

The history of reproductive health in the philippines



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

St. Jude College School of ArtScienceandEducationManila A Term Paper

Submitted as a Requirement For the Subject: Philippine Government and

Constitution Submitted By: Jim Waine C. Averilla Karissa Helene B. Salvador

Submitted To: Diosdado B. Lopega March 27, 20 HISTORY

According to the Senate Policy Brief titled Promoting ReproductiveHealth, the history of reproductive health in the Philippines dates back to 1967 when leaders of 12 countries including the Philippine's Ferdinand Marcos signed the Declaration of Population The Philippines agreed that the population problem should be considered as the principal element for long-term economic development.

Thus, the Population Commission was created to push for a lowerfamilysize norm and provide information and services to lower fertility rates. Starting 1967, the USAID started shouldering 80% of the total family planning commodities (contraceptives) of the country, which amounted to US\$ 3 Million annually. In 1975, the United States adopted as its policy the National Security Study Memorandum 200: Implications of Worldwide Population Growth for U.

S. Security and Overseas Interests (NSSM200). The policy gives " paramount importance" to population control measures and the promotion of contraception among 13 populous countries, including the Philippines to control rapid population growth which they deem to be inimical to the socio-political and economic growth of these countries and to the national interests of the United States, since the " U. S. conomy will require large and increasing amounts of minerals from abroad", and these countries can produce destabilizing opposition forces against the United States. It <https://assignbuster.com/the-history-of-reproductive-health-in-the-philippines/>

recommends the US leadership to "influence national leaders" and that "improved world-wide support for population-related efforts should be sought through increased emphasis on mass media and other population education and motivation programs by the UN, USIA, and USAID. Different presidents had different points of emphasis.

President Marcos pushed for a systematic distribution of contraceptives all over the country, a policy that was called "coercive," by its leading administrator. The Cory Aquino administration focused on giving couples the right to have the number of children they prefer, while the Ramos presidency shifted from population control to population management. Estrada used mixed methods of reducing fertility rates, while Arroyo focused on mainstreaming natural family planning, while stating that contraceptives are openly sold in the country.

In 1989, the Philippine Legislators' Committee on Population and Development (PLCPD) was established, "dedicated to the formulation of viable public policies requiring legislation on population management and socio-economic development." In 2000, the Philippines signed the Millennium Declaration and committed to attain the MDG goals by 2015, including promoting gender equality and health. In 2003, USAID started its phase out of a 33-year-old program by which free contraceptives were given to the country.

Aid recipients such as the Philippines faced the challenge to fund its own contraception program. In 2004, the Department of Health introduced the Philippines Contraceptive Self-Reliance Strategy, arranging for the replacement of these donations with domestically provided contraceptives.

<https://assignbuster.com/the-history-of-reproductive-health-in-the-philippines/>

In August 2010, the government announced a collaborative work with the USAID in implementing a comprehensive marketing and communications strategy in favor of family planning called " May Plano Sila. " Summary of criticism

Opponents of the bill argue that: (1) " The world's leading scientific experts" have resolved the issues related to the bill and show that the " RH Bill is based on wrong economics" as the 2003 Rand Corporation study shows that " there is little cross-country evidence that population growth impedes or promotes economic growth". (2) The bill takes away limited government funds from treating many high priority medical and food needs and transfers them to fund objectively harmful and deadly devices.

The latest studies in scientific journals and organizations show that the ordinary birth control pill, and the IUD are abortifacient to 100-celled human embryos: they kill the embryonic human, who as such are human beings equally worthy of respect, making the bill unconstitutional. (3) US National Defense Consultant, Lionel Tiger, has shown empirical evidence that contraceptives have deleterious social effects (abortion, premarital sex, female impoverishment, fatherless children, teenage pregnancies, and poverty).

