



Congressional Record

PLENARY PROCEEDINGS OF THE 17th CONGRESS, SECOND REGULAR SESSION

House of Representatives

Vol. 1

Wednesday, August 2, 2017

No. 6

CALL TO ORDER

At 4:00 p.m., Deputy Speaker Gwendolyn F. Garcia called the session to order.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The session is now called to order.

NATIONAL ANTHEM

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). Everyone is requested to rise for the singing of the Philippine National Anthem.

Everybody rose to sing the Philippine National Anthem.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia G.). Please remain standing for the Invocation to be led by the Lady from the Third District of Nueva Ecija, the Hon. Rosanna “Ria” Vergara.

Everybody remained standing for the Invocation.

INVOCATION

REP. VERGARA. O Most Holy Our Father: Creator, Redeemer, Consoler and Our Savior.

We come to You today, Your humble servants, and ask for Your guidance.

Help us all keep a clear eye towards life’s end. Let us not forget our purpose and destiny as God’s creatures. And that what we are in Thine eyes is what we are and nothing more.

Let not our worldly cares and anxieties or the pressures of public office cast a shadow over the divine life within each one of us or the voice of God’s spirit guiding our great task of leading humanity to wholeness. Remind us that if we open ourselves to God and His plan printed deeply in each of our hearts, God will open Himself to each one of us.

Let us never forget that when we leave this earth, we can take nothing that we have received—fading symbols of honor, trappings of power—but only what You have given: a full heart enriched by honest service, love, sacrifice and courage.

May we embrace the God of us all and His word wherever it surfaces, that we may imitate His preference for the poor and powerless.

Keep us ever mindful of His plan of liberating all people from everything that oppresses them and obstructs their development as human beings.

Strengthen us always that we may never tire of working for peace among all people. Use us as Your instruments to remove unjust social structures, patterns of exploitation, and institutionalized corruption.

May we always uphold the rights and dignity of the human person so that we may foster a society where every human life is cherished and where all people of this planet can enjoy its gifts, which God created for all in a spirit of love, justice, and equality.

May our Blessed Mother, Queen of heaven and earth, intercede for us and look kindly on our prayers, both spoken and unspoken.

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit.

Amen.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). Amen.

The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

ROLL CALL

REP. DEFENSOR. Mme. Speaker, I move that we call the roll of Members.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). 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. 6, dated August 2, 2017:

PRESENT

Abaya
Abayon

Abellanosa
Abu

Abueg	Castro (F.H.)	Gonzales (A.D.)	Pichay
Acop	Catamco	Gonzalez	Pimentel
Acosta	Celeste	Gullas	Plaza
Adiong	Cerafica	Hernandez	Primicias-Agabas
Advincula	Cerilles	Herrera-Dy	Quimbo
Agarao	Chavez	Hofer	Radaza
Aggabao	Chipeco	Jalosjos	Ramirez-Sato
Aglipay-Villar	Co	Kho	Ramos
Albano	Cojuangco	Khonghun	Relampagos
Alejano	Collantes	Labadlabad	Revilla
Almario	Cortes	Lacson	Roa-Puno
Alvarez (F.)	Cortuna	Lagman	Robes
Alvarez (P.)	Crisologo	Lanete	Rocamora
Amante	Cua	Laogan	Rodriguez (I.)
Amatong	Cuaresma	Lazatin	Rodriguez (M.)
Angara-Castillo	Cueva	Lee	Romualdez
Antonio	Dalipe	Limkaichong	Romualdo
Aquino-Magsaysay	Datol	Lobregat	Roque (H.)
Aragones	Daza	Lopez (B.)	Roque (R.)
Arcillas	De Jesus	Lopez (C.)	Sacdalan
Arenas	De Venecia	Loyola	Sagarbarria
Atienza	De Vera	Macapagal-Arroyo	Sahali
Aumentado	Defensor	Maceda	Salceda
Bagatsing	Del Mar	Malapitan	Salimbangon
Baguilat	Del Rosario	Mangaoang	Salo
Banal	Deloso-Montalla	Mangudadatu (S.)	Salon
Barbers	Dimaporo (M.K.)	Marcoleta	Sandoval
Bataoil	Dy	Marcos	Sarmiento (C.)
Batocabe	Elago	Mariño	Sarmiento (E.M.)
Bautista-Bandigan	Enverga	Marquez	Savellano
Belaro	Erice	Martinez	Sema
Belmonte (F.)	Eriguel	Matugas	Siao
Belmonte (J.C.)	Ermita-Buhain	Mendoza	Silverio
Belmonte (R.)	Escudero	Mercado	Singson
Benitez	Espino	Mirasol	Suansing (E.)
Bernos	Estrella	Montoro	Suansing (H.)
Bertiz	Evardone	Nava	Suarez
Biazon	Fariñas	Nieto	Tambunting
Billones	Fernando	Noel	Tan (A.)
Biron	Ferrer (J.)	Nogralles (J.J.)	Tan (M.)
Bondoc	Ferrer (L.)	Nogralles (K.A.)	Tejada
Bordado	Flores	Nolasco	Teves
Bravo (A.)	Fortuno	Oaminal	Tiangco
Bravo (M.V.)	Fuentebella	Ocampo	Ting
Brosas	Garbin	Olivarez	Tinio
Bulut-Begtang	Garcia (G.)	Ong (E.)	Tolentino
Cagas	Garcia (J.E.)	Ong (H.)	Treñas
Calderon	Garin (R.)	Ortega (P.)	Tugna
Calixto-Rubiano	Garin (S.)	Ortega (V.N.)	Tupas
Caminero	Gasataya	Pacquiao	Turabin-Hataman
Campos	Gatchalian	Paduano	Ty
Canama	Geron	Palma	Umali
Cari	Go (M.)	Pancho	Unabia
Casilao	Gomez	Panganiban	Ungab
Castelo	Gonzaga	Panotes	Unico
Castro (F.L.)	Gonzales (A.P.)	Papandayan	Uy (J.)

Uy (R.)	Villaraza-Suarez
Uybarreta	Villarica
Vargas	Villarin
Vargas-Alfonso	Violago
Velarde	Yap (A.)
Velasco	Yap (M.)
Velasco-Catera	Yap (V.)
Veloso	Zamora (R.)
Vergara	Zarate
Villafuerte	Zubiri
Villanueva	

OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE ‘NATIONAL BOOK DEVELOPMENT TRUST FUND ACT’, TO FOSTER A MORE DYNAMIC AND CONDUCIVE ENVIRONMENT FOR THE PROMOTION AND SUPPORT OF FILIPINO AUTHORSHIP AND OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITIES IN BOOK DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES”

By Representative Romero
TO THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION AND CULTURE

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. The Speaker is present.

Mme. Speaker, the roll call shows that 249 Members responded to the call.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). With 249 Members responding to the call, the Chair declares the presence of a quorum.

The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

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

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

The Secretary General is directed to proceed to the Reference of Business.

REFERENCE OF BUSINESS

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

BILLS ON FIRST READING

House Bill No. 6076, entitled:

“AN ACT AMENDING REPUBLIC ACT NO. 6426 OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE ‘FOREIGN CURRENCY DEPOSIT ACT OF THE PHILIPPINES’, TO FOSTER A MORE EFFICIENT FOREIGN DEPOSIT POLICY THAT WILL ENABLE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS TO REDUCE THEIR OVER-ALL SECURITY RISK, TO CONTRIBUTE TO A HEALTHIER AND MORE STABLE FINANCIAL SYSTEM, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES”

By Representative Romero
TO THE COMMITTEE ON BANKS AND FINANCIAL INTERMEDIARIES

House Bill No. 6077, entitled:

“AN ACT AMENDING REPUBLIC ACT NO. 9521

House Bill No. 6078, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING THE SEVENTEENTH OF NOVEMBER OF EVERY YEAR AS NATIONAL STUDENT LEADER’S DAY”

By Representative Dalipe
TO THE COMMITTEE ON HIGHER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

House Bill No. 6079, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING JULY 25 OF EVERY YEAR AS THE NATIONAL CAMPUS PRESS FREEDOM DAY”

By Representative Dalipe
TO THE COMMITTEE ON HIGHER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

House Bill No. 6080, entitled:

