

BILL ON SECOND READING
Senate Bill No. 891--Death Penalty/
Defining Heinous Crimes
(Continuation)

Senator Romulo: Mr. President, I move that we resume consideration of Senate Bill No. 891 as reported out under Committee Report No. 30.

The President: Resumption of consideration of Senate Bill No. 891 is now in order.

Senator Romulo: Mr. President, yesterday, Senator Lina delivered the sponsorship speech. May I ask that for the second sponsorship speech, the distinguished Gentleman from Catanduanes and Quezon City, Senator Francisco Tatad be recognized.

The President: For the second Sponsorship Speech, Senator Francisco Tatad is hereby recognized.

SPONSORSHIP SPEECH OF SENATOR TATAD

Senator Tatad: Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Mr. President, distinguished Colleagues of the Senate:

I am honored and pleased to join the distinguished Sponsor of Senate Bill No. 891 in commending the said bill--An Act Defining Heinous Crimes, Imposing the Penalty Therefor, Amending for that Purpose Article 27 and Adding a New Article 27-A in Act No. 3815, As Amended, the Revised Penal Code, and for Other Purposes--to the wisdom of the Senate. Seven measures are consolidated in this bill, and all except one had proposed the reimposition of the death penalty.

The committee, in its wisdom, chose to scale down the maximum penalty from death to *reclusion perpetua*. This required no small amount of courage, for given the number of those who signed Committee Report No. 30 with reservations, we should probably expect some members to try during the period of amendments to overturn the committee report in order to revive the original proposal for the reimposition of the death penalty.

In the Lower House, Mr. President, we are told, an overwhelming majority favors the reimposition of capital punishment. Here in the Senate, we are told, a fairly sizeable number are inclined to share the same sentiment. Outside the halls of Congress, the Catholic Bishops' Conference of the Philippines (CBCP) and representatives of other churches, progressive, liberal and conservative blocs, intellectuals, academics and

members of the toiling masses have voiced their opposition to the reimposition of capital punishment. But there is a rabble out there, crying for blood. And they may have managed to teach some of our leaders how to think on the issue.

It has been suggested that if the Bases Treaty was the defining issue for the Senate in the previous Congress, the death penalty could very well be the defining issue for us in this Congress. I have no position to take on that statement. But so emotional is this issue that no elective official can afford to be caught dead on the losing side of the debate. This will prompt some to fall silent, others to be discreet, and others still to simply follow the latest reading of the "public pulse."

But this is one issue, Mr. President, where our duty is to speak out according to our appreciation of the common good, not according to our calculation of the "public pulse." This is one issue where we must be prepared to exercise our teaching function--to teach the Nation what it does not know--at the risk of converting those who are sincerely convinced about the virtues of capital punishment. This is the reason I rise today to ask my distinguished Colleagues to give Senate Bill No. 891 the support it so richly deserves.

I am convinced, Mr. President, that reimposition of capital punishment will not help. It is the wrong solution to the problem we all seek to solve, and it will not solve it. It does not relate whatsoever to the quality of enforcement of our laws and the operation of our justice system, and it goes against the winds of change sweeping the countries around the world. It would not be worthy and fitting for the Senate to reinstate capital punishment. The Senate would more fittingly honor itself and serve the common good by accepting the wise and sober recommendation of Senate Bill No. 891 that *reclusion perpetua* is just and adequate punishment.

In 1987, the Constitution, which was ratified--we used to hear people say--by "an overwhelming majority of the Filipino electorate," abolished capital punishment. That was universally acclaimed as proof of our having come of age--of our having joined the ranks of civilized countries. But the Constitution left it in the hands of Congress to reimpose the death penalty "for compelling reasons involving heinous crimes."

Article III, Section 19 provides: "Excessive fine shall not be imposed, nor cruel, degrading or inhuman punishment inflicted. Neither shall death penalty be imposed, unless, for compelling reasons involving heinous crimes, the Congress hereafter provides for it. Any death penalty already imposed shall be reduced to *reclusion perpetua*."

consideration of Senate Bill No. 929 until tomorrow.

