

Chapter I

Disadvantaged Groups and the Philippine Congress: Introduction to the Study

If democracy is indeed the government of, by and for the people, the voice of the majority who are poor, underserved and otherwise disadvantaged should be the dominant voice in society. However, most countries are still saddled with an unequal economic structure that privileges those who already have power and wealth not only in business and industry but also in affairs of the State. Nevertheless, believing that democratic governance is a work in progress, many members of the disadvantaged sectors have taken that idea seriously and have undertaken to have their views heard in the corridors of power. At the same time, the State, and individual political leaders have also opened avenues for their participation and representation in the parliamentary and other decision making processes. These efforts on both sides can go a long way towards making democracy realizable as the rule of the people.

Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

The role of the State in societal affairs is usually seen from two conflicting perspectives: the liberal view which regards the State as balancing the interests of relatively equal groups that bring their demands upon it; and the Marxist (or elitist) view, which sees the State as the executive committee of the elite, and therefore one that regularly decides in their interest. The liberal view falls flat in the face of a grievous lack of equality in societies, a requirement for the State to manage the balance. The elitist view flies against popular belief in the democratic credo which assigns to people sovereignty - despite their lack of actual power.

This study tends towards a third view that takes into account both the empirical power distribution and the power of ideas and ideals in shaping human action. This perspective posits the State as a “playing referee,” with the State playing on the side of the elite but from time to time opts to have the other teams score (Carino 1992). The inclination toward the elite is due to the power equation, and the identity of many leaders of government as members of the elite themselves.

Yet some policies may lean in the other direction. Many reasons are cited to explain these exceptions. First is the need to legitimize the State, because its being a democracy is not just rhetorical but is enshrined in law. The State may do this because it has to deal with people who move into a democratic space which they presume is there. In W.I. Thomas’ classic statement: “if people perceive situations as real, they are real in their consequences” (Thomas and Znaniecki 1918). Or the State may allow the disadvantaged to gain ground in the process that Piven and Cloward (1993) called “regulating the poor.” In those times that the poor are able to get concessions, Piven and Cloward find the State acting “generously” only as a way to control political unrest. Thus, they see the welfare system as a stabilizing force to retain the status quo and placate the poor in the process.

This study seeks to understand how the State positions itself between the power of power and the power of ideals and system preservation in situations when disadvantaged groups place their demands upon it. It will lay out what avenues of access are available and are actually used, and identify what forces are mustered by the interest-bearers to produce their desired policy. The principal arena for the struggle of interests in this study is Congress, the national-level legislative body of the State.

Studies of interest group politics have tended to use either the liberal or the elitist view. However, towards the end of the twentieth century, two factors have made both citizens and scholars view the State as capable of more responsiveness to, and permeability by, non-elites (though not yet the balancer of liberal dreams). The first is the show of people power, manifested dramatically in the Philippines in EDSA I,¹ also called the People Power Revolution of 1986 that toppled the dictatorship of Ferdinand E. Marcos. It was repeated a scant fifteen years later in EDSA II, where the people finished a failed impeachment process of alleged corruption by another sitting president, Joseph Ejercito Estrada. The EDSAs however are merely a tip of the iceberg. Thousands of organizations in villages and cities had worked with great difficulty during the Martial Law period to conscientize, build capacity, organize, and empower people.

The first EDSA saw a new democratic space opened by Marcos' departure. From one perspective, this was a uniquely Filipino event: masses of men, women and children stopping tanks with flowers and religious symbols, pushing to the presidency a widow in yellow. However, it was also the start of an international wave of democratization that saw popular participation - and changes in governments -in South Africa, Eastern Europe, and closer home, Thailand, Indonesia, and South Korea. It in turn has been part of the growth of globalization, which, beyond the international economic linkages, also has political and social manifestations and repercussions, helped along by international covenants, ICT and media, and, increasingly, by global civil society linkages and movements.

The factor introduced above is shown in action, but a second factor is more conceptual, though triggered and sustained as well by practice. This is the acceptance of the paradigm of governance, where the management of societal affairs is seen no longer as the monopoly of government, but as shared by it with institutions of the market and civil society. The shift in the label "interest groups" to "civil society" signifies the recognition of stakeholders other than "the usual suspects." Pre-governance, that would have been chambers of commerce, industry associations, professional organizations, and the like. Civil society includes these as well as all other organizations that have political and social agenda to bring before the State. Many of these were unorganized, or if organized, unknown and ignored before the "legitimation" brought about by the governance paradigm. The term "interest group" is hardly used now because many civil society organizations believe that they represent the public interest rather than smaller individual interests. In this study, we have focused on "disadvantaged groups" to emphasize the fact that these are organizations representing people outside the elite.

