



Congressional Record

PLENARY PROCEEDINGS OF THE 17th CONGRESS, FIRST REGULAR SESSION

House of Representatives

Vol. 4

Wednesday, March 1, 2017

No. 77

CALL TO ORDER

At 4:00 p.m., pursuant to Section 15(h), Rule IV of the House Rules, the Presiding Officer, Rep. Gerald Anthony "Samsam" V. Gullas Jr. called the session to order.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Rep. Gullas). The session is called to order.

NATIONAL ANTHEM

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Rep. Gullas). Everybody please rise for the singing of the Philippine National Anthem.

Everybody rose to sing the Philippine National Anthem.

PRAYER

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Rep. Gullas). Please remain standing for a minute of silent prayer.

Everybody remained standing for the silent prayer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Rep. Gullas). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. GONZALES (A.D.). Mr. Speaker, I move to defer the calling of the roll.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Rep. Gullas). There is a motion to dispense with the calling of the roll.

REP. ATIENZA. Objection, Mr. Speaker.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Rep. Gullas). The session is suspended.

It was 4:02 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 4:52 p.m., the session was resumed with Deputy Speaker Raneo "Ranie" E. Abu presiding.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The session is resumed.

The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

ROLL CALL

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, I move that we call the roll of Members.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). 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. 77, dated March 1, 2017:

PRESENT

Abad	Amatong
Abaya	Andaya
Abayon	Angara-Castillo
Abellanos	Aragones
Abu	Arbison
Abueg	Arcillas
Acop	Arenas
Acosta	Atienza
Adiong	Aumentado
Agarao	Bag-ao
Aggabao	Bagatsing
Albano	Banal
Alejano	Barzaga
Almario	Bataoil
Almonte	Batocabe
Alonte	Bautista-Bandigan
Alvarez (F.)	Belaro
Alvarez (P.)	Belmonte (F.)
Amante	Belmonte (J.C.)

Belmonte (R.)	Garcia (J.E.)	Pacquiao	Singson
Benitez	Garcia-Albano	Palma	Suansing (E.)
Bernos	Garin (R.)	Pancho	Suansing (H.)
Bertiz	Garin (S.)	Panganiban	Suarez
Biazon	Gasataya	Panotes	Tambunting
Billones	Geron	Papandayan	Tan (A.)
Bolilia	Go (M.)	Pimentel	Tejada
Bondoc	Gonzaga	Pineda	Teves
Bordado	Gonzales (A.P.)	Plaza	Tiangco
Bravo (A.)	Gonzales (A.D.)	Primicias-Agabas	Ting
Bravo (M.V.)	Gonzalez	Quimbo	Tinio
Brosas	Gullas	Radaza	Treñas
Calderon	Hernandez	Ramirez-Sato	Tugna
Calixto-Rubiano	Herrera-Dy	Ramos	Tupas
Caminero	Hofer	Relampagos	Turabin-Hataman
Campos	Jalosjos	Revilla	Ty
Canama	Javier	Roa-Puno	Umali
Cari	Labadlabad	Robes	Ungab
Casilao	Lagman	Rocamora	Unico
Castelo	Lanete	Rodriguez (I.)	Uy (J.)
Castro (F.L.)	Laogan	Rodriguez (M.)	Uy (R.)
Castro (F.H.)	Lazatin	Roman	Uybarreta
Catamco	Leachon	Romualdo	Vargas
Celeste	Limkaichong	Roque (H.)	Vargas-Alfonso
Cerifica	Lobregat	Roque (R.)	Velasco-Catera
Chipeco	Lopez (B.)	Sacdalán	Veloso
Co	Lopez (C.)	Sagarbarria	Vergara
Cortes	Lopez (M.L.)	Sahali	Villanueva
Cortuna	Macapagal-Arroyo	Salimbangon	Villaraza-Suarez
Cosalan	Madrona	Salo	Villarica
Cuaresma	Malapitan	Salon	Villarin
Dalipe	Manalo	Sambar	Violago
Daza	Mangaoang	Sandoval	Yap (A.)
De Jesus	Mangudadatu (Z.)	Santos-Recto	Yap (M.)
De Venecia	Marcoleta	Sarmiento (C.)	Yap (V.)
De Vera	Marcos	Sarmiento (E.M.)	Yu
Defensor	Mariño	Savellano	Zamora (R.)
Del Mar	Marquez	Sema	Zarate
Dimaporo (M.K.)	Martinez	Siao	Zubiri
Duavit	Matugas	Silverio	
Dy	Mellana		
Enverga	Mendoza		
Erice	Mercado		
Ermita-Buhain	Mirasol		
Espina	Montoro		
Estrella	Nava		
Eusebio	Nieto		
Fariñas	Noel		
Fernando	Nogralas (K.A.)		
Ferrer (J.)	Nolasco		
Ferrer (L.)	Nuñez-Malanyaon		
Flores	Oaminal		
Fortun	Ocampo		
Fortuno	Olivarez		
Garbin	Ortega (P.)		
Garcia (G.)	Ortega (V.N.)		

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. Mr. Speaker, the roll call shows that 229 Members responded to the call.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). With 229 Members present, the Chair declares the presence of a quorum.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). What is the pleasure of the Gentleman from BUHAY Party-List?

REP. ATIENZA. Again, we would like to stress that there are enough Members on the floor to constitute a quorum. Yes, we have much more than a quorum, but

the count of the Secretariat this time jibes with our count and that is surprising. I would like to put that on record. Their count now today is accurate.

Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, as usual, we manifest that it is the count of the plenary tellers that we use as the official count for our quorum. With that, Mr. Speaker, I move that we defer the Reference of Business.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

CONSIDERATION OF H.B. NO. 4727

Continuation

PERIOD OF AMENDMENTS

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, I move that we resume the consideration of House Bill No. 4727 as contained in Committee Report No. 47. For that purpose, I move that the Secretary General be directed to read only the title of the measure.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Secretary General is directed to read only the title of House Bill No. 4727, as contained in Committee Report No. 47.

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 4727, entitled: AN ACT IMPOSING THE DEATH PENALTY ON CERTAIN HEINOUS CRIMES, REPEALING FOR THE PURPOSE REPUBLIC ACT NO. 9346, ENTITLED "AN ACT PROHIBITING THE IMPOSITION OF DEATH PENALTY IN THE PHILIPPINES," AND FURTHER AMENDING ACT NO. 3815, AS AMENDED, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE "REVISED PENAL CODE," AND REPUBLIC ACT NO. 9165, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE "COMPREHENSIVE DANGEROUS DRUGS ACT OF 2002."

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker...

REP. DAZA. Mr. Speaker.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). What is the pleasure of the Gentleman from BUHAY Party-List?

REP. ATIENZA. Before we start deliberating on the all-important measure that is House Bill No. 4727, I would like to pose a query on the Dep. Majority Leader's position since yesterday we adjourned on a question of defining Section 116 which pertains to nominal voting.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Gentleman from Manila be given five minutes to explain his manifestation.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Gentleman from BUHAY Party-List has five minutes.

REP. ATIENZA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday, this Representation and Cong. Harry Roque, together with several other Members of Congress, insisted on being given the chance to enjoy the privilege and their right to have a nominal voting. We wanted to be sure that on the issue that was raised on the floor and decided by the Body with *ayes* and *nays*, we would have a more definite and reliable count faithful to the real sentiments of the Body. So, we were citing Section 116 which clearly provides the right of this Body to have a nominal voting on very important issues.

Section 116 states "Nominal Voting," and I would like to read it into the record:

Upon motion of a Member, duly approved by one-fifth (1/5) of the Members present, there being a quorum, nominal voting on any question may be called. In case of nominal voting, the Secretary General shall call, in alphabetical order, the names of the Members who shall state their vote as their names are called.

Alam ko po naman na ang ating Secretariat is well-versed on this particular provision because we use nominal voting in many occasions where we are approving measures on Second Reading. At this point in time, we want a definitive position from the Dep. Majority Leader so that our proceedings will go on smoothly and we will not waste time defining, redefining and misinterpreting, and in the process, distorting the intention of Congress, where one-fifth of the Body will decide on the nominal voting issue. The Chair, with all due respect to the Gentleman now presiding, does not have the power to refuse that. He has to throw the question to the floor, and we have to decide whether we would want a nominal voting or not. If we cannot gather one-fifth of those present, then the motion is automatically lost. Now, if we have more than one-fifth agreeing, in fact, wanting a nominal voting, then we

should grant that automatically, without further debate, para tumakbo po ang ating procedure nang maayos at mas magiging credible ang ating ginagawang trabahong ito on the all-important issue of the death penalty.

With that, I would like to get the response of the Dep. Majority Leader.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, it says in Section 115, on the “Manner of Voting x x x If the Speaker doubts the result of the voting or a motion to divide the House is carried, the House shall divide.” In our past votation, it has been very clear as to the results of the voting, and we enjoin our Members to refrain from using the microphone, and our dear kababayans in the gallery from joining in the voting, so that we can get the true sentiment of the House. There has been no need for us yet to go into nominal voting, but should that arise in time, the Majority will gladly accede to the will of the Body should a nominal voting be called for. With that, Mr. Speaker,...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). What is the pleasure of the Gentleman from KABAYAN Party-List?

REP. ROQUE (H.). Mr. Speaker, I believe I have a pending motion for nominal voting, and while I do not dispute the provision of Section 115, the provision in Section 116 of our rules is also very clear that, upon motion of any Member for a nominal voting, it is incumbent upon this Body to determine if there is one-fifth vote in support of the motion for a nominal voting.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this has not been acted upon—there has not been any ruling made by the Chair and therefore, I reiterate my motion that we have a nominal voting on the last amendment that was discussed yesterday.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. DAZA. Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, we have the highest respect ...

REP. DAZA. Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, I have the floor.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Please allow the Dep. Majority Leader to first respond to the query of the Gentleman from KABAYAN Party-List.