Harvard School of Public Health scientist Edward Green observes that 'when people think they're made safe by using condoms at least some of the time, they actually engage in riskier sex', in the phenomenon called " risk compensation". There is evidence for increased risk of cancer (breast, cervical, liver) as well as significant increase of risk for heart attack and stroke for current users of oral contraceptives. The increased usage of <https://assignbuster.com/the-history-of-reproductive-health-in-the-philippines/>

contraceptives, which implies that some babies are unwanted, will eventually lead to more abortion; the correlation was shown in a scientific journal and acknowledged by pro-RH leaders, (4) People's freedom to access contraceptives is not restricted by any opposing law, being available in family planning NGOs, stores, etc. The country is not a welfare state: taxpayer's money should not be used for personal practices that are harmful and immoral; it can be used to inform people of the harm of BCPs. (5) The penal provisions constitute a violation of free choice and conscience, and establishes religious persecution.

President Aquino stated he was not an author of the bill. He also stated that he gives full support to a firm population policy, educating parents to be responsible, providing contraceptives to those who ask for them, but he refuses to promote contraceptive use. He said that his position " is more aptly called responsible parenthood rather than reproductive health. Economic and demographic premises The Philippines is the 39th most densely populated country, with a density over 335 per squared kilometer, and the population growth rate is 1. % (2010 Census), 1. 957% (2010 est. by CIA World Fact Book), or 1. 85% (2005-2010 high variant estimate by the UN Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 2008 Revision) coming from 3. 1 in 1960. The 2010 total fertility rate (TFR) is 3. 23 births per woman, from a TFR of 7 in 1960. In addition, the total fertility rate for the richest quintile of the population is 2. 0, which is about one third the TFR of the poorest quintile (5. 9 children per woman). The TFR for women with college education is 2. , about half that of women with only an elementary education (4. 5 children per woman). Congressman Lagman states that the

bill " recognizes the verifiable link between a huge population and poverty. Unbridled population growth stunts socioeconomic development and aggravates poverty. " The University of the Philippines' School of Economics presented two papers in support of the bill: Population and Poverty: the Real Score (2004), and Population, Poverty, Politics and the Reproductive Health Bill (2008).

According to these economists, which include Solita Monsod, Gerardo Sicat, Cayetano Paderanga, Ernesto M. Pernia, and Stella Alabastro-Quimbo, " rapid population growth and high fertility rates, especially among the poor, do exacerbate poverty and make it harder for the government to address it," while at the same time clarifying that it would be " extreme" to view " population growth as the principal cause of poverty that would justify the government resorting to draconian and coercive measures to deal with the problem (e. g. denial of basic services and subsidies to families with more than two children). " They illustrate the connection between rapid population growth and poverty by comparing the economic growth and population growth rates of Thailand, Indonesia, and the Philippines, wherein the first two grew more rapidly than the Philippines due to lower population growth rates. They stressed that " the experience from across Asia indicates that a population policy cum government-funded [family planning] program has been a critical complement to sound economic policy and poverty reduction".

In Population and Poverty, Aniceto Orbeta, Jr, showed that poverty incidence is higher among big families: 57. 3% of Filipino families with seven children are in poverty while only 23. 8% of families who have two children live below

the poverty threshold. Percentage of population living below poverty line (2003). Darker areas mean more poverty. Proponents argue that smaller families and wider birth intervals resulting from the use of contraceptives allow families to invest more in each child's education, health, nutrition and eventually reduce poverty and hunger at the household level.

At the national level, fertility reduction cuts the cost of social services with fewer people attending school or seeking medical care and as demand eases for housing, transportation, jobs, water, food and other natural resources. The Asian Development Bank in 2004 also listed a large population as one of the major causes of poverty in the country, together with weak macroeconomic management, employment issues, an underperforming agricultural sector and an unfinished land reform agenda, governance issues including corruption. Criticism of premises

Opponents refer to a 2003 study of Rand Corporation, which concluded that "there is little cross-country evidence that population growth impedes or promotes economic growth... population neutralism has in fact been the predominant school in thinking among academics about population growth for the last half-century." For example, the 1992 study of Ross Levine and David Renelt, which covered 119 countries over 30 years (vs UP study of 3 countries over a few years). The RAND study also said that a large population can promote growth given the right fundamentals.