“AN ACT EXEMPTING THE BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE FROM THE COVERAGE OF REPUBLIC ACT NO. 6758, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE SALARY STANDARDIZATION LAW, AS AMENDED, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES”

By Representative Alonte
TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

House Bill No. 6082, entitled:

“AN ACT CONVERTING BURGOS EXTENSION ROAD INTO A NATIONAL ROAD AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

By Representative Gasataya
TO THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND HIGHWAYS

House Bill No. 6083, entitled:

“AN ACT CONVERTING LACSON EXTENSION ROAD INTO A NATIONAL ROAD AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

By Representative Gasataya
TO THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND HIGHWAYS

House Bill No. 6085, entitled:

“AN ACT CREATING AN ADDITIONAL TRIAL

COURT IN THE PROVINCE OF SULTAN KUDARAT TO BE STATIONED IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF ISULAN, FURTHER AMENDING FOR THE PURPOSE SECTION 14, PARAGRAPH (I) OF BATAS PAMBANSA BLG. 129, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS ‘THE JUDICIARY REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1980’, AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFORE”

By Representative Mangudadatu (S.)
TO THE COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE

House Bill No. 6086, entitled:

“AN ACT CREATING AN ADDITIONAL TRIAL COURT IN THE PROVINCE OF SULTAN KUDARAT TO BE STATIONED IN TACURONG CITY, FURTHER AMENDING FOR THE PURPOSE SECTION 14, PARAGRAPH (I) OF BATAS PAMBANSA BLG. 129, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS ‘THE JUDICIARY REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1980’, AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFORE”

By Representative Mangudadatu (S.)
TO THE COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE

House Bill No. 6087, entitled:

“AN ACT CREATING THE NATIONAL TRUST FUND FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

By Representative Sahali
TO THE COMMITTEE ON INDIGENOUS CULTURAL COMMUNITIES AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

House Bill No. 6088, entitled:

“AN ACT FURTHER EXPANDING THE DEFINITION OF THE CRIME OF RAPE, AMENDING FOR THE PURPOSE ACT NO. 3815, AS AMENDED, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE ‘REVISED PENAL CODE’ ”

By Representative Sahali
TO THE COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF LAWS

House Bill No. 6089, entitled:

“AN ACT PRESCRIBING THE REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS FOR THE OPERATION OF TRANSPORTATION NETWORK COMPANIES, PROVIDING PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION THEREOF, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES”

By Representative Bagatsing
TO THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

House Bill No. 6090, entitled:

“AN ACT ESTABLISHING AND CONSTRUCTING A HOSPITAL FOR THE PHILIPPINE COAST GUARD, ITS PERSONNEL AND DEPENDENTS TO BE KNOWN AS THE PHILIPPINE COAST GUARD GENERAL HOSPITAL AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

By Representative Sandoval
TO THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH

RESOLUTIONS

House Resolution No. 1152, entitled:

“RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COMMITTEE ON BANKS AND FINANCIAL INTERMEDIARIES TO CONDUCT AN INQUIRY, IN AID OF LEGISLATION, INTO THE CURRENT SAFEGUARDS ON THE CONTRACTING OF LOANS BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT UNITS AND INTO THE PERFORMANCE OF THE BUREAU OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE IN ENSURING RESPONSIBLE LOAN MANAGEMENT”

By Representative Quimbo
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

House Resolution No. 1153, entitled:

“A RESOLUTION STRONGLY CONDEMNING IN THE STRONGEST POSSIBLE TERMS PRESIDENT RODRIGO ROA DUTERTE’S THREAT TO BOMB LUMAD SCHOOLS IN MINDANAO AND URGING HIM TO IMMEDIATELY RETRACT HIS STATEMENT”

By Representatives Tinio, Castro (F.L.), De Jesus, Zarate, Brosas, Casilao and Elago
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

House Resolution No. 1154, entitled:

“RESOLUTION STRONGLY CONDEMNING AND CALLING FOR AN URGENT INVESTIGATION IN AID OF LEGISLATION, INTO THE ATTACKS AGAINST LUMAD SCHOOLS, STUDENTS, TEACHERS, AND ADVOCATES IN SOUTHERN MINDANAO FROM JULY 2016 TO JULY 2017”

By Representatives Tinio, Castro (F.L.), De Jesus, Zarate, Brosas, Casilao and Elago
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

House Resolution No. 1155, entitled:

“RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE APPROPRIATE COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION, IN AID OF LEGISLATION, INTO THE DUMPING OF 25,000 METRIC TONS OF GARBAGE

FROM SOUTH KOREA IN CEBU IN
FEBRUARY, 2017”
By Representative Garcia (G.)
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

COMMUNICATIONS

Letter dated February 24, 2017 of Celso L. Vocal, Regional Director, Regional Office No. X, Commission on Audit, furnishing a copy of the Annual Audit Report on the Oroquieta City Water District, Oroquieta City, for calendar year 2016.
TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Letter dated February 24, 2017 of Celso L. Vocal, Regional Director, Regional Office No. X, Commission on Audit, furnishing a copy of the Annual Audit Report on the Metro Ozamiz Water District (MOWD), Ozamiz City, for calendar year 2016.
TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Letter dated February 24, 2017 of Celso L. Vocal, Regional Director, Regional Office No. X, Commission on Audit, furnishing a copy of the Annual Audit Report on the Tangub City Water District, Tangub City, for calendar year 2016.
TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Letter dated May 22, 2017 of Atty. Usmin P. Diamel, Director IV, Regional Director, Regional Office No. XIII, Commission on Audit, furnishing the Annual Audit Reports (AARs) for CY 2016 on the following Water Districts (WDs):

1. Buenavista Water District
2. Nasipit Water District
3. Prosperidad Water District
4. Bacuag Water District
5. Del Carmen Water District
6. Metro Siargao Water District
7. Placer Water District
8. San Jose (Dinagat Islands) Water District
9. Socorro Water District
10. Bislig City Water District
11. Cantilan Water District
12. Hinatuan Water District
13. Lianga Water District
14. Madrid Water District
15. Tagbina Water District
16. Tandag Water District

TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Letter dated May 26, 2017 of Lynn S.F. Sicangco, Regional Director, Regional Office No. III, Commission on Audit, furnishing a copy of the

Annual Audit Report on the Philippine Rice Research Institute for the year ended December 31, 2016.
TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Letter dated May 29, 2017 of Lynn S.F. Sicangco, Regional Director, Regional Office No. III, Commission on Audit, furnishing a copy of the Annual Audit Report on the Aurora State College of Technology, Baler, Aurora, for the year ended December 31, 2016.
TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Letter dated June 8, 2017 of Silvestre H. Bello III, Secretary, Department of Labor and Employment, submitting the Department's Semi-Annual Report to Congress (January to June 2016).
TO THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT

Letter dated June 13, 2017 of Isra Sunthornvut, Secretary General of Asean Inter-Parliamentary Assembly, AIPA Secretariat, submitting the IPU Annual Report 2016 and Results of the proceedings of the 136th IPU Assembly and related meetings.
TO THE COMMITTEE ON INTER-PARLIAMETARY RELATIONS AND DIPLOMACY

Letter dated June 13, 2017 of Michael G. Aguinaldo, Chairperson, Office of the Chairperson, Commission on Audit, furnishing a copy of CY 2016 Annual Audit Reports on the following:

1. Local Government Academy
2. Bureau of Jail Management and Penology
3. Philippine Public Safety College
4. Philippine National Police
5. Department of National Defense
6. National Defense College of the Philippines
7. Office of Civil Defense
8. Veterans Memorial Medical Center
9. Philippine Veterans Affairs Office
10. Armed Forces of the Philippines Commissary & Exchange Service
11. Department of Justice
12. Bureau of Immigration
13. National Bureau of Investigation
14. Land Registration Authority
15. Parole and Probation Administration
16. Public Attorney's Office
17. Office of the Solicitor General
18. Office of the Government Corporate Counsel
19. Presidential Commission on Good Government

TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Letter dated June 14, 2017 of Rolando F. Hechanova, Ph.D. University President, Sultan Kudarat State