REP. DAZA. I reserve the right to reply to the Dep. Majority Leader, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Yes, at the proper time, Gentleman from Samar.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, we have the highest esteem for the Gentleman from the Party-List KABAYAN, but his motion was lost in yesterday’s proceeding. When we opened the period of amendments and for the subsequent actions of the body politic, we will entertain the appropriate motions should the Body so decide.

REP. ROQUE (H.). Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the Dep. Majority Leader, actually, I do not even recall the subject of our *viva voce* voting yesterday. May I inquire again, for the record, what was the last subject of our *viva voce* voting when I raised the issue of nominal voting, Mr. Speaker?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. With the indulgence of the Honorable Daza, I will first reply to Hon. Harry Roque. Let me clear up our parliamentary status. We are in consideration of House Bill No. 4727, and our last directive yesterday was for the Secretariat of the House plenary to prepare a clean copy of the Bill with the amendments that I proposed and those that were approved on the floor. So, we proceed from this point, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor. We will now be considering individual amendments to our House Bill, as amended yesterday, and all Members are free to propose amendments which will be accepted or denied by the honorable Chairman, whom we hope to recognize.

REP. ROQUE (H.). Mr. Speaker, I recall that yesterday, Deputy Speaker Castro (F.H.) already had two, or it was the Dep. Majority Leader who proposed two individual amendments. So, do I take it that we begin anew from scratch on the individual amendments and we go back to the provisions that were already discussed yesterday? As mentioned by Congressmen Atienza and Lagman yesterday, we were entertaining individual amendments without the benefit of a clean copy of the Bill that is being discussed for possible amendments.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, our parliamentary status is that we are in consideration now

of House Bill No. 4727, of which a clean copy is being provided really for the understanding of all Members. In previous occasions such as in the consideration of the budget or other House bills, the amendments were free-willing and it is up to the Members themselves to keep track of the individual amendments. But we have gone out of our way to furnish the Body with clean copies to which the Hon. Harry Roque can now propose amendments at this point because we are in the period of individual amendments and it is now open.

May I ask that we recognize, Mr. Speaker, our honorable Sponsor, so he can now accept individual amendments from our colleagues who have registered, including the Hon. Harry Roque who is third on our list.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Sponsor, the Chairman of the Committee on Justice, our distinguished colleague, the Hon. Reynaldo V. Umali from Oriental Mindoro, is recognized to accept amendments.

REP. DAZA. Mr. Speaker, I reserved to make a remark.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). What is the pleasure of the Gentleman from Samar?

REP. DAZA. I would like to put on record a matter relating to the question on nominal voting. Now, Section 116 of the rules ...

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, I move that we give the Honorable Daza five minutes for his manifestation.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The honorable Gentleman from Samar is recognized and he has five minutes to explain his point of order.

REP. DAZA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Dep. Majority Leader.

Section 116 states, "Nominal Voting. - Upon motion of a Member, duly approved by one-fifth (1/5) of the Members present, there being a quorum, nominal voting on any question may be called." Now, this is not just a matter in the rules; the Constitution provides it explicitly. Article VI, Section 16, paragraph 4 says "x x x and the *yeas* and *nays* on any question shall, at the request of one-fifth of the Members present, be entered in the Journal." In other words, this is not a matter which is just under the rules, but this provision in the rules is in compliance with the constitutional provision. According to the practice of the past Congresses, and I would like to quote it into the Record, it is the

constitutional right of any Member in the House, on any question, to ask for nominal voting.

Now, I have with me this book which I have already adverted to, the Rules of the House of Representatives by Dr. Inocencio Pareja. There is a copy of this book in the library of the House of Representatives. What does it say? It says, on page 400:

A vote by *yeas* and *nays* entered in on the Journal shall be taken, even after a vote by division has been had, at the desire of one-fifth of the Members present.

Now, the precedents have been set here. In the House of Representatives that sat in 1945, and it is quoted here on the same page, it states:

Upon motion and supported by one-fifth of the Members present, nominal voting was taken on motion to postpone.

The nominal voting was only on a motion to postpone. Then the precedents in the US Congress are also under our Rules' supplementary source of interpretation and it is on page 401 of the book. It says on pages 400 to 401, this is a precedent in the House of Representatives from which we borrowed this rule. This provision in our Constitution is lifted from the US Constitution, Mr. Speaker, it says here:

The right to demand the *yeas* and *nays* is a constitutional privilege which may not be denied or abridged and may not be ruled out as dilatory, but to be construed liberally in favor of the demand by any Member.

The constitutional right to demand the *yeas* and *nays* does not exist as to the vote to second a motion when such second is required by the rules.

In other words, the right to demand a nominal voting, upon the ascertainment that there are one-fifth of the Members present in support of the demand for a nominal voting, is not merely granted by the rules; it is a constitutional right of a Member, and it is a constitutional duty on the part of the House to respect this constitutional provision.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, we note with gravity the comments of the Honorable Daza, an esteemed lawmaker even when I was still a young child. So, his points are very well-taken and will be applied at a proper time, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, upon the wish of the Plenary.

Thank you for your manifestation, the Honorable Daza.

REP. DAZA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Dep. Majority Leader.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Thank you, Gentleman from Northern Samar.

May I recognize now the distinguished Sponsor of House Bill No. 4727, to accept or not to accept the amendments to be laid by our fellow Members.

The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, to first make his individual amendments to our House Bill No. 4727, as amended, I move for the recognition of the Deputy Speaker from the First District of Camarines Sur, the Hon. Rolando G. Andaya Jr. I move for his recognition.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Deputy Speaker from the First District of Camarines Sur, the distinguished Gentleman, the Hon. Rolando Andaya, is recognized.

REP. ANDAYA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the Chairman ready?

REP. UMALI. With pleasure, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor.

REP. ANDAYA. Thank you very much.

My proposed amendment would be on page 1, lines 1 to 21, to delete Section 1, Section 2 and Section 3; and on page 2, lines 2 to 6, to delete the whole paragraph. As a consequence of such, to amend the title to read as follows: AN ACT IMPOSING THE DEATH PENALTY ON CRIMES ENUMERATED UNDER REPUBLIC ACT NO. 9165, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE COMPREHENSIVE DANGEROUS DRUGS ACT OF 2002.

I submit, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). What does the Sponsor say?

REP. UMALI. Just to clarify, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, you want to change the title of the Bill and you directly moved for the amendment of the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act. Is that the intention?

REP. ANDAYA. That is correct.

REP. UMALI. Your Honor please, we are not prepared to accept that proposed amendment because the focus really of this particular Bill is just to amend

the penalty by increasing it from *reclusion perpetua* to death in the law itself because the law provides for a penalty of life imprisonment. We are changing this or we are amending this to be consistent with what the Code of Crimes Committee is now working on to change the nomenclature of the penalties to be imposed under the Revised Penal Code and/or special laws which will be incorporated in the Code of Crimes. So, we are not amending the Dangerous Drugs Act only, but this is really a new law that reimposes the death penalty on heinous crimes which are deemed required for compelling reasons, as defined by the Constitution.

REP. ANDAYA. Yes, may I be given five minutes to explain my position, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). You have five minutes.

REP. ANDAYA. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Just to take a little trip down memory lane: under the administration of President Ramos, Republic Act No. 7659 restored capital punishment. In this particular Bill, for the first time, the phrase “heinous crimes” was used and this is the first time it was defined; it is the first time that standards are set on how a heinous crime should be defined. It also listed 13 major crimes, and if we add the minor crimes covered under heinous crimes, they will amount to around 21 crimes, Mr. Speaker. Now, under the administration of President Arroyo, a bill was passed, Republic Act No. 9346, which merely repealed the imposition of the death penalty. It did not—and I would like to emphasize this, Mr. Speaker—it did not repeal Republic Act No. 7659, it did not repeal the definition, it did not repeal the enumeration of these 13 major crimes.

Now, under our current House Bill No. 4727, we are using the exact template of the original law under President Ramos which was RA 7659. Now, if we are to pass the Bill and it becomes a law, in its present form, we have to remember—if I am not mistaken, Mr. Chairman, House Bill No. 4727 does not repeal the original Death Penalty Law. It does not, and it is in existence, at this point in time. So, if this House Bill No. 4727 comes in existence, we now have an absurd situation in which we have the same definition of a “heinous crime,” the same standards for a heinous crime, except one has a listing of 13 major crimes and another one with just one crime.

REP. UMALI. But in ...

REP. ANDAYA. Now, of course, we all know that this will undergo the test of constitutionality and one of the guarantees of Constitution is the equal application

of the law. We all know that from law school and this applies not only to privileges given by the government, but also the burden given by the government to certain crimes. So, basically, those who belong to the same group should be treated the same way. In this particular situation, there is a test and the first test would be: is there any substantial distinction between drug pushing or, let us say, mass murder? Using the same stand, is drug pushing more odious, is it more repugnant, is it more vicious, or is it more hateful? It is not. It is almost the same.

What I am trying to say is, let us not insist on following the template of the original Death Penalty Law. Let it be a stand-alone law; otherwise, we will violate the equal protection clause, Mr. Speaker. Second, is it germane to the purpose of the law? What is the purpose of this Bill anyway? Our purpose, as agreed upon in the caucus, is to make the crime of drugs and all the crimes under it be punishable by death. We cannot have the excuse that there are pending bills which might be filed in the future which will fall under heinous crimes. Wala pa ho iyon. Ito, nandito na.

If you apply the test again of equal protection, it will fail. The dangerous part there is, Mr. Speaker, if this particular provision or enumeration is declared unconstitutional because it is not protective of or does not follow the equal protection clause, then we have a situation in which we have successfully legislated the return of the death penalty pero hindi lang para sa isa, para sa lahat na, because na-declare na unconstitutional iyong isa lang na krimen dahil ang totoong enumeration ...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). May I remind the Gentleman, the Deputy Speaker, that he has already consumed the five minutes under our rules.

REP. ANDAYA. Can I consume another five minutes?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). No more. Sorry, Deputy Speaker. The rule under Section 56 explicitly says, you only have five minutes.

REP. ANDAYA. Yes, can I make my closing statement now.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Okay.