Thus, they refer to the HSBC 2012 projection for 2050 that the Philippines will be 16th largest economy due to its large growing population, and those whose populations are decreasing will suffer decline. In his Primer which critiques the bill, Economist Roberto de Vera refers to Nobel prize winner <https://assignbuster.com/the-history-of-reproductive-health-in-the-philippines/>

Simon Kuznets's study which concludes that " no clear association appears to exist in the present sample of countries, or is likely to exist in other developed countries, between rates of growth of population and of product per capita. Julian Simon compared parallel countries such as North and South Korea, East and West Germany whose birthrates were practically the same but whose economic growth was entirely different due to different governance factors. De Vera says that " similar conclusions have been arrived at by the US National Research Council in 1986 and in the UN Population Fund (UNFPA) Consultative Meeting of Economists in 1992" and the studies of Hanushek and Wommann (2007), Doppelhoffer, Miller, Sala-i-Martin (2004), Ahlburg (1996), etc.

The other Nobel Prize winner who expressed the same view is Gary Becker. De Vera also states that from 1961 to 2000, as Philippine population increased almost three times, poverty decreased from 59% to 34%. He stressed that the more probable cause of poor families is not family size but the limited schooling of the household head: 78% to 90% of the poor households had heads with no high school diploma, preventing them from getting good paying jobs.

He refers to studies which show that 90% of the time the poor want the children they have: as helpers in the farm and investment for a secure old age. Instead of aiming at population decrease, De Vera stressed that the country should focus through education on cashing in on a possible " demographic dividend", a period of rapid economic growth that can happens when the labor force is growing faster than the dependents (children and elderly), thus reducing poverty significantly.

In a recent development, two authors of the Reproductive Health Bill changed their stand on the provisions of the bill regarding population and development. Reps. Emerciana de Jesus and Luzviminda Ilagan wanted to delete three provisions which state that "genderequalityand women empowerment are central elements of reproductive health and population and development," which integrate responsible parenthood and family planning programs into anti-poverty initiatives, and which name the Population Commission as a coordinating body.

The two party-list representatives strongly state that poverty is not due to over-population but because of inequality and corruption. Opponents also refer to the statement of the Federation of Free Farmers that history teaches about the economic advantages of a large population, and the disadvantages of a smaller population. The Wall Street Journal in July 2012 said that Aquino's " promotion of a 'reproductive health' bill is jarring" since it could lead to " a demographic trap of too few workers.

The Philippines doesn't have too many people, it has too few pro-growth policies. " Opposing the bill, FormerFinanceSecretary Roberto de Ocampo wrote that it is " truly disingenuous for anyone to proceed on the premise that the poor are to blame for the nation's poverty. " He emphasized that the government should apply the principle of first things first and focus on the root causes of the poverty (e. g. poor governance, corruption) and apply many other alternatives to solve the problem (e. g. giving up pork barrel, raising tax collection efficiency).

They also point to the five factors for high economic growth and reduction of poverty shown by the 2008 Commission on Growth and Development
<https://assignbuster.com/the-history-of-reproductive-health-in-the-philippines/>

headed by Nobel prize winner Michael Spence, which does not include population control. Status Legislature On 31 January 2011, six different bills were consolidated into a single RH Bill which was then unanimously approved for plenary debate by the House Committee on Population and Family Relations. On 7 February 2011, the bill was scheduled to go before the House Appropriations Committee. 6 February 2011 the bill was endorsed by the House Appropriations Committee with amendment and referred back to the Population Committee for finalizing the language. President and Cabinet President Noynoy Aquino during the presidential campaign said that it confounds him why he is always associated with the RH Bill and reiterated that he is neither an author nor a co-author, much less did he sign the committee report regarding the bill. He said that " he will fully support the crafting of a firm policy that will address the serious problem on population. At the same time, Aquino said that " artificial contraception was a matter of choice and conscience and that health professionals who fool people into using artificial contraceptives should be penalized. As a Catholic, Aquino said he himself was not promoting artificial contraception but believes that the government should be able to provide it to Filipinos who ask for it. " Aquino stressed: " I'm a Catholic, I'm not promoting it. My position is more aptly called responsible parenthood rather than reproductive health.