¹ EDSA stands for Epifanio de los Santos Avenue, where most of the people congregated in 1986 to protect military mutineers from the wrath of the ruling power.

However, there is no necessary prejudice that it is their position that redounds to the long-term benefit of the greatest deserving number in the State.

Theoretical Approach of the Literature. The literature on the participation and representation of disadvantaged groups in parliamentary processes in the Philippines is largely subsumed under the rubric of State-civil society relations, rather than, as alluded to above, the more popular topic in the middle of the last century, interest group politics. Most of them take a perspective similar to ours. The one closest to an interest group politics perspective is also the first, the State of the Nation Research Report of the Third World Studies Center (TWSC). Its *Policy Issues, Responses and Constituencies: State-Civil Society Relations in Policy Making* (1994) studied five policy issues and identified the policy actors and their corresponding views on each issue. It found that “strong” constituencies have tended to win the debate. These tend towards conservative views and their policy demands tend to coincide with the policy later promulgated by the State. Meanwhile, the NGO-PO sector is among the “weak” constituencies, being “unable to penetrate the policy making structures of the State, and whose positions are thus, marginalized” (173-174). Yet, despite a finding that reinforces the elitist view, the study asserts that:

It has long ceased to be useful for adequate analysis of the political environment, as well as of competent democratic intervention, to view the State as a monolith. For as long as the State-as-monolith view² prevails, political involvement of the masses shall remain restricted and political action by transformative groups shall remain trapped in an apocalyptic paradigm (1994: 174).

The other studies have tended to look at civil society as organizations espousing views alternative to the elite. After a series of case studies on the role of such NGOs in the Philippine State, G. Sidney Silliman and Lela Garner Noble conclude thus:

It is our contention... that the Philippines is more democratic because of the political actions of NGOs... NGOs have increased the capacity of middle- and lower-class Filipinos to act autonomously; consequently, **the State is less completely captive of elite interests than previously** (1998: 306; emphasis supplied).

Marlon Wui and Glenda Lopez likewise locate their study of State-civil society relations in the context of the democratic transition. They recognize “the backdrop of this intersection” as “a reformed legal/policy environment that offers greater possibilities for civil society intervention in policy making but whose openness and hospitality to actual civil society participation remain to be tested” (1997: 3). The opened-up democratic space is also the starting point of the studies of the Ateneo Center for Social Policy and Public Affairs (ACSPPA 1997). In its focus on the policy success of NGO involvement in six movements, the ACSPPA adds to the literature the concern for social capital and the discourse of resistance.

² What we have called earlier the elitist or Marxist view.

The Terrain for Civil Society Intervention. The Constitution of 1987, promulgated in the wake of the People Power Revolution, explicitly recognizes civil society's important role in State and society. That is evident from the following:

The State shall encourage nongovernmental, community-based or sectoral organizations that promote the welfare of the nation. (Article II, Section 23)

The State shall respect the role of independent people's organizations to enable the people to pursue and protect, within the democratic framework, their legitimate and collective interests and aspirations through peaceful and lawful means. (Art. XIII, Sec. 15)

The right of the people and their organizations to effective and reasonable participation at all levels of social, political and economic decision making shall not be abridged. The State shall, by law, facilitate the establishment of adequate constitutional mechanisms. (Art. XIII, Sec. 16)

In addition, the Constitution provided for a party-list system of registered national, regional, and sectoral parties or organizations [Art. VI, Sec. 5(1)]. Its intent to have the party-list represent groups other than the usual members of Congress may be gleaned from the transitory provision attached to Sec. 5(2):

For three consecutive terms after the ratification of this Constitution, one-half of the seats allocated to party-list representatives shall be filled, as provided by law, by selection or election from the labor, peasant, urban poor, indigenous cultural communities, women, youth, and such other sectors as may be provided by law, except the religious sector.

This "publicly NGO-friendly State" (David 1997: 43) notwithstanding, some civil society groups have found a "chilling effect" (Wui and Lopez 1997: 5) in perceived State biases against civil society intervention. Some of these are "normal" parts of the policy process – governmental red tape, long and often delayed judicial litigation, slow legislative processes. But others reflect the legislative composition and the substantive interests of an elitist State. Against this, civil society groups have to maneuver between a defeatist adversarial stance and the danger of cooptation and surrender of deeply held views.

