



Congressional Record

PLENARY PROCEEDINGS OF THE 17th CONGRESS, FIRST REGULAR SESSION
House of Representatives

Vol. 3

Tuesday, January 24, 2017

No. 61

CALL TO ORDER

At 4:00 p.m., Deputy Speaker Mercedes K. Alvarez called the session to order.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The session is now called to order.

NATIONAL ANTHEM

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Everybody is requested to rise for the singing of the Philippine National Anthem.

Everybody rose to sing the Philippine National Anthem.

PRAYER

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Please remain standing for a minute of silent prayer.

Everybody remained standing for the silent prayer.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. CRISOLOGO. Mme. Speaker, I move that we defer the calling of the roll.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The calling of the roll is deferred.

REP. CRISOLOGO. Mme. Speaker, I move that we defer the approval of Journal No. 60.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The approval of the Journal of the previous session is deferred.

REP. CRISOLOGO. Mme. Speaker, I move that we now proceed to the Reference of Business.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Secretary General will please read the Reference of Business.

REFERENCE OF BUSINESS

The Secretary General read the following House Bills and Resolutions on First Reading, and Committee Reports, and the Deputy Speaker made the corresponding references:

BILLS ON FIRST READING

House Bill No. 4777, entitled:

“AN ACT SEPARATING THE MUÑOZ NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL - RIZAL ANNEX IN BARANGAY RIZAL, SCIENCE CITY OF MUÑOZ, PROVINCE OF NUEVA ECIJA FROM THE MUÑOZ NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL, CONVERTING IT INTO AN INDEPENDENT NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TO BE KNOWN AS SCIENCE CITY OF MUÑOZ NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

By Representative Violago
TO THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION
AND CULTURE

House Bill No. 4778, entitled:

“AN ACT CREATING A SEPARATE ENGINEERING DISTRICT IN THE CITY OF BATANGAS AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

By Representative Mariño
TO THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
AND HIGHWAYS

House Bill No. 4779, entitled:

“AN ACT REMOVING THE RESTRICTIONS

UNDER SECTIONS 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, AND 123 OF COMMONWEALTH ACT NO. 141, AS AMENDED, ON FREE PATENTS ISSUED UNDER SECTION 44 THEREOF”

By Representative Del Rosario
TO THE COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE

House Bill No. 4780, entitled:

“AN ACT PROHIBITING THE USE OF THE WORD LANAO TO GENERALIZE THE AREA IN THE PROVINCES OF LANAO DEL NORTE, LANAO DEL SUR AND ILIGAN CITY IN MASS MEDIA AND PROVIDING PENALTIES THEREFOR”

By Representative Dimaporo (M.)
TO THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC INFORMATION

House Bill No. 4781, entitled:

“AN ACT INSTITUTIONALIZING MADRASAH IN THE BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM AND AMENDING CERTAIN SECTIONS OF REPUBLIC ACT NO. 9155 OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATION ACT OF 2001”

By Representative Dimaporo (M.)
TO THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION AND CULTURE

House Bill No. 4783, entitled:

“AN ACT DESIGNATING THE PHILIPPINE NATIONAL PERFORMING ARTS COMPANIES, DEFINING THEIR ROLES AND FUNCTIONS, AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

By Representative Salceda
TO THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION AND CULTURE

House Bill No. 4784, entitled:

“AN ACT STRENGTHENING THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MUSLIM FILIPINOS AND AMENDING CERTAIN SECTIONS OF REPUBLIC ACT NO. 9997 OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MUSLIM FILIPINOS ACT OF 2009”

By Representative Dimaporo (M.)
TO THE COMMITTEE ON MUSLIM AFFAIRS

House Bill No. 4785, entitled:

“AN ACT PROVIDING FOR A COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR REGULATION, CREATING FOR THE PURPOSE, THE PHILIPPINE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION, AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

By Representative Macapagal-Arroyo
TO THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION AND THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

House Bill No. 4786, entitled:

“AN ACT AMENDING REPUBLIC ACT NUMBER 9160, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING ACT OF 2001, AS AMENDED BY REPUBLIC ACT NUMBERS 9194, 10167 AND 10365, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES”

By Representative Gonzales (A.D.)
TO THE COMMITTEE ON BANKS AND FINANCIAL INTERMEDIARIES

House Bill No. 4787, entitled:

“AN ACT FURTHER AMENDING COMMONWEALTH ACT NO. 146 OR THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT, AS AMENDED”

By Representatives Belmonte (F.) and Belmonte (J.)
TO THE COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

House Bill No. 4788, entitled:

“AN ACT PROHIBITING THE PUBLIC DISPLAY OF PERSONS ARRESTED, ACCUSED OR UNDER CUSTODIAL INVESTIGATION IN A DEGRADING MANNER, AND AMENDING REPUBLIC ACT NO. 7438, ENTITLED AN ACT DEFINING CERTAIN RIGHTS OF PERSONS ARRESTED, DETAINED OR UNDER CUSTODIAL INVESTIGATION AS WELL AS THE DUTIES OF THE ARRESTING, DETAINING, AND INVESTIGATING OFFICERS AND PROVIDING PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS THEREOF ”

By Representative Belmonte (J.)
TO THE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

House Bill No. 4789, entitled:

“AN ACT AMENDING REPUBLIC ACT NO. 10871, ENTITLED AN ACT REQUIRING BASIC EDUCATION STUDENTS TO UNDERGO CARDIOPULMONARY RESUSCITATION (CPR) TRAINING, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES”

By Representative Gomez
TO THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION AND CULTURE

House Bill No. 4790, entitled:

“AN ACT AMENDING CERTAIN SECTIONS OF REPUBLIC ACT NO. 9184, OTHERWISE

KNOWN AS THE GOVERNMENT
PROCUREMENT REFORM ACT”

By Representative Macapagal-Arroyo
TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

House Bill No. 4791, entitled:

“AN ACT CREATING A CRIMINAL JUSTICE
REFORM COMMISSION CHARGED WITH
THE INVESTIGATION AND PREVENTION
OF WRONGFUL CONVICTIONS”

By Representative Mariño
TO THE COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE

House Bill No. 4792, entitled:

“AN ACT PROHIBITING BUSINESS
E S T A B L I S H M E N T S F R O M
ACCOMMODATING TRUANTS DURING
SCHOOL HOURS”

By Representative Ocampo
TO THE COMMITTEE ON TRADE AND
INDUSTRY

House Bill No. 4793, entitled:

“AN ACT TO INSTITUTE A MECHANISM
FOR THE EFFECTIVE EVALUATION,
PROMOTION AND RECOMMENDATION
OF FUNDING FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE
PROGRAMS THAT AIM TO REDUCE THE
RATE OF TEENAGE PREGNANCY”

By Representative Ocampo
TO THE COMMITTEE ON WOMEN AND
GENDER EQUALITY

RESOLUTIONS

House Resolution No. 695, entitled:

“A RESOLUTION CONVEYING THE
CONDOLENCES OF THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES TO THE FAMILY OF
FORMER MANILA MAYOR, FORMER
MANILA CONGRESSMAN, AND FORMER
CHAIRMAN OF THE PHILIPPINE SPORTS
COMMISSION (PSC), HONORABLE
GEMILIANO MEL C. LOPEZ, JR.”

By Representative Bataoil
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

House Resolution No. 697, entitled:

“A RESOLUTION OF THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES EXPRESSING
PROFOUND CONDOLENCES TO THE
FAMILIES OF THE VICTIMS IN THE
BOMBING ATTACK IN ISTANBUL,
TURKEY”

By Representative Olivarez
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

House Resolution No. 698, entitled:

“A RESOLUTION OF THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES EXPRESSING
DEEPEST SYMPATHY ON THE VICTIMS
OF DEADLY FLOOD IN SOUTHERN
THAILAND”

By Representative Olivarez
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

House Resolution No. 699, entitled:

“RESOLUTION COMMENDING MR. EROS
VINCENT GATCHALIAN BALUYOT
OF ATOS JIU JITSU PHILIPPINES FOR
WINNING TWO (2) GOLD MEDALS IN
THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES JIU JITSU
ABU DHABI GRAND SLAM HELD ON
JANUARY 13 TO 14, 2017 AT IPIC ARENA,
ABU DHABI, UNITED ARAB EMIRATES”

By Representative Cortuna
TO THE COMMITTEE ON YOUTH AND
SPORTS DEVELOPMENT

House Resolution No. 700, entitled:

“A RESOLUTION OF THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES COMMENDING AND
CONGRATULATING MR. EROS BALUYOT
FOR WINNING (2) GOLD MEDALS IN
THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES JIU JITSU
GRAND SLAM COMPETITION”

By Representative Olivarez
TO THE COMMITTEE ON YOUTH AND
SPORTS DEVELOPMENT

House Resolution No. 701, entitled:

“RESOLUTION URGING MEMBERS OF
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TO DONATE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE
TO THE VICTIMS OF TYPHOON NINA
(NOCK-TEN)”

By Representative Belmonte (J.)
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

House Resolution No. 702, entitled:

“RESOLUTION ORGANIZING
THE PHILIPPINES-ROMANIA
PARLIAMENTARIANS’ FRIENDSHIP
SOCIETY”

By Representative Macapagal-Arroyo
TO THE COMMITTEE ON INTER-
PARLIAMENTARY RELATIONS AND
DIPLOMACY

House Resolution No. 703, entitled:

“A RESOLUTION CONGRATULATING AND
COMMENDING EDUARD FOLAYANG
FOR WINNING THE ONE CHAMPIONSHIP

LIGHTWEIGHT TITLE AT ONE
CHAMPIONSHIP: DEFENDING HONOR ON
NOVEMBER 11, 2016 IN SINGAPORE”

By Representative Nieto

TO THE COMMITTEE ON YOUTH AND
SPORTS DEVELOPMENT

ADDITIONAL COAUTHORS

Rep. Manuel Jose “Mannix” M. Dalipe for House
Bills No. 72, 73, 577, 918, 4128, 4521, and 4689;

Rep. Carlos Isagani T. Zarate for House Bill No.
3398;

Rep. Angelina “Helen” D.L. Tan, M.D. for House
Bill No. 473;

Reps. Jesulito A. Manalo, Ma. Theresa V. Collantes,
Lorna P. Bautista-Bandigan, Mark O. Go, Raneo
“Ranie” E. Abu, Rolando “Klaxex” A. Uy, Carmelo
“Jon” B. Lazatin II, and Jericho Jonas B. Nograles for
House Bill No. 4105;

Reps. Wilter “Sharky” Wee Palma II, Arnel M.
Cerafica, Mario Vittorio “Marvey” A. Mariño, Rodante
D. Marcoleta, Jose “Pingping” I. Tejada, and Abraham
“Bambol” N. Tolentino for House Bill No. 4689;

Rep. Victoria Isabel G. Noel for House Bills No.
1469, 2816, and 3254;

Rep. Tom S. Villarin for House Bill No. 449;

Rep. Rodel M. Batocabe for House Bills No. 247,
248, 249, 250, 251, and 4521;

Rep. Abdullah D. Dimaporo for House Bill No.
4784;

Rep. Harlin Neil J. Abayon III for House Resolution
No. 693;

Rep. Leopoldo N. Bataoil for House Bills No. 4136,
4302, 4342, and 4343;

Rep. Cecilia Leonila V. Chavez for House Bill No.
555;

Rep. Dale “Along” R. Malapitan for House Bills
No. 559 and 1041;

Rep. Scott Davies S. Lanete, M.D. for House Bill
No. 3967;

Rep. Celso L. Lobregat for House Bill No. 3752;

Rep. Lawrence H. Fortun for House Bill No.
3924;

Rep. Jose Antonio “Kuya Jonathan” R. Sy-Alvarado
for House Bills No. 42, 4211, 4212, 4397, 4508, 4530,
4597, 4629, 4684, 4685, 4695, and 4697;

Rep. John Marvin “Yul Servo” C. Nieto for House
Bills No. 4211 and 4212;

Rep. Christopher “Toff” Vera Perez De Venecia for
House Bill No. 4212;

Rep. Gus S. Tambunting for House Bills No. 662,
914, 915, 1577, 1767, 1813, 1823, 1824, 1827, 1829,
2005, 2635, 2637, 2641, 2643, 2649, and 2937;

Rep. Luis Raymund F. Villafuerte Jr. for House
Bills No. 287 and 4174;

Rep. Carmelo “Jon” B. Lazatin II for House Bill
No. 4697;

Rep. Cristina “Chiqui” Roa-Puno for House Bills
No. 262 and 264;

Rep. Carlos Roman L. Uybarreta for House Bill
No. 642;

Rep. Rico B. Geron for House Bills No. 3113, 3234,
3543, 3708, 3709, 4153, 4154, and 4155;

Rep. Jose T. Panganiban Jr., CPA, LLB. for House
Bills No. 1858, 4174, and 4689;

Rep. Gavini “Apol” C. Pancho for House Bill No.
4056;

Rep. Aurelio “Dong” D. Gonzales Jr. for House
Bill No. 2247;

Rep. Sherwin N. Tugna for House Bill No. 813;

Rep. Alfredo A. Garbin Jr. for House Bill No. 440;

Rep. Pantaleon D. Alvarez for House Resolution
No. 708;

Rep. Antonio L. Tinio for House Resolution No.
470; and

Rep. Raul V. Del Mar for House Bill No. 4113.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Report by the Committee on Ways and Means
(Committee Report No. 56), re H.B. No. 4814,
entitled:

“AN ACT GRANTING AMNESTY IN THE
PAYMENT OF ESTATE TAX”

recommending its approval in substitution of House
Bills Numbered 1889 and 3010

Sponsors: Representatives Cua, Defensor and
Quimbo

TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Report by the Committee on Ways and Means (Committee
Report No. 57), re H.B. No. 4815, entitled:

“AN ACT SIMPLIFYING THE ESTATE TAX
RATE AMENDING FOR THE PURPOSE
SECTION 84 OF THE NATIONAL
INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1997, AS
AMENDED”

recommending its approval in substitution of House
Bills Numbered 458, 511, 3311, 3528, 3794
and 4394

Sponsors: Representatives Cua, Manalo, Barbers,
Uy, Tan (A.), Ocampo and Escudero

TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The
Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, I move that
we acknowledge the presence of the following guests and
individuals: Lieutenant Erik Lloyd from the Las Vegas
Metropolitan Police Department of Las Vegas, Nevada;

and Minddie Magno Lloyd, co-founder and chairperson of Bamboo Bridges Organization, Asia-Pacific American Community of Las Vegas, Nevada, the guests of the Hon. Eugene Michael B. De Vera, Representative, ABS Party-List.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Welcome to the House of Representatives. (*Applause*)

PRIVILEGE HOUR

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move that we open the Privilege Hour.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the Privilege Hour is declared.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, I now move that we recognize the Gentleman from Party-List ANAKPAWIS, the Hon. Ariel “Ka Ayik” B. Casilao, to avail of the Privilege Hour.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Hon. Ariel Casilao of ANAKPAWIS Party-List is hereby recognized for his privilege speech.