University, submitting the 2016 Annual Report of the Sultan Kudarat State University.
TO THE COMMITTEE ON HIGHER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Letter dated June 15, 2017 of Amando M. Tetangco, Jr., Governor, Office of the Governor, Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas, submitting the Report on Economic and Financial Developments in the Philippines, First Quarter 2017.
TO THE COMMITTEE ON BANKS AND FINANCIAL INTERMEDIARIES

Letter dated June 15, 2017 of Jose Antonio E. Goitia, Executive Director, Office of the Executive Director, submitting the Pasig River Rehabilitation Commission accomplishment report covering the period March 2017 to the present.
TO THE COMMITTEE ON ECOLOGY

Letter dated June 16, 2017 of Amando M. Tetangco, Jr., Governor, Office of the Governor, Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas, submitting data on outstanding Philippine external debt as of 31 March 2017.
TO THE COMMITTEE ON BANKS AND FINANCIAL INTERMEDIARIES

Letter dated June 19, 2017 of Maria Gleda E. Lim, State Auditor V, Supervising Auditor, Regional Office No. VI, Commission on Audit, furnishing a copy of the Annual Audit Report on the Estancia Water District for CY 2013-2015.
TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Letter dated June 19, 2017 of Maria Gleda E. Lim, State Auditor V, Supervising Auditor, Regional Office No. VI, Commission on Audit, furnishing a copy of the Annual Audit Report on the Anilao Water District for CY 2016.
TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Letter dated June 23, 2017 of Lynn S.F. Sicangco, Regional Director, Regional Office No. III, Commission on Audit, furnishing a copy of the Annual Audit Report on the Aurora Pacific Economic Zone and Freeport Authority, Casiguran, Aurora Province for the year ended December 31, 2016.
TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Letter dated July 4, 2017 of Maria Gleda E. Lim, State Auditor V, Supervising Auditor, Regional Office No. VI, Commission on Audit, furnishing a copy of the following Annual Audit Reports (AARs):

1. Metro Iloilo Water District (CYs 2013-2015)
2. Dumangas Barotac Nuevo Water District (CYs 2014-2016)

3. Alimodian Water District (CYs 2008-2016)
TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Letter dated July 4, 2017 of Evelyn S. Marañon, State Auditor V, Supervising Auditor, Regional Office No. XVI – Negros Island, Commission on Audit, furnishing copies of the Audit Reports on the following Water Districts of the Province of Negros Occidental, Negros Island Region:

1. Kabankalan City Water District – Calendar Year 2016
2. La Castellana Water District – Calendar Year 2016
3. Pulupandan Water District – Calendar Year 2016
4. Sagay Water District – Calendar Year 2016
5. Sipalay Water District – Calendar Year 2016
6. La Carlota City Water District – Calendar Years 2013 – 2015
7. Murcia Water District – Calendar Years 2013 – 2015
8. Talisay Water District – Calendar Years 2013 – 2015
9. Silay Water District – Calendar Years 2013 – 2015

TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Letter dated July 14, 2017 of Salvador C. Medialdea, Executive Secretary, Office of the President, Malacañang, transmitting two (2) original copies of Republic Act No. 10927 which was signed on even date by President Rodrigo Roa Duterte, entitled:

“AN ACT DESIGNATING CASINOS AS COVERED PERSONS UNDER REPUBLIC ACT NO. 9160, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE ‘ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING ACT OF 2001’, AS AMENDED”

TO THE ARCHIVES

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Report by the Committee on Basic Education and Culture and the Committee on Appropriations (Committee Report No. 333), re H.B. No. 5550, entitled:

“AN ACT SEPARATING CAMALOG NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL – MALAGNAT EXTENSION IN BARANGAY MALAGNAT, MUNICIPALITY OF PINUKPUK, PROVINCE OF KALINGA FROM THE CAMALOG NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL, CONVERTING IT INTO AN INDEPENDENT NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TO BE KNOWN AS MALAGNAT NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

recommending its approval with amendment

Sponsors: Representatives Durano, Nograles (K.A.)
and Mangaoang
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Report by the Committee on Basic Education and Culture and the Committee on Appropriations (Committee Report No. 334), re H.B. No. 6099, entitled:

“AN ACT SEPARATING THE MAYOR BARTOLOME SERUT NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL AND TRADE HIGH SCHOOL – MUSIMUT ANNEX IN BARANGAY MUSIMUT, MUNICIPALITY OF KABUGAO, PROVINCE OF APAYAO FROM THE MAYOR BARTOLOME SERUT NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL AND TRADE HIGH SCHOOL, CONVERTING IT INTO AN INDEPENDENT NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TO BE KNOWN AS MUSIMUT NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

recommending its approval in substitution of House Bill No. 4295

Sponsors: Representatives Durano, Nograles (K.A.)
and Bulut-Begtang
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Report by the Committee on Basic Education and Culture and the Committee on Appropriations (Committee Report No. 335), re H.B. No. 6100, entitled:

“AN ACT SEPARATING THE GOVERNOR BENJAMIN LEGUIAB, SR. MEMORIAL NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL – SACPIL ANNEX IN BARANGAY SACPIL, MUNICIPALITY OF CONNER, PROVINCE OF APAYAO FROM THE GOVERNOR BENJAMIN LEGUIAB, SR. MEMORIAL NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL, CONVERTING IT INTO AN INDEPENDENT NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TO BE KNOWN AS SACPIL NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

recommending its approval in substitution of House Bill No. 4294

Sponsors: Representatives Durano, Nograles (K.A.)
and Bulut-Begtang
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Report by the Committee on Basic Education and Culture and the Committee on Appropriations (Committee Report No. 336), re H.B. No. 6101, entitled:

“AN ACT SEPARATING THE MATAGUISI COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL HIGH

SCHOOL – CACALAGGAN ANNEX IN BARANGAY CACALAGGAN, MUNICIPALITY OF PUDTOL, PROVINCE OF APAYAO FROM THE MATAGUISI COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL, CONVERTING IT INTO AN INDEPENDENT NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TO BE KNOWN AS TAWIT NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

recommending its approval in substitution of House Bill No. 4293

Sponsors: Representatives Durano, Nograles (K.A.)
and Bulut-Begtang
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Report by the Committee on Basic Education and Culture and the Committee on Appropriations (Committee Report No. 337), re H.B. No. 6102, entitled:

“AN ACT ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL IN BARANGAY LINGUNAN, VALENZUELA CITY, TO BE KNOWN AS LINGUNAN NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

recommending its approval in substitution of House Bill No. 1331

Sponsors: Representatives Durano, Nograles (K.A.)
and Gatchalian
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Report by the Committee on Basic Education and Culture and the Committee on Appropriations (Committee Report No. 338), re H.B. No. 6103, entitled:

“AN ACT SEPARATING THE CONNER CENTRAL NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL – GUINA-ANG ANNEX IN BARANGAY GUINA-ANG, MUNICIPALITY OF CONNER, PROVINCE OF APAYAO FROM THE CONNER CENTRAL NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL, CONVERTING IT INTO AN INDEPENDENT NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TO BE KNOWN AS GUINA-ANG NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

recommending its approval in substitution of House Bill No. 4296

Sponsors: Representatives Durano, Nograles (K.A.)
and Bulut-Begtang
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Report by the Committee on Basic Education and Culture and the Committee on Appropriations (Committee Report No. 339), re H.B. No. 6104, entitled:

“ANACTCONVERTINGTHELICOPELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN BARANGAY LICOP, MATI CITY, PROVINCE OF DAVAO ORIENTAL INTO AN INTEGRATED SCHOOL TO BE KNOWN AS LICOP INTEGRATED SCHOOL AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

recommending its approval in substitution of House Bill No. 4840

Sponsors: Representatives Durano, Nograles (K.A.) and Almario

TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mme. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move that we recognize the esteemed Gentleman from the Lone District of Marinduque, the Chairman of the Committee on Energy, the Hon. Lord Allan Jay Q. Velasco, for a manifestation.

I so move, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Hon. Lord Allan Jay Q. Velasco is recognized.