The President: Is there any objection? [*Silence*] Hearing none, consideration of this bill is hereby suspended.

BILL ON SECOND READING
Senate Bill No. 176--Hazing as a Crime
(Continuation)

Senator Romulo: Mr. President, I move that we resume consideration of Senate Bill No. 176 as reported out under Committee Report No. 18.

The President: Resumption of consideration of Senate Bill No. 176 is now in order.

Senator Romulo: We are still in the period of amendments when we suspended consideration of this bill. The Sponsor and the committee would formulate the Committee/individual amendments. I believe they are now ready, Mr. President. I ask therefore that Senator Lina be recognized.

The President: Senator Lina, the Author of this bill, is hereby recognized.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

Senator Lina: Mr. President, after the powwow yesterday between and among Senators Mercado, Guingona and this Representation, an agreement was reached to define the crime of "hazing" in this manner.

"THE CRIME OF HAZING IS COMMITTED BY ANY PERSON OR GROUP OF PERSONS WHO, THROUGH FORCE, VIOLENCE, THREAT, INTIMIDATION, TORTURE OR ANY OTHER MEANS, SHALL CAUSE PHYSICAL HARM OR PSYCHIATRIC DISORDER UPON ANOTHER PERSON SEEKING MEMBERSHIP IN, OR BEING RECRUITED TO JOIN AN ORGANIZATION.

THE TERM 'ORGANIZATION' SHALL MEAN ANY FRATERNITY, SORORITY, OR CLUB OR THE ARMED FORCES OF THE PHILIPPINES, PHILIPPINE NATIONAL POLICE, PHILIPPINE MILITARY ACADEMY, OR OFFICER AND CADET CORPS OF THE CITIZENS MILITARY TRAINING, OR CITIZENS ARMY TRAINING."

That is the reformulated definition, Mr. President.

The President: So what we are amending are lines 5 to 15 of page 1.

Senator Lina: Yes, Mr. President.

The President: Is there any objection to this amendment? [*Silence*] There being none, the amendment is hereby approved.

Did I see the hand of Senator Biazon?

Senator Biazon is recognized.

Senator Biazon: Mr. President, will the Gentleman take some proposals?

The President: Is this intended to reopen this definition of "hazing" because the amendment has already been approved so that we can have a reconsideration of its approval?

Senator Biazon: An addition to what we discussed with Senator Lina yesterday, Mr. President.

Senator Lina: Maybe during the period of individual amendments, Mr. President, I am sure Senator Biazon and I... We have already an initial talk, but we still could not craft the amendment that he wants to introduce.

This refers, Mr. President, to the training programs of the Armed Forces of the Philippines which are considered regular and which may cause physical harm or even psychiatric disorder, and the clear provision that these are exempted from this operation of this article needs to be introduced.

But the definition, the way it is worded now, speaks of force, violence, threat, intimidation, or torture or any other means. These are not present, unless the PMA or the armed forces and the various services make hazing a part of the program the way it is defined. And the way it is defined, immediately conveys the idea that those without the torture, without the intimidation, without the force, and other similar means, that will not be considered hazing.

But if the good Senator would like to further clarify that and make it crystal clear that the training programs which may cause physical harm in the process of the recruitment or training or even psychiatric disorder when, I understand that the psychological stability of the cadet is being tested in order to find out whether he is fit to be a soldier or a policeman or a future officer of the armed forces, if the recruit fails the test, then he is out of the school, like the PMA.

During the period of individual amendments, I am most willing to accommodate an amendment to that effect if only we can have the language that will form part of this definition.

Senator Biazon: Thank you, Mr. President.

Senator Lina: Thank you very much, Mr. President.

On page 2, line 3, put an S after the word "RESULT". We have already approved this, Mr. President, during the last session. Unfortunately, it was not incorporated in the clean copy. It is a matter of adding an S.

The President: Is there any objection? [Silence] The Chair hears none; the amendment is approved.

Senator Lina: On page 2, line 5, delete the phrase "AN INDEMNITY", and in lieu thereof, insert the phrase A FINE.

The President: Is there any objection?

Senator Herrera: Mr. President.