PRIVILEGE SPEECH OF REP. CASILAO

REP. CASILAO. Thank you, Mme. Speaker, Floor Leader.

Magandang hapon sa lahat. Maayong hapon sa inyong tanan.

Honorable Speaker, mga kasamang Mambabatas, magandang hapon. I am here today as a fulfillment of my mandate to echo the cries of the marginalized and on this particular occasion, the Mindanao farmers. Kabahagi pa rin ng paggunita ng ika-30 anibersaryo ng Mendiola massacre na naganap noong January 22, 1987, gayundin bilang suporta sa ika-0 pang-apat na araw na nagaganap na peace talks sa third round sa pagitan ng gobyernong Republika ng Pilipinas at ng National Democratic Front of the Philippines sa Rome, Italy. Libu-libong magsasaka at katutubong Lumad mula sa Davao Region at SOCCSKSARGEN, sa pangunguna ng Kilusang Magbubukid ng Pilipinas-Southern Mindanao Region at KMP-SOCCSKSARGEN Chapter, ang maglulunsad ng mga pagkilos upang ipanawagan ang lupa, hustisya at pagkain mula Enero 25 hanggang Enero 27 ngayong taon sa iba’t ibang sentro at highway ng dalawang rehiyon. Sana ay nabalitaan na ng mga kasamahan ko sa Kongreso na sa second half ng 2016 ay tuloy-tuloy ang mga kilos-protesta ng mga magsasaka, na karaniwang bilang pagtatambol ng panawagang tunay na reporma sa lupa at pagtatanggol ng kanilang karapatan sa lupa.

Noong Disyembre, ang mga magsasaka sa plantasyon ng Lapanday sa Tagum City ay nanawagan na ipamahagi sa kanila ang lupa, at ang mga magsasaka sa lupang sinasaklaw ng Cotabato Foundation College of Science and Technology o CFCST ay sumisigaw ng ganitong panawagan at nilalabanan ang mga pagpapalayas sa kanila mula sa kanilang mga lupain. Bukod dito, ilang Lakbayan patungong Maynila ang kanilang dinaluhan tulad noong Hulyo at Oktubre, gayundin ang mga kampuhan sa Koronadal noong Agosto, at ang pagkilos ng libu-libong mga magsasaka noong Disyembre para suportahan ang GRP-NDFP peace talks at ipanawagan ang just peace o kapayapaang nakabatay sa hustisya. Hindi nakapagtataka na ang mga magsasaka sa Mindanao ay aktibong naglulunsad ng mga kilos-protesta na ito, kahit na ito ay mahirap gawin, dahil ang kanilang motibasyon ay kahirapan at kagutuman, na pangunahing bunga ng kawalang lupa, pagpapalayas sa kanilang mga sakan at mga kabuhayan, mga atake sa kanilang mga kabuhayan, gayundin ang sistematikong pang-aabuso ng mga armadong puwersa ng estado, at ang nagpapatuloy na militarisasyon ng mga asyendero at mga kumprador.

Ang Mindanao na tinaguriang “food basket of the Philippines” ay tirahan ng milyun-milyong mga magsasaka at mga katutubong Lumad, ngunit mga nagugutom. Ayon mismo sa gobyerno, 11 sa 20 na pinakamahirap na probinsiya ay nasa Mindanao. Kung ang bansa ay may 26.3 percent poverty incidence as of first half ng 2015, ang mga probinsiya sa Region XI sa Compostela Valley ay may 36.8 percent; Davao del Norte, 34.4 percent; Davao Oriental, 36.6 percent; habang ang Soccsksargen ay may 44.5 percent; Sarangani, na may pinakamataas, 61.7 percent; Sultan Kudarat, 56.2 percent; North Cotabato, 48.9 percent; ang Cotabato City na may 42.9 percent; at ang South Cotabato na may 30.1 percent. Ito ay isang malaking kabalintunaan, kabaligtaran o irony dahil nga sa mga binanggit ko kanina—napakalawak ng mga rekurso at lupain ng Mindanao ngunit ang karamihan ng mga mamamayan nito na mga magsasaka ay nagugutom.

Sa aming pagtingin, ito ay dahil sa ang mayorya na halos 22 milyong populasyon ng Mindanao ay mula sa uring magsasaka, at kalakhan sa kanila ay walang sariling lupa. Ang pinakamalala ay ang mga abang manggagawang bukid sa mga malalawak na plantasyong pag-aari ng mga dayuhan at lokal na mga asyendero at kumprador. Habang papalaki nang papalaki ang mga inaaning produkto sa mga malalawak na sakahang ito, ay kinokopo lamang ng mga mayayaman, at ang mga magsasaka ay nalulubog sa matinding kahirapan at kagutuman. Samakatuwid, kung sino ang nagpapakahirap at nagsasakripisyo, nagpapagod upang maabot ng Mindanao ang katawagang “food basket” ay siyang mga nagugutom sa kasalukuyan. Kaya, mga kasamahan kong Mambabatas, huwag tayong magtaka

kung ang mga magsasaka at mga katutubo ay gayun na lamang ang pagtatanggol sa kanilang mga sakahan at komunidad, kontra sa land grabbing, mining at iba pang proyekto na nagpapalayas at patuloy na nagpapalayas sa kanila at lumalabag sa kanilang mga karapatan sa lupa. Ito ay, sa batayang nila, “ang lupa ay buhay” at ang kawalan nito ay kamatayan.

Kaugnay nito, marami nang nagbuwis ng buhay para sa pakikibaka para sa tunay na reporma sa lupa sa ilalim ng bagong administrasyon, kasama na si Ka Jimmy Saypan na lider ng Compostela Farmers Association o CFA, isang pamprobinsiyang balangay ng KMP, na nilalaban ang malawakang mining operations ng Agpet o Agusan Petroleum and Mining Corporation, at para din sa mga magsasaka at katutubong pinatay ng mga militar at ng mga ahente nito. Noong Enero 20 mismo, habang inaalala at ginugunita ng KMP ang ika-30 anibersaryo ng Mendiola massacre ay may pinatay na Lumad Mamanwa sa Surigao del Norte, si Veronica Lapsay Delamente na nilalaban ang malawakang mining operations sa Claver, Surigao del Norte. Sa parehong araw din, pinatay ang lider ng sugar workers sa ilalim ng National Federation of Sugar Workers sa Negros na si Alexander Ceballos.

Kaya upang itambol ang kanilang panawagan dito sa loob ng Kongreso, sila ay nananawagan sa tunay na reporma sa lupa, partikular ang libheng pamamahagi ng lupa na itinutulak ng House Bill No. 555 o Genuine Agrarian Reform Bill. Ito rin ay laman ng GRP-NDFP peace talks, partikular sa Comprehensive Agreement on Socio-Economic Reforms or CASER. Hinihikayat ko ang aking mga kapwa Mambabatas na ang rehimen ng Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program o CARP ay tapos na at ang batas nito ay patay na. Huwag na nating buhayin. Panahon na para sa bago at tunay na programang magsisilbi sa napakaraming mga magsasaka sa ating bansa.

Panawagan din nila ang pagtapos sa mga mala-pyudal na pagsasamantala tulad ng usura, pambabarat sa presyo ng mga produktong magbubukid, matataas na upa at presyo ng makinarya at farm inputs, at iba pa. Karugtong dito ang panawagan para sa suporta sa pagsasaka, mga farm tools at animals, mga proyektong pangkabuhayan, pre- at post-harvest facilities at food processing facilities, organic fertilizers at pesticides, hauler trucks, at mga lokal na teknolohiya para sa food production. Nanatili pa rin ang kanilang panawagang relief para sa pagkain at sa panimula ay 15,000 sacks of rice dahil sa epektong dulot ng nakaraang matinding tag-tuyot at sa ngayon naman, ang walang tigil na malalakas na pag-ulan.

Isinisigaw nila ang panawagang hustiya para sa mga biktima ng human rights violations sa ilalim ng Oplan Bayanihan ng dating Pangulong Noynoy Aquino, hanggang sa walang tigil at nagpapatuloy na militarisasyon ng mga komunidad ng mga magsasaka at ng mga katutubo. Dahil sa sila ang pangunahing biktima ng atake ng estado,

mahigpit nilang sinusuportahan ang pagpapatuloy ng GRP peace talks para makamit ang just peace. Habang nag-uusap, isang napakasamang balita—may naganap na engkuwentro noong nakaraang dalawang araw lamang sa pagitan ng mga puwersa ng gobyerno at ng New People’s Army, na ikinamatay ng isang miyembro ng NPA sa Makilala, North Cotabato. Habang nakatindig ang dalawang deklarasyong unilateral ceasefire, nagpapatuloy ang pagkakampo ng mga militar sa mga komunidad ng mga magsasaka at katutubong Lumad.

Kaya bilang Kinatawan ng ANAKPAWIS Party-List, ng mga magsasaka mula sa Mindanao, ako ay umaasa na maririnig ng Kongresong ito ang kanilang mga lehitimong panawagan. Ako rin ay humihimok sa aking mga kapwa Mambabatas na suportahan ang GRP peace talks, ang pagpapatupad ng 1998 Comprehensive Agreement on Respect for Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law o CARHRIHL at ang mga supplemental agreements na bago lamang pinirmahan ng dalawang partido, ang pagbubuo ng Comprehensive Agreement on Socio-Economic Reforms at ang implementasyon nito, at libheng pamamahagi ng mga lupa, lupang agrikultural, para sa mga magsasakang Pilipino.

Maraming salamat, Mme. Speaker, fellow lawmakers. I conclude by calling for land and peace now; for land, justice and food for Mindanao farmers.

Magandang hapon, maayong hapon kanatong tanan.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, there being no interpellators, I move that we refer the speech of the Honorable Casilao to the Committee on Rules for its appropriate action.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion to refer the speech of the Honorable Casilao to the appropriate committee is approved.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we recognize the Hon. Arnolfo A. Teves Jr. of the Third District of Negros Oriental to avail of the Privilege Hour.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Hon. Arnolfo “Arnie” A. Teves Jr. of the Third District of Negros Oriental is hereby recognized for his privilege speech.

PRIVILEGE SPEECH OF REP. TEVES

REP. TEVES. Thank you, Mme. Speaker. Good afternoon, everyone.

Again, I rise here today to speak on the law that gives benefits like free education to dependents of barangay officials.

Kailan lang kasi, nag-deliberate kami ng maraming batas tungkol sa free education at nabalitaan ko rin na mayroon tayong P8 bilyon na ilalaan para sa free education. Ang hindi ko maintindihan, Mme. Speaker, ang tagal-tagal na ng batas na dapat naipatupad pero hindi pa rin napapatupad hanggang ngayon. Dapat libre ang lahat ng mga dependents ng barangay officials natin sa ating mga SUCs. I had been a barangay captain for six years and a Liga president before I became a Congressman kaya alam na alam ko na hindi naipapatupad ang batas na ito.

Why am I standing here? Gusto ko sanang ipatawag natin ang CHED, ipatawag natin ang ibang agencies na involved, at matanong sila kung bakit hindi naipapatupad ang batas na ito. Also, before we even make additional legislations on free education, I think we should implement existing laws that are already mandated to be implemented. Hindi ko nga alam kung iyong free education, kung kailangan ba na bayaran ng gobyerno iyong mga SUCs because ito iyong claim ng mga SUCs—they are claiming that they could not give free education to children of barangay officials because they do not know from where to collect the tuition or the subsidy. So, I am not sure if the law dictates that it be subsidized or just be given free. Bahala na kung saan i-charge. Kung sakali man na kailangang i-charge kung saan mang account, I would like to appeal to the CHED na gamitin na natin iyong P8 bilyon para ma-implement iyong batas na matagal nang dapat na-implement para matulungan naman natin ang mga anak ng ating mga barangay officials sa ating bansa.

That is all for now, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, there being no interpellators, I move that we refer the speech of the Hon. Arnolfo Teves of the Third District of Negros Oriental to the Committee on Rules for its appropriate action.

I so move, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion to refer the speech of the Honorable Teves to the appropriate committee is hereby approved.

The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I now move that the Gentleman from COOP-NATCCO Party-List, the Hon. Anthony M. Bravo, PhD, be recognized to avail of the Privilege Hour.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Hon. Anthony Bravo of Party-List COOP-NATCCO is now recognized for his privilege speech.

PRIVILEGE SPEECH OF REP. BRAVO (A.)

REP. BRAVO (A.). Thank you, Mme. Speaker. Thank you, Floor Leader.

Mme. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, magandang hapon po sa ating lahat.

I rise today to speak on contraceptives distribution in our school campuses—the right time, the wrong place. Growing up in Bicol, Mme. Speaker, one of the lessons imparted to me by my parents was this familiar line: “There is a time and a place for everything.” My thoughts have revolved around this phrase since learning about the plan of the Department of Health to distribute condoms in our schools. The issue is controversial because it is natural for most Filipinos, especially parents like me, to be sensitive to any discussion that involves sex and teenagers or, to be specific, teenagers having sex.

I admit that I, too, am uncomfortable with the matter, Mme. Speaker, distinguished colleagues. I am a product of a different age. Lumaki po ako sa probinsiya and it would be accurate to say that I grew up in a conservative environment, with rules and standards that young people today would consider draconian. Noong panahon ko po, hindi ka puwedeng makipag-date na walang chaperone ang iyong kasamang babae. Noong panahon ko, hindi malayo na aabutin ka ng isang buwan o dalawa o minsan taon bago ka sagutin ng nililigawan mo kahit siguro kasing-guwapo ka ng ibang mga Mambabatas na narito ngayon.

We must acknowledge, however, that times change, Mme. Speaker, and with it, the problems being faced by our youth. There is a time and a place for everything, Mme. Speaker, and while I take issue with the proposal of DOH Secretary Ubial to distribute condoms to students in our schools, I nonetheless understand that we must address this matter now because a whole generation of Filipinos will suffer if the government ignores the fact that we are one of the few countries in the world where teen pregnancy and HIV rates continue to rise. To quote a study by the United Nations Population Fund:

Adolescent fertility rates have declined in the last two decades in all countries with available data, with the exception of the Philippines where there has been little change.

The numbers are distressing. According to data from the 2013 National Demographic and Health Survey of the Philippine Statistics Authority, one in 10 girls

aged 15 to 19 is already a mother. When you consider that 10 percent of our population is composed of this demographic, that means that in 2013, we already had one million teenagers who were already mothers. These are girls who should be preparing for their junior prom, not pushing prams; girls who should be working on their homework, not reviewing their child's schoolwork. Think about it, Mme. Speaker, distinguished colleagues. Hindi pa nga sila puwede bumoto pero mga nanay na sila. Hindi pa nga sila makakabili ng alak sa 7-Eleven pero mga nanay na rin sila.