According to Rina Jimenez David who is pro-RH, during the " Women Deliver Philippines" Conference held September 2010, Dinky Soliman, Aquino's Secretary of Social Welfare and Development, said that " choice and access" constituted the keystone of the Aquino government's policy, reiterating the administration's support for the pending reproductive health bills. On

December 2010, the Cabinet and the CBCP agreed to have a joint campaign providing full information on the advantages and risks of contraceptives, natural and artificial family planning and responsible parenthood.

They have established a technical working group for this purpose. They also agreed that government will not be an "instrument to enforce or violate the conscience of the people about these issues." However, by April 2011 the President has given his full support to the entire RH Bill in a speech at the University of the Philippines and promised to push for its passage even at the "risk of excommunication." **Compromise and alternatives**

Senate President Juan Ponce Enrile, Congressman Roilo Golez and Buhay party-list separately filed bills that seek to restrict abortion and birth control use. These bills have been seen either as a nullification of the RH Bill, its alternative, or as a way of achieving unity among the populace, since the RH Bill proponents have stated their concern in preventing abortion. Presidential candidate Gilbert Teodoro or Gibo suggested a cash transfer from the government to individuals wanting access to family planning methods, whether natural or artificial.

The individuals can then make use of the cash they receive to purchase birth control devices they may choose, thus guaranteeing freedom of choice. The Loyola School of Theology and the John J. Carroll Institute on State and Church Issues issued 9 "Talking Points" on the RH Bill. Among other points, they proposed a study on the meaning of conception in the Constitution, and if it means fertilization, abortifacients "are to be banned even now and regardless of whether the RH Bill is passed".

They also proposed " parallel programs for providing information and training, one for Natural Family Planning (NFP) and another for artificial methods of family planning". Columnist Jose Sison of the Philippine Star criticized this: " a Catholic School of theology has actually proposed in public, the use of tax payers' money to train Filipinos to employ methods that are objectively and intrinsically evil" and cites " empirical evidence and scientific proofs confirming the harmful and evil effects of contraceptives to individuals and to society. " Recent events

In September 2010, Aquino during this visit to the US reiterated his stand that he is in favor of responsible parenthood and respects the decision of each couple as to the number of children they want, and if they need the government support for contraception, then the government will provide it. This statement has created a furor as Catholic church leaders say that Aquino has sold out the Filipino soul in exchange for some " measly" aid from the United States. The President of the Catholic Bishops Conference said that there can possibly be an excommunication of the President if he continues on with his stance.

Pro RH Bill Senators encouraged the President to be steadfast to do his duties towards the state. The President's spokesperson Edwin Lacierda explained that the President " has not changed his stand" and is reaching out to the prelates and said that the President himself has not made any decision in support of the Reproductive Health Bill as he is still studying the document. Lacierda said that the Executive Branch " is not involved in the passage of the RH bill, saying the measure's fate rests solely on the legislative branch. "

Filipino Freethinkers, an association of agnostics, atheists, progressives, etc. , who have been very active in the fight in favor of the RH bill, stepped up the pressure, creating more controversy that fired up renewed interest in the bill on both sides. On 30 September 2010, one of the freethinkers, Carlos Celdran staged a protest action against the Catholic Church, holding a sign which read " DAMASO" - a reference to the villainous, corrupt clergyman Father Damaso of the novel Noli Me Tangere by Filipino revolutionary writer Jose Rizal- and shouting " stop getting involved in politics! A fan page, Free Carlos Celdran was created in Facebook, which generated 23, 808 fans in 24 hours. Francisco Montalvan of the Inquirer said that in the end the Damasos are the scheming, corrupt and deceptive people, implying that the " pro-death advocates" are these, while the Cardinal Rosales who started a nationwide fund for the poor is very far from Damaso. Meanwhile, the Imam Council of the Philippines, the top leaders of the Moslem population which at 4. M constitutes 5% of the Philippine population, declared that they are against contraceptives since using them " underestimates God," and " makes one lose morality in the process. " During the first public hearing on 24 Nov, the chair of the Committee on Population handling the bill said that there is no instruction from the Speaker of the House to expedite the bill. Upon the call of anti-RH congressmen, the Committee Chair decided to refer the bill also to the Committee on Health, since the bill is about Reproductive Health.