The President: Senator Herrera is recognized.

Senator Herrera: Mine is not an objection, Mr. President. But I would like to be enlightened why in the case of Senate Bill No. 891, heinous crime will have a penalty of *reclusion perpetua* and here also, we have *reclusion perpetua*. Are these considered also as heinous crimes?

Senator Lina: I would like to explain, Mr. President.

In Senate Bill No. 891, it is not the *reclusion perpetua* that is defined in the Revised Penal Code. It is a modified *reclusion perpetua* in Senate Bill No. 891 to distinguish it from the *reclusion perpetua* that is presently in the Revised Penal Code. It is actually 30 years uninterrupted service in the Senate Bill No. 891, whereas, *reclusion perpetua*, although it has been interpreted to mean 30 years, there can be good conduct allowance. So that if the prisoner has been penalized with the penalty of *reclusion perpetua* under the present law, with good conduct time allowance, he can be free after 21 years, five months and 18 days. But in Senate Bill No. 891, it is an uninterrupted 30 years. So there is a difference, Mr. President.

Senator Herrera: Then, what is, therefore, the rationale if listening to his sponsorship speech on Senate Bill No. 891, the intention was to give a chance to rehabilitate the criminal? If one is punished by *reclusion perpetua* under Senate Bill No. 891, and he has a good behavior, why can he not be released like under this bill, if he is punished of *reclusion perpetua*, if the yardstick there is that he has a good behavior for a certain number of years?

Senator Lina: Because when the death penalty was abolished, and all the death sentences were commuted to *reclusion perpetua*, there resulted a distortion in the gradation of penalty in the Revised Penal Code, Mr. President.

So there is need to distinguish these previous crimes that had death penalty as the impossible penalty from the other crimes which were considered not as grave as the original crimes that had death penalty.

Senator Herrera: Does the Gentleman not see the injustice if one commits hazing which results in physical deformity, assuming that two of his fingers were cut off and that resulted in a physical deformity, one will be sentenced to *reclusion perpetua*? And here is a murderer who raped, murdered and asked ransom, he will also be punished only for *reclusion perpetua*.

I think there is something wrong in putting this particular crime of hazing on the same level with heinous crimes.

Senator Lina: Mr. President, we are not going to belabor that point. We are ready to remove permanent physical disability or deformity from enumeration number one on page 2. But definitely, death, rape, mutilation, insanity or mental illness will have to be punished with *reclusion perpetua*.

Even under the Revised Penal Code, permanent physical disability, when it is the result on the person who is the victim, is treated on a higher scale.

Senator Herrera: My point is, if the penalty for a heinous crime is *reclusion perpetua*, I do not see the balance if the Gentleman imposes the same penalty in the case of hazing, even if it will result in death but there was no intention to kill. For example, if one under hazing was asked to drink two bottles of rum and then he died as a result of that as part of initiation, under this bill, he will be punished with the penalty of *reclusion perpetua*.

In the other bill, which is Senate Bill No. 891, one who kidnapped for ransom, and then raped, and later murdered, will only be punished also of *reclusion perpetua*. I can see the injustice here, Mr. President.

Senator Lina: Mr. President, I think I have explained it a while ago that this *reclusion perpetua* in Senate Bill No. 891 is not the *reclusion perpetua* presently being imposed under the Revised Penal Code. It is a modified *reclusion perpetua*.

It is redefined in Senate Bill No. 891 when it pertains to heinous crimes, and hazing is not considered one of the 14.

To be concrete, under the Revised Penal Code, the *reclusion perpetua* can even go down to 21 years, 5 months and 18 days. This is under the Revised Penal Code.

As it is defined in Article 27 of the Revised Penal Code, "Any person sentenced to any of the perpetual penalty shall be pardoned after undergoing the penalty of 30 years, unless such person, by reason of his conduct or some other serious cause, shall be considered by the Chief Executive as worthy of pardon."

That is the Revised Penal Code definition of the *reclusion perpetua*. We are redefining it in Senate Bill No. 891 in connection with those 14 offenses, Mr. President.

