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AT 9:24, ATTY. RIA SALABIT, PRESIDING OFFICER, CALLED THE TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING TO ORDER.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Good morning everyone.

We'd like to start our third TWG, actually the last TWG was supposed to be the final TWG but we are in receipt of several position papers from the different professions regarding the proposed amendments to the architecture bill.

We'd like to acknowledge the presence of our resource persons: We have Architect Robert Sac, President of the United Architects of the Philippines. We have Architect Henry Olonan, Vice-President of the UAP; Architect Yolanda Reyes, also of the UAP; Architect Ricardo Poblete; Architect Edilberto Florentino; Architect Abelardo Mirafior, all of the UAP. We also have Architect Armando Alli of the Architect Advocacy International Foundation Incorporated. We have Engineer Florencio G. Cunanan, Chairman, Board of Sanitary Engineering. We have Engineer Jose Marciano, the President of the Philippine Technological Council. And we have Architect Ricardo Poblete of the UAP, he's the Chancellor of the College of Fellows. And we have Architect Henry-- I think, I mentioned him already, Henry Olonan.
So, maybe we can start with the related professions first and we can have your respective positions.

Maybe we can begin with the civil engineers, who is willing to speak for them?

Yes, Engineer Sison.

MR. SISON. Engineer Sison.

Well, in our last meeting, technical group meeting, we already agreed that we are going to harmonize the proposed architectural law and the proposed civil engineering law. That if it concerns architecture we'll just-- all the plans and specifications and documents will be preceded by architectural.

While on the other hand, for the civil engineering it will be preceded by the civil engineering plans, specifications and other documents.

We rushed the preparation of our proposed law and we submitted it. And I know that we - - it was already introduced by Senator Jaworski with a Senate number -- what's the number? 2590.

So, I suggest that since we already filed our proposed amendment, in order that the two laws can be harmonized, we can tackle it on the same - - if possible, if we can tackle it at the same time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Do we have any other positions from the civil engineers?
We are in receipt of your position paper from the Philippine Institute of Civil Engineers and the body of the proposed amendments, both to the House version of the bill and the Senate version is generally a complete deletion of all references to structure.

Would you kindly explain why you are proposing that amendment?

MR. SISON. Because when you talk of structures, it is very encompassing. It involves roads, bridges and so on and so forth.

Wherein I think the difference only lies between the contention between the architects and the civil engineers are related to the - - our scope of work related to buildings.

MR. PAREDES. It is not necessary.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Paredes, please use your microphone.

MR. PAREDES. The practice of architecture is very much different from civil engineering in a very big sense. Because the architect in this case creates the building in totality, structure and function all.

For that matter, the foremost architect of the world, Frank Lawdright, as a .. formed various function amidst the concern of the architect, the function of the building is the utmost concern of the architect for his client, for what the client demands. And the concept of structure comes from the architect or
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emanates from the architect's idea, then we pass it over to the civil engineer or structural engineer to design the detailed structural design of the structure. But the concept of the total structure is the architect.

So, we cannot harmonize the profession of civil engineering and architecture.

And our responsibility for human safety and all that is premised on that. That's why, when we finish our regular course in architecture, we are not qualified to enter-- to qualify for the, what you call the licensure examination, unless we have two years of experience.

The civil engineer does not have that. When you graduate, you could take the board.

But this is mandatory. We have two years experience to be able to qualify for the licensure examination. And that's the organic law, Republic Act 545.

And I have been practicing that for the past - - I am already 82 years now, Madam Chairman. I've been practicing for 50 years. And I worked under a national artist Pablo Antonio for seven years and Carlos de Silva and several architects before I was a licensed architect.

That's why, that's most important for the protection of life, safety and general public welfare which is not inherent in the engineering law.
Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Engineer Sison, may I invite...

MR. SISON. I think the subject matter is about structures.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sir, sandali lang po.

I would like to invite your attention to the amendments being proposed by the bill. The old architectural law includes structural designing. So, why are we proposing to exclude it from them when, as I understand it, the civil engineering law and the architectural law was passed roughly at the same time. So, at that time, we are assuming that the Senate and the House were both cognizant of their respective professions.

MR. SISON. I think the conflict lies because our law also, which is R.A. 544, which is our law at present, which is not yet revised, we can also do any design.

MR. PAREDES. No.

MR. SISON. No, it is here.

MR. PAREDES. No, no.

MR. SISON. I have our law.

Our law states that we can design, consult and all other for all buildings, structures and so on and so forth. And the reason why we agree that we should harmonize is to qualify. If it is architectural, then we will just put
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architectural. And if it is civil, then we will put civil. I think that is the agreement before and that's...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. For - - may I solicit the opinion of the PTC, is there such a thing as civil engineering structural design as opposed to an architectural structural design? Are those two separate animals?

MR. PAREDES. (Off-mike).

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, our bill can accommodate the word "structural" without encroaching on the practice of civil engineers, is that possible?

MR. SISON. No.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Engineer Sison.

MR. SISON. But in our case, they would prevent us to do their own architectural. Wherein, in our law, we can also do.

MR. PAREDES. No, Madam. May I verify...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Paredes.

MR. PAREDES. ...that.

Civil engineering for that matter, as a matter of course, as given encourages do not have space planning which is actually related to the human being as the apportionment of space depending upon the activities of the individual or the client's need as a factory ward or a hospital, they are not.
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trained to that. But that matter, if they are given the design, a mere residential, they cannot really plan it to the real needs of the client. They are not trained to that, space planning. That's why, it's very important.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, sir...

MR. PAREDES. Because, for example, to have an assembly hall of 500 or 1,000, they are not actually akin to that.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, sir, you reject the idea that there is such a thing as a civil structural design?.../rommel.
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THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ...as a civil structural design.

MR. PAREDES. Yes, Madam.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no...

MR. PAREDES. But it is more on infrastructures, more on infrastructures, roads and bridges and the like.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. But not buildings.

MR. PAREDES. But such a design of architecture is confined only to building design.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

Architect Florentino.

MR. FLORENTINO. Yes. Good morning, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Good morning.

MR. FLORENTINO. I believe that there is no conflict in stating the words "structural designing" in both the architects and the engineers, as you have pointed out. But there is really a distinction between the two. First distinction is that the main concern of architects are buildings and the main concern of civil engineers are structures. In general, principally civil structures. That's why they are called civil engineers - roads, bridges, waterworks, etcetera, etcetera. That's the first difference. Second difference is that the architect is mainly concerned with the holistic design of the building; the qualitative aspect of the building, the concept of the building.
Now, when it comes, however, to detailed analysis of computation of structures, then he generally gives that to the civil engineers who are more equipped, who has the forte, shall we say, of quantitative detailed computations. We really give that to our civil engineers. And there is no conflict between us. We collaborate with each other. We concentrate on the qualitative part. The engineers concentrate on the quantitative part. And therefore, we do not—there is really no conflict. We are just creating a conflict where there is none. We collaborate with one another.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Thank you. Thank you. That's very enlightening.

Architect Villarosa.

MR. VILLAROSA. Good morning, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Good morning.

MR. VILLAROSA. I'm Architect Villarosa of the Philippine Institute of Architects.

I agree with Architect Florentino, there is no conflict. I think it will be best to start with the definition of the term "design" and "engineering." According to Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, the Tenth Edition, the word "design" in one of the several definitions of the word "design" is creative art of executing aesthetic or functional designs. That's one. The other one is the arrangement of elements or details in a product or work of art.
On the other hand, "engineering" is defined as the application of science and mathematics by which the properties of matter and resources of energy in nature are made useful to people. There is no conflict. We are in architectural design. We do creative art of executing aesthetic or functional ideas or designs. We make also designs for the arrangement of elements or details in a product or work of art. And this structure is an element of the design or the work of art. Plumbing arrangement, electrical arrangement, structure arrangement, size of structure, kind of structure, all these encompassing. All the engineering works are elements of the building. But we don't do the computation for them. It is the engineering, as defined by the dictionary, the application of science and mathematics by which the properties of matter and sources of energy in nature are made useful.

So in simple terms, the architects design and the engineers compute-period.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Thank you po.

Architect Sac.

MR. SAC. Good morning, Madam Chair.

Exactly, Madam Chair, we, the PICE and the UAP and the other architects' representatives last time already agreed on how we define the scope of our responsibility and practice. We completely agree with PICE. The only...
thing that probably we would like to be clarified is the word that they want to omit, and that is structure, or is it structural?

VOICE. Structural.

MR. SAC. Because if it's "structure," we would like to know what is the substitute to this word because "structure" is different from "structural." Because we are told earlier that what is being petitioned is the complete omission of the word "structure." So these are two different things. "Structure" is definitely not the same as "structural." So which one would they want to be amended, the "structural" or the word "structure"?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. Is it Architect Aventajado?

MR. AVENTAJADO. PICE.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oh, engineer.

MR. AVENTAJADO. Engineer Aventajado. Good morning.

Madam, can you help us find the right word? The only conflict here is -- imagine the Glorietta. The Glorietta, the one who designed the aesthetic is the architect. Engineer Sison here was the one who computed the Glorietta, na hindi babagsak, Madam, pagka nag-earthquake. So we are looking for just this right word, the structural engineer who designs -- we use also the word "design". The structural engineer who designed the Glorietta and the architect who designed the Glorietta, the architect. So the only problem here is, how do we call the -- proper words on the structure or the structural. So we agreed already on this.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Maybe we can take a lift from the book of Architect Villarosa and limit it to design and computing. Okay. So we have that established already.