Nakakalungkot, Mme. Speaker, distinguished colleagues.

Teenage pregnancy is not the only challenge faced by Secretary Ubial and the Department of Health. We also have what we refer to as HIV epidemic, and the statistics should give us all a pause. In 2008, there was, on the average, one new diagnosed HIV case per day; while in 2010, that number had quadrupled to four new HIV cases per day. Two years later, Mme. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, in 2012, that number doubled to nine new HIV cases per day and in 2014, that number jumped to 17 new HIV cases per day. Last year, Mme. Speaker, 25 new HIV cases were diagnosed on a daily basis—25 per day, Mme. Speaker, or over 9,000 new HIV cases a year. My dear colleagues, these numbers are alarming. Consider these statistics. From January 1984 to December 2010, a period spanning 27 years, the number of reported HIV cases was 6,015. From January 2011 to March 2016, a period covering just over five years, the total number of reported HIV cases was 26,632. Take note, these are only the reported cases. Who knows how many more suffer from HIV but refuse to seek treatment?

There is a time and a place for everything, Mme. Speaker, and it is time we admit that we have a serious problem on our hands. It is also time for us to acknowledge that the distribution of condoms has been known to effectively address the spread of HIV and to quote from a UNFPA, WHO (World Health Organization) and UNAIDS joint statement released in July 2015:

Condoms are a critical component in a comprehensive and sustainable approach in the prevention of HIV and other sexually transmitted infections (STIs) and are effective for preventing unintended pregnancies.

x x x

Condoms have helped to reduce HIV transmission and curtailed the broader spread of HIV in settings where the epidemic is concentrated in specific populations.

A recent global modeling analysis estimated that condoms have averted around 50 million new HIV infections since the onset of the HIV epidemic.

However, Mme. Speaker, we should not lose sight of the fact that the distribution of condoms must be accompanied by proper education. By education, Mme. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, I mean not just sex education, but values education—education that puts an emphasis on the “whys” behind sexual relations, not just the “hows” of sexual intercourse. To quote from Clive Staples Lewis: “Education without values, as useful as it is, seems rather to make man a more clever devil.”

It is in this light, Mme. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, that this Representation commends the DOH for working with the Department of Education to provide sex education using the ABC framework: Abstinence, Being faithful and Condom use. As I said earlier, Mme. Speaker, there is a time and a place for everything. In her interviews in the media, Secretary Ubial said that the plan is to distribute condoms in school clinics and health centers. While I believe that high school is the right time to educate our youth about sex, I do not believe that our schools are the right places to distribute condoms. Simple lang po ang paniniwala ko dito, Mme. Speaker: Ilagay natin sa tamang lugar.

Our schools are sacred, Mme. Speaker, distinguished colleagues. Our children go to school to study—to obtain knowledge, to learn about the world around them and to learn about themselves. Our schools are sacred, Mme. Speaker. Our children go to school to become productive members of society—to obtain wisdom, to appreciate our nation's values and to build their character. Our schools are sacred, Mme. Speaker. I acknowledge that there is a need to make condoms accessible to those who need and want them, but I believe that this need not be done within the campuses of our school.

Again, Mme. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, ilagay natin sa tamang lugar. Let the DOH use barangay health centers as distribution points. In sex education classes, the DOH and the DepEd can stress that all those who want condoms can obtain these from their barangay health centers and government hospitals where health professionals can give them even more in-depth information about reproductive health. The focus of our schools should be our children's education, while the focus of our health centers should be our children's health.

Ultimately, Mme. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, I believe education is the key to addressing the root cause of teen pregnancies and the spread of HIV and other sexually-transmitted infections, especially since studies show that an increasing proportion of our population begin sexual activity before the age of 18. Among males, the proportion increased from 13.8 percent in 1994 to 25.1 percent in 2013, while for females, the increase was from 12 percent to 22 percent during the

same period. Given the use of social media platforms and smartphone applications that allow young men and women to instantly hook up, these numbers will only grow if we do not respond.

Clearly, the Department of Education and the Department of Health must work together to come up with a program that can slow and maybe, reverse this disturbing trend. Someone once said that education is a better safeguard of liberty than a standing army. In the same vein, I sincerely believe that no amount of condoms can be as effective as proper education.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mme. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, it is clear that times have changed. Wala nang love letters, text-text na lang. Hindi na kailangan ng tulay dahil mayroon nang Tinder, dating online. We cannot turn back the clock, but we can and we must find ways to reach out and educate our children so that we can lower teen pregnancies and HIV rates, and so that our youth can appreciate and inculcate the values necessary to become mature and responsible partners, spouses and parents.

Maraming salamat po. Magandang hapon pong muli sa ating lahat.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, there being no interpellators, I move that we refer the speech of the Hon. Anthony Bravo of COOP-NATCCO Party-List to the Committee on Rules for its appropriate action.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion to refer the speech of the Honorable Bravo to the appropriate committee is approved.

The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, there being no Member who wishes to avail of the Privilege Hour, I move that we terminate the Privilege Hour.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the Privilege Hour is terminated.

CONSIDERATION OF H.B. NO. 4113 ON SECOND READING

PERIOD OF SPONSORSHIP AND DEBATE

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, under the Calendar of Business, I move that we consider House

Bill No. 4113, contained in Committee Report No. 13, as reported out by the Committee on Women and Gender Equality.

May I ask that the Secretary General be directed to read only the title of the measure.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.*

The Secretary General is directed to read only the title of the measure.

With the permission of the Body, and since copies of the measure have been previously distributed, the Secretary General read only the title thereof without prejudice to inserting its text in the Congressional Record.

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 4113, entitled: AN ACT INCREASING THE MATERNITY LEAVE PERIOD TO ONE HUNDRED (100) DAYS FOR FEMALE WORKERS IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE AND IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR, AND GRANTING AN OPTION TO EXTEND FOR AN ADDITIONAL THIRTY (30) DAYS WITHOUT PAY.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I move that the Chairperson of the Committee on Women and Gender Equality be recognized.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Hon. Emmeline Aglipay-Villar of the sponsoring Committee is hereby recognized to sponsor the measure.

SPONSORSHIP SPEECH OF REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. We are a people formed by mothers in a literal and figurative sense. To our mothers is our first debt, our first reprieve, and our first experience of unconditional love. Most mothers, if they could ask their God for one thing, they would ask for nothing more than to be the best mothers to us that they could possibly be. It is for these reasons and more that we call them “the light of the home.” It is difficult to be the light of the home when you are not at home, and that is the case too often and too soon in the lives of children when mothers are forced by economic circumstances to return to work too early.

* See MEASURES CONSIDERED (printed separately)

According to data from the Philippine Statistics Authority, there were approximately 38.5 million employed persons in the country in October 2013. Of the total employed, 57.6 percent or 22.2 million were wage and salary workers. Of this number, 8.3 million or 37.5 percent were women and many of them are parents. One in 10 young Filipino women below the age of 20 has already begun childbearing; eight percent are already mothers; and another two percent are pregnant with their first child, according to the results of the 2013 National Demographic and Health Survey. Of the women who are parents, a substantial number will not have the assistance of a partner. Based on a DOH/UP-NIH study in 2011, solo parents comprised 14 to 15 percent of an estimated 94 million Filipinos, thus, placing their number at that time at about 13.9 million. Currently, our laws provide that pregnant women may take a leave for 60 days for normal delivery or 78 days for caesarean delivery, with pay equivalent to their actual monthly salary credit. This number, however, fails to fully cover even the first 100 days in the life of a child, a period that is critical to breastfeeding in establishing a bond with the baby and developing a resistance to chronic diseases such as asthma.

The Philippines is one of a shrinking minority of nations providing for less than a minimum 14 weeks of statutory maternity leave. Among our neighbors in the ASEAN, only Malaysia has a comparably short period of maternity leave. The trend towards longer maternity leaves is one that acknowledges that the presence of the mother is essential to the early health and long-term development of children; is essential to the health of the mother, the economic security of families as well as a contributor to greater gender equality in the workplace.

It is long past time that we join the rest of the world in recognizing the need for a longer period of time when mothers can focus on being just that—mothers.

First, we take a look at how an expanded maternity leave period benefits children. We start with benefits to infant health. The most immediate benefits of a mother's presence are felt by her child. Studies by the Council of Economic Advisers of the United States Government have shown a clear positive impact of maternity leave on the health of infants, leading to an increase in average birthweight, a decrease in premature birth and a decrease in infant mortality. These effects can be attributed to maternity leaves taken before the child is born, allowing the prospective mother to focus on rest and proper nutrition. Working women are more likely to take their maternity leaves in advance of the projected birth if the period set aside for these leaves is longer. After the child is born, the work of parenting begins in earnest. As any mother or father will tell you, parenting is incredibly time-consuming, especially in the first few months. Maternity leave allows a mother to

be physically present in that crucial period, and this has a dramatic effect on the chances of an infant's survival. According to Christopher Ruhm in the study "Parental Leave and Child Health," parental leave can reduce the incidence of the leading causes of post-neonatal mortality such as sudden infant death syndrome, pneumonia, influenza and accidents.

Sudden infant death syndrome is more than twice as common among infants who prone sleep than those who do not, and parental leave could increase the frequency of non-prone sleeping if parents have more energy to monitor sleeping positions or are more able to directly observe them. As for the avoidance of accidents, in the United States, the decrease in deaths due to accidents and unintentional injuries has been the most important contributor to the decline in child mortality since 1970. There is no better safety blanket for a child than the presence, the active involvement, of a parent. There is simply no substitute for that care, and the facts bear that out. According to research, a 10-week increase in paid leave is predicted to reduce infant mortality rate by 2.5 to 3.4 percent, a 10-week extension is predicted to decrease post-neonatal deaths by 3.7 to 4.5 percent, and child fatalities by 3.3 to 3.5 percent.

Second, the benefits of breastfeeding. One of the most important reasons longer maternity leaves lead to healthier children is that maternity leaves increase the likelihood that a woman will be able to breastfeed her child. Breastfeeding is, as I had stressed before, a public health issue of national importance. Breast milk is, as one study puts it, "the gold standard for protective nutrients fed to newborn infants," with clear clinical evidence of its protective effect: lowering risks of some diseases by as much as fourteenfold, decreasing infant mortality rates fivefold and facilitating neurocognitive development. It should go without saying therefore that the longer a mother is able to breastfeed her child, the better it is for her child. However, once women return to the workforce, it becomes more difficult to breastfeed and this leads to a reduction both in the frequency and the duration of breastfeeding. On the other hand, studies have shown that one way to lengthen the duration of breastfeeding is precisely for new mothers to be able to delay the time of their return to work or, in other words, for a longer period of maternity leave.

Third, the long-term benefits to children. All of the aforementioned lead not only to better health for children in the short-term, but better prospects in the long-term as well. A Norwegian study by the Institute for the Study of Labor in Bonn, Germany on the impact on children of increasing maternity leave benefits revealed that the increased time with the child eventually led to a decline in high school dropouts and an increase in average wages at age 30.

An expanded maternity leave does not only benefit the children, it also benefits the mother. All of

these do not even touch upon the benefits of the longer maternity leave on the mothers themselves. First, the breastfeeding benefits for the mother. According to the WHO and the UNICEF, breastfeeding can reduce the risk of breast and ovarian cancers while fostering a bond between the mother and the child that can prove to be an invaluable mental support when faced with the stress and challenges of parenthood, which can in turn combat any temptation towards abuse or abandonment. New studies also indicate that breastfeeding increases the bone density of nursing mothers. Second, there is less depression and more satisfaction. Work-related stress is the primary reason for a parent's experience of work-life conflict which is, in itself, the primary cause of stress for Filipino parents. After all, work problems mean less time with family and for working mothers in particular, this comes with a deep burden of guilt. In contrast, a study has revealed that women who took longer than 12 weeks maternity leave reported fewer depressive symptoms, a reduction in severe depression and an improvement in their overall mental health.

We also examined how an expanded maternity leave benefits the financial stability of the family. The benefits of the family of a mother who had an expanded maternity leave go beyond direct health benefits, bringing about a more secure financial future for the family as well. First, a mother is more likely to return to work. Research has revealed that access to paid leave increased the likelihood of a new mother returning to her employer, which in turn improves the financial outlook of the family by encouraging the mother to return to a prior job where she is likely to have accrued seniority, salary adjustments and other benefits that would be lost if she were to start anew with a brand new job. Second, there is a narrowing of the gender-pay gap. There is a much smaller wage gap when women and men first enter the workforce right after college but as women move through the workforce, get married and have children, the gap widens.

A woman's child-bearing years and peak earning years coincide, and that has a big effect on her earnings. A University of Massachusetts study revealed that for every child a woman has, her salary decreases by four percent and that penalty is worse for low-wage workers; but for men, fatherhood increases his earnings by more than six percent. Encouraging and facilitating a woman's return to her previous job would help alleviate the gap in earnings caused by a woman being forced to keep starting again from square one. Economists had found that with paid leave, more people take time off, particularly low-income parents who may have taken no leave or dropped out of the workforce after birth. Paid leave raises the probability that mothers will return to employment later and then work more hours and earn higher wages.

With regard to the business impact of an expanded maternity leave, those who wish to argue against an expanded maternity leave will frequently drift to the potential economic impact on businesses that they fear such an expansion might bring about, but we do not need to make guesses about this impact. We have factual case studies that we can refer to in order to verify whether or not adding days of paid parental leave actually will have the negative effects that critics so vocally fear. The answer? In truth, the evidence shows that these parental leave policies do not cause undue interruptions in the workplace. In fact, a body of research revealed that these practices can benefit employers by improving their ability to recruit and retain talent, lowering costly worker turnover and minimizing the loss of firm-specific skills and human capital, as well as boosting morale and worker productivity. According to a paper published by the White House, following the implementation of state programs providing for paid maternity leave, most businesses reported no negative effect on profitability and by that I mean, more than 80 percent.

Moreover, the Bill, as drafted, provides exceptions from the mandate for establishments to answer for the salary differential between the actual cash benefits received from the SSS and the average weekly or regular wages of the employees such as for distressed establishments or micro-business enterprises. Those businesses that truly cannot bear the costs of this Bill will not have to do so. As for the claims that longer maternity leaves will cause discrimination against women, we already have statutes penalizing such misogynistic practices and, let us face it, employers would commit such discrimination or are likely already doing so; expanding the maternity leave would increase the probability of them discriminating against women employees.

There is no good reason to stand against an expansion of the mandatory maternity leave. As for reasons to stand with this Bill, there are over a hundred million. A hundred million was the totality of the population of our nation in 2015, and each and every Filipino has a mother that would have benefited from a hundred days of maternity leave. Each and every Filipino is now, or was at one time a child that would have benefited from a hundred days of their mother's undivided attention.