REP. VELASCO. Mme. Speaker, I would just like to take this opportunity to manifest that on the occasion of the 8th National Electrification Awareness Month and the 48th Founding Anniversary of the NEA, we have here today the officers and the members of electric cooperatives representing roughly around 12 million Member-Consumer-Owners. From the NEA and the associations of electric cooperatives, specifically, I would like to acknowledge the presence of the following guests: Department of Energy Secretary Alfonso Cusi (*Applause*), NEA Administrator Edgardo R. Masongsong (*Applause*), NEA Board Member Rene M. Gonzales (*Applause*), NEA Board Member Agustin L. Maddatu (*Applause*), NEA Board Member Eugene A. Tan (*Applause*), NCECCO Chairman Akmad M. Mamalinta (*Applause*), ABDEC President Reynaldo Lazo (*Applause*), NEA ADCOM and Secretary General Erico Budoy (*Applause*), AMRECO President Sergio C. Dagooc (*Applause*), PHILFECO Chairman Narciso Salunat (*Applause*), PHILRECA President Jose Raul A. Saniel (*Applause*), NL-EC-MCO Board President Corazon Cullantes (*Applause*), ECAP President Roy Cordova (*Applause*), PHILFECO Executive Director Ponciano Payuyo (*Applause*), CAREZPI President Manuel Barrientos (*Applause*), LeCARES President Allan Laniba (*Applause*), MCPC President David Tauli (*Applause*), and NRECA members—Mr. Chuck Dawsey (*Applause*) and Mr. Gil Medina (*Applause*).

Dear colleagues, if I may ask for your attention, I have here a short video of the NEA, outlining its accomplishments through the years.

(*Video presentation*)

REP. VELASCO. Mme. Speaker, this Representation would just like to thank the House for the opportunity to acknowledge the presence of the 12 million electric cooperative Member-Consumer-Owners in the whole country in their celebration of the 48th Founding Anniversary of the NEA, and the 8th National Electrification Awareness Month.

Thank you, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.) Thank you, Cong. Lord Allan Jay Velasco. On behalf of the House of Representatives, we welcome all of the officers and men of the electric cooperatives representing over 12 million Filipinos. (*Applause*)

The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. GARCIA (J.). Mme. Speaker, may we acknowledge the presence of the guests of the Representative from the Lone District of Malabon City, Hon. Federico “Ricky” S. Sandoval II. They are members of the Malabon Premier Association of Private Schools Administrators Incorporated, and these are Dr. Jeannie D. Quirante, Engr. Ulysses Tumbocon, Joselina S. Cartagena, Dario B. Serrano, Ma. Gina T. Roxas, Arlene B. Agocoy, Kim Tan-Ong, Jovita T. Hizon, Lee Johnhan and Magdalena P. Catacunan. (*Applause*)

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The guests of Representative Sandoval, welcome to the House of Representatives.

The Floor Leader is recognized.

CONSIDERATION OF H.B. NO. 5475

Continuation

PERIOD OF SPONSORSHIP AND DEBATE

REP. GARCIA (J.). Mme. Speaker, under the Calendar of Unfinished Business, I move that we resume the consideration of House Bill No. 5745, contained in Committee Report No. 262, as reported out by the Committee on Agriculture and Food.

For this purpose, may I ask that the Secretary General be directed to read the title of the Bill.

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

The Secretary General is directed to read the title of House Bill No. 5745.

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 5745, entitled: AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE COCONUT FARMERS AND INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT TRUST FUND AND PROVIDING FOR ITS MANAGEMENT AND UTILIZATION.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. GARCIA (J.). Mme. Speaker, the parliamentary status of the Bill is that it is in the period of sponsorship and debate.

I move that the Chairperson of the Committee on Agriculture and Food be recognized.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the Chairperson of the Committee on Agriculture and Food, Rep. Jose T. Panganiban Jr., CPA, LLB, is recognized.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Thank you, Mme. Speaker.

This Representation is ready for the interpellation.

REP. GARCIA (J.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we recognize the Lady from GABRIELA Party-List, the honorable Rep. Arlene D. Brosas, for her interpellation.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Hon. Arlene D. Brosas is recognized.

REP. BROSAS. Yes. Maraming salamat po, Mme. Speaker. Maraming salamat po sa proponent ng House Bill No. 5745. My dear colleagues, magandang hapon po. Maaari po bang mag-interpellate ng ilang mga tanong sa ating proponent, Mme. Speaker.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Ikinagagalak ko pong mapakinggan ang katanungan ng ating kasamahan, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). Please proceed.

REP. BROSAS. Okay. Mme. Speaker, sa kasalukuyan po, ang House Bill No. 557, na mayroon ang ANAKPAWIS Party-List, ay marami pong pagkakaiba sa House Bill No. 5745. Sa Coconut Farmers and Industry Development Trust Fund na substitute bill po ngayon na ating tinatalakay, marami pong pagkakaiba sa mga probisyon dito. Ang malaki pong pagkakaiba ng House Bill No. 557 at House Bill No. 5745 ay ang pagkilala sa multi-bilyong pisong Coco Levy Funds scam, na ito ay isang malaking inhustisya sa masang magsasaka sa niyugan na ipinataw ng diktaturyang Marcos sa ilalim ng martial law. Ang pangunahing biktima po rito ay ang masang mga magsasaka na nangangailangan lamang ng pinakamataas na konsiderasyon sa hakbang na pagbawi at pamamahagi ng Coco Levy Funds. Alam ko pong nagkakaisa tayo na dapat makuha at naniniwala tayo na ang Coco Levy

Funds ay pera ng mga kapatid nating magniniyog at dapat po ay mapunta sa kanilang mga magniniyog. Kung kaya nais ko pong itanong, Mme. Speaker, paano po natin masasabi na social justice nga po ang maibibigay ng House Bill No. 5745 kung ang nabawi, ang ninakaw na pera mula sa Coco Levy Funds ay hindi mapupunta sa mga direktang naapektuhan ng Coco Levy Funds scam, simula pa noong 1971? Halos apat na dekada na po ito. Iyon po ang aking katanungan, Mme. Speaker.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, iginagalang kong Representante ng GABRIELA Party-List, ang House Bill No. 557 na tinuran po ng ating kasamahan ay isa lamang sa 16 na House Bills na nakonsolida para makarating po dito sa substitute bill, House Bill No. 5745. Ngayon, ang itinatanong po ng ating kasamahan ay kung ito bang House Bill na ito ay isang social justice measure. Ang sagot ko po ay opo. Ito pong House Bill na ito ay isang social justice measure dahil ang layunin po nitong House Bill na ito ay upang maipamahagi at magamit ang nabawi na Coco Levy Funds. Ang direktang makikinabang po dito, kagaya nga po ng nasabi ko kahapon, ay iyong ating mga magsasaka na magniniyog at iyong industriya ng niyog. Kaya nga po nagtataka ako kung bakit sinasabi ng ating kasamahan na hindi mababawi ng mga magniniyog iyong pondo samantalang ang makikinabang po dito ay walang iba kundi iyong ating mga magsasakang magniniyog at iyong kabuuang industriya ng ating niyugan po dito sa ating bayan, Mme. Speaker.

REP. BROSAS. Yes, Mme. Speaker, iyong titulo po ay nakalagay, malinaw na idinadamay ang coconut industry at hindi eksklusibo para sa kapakanan ng masang magsasaka na biktima ng Coco Levy Funds scam. Wala po iyon doon sa ating ano. Ang nakalagay lang po sa short title ay, "This Act shall be known as the 'Coconut Farmers and Industry Development Trust Fund Act.' " Even sa Declaration of Policy, hindi po doon nakalagay na eksklusibo para sa kapakanan ng masang magsasaka. Subalit, sinagot po tayo kanina na naniniwala sila na ang Coco Levy Funds scam ay maibibigay direkta sa ating mga magniniyog. Sa Declaration of Policy po nito ay hindi nito kinikilala na ang Coco Levy Funds ay dinambong mula sa masang magsasaka sa niyugan noong martial law, kung kaya hindi sila kinikilalang biktima. Samakatuwid, wala pong hustisyang panlipunan na nakasaad doon sa batas.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, kung hahayaan po ninyo ako na kung puwede kong basahin po ang Declaration of Policy na nakalagay po sa Section 2 nitong House Bill na ito ay maaari pong masagot ang sinasabi ng ating kagalang-galang na Representante ng GABRIELA, Mme. Speaker.