So I think nine years' difference between this penalty when there is good conduct allowance and the penalty in Senate Bill No. 891 is a whale of a difference.

Senator Herrera: Anyway, I said I raised the issue of wisdom and justification. The other is, we might become inconsistent if we have to take these two bills. On the other side, on Senate Bill No. 891, we are saying we have to protect human dignity, human rights.

And here, in this case of hazing, even if one has no intention to kill but in the height of the hazing required the neophyte to drink two bottles of rum, but because of his physical constituents, he died, the participants to the hazing will suffer the same penalty. A little variance like that definition under Senate Bill No. 891 of *reclusion perpetua* and the one in the Penal Code does not meaningfully differ in substance.

I am just pointing this out, because I think we have to be consistent.

Senator Lina: Yes. I think I have already explained the variance, Mr. President. I am very thankful to Senator Herrera for pointing a seeming inconsistency. But I think I have already explained my position on the matter, and the inconsistency is not present when we did compare Senate Bill No. 891 and this bill.

The President: Is there any further committee amendment?

Senator Lina: Yes. Mr. President, on page 2, line 7, again a matter of putting S after the word "RESULT".

The President: Is there any objection? [Silence] There being none, the amendment is approved.

Senator Lina: On page 2, lines 10 to 11, delete the phrase "AN INDEMNITY" and in lieu thereof, insert the phrase A FINE.

The President: Is there any objection? [Silence] There being none, the amendment is approved.

Senator Lina: On page 2, line 17, delete the phrase "AN INDEMNITY" and in lieu thereof, insert the phrase A FINE.

The President: Is there any objection? [Silence] There being none, the amendment is approved.

Senator Lina: On page 2, lines 24 to 28, delete after the word "PERIOD", the comma and the phrase "EVEN IF NO ACTUAL INJURY OCCURS TO THE NEOPHYTE OR MEMBER WHO WILL BE HAZED OR THE HAZING ITSELF IS PREVENTED BY REASON OF CAUSES INDEPENDENT OF THE WILL OF THE PERPETRATORS."

The President: Is there any objection? [Silence] There being none, the amendment is approved.

Senator Lina: On page 2, lines 29 to 34, the entire paragraph is reformulated to read as follows: THE RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS OF THE SCHOOL OR OF THE POLICE, MILITARY OR CITIZENS ARMY TRAINING ORGANIZATION, MAY IMPOSE THE APPROPRIATE ADMINISTRATIVE SANCTIONS ON THE PERSON OR PERSONS CHARGED UNDER THIS PROVISION EVEN BEFORE THEIR CONVICTION.

The President: Is there any objection? [Silence] There being none, the amendment is approved.

Senator Lina: On page 3, lines 8 to 10, delete the phrase...

The President: Before that, is there any reason why paragraph (A) shall be considered as a qualifying circumstance to authorize the imposition of the maximum penalty, when it is itself a component of the crime itself as it is now defined because of the amendment? This is a regular component of the crime of hazing as now defined.

Senator Lina: Yes.

The President: And yet under this provision, it is now considered a qualifying circumstance for purposes of imposing the maximum penalty.

Senator Lina: What paragraph is this, Mr. President?

The President: Paragraph (A). These are lines 3 to 5. "FORCE, VIOLENCE, THREAT, INTIMIDATION OR DECEIT", these are the regular components or elements of the crime of hazing.

Senator Lina: Yes. Let me explain, Mr. President, that the force, violence, threat, intimidation or deceit on the person of the recruit--This is what has happened in one school here in Metro Manila where the student by force was brought out of the classroom and he was brought to an isolated place even if he does not want to go with the person. Then, because he was forced to go there, he allows himself to be hazed or he was forced to join the organization.

The President: In short, the key words are, "who refuses to join"?

Senator Lina: Yes, Mr. President.

The President: All right. Is there any other Committee amendment on page 3?

Senator Lina: On page 3, lines 8 to line 10, delete the phrase "AND IS MADE TO UNDERGO HAZING THROUGH FORCE, VIOLENCE, THREAT OR INTIMIDATION" because that is already an essential element of the crime, Mr. President.