Why Civil Society Intervenes. The open door provided by the Constitution does not explain why civil society enters it. It is interesting to note two conflicting explanations. The first highlights the positive circumstances that have made this possible – that it is a positive use of the democratic space widened by EDSA, the new view of the post-dictatorship State held by some organizations, the perceived openness of policy makers to the sector's entry, the success of previous efforts that now is expected to breed new success. An instance of the last may be seen in new laws such as the Local Government Code that mandate citizen representation in many local decisions. The second sees its roots in the failure of the State. Aver Silliman and Noble:

Most simply, citizen activism in the Philippines has been caused by deteriorating socioeconomic conditions and the failure of the State (and the market) to address them... Citizens have organized in response to these circumstances to compensate for the State's failures and to pressure the State to correct its policies (1998: 283).

This issue is not a central concern in the literature nor of this study. However, it is important to recognize the second view which may support an adversarial and arrogant attitude that could inhibit the success of civil society intervention.

Where Civil Society Intervenes. TWSC provided what it called "a modified flowchart for intervention" (1994: 168) where it detailed important nodes in the policy making process where civil society might intervene. The chart centered on the legislative process but also identified the executive, the judiciary and the media as other points of intervention. This chart has been our point of departure in finding the avenues of access for disadvantaged groups.³

Wui and Lopez (1997) provided their own matrix of formal and informal venues of interaction, which is a list of points of intersection between civil society and Congress, the executive branch, the judiciary, local government units and autonomous regions, and informal venues. The matrix found relative unevenness in the utilization of venues and means, a relative underutilization of formal venues and means, and a corresponding increased use of informal means. It also pointed out the need to consider the time element and appropriateness in choosing a particular venue for intervention.

Factors affecting the Effectiveness of Civil Society Intervention in Policy Making. The literature presents case studies of various policy areas where State and civil society have intersected. Civil society has not been effective in all of these, even in the six case studies of ACSPPA which specifically looked for "what constitutes success in policy influence." However, there is convergence on the importance of the capacity of the civil society group, what TWSC called "adeptness." That monograph explains its importance as follows:

The emergence of new global and national conditions signals greater complexity in the mode of governance and greater diversity in societal demands. It is part of the nature of open, pluralistic, and democratic political processes that the views and interests of the more politically adept groups prevail. The challenge of broadening the base of participation and raising the quality of representativeness of governance lies not in the diminution of democracy but *in raising the level of political adeptness of presently marginalized groups* (Third World Studies Center, 1994: 174-175, emphasis supplied).

What constitutes "adeptness" or "capacity"? Valerie Miller and Henedina Razon-Abad, writing the synoptic paper for ACSPPA (1997), Edna Estefania A. Co, reporting on the work of the Advocacy Working Group (1990), Patricia Anne Paez, writing the

³ It is reproduced here as Annex 1.1.

synthesis paper on State-Civil Society Relations focusing on access of civil society to the legislature (1997) and Alex Brillantes, Jr., writing the counterpart paper on access to the executive (1997) attribute success to several qualities that CSOs must possess. We classify their list into this study's categories of internal capacity and capacity for external linkages or alliances. Elements of internal capacity that they identify are:

- Organization: a coalition structure, full-time secretariats, and professional staff (Miller and Razon-Abad); grassroots membership (Paez). Brillantes recommends a coalition to avoid wasteful competition and duplication of efforts. He also suggests that NGOs must specialize and focus to be more effective advocates. Paez emphasizes, on the other hand, the necessity of civil society to speak with one voice, so as not to divert congressional attention away from the issues they are advocating.
- Management processes: speedy and quick decision making processes, "effective grassroots education and organizing efforts" (Miller and Razon-Abad); monitoring and constant evaluation of their experiences (Brillantes); "strengthening their organization and management for advocacy work (Co); resource advantage (Paez).
- Vision and strategy: "a combination of modest but strategic short-term policy goals with comprehensive long-term goals" (Miller and Razon-Abad 1997: 203).
- Knowledge and capacity building: "know the power grid in Congress and the workings of the legislative mill... the executive branch,... the media and legislators' constituents" (Paez); "increased appreciation of government rules and procedures" (Brillantes); acquisition of negotiation skills, conduct of policy research (Brillantes, Co); developing the discipline for advocacy (Co);
- Attitude enhancement: flexibility and willingness to compromise, unity, credibility (Paez).