REP. BROSAS. Please do, Representative Panganiban.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Under Section 2 of the Declaration of Policy, it states:

It is hereby declared the policy of the State to pursue and attain the balanced, equitable, integrated, and sustainable growth and development of the coconut industry. Towards this end, the State shall adopt the necessary measures to immediately address the serious problems besetting the coconut industry, protect the socio-economic well-being of coconut farmers, and ensure that the benefits due to coconut farmers, especially the poor and the marginalized under various statutes shall be consolidated and their delivery expedited.

So, Mme. Speaker, nakasaad po dito sa ating deklarasyon ng polisiya na ang tutulongan po natin dito ay iyong mga magniniyog at iyong industriya po ng niyog dito po sa ating bayan.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). Representative Brosas is recognized.

REP. BROSAS. Yes, Mme. Speaker, pero wala po dito sa House Bill No. 5745, sa Declaration of Policies na ito ay hindi para sa social justice o ito ay para sa mga magsasaka kung hindi lantay na paano gagamitin iyong pondo para sa kapakanan ng industriya ng niyog, na ang pag-unlad daw nito ay madadamay na sa pakinabang ang mga masang magsasaka. So, malinaw po doon—industriya, na ang resulta ay madadamay na sa pakinabang ang mga masang magsasaka.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, hindi po kailangang ilahad sa deklarasyon ng polisiya iyong mga salita na “social justice.” Ang sinasabi po namin dito, ang pakinabang po ng House Bill na ito ay mapupunta sa mga magsasakang magniniyog at sa pangkalahatang industriya po ng niyog, Mme. Speaker.

REP. BROSAS. Mme. Speaker, nais ko pong basahin iyong Declaration of Policy ng House Bill No. 557, kung saan inilahad dito na direkta talagang makikinabang ang ating mga genuine small coconut farmer na hindi po nailagay doon sa House Bill No. 5745 na tinatalakay natin ngayon.

Inilagay po namin sa Section 2:

It is the policy of the State to promote the welfare of coconut farmers especially the genuine small coconut farmers. The State shall give highest consideration to the promotion

of social justice among coconut farmers in accordance with sound rural development and industrialization.

The State shall adopt necessary measures to immediately address the serious problems besetting the coconut industry and protect the socio-economic well-being of coconut farmers especially the genuine small coconut farmers.

To this end, the State shall recognize the right of coconut farmers especially the genuine small coconut farmers as defined in this Act, to participate in the planning, organizing, administration and management for the integrated development of the coconut industry, and shall provide support in whatever form.

So, it is possible na ilagay po sa ating Declaration of Policies ang termino na “social justice,” at maging ang termino na “socio-economic well-being” ng ating mga coconut farmers. Kasama din po iyong “to participate in the planning, organization and administration, management” ng ating mga integrated development of the coconut industry. So, kung wala po sa ating Declaration of Policy ang social justice, ito po iyong isa sa mga kinukuwestiyon namin. But, I have to move on to my second question po para tanungin ang ating good Sponsor kaugnay sa control at plano para sa Coconut Levy Fund na sinasabi natin, na kung may tunay na social justice ay dapat nasa kamay ng mga magsasaka ang mga pagpapalano, ang mga pagdedesisyon kaugnay sa Coco Levy Funds. Kung kaya, totoo po bang nasa kamay ng mga magsasaka?

Ayon po sa panukalang batas, ang Chairperson at Vice Chairperson, na may control sa bilyun-bilyong Coco Levy Funds, ay opisyal ng gobyerno. Ang tanong ko po, Mme. Speaker, nasaan po ang mga biktimang magniniyog sa pagbubuo ng Committee na hahawak sa pondong ito? Hindi po ba dapat sila ang pangunahing mga tao na may kontrol at kasali sa plano at nagpapalano kung paano po mapapaunlad ang nabawing nakaw na perang ito ng kanilang industriya?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, direktang sagot po sa katanungan ng ating kasamahan, under Section 11 po ng proposed House Bill, nakasaad po rito na ang pondo—ang paggawa or the creation of the Coconut Farmers and Industry Development Trust Fund Committee. Dito po sa Komitibang ito, dito po babalangkasin kung papaano po gagamitin ang pondo. Dito po sa Komitibang ito, mayroon pong 16 na miyembro. Sa 16 na miyembro, 9 po ang galing sa Representante ng magsasaka. Kaya, hindi ko po malaman kung ano po ang ibig sabihin ng ating kasamahan na hindi represented ang mga magniniyog dahil majority po ng membership ng Trust Fund

Committee ay manggagaling na Representante ng magsasakang magniniyog.

Saka, sa katunayan po, sa unang bersyon po nito ay anim lamang ang miyembro na galing sa magsasakang magniniyog. Pero, sa discussion po ng Komitiba ay ginawa po naming 9 out of the 16. So, maliwanag po na ang may boses dito ay iyong mga miyembro na galing po sa hanay ng ating magsasakang magniniyog, Mme. Speaker.

REP. BROSAS. Mme. Speaker, malinaw po sa House Bill No. 5745 na wala sa kontrol ng mga magsasaka ang bilyun-bilyong pisong Coco Levy Funds. Sa Chapter 4, Section 12, ang Coconut Farmers and Industry Development Trust Fund Committee ay binubuo ng limang opisyal mula sa gobyerno: DA, DOF, DTI, NEDA at PCA.

Good Sponsor, sabihin ninyo po kung tama ang aking mga sinasabi kung saan ang Chairperson ay ang Kalihim ng Department of Agriculture at Vice Chairperson ang Department of Finance Secretary, siyam mula sa coconut farmers' organizations, tatlo mula sa Luzon, Visayas at Mindanao, at dalawa mula sa coconut industry sector.

Kapansin-pansin po na ang Chairperson at Vice Chairperson ay opisyal ng gobyerno na hindi naman sila biktima ng Coco Levy Funds scam. Kung sila man ay tumatayong kinatawan ng gobyerno o mismo ang gobyerno o Estado nga ang perpetrator ng inhustisyang ito. Ngunit ngayon, Estado pa rin ang may kontrol sa pondong mismong ninakaw sa masang magsasaka. Ibinibida po ng Bill na ito na may malaking bilang raw o mayorya ang mga magsasaka sa Committee kasi siyam nga, nine, na magsasaka kontra lima mula sa gobyerno at dalawa mula sa coconut industry sector.

Gayun pa man, ang pag-appoint sa mga kinatawan ng magsasaka ay nakaasa sa kontrol at bulnerable sa maniobra ng PCA dahil ito ang inaasahang mag-validate at maglista ng mga kandidatong magsasaka batay sa letter ng Section 12. Tama po ba, good Sponsor, Mme. Speaker? Ano po ang role ng PCA?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, ang role po ng PCA dito ay siya lamang ang magva-validate at magsho-shortlist ng mga hanay o asosasyon ng mga magsasaka, pero hindi lamang po ito isang ahensiya, PCA, dahil PCA in consultation with the National Anti-Poverty Commission. Kaya nga po sinasabi ng ating kasamahan na PCA lamang, pero hindi po totoo iyon dahil nandito po sa Bill na iyong mga nominee po ng mga coconut farmers' organizations shall be validated and shortlisted by the PCA, in consultation with the National Anti-Poverty Commission.

Kaya nga po kung natatakot po ang ating kasamahan na baka hindi galing sa ating mga totoong magsasaka itong representante galing Luzon, Visayas at

Mindanao, nandoon naman po sa National Anti-Poverty Commission iyong kasamahan po ng ating mga—dating kasamahan na si former Rep. Liza L. Masa, kaya tiyak po na nakakasiguro po ako na mapoproteksiyonan itong mga hanay ng mga magsasaka na ito, Mme. Speaker.

REP. BROSAS. So, sinasabi ninyo po ba, good Sponsor, Mme. Speaker, na ang kontrol para sa pagva-validate, paglista ng mga kandidatong magsasaka ay mula sa PCA at NAPC manggagaling?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Bale ang magsho-shortlist lang po at magva-validate ay PCA, kokonsultahin po ang National Anti-Poverty Commission.

REP. BROSAS. So, konsultasyon lang po at wala sa kanya ang pagdedesisyon ng pagtatalaga at pagva-validate ng kandidatong magsasaka para makasama doon sa sinasabi natin na mga kinatawan ng magsasaka para sa coconut industry sector?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Sa ngayon po, Mme. Speaker, tanging ang PCA lamang ang may listahan ngayon ng mga asosasyon ng mga magsasakang magniniyog. Kaya nga po dapat, kung mayroon man po silang gustong ipalista, dapat mayroon na po silang listahan o accreditation sa PCA, Mme. Speaker.

