong fees to be determined by the Commission.

MR. ALMELOR. You are absolutely right because under Section 7, Paragraph (g) or ganoon, it is within the power of the board to prescribe the charge and to collect.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. ALMELOR. Unless our Chairman Gan will be designated to be...
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. O, so alisin na po natin ito dito. I-delete natin.

MR. ALMELOR. Opo. Madam Chair, itong Section 24 sa bill na kuwan, hindi sa kanila ganito, "Let's do away with this reexamination.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, reexamination.

MR. ALMELOR. Wala na. Kasi, why should you preclude, prevent the person who would like to immediately retake the examination? Diretso na.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Opo, sir.

MR. ALMELOR. Refresher course, wala iyan, hindi iyan, nakakatulong. iyan.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oho. So, this is the current trend. They are removing now the refresher course and the reexamination. They do not limit the number of times if flunker takes examination. So, wala na. So, kahit na ika-10 times na.

(Off-the-record)

MR. ALMELOR. We completely agree with that, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Oo.

(Off-the-record)

So, I think there's no—wala naman po yatang masyado ng problema dito.

Atty. Almelo, tingnan ninyo baka ano pa mayroon kang, so we can now go...
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MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, kasi we would like to inform...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, teka muna. Dito na lang tayo, anyway, refusal to—in Section 29, wala na sigurong problem diyan, in Section 30.

MR. ALMELOR. Okay.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Now we go to Article 4 – "The Sundry Provisions relative to the Practice of Architecture."

Atty. Almelor, kasi iyong ibang profession they do not carry this provision on corporate practice.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, it's very important...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, they do not carry this, but if you will be allowing them to have this provision, so okay lang po.

MR. ALMELOR. Excuse me. Madam Chair. This regarding the "reissue of revoked or suspended certificates."

You know, this provision when it comes to revocation of the certificate of registration one year or two years after, the respondent registered architect can file his or her petition for reinstatement not appeal. But it is not automatic, this is our practice. If the court will have to issue...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That is Section 30 or Section....

MR. ALMELOR. Section 30 under the guide na iyong reissue of revoked or suspended —pero ang kuwan dito, what is to be reissued is the certificate of registration which has been revoked. It must be one year or two years. Anong
gusto po ninyo, one-year or two years? Kasi ang karamihan, two years. Ngayon, the board will issue a resolution subject to approval by the commission. Kaya hindi automatic. Halimbawa, during the time when the registered architect was not allowed to practice, he still violated the law. Halimbawa, ang ground eh moral conduct, he is still cohabited with his concubine, paramour. Naturally, he was— at the time when he applied for reinstatement, he was still lacking good moral character. So, the board will deny such petition for reinstatement.

Now, as regards this suspension, so we can do away with suspension, it is automatic......../app.
MR. ALMELOR. ... it is automatic. Let's say that the period for suspension meted out by the board is one year or two years, automatically, after the lapse of one or two years, then that registered architect will be allowed to practice again his profession. However, if that the time when he was not allowed to practice for one year or two years, he did practice, then even the board can motu proprio file a formal charge against this registered architect. This time, it will be a revocation. 'Yon, by degree 'yan, depending upon the kuwan.

So, we have to revise this –

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Atty. Almerol, how do we word this Section 30?

MR. ALMELOR. Section 30, wala ba kayong pattern dito sa inyong version? Tingnan natin. Ah, ito, Section 30. "The board may, after the expiration –" One year, ano'ng gusto niyo, one year or two years, mga architects, honorable architects? Kayo ang magkuwan dito sapagkat kung kayo and naging respondent –

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the expiration of one year?

VOICE. 'Yong appeal ...

MR. ALMELOR. Hindi naman appeal ito. Ipaliwanag ko –

VOICE. After révocation.
MR. ALMELOR. After revocation, there must be a certain period na, let's say, one or two years, a registered architect whose certificate has been revoked will be given the opportunity to file his or her petition for reinstatement. But this is not automatic kasi baka ang board ayaw talaga. Saka ang resolution of the board shall be subject to approval by the Commission under such basis that it is not only the board that issues the certificate but also the Commission. Kaya nga ang certificate na nakalagay diyan 'yong mga boss tapos 'yong chairperson. Pag halimbawa revocation, ano ba ito, after two years or after one year? Ano po ang gusto ninyo? Kasi sa accountancy — It depends upon the degree sapagkat 'yan, hindi ito suspension. Pag suspension, one year or two years, automatic 'yan. Kaya 'yan ang pinapaliwanag ko sa inyo — ano, gusto niyo one year or two years?