Leader of the pro-RH group, Elizabeth Ansico, said that the bill is doomed if it is referred to the Committee on Health. Anti-RH Deputy Speaker Congressman Pablo Garcia said the members of the Committee on Health know of the WHO announcement on the carcinogenicity of combined

estrogen-progestogen oral contraceptives. House Speaker Belmonte said that Congress is not likely to rush the legislation of the bill and will tackle it in plenary early next year. Belmonte said it is better that highly contentious bills be given more attention.

On 3 December, the Senate cut the proposed budget of P 880M for contraceptives down to P 8M for condoms since other contraceptives violated the Constitution's ban on abortifacients, and Senator Tito Sotto III said that his constituents never asked for contraceptives. On 27 July 2012, the Speaker of the House decided to put to a vote by 7 August 2012 whether the debates have to be terminated. In response, pro-life groups and the Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines have decided to call for a "Prayer Power Rally", on 4 August 2012 at the historic Edsa Shrine.

Meanwhile, 6 co-authors of the bill withdrew support, with the head of the minority group of the house declaring that 8 of their group are withdrawing their previous support for the bill. Congressional approval and presidential assent At 3 in the morning on December 13, 2012, the House of Representatives voted on second reading in favor of the bill with 113-109, while five representatives abstained. In the upper house, the Senate voted on December 18, 2012 to pass the bill on second reading with 13-8, while Senators Sergio Osmeña, III and Lito Lapid were absent.

On the same day, both houses passed the bill on the third and final reading. Members of the House of Representatives voted 133-79, while seven representatives abstained. The Senate registered 13-8, the same result as the second reading. On December 19, 2012, both versions of the bill were passed to the Bicameral Committee to produce a final version to be signed <https://assignbuster.com/the-history-of-reproductive-health-in-the-philippines/>

by the President Aquino. The committee quickly passed the bill in just one session.

It was transmitted back to the House of Representatives and the Senate, which both ratified the bill, with the Senate voting 11-5 in favor of ratification, and the House of Representatives voting via voice vote. On December 21, 2012, President Aquino signed the bill into law, codifying the bill as Republic Act No. 10354, otherwise known as the "Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act of 2012". News of the signing was announced by House Majority Leader Neptali Gonzales II on December 28, 2012. Reactions Averilla, Jim Waine C.

Philippine Government & Constitution I used to support the RH bill. But finding out the truth behind it, neither would you. I believe this law will put the Filipinos at risk of extinction because at its very core, the RH law is an extension of a secret, global conspiracy, a western attempt, to apply principles of eugenics on unsuspecting, inferior populations in order to prevent them from the human evolutionary process, at the end of which would, at the highest point, call forth the "master race". The truth is in our hearts, we just have to listen to it.

At first my interpretation of the RH bill led me to think that it was just a bill meant to help educate the uninformed about ways to prevent them from fornicating their way to a very bad financial situation. My ignorant mind devised some simple points as to why the RH Bill was right. I thought: 1. Minimum wage of a non-agricultural Filipino worker is P404. 2. If there were 20 working days in a month, the average minimum wage earning Filipino

would earn around P8000 a month. 3. In average that person ate food on a regular basis, he will spend about around P70/day on food.

There are 20 days in a month, so I guess that would equal to P2100 a month.

4. But if this person had a partner, he might want to feed her too. Feeding her would cost another P2100 a month. 5. $P8000 - P4200 = P3800$ 6. If this person and his wife rented a home, or used electricity and bathed from time to time, the amount left from his salary would be significantly reduced. Lets say their utility bills and rent amounted to P1800 7. $P3800 - P1800 = P2000$ 8. P2000 is a lot of money, but I don't think they should have more than 3 children right?

Babies need milk, diapers, toys, immunity injections, baby medicine, etc... 9. From this let's deduce that babies cost money. If babies cost money, I theorized that having more babies would cost more money. And from this data, I see that a person who spent a lot of money on children, but I didn't earn a lot of money, would soon be broke and unable to provide for both himself and his children. Another word for broke situation is poverty. 10. I believe that a person can avoid being poor by making less babies. So, I thought that steps should be taken to inform people about this very little known fact.