Senator Herrera: Mr. President.

The President: Senator Herrera is recognized.

Senator Herrera: Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Chamber that on page 2, line 31, the penalty of *reclusion perpetua* shall be imposed when the victim is below 12 years of age at the time of the hazing. But under Senate Bill No. 891, if one kills a child 12 years old or below, his penalty will also be *reclusion perpetua*. Under this Section 4, even if it will be slight physical injury, if the neophyte or the victim is 12 years or below, the penalty is *reclusion perpetua*. But under Senate Bill No. 891, if one kills a boy who is 12 years old, the penalty is also *reclusion perpetua*. I cannot see the justice, the fairness there.

Under this particular provision, *kahit* less serious, *kahit* pa act of lasciviousness, *reclusion perpetua*. *Patayin mo ang batang* 12 years old, under Senate Bill 891, *reclusion perpetua* pa rin.

Senator Lina: Mr. President, there is nothing in this bill that says acts of lasciviousness will be punishable with *reclusion perpetua*. The bill is here, and there is nothing to that

effect, that acts of lasciviousness...

Senator Herrera: Under paragraph 4, the Gentleman mentioned here that the penalty of *reclusion perpetua* shall be imposed when the victim is below twelve (12) years of age.

Senator Lina: But the Senator said that acts of lasciviousness are punishable by *reclusion perpetua* when they are committed in line with hazing. There is nothing in the bill. I just would like to clarify that, Mr. President.

But it is true. In paragraph 4, the penalty of *reclusion perpetua* shall be imposed when the victim is below 12 years of age at the time of hazing. Anyway, we are not yet discussing Senate Bill No. 891, Mr. President. That will be the proper time when we will really have to dissect the bill itself. We have not even had any interpellation on Senate Bill No. 891 but, I think, the comment of Senator Herrera is fair and I have already explained the difference. If this is discussed in the light of Senate Bill No. 891, this is not considered a heinous crime.

So the *reclusion perpetua* is the *reclusion perpetua* as defined in Article 27 of the Revised Penal Code which I have already read. But in Senate Bill No. 891, *reclusion perpetua* is redefined. It is a much graver penalty. If I have to repeat myself in explaining the difference, then I will do so, Mr. President.

Now, twelve years of age...

Senator Herrera: May I now have the Floor?

Mr. President, even with that variance we can immediately see the injustice here. Because if one kills a boy who is 12 years old, under Senate Bill No. 891--and I would insist that we have to discuss this in relation to that--the perpetrator will be punished with *reclusion perpetua* as defined in that bill.

Under this bill, even if one commits or inflicts less serious injury but the victim is 12 years old, the penalty is still *reclusion perpetua*, with a slight variation of the *reclusion perpetua* as defined in Senate Bill No. 891.

Even with that variation, Mr. President, there is still that injustice.

Senator Lina: Mr. President, maybe during the period of amendments, with due respect to the distinguished Senator, he may introduce the amendment that he wishes to introduce so that we can go ahead, because we are in the period of Com-

mittee amendments. This is the time I have to introduce the Committee amendments. But after we have closed the period of Committee amendments, then we can go to the period of individual amendments.

If there is a provision here which the distinguished Senator from Cebu and Bohol would like to amend, then we can agree or disagree whether to accept or not. That will be the proper time, Mr. President.

Senator Herrera: Mr. President, at this stage, when the Sponsor is proposing Committee amendments, we would like to be enlightened on what is really the justification of the Committee to propose those amendments in preparation for the amendments that I will propose during the individual amendments.

Senator Lina: Mr. President, I am not introducing an amendment on the paragraph that the Senator from Cebu and Bohol had adverted to. He was the one who brought up paragraph 4, so I do not know how to respond. I cannot introduce an amendment which I do not want to propose. Maybe, during the period of amendments on that particular point, if the distinguished Senator would like to have it amended, then we can tackle it at that time. In the list of Committee amendments that I prepared today, there is no proposal to amend paragraph 4 of Section 1.

The President: Let us correct that. It is not paragraph 4. It is paragraph 5. It is on page 3.

Senator Lina: Yes, Mr. President. On the penalty for...