MS. REYES. Two years.

MR. ALMELOR. Kasi pag suspension, ang board puwedeng one year, two years, three years. So, reasonable na two years na, okay?

MS. REYES. (inaudible)

MR. ALMELOR. Nasa inyo kasi ako — sa inyo 'yan, wala naman akong kuwan niyan although I'm aspiring to become a CPA also pero huwag muna ngayon.— Hindi talaga.

Ang suspension automatic. Ang board, may —
(talking simultaneously)

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay, two years. 
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MR. ALMElor. If it's a revocation, alisin na natin ang word na "to suspend" sapagkat automatic ito. Ang suspended, wala 'yan. Revocation na lang.

(talking simultaneously)

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sige, two years na and then remove the word "or suspended".

Section 31 – Prohibitions in the practice of architecture.

MR. ALMElor. 'Yan, nandoon kasi sa unang kuwan, nandito na naman. Okay naman itong version ninyo na pinag-agree upon.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. May penalty po ito so this is penal provision.

MR. ALMElor. By the way, this is not malpractice. This is illegal practice. Any violation of the law – Gusto nga ng isang librarian, si director ng House of Representatives ay,"any violation of the provisions of this law or any provision of the IRR", sufficient na raw 'yon. Pero ako naman gusto ko gaya dito – Kasi alam mo, there must be a specific offense. Misdemeanor kasi ito, mga small offense ito, hindi gaya ito ng offenses in the Revised Penal Code.

Ang importante lang, ma-protect ang profession ninyo not to allow any person who will be illegally practicing your profession. That's unfair. Kayo, nag-burn the midnight oil, pagkatapos, minsan na-deprive pa ang girlfriends ninyo ng 'yong kuwan. Then later on, nag-take ka ng exam minsan di pa rin ang iba na makapasa kaagad. Kaya we must not allow illegal practioners or violators of
this law. Ang penalty dito imprisonment or fine or both depending upon the nature. Kaya nasa inyo 'yan kung – Kasi, itong old law na ito, 'yong fine noon at saka number of years ang baba. Dapat ngayon ay itaas na rin ninyo. So ito meron silang recommendation dito na, Madam Chair, ito na lang ang sundin.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. ALMELOR. Sa electronics, mataas talaga.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ito, 300,000.

MR. ALMELOR. Kayong mga construction, kuwan 'yna. Biruin mo 'yon kung si Architect Villarosa naggawa ng Eiffel Tower –

Nasa inyo na 'yan kasi sa inyo ito.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Atty. Almelor, if you still find some objectionable or anything that is not in consonance with your opinion –

MR. ALMELOR. Alam mo, kung nahawakan ko sana ito no'ng prior ano hindi naman, we could have facilitated.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Pero, we can coordinate naman.

MR. ALMELOR. Ay naturally, kasi ito lang ang kuwan – onething for sure, provisions that the architects would like to be introduced into this new law, we must accept them. But let's find out whether it is appropriate or not, whether the same can be embodied in the IRR. 'Yon na lang ang kuwanin natin.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sir, ang problem ko lang po dito, why is it, under Section 38, there is another definition of terms here.
MR. ALMELOR. Alin?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That is Section 38.

MR. ALMELOR. 'Yong 34 ang nakalagay, this version?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oho. Professional architectural corporation –

MR. ALMELOR. Hindi. Ito kasi ang present provision doon sa Republic Act 545. Ngayon, ang trend ngayon ay to include corporation. Ang civil engineers nga, di ba may amendment diyan? So ito, i-pattern na lang natin kasi mahirapan talaga ang paggawa nitong secretariat ng mga provisions. Basta ang importante, 'yong substance, 'yong gusto niyo, nandoon. Kasi, in the very first place –

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sir, meron po ditong mga definitions of terms again like professional architectural corporation means a corporation organized –

MR. ALMELOR. Ang dami kasi.

VOICE. Wala na ho 'yon.

MR. ALMELOR. Wala na ito. Sa version nila, wala na. Tingnan nga natin. To see is to believe.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, inalis na po niyo 'yan.

VOICE. Wala na:

MR. ALMELOR. Wala na.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Kasi, lumalabas na scattered 'yong definition of terms ninyo.