Some still yearn for a past when the light of the home only stayed at home, without an outside vocation; but by choice and by necessity, this is increasingly no longer the case. No region in our country has a statutory minimum wage of more than P500 a day and yet, a year at that level of compensation would not be able to pay for the costs of pregnancy, vaccination, clothes and diapers that are attendant to a baby's first few months of life. Yes, there are mothers who manage to do the impossible,

who manage to juggle work and home with alacrity, who manage to feed the household on the slimmest budget, but these achievements do not change the fact that we ask too much of working mothers. That they are so often able to do as we ask, as we demand, stands as a testament to their heroism, but in no way makes those demands moral or reasonable. To valorize the importance of mothers on one hand, but then at the same time deny them the chance to devote themselves fully to the most important formative period in the life of the child, that is hypocrisy.

The State fancies itself as *parens patriae*. It is time that the State acted as such. What we need is not a Mother's Day, but a Hundred Mother's Days—a hundred days for our mothers, to be solely, exclusively, lovingly for mothers. We will never be able to repay our debt to our mothers, but this much we can give to them and to the future mothers and children of our country.

Thank you, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

SUSPENSION OF CONSIDERATION OF H.B. NO. 4113

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we suspend the consideration of this Bill so we may call the roll.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

ROLL CALL

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we call the roll.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Secretary General will please call the roll.

The Secretary General called the roll, and the result is as follows, per Journal No. 61, dated January 24, 2017:

PRESENT

Abad	Acharon
Abaya	Acop
Abayon	Acosta
Abellanos	Advincula
Abu	Aggabao
Abueg	Aglipay-Villar

Albano	Dalipe
Almario	Daza
Almonte	De Jesus
Alonte-Naguiat	De Venecia
Alvarez (M.)	De Vera
Alvarez (P.)	Defensor
Amatong	Del Mar
Angara-Castillo	Deloso-Montalla
Antonio	Dimaporo (A.)
Arbison	Dimaporo (M.K.)
Arcillas	Durano
Arenas	Dy
Atienza	Elago
Aumentado	Eriguel
Bagatsing	Ermita-Buhain
Baguilat	Escudero
Banal	Espina
Barbers	Estrella
Batocabe	Evardone
Bautista-Bandigan	Fariñas
Belaro	Ferrer (L.)
Belmonte (F.)	Ferriol-Pascual
Belmonte (R.)	Floirendo
Bernos	Flores
Biazon	Fortun
Billones	Fortuno
Bolilia	Fuentebella
Bondoc	Garbin
Bordado	Garcia (G.)
Bravo (A.)	Garcia (J.E.)
Bravo (M.V.)	Garcia-Albano
Brosas	Garin (R.)
Bulut-Begtang	Garin (S.)
Cagas	Gasataya
Calderon	Go (M.)
Calixto-Rubiano	Gomez
Campos	Gonzaga
Canama	Gonzales (A.P.)
Casilao	Gonzales (A.D.)
Castelo	Gonzalez
Castro (F.L.)	Gorriceta
Castro (F.H.)	Gullas
Cayetano	Hernandez
Celeste	Herrera-Dy
Cerilles	Hofer
Chavez	Kho
Chipeco	Labadlabad
Co	Lacson
Cojuangco	Lagman
Collantes	Lanete
Cortes	Laogan
Cortuna	Lazatin
Crisologo	Leachon
Cua	Lee
Cuaresma	Limkaichong
Cueva	Lobregat

Lopez (B.)	Romualdez
Lopez (C.)	Romualdo
Lopez (M.L.)	Roque (H.)
Macapagal-Arroyo	Salimbangon
Malapitan	Salo
Manalo	Salon
Mangaoang	Sambar
Mangudadatu (S.)	Santos-Recto
Mangudadatu (Z.)	Sarmiento (C.)
Marcoleta	Sarmiento (E.M.)
Marcos	Savellano
Mariño	Siao
Marquez	Silverio
Martinez	Singson
Matugas	Suansing (E.)
Mellana	Suansing (H.)
Mercado	Suarez
Mirasol	Sy-Alvarado
Montoro	Tambunting
Nava	Tan (A.)
Noel	Tan (M.)
Nogralles (J.J.)	Tejada
Nogralles (K.A.)	Teves
Nolasco	Tiangco
Nuñez-Malanyaon	Ting
Oaminal	Tinio
Ocampo	Tolentino
Olivarez	Treñas
Ortega (P.)	Tugna
Ortega (V.N.)	Turabin-Hataman
Pacquiao	Ty
Paduano	Ungab
Palma	Unico
Pancho	Uy (J.)
Panganiban	Uy (R.)
Panotes	Uybarreta
Papandayan	Vargas
Pichay	Vargas-Alfonso
Pimentel	Velasco
Pineda	Velasco-Catera
Plaza	Veloso
Primicias-Agabas	Vergara
Quimbo	Villanueva
Radaza	Villaraza-Suarez
Ramirez-Sato	Villarica
Ramos	Villarin
Revilla	Violago
Roa-Puno	Yu
Rodriguez (I.)	Zamora (R.)
Rodriguez (M.)	Zubiri
Roman	

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. Mme. Speaker, the roll call shows 225 Members responded to the call.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). With 225 Members responding to the call, the Chair declares the presence of a quorum.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, considering that copies of the Journal of the previous session had been distributed to the Members, I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we approve Journal No. 60 dated 23 January 2017.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

Journal No. 60 dated January 23, 2017 is hereby approved.

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, before we start, we would like to acknowledge the presence of the guests from the gallery of the Hon. Rodante D. Marcoleta of SAGIP Party-List, namely: Chito Escudero, Vicky Escudero, Olivia San Antonio, Bert San Antonio and Eva Asuncion. They are from Orange County, California, USA.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The guests of the Honorable Marcoleta is requested to stand up to be recognized. (*Applause*) Welcome to the House of Representatives.

The Floor Leader is recognized.

CONSIDERATION OF H.B. NO. 4113

Continuation

PERIOD OF SPONSORSHIP AND DEBATE

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we resume the consideration of House Bill No. 4113, contained in Committee Report No. 13 as reported out by the Committee of Women and Gender Equality.

May I ask that the Secretary General be directed to read only the title of the measure.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.*

The Secretary General is directed to read only the title of the measure.

* See MEASURES CONSIDERED (printed separately)

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 4113, entitled: AN ACT INCREASING THE MATERNITY LEAVE PERIOD TO ONE HUNDRED (100) DAYS FOR FEMALE WORKERS IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE AND IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR, AND GRANTING AN OPTION TO EXTEND FOR AN ADDITIONAL THIRTY (30) DAYS WITHOUT PAY.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we recognize the Lady from the Second District of Taguig City, the Hon. Pia S. Cayetano, to deliver her sponsorship speech.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Honorable Cayetano is hereby recognized to sponsor the measure.

SPONSORSHIP SPEECH OF REP. CAYETANO

REP. CAYETANO. Thank you, Mme. Speaker.

Our fundamental law recognizes the important role of women in nation building. Article XIII, Section 14 of the Constitution mandates:

The State shall protect working women, by providing safe and healthful working conditions, taking into account their maternal functions, and to provide facilities and opportunities that will enhance their welfare and enable them to realize their full potential in the service of the nation.

So, let us break that down: First, protect the rights of working women; second, take into account their maternal function; and third, provide facilities and opportunities. These are embodied in our Constitution and these are what the Bill is meant to implement. With this in mind, consider our existing maternity leave, it is a mere 60 days or two months. Do you know how a two-month old baby looks like? That baby is still so fragile. He or she cannot even hold his or her head up and yet by that time, most mothers must go back to work, as I did and as many of our female colleagues here did.

My own childbirth experience and those of the other women I had worked with are my inspirations for this Bill. That is why when I sponsored it in the Senate last Congress, I named it, “The One Hundred (100)-Day Maternity Leave Law.” I took into consideration the International Labor Organization’s recommendation of 98 days maternity leave and I added two days to make it 100 days. This Bill passed Third Reading in the Senate.

The 100 days include the additional 40 days that will give mothers the much-needed extra time to care for and breastfeed their babies—by that time, many babies can hold up their head, and they have gained substantial weight, sometimes doubling their birthweight—also giving the mothers the much-needed reassurance that her baby will be all right when she goes back to work. It necessarily also gives the mothers the much-needed rest that she needs to recuperate. It also gives mothers a chance to establish a breastfeeding routine. Studies had shown that the biggest hindrance in successfully breastfeeding one’s baby is going back to work; thus, longer maternity leave periods encourage exclusive breastfeeding in women.

A long maternity leave policy is also beneficial for employers as studies show that it creates a more stable and loyal workforce, reduced employee turnover and absenteeism, and increased participation of women in the workforce. In the ASEAN Region, we lag behind in terms of maternal leave duration. Vietnam provides 120 to 180 days as maternity leave. Singapore gives 112 days as maternity leave. Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Myanmar and Thailand provide for 84 days. The Philippines provides 60 days for normal delivery and 78 days for caesarian delivery.

Colleagues, I stand before you today to co-sponsor and seek your support for Committee Report No. 13 regarding House Bill No. 4113 or the One Hundred (100)-Day Maternity Leave Law. I am certain that many of our male colleagues here are supportive partners to their wives who juggle motherhood and career. As I had mentioned earlier, many of our female colleagues themselves have had to go through this problem of leaving their newborn baby because of the 60-day maternity leave in place. Through policies like this, we can institutionalize standards that promote the rights of working women and protect them from discrimination based on maternity, and give them the chance to realize their full potential in the service of the nation as envisioned in the Constitution.

In this light, I humbly urge the swift passage of this Bill. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we recognize the Hon. Linabelle Ruth R. Villarica of the Fourth District of Bulacan for her sponsorship speech.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Honorable Villarica of Bulacan is hereby recognized to deliver her sponsorship speech on this Bill.

SPONSORSHIP SPEECH OF REP. VILLARICA

REP. VILLARICA. Thank you, Mme. Speaker.

Honorable Speaker and Members of this august Body, this is a rejoinder to the consolidated House Bill No. 4113 presented by our Chair to the Plenary this afternoon. I authored House Bill No. 1644, entitled: AN ACT INCREASING THE MATERNITY LEAVE PERIOD TO ONE HUNDRED (100) DAYS FOR FEMALE EMPLOYEES IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE AND IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR, AND GRANTING AN OPTION TO EXTEND FOR AN ADDITIONAL THIRTY (30) DAYS WITHOUT PAY.

It is analogous to the draft resolution that I presented to the ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Assembly in its 37th General Assembly at Nay Pyi Taw, Myanmar last September 29 to October 3, 2016. As the Philippine Representative to the Committee on Women Parliamentarians of ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Assembly or AIPA, I advocated for the crafting of enabling national legislation, in accordance with international standards, on extending maternity protection to working women in ASEAN. Quite significantly, our country's proposed resolution on extending the maternity benefits of working women in ASEAN was adopted and approved by the AIPA and marked the first time in 20 years that a proposal from the Philippines was so adopted and approved. It is mainly concerned with the provisions on the rights of women to receive health protection, maternity-related benefits and childcare facilities at work, including paternity benefits which encourage fathers to share in their responsibilities on the care of children. With our country hosting ASEAN 2017, today is certainly a most opportune time to hear out the case for extending our country's maternity leave benefits.

Sadly though, at the dawn of ASEAN integration, none of the 10 ASEAN member states have ratified the International Labor Organization Conventions related to Maternity Protection: Nos. 102 and 183. Among seven of the 10 ASEAN member states offering a 100-percent income replacement or full paid leave, the Philippines, along with Malaysia, performs poorly with a coverage period of only 8.5 weeks. This is way below the ILO's minimum prescription of 12 to 14 weeks under the ILO Convention 2000's Maternity Protection No. 183. Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Lao and Thailand provide 13 weeks leave. While Vietnam astounds by having a paid leave of 26 weeks—far above the 18-week minimum of the ILO Convention 2000's Maternity Protection No. 191.

Investing on an adequate and effective maternity leave benefit scheme is a good investment for the country. It is essential for the achievement of gender equality, beneficial to the health of both mother and

child and in the long run, advantageous to employers. It will certainly signify that our country follows through its commitments for solid regional cooperation.

Recognizing that Filipino women are an important asset in the empowerment of the ASEAN workforce, may I ask our esteemed Members to vote for the passage of this Bill.

Thank you very much, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we recognize an additional Sponsor for this measure, the Hon. Emmi A. De Jesus of GABRIELA Women's Party-List.

I so move, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Honorable De Jesus is recognized to sponsor the measure.

SPONSORSHIP SPEECH OF REP. DE JESUS

REP. DE JESUS. Maraming salamat, Mme. Speaker.

Mme. Speaker, distinguished Members of the House, good afternoon.

I rise at this important juncture to recognize and actively promote a vital social function played by women in the nation's economy. In the legislative realm, passing a bill that promotes women's maternal health is certainly in line with this thrust to advance women's role in our society. It has been demonstrated in several studies that a longer maternity period benefits everyone—improving the infant's health and aiding in the complete recovery of the mother. It also extends the breastfeeding period, thereby also extending the positive impacts of breastfeeding on the development of the child—indeed, an investment on our future.

In the Philippine setting wherein much remains to be improved in terms of maternal protection and delivery of basic social services, inadequate maternity leave period puts both women and children at greater risks. This is exacerbated by the creeping privatization of public hospitals and stringent company rules that force women workers to cut short their maternity leave. Some companies even explicitly discourage pregnancy among women workers, or retrench women workers who are found to be pregnant. The State should intervene, at the minimum, for decent work for women workers who suffer from multiple layers of exploitation in the workplace, and pregnancy should never be a basis for a woman worker to be denied of her job.

Based on the latest gender statistics on employment, 39.55 percent of the total employed or 15.29 million are women workers while 23.37 million are male workers. In terms of employment opportunities, women workers are concentrated in low-paying contractual jobs. In the wholesale and retail trade sector, which include malls and supermarkets, women account for 60 percent of total workers. This is the sector where labor contractualization is rampant, where sales ladies are shuffled every five months and are forced to endure long hours of standing for a measly pay. We should also take note that 5.62 million women workers or one third of total female workers with ages 20 to 34 years old, which are the best reproductive years for women, are mostly hired. Unfortunately, the current law gives pregnant women workers only 60 calendar days of paid maternity leave for normal delivery and 78 calendar days in case of caesarian section delivery. This is a far cry, as already mentioned by my colleagues who already delivered their speeches, from the International Labor Organization Maternity Protection Convention which specifies at least 14 weeks, with provision for a six-week compulsory post-natal leave; and from the 90-day standard of Southeast Asian countries.

This highlights the need for Congress to step in and approve measures that will raise the current length of maternity leave closer to the International Labor Organization standards on maternity protection.