MR. CAL. Madam.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Atty. Cal.

MR. CAL. It says attorney but I'm also a civil engineer. That's why I'm representing PICE at this moment.

I'm very glad that really in concept there is no conflict between the position of the architects and the civil engineers. We are just bogged down with the use of words. In the existing law, the coverage of architecture includes architectural and structural design which, therefore, gives different meanings to architectural and structural.

Now, if we remove from the coverage the word "structural" and then the architectural design would be defined in such a way that it will encompass what the architects are saying, and then the word "structural design" be used by the civil engineers and then defined in the way that are agreed by both, then that should be okay. The problem, you see, if you start saying "architectural and structural design" which immediately means that the architects are going beyond architecture because why do you need to separate structural design from architectural design. So really, even if the word "architectural design" is used but then it's defined to encompass what the architects are saying, then there should be no problem.
But the other point of Engineer Sison, and I think it's confused with structural, we are saying “structures.” Because in the existing law of the architects, they are also empowered to do architectural design of other structures, meaning, structures other than buildings. Now, this is the one that we would like to clarify whether really the architects are saying that they would also cover structures other than buildings, meaning, roads, bridges, dams and other civil engineering structures. This also requires clarification.

MR. PAREDES. May I clarify on that?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Paredes.

MR. PAREDES. Actually, architects in the design of structures, for example, I don't know if he's familiar with the Jones Bridge. That is an architectural design of a bridge, the prewar Jones Bridge. Well, the Ayala...
MR. PAREDES. ... the Ayala then in Quezon Bridge is an engineering design of the bridge. There is a big difference between the two but the functions of which is the same, but the structure differs. One is aesthetical, the other one is purely utilitarian in nature. That is the difference between the two.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. When you say utilitarian, that is the...?

MR. PAREDES. Engineering.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Engineering.

MR. PAREDES. Mostly engineering design. Like, Madam Chairman, for example, what is happening with our flyover and freeways? They are structural design but devoid of functional because instead of increasing the circulation of the traffic, they barred the old road with gargantuan pylons and all that. But an architect will not do that if he knows that the function is -- circulatory is foremost in the design of such super structure. And there lies the difference, Madam Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. All right. May I invite you to the definition here of architecture. It says:

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.

So, based on your previous explanation, we should exclude utility and strength here.
MR. PAREDES. We could design. We could design the structures if the clients demand so but the detailed computation of which we usually collaborate – ask collaborative from the – collaboration from the engineers because that is their forte. We don’t know the – for that matter, in any design of structure or building, the architect makes a preliminary structural design of his own.

He has the size of beam, for example. A beam may be limited by the engineers to be one meter in depth for the span, but the architect needs only six centimeters. There is where the detailed analysis of the structure comes in as the responsibility of the engineers.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Let me summarize.

As far as structural design is concerned, both the architects and the civil engineers have participation.

MR. PAREDES. Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The architects are concerned with beauty and aesthetics while the civil engineers are concerned with strength and computation.

MR. SISON. Strength and stability.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Maybe we should include a definition in our proposed bill of structural design insofar as architects are concerned. Okay.

So, that is one down.

MR. APOSTOL. Madam Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Dr. Apostol.
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MR. APOSTOL. I am a hydraulic engineer and my job is to design dams and waterworks system, irrigation, flood control.

Now, they are all functional when we prepare the design and strength which is the most important. We don't need the services of architectural engineers – architects in the design. So, even in the functional aspect, even in the functional aspect, dams are designed by hydraulic engineer which are civil engineer – structural engineer.

So, my view is, when we say other structures according to what they are proposing...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. May I interrupt? We are still on the topic of structural design. We will deal with other structures and building environments later.

MR. PAREDES. I beg your pardon.

So, when we talk about structural design, it is a common knowledge, even to our client, that when we say structural design, it refers to the strength, which is not the problem of the architects.

Thank you.

Yes, yes, indeed, no argument about that. But the terminology is the one that we are really talking at this point.

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam.


MR. FLORENTINO. First of all, to allay the apprehension of the other professions, may I point out to a provision on the last part which says that, “This Act
shall not be constituted to affect or prevent the practice of any other legally recognized profession.” All right.

On the structural design, we have already a definition which I believe encompasses, more or less, what we have been discussing. It’s already here. In fact, what – my suggestion, Madam, is that we go to specific provisions of the proposed law, what specific provision there are we objecting to. We have to go into specifics. But let me point out only the matter that we are discussing, structural design. The structural design in this act, means “the act of conceiving, choosing and developing the type, disposition, arrangement and proportioning of the structural elements of an architectural work giving due consideration to safety, cost-effectiveness, functionality and aesthetics.”

This is our definition of structural design which I don’t think conflicts with any profession.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Alin pong section ‘yan of which bill?

MR. MARCIANO. Madam Chair. Madam Chair, point of order, please.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Engineer Marciano.

MR. MARCIANO. In the interest of expediting the discussion, may I suggest really that we take this up point by point so that we can address specific contentious issues.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Maybe that was a fault on my part. I thought we were all on the same page that we are looking at, the scope of the general practice of architecture which is Section 3 (c).
MR. MARCIANO. We have to define exactly which version we are referring to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. S.B. 2081 of Senator Magsaysay.

MR. SISON. Is this the one with signature or the one without the signature?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without the signatures, Senate Bill 2081.

MR. ALLI. If I may, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Mr. Alli.

MR. ALLI. I think what you have with you is the copy of the original bill filed by Senator Magsaysay in April of 2002.

In January, I think the architects filed a position paper requesting that changes or amendments be made on the original bill and that is diversion we are looking at right now.

MR. MARCIANO. Madam Chair and also may I point out that there has been already some agreements made between the two groups on the draft which – and they have signed on a copy of this bill and, therefore, I think that should be the one which should be taken up as the working copy.

MR. SISON. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Were these agreements between the interest groups re-filed as a new bill?

MR. SISON. No.

MR. MARCIANO. That is the output of the Technical Working Group, ma’am.

That is the output of the technical working group meeting in which case it takes
precedence -- well, it takes precedence as a working copy over the original bill filed by
the good senator.

MR. SAC. Madam Chair. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Sac.

MR. SAC. Yes. We already had gone through last time during the last technical
working group meeting one by one, provision by provision, and what we are expecting at
this point, we should be furnished a copy of that output and that is where we will go back
because the PICE and our group, our organization has already agreed and we went
through already these things.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, I understand that. But we have papers from
other senators submitting to us additional amendments. For example, in the version as
you claimed to have been agreed upon during the last TWG, the PICE wants to propose
the deletion of the word "utility" or "strength" under Section 3 (a). I don't think that was
agreed upon because it is not in the...

MR. SAC. No. That is why if we could go back on those item so that we would
so, basically, because we were through debating last time on the definition of what is
structural as far as the civil engineers are concerned, what are structural as far as the
architects are concerned, and so, if we could deal on this already new developments.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. O, sige po. Sige po. Okay. I don't think
everybody has a copy. So, I'll just read it through.
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"Section 3, Definition of Terms - As used in this Act, the following terms and their definitions shall apply:

(a) "Architecture" is the art.../snt
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THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ... 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.

Comments?

MS. REYES. Tapos na kami rito.

MR. SISON. We are opposing the "strength."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That's what I'm talking about. Actually, this TWG shouldn't have come to this point because we were already in the process of drafting a committee report. And then we got all of these position papers again proposing – you draft na po eh.

MS. REYES. Madam

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Reyes.

MS. REYES. Therefore if we have – you're already supposed to submit ‘no a committee report, can we have a copy of that paper and then if there are new comments, then we can probably work on that.

MS. ZULUETA. This is the draft.

MS. REYES. This is the draft which was a result of the meeting of the last TWG.
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MS. ZULUETA: And the definition which was read is the same as what you...

MS. REYES. All right. But we don’t have any contentions on that, we have agreed on that already. Probably, what we will be requesting now would be new comments from other sectors, if there are, or other senators.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So is that the case?

MR. SISON. Yeah. Madam Chair, it was also agreed during that time in order to harmonize to rush up our amendments for our civil engineering law which I was mentioning earlier, and it is now filed and the number is 2590. So I think I suggest that, you know, if possible, if it can be worked together.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. But working within the parameters of the bill that we are taking up now, do you have any objections to the way it is worded now, as agreed upon during your last TWG?

MR. SISON. We don’t have any copies based on what we discussed on our last meeting. Yeah.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So I’ll go back ‘no. Para we can accomplish something, do you still want to propose the deletion of the word “strength” in the definition of architecture?

MR. PAREDES. Madam.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.
MR. PAREDES. I have explanation. That definition is vitruvius yet. Vitruvius is an ancient definition of architectural. Utility, strength, and beauty. How is that worded in Greek?

VOICE. It's an ancient ...

MR. PAREDES. It's an ancient definition of architecture. He is contesting now.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. No, for our purposes po kasi ...

MR. PAREDES. So, I don't think ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been emphasized by the PRC that the scope of practice will be the basis for the filing of cases in case there is illegal practice or in case there is encroachment. So as far as we are concerned, we have to be very, very specific because this is criminal law eh. It will be a criminal offense.

MR. MARCIANO. Would you like to have the opinion of an ostensibly neutral person, ma'am?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Engineer Marciano.