MR. ALMELOR. At saka ito. I would like to take note of this collection of professional fees. Kailangan pa ba ito, na whether you like it or not, you ought to be – You deserve to collect fees. Ngayon, if you are practicing as a single proprietorship, a partnership or an association or a corporation, naturally, you will be receiving fees. Kasi, ito dapat, ikuwan na natin ang mind natin na hindi itong mga – gaya ng sa version ninyo, Section 37, 33 sa present law, pero sa version ninyo ay 37. Kasi, whether we like it or not, professional has to receive a fee pero huwag lang kasi if you are now in the practice of, let's say, a construction, may nag-advis nga 'yan, kasi hindi ba 'yong board kasi 'yan, under sa PRC 'yan noon. Ngayon, inilipat sa Department of Trade and Industry, may isang kuwan doon.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sir, excuse me, hindi pa ho pala na-erase, nandito pa ang definitions.

MR. ALMELOR. Oo. Ngayon tanungin natin kung kailangan ba dapat kayo magkaroon ng provision dito.

MS. REYES. Na it shall be unlawful?

MR. ALMELOR. Hindi po. Itong kuwan ... nasa ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. We're now in Section 38 – "A professional architectural corporation may register."
MR. ALMELOR. Hindi. Maliban diyan, itong Section 37 na collection of professional fees. Hindi na ito maganda kasi –

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, are you proposing –

MR. ALMELOR. For the deletion. Pero with the conformity of the honorable architects of strength.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. "It shall be unlawful to any" – Okay, may I invite you to Section 37 – collection of professional fees. "It shall be unlawful to any unregistered person to collect a fee for architectural services except as an employee collecting a fee as representative of a registered architect."

MR. ALMELOR. Ano, kailangan pa ba ito sa inyo? Kailangan pa ito?

MS. REYES. Yes.

MR. ALMELOR: O, sige, nasa sa inyo ‘yan. Kasi, from the very start, if you are not a registered architect, you cannot practice a profession. Of course, when you practice a profession, you have to receive your fee. Kasi this is different from if you’re engage in business, construction, that will be different.

MS. REYES. We’re not talking about the architects. We’re talking about the non-architects who collect fee for architectural service and that should be included here like developers. So, I think it’s better written.

MR. ALMELOR: Okay. This can be included in this provision ...
MR. ALMELOR. ... in this provision or in the penal provision because this is one of the violations of the law. So, nasa inyo iyan.

MS. REYES. May liability naman din sila.

MS. ALMELOR. Opo, opo. Kasi ang ibig kong sabihin, if one violates the law, he or she can be held liable for imprisonment and/or fine. Iyan ang kuwan natin. Kasi upang ma-detere ang magba-violate ng profession n'yo. So, there is nothing wrong. Kung gusto n'yo i-include pa rin ninyo. Kayo lang ang nakakaalam.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. O sige po. Okay. In number 38, in Section 38. Atty. Almeler, they have another definition of terms under Section 38.

MR. ALMELOR. Ang dami kasi dito. IRR na lang kasi alam mo... At tinanggap na rin sa version daw ninyo?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. It's still here, iyong small. Kasi iyong bracketed portion is only until here. O eto, wala namang bracketed portion iyon, eh. Page 16?

MR. SANTOS. Up to Section 41.


Okay, 42. So, deleted pala ito. Wala nang problema pala. Tapos na tayo.

O, number 43, Section 43 – Coverage of Temporary/Special Permits.
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MR. SANTOS. In-expound lang ho namin.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, in-expound lang.

MR. ALMELOR. Mayroon na sila dito sa version nila – kasi ito similar ito sa mechanical, electrical, sa interior design, sa landscape architect. Pero ang point ko lang ito, alam natin na mayroon tayong World Trade Organization, iyong GATTs, itong APEC, itong ASEAN, ito written agreement iyan pero ang application ng provision sa temporary/special permit o reciprocity provision, there is no need for a bicameral, multilateral, treaty or agreement between and among the countries or states or economies. Pero ito, it is being allowed by the Constitution under Section 12, no, Article XII, Section 14 of the Philippine Constitution, that practice of the profession shall be reserved or allowed to Filipino citizens except if, otherwise, provided for by law. Ang treaty, that is a law. This one, professional regulatory law, is also a law. But this does not require written agreement. What is important is that the board, subject to approval by the commission, shall issue that resolution granting a foreigner to practice architecture in the Philippines.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oo nga ho ang haba nito. This is very long.