REP. BROSAS. So, therefore, good Sponsor, Mme. Speaker, totoong nasa PCA lang, nasa kamay ng PCA ang pagva-validate at paglista.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Hindi po totoo iyon dahil nga po nakalagay mismo sa Bill, PCA in consultation ng National Anti-Poverty Commission. Kaya nga po inilagay natin dito na dapat kumonsulta muna ang PCA sa National Anti-Poverty Commission, Mme. Speaker, dahil kung hindi natin—sana natin—kung gusto natin na PCA lamang, sana tinanggal na natin iyong words na nagsasabi na dapat konsultahin ang National Anti-Poverty Commission, Mme. Speaker.

REP. BROSAS. Kaya nga po, Mme. Speaker, and good Sponsor, konsultasyon lamang—malinaw naman na konsultasyon lamang ang NAPC at hindi talaga siya ang magde-decide, at PCA pa rin po, babalik pa rin po tayo na PCA ang siyang may desisyon para sa pag-validate at paglista ng mga kandidatong magsasaka. Ang desisyon ay nasa PCA, ano po?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, ang listahan po ng asosasyon ng magsasaka ay nasa PCA, subalit iyon pong mga kakandidato o magiging miyembro nitong komitiba na ito ay manggagaling sa shortlist at nominasyon ng PCA, kukonsultahin ang National Anti-Poverty Commission, Mme. Speaker?

REP. BROSAS. Mme. Speaker, mukhang konsultasyon lamang sa—iyon po ay malinaw dito, konsultasyon lamang ang sa NAPC at PCA pa rin ang siyang makapangyarihan na magsasabi kung sino ang mga magsasaka na mapapabilang dito sa mava-validate at mapapabilang dito sa mga magdedesisyon sa komposisyon at magkokontrol sa plano para sa Coco Levy Funds.

Samantala, on another topic po, ano po ang komposisyon ng Trust Fund Committee na binuo ayon sa Bill na ito?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Ang Trust Fund Committee ay mayroong 16 na miyembro, Mme. Speaker. Lima po dito ay manggagaling sa Secretary ng Department of Agriculture, Secretary of the Department of Finance, Secretary of the Department of Trade and Industry, Secretary of the National Economic and Development Authority, and Administrator of the PCA or the office where the PCA is attached. Nine representatives from the coconut farmers' organizations who have considerable experience, substantial membership and reputable track records, allocated as follows: three representatives from Luzon; three representatives from Visayas; three representatives from Mindanao, and two representatives from the coconut industry sector who have considerable experience and reputable track record, Mme. Speaker. So, all in all, the membership of the Trust Fund Committee is composed of 16 members, nine of whom come from the representative of the coconut farmers, Mme. Speaker.

REP. BROSAS. Hindi na nga po demokratiko at malaya ang komposisyon ng Trust Fund Committee. Ang Coconut Farmers Industry Development Plan ay nasa kamay pa ng napakaraming ahensya ng gobyerno bilang kasama dito sa sinasabi ninyo, iyong PCA Administrator bilang Chairperson, iyong DA, DAR, DILG, DOF, DPWH, DOST, DSWD, DTI, NAPC, NEDA, at CHED, napakarami po na pawang sa mga gobyerno ang kanilang posisyon.

So, sa ganito pong komposisyon, kinukuwestyon po natin ito kasi ang sinasabi nga natin ay para sa genuine small coconut farmers fund iyong dapat na narapat para sa kanila ano po. Napakalayo ng Committee na ito sa iniisip po namin na Small Coconut Farmers Council na pinanukala ng House Bill No. 557 sa Section 11, Section 12, na ang council ay may nine na regular na miyembro kung saan pito ay mula sa mga maliliit na magsasaka sa niyogan, at dalawa ay mula sa non-government organization na matagal nang tumutulong sa kapakanan ng mga magsasaka, at dalawa sa pitong maliliit na magsasaka ay magmumula sa kababaihang magsasaka para po mayroon bahagi ng sektor ng kababaihan sa kababaihan na magsasaka sa pag-a-administer ng Coco Levy Funds. Dagdag dito

mayroong dalawang ex officio na miyembro ng council na walang karapatang bumoto mula sa ahensya ng gobyerno at iyong administrator ng PCA at Chairperson ng PCGG.

So, sa komposisyon po na ito masi-secure natin iyong karapatan ng mga magsasaka, maliliit na magsasaka para sa Coco Levy Funds. Iyon po iyong tinitiyak sana noong komposisyon na ito. Pero sa komposisyon na inilahad ninyo, nawala po ang lahat ng ito. Hindi rin kontrolado o madidikta ng gobyerno kung sino ang mapipiling mga maliliit na magsasaka o miyembro ng council dahil sila ay ihahalal ng isang National General Assembly kung saan tutulong lamang sa pag-facilitate ang PCA sa paglulunsad ng mga asembliya. Iyon po sana iyong iniisip naming paraan na mas maganda para talaga ma-ensure na iyong mga magsasaka natin ang makapagplano, makapagdesisyon, at makinabang.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, sa komposisyon lamang po ng coconut industry and coconut, itong pondo po na ito, sa 16 po na miyembro, siyam na po ang galing sa magsasaka kaya hindi ko po maintindihan kung ano pa pong puwede na makakapagprotekta sa kapakanan ng mga magsasaka. Dahil dito po sa 16 na ito, hindi naman po sinasabi na iyong lima ay mas maraming boto kaysa doon po sa siyam. Lahat po sila boboto. At hindi ko ho maintindihan kung papaano matatalo ng lima o noong pito iyong siyam po na galing sa hanay ng magsasaka pagdating po sa pamamaraan ng paggastos po dito sa pondo na ito.

Iyon pong tinuran ng ating kasamahan doon sa maraming Committee na manggagaling sa lahat po ng ahensya ng ating gobyerno ay iyon po sa Section 21, the "*Preparation of the Coconut Farmers and Industry Development Plan.*" Okay. Pero ganoon pa man po, dito po sa second paragraph ng Section 21, nakasaad po dito maliwanag:

The Ad Hoc Committee, in consultation with the coconut farmers' organizations, industry associations, civil society organizations, academe, and other concerned government agencies and other stakeholders in the coconut industry shall indicate in an integrated coconut industry strategy map x x x.

Kaya anuman po ang gagawin nitong mga ahensya ng gobyerno ay dapat ikonsulta ang ating mga magsasakang magniniyog. Napakalinaw po dito sa ating proposed House Bill na ito, Mme. Speaker.

REP. BROSAS. Ang mga hakbang po na sinabi ko kanina kaugnay sa House Bill No. 557 ay nagtitiyak na magtataguyod ng demokratikong interes at kalayaan ng masang magsasaka kontra sa anumang maniobra

na nagmumula o magmumula sa gobyerno at iba pang sektor kung mas marami sila. Ito po iyong sinasabi ninyo kanina na siyam naman sila pero marami din naman mga ahensya ng gobyerno na nakapaloob dito.

Hindi po saklaw ng House Bill No. 557 ang pagpapaunlad ng coconut industry, dahil malinaw na mandato ito ng PCA o ng DA. Ang House Bill No. 557 ay nakatuon sa pagtugon sa mga mahahalagang pangangailangan ng masang magsasaka na siyang biktima ng Coco Levy Funds scam o pag-angat sa kanilang kalagayan sa pamamagitan ng mga batayang probisyon. Inilagay po namin doon ang mga probisyong kakailanganin talaga ng ating mga coco levy—pakinabang ng ating mga—mula sa pondo ng Coco Levy Funds—mula sa pondo ng coco levy: pension, medical, hospitalization benefits, maternity, educational assistance at scholarship, kasabay ng mga livelihood programs, projects, small and medium coconut enterprise, mga kaugnay na proyekto nito, at mga pautang para sa mga maliliit na magsasaka.