Mme. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, before us for consideration is House Bill No. 4113 or the consolidated Bill on the 100 days maternity leave. Section 3 of the measure stipulates:

All covered female employees in government and private sector including those in the informal economy, regardless of civil status or the legitimacy of her child, shall be granted one hundred (100) days maternity leave with pay and an option to extend for an additional thirty (30) days without pay.

I would like to emphasize also, that granting a longer maternity leave for women workers should be unconditional on the part of the Social Security System. If approved, the measure should not be an added basis to hike workers' contributions. Legislating stronger maternal protection should not come at the expense of those we would like to uplift and protect.

Mme. Speaker, distinguished Members of the House, let us mark the first month of 2017 with a bold, landmark move to uphold and promote women's vital role in the economy by approving House Bill No. 4113, extending the maternity leave to 100 days.

Maraming salamat at magandang hapon.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, I move that the Hon. France L. Castro from the ACT Teachers Party-List be recognized for her sponsorship speech on the measure.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Honorable Castro is hereby recognized to sponsor the measure.

SPONSORSHIP SPEECH OF REP. CASTRO (F.L.)

REP. CASTRO (F.L.). Good afternoon, Mme. Speaker. Good afternoon, distinguished colleagues.

Mme. Speaker, my fellow ACT Teachers Party-List Representative, the Hon. Antonio Tinio, and I are the principal authors of House Bill No. 472, AN ACT EXTENDING THE MATERNITY LEAVE, one of the Bills consolidated into House Bill No. 4113.

As a former public school teacher, I myself can attest that there is a clamor in the field for a longer, paid maternity leave for teachers, especially those teachers who are solo parents. The demand for such extension will enable the teachers to breastfeed and nurture their newborns and attend to all their needs. Aside from the salient points already noted by our able Committee Chair and the previous Sponsors, I would like to highlight that the proposed law we are considering today embodies many of the demands of our women employees and workers in the field. These demands we included in our House Bill No. 472 and were later adopted by the Committee:

First is the coverage of all female employees without any discrimination. We note that the last paragraph of Section 3 of House Bill No. 4113 states:

Maternity leave shall be granted to all female workers in every instance of pregnancy, miscarriage or abortion, regardless of its frequency.

This reverses the current setup where, for instance, an employee pregnant for the fifth time is barred from taking a paid maternity leave, notwithstanding the fact that her maternal health and her need to nurture her newborn is the same as when she was pregnant with her first to the fourth child.

We also note that Section 6 states, and I quote:

SEC. 6. Maternity Leave for Women Regardless of Civil Status. – All female workers in the government and female members of the

SSS, regardless of their civil status, shall be granted maternity leave, with pay, upon compliance with the preceding section.

Maternity protection extends to both the mother and the child in cases of unmarried women or those whose child is illegitimate.

We also note the adoption into our proposed law of several provisions which seek to institutionalize the following rules and regulations in the Civil Service Commission issuances. These provisions follow the principle of extending the maternity protection to as many female employees as possible. It is found in Section 7, Maternity Leave With Pay in Case of Childbirth, Miscarriage, or Abortion After Termination; and Section 10, Maternity Leave of a Female Worker with Pending Administrative Case.

Mme. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, we would like to appeal to all of you to hasten the approval of House Bill No. 4113 which is an essential social legislation for every woman and her children.

Maraming salamat po.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we recognize the Gentleman from the Party-List BUHAY, the Hon. Jose “Lito” L. Atienza Jr., for his interpellation.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Honorable Atienza is hereby recognized to interpellate the Sponsor.

REP. ATIENZA. Thank you, Mme. Speaker. With the kind permission and acceptance of the Sponsors or the principal Sponsor, we would like to clarify certain matters so that we may be able to help craft a good law that will really be enjoyed by our people.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Certainly, Mme. Speaker.

REP. ATIENZA. At the outset, Mme. Speaker, I would like to point out and stress for the record that we welcome the intentions of this Bill. Having been very active in providing certain programs and projects for protecting our women, I had been involved, in fact, in organizing one of the biggest women’s organization and we, at one time, had about 100,000 card-bearing members in the city of Manila. Ang organisasyon pong ito ay iyong Kababaihan ng Maynila.

At this point, we would like to ask relevant questions para po naman matiyak natin na, hindi lamang ipasa natin ang batas kundi matuloy ang benepisyong

magandang layunin ng batas. Hindi ko po malilimutan, Mme. Speaker, na ipinasa natin dito unanimously, without a single negative vote, iyong dagdag na P2000 para sa mga elderly retirees ng SSS. The Senate also immediately or simultaneously passed the same measure. This happened in the Sixteenth Congress. After celebrating the good intentions of that Bill, we were very disappointed that the President then, upon the advice of the SSS Board, did not support and in fact, vetoed the measure. Indeed, that measure was thrown in the wastebasket, in the dustbin of history. Mabuti na lang ang ating Pangulo ngayon ay nagkaroon ng second thoughts, at hindi man niya nagawang ibigay iyong P2000 na layunin ng batas, ibinigay niya ang unang P1000 at ipinangako niya na sa taong 2022, kung sakali, ibibigay iyong pangalawang P1000.

Kaya ang tatanungin ko po, Mme. Speaker, ay mga basic questions which I would like the Sponsors or the Lady Sponsor, the principal Sponsor, to assure for the record na ang batas na ito ay matutuloy at ito ay pakikinabangan ng ating mga kababaihan. We do not want to create false hopes for our women and for our mothers if we pass this and then later on, it cannot be pursued simply because the sectors which are going to shoulder the additional expense are not in favor or cannot afford or cannot comply with the law.

Ang unang tanong ko po ay, tinanong po ba natin ang mga ahensiya ng ating pamahalaan na ito kung kaya nilang pasanin ito with their finances now? For institutions like the GSIS for government employees and the SSS for the private employees, sila po ba ay na-konsulta? Kung mayroon po silang rekomendasyon o opinyon, puwede po bang makakuha kami ng kopya nito for our assurance that the financial institutions can afford and concur to their responsibilities in the Bill.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Opo, kinonsulta natin ang mga ahensiya ng gobyerno tungkol po dito sa proposed 100-Day Maternity Leave Law. Pagdating po sa GSIS, wala pong objections ang GSIS dito sa 100-Day Maternity Leave Law, no objections. Pagdating naman po sa SSS, nagbigay po sila ng schedule. Ibig sabihin po, tinala nila kung gaano kalaki ang mai-increase sa ibinigay o kinakaltas sa suweldo if in case magiging 100 days ang maternity leave at ito ay point five (0.5).

REP. ATIENZA. Ang tanong ko po, Mme. Speaker, ginagarantiyahan po ba ng GSIS at SSS na sila ay sang-ayon at magbibigay ng benepisyong kagaya po ng layunin natin? Do they have any document or any assurance that they can afford and therefore, they have no objection? It is not enough to say that they agree with the intentions of the Bill. Ang kailangan po natin ngayon ay garantiya na may pera na ibibigay para sa magandang layuning ito.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Pagdating po sa GSIS, hindi po ang GSIS ang nagbibigay ng payment para sa maternity leave. Ang government agencies concerned, the employer government agencies, the LGUs— sila ang nagbibigay po ng payment. Kinunsulta po namin ang lahat ng government agencies tungkol po dito at nagbigay po sila ng position paper nila. Lahat po sila ay nagbigay ng position paper at wala po namang nag-object.

Pagdating po sa SSS, ang assessment po nila sa financial impact of the maternity leave, through the SSS position paper, sinabi po nila na the SSS fund life is shortened by one year if the maternity leave is extended to 100 days. Iyon po ang sinabi nila.

REP. ATIENZA. Mme. Speaker, from what I am hearing, the statement of the Lady, as supposedly said by the SSS, that is not an assurance that they will have the money if this Bill is passed. Dito po naman, aking sinisiguro lang ay hindi tayo masisiphayo na naman at masisisi na tayo ay nagpapasa ng mga batas pero wala naman talagang kasiguruhan sa pananalapi ng kinaaukulan. Did they give an assurance that if we pass the Bill, they will have the money to give our mothers who will deliver babies?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. First, I would like to point out that in the SSS Law itself, it provides that in case there is any shortage of funds, Congress itself can provide for that. That is under the SSS Law but as I mentioned earlier, the fund will just be shortened by one year if we push through with the proposed 100-Day Maternity Leave Law, which means that in this one-year shortage, this means that the fund sits as is. With proper investments, with proper collections, then it might result in that the fund would not be diminished or would not be shortened to begin with.

Aside from this, there is an option also for the increase of point five (0.5) which the SSS proposed in case we want to increase the maternity leave to 100 days. That is also an option. Aside from this, right now, according to statistics from the SSS, less than two percent of the membership of the SSS actually availed of maternity leave benefits and so, this will not cause the SSS to be bankrupt or the SSS fund life to be severely diminished. As I mentioned earlier, it is just by one year. We weigh this against the benefits that we will be experiencing through the health of our children, the health of our mothers. I think there is not much debate if the benefits would be weighed against a one-year fund life decrease. This one-year fund life decrease, may I point out, is assuming that nothing is done with the fund, that it just sits there. So, if it is properly invested, if there is proper collection by the SSS, we might not even have that one-year fund life decrease to begin with.

REP. ATIENZA. Mme. Speaker, the statements of the Lady are not assurances that the SSS will be able to shoulder the additional expense. I heard a lot of ifs and whens and uncertainties. Hindi po pupuwede iyong magpasa tayo ng batas na wala pong kasiguruhan ang pondo. I believe that in making an ordinance or making a law, we have the same requirement that there has to be a certified sourcing of income. We cannot say that if we pass this, the government can shoulder—mayroon po bang pondo ang gobyerno at ito ba ay tinatanggap ng ating national government, na ito ay popondohan nila kung ipapasa natin. Puwede po ba iyong ganoon, na magpapasa tayo ng batas na wala pong certified sourcing of funds which is necessary for the good intentions of the law. Hindi puwede ho iyong prospective or presumptive. Kailangan po mayroong statement diyan that we have the money for this well-intended measure.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Mme. Speaker, the reason I used the words “if” and “when” is I was pertaining to a particular bill that has not yet been approved. That is why I said, “if the bill is approved, when the bill is approved, then the fund life will decrease by this”—so those are the only instances when I used the words “if” and “when.”

If the Gentleman wants certainty, then that is the certainty that I am saying. When this law is passed and the fund life—if nothing is done with the fund life, it just sits there, then it would decrease by one year—that is very manageable. This means that the SSS said that they can pay, they can accommodate all requests for maternity leave benefits of 100 days, but the fund life will decrease by one year. That is a certain statement, that is a period, not an “if,” not a “when.” In that case, I am stating that that one year is very manageable. In that one year, assuming that nothing is done with the fund, it just sits there, ganoon ba ang mangyayari, ganoon ba ang dapat mangyari? Hindi. Dapat ang fund ay properly invested para mag-generate ng income. In that case, it is possible that, if that is what the SSS would do, which is its job in the first place, then we do not even need that one-year decrease in the fund life.

Thank you, Mme. Speaker.

REP. ATIENZA. Naintindihan po namin ang sinasabi ng ating Gentlelady na maaaring humanap ng paraan kung saka-sakaling magigipit. Ang tatanungin ko na lang po ay more fundamental—mayroon po ba tayong dokumento kung saan sinasabi ng SSS na “mayroon kaming pera para diyan ngayon”—hindi bukas, hindi sa makalawa—“Ngayon, mayroon kaming pera para diyan, maglalaan kami ng pera para diyan,” to assure the Members of Congress that if we pass this law, it will not suffer the same fate of the good intention of the law where the SSS will give P2,000 a month additional retirement pay for our senior citizens.

Mayroon po ba tayong dokumentong ganoon? Kung mayroon po, hinihingi po ng inyong lingkod para po naman sa aming katiyakan na ito ay susuportahan ng kinauukulan.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Yes, Mme. Speaker, we do have that document, which is the position paper of the SSS, where they said that they can answer for the maternity leave benefits of workers who will apply for the 100-day maternity leave. The SSS said that. They also said that less than two percent availed of it and in their computation, if the 100-day Maternity Leave Bill becomes a law, they will be able to answer for that, and the fund life would decrease by only one year. That is what they said. That is assuming that nothing is done with the fund and it just sits there. That computation is based on that assumption.

I can provide the good Gentleman with a copy of that position paper where the SSS said that, and that is an imperative statement. If we compare this one year—actually, the decrease in the fund life with the SSS pension which is 18 years, this is only a small fraction of what we ought to give to our mothers.

REP. ATIENZA. Mme. Speaker, I understand every word that has been said but I repeat my question—can we have a copy of this particular document that is necessary now because it should have been part of the hearings conducted by the Committee of the Gentlelady. Mayroon po ba tayong kopya ngayon?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Yes, it was part of the hearings and yes, we have a copy right now which we can hand over to the Gentleman.

REP. ATIENZA. I will appreciate it, Mme. Speaker, if we can have a copy of that now after this interpellation so that we can have a very well-informed judgment on how to support this particular Bill.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. We will provide the Gentleman with the copy of the position paper of the SSS.

REP. ATIENZA. On a similar note, Mme. Speaker, since all local government units shall be affected by this measure, marami pong mga local government units ay mayroong maraming empleyadong kababaihan. E, kadalasan po ay nahihirapan sila kapagka iyong isang babaing empleyado ay nagli-leave dahil manganganak. Kaya ako po ay isa sa mga susuporta sa measure ninyo basta matiyak lang natin na matutuloy ito dahil alam kong dapat ini-encourage natin ang mga ina, “manganak kayo.” Huwag kayong matakot sa sinasabi ng gobyerno na pabigat lang ang anak. Hindi natin dapat pinakikialaman ang pagbubuntis ng sinumang ina. It

is a fact that local government units are burdened in every way. Having been a part of a local government in Manila, I know how difficult it is to assure those who are protected by law of funding every time you prepare the budget.

So, nakonsulta po ba natin ang mga local government units dito sa isyung ito at mayroon po ba silang position paper on the matter, na puwede nating panghawakan para walang mayor, walang governor na magsasabing “Hindi naming matutupad iyan sapagkat hindi naman kami natanong.”

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Opo. Simulatan po namin sila upang madinig po ang kanilang opinyon tungkol dito pero despite our efforts to follow up almost everyday, wala pong nagbalik sa amin ng position paper.

REP. ATIENZA. Therefore, Mme. Speaker, the local government units did not display any interest on the measure by not attending or responding to your letter.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Yes.

REP. ATIENZA. May we ask if any mayor, any governor, even responded through a letter since you wrote them? It behooves any mayor, any governor whom you have written to respond even in writing. Ano ang kanilang posisyon dito sa karagdagang gugulin na papasanin nila? Mayroon po ba kayong sulat ng isang local government unit?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Wala pong nag-reply sa amin pong sulat pero simulatan po namin lahat. So, their silence, despite our repeated follow-ups, means there is no strong opposition to the Bill.