MR. ALMELOR. Hindi kasi ang kwan niyan – may nalagay pa doon – iyon kasi hindi ba may counterpart, di ba doon dapat talaga mayroong Filipino architect kung if we have to allow a foreigner to practice architecture in the Philippines? Sa tāx may agreement diyan, ganon, whatever.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, okay na ito.

MS. REYES. Oo, okay na ito.

MR. ALMELOR. O siguro na mandito na... Di taas na po iyan? Kasi, anyway, that will be screened by the secretary here. Sa bicameral naman... Ang version kasi ng House of Representatives hangga ngayon di pa naman namin nakikita.

MR. TIMBOL. Attorney, okay na sa inyo, attorney?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Pero as much as possible if I can lift some provisions similar to the...

MR. ALMELOR. Hindi, okay na ito, kinakailangan magkaroon ng temporary/special permit because this is in consonance with Section 7, paragraph (j) and (l) of Republic Act 8981, The PRC Modernization Act of Year 2000.

At saka isang... I would like to introduce also the provision on Republic Act 8981. Dapat sana si chairman and the others must have a copy thereof, iyong if Filipino – if foreigners are allowed to practice in the Philippines without at least a temporary/special permit, the one who has hired that foreigner must also be criminally held liable. Pinadagdag iyan ni Senator Coseteng. Nandito na rin? Very good, very good. Kasi for your protection upang ang mga commissioner, chairperson, hindi na ma-file (file) ng kaso sa Ombudsman by some...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Technicalities.

MR. ALMELOR. Hindi, by some architects. Kasi sila ang nag-file ng kaso.
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MR. SISON. Hindi ba kuwan doon sa Ombudsman?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. O, tapos na.

MR. ALMELÓR. Another matter, Your Honor.

This CPA. Are you now in favor of the mandatory requirement of CPA upon renewal of the professional identification card?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sir, sa ano siguro po iyan sa powers and functions of the board.

MR. ALMELO. Hindi, aside from the powers, puwede, pero there must be a separate provision making it mandatory. Alam ninyo, sa Section 20, repealing clause ng Republic Act 8981, ang electrical engineering, ang optometry, pagkatapos iyong sa professional teachers ay may provision doon sa CPA na mandatory. More or less, ganon.

MS. REYES. But who will be the providers?

MR. ALMÉLOR. Hindi, ang kuwan diyan, kaya nga dito sa provision ng batas ninyo magakakaroon diyan ng iyong parang composition. Eh, siyempre dapat talaga iyan gaya ng CPA Council noon. However, ang guidelines, siyempre, gagawin by the board subject to approval by the commission kasi... Ganito iyan. Kasama ang APO diyan kasi whether you like it or not, ang practice regulation ng profession: dito sa Philippines gaya ng architecture governmental iyan. Iyong association ninyo non-governmental iyan. That is violative of the Constitution kasi... Ibig kong sabihin, ang practice ng profession dito hindi gaya sa ibang countries na association ang nagregulate. Pero sa Philippines it is a
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governmental body created by a law pursuant to Section 5, Article II of the Philippine Constitution kung sa'yan na. Eh, ngayon sa ibang countries, ina-allow iyong association. Sa ibang countries naman combination, association at saka governmental body. Pero sa Philippines, it is only the governmental body although the association may also be, to some extent, allowed by the law. But it has to be included in the law. Kasi gaya nang nangyari iyan sa nurse, ewan ko doon, isang function na dapat by the Board of Nursing, kinukuwan ng association. So, iyan ang importante kung gusto ninyo ng mandatory ng CPA. Mechansim lang naman iyan pag tungkol diyan, kung paano ma-implement.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Atty. Almelor, dito po sa House bill, they have here the provision on continuing professional development.

MR. ALMELOR. Oh, yeah.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If I may be allowed to read this and if I may also be allowed to lift this provision to include this in your bill. So, to read: "Continuing Professional Development – To promote public interest and to safeguard life, health and property, all practicing architects shall maintain a program of continuing professional development. The accredited professional organization shall have the responsibility of developing a continuing professional development program for architects."

So, i-lift ko na lang po ito, iyong sa House.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, thank you for having informed us about that version but we have to refer to the provision of the Electrical Engineering
Law or the Optometry Law considering that we used to have such council composed of the board, the association and the academe.