REP. ANDAYA. As a practical reason for this amendment, if we will leave the title this way, and you will leave the definition and standards for a heinous crime as presented in this particular Bill, there is a possibility that during the Bicameral Conference Committee, we can include more crimes under this particular Bill contrary to what we have agreed upon.

Ang usapan natin, isa lang. If we leave this the way it is worded, we can put some more crimes, even more than the 13 crimes, because such is covered in the title and in the policy in this particular Bill.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Thank you, Deputy Speaker.

REP. ANDAYA. I submit, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). You have five minutes to respond.

REP. UMALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor. There is no distinction. They are both heinous crimes as defined in the case of *People vs. Echegaray*. The only difference is that the Constitution provides that there must be compelling reasons.

At this point in time, the intent of this Bill is to really reimpose the death penalty on certain heinous crimes. So we are not violating the equal protection principle of the law under the Constitution because, while we are reimposing death penalty, we are not reimposing the death penalty as of the moment only—we will reimpose death penalty for heinous crimes, but we are presenting the war on drugs in particular as one of the compelling reasons we should reimpose the death penalty on drug cases. Anyway, and this is very much germane to the purpose of the law, the intent really is, in the future, we can reimpose also the death penalty on other heinous crimes which will find compelling reasons for the reimposition thereof.

Now, on the matter of the point of the Gentleman that in the Bicameral Conference, there may be a possibility of increasing or incorporating crimes therein. Of course, this is an agreement of the House of Representatives, which is a coequal body of the Senate; but then, we will not agree to any additional crimes that will be incorporated in this Bill. So, the point here of the distinguished Gentleman is that, to this Representation, this sphere of the unknown, I believe, will never happen because we will stand by our position that we will not accept any additional crimes to be incorporated and/or covered by this Bill that we will approve.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). There is an amendment coming from the Deputy Speaker Andaya, and the Sponsor is not accepting the amendment.

REP. ANDAYA. I would like to make an appeal to the Body, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. ANDAYA. May I be given five minutes to explain before we act on the appeal.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). I have given you five minutes.

REP. ANDAYA. Yes, but that was for the proposal of the Bill.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, the honorable Deputy Speaker has proposed his amendment. It has been rejected, and his five minutes was already the appeal. It was also explained by the Sponsor why he is rejecting. We now go to voting.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Yes.

REP. BONDOC. So, may I please explain our status. Those in favor of the appeal, please vote *aye*. With the Majority backing the decision of our Sponsor, we ask for your *nay* vote. We ask our colleagues to please not use the microphone to shout, and we ask those watching in the gallery to please respect our proceedings and allow the Congressmen to vote properly.

So, once again, an *aye* vote sustains the appeal ...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The amendment.

REP. BONDOC. ... the amendment of the Deputy Speaker; and a *nay* vote supports our honorable Sponsor in defeating the amendment, and the majority asks for your *nay* vote. That is our status, Mr. Speaker.

VIVA VOCE VOTING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). As many as are in favor of the amendment proposed by Deputy Speaker Andaya, please say *aye*.

FEW MEMBERS. *Aye*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). As many as are against, please say *nay*.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. *Nay*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The *nays* have it; the amendment is lost.

The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. ANDAYA. May I move for a nominal voting.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Under our rules, Mr. Speaker, if there is doubt regarding the voting, the House shall divide. To make it simple, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, to satisfy our honorable Deputy Speaker, as it says in our rules, the Speaker shall ask those in favor to rise, to be followed by those against.

So, we will see, Mr. Speaker. For those in favor, there are a total of 229 who responded to our call, and one-fifth of that is 46. So if 46 of our Members rise, then we will proceed to nominal voting.

DIVISION OF THE HOUSE

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Rep. Abu). May I request all those in favor of the amendment sponsored by Deputy Speaker Rolando G. Andaya Jr...

The Body will now proceed to a division of the House.

All those in favor for a nominal voting, please rise.

Few Members rose.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Rep. Abu). Thank you. All those who are against, please rise.

Several Members rose.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Rep. Abu). The number of those against has it; the motion for nominal voting is lost.

REP. ANDAYA. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, the Honorable Andaya is still recognized to propose further amendments.

REP. ANDAYA. No, I am done. Thank you very much.

REP. BONDOC. With that Mr. Speaker, I move that we recognize the Gentleman from the Lone District of Siquijor, the Hon. Ramon V.A. "Rav" Rocamora for his amendments.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Rep. Abu). What is the pleasure of the Gentleman from the First District of Albay?

REP. LAGMAN. The amendment of individual

Members should be based on a page by page, line by line basis. It is not by prior registration. We are now finished with page 1; we are now going to page 2. I have amendments on page 2, starting with line 14. Unless there are anterior amendments, I should have the floor.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, at the outset, let me thank the Honorable Lagman for his amendments, and I believe he will now be voting in favor of the Bill since he is helping to perfect our legislation and we in the Majority appreciate that. May I just explain that we have a list of our colleagues who have listed themselves to propose their amendments and by leave of the House, we will follow the list in order to make our proceedings easier to understand, both for the Members and for the public, regarding this Bill. So I seek the indulgence of the Honorable Lagman to please allow our colleagues to do so and at the proper time, we will recognize the esteemed Gentleman and give him the necessary time for his amendments.

REP. LAGMAN. The tradition of the House is that individual amendments should be based on a page by page, line by line basis, not by reservation. We have already finished page 1, let us now go to page 2. I have a couple of amendments on page 2, and the Dep. Majority Leader is not at liberty to say that I am now in favor of the Bill because I am proposing amendments.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Rep. Abu). With due indulgence to the Gentleman from the First District of Albay...

REP. ROCAMORA. Mr Speaker, please.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Rep. Abu). ... we are now going to recognize, as I am now going—the Chair is going to recognize, as a motion or as moved by the Dep. Majority Leader, the Representative from Siquijor, Congressman Rocamora and at the proper time, we will recognize the distinguished Gentleman from Albay.

REP. ROCAMORA. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Rep. Abu). The distinguished Gentleman from Siquijor is recognized for...

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker, the proper time should be based on a page by page, line by line basis.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Rep. Abu). ... his amendments to the proposed Bill as amended.

REP. ROCAMORA. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the better part of discretion is to follow procedure. To observe the proper procedure, we should start with the earlier pages. I am proposing an amendment on page 3 while Congressman Lagman is proposing an amendment on page 2.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Rep. Abu). Please proceed.

REP. ROCAMORA. I will allow Congressman Lagman to have his amendment first on page 2, then I will proceed with mine.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Rep. Abu). Gentleman from Siquijor, we would like to have a proper and orderly proceeding for everyone who has an amendment to the proposed Bill as amended, please. Let the Dep. Majority Leader make the sequence.

REP. ROCAMORA. I believe that is the proper sequence, Mr. Speaker—an amendment on page 2 before an amendment on page 3.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. With the indulgence of the Gentlemen who have registered, if that is the wish of those who will propose amendments, I move that we recognize the Hon. Edcel C. Lagman for his amendments, and we thank him for his support of this legislation.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The honorable Gentleman from the First District of Albay, the distinguished Edcel Lagman, is recognized for his amendments.

REP. ROCAMORA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. LAGMAN. These amendments will not be in support of the proposed Death Penalty Bill, definitely.

On page 2, line 14, before the words "*RECLUSION PERPETUA*," insert the following words: *RECLUSION TEMPORAL TO*, and delete the words "*TODEATH*" after the words "*RECLUSION PERPETUA*." Accordingly, as proposed, line 14 should read as follows: "*RECLUSION TEMPORAL TO RECLUSION PERPETUA*."

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). What does the Sponsor say?

REP. UMALI. The Sponsor is not amenable to the proposed amendment of our distinguished colleague.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Sponsor is not accepting the amendment proposed by the distinguished Gentleman from Albay.

REP. LAGMAN. So, pursuant to our Rules, I would now appeal the rejection of my amendment to the Body and I am requesting for five minutes to justify the appeal.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). You have five minutes to explain your amendments.

REP. LAGMAN. The following are the justifications for this amendment:

1. The Philippines is a state party to the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, wherein the Philippines has irrevocably committed not to reimpose the death penalty on any crime, including drug-related offenses.

2. International law and jurisprudence and the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, to which, again, the Philippines is a signatory, authoritatively and indubitably declare that a state cannot use its domestic law, including its Constitution, to renege on or violate its treaty undertakings.

3. The 1988 UN Drug Convention, to which the Philippines is likewise a state party, does not prescribe the death penalty on drug-related offenses.

4. The International Narcotics Control Board has consistently advised countries not to impose the death penalty on any drug-related offenses because capital punishment violates the right to life.

The International Narcotics Control Board has also reported that:

Over four decades of global drug control analysis, the Board has borne witness to socio-economic drivers of drug dependents, which cut across national, cultural and generational divides.

In all parts of the world, populations are affected by poverty, food insecurity, economic inequality, social exclusion, deprivation, displacement, shortages of educational and recreational facilities, limited employment prospects, poor parental engagement during early childhood and exposure to violence and abuse.

These factors play into both the demand and supply sides of illicit drug abuse, driving both drug dependence and illicit trafficking, and require an integrated, holistic and balanced response from States.

Consequently, what the International Narcotics

Control Board is saying is that the solution to the drug problem is not the imposition of the death penalty.

6. The proponents of House Bill No. 4727 have failed to conclusively present compelling reasons why death should be imposed as the maximum penalty on the quote, “importation of dangerous drugs and/or controlled precursors and essential chemicals.”

For all of those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I appeal the rejection by the sponsoring Committee of my amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, the Honorable Lagman has proposed his amendment, it has been rejected by the Sponsor, the appeal has been made and now, therefore, we go into voting.

May I explain the voting. A vote of *aye* sustains the amendment of the Honorable Lagman, and a vote of *nay*, which the Sponsor and the Majority asks for, defeats the amendment. The Majority asks for your *nay* vote.

VIVA VOCE VOTING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). As many as are in favor of the amendment presented by the Gentleman from the First District of Albay, please say *aye*.

FEW MEMBERS. *Aye*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). As many as are against, please say *nay*.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. *Nay*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The *nays* have it; the amendment is lost.