MR. MARCIANO. Well, it says here, anyway, in the definition that it refers only to designing, constructing buildings. And so there is no harm in putting the word “strength” there because after all strength of building is a primordial concern of the architect.

MR. FLORENTINO. Agreed.
MR. MARCIANO. Pumayag na kayo, Paeng. I'm sure the civil engineers will not object to that.

MR. SANTOS. Eh, kayo ang gagawa noon eh. Kayo ang magko-compute noon.

MR. SISON. I think we agreed that -- I remember our agreement was that, para maging very specific ang delineation ng scope of works, all documents, plans and specifications shall be preceded by architectural. And in our case, it shall be preceded by civil engineering. And it was also agreed during the time that maybe it is better that we would like also to look on your proposed amendment and we would like to find out whether the civil engineering is also included in our proposed amendments which we did. 'Yon ang agreement eh.

MR. ALMELOR. Your Honor, excuse me.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Atty. Almelor.

MR. ALMELOR. I believe that we are gathered again in order to take up the scope of practice of architecture. I would like to find out what was agreed upon last meeting because there was participation by other professions like the PICE, in short, the civil engineers.

Now, before we delve on that, I would like to emphasize this harmony between and among these important matters.

Number 1. Scope of practice must be in relation to the degree or course that will be qualification for taking the licensure examination. So if there is a...
Bachelor of Science in Architecture, there is a Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering, it must be seen to it that the subjects embodied in the respective programs or courses, more or less, are not overlapping. Otherwise, if there will be overlapping, then eventually, there can be also an overlapping in the scope of practice.

So, another is that, the subjects to be given in the licensure examination must be also set forth in this law so that the board will be properly guided. So it’s a matter of defining. That’s why we have a provision on the definition of terms. But the definition of terms, if it is in conflict with the provisions of the scope of practice, then what shall prevail? The scope of practice. Although we are defining architecture here, the other professional regulators will have a term defining what is a particular profession. But it was suggested in the previous hearings in the House of Representatives that we have to define what is the profession like this, architecture.

For me, what will be governing is the scope of practice in relation to the degree or program that is being accredited and/or recognized by the government, through the CHED, and of course, the subjects that are included in the licensure examination considering that these subjects are to be taken from the curriculum or program that is being offered by a particular school, college or university.

So we have to be guided by this. This overlapping can be resolved by including in the scope of practice those activities that are exclusively within the
ambit of the practice of architecture and the like of the degree or program. I am becoming repetitive, but that is the very basis in resolving the problem. Because my expectation a while ago was to really touch on matters that are still bugging the other professions.

Now as regards the statement of the civil engineer there, Engineer Sison, it’s premature to be comparing with what is to be stated in your bill. But if you have an objection to the scope of practice, as set forth in this bill, then you can now say. So that when the time when your bill is to be deliberated upon by the same body, there will be no more objection.

So we have to consider first this bill, but see to it that those who are, may I repeat, who are objecting to any provision in the scope of practice, must voice out now their contention.

Thank you.

MR. APOSTOL. Madam Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Doctor Apostol.

MR. APOSTOL. First of all, with due respect to the architects, my opinion is we should delete the word “strength.” Although Architect Paredes has rightly pointed out that strength is one of the earliest historical part of architecture, civil engineering was the only profession as far as engineering is concerned in the past. But now the present, we have so specialized in order to protect the public. The field has already broadened itself. Like civil engineering, we have
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specializations which structural engineer cannot say that he is structural engineer of all civil engineering discipline because it has broadened itself through the addition of science and technology. So architecture rightly may have that strength included in their historical... /as
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MR. APOSTOL. ...included in their historical or earliest definition of architect.

But at this point in time, when we talk of strength, it is already attached or inherent on the structural design of structure.

So, that is the practice, Madam Chairwoman, at this point in time.

Now, with regards to Atty. Carlos Almelor’s view on that curriculum in our college days, well, there is also a structural design in structure but they were basic. They are basic at this point. When you talk of the design of metrics for the high-rise buildings which we call structural design, that’s to involve and to specialize already when it comes to knowing the strength or determining the strength of buildings.

So, we don’t want to mislead the public because it’s the public really that we want to protect. So, when we talk of structural design, it refers to strength; and strength is ably handled by structural design engineer who is also a civil engineer.

Thank you.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, again.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If I may interrupt.

MR. ALMELOR. Okay.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. We have already agreed that both parties can participate in structural design. One is concerned with beauty and utility and the other is concerned with engineering and computation.

Agree na tayo doon. We will close that topic. Okay.

We have also agreed to include the definition of structural design insofar as architects are concerned. Okay na po tayo diyan? Okay na po?
Yes, Engr. Sison.

MR. SISON. I still believe that the word "structural" should be deleted because the standard definition of structural means that it is related to strength, stability and serviceability, which is under the domain of the Civil Engineer.

If you want to put designing or act of conceiving/choosing, then we delete the "structural" and put "architectural layout of structural systems." That is in accordance with your definition, but not "structural design" because it might create confusion later on because the standard word "structural design" always refer to computations of strength, stability and serviceability, which is under our domain, so it is just a matter, I think, of rewording.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. Paredes.

MR. PAREDES. May I clarify to the gentleman that when a client calls an architect to design a building, he is the signatory and responsible for the total design of his building. Now, the architect makes preliminary computation of the structural concept, but the detailed engineering design of which, we hire the collaboration or we need the collaboration of structural engineers, then we select our structural engineers, for that matter who is capable of designing that certain magnitude of structure that we have envisioned. We just don't get any structural engineer. But the structural engineer to design building, it's out of place for them as I have explained earlier. So we architects are multidiscipline in our curriculum. We have structural designing for that matter.

We are given examination in structural designing in our board, in our licensure examination. For that matter, if you fail in structural designing, we don't get the license.
But we engage in structural designing as part of the preliminary design, as we said. For example, I need a headroom. I cannot put an enormous bedroom header unlike the engineer, well, that’s the headroom that he required. He resolved to emanate or innovate other system. If he want, we will put there structural seal ensuzu(?) I mean, the detailed engineering design of building is the prerogative of the engineer which we ask their collaboration. For that matter, you will lose your job from the architects if you insist on that. We will not give you a nice structure, we will resort to computer design.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I think we are all in agreement on that.

Yes, Architect Poblete.

MR. POBLETE. I think we need to be more objective.

Why are we very much concerned in the overlapping? After all, we complement each other. Architects and structural engineers complement each other. Under the Revised Civil Code, Article 1723, we are both liable/responsible for the building’s collapsed. Either the architect or engineer is placed there in the Revised Civil Code, 1723. It is there. But the more important thing, I think, is the area of responsibility.

Iyung sinasabi ni Atty. Almelor ay iyong code of practice kailangan magkaroon ng ano. Because, actually, iyong responsibility ng architect, nabanggit nga ni Apostol, prime professional. Actually, we are very happy to be considered a prime professional. In most cases, when we are in private practice, we select our structural engineer. But that is not necessarily—we are not authorizing the structural engineer only to prepare plans but not to be responsible. We are still responsible as an architect. So, our area of responsibility as far as the building or any structure that we design is still our
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responsibility. We are only responsible to the client. Kung sakaling magkaroon ng design defect, idi-demanda namin iyong structural engineer or maybe we should be blamed because we are the ones who hire. That is the most important, the responsibility.

Alam ba ninyo iyong nangyari sa Ruby Tower? It took eight years to come up with the decision, and they finally decided, the architect, the structural engineer and the contractor is both liable under the Revised Civil Code, iyon ang sinunod, eh. They were all fined one million all in all - one-third, one-third, one-third. We need to be more responsible or to be more objective to use responsibility. Because under the Civil Code or under our republic act, it is more important para walang overlapping. I think we should be more concerned on the responsibility. What are we authorized to do, we should be responsible for. And when we are responsible for it, we must be accountable for it.

Thank you.

MR. APOSTOL. Madam Chairwoman, may I have the floor please?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sandali lang po, ano.

I think we are in agreement na wala na nga pong overlapping. Iyon isa nasa design, nasa beauty; iyon isa nasa computation and engineering.

VOICE. Ang sinasabi ko nga, ma’am, pinatatanggal ko iyan, iyong word na “structural.”

MS. REYES. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Reyes.

MS. REYES. Thank you.
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I would like to invite everybody to backtrack in our last meeting.

We all agreed on these definitions and that we are going to have its own profession's or discipline's definition on what structural design is all about. And I remember that we agreed on this definition of structural design.

May we request our colleagues in the engineering profession to kindly listen.

Structural design in this Act means the act of conceiving, choosing and developing the type, disposition, arrangement and proportioning of the structural elements of an architectural work giving due consideration to safety, cost-effectiveness, functionality and aesthetics, which means we will be the ones, as architects, to arrange where we want the columns to be—mga ganoon, and then we will give all of these to the engineers. Dapat mayroon kaming ganoon. And then they will have their own definition of structural design in their law.

VOICE. Iyan ang-problema, eh. Kailangan i-standardize natin, eh.

MS. REYES. Yeah. Kaya nga. Kaya nga kami we are concerned more of the arrangement and proportioning of the structural elements.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Atty. Cal.

MR. CAL. Madam Chair, you know, we appreciate the intention, but we cannot use two phrases for different things. In other words, you define structural design in accordance with your interpretation, then the Civil Engineering Law will have another definition on structural design. That will confuse. What I am trying to say... /jmb
MR. CAL. ... So, what I am trying to say is, in practice, structural design is known to be really the domain of civil engineers, di ba? 