For me, under this integration, the members of the academe are also members of the organization. So, we can have only two composition or it depends. Probably, we can have that five members coming from the board and from the organization. Kasi iyan ang beauty, strength ng integration. Sapagka’t if you are in the academe, you are a registered architect, you are a member of the integrated organization, covered ka na unlike this time na walang integration. Iyong iba diyan hindi naman members ng UAP, hindi naman members ng PIA. Kasi you cannot compel. However, if there is a provision in the law pursuant to the police power of the state, general welfare clause, then such membership can be made mandatory.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Sir, I notice that you do not have your transitory provisions here.

MR. ALMELOR. Ang transitory provision is – isa iyan iyong vested automatic – vested right na...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That those who are existing architects shall be automatically registered upon the effectivity of this act.

MR. ALMELOR. I think you are right, Madam. May pattern naman tayo. Iyong sabi na, those architects registered at the time when this law became effective.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Kasi baka ma-misplace kayo, ma-displace kayo, iyong mga existing architects with the enactment of this bill. Meron na ba dito? Anung ano iyon, provision?

MR. TIMBOL. Madam Chair, I would like to explain... /jss
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MR. TIMBOL. ... I would like to explain for that reason, 'no. Our proposal before is amendment. That's why that provision is not included. But since this time it is more a repeal, we need it.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yeah.

MR. TIMBOL. Yes. Now, Madam Chair, I would like to be excused from this wonderful gathering for another matter. But before I do so, I would like to request in behalf of our organization for the Secretariat, your committee to give us, at least, five days in advance whatever the civil engineers are proposing.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I see.

MR. TIMBOL. Please, yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, sir.

MR. TIMBOL. We don't like to be caught unprepared.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I will do that.

MR. TIMBOL. Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I will let you know, sir. We will let you know. Okay.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair. This gentleman...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, I think we have finished all the provisions.
MR. ALMELOR. Okay, okay, Ma'am.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. And we have to wind up the discussion. So, I'll just prepare the bill and the Committee Report. And siguro I need somebody to coordinate this. Padalhan ko na lang po kayo ng copy before I'll have this signed by the Senator.

And then may I request na if I prepare the committee report, please prepare also the sponsorship speech. Kasi pagka po ito'y ano madali na po ito pag napirmahan ni Senator Pimentel. Tuloy-tuloy na ho ito. So, baka po during the sponsorship speech ipi-prepare niyo na po ang sponsorship speech, and also 'yong possible questions and answers that might be asked by the senators during the interpellation.

MR. VILLAROSA. Madam Chair, may I.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Villarosa.

MR. VILLAROSA. Mayroon pong isang isyu, Madam Chair, kadugtong nung CPD or 'yong Continuing Professional Development.

In the House version that was passed, there is another provision there that although it encouraged—the CPD is encouraged, however, it is not a mandatory requirement for the renewal ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The renewal of license

MR. VILLAROSA. ... in the House version.
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THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yeah. Okay. So, if it is silent here...

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, that could be reconciled during that Bicameral Conference Committee meetings considering that Senator—the Chairman of the Committee has no objection to that mandatory requirement, sa library, ganon.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. In fact, we have repealed that ano, we have repealed that law 266 requiring CPE before renewal of license.

MR. ALMELOR. Kaya na re-repeal 'yon under Section 20, pero ngayon that has to be revived.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Revived.

MR. ALMELOR. In short, revived sapagkat because of this era of competition. As a matter of fact, you would like a corporation to practice now as a juridical person. Kailangan 'yon kasi ang problema lang kasi 'yong sabi cause ng source ng corruption. No. You have to believe in your being professionals, possessed of good moral character, including reputation and technical competence. Kasi kung walang paniwala tayo as professionals ay kasi iisipan niyan o, mag a-attend lang ng first day pagkatapos after ng kuwan niyan ng mga third day babalik kasi mag sa-shopping. A shopping is an activity for the continuing development program. So, that is ... Nasa inyo 'yan.
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THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. I think we have to wind up since it is already 5:00 o'clock. What time is it? 5:30? Oh, I see. Overtime. Pero anyway we’re happy that we’re able to finish all the provisions. And so, rest assured that your Committee Report will be prepared by yours truly. Okay.

Sige. Thank you very much for coming and helping this committee in evaluating the merit of this bill. Okay. Thank you very much. Okay.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 5:39 P.M.
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