The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker, under Section 116 of our Rules, I am entitled to move for a nominal voting.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, our process will be such that if the Chair doubts the result of the voting, or if a motion to divide the House is carried, the Chair shall ask those in favor to rise. So, those in favor of nominal voting shall be asked by the Chair to rise.

DIVISION OF THE HOUSE

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Those who are in favor of a nominal voting, please rise.

Few Members rose.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Those against, please rise.

Several Members rose.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The motion for nominal voting is lost.

The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, I move for the recognition of the Hon. Ramon V.A. "Rav" Rocamora of the Lone District of Siquijor as our next colleague to propose an amendment.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Gentleman from the Lone District of Siquijor, Congressman Rocamora, is recognized.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have an anterior amendment on page 2. The Honorable Rocamora has an amendment on page 3.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, does the Honorable Rocamora yield the floor?

REP. ROCAMORA. What was that? I am sorry I did not hear it.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the Honorable Rocamora, the Honorable Lagman wishes to propose more amendments.

REP. LAGMAN. On page 2.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Congressman Rocamora is recognized.

REP. ROCAMORA. I understand there is also a proposal to amend, there is an amendment on page 1 and an additional amendment on page 2. I will give in to the earlier amendments.

REP. BONDOC. With that, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion for the recognition of the Honorable Rocamora.

With the indulgence of the Honorable Lagman, I move for the recognition of the Hon. Rodante D. Marcoleta of the Party-List SAGIP. I so move, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Representative from SAGIP Party-List, Rodante Marcoleta, is recognized.

REP. MARCOLETA. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I have an amendment, Mr. Speaker, on line 11, page 1: after the phrase "rule of law," I propose that the entire phrase "and the need to rationalize and harmonize the penal sanctions" be eliminated. So after that, Mr. Speaker, this whole paragraph will read as follows:

Towards this end, and in the interest of justice, public order and the rule of law, the Congress finds compelling reasons to impose the death penalty on heinous crimes committed by offenders who are a continuous threat to society.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I proposed this amendment, and I hope that it will be accepted, is, I believe, in the caucuses I have attended, that in the final version of the amended draft, Mr. Speaker, which we are now considering, only the drug-related cases were not a product of rationalizing and harmonizing the penal sanctions because the entire Revised Penal Code, Republic Act No. 3815 was eliminated. This is not rationalization, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker, neither is it harmonization. I think that, in the caucuses which I attended, it was a product of consensus-building. We arrived at a consensus until the Majority chose to drop all the crimes and maintained only drug-related cases and therefore, we might be facing a very hard wall in defending that we were able to rationalize and harmonize the penal sanctions when we did not, Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). What does the Sponsor say?

REP. MARCOLETA. To eliminate the phrase ...

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, we appeal to the Honorable Marcoleta. First, he has to propose the amendment, then the Sponsor will accept or reject it. After the acceptance or rejection, he has five minutes to appeal. So, first, let us hear from the Sponsor regarding the proposed amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Gentleman from SAGIP Party List, the Hon. Rodante Marcoleta has already explained his amendment. So, what does the Sponsor say?

REP. UMALI. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, I regret that we are not amenable. We reject the proposed amendment because, in fact, we are rationalizing and harmonizing the penal sanctions because this is the direction of the Code of Crimes Committee that is now working on the Code of Crimes to replace the Revised Penal Code as well as the consolidation therein of all special laws. In fact, we are harmonizing the penal sanctions because what is contained in the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act is that the penalty is life imprisonment, which we are changing or amending to *reclusion perpetua* so that we will do away with the reference to life imprisonment in a special law which is the direction also of the Code of Crimes.

REP. MARCOLETA. Mr. Speaker, may I explain the proposed amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Yes, he has five minutes.

REP. MARCOLETA. Mr. Speaker, the reason I proposed this amendment is, I did not see and I do not know how the Committee was able to rationalize and harmonize the penal sanctions by simply reducing the number of crimes, let us say, from 21 criminal offenses to concentrate merely on drug-related cases. How was it done, Mr. Speaker, that all of a sudden when carnapping, for example, was omitted and therefore, we did not already include the special law on carnapping, when the crimes punishable under the Revised Penal Code were all eliminated and we just concentrated on drug-related cases—how did we rationalize it, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor? How did we harmonize it?

We already eliminated all the crimes punishable under the Revised Penal Code.

We eliminated the crimes that were supposed to be punishable by death, also those under special laws. What is left, Mr. Speaker, is the special Law on Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs or Republic Act No. 9165. Mr. Speaker, we cannot rationalize or harmonize by simply eliminating the other special laws and by just concentrating on one law. That is why I am amending this because we would like to make it more consistent and even simple to defend, Mr. Speaker. If we use the phrase “in the interest of justice, public order and the rule of law,” I think this is more sufficient than invoking another round of rationalizing and harmonizing the penal sanctions when, in reality, we did not, Mr. Speaker.

That is the only reason.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, there has been a proposed amendment by the Honorable Marcoleta. It has been rejected by the honorable Sponsor. The appeal has been made; now the House shall vote either in favor or against the proposed amendment. A vote of *aye* sustains the proposed amendment of the Honorable Marcoleta and a vote of *nay*, which the Sponsor and the Majority ask for, defeats the amendment. The Majority asks for your *nay* vote.

VIVA VOCE VOTING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). As many as are in favor of the proposed amendment, please say *aye*.

FEW MEMBERS. *Aye*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). As many as are against, please say *nay*.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. *Nay*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The *nays* have it; the amendment is lost.

The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. DAZA. Mr. Speaker, individual amendment.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, in the interest of order, I appeal to our colleagues, if they have amendments, to please register with the Majority Leader so that we can arrange them in the proper order.

REP. DAZA. I already have, Mr. Speaker. The Majority Leader sent a member of the Committee on Rules to me and I explained to him my individual amendment.

REP. BONDOC. Yes. I would like to ask the Honorable Rocamora if he would give way to the Honorable Daza.

REP. ROCAMORA. As I understand, there are even more who want to introduce amendments. For one, Congressman Lagman has an additional amendment on page 2. Congressman Villarín also has an amendment on page 2.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). May

I suggest to the Members who want to propose an amendment, to please course it through the Majority Leader.

REP. ROCAMORA. Okay, Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. With that, Mr. Speaker, I move for the recognition of the Hon. Tomasito “Tom” S. Villarín from the Party-List AKBAYAN for his proposed amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Representative from AKBAYAN Party-List, the Hon. Tom Villarín, is recognized for his amendment.

REP. VILLARIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on page 2, lines 13 and 14, I propose that we retain the phrase “The penalty of life imprisonment” and delete “*RECLUSION PERPETUA TO DEATH.*” On line 28, Mr. Speaker, again, we retain the phrase “The penalty of life imprisonment” and delete “*RECLUSION PERPETUA TO DEATH.*” On line 41, Mr. Speaker, the phrase “The penalty of life imprisonment” will be retained and the phrase “*RECLUSION PERPETUA TO DEATH*” will be deleted.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). What does the Sponsor say?

REP. UMALI. The Sponsor rejects the proposed amendments of Congressman Villarín.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Sponsor rejected the proposed amendments.

REP. VILLARIN. Mr. Speaker, can I give my explanation.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). You have five minutes.

REP. VILLARIN. Mr. Speaker, the current Death Penalty Bill, this substitute Bill through Committee amendments, is a radical departure from the original death penalty bills filed, hastily deliberated and passed by the Committee on Justice. As I recall, Mr. Speaker, during the Committee deliberations, the original proposal to focus only on the death penalty was rejected and now, it is being reimposed. The proposed amendments done by substitution, Mr. Speaker, raise several questions. First, the proposed Death Penalty Bill was deliberated and debated using various assumptions, statistics and legal foundations. It started with a proposal of more than 20 crimes and now, the number

has been reduced. What are the bases of removing the crimes enumerated in the original House Bill No. 4727 from the ambit of the death penalty? What is the rationale for removing these crimes from the coverage of House Bill No. 4727?

Now, the basic question, Mr. Speaker: what is the basis of imposing the death penalty on drug-related cases only? Again, as what was raised earlier by Deputy Speaker Andaya, this will be violative of the equal protection clause because we would be providing a distinction between heinous crimes that are not drug-related and drug-related heinous crimes. For that, Mr. Speaker, even drug-related offenses should be removed as offenses resulting in the imposition of the ultimate penalty of death. The public deserves an explanation for these very important questions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the Plenary to a violation of our House rules and I am invoking Section 28. In Section 28, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Dangerous Drugs has authority over “all matters directly and principally relating to illegal and prohibited drugs, controlled precursors and essential chemicals, the production, manufacture, use and trafficking thereof” et cetera. Mr. Speaker, in the sense that this proposal, this measure was not deliberated upon in the Dangerous Drugs Committee, ang mangyayari nito, inuuna natin ang penalty, inuuna natin ang karitela sa kabayo. We have to define the nature of the crimes punishable under the Dangerous Drugs Act before we have this death penalty.

I think the danger here, Mr. Speaker, is that, I would like to point to the statement of the Philippine chemists community and they have very, very valid points, Mr. Speaker. While we could recognize this important concern against the drug menace, we oppose the provision that equates dangerous drugs per se with precursor chemical and essential chemicals. With their importance in the industry, agriculture, health, education and research, the inclusion of these precursor chemical and essential chemicals must be done with adequate scientific knowledge because the proposed Bill does not define and identify them. Virtually, all precursor chemicals and essential chemicals are multi-use chemicals. Precursor chemicals may also be precursors to other important products such as pharmaceuticals, fragrances, cosmetics, agro-chemical and many others. Likewise, essential chemicals may also be essential for many other purposes, including household and health uses. The cost to the economy by this proposed Bill can be staggering, Mr. Speaker, and the Bill is not scientifically rational.

Again, let me point out, Mr. Speaker, the mere possession of a precursor chemical or an essential chemical, as what is contemplated under the Dangerous Drugs Act, is not equivalent to possession or manufacture of dangerous drugs. The proposed Bill will criminalize

legitimate users and raise the cost of goods and damage the economy.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Thank you, Representative from AKBAYAN Party-List. Your time has expired.