I also thought that the government should make contraceptives accessible so that people who don't earn a lot can properly manage the little resources that they have. That's why I supported the RH Bill. But now I know that I was wrong. I believe that the issue of the RH Bill is not a religious issue. " The RH Bill is wrong because it assumes that the Philippines is overpopulated. " -I agree. I, myself, have observed that the Philippines is not overpopulated. In <https://assignbuster.com/the-history-of-reproductive-health-in-the-philippines/>

fact, if you use your common sense and think about it, you will realize a few things: 1. We are not overpopulated!

Look at the mountains, the jungles, the caves and the ocean floor. There are no people there! 2. If we were really overpopulated, we would have trouble traveling. But if you go to EDSA, there's no traffic. When you ride the MRT, it's not packed with people. 3. Students in public schools are well educated because the teacher to student ratio is very low. In fact, because of our low population the government can basically guarantee that all public school students are provided books, notebooks and other school supplies. " The RH Bill is wrong because it assumes that contraceptives are good for mankind and women. 1. I agree, the RH Bill/Law is not good for women because it might draw a woman away from her one, true, universal purpose - the uninterrupted production of healthy babies 2. Furthermore, the role of women in society and the universe is to make babies. That's why God made women. That's their sole purpose in life. They're not good for anything else. Ever wonder why there are no women in the clergy? Because they're not good enough. 3. Contraceptives would allow women to enjoy the benefits of physical intimacy while maintaining a successful and productive career, if she so chooses.

That is so wrong. Only men should be able to enjoy that privilege. 4. Women should get pregnant every single time they have sex and only immoral women enjoy sex without the possibility of conception. In fact, a better alternative would be for women, in general, to follow the example made by Mother Mary - to learn how to conceive without having sex. " The RH Bill/Law will put Filipinos at risk of extinction! " 1. Population decline is just bad for

nations. Just look at the countries which have a declining population - Italy, Japan and Singapore. They're in such a bad shape.

The Philippines obviously has a better economy and has a higher literacy rate than these countries. In fact, many Italians, Japanese, and Singaporeans go to the Philippines for work. That only goes to show that a decline in population is bad for the economy. " Our population is our biggest asset! " 1. In my opinion, people should make as many babies as they can because the population is not a problem. In fact, the more babies a person has, the more assets he has. Forget real estate properties, stock investments, or Jollibee franchises. The real secret to increased wealth is babies. 2.

If you have 15 babies, you're practically wealthy because babies are assets 3. If you need money, you can sell them 4. If you can keep them alive until they can walk, they can one day beg for money in the streets - they're going to have to anyway because there's no way in hell you'll be able to provide for all of them on your own 5. If ever a person is not able to feed the 15 babies he made, it's the government's fault, because it's the government's sole responsibility to make sure that every Filipino baby is fed. 6. The best way a person can contribute to this country is to contribute to its population. The RH Bill/Law is wrong because it assumes that reproductive education and contraceptives will effectively reduce cases of abortion. " 1. Reproductive/contraceptive education will have no effect on the number of abortion cases. In my opinion, these abortion cases will not lessen because women will continue to have abortions regardless of whether they are pregnant or not. 2. Abortions cannot be prevented. It's just something that women naturally do. Like shopping, for example. " The RH Bill/Law is wrong

because it will make people participate in extra-marital and pre-marital sex. " 1.

The RH Bill/Law will practically encourage our people to engage in immoral activities. 2. We must protect our moral values and reject the RH Bill. Because, currently, not a single Filipino engages in pre-marital sex or extra-marital sex. Well at least this is what we believe until to this day. 3. The root cause of extra-marital and pre-marital sex is one's exposure to contraceptives. There is just something in contraceptives that people find very arousing. 4. In western countries, men lure strange women into bed by shown those condoms. 5. If we ban condoms, absolutely no one would engage in premarital or extra-marital sex. The RH Bill/Law is wrong because it assumes that parents don't teach their children about sex. " 1. The truth is that parents talk to their children about sex all the time. It's so not awkward. The dad usually tells his children how he takes off all his clothes, does a sexy Tiger growl and makes sweet, sweetmusicwith their mother's body. 2. Also, a father usually advises his daughter that if she's going to have sex with her boyfriend, she should use a condom. Sometimes the father even drives the daughter to the boyfriend's house and waits for the couple to finish 3.