Yung computation. So, really, — and then, tingnan mo na lang. Why would the architects in the scope of practice both used the words "architectural design, "structural design"? By using another term, structural design, that means, they are going beyond their scope because architectural design, therefore, will not encompass their practice.

What I am trying to say is, you define architectural design and then put what you mean in the structural design as part of architectural design. Why can't that not be done so that the scope of civil engineering, one speciality, in fact, is structural engineering, will not be affected — adversely affected.

MR. MARCIANO. Madam Chair, from the referee.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I earlier invited your attention, the old law of architecture already includes structural designing.

MR. CAL. Alam natin 'yan, but I thought we are trying now ....

VOICE. Trying to harmonize.

MR. CAL. .... to sort out the problem because that is part of the problem.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Was there a problem before?

MR. SISON. Yes ....

(Nota: Talking simultaneously).
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MR. PAREDES. For that matter, I have been practicing structural designing as an architect.

VOICE. Excuse me....

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sandali lang po.

MR. PAREDES. We could design structures. ....

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Let's take a collective breath. Thirty seconds silence.

Okay, Engineer Marciano.

MR. MARCIANO. Well, based on what I have heard, ma'am, ang pinagtatalunan ditto the inclusion of the phrase "structural designing in the definition of the general practice of architecture".

According to the architects naman, they have defined exactly what is the meaning of “structural designing”. My proposal is, therefore, to word this phrase so that it reads: “The art of planning architectural and structural designing as defined in this Act, specifying, supervising, etcetera”, so that it will be clear.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Actually, automatic na po ‘yon.

MR. MARCIANO. I know, I know. I understand that, ma'am, but just to satisfy everybody, I think ....

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. MARCIANO. ... it would be very good to make that very explicit.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is that acceptable?
MR. POBLETE. Madam Chairwoman, that is not acceptable to civil engineers for the reason, I don't know which side Engr. Marciano is in, the thing is, as what Dr. Cal have pointed out, you cannot have words that will design with two different meanings. That is confusing to the public. It is just simply like that.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Actually, it has been done. It has been done.

MR. POBLETE. We are not working out a dictionary.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sandali lang po. Yes.

MR. ALMELOR. May I add, Madam Chairwoman, if only to contribute something.

Madam Chairwoman, it is this. Yes, indeed it is acceptable that it is a board subject, the structural design is for the architects. But the thing is, they are really basic, not in-depth of designing the strength.

So, if the lady architect here was talking about layout, it doesn't speak of strength. Layout is – you don't have to mention strength in layouting.

And then when Architect Poblete mentioned about responsibility of signing, even in the overall – even in the pages of the building plans which is about 100 pages or so, there is A-1, A-2, A-3. Meaning, architectural drawings there.
When we talk of S-1, S-2, that's structural design. Even if the architect signs that, there has to be a structural engineer who must also affix his signature.

So meaning, when you talk of "S", structural design, S-1, S-2, S-3, in the pages of the overall building plan, that is now the province of the structural design engineer who affix his signature and who puts his seal on the plans.

So, even though if he was invited by an architect to do so, but that still does not encroach to his responsibility in putting the strength to the layout that the architect is actually drawing.

So meaning to say, the layout – you can layout – the architect can layout this -- but it does not consider any strength there. Layout is layout. But when you talk of sizing and the strength, putting the reinforcement, that is already structural design.

I cannot see any other meaning to talk of structural design but giving strength to the layout. Precisely, that is what a layman – what a layman knows, what structural designing is.

So I propose, Madam Chairwoman, that the architectural design; should be confined to be used only as a word for architectural design and structural design to be used for strength.

That's all.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Thank you.

MS. REYES. Madam Chair.
MR. SISON. ... Madam Chair. That's why we are objecting to the word "structural" to be part of the general practice. Ire-word lang natin. We have no objection with the act of conceiving, choosing and so on and so forth. It's only the word "structural". So if we can use maybe "architectural – structural layout", I think that is acceptable because ..... (interrupted).

MR. PAREDES. No. But that is in our old law, madam.

MR. SISON. No, I think what we agreed before is to repeal our law. It is also based on that agreement that we qualify our law that instead of "design" you already put "civil engineering design". So that it shall be different from the architectural design.

MR. SANTOS. Madam Chair. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Santos.

MR. SANTOS. The point of these contentions ano, isa lang naman, eh. Yung reality nitong usapan na ito, no. Pagka ikaw isang arkitekto, kasama mo lahat iyong mga inhinyero. Consultant mo 'yan sa structural, electrical, mechanical and everything, pati soil – soil, hydraulics engineer. Lahat yan.

Ang arkitekto, kung ako may project, hindi naman ako puwedeng pumirma ng structural, eh, di na ako puwedeng pumirma ng elektrial, so I their services – I get their services.
Ngayon, ibig sabihin, kung ide-define mo yung architecture, ang architecture hindi lang siya magde-design sa papel na ganun-ganun. Kailangan mayroon siyang component ng structural, electrical and everything. It's a complete building structure.

Ngayon, in the process, ngayon I will ask you, if you are going to design a structural, first, what are you going to do? Foundation plan, framing plan and everything.

So, kami, belang arkitekto kung paano yung gusto naming structure lumabas, kami mag-e-sketch ng pundasyon, kami gagawa ng framing, kami mag-e-spacing ng column, ayon doon sa design, space requirement na kailangan ng may-ari.

Ngayon, kukunsultahin kita ngayon, dahil ipapagawa ko na sa iyo yung structural design computation and analysis. Walang problema doon, eh.

Kung ang ikinakatakot n'yo kami maggagawa ng structural computation at pipirma ng structural design, hindi mangyayari. Sama-sama tayo. Isang buong project, sama-sama tayo.

**MR. SISON.** Kung hindi mangyayari pala, bakit ayaw nating alisin yung "structural" dito?

**MR. SANTOS.** Hindi, pero yun nga, kine-concede mo yung structural framework and everything, that is part of structural designing. Pero

---
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The structural design is Phase I, Phase II, and then you go on to Phase II. Let's conceptualize muna natin base sa requirement namin.

The Presiding Officer. Excuse me, Architect, please. I think we have enough information on this.

Mr. Santos. And the reality, Madam Chair, just one last ano. The reality is this. No architect would sign a structural plan and apply for a building permit in any municipality, but there are engineers signing architectural plans, applying for building permits. Mas marami sila ang violations.

Mr. Sison. No, no, no, no. That is under our law. Hindi, nasa law namin yan....

The Presiding Officer. Please, please.

Note: (talking simultaneously).

Mr. Sison. Madam Chairwoman, the honorable architect here is confusing layout and strength. I think it's simply just like that. With architect layout ....

Voice. Preliminary ..... 

The Presiding Officer. Order please.

Voice. Madam Chairman.

The Presiding Officer. No, you are not recognized....pyb/
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. No, you are not recognized.

Okay. We have enough information on this particular topic. We will refer the matter to our principals and let them make the decision.

Fortunately for us, we do not have to make the decision now.

MS. REYES. Just one last, if I may.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ma'am, please, can you ano...

MS. REYES. Very short lang.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If you want to submit it, please reduce it in...

MS. REYES. Very short, very short.

Kasi, they don't want us to use the word “structural.” How about planning? Planning is you also use in management in every, you know, it's a very broad word. So, it's very impossible for us, especially doing our laws not to repeat words that are reusable in all disciplines in most of disciplines.

That's all, Madam Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay, thank you.

Do we have representatives from the plumbing engineer profession? Did they confirm? (To the Committee Secretary).

MS. ZULUETA. Nag-confirm ba ang plumbing?
MR. SE. We have ma'am, sanitary engineering, but there is not yet a plumbing engineering profession in the Philippines.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. But, ano na po, eh. It's going to be approved. We already have the committee report. There's already a version in the House. So, we anticipate it to be approved within a year.

MR. SE. We expect to have been provided information because we have raised some positions against some provisions of that particular law.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oo. But we are -- let us limit ourselves to the architectural bill. Mr. Se, maybe you have position on the architectural bill.

MR. SE. Madam Chair, we have already submitted our position paper concerning - - and we have already discussed it with the President of UAP and under the auspices of the Philippine Technological Council.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. And the result of that discussion was?

MR. SE. I have not seen how was it reflected in that report. I have just have the copy.

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair, Madam Chair, I had the opportunity of being in the dialogue with the mechanical engineers and they...
electrical engineers. And as far as I recall, their only suggestion was to insert the word "architectural" to the phrase here, layout in Article I, Section D-E. Because this is where their profession was mentioned. And our - - what was agreed on in that dialogue was, we insert the word "architectural" to the phrase, "lay-outing of mechanical, electrical, electronic, sanitary, plumbing, communication, and/or utility systems, equipment and fixtures."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ano hong section 'yan?

MR. FLORENTINO. They only would like to request that the lay-outing be qualified.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ano pong section 'yan, sir?


THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Of which version po?

MR. FLORENTINO. The version that was...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Signed.

MR. FLORENTINO. ...agreed upon by all architects and also the subject of the technical working group last meeting.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Again, again, this is Section...

MR. FLORENTINO. Section D...
MR. ALLI. If I may again.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Anong number po?