REP. ATIENZA. Mme. Speaker, we have 1,700 municipal governments and we have more than 80 cities all over the country, and we have more than 80 provinces, and not one of them showed interest in the measure. We must interpret that as their non-interest or their refusal to even commit themselves on the matter. Kung wala po tayong response ng local government units sa napakahalagang gugulin na ito ay mahihirapan po tayong sabihin sa kanila later on na kailangang tumupad sila. Baka sabihin nila, “Hindi kami kasali diyan. Kayo ang gumawa ng batas, kayo ang mag-pondo rian.”

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Well, we wrote po. We wrote to LGUs and none replied to us. So, we wrote to the League of Barangays. We do not write to every single barangay, we do not write. So, whom we wrote to are the cities, provinces and municipalities, but none replied.

REP. ATIENZA. Now, we are treading on very, very sensitive grounds, Mme. Speaker, because out of our thousands of local government units, not one responded to us to support the good intentions of the measure. Iyon po ang aming medyo pinag-aalinlanganan. Maganda ang intensyon at kahanga-hanga ang mangyayari dahil ang ating mga ina ay bibigyan ng additional incentives to bear more children, pero kung hindi po naman susuportahan ng mga kinaukulan katulad po ng mga probinsiya, lungsod, munisipiyong, saan po kukunin ang benepisyong ito na hinahangad nating lahat?

Hindi lamang po ito. Ang hindi kumibo, nag-object, hindi pinansin ang panukalang batas, para sa akin, ang basa ko po diyan ay hindi sila sang-ayon. Baka nahihiya na lamang sila sa Sponsors. Ayaw nilang kumontra dahil maraming kadahilanan o baka naman nag-aalinlangan sila, pero iyong hindi nila pagkibo, I will interpret that as nonsupport for the measure, para bang, “O, sumulat si Congresswoman Villar pero huwag mo nang pansinin iyan. Wala iyan.” Ganoon po ba?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Mali pong interpretasyon iyon.

REP. ATIENZA. Dapat tingnan po natin iyon dahil hindi puwedeng assumption natin ang susunod sa bisa ng batas. Hindi po ganoon iyon. Local autonomy—the Lady may not be aware that local autonomy is now enshrined in the Constitution—provides that no measure that pertains to the burden of local government units can be passed without consulting them. In fact, a project—if the husband of the Lady has a good intention to build a bridge that will connect to provinces, he has to have the concurrence of the provinces that will be covered. Hindi puwede ho iyong basta sasabihin ng national government, “Gagawin ko po ang tulay na ito dahil makakabuti ito.” Kapag ayaw po noong gobernador ng dalawang probinsyang iyon, hindi po matutuloy iyong project. Ganoon po kalakas ang bisa ng garantiya ng ating Saligang Batas that the State shall ensure—“shall ensure,” hindi “may,” hindi “may be”—shall ensure local autonomy and local autonomy dictates self-decision, self-government, independence. Iyong pananalapi e talaga po iyan ay pasanin ng local government units. Kapag binigyan ninyo kami ng batas na magdagdag sa gastusin namin na hindi ninyo kami tinanong at hindi kami sumagot, wala po akong tungkulin diyan. Sisihihin namin iyong mga Congressmen na nagpasa niyan. Kayo ang magbayad niyan.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Mme. Speaker, first of all, I would like to point out a very important point that the Gentleman might have missed. With respect to the government sector like the LGUs, there is already an allocation for the salary of that woman worker who, let us say, went on leave because of pregnancy. It means that there is no additional appropriation that needs to

be made because there is already that salary for that woman that has been set aside to begin with. So, there is no additional cost to the LGU.

Second, with respect to the silence of the local government units, we can only do what is reasonably expected of us, which is to write to all the organizations of barangays, organizations or the league of cities, the league of municipalities; to write to them and inform them about the Bill, invite them to participate in the hearing, invite them to send us their position papers, objections, comments, questions, and if despite our repeated follow-ups to them they do not send us anything, nothing, no word, what else can we do? What else, Mme. Speaker, is expected of us when we have done due diligence in inviting them, writing to them, and following them up? I do not know what else we can do—knock on their doors, go to their houses, beg for their comments when they do not want to comment. How can we assume that their silence is an objection? Objection has to be categorical.

That is it, Mme. Speaker.

REP. ATIENZA. Nabanggit po ni Congresswoman Villar ang barangay. Iyon po bang mga empleyado ng barangay covered nitong layunin natin sa batas natin? Mayroon pong mga empleyado ang bawat barangay. Mayroon din pong mga ina diyan. Sila po ba ay makikinabang dito sa batas na ito o exempted sila?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. With respect to government employees, there is no exemption made for barangay workers.

REP. ATIENZA. So, lahat sila ay makikinabang.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Yes.

REP. ATIENZA. There are 46,000 barangays all over the country. Did you write them and tell them the good news, “We are preparing a law that will give extra benefits to your lady employees. Please send in your reaction.” Mayroon po ba tayong sulat na ganoon?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. We wrote to the organizations of barangays.

REP. ATIENZA. Organizations.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. League of Barangay.

REP. ATIENZA. How many times did you write, Mme. Speaker, the organizations, like for instance, the governors and the mayors? They did not respond the first time and you said you repeatedly wrote them many, many times. How many times did she wrote to these organizations?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. We wrote them once but followed up several times.

REP. ATIENZA. Wrote them once and everything was done just by following it up. Again, I will have to point out that we would be subject to very serious questions. If this reaches the courts, these questions that I am asking will be asked of all of us, and writing to somebody one time, palagay ko hindi supisyente po iyan. Kailangan siguro ipakita natin na talagang iyong sinabi ninyo kanina: "We wrote to them and we wrote to them and we wrote to them many times."

Mayroon po ba tayong mga kopya noong ganoon, maraming sulat? Sabi ninyo ngayon, "Minsan lang." So it shows the weakness of our argument that we have not communicated properly to those who will shoulder the additional expense and the Lady said na wala naman daw additional expense. Hindi pupuwede pong walang additional expense ho dahil gagawin nating 100 days with pay. Magkano po ba ngayon ang karapatan ng isang ina na magkaroon ng maternity leave with pay? Ilang buwan po ba iyan?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. The current is 60 days for normal delivery and 78 days for caesarean. Before I proceed, I would like to say that, first of all, the standard that all committees in the House of Representatives follow is for us to send one letter. There is no requirement for us to send repeated letters to people who apparently do not want to respond. It is their responsibility to respond to the letter actually. It is not our responsibility to keep on writing people. Also, the standard being followed by all committees of the House of Representatives with respect to securing the opinions of barangays and other LGUs is to write, not every single barangay in the thousands, of hundreds of thousands of barangays in this country, but to write to the League of Barangays.

I do not know why we, the Committee on Women and Gender Equality, for this 100-Day Maternity Leave Bill is required, all of a sudden, to write to all the barangays and to write more than once. I do not know. I think, Mme. Speaker, that we followed the correct procedure, and it is the responsibility of the League of Barangays which is an active organization, if they are interested or if they have comments or objections, to respond to our letter.

REP. ATIENZA. This Representation disagrees with the Gentelady. I cannot assume concurrence in silence. We were pursuing a law that will affect the rights of other parties. We have to go out of our way to make sure that their positions are registered, especially now that we are tackling it on Second Reading.

Kaya ito po ay nilalagay ko sa records na hindi sila nakonsulta nang maayos and we cannot cite, again, the

defective system being followed by some committees, kung mayroon man. Ako naman ay naniniwala na, siguro, baka wala naman siguro, dahil sa tinitiyak ng mga committees na iyong mga maaapektuhang partido o sektor ay kailangang marinig nila.

Mayroon tayong prinsipyo sa ating batas na iyong taxation without any representation is illegal. Therefore, making me pay for something I did not agree with, I would question it in court and probably, win my case that it is illegal. Kaya kailangan po ang mga tanong na ito ay masagot officially and documented.

I will beg to disagree with that position that this Congress does not care about the positions of those who will be affected by laws we passed. Kapag iyan ay gastusin, kailangan mayroong notification, mayroong support or objection para kasama po sa ating pagdedebate dito. Tayo po naman ay mga Kinatawan lang. Hindi po naman tayo nagdi-dictate. Kung ano ang talagang kagustuhan ng taong-bayan, iyon ang dapat salaminin natin dito sa Kongreso.

So, let me just shift to another sector because as far as government units, local government units are concerned, wala pong concurrence at wala pong suporta na ipinakita ang ating principal Sponsor.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Mme. Speaker, before we proceed I just like to point out that even in courts, the important thing is for the other party or the persons concerned to be given opportunity to be heard. We wrote to them and in the courts, one notice is enough. Also in the courts, if there was no response to the notice, they can actually be held in contempt, and even in our proceedings in the committees, we can actually cite people who do not attend, in contempt for not attending or responding. Does the Gentleman suggest that because we wrote the Ligas and they did not respond, we can even cite them in contempt based on our rules?

REP. ATIENZA. Iyon po ay nasa chairman ng komite kung nire respeto niya at kung kailangan niyang talaga ang posisyon ng mga sektor na inaanyayahan nila ay puwede niyang puwersahin iyong kanilang posisyon whether by a letter or telegram, cellphone, whatever, to communicate with the committee asking very important fundamental questions from them. Anyway, I have said it and I am quite disappointed to hear that the local government units are not part of this decision we are about to make.

Let me shift to the private sector, Mme. Speaker. Iyon po bang mga kompanya, private sector lang, natanong natin whether they have the funds for this very important legislative matter of additional expenses for their operations? Sila po ba ay mayroon ding opinyon o posisyon na ibinigay sa Komite before you proposed the discussion of this matter in the plenary?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. We have the position paper of the Employers Confederation of the Philippines and they are in favor of the Bill. However, they have several comments with respect to certain provisions of the Bill like for instance—actually, for private employees in general under the Bill, it is the SSS that funds the payment of their maternity leave benefits. The employer only comes in if the salary of the female worker who goes on leave is more than the maximum average monthly salary credit that has been determined. So right now, that is P16,000.

Under the Bill, the employee who goes on leave, the maternity leave benefit that she should be getting should not be less than two-thirds of her average salary. So, if there is a difference between that two-thirds average salary and the maximum average monthly salary credit which is P16,000, that difference or the salary differential will be shouldered by the employer. The Employers Confederation of the Philippines, in their position paper, request, that they should not be asked to pay that salary differential. That is their position.

REP. ATIENZA. Uulitin ko po iyong tanong ko kanina na hindi nasagot ng ating principal Sponsor. Ilan po ba ang mga benepisyo ngayon ng isang babae na nag-a-apply ng maternity leave? Ilang buwan po ba iyong kanyang puwedeng leave with pay?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. It is 60 days for normal delivery and ...

REP. ATIENZA. Sixty days.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. ... 78 days for caesarian delivery.

REP. ATIENZA. Ilan pong buwan ngayon itong ating nilalayon na idagdag?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. It is for 100 days, meaning, ang dagdag ay 40 days for the normal delivery and 22 days for the caesarian.

REP. ATIENZA. So, almost doble po, nadoble iyong gastos. Ang sinasabi po ng ating principal Sponsor, kung hindi makakayanan ng kompanya ay SSS ang sasagot. Mayroon po ba tayong ganoong garantiya ng SSS na “we will answer for whatever is not provided” if this law is passed?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Ang sinabi ko po kanina is, generally, the SSS will pay the maternity leave benefit, and the employer has no money out, generally. The only time that the employer has some money out is when the maximum average monthly salary credit is less

than two-thirds of the average salary of the employee. That is the only time that the employer comes in to pay the salary differential, and not the other way around as you just said.

REP. ATIENZA. What the Lady is stressing for the record, actually, stresses the fact that SSS will play a major role in providing the differences.

Iyon po ang sinasabi nila na mayroong role ang SSS. Sila ang dapat magbigay at iyan po ba ay ayon sa nangyayari ngayon sa negosyo? Ganoon po ba ang trato ng management, ng mga kompanya, na iyong kanilang mga kababaihan kapag nagkaroon ng maternity leave ay hindi nila sinasagot iyong gastusin? Iyon po ba ang nilalagay ninyo sa titik ng ating diskusyon?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Mme. Speaker, baliklad po yata iyong intindi po. Ang employers po, hindi po sila iyong nagbabayad ng maternity leave. Ang ina-answer po nila is, if magkakaroon ng salary differential. So, if the salary of the employee is more than P16,000, that is the time that they will step in to pay for the salary differential between that and two-thirds of the salary of the employee. So, hindi pa nga 100 percent ng salary, maximum of two-thirds lang of the salary of the employee.

REP. ATIENZA. Ang tanong ko po ay kung mayroon nga pong diperensiya, sino ang sasagot? Iyong employer o SSS?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. The employer.

REP. ATIENZA. The employer?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. The employer.

REP. ATIENZA. Mayroon po ba tayong position paper ng mga employers of the Philippines—big companies, medium companies and small companies—whether they can afford this additional expense that this law will force them to give to their employees?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. I mentioned earlier that the Employers Confederation of the Philippines actually said that they requested that particular—they opposed that particular provision that they should answer for the salary differential.

REP. ATIENZA. For the record, sino po ba iyong president ng Employers Confederation of the Philippines?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. If I remember it correctly, it is Donald G. Dee.

REP. ATIENZA. Sino po?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Donald G. Dee.

REP. ATIENZA. Donald Dee.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Yes.

REP. ATIENZA. Opo. He is in favor of this, he is in favor of the intention of the law?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. He is in favor of the intention.

REP. ATIENZA. Yes, and who else among the companies in the country that you can cite will immediately embrace the impact of this law—big companies, medium and small companies?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Actually, we have a lot.

REP. ATIENZA. Lalo na po iyong mga maliliit dahil malaking bagay po iyong additional na 40 days of leave with pay.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Actually, I would just like to point out also that for micro and small business enterprises, they are exempted under the law from paying for the salary differential. So that is Section 5, the salary differential payment to be made by employers is found under Section 5 of House Bill No. 4113. Under House Bill No. 4113, the following are exempted: distressed establishments, those establishments that pay by commission; commission, boundary or task-based; and those that are paid a fixed amount for performing a specific work; retail and service establishments employing not more than 10 workers; micro-business enterprises; those engaged in the production, processing or manufacturing of products or commodities, including agri-processing, trading, and services whose total assets are not more than three million pesos; and those establishments that are already providing similar or more than the benefits that are provided under the Bill.

So, with respect to small enterprises, small business enterprises, they are exempted from paying the salary differential.

REP. ATIENZA. Did you say they are exempted? Exempted?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Exempted from paying the salary differential.

REP. ATIENZA. Then who will pay the salary differential? The SSS?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Actually, if they are micro, small business enterprises, most likely, there will be no salary differential because the maximum salary credit is P16,000.