Samakatuwid, iyong House Bill No. 5745 po ay sa tingin namin, dalawa iyong mayór na punto dito na kailangan natin talagang balikan. Binuo nitong Komite na dominado ng mga opisyal ng gobyerno kung kaya hindi na ito demokratiko saka makatarungan. Wala sa kontrol ng mga masang magsasaka ang Coco Levy Funds.

Ikalawa, ang plano para rito na dominado muli ng mga opisyal ng gobyerno ay paglabag sa kalayaan ng masang magsasaka dahil idinidikta sa kanila kung ano ang gagawin sa pondong sila naman ang tunay na may-ari. Kahit pa po sinasabi ninyo kanina, Mme. Speaker, good Sponsor, na may konsultasyon naman, open pa rin siya para sa pagmamaniobra ng gobyerno at ng iba pang sektor na may gusto sa pondong ito.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, maliwanag na maliwanag po na nakasaad dito sa House Bill na ito, at babasahin ko po kung papayagan ninyo po ako, iyong nilalaman noong plano na dapat magawa, kung anong tulong ang dapat magawa para sa ating mga magsasaka. Napakaliwanag po, nakasaad po dito:

In the formulation of the plan, the Ad Hoc Committee shall be guided by the following objectives:

- a. Increase in the income of coconut farmers and increase coconut productivity including intercropping and livestock-raising;
- b. Establishment of coconut-based enterprises including integrated processing of coconut products and downstream products;
- c. Rehabilitation and modernization of the coconut industry towards global competitiveness;
- d. Provision of timely and critical support to coconut farmers' organization; and

- e. Establishment of social protection programs that directly benefit coconut farmers and farm workers, in case these social protection programs are not funded by an appropriations law or any act or special law, or where funding is insufficient.

The social protection programs shall include:

1. social services such as life, medical, and accident insurance coverage of the coconut farmers;
2. scholarship for the benefits of the deserving descendants of the coconut farmers; and
3. livelihood programs.

Mme. Speaker, napakaliwanag po na ang layunin nitong House Bill na ito ay upang matulungan sa lahat ng aspektong sosyal ang ating mga coconut farmers, Mme. Speaker.

REP. BROSAS. Mme. Speaker, nais ko pong sabihin na maaari po talagang mamaniobra sa iba't ibang pamamaraan lalo na kung ang komposisyon ay mas marami ang taga-gobyerno.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, hindi ko maintindihan kung anong maniobra ang gagawin dahil doon nga sa komposisyon ng magmamaneho ng pondo na ito, siyam po ang galing sa hanay ng mga magsasaka, lima lamang sa hanay ng mga departamento ng ating gobyerno at dalawa ang manggagaling sa coconut industry, kaya hindi ko po maintindihan kung papaanong maniobra ang ibig sabihin ng ating kagalang-galang na Representate ng GABRIELA Party-List, Mme. Speaker.

REP. BROSAS. Kaya po, ang sinasabi ko po na komposisyon ay nariyan sa Section 21, entitled: "*Preparation of the Coconut Farmers and Industry Development Plan.*" Ang Ad Hoc Committee po ay kinabibilangan ng Secretaries ng DA, DAR, DILG, DOF, DPWH, DOST, DSWD, DTI, NAPC, NEDA CHED, et cetera. Ang pinakaimportante po dito ay ang PCA Administrator ang Chairperson.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, ang tinuran ko po sa Section 21, sila lamang po ang gagawa ng plano at hindi po mangangasiwa ng pondo. Sa pangangasiwa ng pondo, mas maraming miyembro ang galing po sa hanay ng ating magsasakang magniniyog, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Chair wishes to clarify. There are two bodies that are being referred to here. Will Representative Panganiban please proceed.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Yes, Mme. Speaker. There

are two committees that we are referring. In Section 12, we are referring to the composition of the Coconut Farmers and Industry Development Trust Fund Committee. This committee shall have the following powers and functions: Coordinate ...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). Can we just go to the composition.

REP. PANGANIBAN. The composition of the Coconut Industry Development and Trust Fund Committee shall be composed of the following:

(a) Five (5) representatives from the government, who shall be serving in ex officio capacities:

- (1) The Secretary of the Department of Agriculture as Chairperson;
- (2) The Secretary of the Department of Finance as Vice Chairperson;
- (3) The Secretary of the Department of Trade and Industry;
- (4) The Secretary of the National Economic and Development Authority; and
- (5) The Administrator of the PCA or the office where the PCA is attached.

(b) Nine (9) representatives from the coconut farmers' organizations are allocated as follows:

- (1) Three (3) representatives from Luzon;
- (2) Three (3) representatives from Visayas; and
- (3) Three (3) representatives from Mindanao.

(c) Two (2) representatives from the coconut industry sector who have considerable experience and reputable track record.

So, doon po sa Sections 11 and 12, the composition of the 16 members of the Trust Fund Committee, 9 members ang galing po sa hanay ng ating mga magsasaka. Kaya out of the 16, ang 9 po ay galing sa magsasaka, mayorya po ang ating mga magsasaka. Ngayon naman po, doon sa isa pang komitiba sa Section 21, ito ang Coconut Farmers and Industry Development Plan, plano po ito. So, magkakaroon po rito ng tinatawag nating Ad Hoc Committee. Ang ibig sabihin nito, pagkatapos po ng plano, wala nang Ad Hoc Committee, dahil nga tapos na ang plano. Ang plano na gagawin ng Ad Hoc Committee ay manggagaling sa Department of Agriculture, Department of Agrarian Reform, DILG, Department of Finance, DPWH, DOST, DSWD, DTI, National Anti-Poverty Commission, National Economic and Development Authority, Commission on Higher Education, nine representatives from farmers groups and two representatives from the coconut industry sector.

The administrator of the PCA shall act as the Ad Hoc Committee's Chairperson. The Ad Hoc Committee, again in consultation with the coconut farmers' organization, industry associations, civil society organizations, and all stakeholders of the coconut industry shall indicate in an integrated coconut

industry stratagem the policies for the development and rehabilitation of the coconut industry. Since this is just an Ad Hoc Committee, kapag natapos na po ang plano, wala na rin ang Ad Hoc Committee. Ang pag-uusapan na lang po rito ay kung papaano gugugulin ang pondo, at ang pondo po ay maaaring magastos lamang dito sa Coconut Industry Development Fund Committee, na kung saan sa 16 ang miyembro ay 9 po ang galing sa hanay ng mga magsasaka, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). Thank you, distinguished Sponsor, for clarifying the composition of the two different committees.

Representative Brosas is recognized.

REP. BROSAS. Thank you, Mme. Speaker, for listening very well doon po sa dalawang composition na binabanggit kanina.

Nevertheless, Mme. Speaker, distinguished Sponsor, ang sinasabi po natin ay kung sa 16 na Ad Hoc Committee members, dominated pa rin ito ng mga taong-gobyerno, kung kaya ibig sabihin, ang pagpapalano ay magmumula pa rin sa mga taong-gobyerno. So hindi po talaga natin maririnig ang boses ng ating mga maliliit na magsasaka, dahil ang susunod ay ang konsultasyon na sinasabi ninyo kung saan mayroong siyam na representante ang grupo ng mga magsasaka. Iyon po ang second composition. Ang first composition na sinasabi natin na may Ad Hoc Committee, ang 16 doon pawang mga nasa gobyerno po kung kaya ang pagpapalano ay sinasabi nating dominated talaga ng mga taong-gogyerno.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, it is very clear in Section 21, paragraph one, that it tackles the composition of the Ad Hoc Committee in the preparation of the plan. But then, if we continue reading on into the second paragraph, "the Ad Hoc Committee, in consultation with the coconut farmers organization," bukod pa po ito doon sa siyam na representante na galing sa farmers' group in the said Ad Hoc Committee. Kailangan pa ring konsultahin ang coconut farmers group sa anumang plano na gagawin, sa pagbalangkas ng Coconut Farmers and Industry Development Plan. So kailangang konsultahin ang mga magsasaka, Mme. Speaker.