REP. VILLARIN. The Bill will also provide many opportunities for corruption, Mr. Speaker. Kakasuhan ka ng homicide.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Your time had expired. I have given you five minutes.

REP. VILLARIN. Lalagyan ka ng 10 grams, 50 grams—death penalty.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. VILLARIN. I hope that we rethink this proposed measure and we recommit this, under Section 28, to the Dangerous Drugs Committee, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, the Honorable Villarain has proposed his amendment and it was rejected by the Sponsor. The appeal has been made, so we now move into voting on the amendment as proposed by the Honorable Villarain. An *aye* vote sustains the amendment and a *nay* vote, which the Majority asks for, supports the rejection by our honorable Sponsor. The Majority asks for a *nay* vote.

VIVA VOCE VOTING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). As many as are in favor of the amendment, please say *aye*.

FEW MEMBERS. *Aye*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). As many as are against, please say *nay*.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. *Nay*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The nays have it; the amendment is lost.

The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, we move for the recognition of the Hon. Raul Daza for his proposed amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Gentleman from Samar, the Hon. Raul A. Daza, is recognized for his amendment.

REP. DAZA. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, I tried to explain to the Rules Committee the nature of my amendment, and I believe that it will be looked more with favor by the Sponsor if I can be granted a recess of five minutes so that I can approach him and explain the nature of my amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, the Honorable Daza is free to approach any of the authors or Sponsors, but in the interest of all those who wish to propose amendments to the Bill, may I move now to recognize the Hon. Ramon V.A. “Rav” Rocamora for his proposed amendment.

REP. DAZA. I agree to that, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Honorable Rocamora is recognized to propose his amendment.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Gentleman from the First District of Albay is recognized.

REP. LAGMAN. As I previously manifested, I have anterior amendments on page 2.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, once again, I seek the indulgence of the Honorable Rocamora. I move to withdraw his recognition and instead, ask that we recognize the Honorable Lagman.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Gentleman from the First District of Albay, Representative Lagman, is recognized.

REP. LAGMAN. Before I proceed with my proposed amendment, I would like to ask the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Justice what the triple “x” in the draft as of February 28, 2017 represent.

REP. UMALI. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, it does not mean anything because there was nothing changed from the previous bill which was the substitute bill presented by the Majority Leader.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the substitute Bill, there were no triple “x.” There are provisions of the existing law which were retained in the amendment by substitution, and I would like to refer to my copy of the substitute bill. Can I ask for a minute suspension to get a copy of the draft?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, rather than waste our time, could the Sponsor please reply to the query while the Honorable Lagman is free to pick up any material he may so need.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The distinguished Sponsor is directed to reply to the query of the distinguished Gentleman from the First District of Albay.

REP. UMALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The triple “x” appearing on lines 23, 37 and 46, page 2 and line 7, page 3 would only reiterate the provisions in the Dangerous Drugs Act that are not being amended. This is a regular practice in any bill that is filed for which no amendment is being made on an existing law, except for those particular sections and/or provisions and/or paragraphs where an amendment is being introduced.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily and traditionally, the “x x x” or the triple “x” would represent the deletion of certain provisions, not reiteration, because if the existing provisions are reiterated, they should be reflected in the draft so that the Members will be fully aware that the existing provisions are reiterated, not deleted. The series of “x x x” would mean a deletion, not a reiteration. For example, Mr. Speaker, under Section 4 of the draft as of February 28, 2017, after the words “decorative and culinary purposes,” there appears three “x.” However, in the amendment by substitution, there appears a series of provisions which I would like to quote: after the phrase “decorative and culinary purposes” on line 36, page 5 of the amendment by substitution, it reads:

The penalty of imprisonment ranging from twelve (12) years and one (1) day to twenty (20) years and a fine ranging from One hundred thousand pesos (P100,000.00) to Five hundred thousand pesos (P500,000.00) shall be imposed upon any person, who, unless authorized by law, shall import any controlled precursor and essential chemical.

Is this deleted or retained in the latest draft of the bill as amended.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The distinguished Sponsor may respond.

REP. UMALI. Mr. Speaker, may I ask our distinguished colleague if we are reading the same document. What am I reading here and what I have as my guide is the substitute Bill as of February 28, 2017. The Gentleman may be reading an abandoned version, Mr. Speaker.

REP. LAGMAN. May I know whether in the version which the distinguished Sponsor has, this provision is included? In any of the previous versions, is this provision included?

REP. UMALI. As I was saying, perhaps, may I refer the distinguished Gentleman to look at the February 28, 2017 version of the Bill so that we will compare apples to apples, Mr. Speaker.

REP. LAGMAN. Anyway, could the distinguished Sponsor read for the record what appears in his version after the first paragraph of Section 4, under Section 7 of the latest version.

REP. UMALI. Section 4 of what, Mr. Speaker, may I be clarified? On what page and line, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor?

REP. LAGMAN. This is on page 5, Mr. Speaker.

REP. UMALI. Page five.

REP. LAGMAN. The first amendment by substitution.

REP. UMALI. May I reiterate my previous answer that this is an abandoned version that was amended yesterday and he is referring to a different version that, as I said, has been abandoned? So, may I ask the distinguished Gentleman to please refer to the version as of February 28, 2017.

REP. LAGMAN. Well, that is precisely the draft where there is a series of “x x x” and according to the distinguished Sponsor, the “x x x” would represent reiteration of existing provisions, not deletions. If they are reiterations, then these should appear in the draft as of February 28, 2017.

Let me proceed. In the amendment by substitution, there is the paragraph which reads:

The maximum penalty provided for under this Section shall be imposed upon any person, who, unless authorized by this Act, shall import or bring into the Philippines any dangerous drug and/or controlled precursor and essential chemical through the use of a diplomatic passport, diplomatic facilities or any other means involving his/her official status intended to facilitate the unlawful entry of the same. In addition, the diplomatic passport shall be confiscated and canceled.

Is that still being retained in the draft as of February 28, 2017?

At this juncture, Deputy Speaker Abu relinquished the Chair to Deputy Speaker Eric D. Singson.

REP. UMALI. Again, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, you are referring to a previous, abandoned Bill that is inappropriate for discussion during the period of amendments. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, perhaps, to abbreviate these proceedings, I would request that the distinguished Gentleman already proceed with his proposed amendment because we are in the period of amendments, and the first thing that ought to be expressed is the proposed amendment which I can respond to, rather than go to back and forth to discussions on an abandoned version of the Bill.

REP. LAGMAN. Well, I premised my second amendment with a statement that I would ask certain questions. In any event, considering that the distinguished Sponsor has said that the provision I have cited had been abandoned, then, let it be of record.

Now, let me proceed to my second amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Singson). You may proceed.

REP. LAGMAN. On page two, line 28, before the words "*RECLUSION PERPETUA*," I move that we insert the following phrase *RECLUSION TEMPORAL TO*; and after the words "*RECLUSION PERPETUA*," delete the words "TO DEATH." Consequently, line 28 should read, "The penalty of *RECLUSION TEMPORAL TO RECLUSION PERPETUA*."

At this juncture, Deputy Speaker Singson relinquished the Chair to Deputy Speaker Raneon "Ranie" E. Abu.

REP. UMALI. The Sponsor rejects.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). What does the Sponsor say?

REP. UMALI. The Sponsor rejects the proposed amendments because these are not consistent with the purpose and even the title of the Bill.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Sponsor rejected the proposed amendments.

REP. LAGMAN. Then, may I appeal the rejection of my amendments to the Body and I would request five minutes to explain.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). You have five minutes.

REP. LAGMAN. Under our Constitution, there are stringent conditions for the limited plenary power of Congress to impose the death penalty, namely: a) compelling reasons and b) involving heinous crimes. From the very start, even in the Subcommittee level, the proponents have not presented unequivocally and conclusively the existence of compelling reasons for heinous crimes. In the same manner, there has been no assertion whatsoever by the Sponsors of the Bill that the sale, trading, administration, dispensation, delivery, distribution and transportation of dangerous drugs and/or controlled precursors and essential chemicals would satisfy the stringent conditions of the Constitution for the imposition of a death penalty.

Number two, even under our international agreements, more specifically the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights or ICCPR to where we are a state party, we undertook to exercise all serious endeavors to eliminate the death penalty from our penal system. This ICCPR was ratified by the Philippines in 1986 shortly before the 1987 Constitution abolished the death penalty; and subsequently, in 2007, we ratified the Second Optional Protocol to the ICCPR wherein we committed not to reimpose the death penalty.

I would like to underscore the chronology of our ratification. We made that ratification shortly after we abolished the death penalty in 2006. All providence, all exhortations of the United Nations, particularly the International Narcotics Control Board, would say and declare that the death penalty is not imposable on drug-related offenses. Likewise, Mr. Speaker, the death penalty is an abhorrent, punitive penalty. It defies the sanctity of life, which no less than Pope Francis has said that the sanctity of life extends even to the criminal.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to the Body to reject the position of the sponsoring Committee declining my amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, the Honorable Lagman has proposed his amendment, it has been rejected by the Sponsor, the proper appeal has been made and now, the Body will vote on the proposed amendment.

An *aye* vote will sustain the amendment of the Honorable Lagman and a *nay* vote sustains the rejection by the Sponsor, and the Majority asks for a *nay* vote, Mr. Speaker.

VIVA VOCE VOTING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). As many are in favor of the amendment, please say *aye*.

FEW MEMBERS. *Aye*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). As many as are against, please say *nay*.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. *Nay*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The *nays* have it; the amendment is lost.

The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Chair had a misappreciation of the *ayes* and *nay* votes, but I am not going to pursue that, Mr. Speaker. I would like to relinquish the floor temporarily to the distinguished Representative Rocamora for his amendments, subject to my prior amendments on page two.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, I move for the recognition of the Hon. Ramon V.A. “Rav” Rocamora from the Lone District of Siquijor for his proposed amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Honorable Rocamora is recognized for his amendment.