REP. ATIENZA. Again, Mme. Speaker, I will immediately interject because the Lady said “most likely.” Wala pong kasiguruhan iyon. In other words, magpapasa tayo ng batas that is “most likely” to be accepted or complied with. Mayroon po ba tayong kasiguruhan na ang medium-sized and small-sized companies can afford this additional expense? If we do not have that, aba mahirap po naman siguro tayong umakasyon ngayon. Baka tayo masisi later on.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Well, under the Bill, with respect to employees under micro-business enterprises, if their salary is more than P16,000 a month, then no one will answer for the salary differential. So that is the maximum that they will get.

REP. ATIENZA. They will not benefit from this law. Is that what we are hearing?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. They will benefit but they will only get up to P16,000.

REP. ATIENZA. My question is, who will shoulder the differential?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Wala nga po. Up to P16,000 lang iyong makukuha nila.

REP. ATIENZA. Walang differential. Mayroon po ba tayong estimate, Mme. Speaker, ng total cost that this will entail? To cover the full implementation of this law, magkano po ba ang magiging involved na salapi, para po naman may idea ang ating mga Miyembro? Does the Lady have anything that will indicate the total volume of pesos and centavos that will be necessary to realize this law?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Total ...

REP. ATIENZA. Mayroon po ba tayong estimate?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Well, right now ...

REP. ATIENZA. Ilan po ba ang—I will rephrase my question.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Okay.

REP. ATIENZA. Ilan po ba ang mga empleyado ngayon sa gobyerno at sa pribado na nabibilang sa women of reproductive age? Dahil iyong mga

babae naman na hindi na reproductive age, hindi na magbubuntis, pero iyong below 44 ay mayroon pa hong kapasidad na magbuntis. Mayroon po ba tayong bilang na ganoon?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Mayroon po. Actually, for those who are currently availing of the maternity leave benefit, it is less than two percent. In the private sector, when we did the survey, also from the information given by the DOLE, it is less than two percent of the workforce. In the SSS, it is consistent, it is less than two percent of the membership of the SSS.

So, for instance, these data came from the SSS and it showed that from 2012 to 2014, the availment of the maternity leave is less than two percent of the total female population of SSS members. This translates to 212,142 beneficiaries for 2012; 231,102 beneficiaries for 2013; and 221,990 beneficiaries for 2014 out of around 12 million female SSS members. So, it is less than two percent or approximately 220,000 female beneficiaries.

REP. ATIENZA. Ito pong record na binabasa ninyo ay galing sa gobyerno?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. From the SSS.

REP. ATIENZA. Opo.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. No, this is private because it is from the SSS.

REP. ATIENZA. Pribado. Mayroon po ba kayong estimate ng mga ina o kababaihan of reproductive age belonging to the local government units? Since they did not respond, I am presupposing that you have no records whatsoever.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. From the local government units, none, since none of the local government units responded but from the departments and agencies, some responded. So, we were able to get data from the departments since they are also part of the government sector. We also wrote to them and it is consistent, actually for some of the departments, sometimes, even a lesser percentage had availed of the maternity leave. If you would allow me, for instance in the Supreme Court since they replied, 2.38 percent of the total population of 1,883 employees had availed of the maternity leave since 2012 to 2016 or roughly 45 employees. For the lower courts, 1.68 percent, which is within the typical availment percentage of maternity leave, or out of 23,133 employees, these are data from the lower courts in the entire Philippines. In the Court of Appeals, with 1,200 employees, only 1.67 percent availed of the maternity leave and roughly, that is

20 employees per year. The City Hall of Davao, in particular, where there are 2,553 employees, there is only 1.06 percent who availed of the maternity leave, that is roughly 27 employees.

In the Philippine Deposit Insurance Corporation, 2.8 percent of the total population availed of the maternity leave or 17 employees. In the Housing and Urban Development Council, only one percent belongs to the reproductive age, and so, none yet filed for maternity leave. In the Department of Agriculture, out of 436 employees, 68.8 percent or 300 are female, and out of the 68.8 percent or 300 female employees, only 0.69 availed of the maternity leave or two employees, which meant that it is not really something so earth-shattering. The departments can handle two employees going on leave, 0.69 percent going on leave. Under the Department of Foreign Affairs, there are 1,547 employees, 1,139 are of reproductive age and 40 employees, on the average, avail of the maternity leave per year, and that is 2.6 percent of the total population.

Actually, may I correct myself, there is one LGU that responded, Paranas, Western Samar, and they have 144 employees. On an average, there are four employees who take their maternity leave per year out of the 144 employees. The Department of Science and Technology has 123 employees and in 2016, only one availed of the maternity leave out of the 123 employees.

So far, out of all the departments that we wrote to, also the LGUs, those are the ones that responded, which is consistent with the data of the SSS, whether public or private, that roughly two percent of the total population or less avail of the maternity leave, sometimes even just 0.6 percent, or in the case of the DOST, 0.8 percent. In the case of the Department of Agriculture, 0.6 percent, even if the number of their female employees is 68.8 percent, which we think would increase the percentage of those who will avail of the maternity leave but, in fact, it is lesser.

So, this goes to show that the maternity leave can be accommodated even if we increase it to 100 days. It can be accommodated by the departments. If you look at any workplace, it is a very, very small percentage—with one going on leave, two people out of 300 employees going on leave, and that is a very small percentage. It is something that we should not be scared of.

In fact, as I mentioned earlier in my speech, a study in California, when California implemented their parental leave, showed that in 2004, they increased their parental leave from what is required by the federal laws; in 2011, after years of having the parental leave, they did a study, and in their private sector, 89 percent said that there were no decreases in the profit of the company, there were no additional costs that were incurred, because in the first place, you have to train workers to substitute for those availing of the normal maternity leave which we already have now. So, increasing the

maternity leave by 22 days would not do much, would not do anything at all to increase the cost in terms of training additional workers. So, as borne out by the records, those who availed of the maternity leave is just a small percentage.

For example, here in Congress, we have almost 300 Members of Congress and out of 3,000 employees, how many go on leave? It is just 10 employees out of 3,000 employees here in Congress. So, it is less than one percent, it is 0.1 percent. Yes, it is 0.1 percent and so, it is a very, very small percentage who availed of the maternity leave. So, there is nothing for us to be scared of, na kung sabay-sabay na mag-maternity leave iyong mga tao, na mapipilayan ang Kongreso or mapipilayan ang kumpanya. That is not the case because, as the records of the SSS showed, as the records of the government agencies showed, roughly about two female employees, I mean, roughly about one percent of female employees go on leave for the entire year at hindi po sabay-sabay. So, I hope that we would put these fears to rest.

REP. ATIENZA. Mme. Speaker, all the data presented by the Lady point to a declining population growth. If women of reproductive age are not bearing children anymore, it should wake all of us up as a danger sign that our population growth is now declining. Iyan po ay masamang senyales. Ibig sabihin niyan ay darating ang araw na wala na pong ipapanganak na Pilipino. Ako ay natutuwa na ito ay binibilad ng ating Sponsor, na may problema na ang Pilipinas with the declining growth of birth of more Filipinos. Iyong namention niya sa California, iyon po talaga ay ginagawa na ngayon ng mga bansa kung saan may problemang malaki sapagkat negative na ang kanilang population growth. In fact, not only incentives for the women and the mothers but incentives for the fathers to reproduce—there are some countries that I know of where the father is given one year paternity leave para buntisin lamang iyong kanyang misis para manganak dahil kailangan nila ng tao. Now, the figures do not support or answer the questions that we are propounding. If we pass this law, iyong nag-de-decline na birth rate ay madodoble sapagkat may incentive. Itong ating pinag-uusapan, hindi po ba incentive ito sa panganganak? Tama po ba iyon o mali ang aking assumption? This is an incentive for our women to have more children. That is why I welcome—Basically, I believe in big families—the incentive.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Yes, Mme. Speaker.

REP. ATIENZA. Lahat iyang mga sinabi ninyong mga figures, malamang madodoble iyan. Kaya iyong aking mga tanong tungkol sa salapi ay gagamitin, ay napaka-importante dahil kung hindi po iyan maibibigay,

we would have failed in our mission to provide answers to the growing social problem of our population and our society. So, that is the reason I am very, very meticulous about the sourcing of funds.

So far, Mme. Speaker, we are not given any guarantee that funds will be made available by those who will be affected, the private sectors especially. Donald Dee does not speak for the whole of our Filipino enterprises, lalung-lalo na po iyong maliliit na mga kumpanya na ngayon ay umuusbong sa ating lipunan at sa ating ekonomiya. They should have been asked because they will, all of a sudden, inherit or will be forced to spend more money for the growing families of their employees. Kaya mabigat po ang magiging bunga nito kung ipapasa natin. I hope that while we are still in the debate period, the Lady will get more support from the outside, not from Congress, because even if we pass this, if it cannot be done and supported financially, it will not push through. Ikulong man nating lahat ang mga negosyante, kung sasabihin nilang wala silang perang ibibigay diyan, hindi rin natin sila mapupuwera. Ang gagawin po ng mga employers and businessmen ay kukuha na lang sila ng kalalakihan, to the detriment of our womenfolk and I do not want that to happen. As I told you, I am one of those concerned with the welfare of our women. We make sure that our women in Manila are well taken care of—their value, their livelihood training, in the generation of additional income for their families.

This measure, although well-intentioned, is no guarantee that it will give them the full benefits of the intentions of the law. Kaya, Mme. Speaker, I will hold my judgment on this measure and I hope that the Lady will come out with more definite documented proof that this Bill will be implemented and will not, in fact, serve as a disincentive to employers to avoid hiring women. Baka iyong maganda nating intensiyon, iyong magandang intensiyon noong limang Sponsors na nagsalita ay hindi matutupad, sapagkat baka ang maging bunga nito ay mabawasan ang mga ina na ngayon ay may trabaho at sila ay unti-unting ilalabas ng mga kompanya, considering sila ay mayroong additional benefits na ibinigay ang Kongreso at hindi naman sila tinanong. I can see the local government units now reacting and avoiding women of reproductive age. Sasabihin noong mayor, “Kumuha na lang tayo ng mga kalalakihan, sigurado tayong wala tayong sagutin diyan, at iyong mga may edad na mga kababaihan para hindi na magbubuntis.” So, it will not serve the intention, the beneficial effects for the women of reproductive age.

We support the good intentions of the Lady and the other Sponsors, but I was just hoping and praying that they would go through the process of guaranteeing the fulfillment of their dreams and our vision na mabigyan ng additional benefits ang ating mga ina. Ayokong

mawalan ng trabaho ang mga kababaihan dahil sa batas na ating pinag-uusapan. It would be very easy for mayors to say, “Ayoko na ng mga batang Pilipina, na kapag magbuntis, additional expenses iyan sa atin.” “Ayoko na,” sasabihin ng mga entrepreneurs sa private sector, “let us avoid hiring women of reproductive age because they will only be getting more from our hard-earned finances.” These are definite effects of this measure; and unless answered squarely, with documented support coming from the sectors we have asked, we have these questions on the realization of the vision of the Ladies who sponsored the Bill.

With that, Mme. Speaker, I am ending my interpellation. More than anything, I am confident and positive that this measure should not be passed.

Thank you.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Mme. Speaker, first of all, there are a lot of points raised which I have already answered a while ago, but I would like to add to what I said: first, I would like to emphasize that we are under the impression that smaller companies, micro-enterprises, will be subject to pay for the salary differential. So, I repeat, they are exempted from paying for the salary differential. We put a provision in the Bill precisely to accommodate the distressed establishments, micro-business enterprises, those with capital below three million pesos, those that are into agro-processing and manufacturing, those that pay by commission, task-based or for a particular work—all of these establishments are exempted.

Second, with respect to the companies—a while ago it was asked but I was not able to answer it since there were other points that came up—if there are other companies that provide maternity leave more than 60 or 78 days. Actually, there are a lot: Accenture provides for 120 days; JPMorgan Chase provides for 84 calendar days for normal delivery and 60 days for miscarriage; IBM provides for 12 weeks of maternity leave and six weeks of unpaid maternity leaves or a total of 18 weeks; CASURECO, a cooperative in Naga City, provides an extension of up to a maximum of 90 calendar days for a total of 150 or 168 days, depending on whether it is normal or caesarean delivery; Sun Life Grepa Financial provides for 104 days; Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation provides for 120 days; CF Sharp Maritime provides for 105 or 123 days, depending on whether the birth is normal or caesarean; and Nestlé Philippines provides for 98 days. So, these are only a few examples of a lot of other companies here in the Philippines that provide for more than 100 days maternity leave. I have a longer list of those that provide more than 60 and 78 days, but I only mentioned those that provide for more than 100 days. So, upon our survey of these companies, they replied that they do not notice any significant change in or decrease in their profit or additional cost, which is

consistent with the study made in California. I hope that we can set our fears to rest that the business sector will be severely crippled or will suffer large losses because of this 100-day maternity leave.

As mentioned earlier, with respect to the SSS, they have given their position paper that if the 100-day maternity leave is implemented, then, the fund life will decrease by one year, just one year, and this computation is based on a premise that nothing will be done to the fund—no investments, no nothing, it will just sit there. So, as I said earlier, if these funds are properly invested, we might not even have that decrease of one year in the fund life. We do not need to speculate on whether or not there will be losses incurred by the companies, whether or not their profitability will decrease, because there are actual companies here in the Philippines which can tell us that there were no additional costs and that there are no losses in profitability or in productivity, I mean. So, I hope, we can set these fears of ours to rest with respect to how it will affect the business sector. In fact, as studies abroad had shown, profitability, in fact, increases and productivity increases when the maternity leave is extended.

The view that women will not be hired because of the 100-Day Maternity Leave Bill is actually an antiquated view. With all due respect, right now, there is a 60-day maternity leave already. Right now, those who are inclined to discriminate against women will not—the probability of them discriminating more women, if the 100-day maternity leave is implemented, does not increase. Kumbaga po, iyong mga gustong mag-discriminate against women, magdi-discriminate sila kahit na ba mayroon o wala itong 100-day maternity leave. So, if there are those who are inclined to discriminate against women even if we implement the 100-Day Maternity Leave Law or not, those who will not discriminate against women, will not discriminate; and those who are inclined to discriminate, will still discriminate kahit wala ito o nandiyan ito. So, if we weigh the benefits of the 100-Day Maternity Leave Law to women, to mothers, to children, we should not think about it at all. We should respect what is in the Constitution—to respect the rights of women, taking into consideration their maternal functions. I hope that we can pass this Bill to give to mothers what is due them.

Thank you, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, the next Member who wishes to interpellate the Sponsor is the Lady from Party-List ANAK MINDANAO, the Hon. Sitti Djalia A. Turabin-Hataman. I move that we recognize her for her interpellation.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Honorable Turabin-Hataman is recognized for her interpellation.