MR. FLORENTINO. Page 3, it's page 3, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. ALLI. That's the- - what Architect Florentino is holding is the position paper of the architects that was filed with the Committee last January. It contains amendments to the bill filed by Senator Magsaysay.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Section D-g.

MR. FLORENTINO. Page 3, but letter D, small letter g.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, the proposal is to include the planning...

MR. FLORENTINO. To insert the word “architectural” to the phrase...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Lay-outing.

MR. FLORENTINO. ...lay-outing of mechanical, electrical, electronic, et cetera. In other words, they would like to qualify the lay-outing. They would like to qualify that the lay-outing will not include the technical computative part of the design of - - gano’n, ha? Oo. Pero ‘yon ang kuwan nila ha? ‘Yung insert the word “architectural.”

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.
MR. PAREDES. If it's okay already as it is.

MR. FLORENTINO. Kaya kami naman, wala namang objection do'n. I think my colleagues will agree with me. Wala namang masama ro'n. Wala namang masama ro'n.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, this has resolved the objections of the mechanical engineering profession and the electrical engineering profession?

MR. PAREDES. Yes, yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. As well as the sanitary.

MR. PAREDES. Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. FLORENTINO. And the electronics and communication engineers ho.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair. Excuse me, over here.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Atty. Almelor.

MR. ALMELOR. I would like to find out if the electrical engineering and mechanical engineering sectors have been invited because in Section 22, we have these terms as found under third subject, "mechanical and electrical and plumbing." So, we would like to find out whether there is...
such an encroachment or overlapping or intrusion in to the field of these other professions. But according to the architects, the other professions can be tapped by the registered architects and the designing planning. That's why, I have been emphasizing that it's a matter of defining what is the services that could be provided by one profession and the like of the other professions. It can be stated in the law. That's why, if what is to be set forth or expressly provided in this law will be prejudicial to the scope of practice of another, they have to declare now their oppositions so that the body, legislative body can make such limitation. Because otherwise...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Atty. Almelor, that's what we are trying...

MR. ALMELOR. Of course, of course, thank you for that. Because it has been our problem regarding the jealousy on the part of one profession as against another, although they are brothers in their rendition of services to the public they must be united.

And as I've learned that without an architect, the other professionals may not have their jobs, is it true or not?

MR. PAREDES. True.

MR. ALMELOR. O, true, according to an architect.

Naturally, there will be again an opposition to that statement.
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Thank you.

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair, I think he is using an old version. Hindi 'yon ang pinag-uusapan, eh.


MS. ZULUETA. Atty. Almelor, in your first query, the electrical engineers were invited but I don't see any representatives here.

Now, with regards to the subject for examination which you just read, during our last technical working group meeting, we already amended that. And we removed already the- - because I think you are reading the revised version. Oo.

MR. ALMELOR. Okay, thank you for that information.

MS. ZULUETA. We already removed that words, "plumbing" and ano, "mechanical," we already removed that in our new version.

Okay, thank you.

MR. CAL. Point of clarification, Madam Chair...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Cal.

MR. CAL. ...just to facilitate.

May we know of what's the status of this version? Dahil 'yon ang nakaka-confuse, eh. Some are really these, and another are reading...
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I think that's the version that you submitted.

MR. CAL. What are we kuwan- - eto 'yun, ano? We should ignore this one, di ba?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. When we began, I think when the TWG's began the working draft was SB 2081 which was filed by Senator Magsaysay. In the course of the TWG, certain agreements were made and proposals were accepted. And a proposed draft- - we came up with the draft for circulation na and approval of the senators. I think the signed copy that you have already incorporates most of the amendments proposed during the last TWGs which included the mechanical engineers, the electrical engineers and I think civil engineers were also included, including sanitation engineers.

MR. CAL. This is our...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Working, opo, opo.

MR. CAL. Then, we have another problem, Madam Chair, because I have noted that the Philippine Institute of Environmental Planners has not been invited. I happened to be the immediate past president of that institute...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay, what is your specific objection?
MR. CAL. Now, the architecture is including town planning, physical and town planning in this kuwan, but dito sa.../rommel.
MR. CAL. ...in this kuwan, but dito okay lang. But now in...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ano pong section at ano pong number niyan?

MR. CAL. Section (d) which defines the scope of architecture.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Which subsection?

MR. CAL. Now it says in (d), Page 2, it says that services in connection with site, physical and town planning, and the design construction, enlargement, conservation. Then iyong physical town planning is really the main scope of practice of environmental planners. Malaking problema. Pero dito, okay lang.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So we will consult the -- we will cross-reference this to the law regulating the practice of environmental planners.

MR. CAL. Yes, please. Dahil iyong PD 1308 amendment is also now filed.

MR. ALMELOR. Madam Chair, for the information of those who will be affected by this repeal of PD 1308, there will be a meeting or public hearing on Wednesday at 10:00 a.m. before the counterpart committee.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sa House?

MR. ALMELOR. House, House version. Now, Madam Chair, in order that we can intelligently -- more intelligently give our inputs for improvement, could we have a copy of the version that was incorporated, what was taken up in the last technical working group meeting? Because I have been misled by this. Imagine, throwing out that issue on the terms "mechanical", "electrical". But this is a
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suggestion, we would like the body to refer also to the National Building Code, to the Local Government Code and other laws that are touching on the practice of architecture and the other professions so that the committee will be very much guided.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of our resource persons, kasi at the TWG level, we are not authorized to come up with an official document on the matters taken up during the TWG. What we can come up with is the working draft.

MR. ALMELOR. Yes, working draft.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So working draft.

MR. ALMELOR. Working draft will be sufficient.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Kasi usually po after the TWG, committee report na iyan. So informally, amongst ourselves, we agreed to come up with the working draft, incorporating iyong mga amendments natin for today and the last TWGs. Okay.

If you could leave -- for profession na lang po, if you could leave the name and contact number, if you want an E-mail address -- para mapa-expedite natin iyong pagbibigay ng working draft natin, please leave them with Dr. Zulueta.

Yes, Architect Villarosa.

MR. VILLAROSA. Thank you, Madam Chair.
This is another topic, Madam Chair, which was actually a part of House Bill No. 334, a very specific -- a very important provision affecting all architects in the Philippines, particularly in the powers...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Architect Villarosa, what is HB 334?

MR. VILLAROSA. 334 is an act providing for the repeal also, repealing Republic Act 545, which is the House version, the House version of this law, for the Senate Bill 2081.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in receipt of HB 5389.

MR. VILLAROSA. Well, it's the same anyway.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. VILLAROSA. Because -- it's the same, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ano pong section, sir?

MR. VILLAROSA. Under the powers and functions of the Professional Regulatory Board.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That is section...

MR. VILLAROSA. I think it's Section 9.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. All right.

MR. VILLAROSA. Referring to prescribed guidelines, is that it?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ano pong sub-letter?

MR. VILLAROSA. This is regarding the CPE, Madam Chair, regarding the CPE.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. It is Section 7(i) of House Bill 5389. For everyone's information, it states: "The board shall exercise the following specific powers, functions and responsibilities. Subsection (i), to prescribe guidelines for the Continuing Professional Education Program in consultation with the accredited national association of architects, provided, that attendance to the said CPE shall not be a mandatory requirement for the renewal of a professional license."

MR. VILLAROSA. Yes, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. VILLAROSA. This was in the draft -- in many of the drafts that we have worked on. But we noticed it is not in the final draft of the Senate bill. I hope it is. Ah, it is.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

MR. VILLAROSA. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I think it's Section 7(i).

Any other matters?

MR. SISON. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. SISON. Since this is now the basis of our discussion, may I refer for the definition of architect of record. I just noticed that the definition assumed only a civil liability. Eh, singong mag-a-assume ngayon ng criminal?
MR. ALMELOR. Excuse me. Criminal matter enters into the picture, one, if there is a violator of this law, specifically if the violator is not lawfully authorized to practice architecture. So, that is illegal practice. It is incumbent upon the board to determine whether the act committed constitutes practice of architecture. So if it is not practice of architecture, that particular person can be gone after -- before the prosecution’s office, then the court under the Revised Penal Code or any law, special law. That’s why we have this Professional Regulatory Law in order to protect the interest of those who are legitimately allowed to practice the profession against those who are not. That’s why we have this, first, we have the law; then the board, the commission and with the support of the association. So anyone who has violated the law can be gone after -- kaya we have this malpractice, criminal, administrative, administrative malpractice.

MR. SISON. I think the definition is this, “shall assume the civil liability for the architect’s plans and specifications.”

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Opo.

MR. SISON. Let’s say, kung may mangyari sa building, ang liability na lang nila civil.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. No, it doesn’t exclude that. This merely refers to the provision under the Civil Code.

MR. ALMELOR. Civil Code as mentioned.  
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THE PRESIDING OFFICER. But it does not save the architect from criminal liability in case of negligence under the Revised Penal Code.

MR. SISON. Ah, okay. Clarification lang naman iyong akin, eh.

MR. ALMELOR. It's an offense under Article 36 -- 360... Basta it is under the quasi-offense chapter.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Any other matters? Okay na po, tayo? Subject to the release of the working draft for further comments.

MR. ALMELOR. So we would like to find out. Because, first of all, has the House forwarded the version thereof?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Opo.

MR. ALMELOR. So, that can be, more or less, a reference.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it will be...