For Miller and Razon-Abad, this capacity will be manifested in a coalition, strategy and tactics, and on how the issue is framed. Coalition is a form of organization already discussed above. We will discuss here only the last two factors. The first, strategy and tactics, are loan words from the military (which may have been unintended) and connote purposiveness and forcefulness (which may have been). The groups they studied combined mass action and legislative tracks at both national and local levels, a rich arsenal (another military term) which we will meet again in the cases we discuss.

The second additional internal element is how the issue is framed. Miller and Razon-Abad noted whether or not it is connected to other grassroots concerns, and if its definition connects it to both narrow and long-term goals. We think that in this dry academic language they may be subsuming vision, passion and commitment which, as we shall see, seem to have propelled the efforts of civil society groups.

It may be instructive to include the list drawn up by NGOs as their capability needs for advocacy. These include advocacy itself, understanding government, staff development and such "special skills" as research/writing, social marketing and

community organizing, negotiation, lobbying and conflict management, and paralegal skills (Alfiler 2001)⁴.

Elements of the capacity for external linkages identified by the earlier studies include:

- An open perspective on relating with the State: “a more dynamic and less monolithic view of the State,” “willingness and capacity to negotiate with government and to accept the validity of incremental reforms” (Miller and Razon-Abad); “take advantage of formal mechanisms made available to civil society,” “find ways to maintain continuous dialogue between government and civil society” (Brillantes) .
- Building allies among influential policy makers and powerbrokers (Miller and Razon-Abad)
- “A concrete effective strategy aimed at opposition players (to) counter their potential impact on a campaign” (Miller and Razon-Abad).

Focus of the Study

The literature described above looks at State-civil society relations in policy making. Though rich, it is still small. More than that, the substance of the literature suggests that the subject of the case studies, particularly the successes, may have been exceptions. With an estimated number of a quarter to half a million organizations, the nonprofit sector and civil society in the Philippines – encompassing all organizations between the space and the market – it may be fair to surmise that the intervention of civil society in policy making has yet to take root in many areas of the country, “area” being understood as both geographic and substantive divisions.

Our concern takes a smaller piece of the field. Rather than looking at all policy making, it is focused only on parliamentary processes and only on the access of disadvantaged groups.

The focus on the legislature is intended to highlight the importance of this institution to the State. In the Constitution, it is the first branch of government introduced. We maintain that that placement is not accidental. The legislature is a collegial body composed of people selected by the citizenry to represent them, and thus, more than any other branch, is the one symbolizing popular sovereignty. It also is charged with making law, giving to people symbolically the weapons with which to govern themselves. Yet the branch in the popular mind is subordinate to the Executive, when the latter is the one supposed to be getting its orders (the laws) from the former. It is probably also the branch where the distance of government from the citizenry is most marked, since the socio-economic status of its members is so different from the population (Coronel, Chua, Rimban and Cruz 2004). It is appropriate that non-

⁴These are organizations within the Christian Aid network which the Center for Leadership, Citizenship and Democracy of the National College of Public Administration and Governance, University of the Philippines assisted in strengthening their capability for advocacy. For a detailed discussion of their concerns see Ma. Oliva Z. Domingo (2001).

governmental groups that purport to also be the people's representatives engage it, and through their intersection give substance to the rule of the people in society.

Also, rather than studying all of civil society, this paper only focuses on disadvantaged groups. As listed in Art. XIII, Sec. 16 of the Constitution, these would include "labor, peasant, urban poor, indigenous cultural communities, women, youth, and such other sectors as may be provided by law, except the religious sector," a list that is as close as we can get to a constitutional definition of what are disadvantaged groups. In a developing country like the Philippines, the majority of citizens fall under this rubric and it is important to document their power (or lack of it).

Disadvantaged groups are but a subset of "civil society," which is composed of all organizations between the State and the market. The latter term includes organizations of the elite (such as chambers of commerce and planters' associations), as well as associations of the poor that do not engage the State or the market in any meaningful degree (such as couples' clubs found in most villages of the country). Adopting the Johns Hopkins criteria, they would be private, self-governing, institutionally separate from government, not profit distributing, and voluntary (Salamon and Anheier 1991). Adapting that to the Philippine context, we have reserved the term "nonprofit sector" to refer to organizations more oriented to the market, and "civil society" to refer to organizations more involved in political and social activities (Cariño 2002: 22-25).