The President: The maximum penalty imposable.

Senator Lina: No, Mr. President. The Senator from Cebu and Bohol adverted to the penalty of *reclusion perpetua*--

Senator Herrera: That is on page 2, Mr. President.

Senator Lina: --that shall be imposed when the victim is below 12 years of age. This is what he is questioning, Mr. President.

The President: I thought we are on page 3.

Senator Lina: That is another point, Mr. President. We are already on page 3. It is all right if Senator Herrera wants us to go back to page 2, but I am not proposing any Committee amendment on page 2.

Senator Herrera: Mr. President, we are proceeding on a page-by-page discussion. Since the Chair is asking our opinion whether we will agree to what the distinguished Sponsor is proposing, I am saying that I am just calling the attention of the distinguished Sponsor that we will have to reconcile this with Senate Bill No. 891 to abbreviate the discussion.

Senator Lina: I am sorry, I cannot understand it, Mr. President. We are talking of a bill that is yet to be discussed so we cannot decide on these two bills together. This bill is already in the period of Committee amendments.

Senate Bill No. 891 is still in the period of interpellations. We should decide each bill one by one. If the provision of this bill is too onerous and will rank injustice in some sectors of society, in the period of amendments, I will consider the matter at the proper time.

Senator Herrera: Mr. President, to abbreviate the discussion, I will see to it that I will not interrupt the distinguished Sponsor. I am just calling his attention to make sure that the committee is consistent in its position in all the bills reported out by it.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Senator Lina: Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, we have yet to approve the amendment on page 3, from lines 8 to 10.

The President: Will the Gentleman repeat the proposed amendment?

Senator Lina: To delete the phrase, "...and is made to undergo hazing through force, violence, threat or intimidation" because these are already essential elements of hazing, Mr. President.

The President: Is there any objection to this amendment? [Silence] There being none, the amendment is approved.

Senator Lina: On page 4, lines 22 to 25, delete the phrase, "FOR PURPOSES OF THIS ACT, OFFICERS-IN-CHARGE OF THE TRAINING OF RECRUITS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE PHILIPPINES, THE PHILIPPINE NATIONAL POLICE, THE CITIZENS MILITARY TRAINING OR CITIZENS ARMY TRAINING" and, in lieu thereof, insert the phrase, ANY PERSON CHARGED UNDER THIS PROVISION.

The President: Is there any objection? [Silence] There being none, the amendment is approved.

Senator Lina: That will be all, Mr. President.

The President: May the Chair ask these questions: What is really the maximum penalty imposable for hazing under this bill?

Senator Lina: *Reclusion perpetua*, Mr. President, as defined in Article 27.

The President: Does not the Gentleman think it proper that because of that paragraph (E), lines 18 and 19, should already be deleted in the face of the fact that under page 2, lines 19 and 21, there is already a provision that the penalty of *reclusion perpetua* shall be imposed when the victim is below 12 years of age?

Senator Lina: Is this on lines 18 to 19, Mr. President?

The President: Lines 18 to 19. It is treated as a qualifying circumstance, and yet on page 2 there is already a definite imposition of *reclusion perpetua* which is actually the highest imposable penalty.

Senator Lina: Yes, Mr. President, that is very logical. We will delete that.

The President: Will the Gentleman make a formal amendment?

Senator Lina: I so move, Mr. President. I will adopt it as a Committee amendment. I move that lines 18 to 19 of page 3 of the bill be deleted.

The President: Is there any objection to the motion? [Silence] There being none, the amendment is approved.

Senator Romulo: Mr. President, I move that we close the period of Committee amendments.

The President: Is there any objection? [Silence] There being none, the period of Committee amendments is hereby terminated.

Senator Romulo: Mr. President, I ask that we now consider individual amendments, if any.

The President: On page 1, is there any individual amendment?

Senator Herrera: Mr. President.

The President: Senator Herrera is recognized.

Senator Herrera: Mr. President, may I ask that we postpone discussion on this bill until next week.

The President: Is there any objection?

Senator Lina: I will not be averse to that, Mr. President, but we discussed the rent control bill. May we know the reason for the request?