REP. TURABIN-HATAMAN. Mme. Speaker, I would like to make a manifestation of support instead of an interpellation. Thank you very much.

ANAK MINDANAO, along with our Muslim women constituents, through this Representation, hereby manifests our support to the Bill as this Bill is not only about the number of days by which a mother can spend with her child in the first crucial days of the infant. May we also remind ourselves, through this Bill, of the responsibility of the government, of the private sector, of society itself, in rearing the next generation of this country. In allowing an extended maternity leave, we as a nation contribute to ensuring healthy, productive citizens in the coming generations. After all, it is the society as a whole, not the mother or the family, that will either suffer or benefit from however and whatever our children will become.

Congratulations go to the Committee on Women and Gender Equality.

Maraming salamat.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, the next Member who wishes to interpellate the Sponsor is the Gentleman from the First District of Albay, the Hon. Edcel C. Lagman. I move that we recognize him for his interpellation.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Honorable Lagman is recognized to interpellate the Sponsor.

REP. LAGMAN. Thank you, Mme. Speaker.

I am consistent in my advocacy for the enactment of pro-women legislation, and I will vote in favor of this measure. Let me just ask a few clarificatory questions, if the distinguished Chairperson of the Committee on Women and Gender Equality would allow me.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. With pleasure, Mme. Speaker.

REP. LAGMAN. I noticed that there is no appropriation language in this Bill or an appropriation provision. Is this a manifestation of the confidence of the leadership of the Committee and the various authors and Sponsors that the SSS and the government agencies like LGUs and the central government would be in a position to fully grant the maternity leave benefit provided for in this Bill?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Yes, Mme. Speaker. With respect to government agencies and the government sector, we should bear in mind that there is already an appropriation for the salaries of these women workers who will go on leave. It is not an additional cost to the government or to the particular LGU, the particular department or agency because there is already an appropriation for this. The assumption is that the women workers would be working the entire year. So, when the woman worker goes on leave, there is still that existing appropriation for her salary, which will be given to her.

With respect to the private sector, the position of the SSS is that, if the 100-day maternity benefit is given, the fund life will decrease by one year. Now, we discussed this in the Committee, we the authors with the members of the Committee, and we are of the opinion that a decrease in one year of fund life—and this is assuming that the funds are not invested, where it just sits there—that can be averted or prevented if these funds are invested properly and wisely. So, it is just a one-year decrease in fund life, which is very manageable through proper investment of the funds, and that is why we did not include any appropriation provision or section in the Bill.

REP. LAGMAN. Well, it is true that the salaries of these women who are going to avail of the maternity leave are already appropriated, but since it is a 100-day leave, I think the employer, whether the government or the private sector, would have to employ substitutes to take over the position of those who will avail of the maternity leave. Is that observation accurate?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Yes, there are substitutes that need to be hired for certain positions.

REP. LAGMAN. Then that would entail additional outlay on the part of the employer, whether the government or the private sector. That is why I was asking whether there is a need for an appropriation language to cover those eventualities.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. With respect to the private sector, I believe that there is no additional cost for them since the training for the substitutes actually is a contingency cost that has already been taken into consideration right now with the existing 60 days and 78 days for maternity leave. With respect to the government, however, there needs to be an additional appropriation for substitutes. However, with the current setup of 60 and 78 days, there is already an appropriation for substitutes that is already taken into consideration by the departments because they can already predict the percentage of those who will go on leave. So if we increase the maternity leave to 100

days, that is a correct observation, there needs to be an additional appropriation to answer for the salaries of the substitutes.

REP. LAGMAN. Most probably, it would be advisable for the Committee to provide for an appropriation language, like a contingency fund from where these additional expenses on the part of government units can be sourced.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Yes, Mme. Speaker, we are open to adding language and provision in the Bill for appropriations to accommodate these contingencies.

REP. LAGMAN. Another source of possible appropriation would be the Gender and Development (GAD) Fund which is provided for annually in the general appropriations act. That is, five percent of all appropriations allocated to the government unit would have to be used for the GAD. Most probably, we could specify that so much of the GAD funding should be used to answer the needs contingent to the implementation of the 100-Day Maternity Leave Law. It should not merely be by attribution but by actual appropriation.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. That is a very good suggestion, Mme. Speaker. We thank the honorable Gentleman for making that suggestion. We are open to amendments. We can even, in fact, propose a Committee amendment to this Bill to accommodate the suggestion.

REP. LAGMAN. Now, when can the maternity leave benefits be available, prenatal or postnatal, or which option?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Mme. Speaker, it can be prenatal or postnatal just as long as it does not exceed 100 days and it is not less than 60 days, and it is availed of in a continuous and uninterrupted manner.

REP. LAGMAN. Yes. According to Section 3, paragraph 2: "Enjoyment of maternity leave cannot be deferred but should be availed of either before or after actual period of delivery in a continuous and uninterrupted manner, not exceeding one hundred (100) calendar days, as the case may be." In other words, it could be availed of after delivery, and there is no availment as a prenatal condition. I would like to suggest that so much should be availed of prenatal and so much should be availed of postnatal because these are both sensitive periods on the part of a pregnant woman.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Actually, it depends on the mother because there are some pregnancies

that have no issues during their term. So, it is her decision—we leave it to the mother to decide whether she would want to avail of—if she would want to avail of the 100-day maternity leave—some days before the delivery and some after, or completely after the delivery. There are some mothers who do not have any problems even until they reach full term, who are still very active and so, they do not need to use any day for prenatal leave. So, we leave it to the decision of the mother to decide on the ratio, whether 10 percent prenatal and 90 percent postnatal, or 100 percent of the 100 days postnatal. It is a case-to-case basis because every mother experiences pregnancy differently, just as long as there is a compulsory postnatal leave of not less than 60 days.

REP. LAGMAN. Most probably, we should be able to encourage pregnant women to avail of the maternity leave benefits soon enough because, Section 5, letter (a), item (2) states, "That the full payment shall be advanced by the employer within thirty (30) days from the filing of the maternity leave application." So, the sooner the application is made, the faster would be the availment which would include already the prenatal period.

Now, I understand that this Bill covers maternity leave for the informal sector.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Yes, it does, Mme. Speaker.

REP. LAGMAN. How would this be implemented in the informal sector?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Well, the members of the informal sector have to make voluntary contributions to the SSS since they have no formal employer who would remit the contributions for them. They have to make voluntary contributions and the same requirements as members of the SSS would be applicable to them in terms of having three monthly contributions in the 12-month period immediately preceding the semester of their child birth or miscarriage.

So, the maternity benefit is based on their average monthly contribution. So, the computation would be based on their contributions.

REP. LAGMAN. In other words, if one is employed in the informal sector and there is no voluntary contributions to the SSS, then no maternity leave benefits will accrue to the pregnant woman. Is that correct?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. No, that is not correct. They will be covered under PhilHealth Circular No. 022-2014 or the Social Health Insurance Coverage and Benefits for women about to give birth.

REP. LAGMAN. What is the nature of this particular circular?

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Actually, it covers non-members of the Social Security System, those who do not give contributions, whether voluntary or compulsory. A certain fund with the PhilHealth is set aside for them. If you want to know how much, I need a moment to look at my notes. Just a minute.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

REP. CRISOLOGO. Mme. Speaker, I move for a one-minute suspension of the session.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The session is suspended.

It was 6:45 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 6:48 p.m., the session was resumed.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The session is resumed.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Mme. Speaker, with respect to PhilHealth Circular 022, S-2014, PhilHealth accredited health care institutions and professionals, PhilHealth members, PhilHealth regional offices and branches, local health insurance offices and central office and all others concerned—so, this is directed to them—and it says that those who would avail, should be members of the PhilHealth, first of all. So, there are other circulars that would allow nonmembers to become members thereof and as members, there is a maternity care package that is available to them. It is a benefit that covers the complete essential health care services for women throughout their pregnancy, those who are about to give birth whether normal delivery or not, during antenatal, intra-partum and immediate post-partum periods, regardless of the type of health care institution where the services are rendered. The services shall include antenatal care, intra-partum monitoring, assistance in normal delivery, and post-partum care within 72 hours and seven days after delivery.

REP. LAGMAN. Those are not equivalent to the maternity leave benefits envisioned in the Bill.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. No, Mme. Speaker.

REP. LAGMAN. No, they are not. In other words, with respect to those in the informal sector where there is no voluntary contribution, they will be denied the

benefits of maternity leave. That is why I was suggesting that there should be a provision on appropriations to cover these contingencies.

Another one. The distinguished Sponsor said that there are five groups of employers who are exempted from paying the salary differential. Consequently, women who would be availing of these maternity leave benefits would not get the full benefit under the law because their employers are exempted. That is another reason there should be an appropriation language to answer for this type of employees who will not get the full benefit of the law.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. Mme. Speaker, the point is well-taken, and we will consider proposing a Committee amendment to provide for an appropriations provision.

REP. LAGMAN. Last point, distinguished Chairperson. Section 7 reads:

Maternity Leave With Pay in Case of Childbirth, Miscarriage, or Abortion After Termination. - Maternity leave with pay shall be granted even if the childbirth, miscarriage, or abortion occurs not more than fifteen (15) calendar days after the termination of an employee's service, as her right thereto has already accrued.

I am thinking of a childbirth after the 15 days from termination, and the termination is without cause, the termination is illegal, or the termination was a forced resignation. I think that even after 15 days from termination, the covered pregnant woman should still benefit from the maternity leave. So, we should craft a language where that would cover instances where the termination is forced termination, illegal termination or without lawful cause, so that a woman who gives birth even after 15 days from termination should get the benefits.

REP. AGLIPAY-VILLAR. The suggestion is also well-taken by the Committee, and we will include this in our Committee amendments.

REP. LAGMAN. Thank you so much, distinguished Chairperson, for accommodating my questions and suggestions.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). The next Member who wishes to interpellate the Sponsor is the Gentleman from the Citizens' Battle Against Corruption Party-List, the Hon. Sherwin N. Tugna. I move that we recognize him for his interpellations.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The Honorable Tugna is recognized to interpellate the Sponsor.

REP. TUGNA. Mme. Speaker, this Representation has waited for his turn since the start of the debate on the proposed measure, but an urgent matter came up and that is why I have to leave. May this Representation manifest that on the day this particular measure is taken up in the Plenary, that he be listed as one of the interpellators again, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The manifestation of Honorable Tugna is noted.

The Dep Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. TUGNA. Thank you, Mme. Speaker.

SUSPENSION OF CONSIDERATION OF H.B. NO. 4113

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, to give way to the Members who would like to interpellate but, unfortunately, are not here tonight, I move that we suspend the consideration of House Bill No. 4113. I so move.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion to suspend the consideration on House Bill No. 4113 is approved.

The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we acknowledge the presence of the following individuals, the guests of the House of Representatives: Mr. Jose Tomas, Ms. Annabelle Tuy, Ms. Jo Adaque, Ms. Leony Ferreras, Rudy Fidelson, and Jorge Fuenzalida. They are guests of the Hon. Anthony M. Bravo of Coop-NATCCO Party-List. I so move, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). The presence of the guests of Congressman Bravo is hereby acknowledged. (*Applause*) Welcome to the House of Representatives.

REFERRAL OF HOUSE RESOLUTIONS ON INQUIRIES IN AID OF LEGISLATION

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, in accordance with our Rules Governing Inquiries in Aid of Legislation, I move that we refer the following House resolutions to the appropriate Committees:

1. House Resolution No. 660 re implementation of Section 20 of Republic Act No. 8042, otherwise known as the Migrant Workers and Overseas Filipinos Act of 1995 as amended by Republic Act No. 10022,

mandating the establishment of a Shared Government Information System on Migration (SGISM), to the Committee on Overseas Workers Affairs;

2. House Resolution No. 661 re warning made by the Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA) on fake jobs being offered through e-mail and social media, to the Committee on Overseas Workers Affairs;

3. House Resolution No. 662 re warning made by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) on lead-laced candles being sold in the market, to the Committee on Health;

4. House Resolution No. 666 re Findings of the UN Environment Program (UNEP) on annual severe bleaching (ASB) due to climate change that threatens the world's coral reefs, including those in the Philippines, to the Special Committee on Climate Change;

5. House Resolution No. 667 re alleged claim of SMMT-TIM 2016, Inc. (SMARTMATIC) that it has the right to enforce the "Considered-Sold" provision of its two (2) lease contracts with option to purchase (OTP), entered into with the Commission on Elections (COMELEC) for the conduct of the May 9, 2016 National and Local Elections, to the Committee on Suffrage and Electoral Reforms;

6. House Resolution No. 668 re revelation of the Philippine National Police (PNP) that up to ten (10) foreigners are training with local terrorist groups before joining the Islamic State (IS) extremists in Syria, to the Committee on Public Order and Safety;

7. House Resolution No. 669 re exorbitant bonuses of SSS Board Members and Executives, to the Committee on Government Enterprises and Privatization;

8. House Resolution No. 672 re possibility of transforming Camp Aguinaldo and Camp Crame into a mixed-use urban housing and economic zone, to the Special Committee on Bases Conversion;

9. House Resolution No. 675 re animal cruelty during the production and filming of the Metro Manila Film Festival Official Entry Movie "Oro," to the Committee on Public Information;

10. House Resolution No. 677 re recent jailbreak incident in North Cotabato District Jail, to the Committee on Public Order and Safety;

11. House Resolution No. 678 re case of the fifty-two (52) Mindanao sakadas as victims of human trafficking, unfair labor practices and slave-like treatment of the Greenhand Labor Service Cooperative, Agrikulto, Inc. and Central Azucarera de Tarlac in Tarlac Province, to the Committee on Human Rights;

12. House Resolution No. 679 re December 24, 2016 extrajudicial killing of Jimmy Sotto, Secretary General of the Aguman Dareng Maglalautang Capampangan (AMC) in Brgy. San Jose, Floridablanca, Pampanga, to the Committee on Human Rights;

13. House Resolution No. 680 re plight of farmers, human rights abuses and militarization in Hacienda Matias in the Municipality of San Francisco, Quezon Province, to the Committee on Human Rights;

14. House Resolution No. 681 re abuses against farmers in Hacienda Uy, Municipality of San Andres, Quezon Province, to the Committee on Human Rights; and

15. House Resolution No. 687 re violent shooting of farmers, resulting in nine injured farmers belonging to the Madaum Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Association, Inc. (MARBAI) by the security guards and personnel of Lapanday Foods Corporation (LFC) in Barangay Madaum, Tagum City, Davao del Norte, to the Committee on Human Rights.

I so move, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

ADJOURNMENT OF SESSION

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we adjourn the session until four o'clock in the afternoon of Wednesday, January 25, 2017.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Alvarez, M.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the session is adjourned until Wednesday, January 25, 2017, at four o'clock in the afternoon.

It was 6:57 p.m.