Filipino daughters don't have sex without the father's permission. Unwanted pregnancies or teen pregnancies never happen to Filipino girls. That's why we do not need the RH Law " The RH Bill is a conspiracy. " It's all lies, all lies Salvador, Karissa Helene Philippine Government & Constitution It is very much unfortunate, disappointing, and alarming that nobody in the mainstream media talks about the negative, unintended consequences of

the fascist Reproductive Health bill, now called Responsible Parenthood bill, on the country's business sector, particularly small businesses.

I reject this legislative proposal primarily because it's anti-reason, anti-individualism, and anti-capitalism. In other words it is against individual rights, liberty and economic freedom. This is just one of the many aspects of the bill- that it can negatively impact the country's industry, particularly small business establishments that employ millions of professionals and skilled and even unskilled workers. Let's take a small cafeteria, canteen, or publishing house near your place. Think about the small establishments and bar and restaurant stools in malls and many places in the metro.

These small businesses that put two to ten or so people will be one of the main targets of the RH bill supported by some misguided, mediocre hippies who are mostly schooled and professionals. Yet nobody wants to talk about this issue. It's as if these pro-RH bill hippies and fanatics think that wealth is created by wishful thinking, that is, by simply passing an intrusive, rights-violating bill purportedly designed to help the poor and women. What these anti-population and pro-regulation advocates don't know is that the proposed legislative measure is itself a big insult to the poor and women.

It is anti-poor and anti-women. The RH bill is a big insult to the poor because it treats them as dependent, parasites, worthless, or a leech who simply rely on other people's extorted money or alms. Authors of the consolidated bill argue that one of the principal objectives of their highly moderate, anti-intellectual measure is to " help reduce poverty and achieve sustainable human development. " Still, what these political idiots do not and refuse to

understand is that the government has no financial capability to deliver the promises of their measure because it is already bankrupt.

The government, which is the worst parasite in this country, is not a productive agency or entity. It can only deliver some of the promised public services by using state force, like taxation, regulation, and forcible immolation of some social sectors like businessmen and health care providers. The consolidated RH law is a huge insult to women- and this is what statistician does not understand - because it considers them as inferior, ignorant, weak, having no mental, physical and emotional capability to decide on her own and to protect herself.

It treats women as ignorant and weak because the law's advocates believe that they need to pass a highly intrusive, unconstitutional legislative proposal to provide them the information and services they need. Also, the proposal is a big insult to every Filipino family because it treats parents as irresponsible, ignorant, weak, lazy, and having no capacity to make informed, responsible family decisions. It is stated that the law's primary goal is to " help give parents the opportunity to exercise their right to freely and responsibly plan the number and spacing of their children. That's the other way of saying that Filipino parents are not free and badly need the help and assistance of the state so to " responsibly plan the number and spacing of their children. " The bill's highly mediocre and ignorant explanatory note adds: " The bill is truly rights-based. It mandates the provision of all forms of family planning, both modern natural and artificial, to women and couples as long as they are legal and medically-safe, and truly effective. However, the acceptance and adoption is the option and decision

of parents and couple, particularly women. If that's the case, why is there a need to pass the bill? The answer is because this is not what the bill is all about. In truth and in reality, it is about more political power! It's about putting the entire business industry, medical profession and education sector under the total control and supervision of the state. In general, the bill is a BIG INSULT to the entire Filipino nation that has somehow embraced rational principles and the concept of freedom and individual rights. Those who ignorantly, naively take the consolidated bill at its face value will certainly accept the contradictory slogans.

There are two sides of the consolidated bill: the fantasy side and the reality side. The measure's fantasy side can be readily gleaned from its highly ignorant explanatory note, which is filled with supportive statistics and some tragic information about the plight of the poor and women. They did not state how except the fact that they enumerated the bill's nice-to-hear intents and provisions. The reality side of the measure is that all those promised, stated RH services would be covered or delivered by sacrificing, enslaving employers and health care providers.