Senator Herrera: For the simple reason, Mr. President, that on a matter of consistency I feel we have also to consider the other bills. Because eventually, when we approve these two bills, *kailangang* consistent *iyong ating* penalties to be imposed.

Senator Lina: With due respect to the Senator from Cebu and Bohol, Mr. President, that will mean that this bill will not be discussed and approved by this Body until we discuss Senate Bill No. 891.

SUSPENSION OF THE SESSION

Senator Romulo: Mr. President, may I ask for a one-minute suspension of the session.

The President: The session is suspended, if there is no objection. [There was none.]

It was 6:22 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF THE SESSION

At 6:23 p.m., the session was resumed.

The President: The session is resumed.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

SUSPENSION OF CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL NO. 176

Senator Romulo: Mr. President, I ask that we suspend consideration of Senate Bill No. 176 on the crime of hazing. We should resume this tomorrow.

The President: Is there any suggestion from the Majority Leader that, in view of a major amendment to the definition of

the crime of hazing, new copies embodying all the Committee amendments should be prepared and distributed to the Members?

Senator Romulo: Yes, Mr. President. The bill with the Committee amendments and other amendments thereof would be prepared so that when we take this up tomorrow, then it would be clear to all after they have read the clean copy.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The President: Thank you.

BILL ON SECOND READING
Senate Bill No. 252--Book Publishing Industry
(Continuation)

Senator Romulo: Mr. President, I move that we resume consideration of Senate Bill No. 252 as reported out under Committee Report No. 28.

The President: Resumption of consideration of Senate Bill No. 252 is now in order.

Senator Romulo: Mr. President, we have closed the period of interpellations. We are now in the period of Committee amendments.

I ask that the distinguished Gentleman from Aurora and Quezon, Senator Edgardo Angara, be recognized.

The President: The Chairman of the Committee on Education, Arts and Culture is hereby recognized for purposes of Committee amendments.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

Senator Angara: Thank you, Mr. President. I wish to submit the Committee amendments to Senate Bill No. 252.

On page 3, line 15, delete the word "through the establishment of".

The President: Is there any objection to the said amendment? [Silence] There being none, the amendment is approved.

I understand that the Committee amendments have been reduced to writing.

Senator Angara: Yes, Mr. President. We anticipated a clean copy being asked, so we had the Committee amend-

ments incorporated in a new draft, which we are to distribute later. We will do it after all the Committee amendments have been approved.

The President: The Gentleman may then proceed.

Senator Angara: Thank you, Mr. President.

On page 3, after line 20, insert a new subparagraph (6) and renumber the succeeding subparagraphs accordingly. The new subparagraph (6) will read as follows:

(6) TO PROMOTE THE TRANSLATION AND PUBLICATION OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL BOOKS AND CLASSIC WORKS IN LITERATURE AND THE ARTS.

The President: Is there any objection? [Silence] There being none, the amendment is approved.

Senator Angara: This reflects, Mr. President, the amendment of Senator Shahani.

On page 4, line 5, after the word "Cultural" insert the words ORGANIZATION (UNESCO).

The President: Is there any objection? [Silence] There being none, the amendment is approved.

Senator Angara: On page 4, between lines 8 and 9, insert a new subparagraph which will read as follows:

(11) TO PROMOTE WHENEVER APPROPRIATE THE USE OF RECYCLED/ WASTE PAPER AND OTHER INEXPENSIVE LOCAL MATERIALS IN THE MANUFACTURE OF BOOKS TO REDUCE THE COST OF SUCH LOCALLY PRODUCED BOOKS.

The President: Is there any objection? [Silence] There being none, the amendment is approved.

Senator Angara: This reflects the amendment of Senator Mercado, Mr. President.

On page 5, line 10, after the word "books" insert the words OR OTHER PERIODICALS SUCH AS APPROPRIATE OR SELECTED COMICS AS INSTRUCTIONAL OR TEACHING MATERIALS.

The President: Is there any objection? [Silence] There being none, the amendment is approved.

Senator Angara: On page 5, lines 20 to 28, the first