REP. ROCAMORA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before I proceed with my proposed amendment, just to foreclose any thought that I am abandoning my stand against reimposition of the death penalty, I would like to restate that I am against the reimposition of the death penalty, but I am introducing this amendment in case this Bill under consideration will pass—to forestall any infirmities therein.

My amendment starts on line 47, page 3, Section 25, which has something to do with the aggravating circumstances of being under the influence of drugs. I believe that we have misconstrued the concept of aggravating or qualifying circumstances. Aggravating ...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Could we ask the Honorable Rocamora to state his proposed amendment for acceptance or rejection by the Sponsor? Should there

be a need, there can be an explanation of the proposed amendment.

REP. ROCAMORA. My proposal is to remove Section 25 which makes the circumstance of being under the influence of drugs an aggravating circumstance. May I be allowed to explain.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). What does the Sponsor say?

REP. UMALI. The Sponsor rejects the proposed amendment for the reason that this is the existing provision of the existing law and that the Bill itself, the title of this Bill itself is “Imposing the Death Penalty” and so, we are not amending the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act. The proper venue for raising this is upon the amendment of the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act, not this particular Bill, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Representative Rocamora is recognized.

REP. ROCAMORA. I believe there is no infirmity in amending the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Do you want to explain your amendment? I am giving you five minutes.

REP. ROCAMORA. Okay. As I have said, we have misconstrued the very reason we aggravate or qualify crimes by attendant circumstances. The very reason we aggravate or qualify a crime by virtue of certain circumstances is because of the greater perversity of the criminal.

Let me simplify this. Under our present Revised Penal Code, intoxication is an alternative circumstance so that if one brings liquor to embolden oneself to commit a crime, then it becomes an aggravating circumstance. Otherwise, if the commission of the crimes is, it just happened when someone is drunk, then it is mitigating, and the reason here is simple. One who is not in full control of his faculties could not be deemed to be more perverse in the commission of the crime. I am not saying that we come up with an alternative circumstance, but what I am proposing is that we remove the provision making it an aggravating circumstance once and for all.

Now, the objection on the part of the proponent stems from the fact that it becomes an amendment of an existing law, the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act, but I say that we can lawfully amend this

because it is well within or it is germane to the title of this proposed Bill. The proposed Bill speaks of increasing the penalties to death. Now, whether or not we aggravate a crime goes into the determination of whether we impose the death penalty or not. So, I would say that it is germane and there is no legal infirmity in introducing an amendment to the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act through this Bill under consideration.

Again, I would like to state that the basic reason we aggravate a crime with the words “certain circumstances” is the greater perversity. Let me ask you then: Could you say that a person who is not in his right mind or not in full control of his faculties is more perverse? I say not. Besides, we forget what we have always said: a user is a victim and it is the pusher who is the real criminal. So if he is a victim, why do we punish him? I say, let us remove that circumstance of being under the influence of drugs as an aggravating circumstance because as I have said, it goes against the basic principle that a person who is not in his right mind, should not be punished, or at least, his crime should not be aggravated.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, the Honorable Rocamora has proposed his amendment, it has been rejected by the Sponsor, the proper appeal has been made and so now, we divide the House.

An *aye* vote sustains the amendment of the Honorable Rocamora while a *nay* vote supports the rejection by our Sponsor, and the Majority asks for your *nay* vote, Mr. Speaker.

VIVA VOCE VOTING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). As many as are in favor of the amendment, please say *aye*.

FEW MEMBERS. *Aye*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). As many as are against, please say *nay*.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. *Nay*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The *nays* have it; the amendment is lost.

The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, I move for the recognition of the Gentleman from the Party-List KABAYAN, the Hon. H. Harry L. Roque Jr, for his amendments to our House Bill.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Gentleman from KABAYAN Party-List, Hon. H. Harry L. Roque Jr. is recognized.

REP. ROQUE (H.). Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Majority Leader.

I have two sets of proposed amendments, the first of which is on Section 6, page 5, starting on line 43. Essentially, my proposed amendment is to limit the means by which to carry out the death penalty only to lethal injection.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

REP. ROQUE (H.). Mr. Speaker, may I be given five minutes to explain my proposed amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). We will ask the Sponsor first. What does the Sponsor say?

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). I will recognize at the proper time the Gentleman from the First District of Albay.

REP. LAGMAN. This is the proper time because I have an anterior amendment on page 2 as I previously reserved, with due apologies to my colleague ...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). We will ...

REP. LAGMAN. ... Congressman Harry Roque.

REP. ROQUE (H.). I will yield, Mr. Speaker, ...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. ROQUE (H.). ... to Congressman Lagman.

REP. BONDOC. With that, Mr. Speaker, I move for the recognition of the Honorable Lagman for his proposed amendments.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Honorable Lagman is recognized.

REP. LAGMAN. On page 2, line 41, before the words “*RECLUSION PERPETUA*”, insert the following phrase *RECLUSION TEMPORAL TO*; and after the words “*RECLUSION PERPETUA*,” delete the words “*TO DEATH.*” Consequently, line 41 should read: “of *RECLUSION TEMPORAL TO RECLUSION PERPETUA.*”

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). What does the Sponsor say?

REP. DAZA. Mr. Speaker, anterior amendments. I have an anterior amendment.

REP. UMALI. This is on page 2.

REP. DAZA. I would not want to intrude into the time of the distinguished Gentleman from Albay.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). What does the Sponsor say?

REP. UMALI. The Sponsor is lost as to what he will respond to, Mr. Speaker. I hear two Members of this House...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). I only recognized the Gentleman from the First District of Albay. He has the floor.

REP. UMALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let me just point out first that, well, first, we would like to register our omnibus rejection of any proposition to amend, by way of deletion, the death penalty because this defeats the very purpose and intent of House Bill No. 4727. So, in the interest of time and likewise because we keep on going back and forth—we were already discussing page 3 and then all of a sudden, belatedly, the distinguished Gentleman from Albay introduced amendments to a previous page—I think, Mr. Speaker, I am also getting lost with the way these proposed amendments are being made.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Gentleman from Albay is recognized.

REP. LAGMAN. I have made a reservation previously that I have an anterior amendment on page 2 and this was not rejected by the Majority Leader. Moreover, it is improper to make an omnibus rejection of individual amendments which are not yet introduced. Individual amendments should be treated individually as they are presented or introduced by Members of this House.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Sponsor has already rejected the proposed amendment of the Gentleman from Albay.

REP. LAGMAN. I have not heard any rejection.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). What does the Sponsor say?

REP. UMALI. Well, we reiterate our omnibus rejection of any and all matters that will propose an amendment by way of the deletion of the death penalty. Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that this has been covered already Section 3, page 1, this particular section entitled “Imposition of Death Penalty; Heinous Crimes Defined.” So, we have already covered this and there was no objection to this particular provision. The clear intent of this House Bill is really to impose the death penalty and therefore, any and all propositions contrary to it can no longer be raised after we have already considered page 1, Section 3 of House Bill No. 4727, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Sponsor has rejected the proposed amendment of the Gentleman from Albay.

REP. LAGMAN. I appeal the rejection to the Body.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Gentleman has five minutes to explain.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker, there can be no omnibus coverage of individual amendments. Precisely, individual amendments are proposed and recognized by the Body because individual Members of the House have different versions of their amendments; so individual amendments should be based on a per line, per page basis as it is the tradition of this House. In support of my amendment, let me quote from a public hearing to launch Amnesty International’s nationwide campaign for the abolition of the death penalty, by Dorothea B. Moorefield, whose 19-year old son was murdered by a thief in Virginia, USA, who declared:

I look at the death penalty from the narrowest of viewpoints and I have rejected it. I know without any doubt that it should not exist. I want compassion for those who have been wronged. I want compassion for those who are left behind. I want the guilty appropriately punished, but only by recognizing the sanctity of life can we truly grieve for those who have lost it. By putting a criminal to death, we cheapen the value of human life. I cannot accept that. My son’s life was too important.

Dorothea Moorefield is not alone. Although she is the mother of a victim of the crime of murder, she did not wish death on the perpetrators. She was looking for justice, not for vengeance. In the same manner that many members of FIND, (Families of Victims of Involuntary Disappearance) the association of victims, are not wishing death for the perpetrators

of the heinous crimes against our kin because we are looking for justice, not vengeance. According to Pope Francis, vengeance is not justice, and this is the reason we are proposing these amendments to exclude the death penalty from our penal system.

I reiterate my appeal.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Lagman has proposed his amendment. It has been rejected by the honorable Sponsor. The proper appeal has been made, and we now go to the voting on the amendment of the Honorable Lagman.

An *aye* vote sustains the amendment of the Honorable Lagman and a *nay* vote, which the Majority asks for, sustains the rejection by the Sponsor. The Majority asks for a *nay* vote, Mr. Speaker.

VIVA VOCE VOTING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). As many as are in favor of the amendment, please say *aye*.

FEW MEMBERS. *Aye*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). As many as are against, please say *nay*.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. *Nay*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The *nays* have it; the amendment is lost.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The session is suspended.

It was 6:48 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

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

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The session is resumed.

The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, I move for the recognition of the Gentleman from the Party-List KABAYAN, the Hon. Harry Roque, for his proposed amendment.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Gentleman from the KABAYAN Party-List, Rep. Harry Roque, is recognized for his amendment.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker, with due deference to Representative Harry Roque, I have anterior amendments on page 3.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the Hon. Harry Roque, I move for the recognition of the Hon. Edcel Lagman for his proposed amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Hon. Edcel Lagman is recognized.

REP. LAGMAN. On page 3, line 2, before the words "*RECLUSION PERPETUA*," to insert the phrase "*RECLUSION TEMPORAL TO*"; and after the words, "*RECLUSION PERPETUA*," to delete the words "*TO DEATH*." Consequently, Mr. Speaker, line 2, page 3, should read, "*OF RECLUSION TEMPORAL TO RECLUSION PERPETUA*."

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). What does the Sponsor say?