The more common usage in the Philippines, however, does not follow this technical distinction. Instead there is a tendency to refer to "civil society" as organizations that engage the State and have a political agenda to push, usually in behalf of the marginalized and underserved groups. Thus, "civil society organizations" (CSOs) are usually a shorthand way of referring also to disadvantaged groups in the literature we have used. In that literature, NGOs and POs are distinguished from each other. NGOs are organizations that mediate between the State and the disadvantaged groups, being primarily composed of concerned citizens from the middle and upper classes. Meanwhile people's organizations (POs) are those whose members are the same as the beneficiaries of their campaigns and causes. Again, conceivably, elite citizens can have POs (the Employers' Confederation of the Philippines or planters' associations come to mind), but they never take the name POs. Rather, people's organizations have been reserved, again, for organizations coming from sectors disadvantaged by society.⁵ This is a usage that pervades the literature.

At the same time, a caveat is in order. The groups to be studied are not necessarily associations composed of all the disadvantaged; certainly no organization, no matter how big a coalition, can have all the poor in that sector as members. It is not even feasible that an organization include all the people under one category of the disadvantaged. For instance, organized labor groups contain no more than ten percent of

⁵ Emmanuel E. Buendia (2005) sees the people's organizations as the proper surrogate of citizens in their sovereign role in a democracy. Thus, when he discusses "people's participation in governance," he focuses on POs and excludes NGOs. His "POs" follows the popular use and excludes membership associations of the elite.

persons eligible to be members. People's organizations (POs) are therefore membership associations of a group of persons, claiming to represent them but having in their roster only the more active and articulate among those qualified to be members.

Another wrinkle is that some groups may claim to represent the disadvantaged even though they are not disadvantaged themselves. These are organizations which mediate between the people and the State, espousing their demands without being one of them. Many NGOs are such intermediary organizations. Both POs and NGOs are representatives of the people they speak for, although they are not elected to be their agents as legislators are. Their legitimacy comes from the acceptance by their principals, and by the effectiveness of their acts of representation. A study of the access of the organizations of disadvantaged groups to the legislature thus in a sense pits the claims of two representatives of the people (elected parliamentarians and CSOs) to bring real democracy to the citizens.

With these clarifications in mind, and guided by the literature, this study analyzes the capacity of the disadvantaged groups – or their assumed organizational representatives - as the main factor to look for in analyzing the access of disadvantaged groups to parliamentary processes. “Capacity” is defined broadly to include the ability for internal management as well as capability to build linkages with external forces and institutions. Internal capacity includes administrative capacity to manage resources and logistics, knowledge of strategy and tactics, knowledge of policy making processes and coalition building within civil society, and the use of such knowledge to advocate the causes of the people claimed to be represented. It also includes the crucial element of the credibility of the groups to be recognized as the spokespersons of the cause of the disadvantaged. External capacity refers to building alliances with legislators, their staffs, other parts of the State (the executive, judiciary, etc.) and other political forces, including media, international organizations, fund-providers, and other institutions, whether or not they are involved directly in legislative policy making.

The ability to penetrate the legislative process does not depend on the capacity of the disadvantaged groups alone. There are always the opposing forces and the tools they bring to make the policy hew to their interests. In addition, other factors affect the clash of interests. These include the environment in which the legislative processes take place, as well as what we call here as “content,” the significance and salience of the issue and its connection to other important concerns the State and society are dealing with concurrently.

Objectives

The following are the objectives of the study:

1. To describe the current state of the art – what avenues of access are provided for by the state, what strategies are currently used by disadvantaged groups, what policies have been forged since the restoration of Congress in the post-Marcos period (1987 onwards) that have direct effects on disadvantaged

- groups, and what role they have played, if any, in their initiation and enactment,
2. To identify and analyze the factors that facilitate or hinder participation and representation of disadvantaged groups in parliamentary processes,
 3. To identify the effective strategies of disadvantaged groups that enable them to make parliaments take notice, listen and adopt the policies they advocate, and
 4. To make recommendations for both further research and action, including the development of educational campaigns, training programs and other areas of future assistance.

Methodology

Given time and resource limitations, the study defines as its scope only the national parliamentary level, including both Houses of Congress, since 1987. This covers all the years of existence of the post-Martial Law Congress, from the Eighth to the current Thirteenth. The major part of the study focuses on the passage of bills that had been participated in by disadvantaged groups. Seven of the bills we studied intensively have become law, although three met with defeat in the first Congress in which they were introduced. (One did not become a law, but that outcome was what the sectoral groups desired.)