MR. ALMELOR. Because the same people, I am not saying all, were participants in that deliberation. However, I have been emphasizing this for the good of your professions, hindi lang architecture but also of others, that we must make CPE as mandatory. Because if we will not make that mandatory, the regulatory function of the board to determine from time to time or to certify the possession of these two essential requisites, good moral character and technical competence, would be defeated. That's why it is regulatory. From time to time, the board has to find out whether a registered professional deserves to be allowed to continue the practice of his or her profession. It is only a privilege although it becomes a right whenever you are being subject to the provision or
the vestment of your continued practice of the profession. There is a due process. So I am emphasizing that CPE must become mandatory although there must be exceptions. Those who can find it hard to comply therewith, this is not only for the good of the association, Your Honor, because the association naturally will principally be involved in the promotion of the technical, moral and professional qualifications of the professionals.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Maybe preliminary, we'd like to inform the group that the House version excludes building environments and the Senate version includes building environments within the scope of the general practice of architecture. Siguro we'll maintain the phrase "building environments" para maiba with the House... /imjv
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THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ... para maiba with the House so that it becomes an issue during the bicameral conference committee and they can resolve that. Okay.

MR. ALMELO. And lastly, Your Honors, we would like again to request the body that the provision on the accredited and/or recognized national integrated organization be — that is, the provision thereon be included for the good of all architects not only of the officers of the association because it is integration of registered architects not integration of the organization. Because we have several ways on how to integrate the existing organizations although in our experience it is the present APO that usually becomes the recognized and/or accredited integrated national organization of professionals.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Atty. Almelo, but not always, I believe.

MR. ALMELO. Yeah. Not always ba? It will be -- because we are trying to standardize the provisions. Imagine, it will be very hard on the part of an APO, which is not integrated by the board and by the commission in maintaining mandatory... what’s this? ... collection of the membership fees.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. We will include the appropriate provision on integration.

MR. ALMELO. Thank you. Thank you.

As a last appeal...

MS. REYES. May I just comment on that because the architects have agreed not to integrate. The other architects who are members of other professional organizations
will join us as the umbrella organization. So, as far as the architects are concerned, PIA representative is here and we came up with our own provision for that integration. So, we have already -- we have agreed on that in the last TWG. ‘Yon ang nawala. It is also very important and that is the Accredited Professional Organization definition.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ano pong section – ah, definition.

MS. REYES. It’s under definition. I don’t think it is there but it is under (g) – letter (g), page 4. We have the Accredited Professional Organization, and definition reads”

“The APO 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 in the Philippines which all registered Filipino architects shall be members without prejudice to membership in other existing voluntary association.”

So, we are very comfortable with that. We don’t have any conflict. So, I hope the PRC will not demand or oppose on this agreement among architects.

MR. ALMELOR. Your Honor, we are not opposing any provision on the integration of registered architects. Neither are we opposing any form of organization because if we have this one national integrated organization of architects, usually, it is the present APO that is being accredited not by the commission alone but by the board. We usually see to it that it will be automatic. That is why, it is considered integration of the professionals. If your name appears in the roster of architects, then you shall become
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automatic or *ipso facto* member of the integrated organization. However, if you are a member therein, you are not barred from becoming a member of another organization. Therefore, the existence of PIA, if the same will not be considered as the national integrated organization, can be maintained. The members therein can continue their membership or they have the option not to become a member therein, however, they must be members of the UAP which is the integrated. So, that is because we have a standard provision.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. As I understand it, the PIA is not integrated.

MS. REYES. It is integrated already with the – in this provision, it is already integrated with the...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. No. I mean, by integration, I mean, that the PI, all architects are not yet compelled to become members of the PIA?

MS. REYES. No.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, the integrated provision in the bill will place the process for the accreditation and integration of a national organization. And only upon that time will all architects be required to be a member of that integrated organization.

MS. REYES. Because there is no integrated organization now that we will be speaking of as far as the architects are concerned.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That is why. That is why.
MS. REYES. So, what we can probably put in that provision is to mandate all architects to be members of the accredited professional organization without prejudice of their membership to other existing professional organization. So, 'yon na lang siguro. But we don’t want to have a provision that talks on reintegration or integration. ‘Yon na lang siguro membership of all architects in the accredited professional organization.

MR. ALMELOR. Thank you, Your Honor.

She is right not to specifically mention the term “integration.” Because in truth and in reality, if you are a registered architect pursuant to the registry book on record with the commission, you shall become ipso facto or automatically a member of the organization. Because that organization cannot be considered as the umbrella until and unless the Board of Architecture and the commission shall have accredited and/or recognized. If it is ipso facto or automatic, in effect, the architects are integrated. But there is no need using the word “integration” provided that there must be one umbrella organization. And those who are members of that umbrella organization must not be barred or proscribed from becoming a member if they wish of other.

Kasi, you know, we are just patterning this after the Integrated Bar of the Philippines. The Supreme Court has the power to make rules, that is why it created the IBP.

Now, Congress, through this bill, once this becomes a law, can also have a provision on the automatic membership of the professionals belonging to this. So, you have nothing to worry because if we will not have a provision on making automatic the
membership of every registered architect, then what will be still prevailing is your APO -
- UAP which does not require a hundred percent membership in that organization.
Because at present, the basis of UAP is Section 5, Paragraph (i), in relation to Article IX
of the rules and regulation governing the regulation and practice of professionals will
end. It is only the commission but not also the board that has the authority to accredit.
And the membership there is 50 plus one whereas, in this provision, it is 100 percent,
because automatic.

Thank you.

MR. VILLAROSA. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I think there is a conflict here. There is. There
is. Ilan po ang membership ng PIA?

MR. VILLAROSA. Minority ho, ma'am.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Minority. That is roughly how much – what
percentage of the total architects?

MR. VILLAROSA. Siguro ... 20 percent.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty percent. Okay.

Yes, Architect Florentino.

MR. FLORENTINO: The fact that – the point of Architect Reyes reflects
already the working draft that we have submitted and this draft has actually been worked
on for two decades already. And finally, recently, all the architects agreed already on that
draft. So, it is not an easy matter for us to have agreed on that draft.
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Second, I wish only also that the committee will finally consider the fact that we are not really changing much the old law, as you have repeatedly pointed out, Madam Chair. Most of what we have embodied here are just elaborations but not changes of concepts of the old law.

And then, thirdly, we are also just following definition – general definitions as expressed by Architect Villarosa and Architect Poblete. We are just following.../snt
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MR. FLORENTINO. ... We are just following generally accepted definitions. So I hope that -- and, please also, remember the fact that there is a provision here that nothing here constitutes anything that will disenfranchise any registered professions. So I wish they will not be too critical because as I said we have been on this already for two decades. Hindi kayo maniniwala, itim pa ang buhok ko noon.

Yeah, Madam Chair. Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Architect Villarosa.

MR. VILLAROSA. Thank you, Madam Chair.

There are only two issues that I would like to put on the table. One, in regards to the integration. That was an issue that have been dragging for a long, long time. And about two years ago, I think, or two Christmas ago, I, being a PIA member -- you cannot imagine that a PIA member will propose or initiate that all architects in the Philippines be member of UAP. It is a PIA member who initiated that move. Why? Just so that we can just be one. And it was of course welcome with whole heart and -- although I have a hard time convincing the PIA members about the logic or rationale of this move, fortunately, I was able to do it.

Anyway, the second item, Madam Chair, is about the CPE. This is also was a dragging issue, maybe about 8 or more years ago. And in one of the hearings, there was an estimate of how much the people, the professional we spent for attending a CPE good for three years. There are about a million
professionals in the Philippines, I think it's about 1.3 or 1 point -- but let us assume only one million. At P300 per session, for 12 months, per session it will mean P300 million spent. For three years, it will mean P10.8 billion, enough to put up a university. And so it's a waste of money. Anyway, if the professional wants to specialize on something, and he really wants to be his worth, then he can get a Ph.D., he can get a master's degree, and some post graduate studies. But if he doesn't want to, why spend that 10 billion? We might just as well set up a university. That's exactly the terminology of Senator Coseteng.

Thank you.

MR. MARCIANO. Madam Chair, in the matter of the CPE, everybody is of course entitled to his opinion. But on the other hand, PTC will have -- rather, I personally believe that is money well spent. So the PTC, as a matter of fact, is drafting a bill which will make CPE compulsory for all professionals, in the same manner that the Supreme Court has ordered this for all lawyers in the Philippines.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I think this will be totally within the powers of the integrated organization if the integrated organization decides to just have two units every three years of CPE, that's within their power. Or to accredit attendance in conventions, CPE, that's also within their power.
Actually, my specific problem is Section (g) on the accredited professional organization. Through all of the bills that we have taken up regarding other professions, we have never gone to the point of actually naming any existing organization as the integrated organization. The specific – our standard provision on that is an integration section requiring all organizations to undergo an accreditation process prior to integration. So I understand the situation of the architects, but maybe I am informing you at this point that this is something that is out of our hands kasi we cannot name a specific organization as an integrated organization.

MR. ALMELOR. Your Honor, I agree with you because unlike the Supreme Court which has that power to make rules – in fact, the Supreme Court created, pursuant to that power in the Constitution, the IBP.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Opo.