REP. UMALI. Mr. Speaker, we register our continuing objection to this amendment, our omnibus rejection, and the Sponsor would like a ruling on our omnibus objection because this is clearly dilatory. The same reasons are advanced everytime this objection or this amendment is proposed by the distinguished Gentleman from Albay.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The distinguished Sponsor has rejected the proposed amendment.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to appeal the rejection.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Gentleman has five minutes to explain.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker, the principal reason I am proposing this amendment is that the death penalty is an abhorrent penalty which should not find any justification or inclusion in our penal system. It destroys the sanctity of life. It is not a solution to criminality. It is not a solution to poverty. It is not a solution to inequity. It is not a solution to the flawed and corrupt pillars of justice like the police establishment, and the prosecutorial and judicial systems.

Moreover, let me reiterate that under UN advisement, including the International Narcotics Control Board, there is no recommendation that the death penalty should be imposed on drug-related offenses. The contrary is prevailing, that only imprisonment, which does not destroy the sanctity of life, should be imposed. Again, let me reiterate that under the UN Drug Convention, to which we are a signatory, this Convention does not prescribe the death penalty for drug-related offenses.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I appeal the rejection of my amendment to the Body.

REP. UMALI. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. UMALI. Mr. Speaker, the Sponsor wishes to reiterate our request for a ruling on our omnibus rejection, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, our parliamentary status is that the same amendment and the same rejection have been brought up repeatedly, hence, the omnibus rejection of any amendment that seeks to change the very nature of the Bill being discussed. So, the Majority supports the omnibus motion of the Sponsor on rejecting all such and similar amendments.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Chair sustains the ruling of the Majority.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). What is the pleasure of the Gentleman from the BUHAY Party-List?

REP. ATIENZA. With the kind indulgence of the two Gentlemen, the Sponsor and Honorable Lagman, this Representation and many of us on the floor would like to be given a short definition of the term “omnibus rejection.” This is the first time I have heard it and I have years of experience in parliamentary procedure. I have yet to remember and recall a statement coming from the Sponsor or the Majority Leader with the term “omnibus rejection.” When there is a proposal coming from the floor for any amendment, we believe that it should be ruled on the basis of that particular amendment and not

by citing an omnibus rejection. It would be a very, very bad precedent if we accept it as a regular term in our parliamentary procedure. Automatically, an omnibus rejection means that people can no longer air their views on specific matters, and it could be misconstrued as nothing but an effort to railroad the Bill.

We can waste a lot of time on this Bill, Mr. Speaker. We can spend a lot of time deliberating on it for as long as each Member is allowed to air his individual amendment. If it so happens that the individual amendments are all in consonance with one term and one theme, then we believe that an omnibus rejection will do. Mabuti po siguro kung tatanggihan isa-isa, subalit bigyan natin ng kalayaan magpaliwanag at humingi ng individual amendment ang sinuman. Let them be rejected by the Sponsor in a manner provided for by the rules and definitely, an omnibus rejection is anathema.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Chair seeks clarification from the Gentleman from BUHAY Party-List. First, is he only asking for the definition of an omnibus rejection?

REP. ATIENZA. Yes.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). It is not an appeal from the ruling of the Chair?

REP. ATIENZA. No.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Okay.

REP. ATIENZA. We would like to be clarified as to what an omnibus rejection actually means and where it comes from, from what book.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The distinguished Sponsor, please.

REP. ATIENZA. From what book of parliamentary rules are they getting it? I would consider this a point of order so that we may be guided in our discussions.

REP. UMALI. Let me respond to that by giving a point of information. I would like to quote Merriam Webster’s definition of “omnibus”: 1. of relating to, or providing for many things at once; 2. containing or including many items, like an omnibus bill.

That is the direct definition but anyway, for clarification, we have already premised our omnibus rejection on any proposition to amend by way of deletion the words “death penalty” because this is inconsistent with the clear intent and purpose of the proposed law. So, we have done that precisely. We have been listening patiently to the proposed amendments and to the lengthy explanations being made by the

Gentleman from Albay. He merely recites the same reasons for wanting to introduce those amendments. So, this is why we have registered our omnibus rejection thereof only on any proposition to amend by way of deletion the words “death penalty” in House Bill No. 4727, which seeks to impose the death penalty on certain heinous crimes. That is the clear intent and purpose for the omnibus rejection that the Sponsor raised before this august Body.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Dep. Majority Leader, please state the parliamentary status with respect to the omnibus rejection.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman did not

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. ATIENZA. ... cite the rules that I was asking for.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker.

REP. ATIENZA. He stated his position and his opinion. We are raising a point of order.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). If it is a point of order, will the Gentleman from the BUHAY Party-List kindly cite the rules that are being violated, please.

REP. ATIENZA. The proof ...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). No, no, the Gentleman is the one asking for the point of order, so he should have ...

REP. ATIENZA. Yes, I am questioning the term “omnibus objection” because the Sponsor did not provide the source of the rules. Please cite the rules and I will accept the rules.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Sorry to the Gentleman from the BUHAY Party-List, but there is no rule that is being violated, so there is no point of order.

The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. ATIENZA. The Gentleman has not provided

any rule, so I am precisely questioning. I should be told what rule he is citing.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, to clarify, our esteemed colleague, the Honorable Atienza, raised a point of information. A point of order accompanies normally the rule or the process being broken. So, the Gentleman from Party-List BUHAY was asking a point of information. Out of respect to the Gentleman, we did not interrupt him even though we are in the parliamentary status now of voting on the amendment as introduced by the Gentleman from Albay. That amendment was rejected by the Sponsor, and the proper appeal was made, so now we go into voting.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. An *aye* vote—please, we are voting, honorable colleague.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. An *aye* vote ...

REP. ATIENZA. I am citing Section 104.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). We are in the process of voting, please, Gentleman from ...

REP. BONDOC. We will entertain your query, Honorable Atienza, after we vote on the appeal of the Honorable Lagman.

REP. ATIENZA. All I want are clarificatory answers. We do not, we cannot, we should not reject questions from the floor.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader may please state the question to be voted on.

REP. BONDOC. In the interest of clarity to our Members ...

REP. ATIENZA. If you insist on an omnibus rejection, we will insist on a continuing objection.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, ...

REP. ATIENZA. That is precisely what I would like to prevent, a continuing motion ...

REP. BONDOC. ... the honorable Sponsor has attempted to answer the query of the Honorable Atienza

as to what an omnibus objection is. So, now we leave it to the Body.

An *aye* vote sustains the amendment of the Honorable Lagman. A *nay* vote, which the Majority ask for, sustains the omnibus rejection of our distinguished Sponsor. The Majority asks for your *nay* vote.

VIVA VOCE VOTING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). As many as are in favor of the amendment, please say *aye*.

FEW MEMBERS. *Aye*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). As many as are against, please say *nay*.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. *Nay*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The *nays* have it; the amendment is lost.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. ATIENZA. I heard the *nays* coming from one side only, but we heard the *ayes* all over.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, ...

REP. VILLARIN. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

REP. ATIENZA. No, we are questioning the statement of the Chair. We ask for a division of the House.

REP. VILLARIN. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

REP. BONDOC. Under Section 115, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, a motion to divide the House shall be carried if one-fifth of the Members present vote for it. Thus, could the Chair please call for those who are in favor of the nominal voting to please stand.

DIVISION OF THE HOUSE

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Those in favor of the nominal voting, please rise.

Few Members rose.

The motion for nominal voting is lost.
The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker, you did not even ask those who are against the nominal voting.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, ...

REP. VILLARIN. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

REP. BONDOC. ... one-fifth has to be met. There is no need to count those in opposition.

REP. ATIENZA. Then, to be sure, Mr. Speaker, ...

REP. BONDOC. I move for the recognition of the Gentleman from Albay who still has the floor to propose further amendments.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Gentleman from the First District of Albay is recognized for his amendment.

REP. LAGMAN. Point of order, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker. When we go to nominal voting, one-fifth of those present, considering that there is a quorum, should be counted. There was no count of those who rose in favor of the nominal voting. How can we now establish that one-fifth approved ...

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, I move again for the previous motion—those in favor of the nominal voting, and according to our rules, a number of 46 has to be met, may we please ask them to rise.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). So, what is the pleasure of the Dep. Majority Leader?

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker, before we do that ...

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, I move that we ask those in favor of the nominal voting to please rise.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker, before we go to the nominal voting, let us first ...

DIVISION OF THE HOUSE

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Those in favor of the nominal voting, please rise; and I am directing the Secretariat to please count.

Few Members rose.

There were 23 who stood up.
The motion for nominal voting is lost.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Gentleman from Albay is recognized.

REP. LAGMAN. In order to determine whether a motion for nominal voting is lost, there should be a determination of how many Members are present in the Session Hall so that we can accurately say that one-fifth stood up or one-fifth did not approve ...

REP. ATIENZA. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

REP. LAGMAN. ... the motion for nominal voting.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. LAGMAN. We have not established—what we are talking about are those present during the roll call; but after the roll call, the number of Members in the Session Hall has greatly diminished. So, there is a need to establish the basis of the one-fifth of the Members of the House in favor of the nominal voting.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. LAGMAN. Let us put this House in order.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Lagman is perfectly correct—one-fifth of the Members present as counted during our quorum call. We have 229 Members present and so, 46 is required.

For the information of the Body and those who are listening, we want to make use of the time to give a chance to all our colleagues to propose their amendments so we can perfect this legislation.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, ...

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. ... may I recognize the Honorable Lagman for his proposed amendment.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Honorable Lagman is recognized for his amendment.

REP. LAGMAN. I have not yet proposed my amendment but let us not derogate the rules on the pretext that we are giving everybody the opportunity to introduce individual amendments.

The roll call showed that 200 plus responded to the call but, by a simple viewing of those present, there are no 200 plus Members in the Session Hall. I call for a second roll call.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, this is taking time away from the amendments. I must object to the motion of the Gentleman.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). There is an objection to the motion.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker, we support the call for a roll call because we do not see 229 anymore. What I see before me are about 127, and to be one-fifth...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. FARIÑAS. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it has been very apparent that what they have just been doing here is not to introduce honest-to-goodness amendments. This Bill is for the reimposition of the death penalty. The amendments being introduced are to change the penalty from *reclusion temporal* to *reclusion perpetua* even if we have already approved Section 3 on page 1 of the Bill which is entitled “Imposing the Death Penalty.”