The study used the following methods:

1. An extensive review of the literature
2. A study of current processes of the Philippine Congress
3. A focus group discussion with ten heads of secretariats of the House Committees with active NGO-PO participation in their hearings
4. Case studies on the passage of seven laws and one set of bills with marked participation of disadvantaged groups.

Inclusions and Limitations

In the original proposal, we expected that we would need to make only three (3) cases, assuming that we could draw on published material to re-analyze as many as nine (9) other cases. Upon embarking on this project, we found outstanding studies on the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Law (Putzel 1992, 1998), the Urban Development and Housing Act (Carroll 1998 and Karaos, Gatpatan and Hotz 1995), the Anti-Rape Law (Reyes 1997) and the Anti-Terrorism Bills (Diokno 1997), all of which we could use for, and did re-analyze in, this study.

Most of the other extant cases gave us much insight into the research problem but were not as useful for our purposes as case studies. For instance, the TWSC studies identified the protagonists and their respective stand on the issues, but did not describe how they acted in the legislative process. Three cases in the ACSPPA volume (1997) focused on civil society participation in executive policy making as did Jocelyn F. Cajuiat and Aurora A. Regalado's case on the GATT-UR debate (in Wui and Lopez 1997).

Teresita Ang See's article in the same book zeroed in on the criminal justice system Others in the Wui and Lopez volume, such as that of Jocelyn Angeles and of Juan Climaco Elago II were local government cases. The generics drug act was a law to benefit the disadvantaged, but the most active in its passage were groups of medical professionals and government agencies (Co 2002).

The studies of the National Coalition of Fisherfolk for Aquatic Reform (NACFAR) and the Ethnic Studies and Development Center (ESDC) Research Team, both in ACSPPA (1997), walked us through the intervention of their respective groups in legislation. However, they were confined to the failure of the Fisheries Code and the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act, respectively, to pass in the Eighth Congress. Therefore we needed to do two new cases to describe the successful passage of those laws. They occurred, as it turned out, both in the Tenth Congress. Thus, although we introduce only two other laws (The Social Reform and Poverty Alleviation Act, and the Anti-Child Labor Law), in a sense we are presenting four cases as studies made specifically for this project.

The voice in all the cases is primarily that of the disadvantaged groups, speaking either directly to us, or through the papers and documents we were able to gather to write up their cases. A more comprehensive case would have included more of the opposing forces, and the legislators and government officials participating in the process. Because of the period of our study, it was difficult to set interviews with legislators; this is a grave limitation we acknowledge. Had there been more time and resources, we would have also sought spokespersons for the opposing forces. Nevertheless, with our limitations, we opted to hear the usually unheard rather than the more prominent groups.

Although not in the original proposal, we opted to make a study of the party-list system. However, it is not as extensive as we would have liked. The period of study coincided with a period of tension among PL members that it was not appropriate to interview them. We also found that even such a basic datum as the number of party-list representatives in a given Congress is so fraught with error⁶ that this portion of the study took more time than an analysis of documents and published papers implies. In the end, we managed to only skim the surface of this important innovation in Philippine representation.

The Structure of this Report

This chapter has introduced the issues and scope of this study. Chapter II describes the legislative process and the avenues allowed by law for the intersection of civil society, particularly disadvantaged groups there, and the legislature. Chapter III, IV and V present eight cases of the journeys of proposed legislative measures in the Philippine Congress. Chapter III presents four cases - two enactments and two failures -

⁶ For instance, even so basic a reference as the House of Representatives website omitted some party-list representatives in the list of House members that it did include in its list of authors of bills and resolutions. Other references such as Datinguino and Olarte (2001b) and Sy Egco (2006) cited fewer members than were actually in the Congresses they studied.

in the Eighth Congress, the first after the People Power Revolution. The first two are the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Law and the Urban Development and Housing Act. The two that failed of enactment are the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act and the Fisheries Code. Chapter IV takes up where the latter two cases left off, and follows them to their successful passage into law. It also discusses the Social Reform and Poverty Alleviation Act and the Anti-Rape Law, which like the first two in this Chapter, belong to the bills under the Social Reform Agenda. Chapter V describes the fate of one set of bills introduced in 1995 but not part of the SRA – all on anti-terrorism – as well as another law passed in the Twelfth Congress (The Anti-Child Labor Law). Chapter VI presents the synthesis of the findings, and the conclusions and recommendations of the study.