Section 18 states: Employers' Responsibilities- The Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) shall ensure that employers respect the reproductive rights of workers. Consistent with the intent of Article 134 of the Labor Code, employers with more than two hundred (200) employees shall provide reproductive health services to all employees in their own respective health facilities. Those with less than two hundred (200) workers shall enter into partnerships with hospitals, health facilities, or health professionals in their areas for the delivery of reproductive health services.

Employers shall furnish in writing the following information to all employees and applicants: (a) The medical and health benefits which workers are entitled to, including maternity and paternity leave benefits and the availability of family planning services; (b) The reproductive health hazards associated with work, including hazards that may affect their reproductive functions especially pregnant women; and (c) The availability of health facilities for workers.

What does this section mean? Section 17 details the bill's horrible fantastic scheme. So once the fascist bill is approved, any potential or aspiring employer would be covered by it, which means that he/she would be legally regarded as an indirect government employee. The employers or companies who have the capacity (with more than 200 employees) would be mandated by law to " provide reproductive health services to all employees in their own respective health facilities. This provision means that those employers and companies with more than 200 employees need to have their own " health facilities", and this means additional expenses on the part of job-creators. On the other hand, employers with less than 200 employees shall enter into " partnerships with hospitals, health facilities, and/or health professionals in their areas for the delivery of reproductive health services. " Logic tells us that since employers and companies would be legally required to shoulder additional expenses, then they are justified to increase the prices of their products and/or services.

Does anyone think of PRICE CONTROL? The state control of the entire medical industry is laid out under Sections 20 (Implementing Mechanisms) and 22(1) on prohibited acts. The penalty that awaits erring, non-compliant

employers and health care providers could be imprisonment ranging from one (1) month to six months or fine of P10, 000 to P50, 000 or both. This means that any employer may be sued by his/her employees for non-compliant with the intents and provisions of the bill.

Once the RH bill is approved, anyone who thinks of starting a business, whether big or small, should consider the measure's punitive provisions, some necessary expenses, and the need to deal with government regulators. In the United States, hundreds companies left the Democratic-infested California because of the state's too much regulations and anti-business policies. This is why I have been telling my blog readers that the bill is NOT simply about serving the alleged interests of the poor and women; it is PRIMARILY about MORE GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS.

The bill is about nanny statism or BIG GOVERNMENT. Already, many foreign investors do not want to invest in the Philippines because of its high tax rates, excessive economic regulations, pro-employee labor courts, leftist-activist court justices, among others. The Doingbusiness. orgrecently ranked Philippines 148th in terms of ease in doing business and 156th in terms of starting business. In terms of paying taxes, the country has been ranked 124th. Corporations pay a total tax rate (% profit) of 45. 8 percent! If approved, the RH bill would have the following negative impacts on small business: . It would be more difficult to start a new business considering the fact the the bill criminalizes the mere act of doing business and its regulative, interventionist provisions. 2. Employers would be forced to make additional expenses so to cover the RH care needs of their employees. 3. Since they are forced to make additional expenses, they might consider

<https://assignbuster.com/the-history-of-reproductive-health-in-the-philippines/>

laying off some of their workers for survival. 4. Since they are forced to shell out additional expenses, they might not accept new applicants, a situation that would worsen the country's unemployment rate. . Since they are forced to shell out additional expenses, they might consider some of the following survival measure: 1) salary cut, 2) less bonus or benefits, 3) cost cutting, 4) no expansion, 5) close business. 6. Since they are forced to shell out additional expenses, they might consider PRICE INCREASE. 7. There would be more informal sectors (unlisted, unregistered businesses) so to avoid paying more taxes and complying with government regulations. 8. Potential and existing employers would be considered a NEW CLASS OF CRIMINALS or ENEMY OF SOCIAL JUSTICE. . Those who have the money and resources would rather invest in a business-friendly economic environment like Hong Kong, India and other Asian countries. 10. Employers would simply shrug. You can help the poor without enslaving and treating businessmen, doctors and some other people as potential criminals or enemies of social progress. Think like a human being, not like a parasite! You don't help the poor and the marginalized by supporting the RH bill; it's both the big and small businesses that can truly help them!