If this will go on and now they are invoking a roll call, I will join and I will move to call the roll. After we determine the actual number of Members, I will move to terminate the period of amendments.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Secretary General ...

ROLL CALL

REP. FARIÑAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that we call the roll now and I invite all Members to come here because after the roll call, I will move to terminate the period of amendments.

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

The Secretary General will please call the roll.

REP. ROQUE (H.). Mr. Speaker.

The Secretary General called the roll, and the result is as follows, per Journal No. 77, dated March 1, 2017:

PRESENT

Abayon
Abellanos

Abu
Abueg

Acop	Cerafica	Laogan	Roman
Acosta	Chavez	Lazatin	Romualdo
Acosta-Alba	Chipeco	Leachon	Roque (H.)
Adiong	Co	Limkaichong	Roque (R.)
Agarao	Cortes	Lobregat	Sacdalan
Aggabao	Cortuna	Lopez (B.)	Sagarbarria
Albano	Crisologo	Lopez (C.)	Sahali
Alejano	Cuaresma	Lopez (M.L.)	Salimbangon
Almario	Dalipe	Macapagal-Arroyo	Salo
Alonte	Daza	Maceda	Salon
Alvarez (F.)	De Jesus	Madrona	Sambar
Alvarez (P.)	De Venecia	Malapitan	Sandoval
Andaya	De Vera	Manalo	Santos-Recto
Angara-Castillo	Defensor	Mangaoang	Sarmiento (C.)
Aragones	Del Mar	Mangudadatu (Z.)	Sarmiento (E.M.)
Arbison	Del Rosario	Marcoleta	Savellano
Arcillas	Dimaporo (M.K.)	Marcos	Sema
Arenas	Duavit	Mariño	Silverio
Atienza	Enverga	Marquez	Singson
Aumentado	Ermita-Buhain	Martinez	Suansing (E.)
Bag-ao	Espina	Matugas	Suansing (H.)
Bagatsing	Estrella	Mellana	Suarez
Baguilat	Fariñas	Mercado	Sy-Alvarado
Banal	Fernando	Mirasol	Tambunting
Barbers	Ferrer (J.)	Montoro	Tan (M.)
Barzaga	Ferrer (L.)	Nava	Tan (S.)
Bataoil	Flores	Nieto	Tejada
Batocabe	Fortun	Noel	Teves
Bautista-Bandigan	Fortuno	Nogralles (K.A.)	Tiangco
Belaro	Garbin	Nolasco	Ting
Belmonte (F.)	Garcia (G.)	Nuñez-Malanyaon	Tinio
Belmonte (J.C.)	Garcia (J.E.)	Oaminal	Treñas
Belmonte (R.)	Garcia-Albano	Olivarez	Tugna
Benitez	Garin (R.)	Ortega (P.)	Tupas
Bernos	Garin (S.)	Ortega (V.N.)	Turabin-Hataman
Bertiz	Gasataya	Pacquiao	Umali
Biazon	Gatchalian	Palma	Ungab
Billones	Geron	Pancho	Unico
Bolilia	Go (M.)	Panganiban	Uy (J.)
Bondoc	Gomez	Panotes	Uybarreta
Bordado	Gonzaga	Papandayan	Vargas
Bravo (A.)	Gonzales (A.P.)	Pimentel	Vargas-Alfonso
Bravo (M.V.)	Gonzales (A.D.)	Pineda	Velasco-Catera
Brosas	Gonzalez	Plaza	Veloso
Calderon	Gorriceta	Primicias-Agabas	Vergara
Calixto-Rubiano	Gullas	Quimbo	Villanueva
Caminero	Hernandez	Radaza	Villaraza-Suarez
Campos	Herrera-Dy	Ramirez-Sato	Villarica
Canama	Hofer	Ramos	Villarin
Cari	Jalosjos	Relampagos	Violago
Casilao	Javier	Revilla	Yap (A.)
Castelo	Khonghun	Roa-Puno	Yap (M.)
Castro (F.L.)	Labadlabad	Robes	Yu
Castro (F.H.)	Lacson	Rocamora	Zarate
Catamco	Lagman	Rodriguez (I.)	Zubiri
Cayetano	Lanete	Rodriguez (M.)	

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. The roll call shows that 227 Members responded to the call.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). With 227 Members present, the Chair declares the presence of a quorum. The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker.

REP. FARIÑAS. Mr. Speaker.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

REP. FARIÑAS. Our parliamentary status is that, a while ago, there was a motion for nominal voting where the Chair made a count of 23, but the Gentleman from the First District of Albay wanted to have a second roll call, which motion the Majority Leader joined and called for the roll. So, our parliamentary status now is, and to satisfy the Gentleman, I move that we have a vote on the nominal voting. Those who want nominal voting, they will stand; and those against will remain seated.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker, before we go ...

DIVISION OF THE HOUSE

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Those who are ...

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). ... in favor for nominal voting, please stand up.

Few Members stood up.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). May I direct then the Secretariat to please count the number of those who stood up.

REP. FARIÑAS. Please do not include me. I am just standing here on my rostrum. *(Laughter)*

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). There were 28 who stood up and according to the Secretariat, one-fifth of 227 is 46, so the nominal voting is lost.

REP. FARIÑAS. Mr. Speaker.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. FARIÑAS. Mr. Speaker, I now move that we recognize the Gentleman from the Third District of Negros Oriental, Rep. Arnolfo “Arnie” A. Teves Jr., for his amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Rep. Arnie Teves is recognized.

REP. TEVES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good evening, everyone.

Anyway, my proposed amendment is on Section 4, page 2, lines 18 to 19. We remove the phrase “regardless of the quantity and purity involved.” Then on line 23, let us insert VALUES here on Section 11, lines 17 to 43. This be inserted after line 21—to put VALUES in Section 11.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). What does the Sponsor say?

REP. TEVES. May I continue, Mr. Speaker.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

REP. FARIÑAS. Mr. Speaker, I move for a one-minute suspension of the session.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The session is suspended.

It was 6:27 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

At 7:31 p.m., the session was resumed.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The session is resumed.

The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, based on our agreement, the Honorable Teves would like to withdraw his amendment.

REP. TEVES. Yes, I withdraw my amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Honorable Teves is recognized.

REP. TEVES. I withdraw my amendments, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. With that, Mr. Speaker, I move to close the ...

REP. ROQUE (H.). Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. ... period of ...

REP. ROQUE (H.). Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. ... amendments on House Bill No. 4727.

REP. ROQUE (H.). Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. I so move, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). There is a motion to close the period of amendments. Is there any objection?

REP. ROQUE (H.). Mr. Speaker, point of order.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). There is a point of order. Please cite the rule that is being violated.

REP. ROQUE (H.). Mr. Speaker, I have been recognized earlier during the period of amendments. I have made my amendment, and it was... (*inaudible*)

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). There is no rule that is being violated.

REP. ROQUE (H.). There is a rule, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Please state the rule.

REP. ROQUE (H.). During the period of amendments, Mr. Speaker, I was recognized earlier, but the Dep. Majority Leader asked me by way of a favor to give way to Congressman Lagman and I did. I have already, in fact, made my proposed amendment and I asked already for five minutes to explain my point.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker.

REP. ROQUE (H.). I can assure ...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. ROQUE (H.). ... the Body, Your Honor, it is an honest-to-goodness amendment.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, ...

REP. ROQUE (H.). It is not in the nature of an omnibus objection, Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. ... we understand the manifestation, the point of order of the Hon. Harry Roque. In effect, it is an objection to my motion to close the period of amendments. It has been objected to and therefore, we now divide the House.

Those who are in favor ...

REP. ATIENZA. No, Mr. Speaker.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. ... of my motion ...

REP. ATIENZA. Before the division, may we be allowed to just make a one-minute manifestation.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, we are now ...

REP. ATIENZA. We are in the ...

REP. BONDOC. ... in the process of voting. I have a motion. It has been objected to. Let me explain our voting. An *aye* vote ...

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. ... sustains my motion to close the period of amendments, and the Majority asks...

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. ...for your *aye* vote to close the period of amendments, and a *nay* vote sustains the objection to close of the period of amendments.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

DIVISION OF THE HOUSE

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Those who are in favor to close the period of amendments, ...

REP. ROQUE (H.). Point of order ...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). ...please say *aye*.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. *Aye*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Those who are against, please say *nay*.

FEW MEMBERS. *Nay*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The *ayes* have it; the motion is approved.

The period of amendments on House Bill No. 4727 is now closed.

The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, I move for approval on Second Reading ...

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. ... of House Bill No. 4727, as amended.

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. I so move, ...

REP. LAGMAN. Ano ba ito?

REP. BONDOC. ... Mr. Speaker.

VIVA VOCE VOTING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). There is a motion to approve House Bill No. 4727, as amended, ...

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). ... on Second Reading.

Those who are in favor, please say *aye*.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. *Aye*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). Those who are against, please say *nay*.

FEW MEMBERS. *Nay*.

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 4727, AS AMENDED,
ON SECOND READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The *ayes* have it; the motion is approved.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). House Bill No. 4727, as amended, is approved ...

REP. LAGMAN. Mr. Speaker.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). ... on Second Reading.

REP. ROQUE (H.). Mr. Speaker.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker.

REP. ROQUE (H.). Point of order.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. ROQUE (H.). Point of order, Mr. Speaker, Rule 118.

ADJOURNMENT OF SESSION

REP. BONDOC. Mr. Speaker, I move to adjourn the session ...

REP. ROQUE (H.). Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

REP. BONDOC. ... until Monday, March 6, 2017 at four o'clock in the afternoon.

REP. ATIENZA. Continuing ...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). The session is adjourned until...

REP. ATIENZA. Continuing point of order.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Abu). ... March 6, 2017 at four o'clock in the afternoon.

It was 7:34 p.m.