MR. ALMELOR. But as regards the organization, integrated organization that will be set forth in the law, it is within the ambit of authority of Congress and it will take longer as compared to the process that could be resorted by the Supreme Court. Imagine, Congress has two houses. What we were doing in the House of Representatives has been under repetition in this other body. But we believe the senators, according to them, probably, are more intelligent than the – oy, no, baka magalit si kuwan. That’s the truth, parang check and balance. So I believe as regards this provision on integration, we have a standardized
provision. What is important is the board, subject to approval by the Commission, can come out with the guidelines. You know, this will not be unconstitutional as far as I am concerned, because as between the interest of the few and of the many, the interest of the few is set forth in the Bill of Rights, Article III, of the 1987 Philippine Constitution. Whereas, the police power of the state is being enshrined under Section 5, Article II, the policies and principles of the same Constitution. So that's why we have this professional regulatory law in order to let the interest of the majority prevail over that of the few. That is police power of the state or general welfare clause principle.

Thank you.


To wrap up our TWG, if there are no other matters ... Yes, Atty. Cal.

MR. CAL. I think there is a pending issue that you set aside earlier because you would like to tackle one by one.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Opo.

MR. CAL. This is the position of PICE that other structures should not be included in the scope.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Did we set that aside?

MR. CAL. Yes. Because you have said, let's take up structural muna and then 'yong other.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.
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MR. CAL. So now, I mean, just for your consideration. I mean, I am reporting that the PICE has so expressed that for what Hercules — so that both provisions can be — that really the scope of practice of architecture should not be extended beyond buildings — to other structures without definition like roads, bridges, dams, you know, and other utilities. We should be clarified.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. How about building environments?

MR. CAL. No, no, that's okay. But the way it's drafted, it encompasses other structures.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Can you point to us the specific provision?

MR. CAL. Yes, okay. Eto, page ...

MR. FLORENTINO. Madam Chair, the definition stated here, I think, recognizes the point of Mr. Cal. It says here, structural elements of an architectural work. Ito 'yong definition na nandito sa structural design. Ang nakalagay, structural elements of an architectural work. Kaya, I think that that should allay the fear of the civil engineers na hindi natin sinasabi rito mga dams, mga railroads, or waterworks. Architectural works ang binabanggit natin dito.


MR. CAL. May I read para ma-kuwan, Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Please indicate the section.

MR. CAL. Page 2 (c).

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Anong section po?
MR. CAL. Hindi, itong "C" nga. General practice of architecture means.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, that's Section 2.

MR. CAL. Yes. Then the first part is the act of planning, architectural and structural designing, specifying, supervising and giving general administration responsible direction to in the erection, enlargement or alterations of buildings and building environs. But instead of stopping there, it says, "and architectural design of engineering structures." 'Yon ang worry natin, engineering structures.


MR. CAL. Anong architectural doon?

MR. PAREDES. Architectural design of engineering – ano? Read your statement, please.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. What are engineering structures?

MR. PAREDES. Actually, that means – for example, a very good example is a case on bridge. It's an engineering structure, but you know, these are corpulence, their architectural elements in the railing of the bridge. Those are parts of engineering structures which was designed by my father ...
MR. PAREDES. ...designed by my father who happened to be in the Department of Public Works Architecture. So that we mean all the parts and not—I have given an example before, Jone’s Bridge, it’s purely an architecture and a utilitarian element.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. But in all cases, with the participation of engineers in the computation and engineering classification.

MR. PAREDES. Yes. The detailed structural that is given to the structural engineer.

MR. SE. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Mr. Se.

MR. SE. Could I suggest replacing “of” with “in,” “agricultural design ‘in’ engineering structures” rather than “of”?

MR. CAL. One more.

MR. CAL. I just would like to emphasize, dahil sinabi ni Architect Florentino that really what is embraced in this signed document iyon lang understanding of the practice of architecture. Sana ganon. Kaya lang, again, I would like to point out that the inclusion of physical and town planning really is directly talaga—now, putting in words something that will be in conflict with the practice of environmental planners. Gusto ko...
that really the Philippine Institute of Environmental Planners should also be allowed to go over this draft, Madam Chair.

MR. PAREDES. Madam Chairman, I think that's a big mistake, that there is no bachelor or baccalaureate course in environmental planning, but there is a mastersal course which was originated during the martial law; and the purpose of that, because I was one of the advisers, is to expand the profession of planning because at that time, martial law government was inclined to develop an archipelagic master plan of the whole Philippines, that's why they connected Aparri to Jolo. That was initial. For that matter, I was one of the consultants there, and the purpose of which is to generate or proliferate environmental planners, but environmental planning is actually the premise of architecture because that is actually space planning in consideration of the geographic or geodetic or natural environment. For example, the mastersal course given in U.P. at that time is to proliferate master planner because of its administrative nature, but not the actual planning per se. Because actual planning per se, you have to have a discipline in architecture, which is multidiscipline. To be able to plan, for example, a community, it's so engrossed and complex that a multidisciplined person or profession could only tackle. For that matter, even architecture as architectural training and engineering is not even sufficient for a designer to do a habitat plan, complete human settlement. We need statistician, practically all the professions involved and disciplines involved which the architect plays a vital role as the conductor in a symphony. He is the one that actually synthesizes this into a physical plan. And all those engineering—I beg your pardon, but I don't mean any malice to any profession—they are devoid of that multidiscipline training.
that the architect has. They are only confined to their own specialized profession. But to synthesize the whole plan of a community, or for that matter, any building as ... we need a conductor of the symphony, and that's the multidisciplined architect.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, your position is...?

MR. PAREDES. So, my position is to be a planner, you must have a BS degree in architecture.

MR. ALMELOR. Your Honor, in relation to what he has been driving at.

There is a pending bill...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. To professionalize--

MR. ALMELOR. ...repealing the present Presidential Decree 1308 when we will see to it that there must be only one degree - Bachelor of Science in Environmental Planning. And, of course, the others, within a certain period, means they will be allowed to register even without examination. Provided that later on, like your profession, only one degree - Bachelor of Science in Architecture. This is equivalent--this will confuse the Board of Architecture, even the CHED and other bodies affected thereby.

So, we have nothing to worry regarding this seemingly overlapping portion of the bill because, naturally, in that environmental planning bill deliberation in the House and in the Senate, the same will be delved into.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, as of now, environmental planners are not regulated by the...

MR. ALMELOR. Ah, yeah. It is being regulated. First of all, it is a presidential decree. We would like that to become a strong republic act. Number two, there are many
professionals. Even a lawyer has become a registered environmental planner, although I
have no ambition to become one (laughter).

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So, I think--

Excuse me. Another, you know, these geodetic engineers are jealous of that
inability on the part of the board to include such profession. So, imagine, this is planning,
then you will deprive the geodetic engineers in making such one.

So, there is no problem regarding that, Your Honors, that can be resolved in the
new law. So, try to be there so that you will become vigilant in protecting your own
interest.

And lastly, Your Honor, I have found out that this version is only for amendment.
I am moving that it is for repeal, otherwise--there are many provisions that have been
embodied therein, so it is more appropriate that it is for repeal.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Thank you po, Atty. Almelor.

MR. CAL. I cannot help but react to the secretary, Please allow me.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Atty. Cal.

MR. CAL. Because I really take exception to the statement of Atty. Almelor
because he should be the one upholding the, you know, the PRC's position on regulated
professions. Environmental planning is a regulated profession.

Now, you set aside the background, PD 130. The fact of the matter is that they
are registered environmental planners.
Now, I am the immediate past president of the Philippine Institute of Environmental Planners. The bill that he is talking about is still being filed. What I am talking about is that the practice now of environmental planning. Now, if architecture will include the main scope of practice of environmental planning, that creates a problem, hindi ba? that will create a problem.

MR. ALMELO. Your Honor, there is no--o, sige.

MR. CAL. It is not so stated now in the existing law, if you read the law; but in the revised version, it is now so specified. That is why I would like to table this for consideration that the environmental planning is a regulated profession and, therefore, it's right that--

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under PD 1308, is there an exclusivity provision excluding other professionals or other professions from the practice of environmental planning?

MR. CAL. My standard provision naman siguro, ano. It's still there, that practice of other professions is not--

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Kasi po we--for example po, we also look at iyong customs' brokering profession. In the development of a profession, it happens that at the inception of the profession, not all who are professionals--for example, a customs broker, not all of them are graduates of customs administration. Maybe this is a similar case na because environmental planning is new, other graduates of other courses are in the practice of environmental planning.

Now, ang dini-describe ho ni Atty. Almelor is that... /jmb  CERTIFIED TRUE COPY
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THE PRESIDING OFFICER. .... ni Atty. Almolor is that when the bill passes, it will provide a sunset provision that after a certain period of years, only graduates of environmental planning will be registered under that law. But ina-anticipate na po natin ito. Maybe may mga vested rights yung ibang profession in continuing in what they have been practicing before until they are excluded by a new law.

MR. CAL. Hindi nga because that will confuse the practice now because there is no prevention of architects taking the board of environmental planning and become environmental planners.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oo.

MR. CAL. Ang pinag-usapan rito is yung scope ng practice and I thought the idea of this discussion is try to harmonize and not create conflicts.

Now, if you are adding something to the scope of practice of architecture, something that is already within the scope of practice of a regulated profession, hindi ba we are going ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, yes, that is our concern ....

MR. CAL. Precisely.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That is why we have to look into 1308 also. And if it conflicts with 1308, we will delete town planning in this bill.

MR. CAL. That's my point.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.
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VOICE.  Excuse me, Madam Chair.  Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER.  Yes, Ms. Reyes.

MS. REYES.  Can I just inform the body that we have lifted this general practice of architecture definition from an international definition, so which means that if we are going to delete “town planning” here, then we are the only architects in the world who will not be able to practice town planning. And I cannot also imagine a town being planned without a physical planner and only architects can do that.

So I hope even if it is here and even if it is in their law, it will not also deprive the architects from participating in the practice of town planning.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER.  Oo. As of now we cannot make conclusion because we have to look into what do environmental planners actually do and put it side by side with what the architect does.

MS. REYES.  And besides, there is no BS yet for environmental planning. There is no BS yet. So it’s really multi-disciplinary. And to be able to come up with a result of environmental planning solution, multi-disciplinarians have to be there, the physical planners, the lawyers, the engineers, lahat tayo nandoon.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER.  Okay. We will include our recommendations on that particular matter with our working draft.

Okay, wala na po tayong ....

MR. SE.  Madam Chair.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. SE. If you would like to have a copy, I have here a copy of the 1308. It is published by PRC.

MR. ALMELOR. Your Honor, Your Honors, that is the law regulating the practice of environmental planning. We did not promulgate the same because according to Engr. Se, it seems that he is trying to blame us, no. Whenever there is a law, it is the responsibility of the Professional Regulatory Board --- excuse me ..... 

MR. SE. This book was published by the PRC.

MR. ALMELOR. Yeah, yeah. What I mean is that it is the law. Because according to him -- because we are allowing this -- what's this, other professionals to practice environmental planning.

There is that law, presidential decree. Unless the same has been repealed or amended, then of course we have to carry out the provisions through the Board of Environmental Planning. We have no problem. We are trying to harmonize the various professions that's why we are trying to avoid any overlapping. But in the practice of environmental planning, certainly there is an overlapping because some professionals are qualified to become registered environmental planners but this time it's not being allowed anymore to be registered without licensure examination.

So, there is a need, an urgent and important need for the repeal of Presidential Decree 1308. That's why we are again forewarning you to be used.
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present so that your respective professions will not be encroached upon or intruded or whatever steps or to be usurped by another profession.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I think this matter would need further study because the definition of the scope of practice is very limited in the presidential decree. Maybe we have to go into the rules and regulations pa, eh., which we cannot address right now. So,...

Yes, Architect Paredes.

MR. PAREDES. ... my observation for that matter. That bill, that law was not implemented from that time it was passed. It was 20 years, at least, before it was introduced by Ramos.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, exactly. It's a presidential decree.

MR. PAREDES. It has been held in abeyance by the board -- by the PRC because it's conflicting. It makes even a physical therapist a planner, so long as they take the masteral degree in UP at that time. Kanya, it was held for more than 20 years.

MR. ALMELO. He is right that it had taken several years before the President constituted the composition of the board. In short, before the President appointed the chairman, this certain Aquino, then Concio, the father of the dean of the College of Architecture, and the other one, this former Loule. Ah, yes, yes.

Because, you know, according to Architect Reyes, the situation is there. Is it pyramidal or not? Kasi, one profession with several
professionals who are qualified to be registered without examination. However, because the period has already expired or lapsed, then they will not be allowed to register until they shall have passed the licensure examination. So, that is what will be taking place in the repealing bill.

To say something about the statement of the doctor, lawyer and civil engineer, we are implementing this PD 1308. However, if there is an overlapping, it will now be the concern of the prosecution office and of the court. That's why we have to respect one another here. You professionals must be respecting each other or one another. Otherwise, according to the scope of practice, you must not be engaged in this activity of one profession so you should not do that. Otherwise, you will be deprived of your freedom. You will be found in the four walls of a prison cell.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Salamat po.

MR. CAL. For the record, the House bill he is mentioning is House Bill No. 6022. It's already filed.

MR. MARCIANO. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. MARCIANO. From the PTC. As a general rule ho, the PTC encourages—which is the umbrella organization of the 13 engineering and one architectural professional organizations in the country, encourages and supports its member organizations in the updating of their respective generic...
laws, many of which were enacted sometime ago and, therefore, need to be amended in order to keep up with the latest technological developments and environment. And, I think, I speak for all the accredited professional organizations ... when I say that it is not the intention of any of our member organizations in the process of updating and amending their respective generic laws, they will create any encroachment in the practice of other professions.

PTC in particular would like to ensure that the governing generic laws of its member organizations are properly harmonized with each other so as to avoid any possible disputes with respect to the scope of practice of the professions. It is, therefore, in this context that I encourage all the personalities present today to please continue talking because apparently wala naman hong dispute, it's a matter of threshing out and expressing correctly and specifically everyone's thoughts and ideas and, I think, that we should all focus on getting the bill passed and achieving something. Otherwise, lahat ho tayo apektado kung hindi mapa-pass itong mga bills na ito. This is not the only bill which is pending in Congress. There are quite a few of these bills and we would like all those bills to be passed and let us not — well, if I may be forgiven for saying this, "Let us not follow our leaders and quarrel with each other. Let us work together."

Thank you.
MR. ALMELOR. Your Honors, I agree with him that you should not only practice your profession but you must be allowed under the Bill of Rights, Article III of the Constitution to exercise your freedom of speech. That is what.... Pyb/
MR. ALMELOR. ...that is what...(Laughter)

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Thank you, Atty. Almelor.

MS. REYES. Madam Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Reyes.

MS. REYES. So, I would just like to reiterate what we have agreed.

First, is to put the term "architectural" in front of all the term "design."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Specifications...

MS. REYES. Oo, parang gano'n. Lalagyan natin ng gano'n. In the same vein that in the engineering laws, they are going to put engineering specific engineering discipline to precede the term "design."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MS. REYES. So, in that way we have really delineated our functions.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Architect Timbol.

MR. TIMBOL. Good morning.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Good morning po.

MR. TIMBOL. I agree with Engineer Marciano that we are all professionals here and we should respect each other and help each other.

But this thing that is going on in the Senate now limits our time, really.
limits our time. So, ang aking suggestion is, for us to talk, 'yung tamang tama lang, maigsi lang at tapusin na natin, tapusin na natin.

Salamat po.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. All right. Thank you very much for this, hopefully by next week we can come up with the working draft already. Because by next week we already are in recess and we resume on October 5. Then by November, December, budget na po 'yan, eh.

MS. REYES. So, may I request, Madam Chair, that we be furnished copy of what we have agreed now...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, yes.

MS. REYES. ...through our e-mails.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Opo, opo.

MS. REYES. So, we will just provide you with the...

MR. ALMELOR. Your Honors, as a motion for reconsideration of the no further exercise of our freedom of speech, we would like to remind again regarding this professional identification card which has to be signed by the Chairperson. Then, the other provision, like for example, this reexamination must no longer be included therein because it is a right of the examinee to take the examination even for hundred times, he or she...
must not be restricted by anybody, provided that he or she is qualified to
take the examination. Whether to pass or to fail, it is his or her concern.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. ALMELOR. Another is that provision in enforcement. Anyway,
it is here. So, more or less we have substantially touched on the vital
important provisions in this bill, however, according to Architect Florentino,
we have not-- with due respect because we advised for the repeal not of
the amendment, considering...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, yes, yes.

MR. ALMELOR. Thank you, thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. We agree with that.

Engineer Marciano.

MR. MARCIANO. Ma'am, just a request to the Committee, that we
be furnished with the status of all the other bills pending with the
Committee. Because we are -- as the umbrella organization we are very
much concerned that the interest of all the member-organizational may be
overlooked.

Thank you very much.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, I think in that matter the Bills
and Index Division can also help you on that.

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY

ANTONIA P. BARROS
DIRECTOR III
LEG. RECORDS & ARCHIVES SVC.
A further no more...

Yes, Atty. Sison.

MR. SISON. Since our agreement is to harmonize...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Opo.

MR. SISON. ...and we agreed that we put architectural for the architectural law and we put civil engineering, then I would like also to suggest that if we can - - we have already filed our own laws or if we can also discuss this so that it can be approved at the same time with the agricultural law. Since historically, it is always a tandem. And historically, the architectural law and the civil engineering law was approved at the same time and even amended at the same time. So, this is just my suggestion.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sige po, we will try our best.

Kung wala na po, 'no, we'd like to...

MR. SE. Meron pa.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Mr. Se.

MR. SE. We have a similar situation with the plumbers, sanitary engineers and plumbers. So, we wish that if there are any such session, we could also be notified...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, yes.
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MR. SE. Again, it will drag down...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of everyone, the Committee is very well-versed in these kind of conflicts. We have doctors versus pharmacists. Occupational therapists versus physical therapists. We have doctors versus physical therapists. It's a very complicated issue.

In behalf of the Committee and Dr. Zulueta, we'd like to thank our resource persons from the architects, from the civil engineers, our sanitation engineers. Unfortunately, our friends from the mechanical engineering profession and electrical engineering cannot join us, but I hope their sentiments have been represented in the agreements that we have made.

This concludes our TWG. Thank you very much.

Thank you to our stenographers.

MS. ZULUETA. Madam Chair, excuse me, before we adjourn. I would like to furnish them a copy of this draft committee report where they can effect the changes we made today.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sige po.

Okay, thank you.

MR. SE. Madam Chair, isa na lang, para sa ano, "sanitary" po, hindi sanitation.
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THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, sanitary.

(THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 11:30 A.M.)...rommel.