REP. BROSAS. Mme. Speaker, kung bakit po natin ito binabanggit, malinaw na ang utilization ng funds ay direktang nakasalalay sa ahensiya ng mga gobyerno kung sila ang magpapalano para sa mga maliliit nating magsasaka. Alam naman natin na sa tagal ng panahon, wala pong napaunlad sa sitwasyon ng mga magniniyog. Nangangamba po tayo na magiging source ito ng panibagong korapsyon at the expense ng mga kapatid nating magsasaka.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, kaya nga po inilagay na natin dito sa mismong House Bill, in the third paragraph of Section 21: "In the formulation of the plan, the Ad Hoc Committee shall be guided by the following objectives..." Kaya hindi na po natin hinintay ang IRR dahil napakalinaw na lahat po ito ay patungkol kung papaano natin matutulungan ang ating mga magsasaka. Ang ibig kong sabihin, hindi na po natin binigyan ng leway ang mga taga-ahensiya ng gobyerno. Gagawa sila ng plano batay lamang sa mga obdyektiba na nakalahad dito sa ating proposed House Bill, Mme. Speaker.

REP. BROSAS. Mme. Speaker, dahil hindi po kinikilala ng ating distinguished Sponsor ang tinutukoy natin na mas marami ang taong-gobyerno o representasyon ng gobyerno na magpapalano para sa kung saan mapupunta ang pondo ng coco levy, sa tingin ko po, hindi kami magkakaroon ng pagkakasundo sa parteng iyon.

Ang panghuli ko na lang po ay ang mga magsasakang tunay na may-ari ay nagmistulang damay lamang na benepisyaryo dahil pinapaniwalaang ang pagpapaunlad, the development of the coconut industry ay mismong mag-aangat sa mga magsasaka kahit pa ito ay dominado ng mga asyendero, trader, may-ari ng oil mills, mga comprador o mga dayuhang negosyo. Kung isasabatas sa kasalukuyang porma, mabubukas lamang sa posibleng pandarambong ng Coco Levy Funds at Assets, at ang siglo ng malawakang panlilinlang na ipinatupad sa ilalim ng diktaturyang Marcos. Ayaw po nating maulit lamang ito sa ilalim ng bagong administrasyon. Ang Coco Levy Funds at Assets po ay dapat lamang gamitin sa pambansang industriyalisasyon bilang ambag sa pangkalahatang pagpapaunlad ng pambansang ekonomiya. Iyan po ang paniniwala ng Representasyong ito.

Magandang hapon po sa ating lahat.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.).
Thank you, Representative Brosas.
The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. GARCIA (J.). Mme. Speaker, the next Member who wishes to interpellate the Sponsor is the Gentleman from the First District of Northern Samar, Rep. Raul A. Daza.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Hon. Raul Daza is recognized.

REP. DAZA. Thank you, Mme. Speaker.

At the outset, I would like to put on record that I am in full support of this Bill. I rise only to raise some questions to help strengthen the Bill, because like many Members of the House, we would like this program,

we would like this Bill to become a law as soon as possible.

Northern Samar which is my home province is in Region VIII. Region VIII is the region in the Visayas which consists of four regions that produce the most coconut. This is a matter of record. In Region VIII, Northern Samar has been number one or number two in coconut production. This is why I have a profound interest in this Bill.

As the distinguished Sponsor earlier acknowledged, the Trust Fund Committee consists of 16 members. This strikes me because when a committee is formed, the practice has been to have an odd-numbered committee. There is a chair and then even-numbered members so that if there is a tie, there would not be an impasse. Now, if you have a 16-member committee as it is now, and if there is a question which evenly divides the committee, an impasse may result. Would the Sponsor comment on that, Mme. Speaker.

REP. PANGANIBAN. That would be possible my dear colleague. But again, in the composition of the Trust Fund Committee, we made it very clear that out of the 16, there would be 9 members coming from the farmers' organizations. So, we are contemplating that, of course, the 9 members coming from the farmers' organizations would have one vote, would have to mend a united vote. Meaning, in every dealing of the committee, we are expecting that the 9 members coming from the farmers' organizations would vote as one. Therefore, it would avoid any impasse, Mme. Speaker, my dear colleague.

REP. DAZA. Mme. Speaker, I would like the Sponsor to take a look at that because in the event that the Sponsor agrees with me, that the committee should be odd-numbered, I would like to suggest an additional member which is going to be the head of the NAPC or the National Anti-Poverty Commission. Does the Sponsor think that my suggestion is worth it, Mme. Speaker.

REP. PANGANIBAN. I would take the suggestion of the Gentleman at the proper time, Mme. Speaker.

REP. DAZA. Thank you, Mme. Speaker. Mme. Speaker, there are 18 regions in the country—8 in Luzon, 4 in the Visayas, and 6 in Mindanao. And we have 82 provinces—39 in Luzon, 16 in the Visayas, and 27 in Mindanao.

I would like the Sponsor to take a look at Section 12. It says that the Fund Committee shall include 9 representatives from the coconut farmers' organizations to be allocated as follows: 3 representatives from Luzon; 3 representatives from Visayas; and 3 representatives from Mindanao.

Of course, common sense dictates that the coconut farmers' organizations should come from the coconut-producing provinces. Would the Sponsor not consider delimiting the allocation of the 3 representatives from Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao by adding some descriptive phrase which says, like for instance, "three representatives from the three top coconut producing regions of Luzon." With 39 provinces from Luzon, I would like to obviate the possibility, which is going to be very hilarious, and without malice when I say having someone from Region I, which we know is a tobacco-producing region, sit in the committee because for instance, there is the Pagudpud Coconut Growers Association of Pagudpud, Ilocos Norte, where you have really coconuts and where coconuts are grown, not for edible purposes but more to attract tourists. Because Pagudpud is a tourist point, you know, tourists would like to drink coconut water. They would like to go under the shed of the coconut tree and they would like their pictures taken with the coconut trees. Would the Sponsor consider that, Mme. Speaker?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, we have discussed this lengthily in the committee level. That is why the validation and shortlisting of the coconut farmers' organizations shall form part of the representatives coming from Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao. It shall be the Philippine Coconut Authority that shall validate and shortlist the said coconut farmers' organizations because as it is now, only the PCA has the complete list of farmers' organizations dealing or planting and producing coconuts, Mme. Speaker. So, the validation and shortlisting shall be made by the PCA because the said agency has the list of all coconut farmers and coconut farmers' organizations in the country, Mme. Speaker.

Of course, this is in consultation with the National Anti-Poverty Commission. With regard to the concern of Representative Daza, I am sure that the Philippine Coconut Authority would not allow a farmer's organization or a coconut farmer coming from, let us say, Pagudpud to become a member of the Trust Fund Committee, Mme. Speaker.

REP. DAZA. Well, Mme. Speaker, for now I would like to share the optimism of the Sponsor, but I recall that in recent times, the PCA itself was headed by someone who comes from a Visayas region that is sugar-producing, and so, I thought that we should put into the provisions now built-in safeguards to ensure that something that is absurd goes into the overall logic of this noble piece of legislation.

In any event, Mme. Speaker, I would like to repeat, I would like to reprise my comments with regard to the composition of the Coconut Farmers and Industry Development Trust Fund Committee under Sections 11

to 21, with regard to the Ad Hoc Committee, because I noticed that, again, in Section 21, if I am not in error with regard to my counting of the number of members, you have again an even-numbered committee consisting of 22. So, I will not anymore belabor that. I would only want to reiterate my comments with respect to this provision.

REP. PANGANIBAN. I understand, Mme. Speaker, that the membership of the Ad Hoc Committee is 23, not 22, Mme. Speaker.

REP. DAZA. How many?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Twenty-three.

REP. DAZA. Twenty ...

REP. PANGANIBAN. Three.

REP. DAZA. Then I stand corrected.

Thank you, Mme. Speaker. I would like to express my thanks to the able Sponsor and, again, I would like to put on record that when this Bill comes to vote, I shall vote in favor of it.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Thank you, Representative Daza.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. GARCIA (J.). Mme. Speaker, the next Member who wishes to interpellate the Sponsor is the Gentleman from BAYAN MUNA Party-List, Rep. Carlos Isagani T. Zarate

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). Rep. Carlos Isagani Zarate from BAYAN MUNA is recognized.

REP. ZARATE. Thank you, Mme. Speaker. Would the good Sponsor entertain some clarificatory questions, Mme. Speaker?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Gladly, Mme. Speaker.

REP. ZARATE. Marami na hong natalakay. Gusto ko lang hong diinan muli itong punto—ano ho ba talaga ang inaasahang ganansya ng ating mga coconut farmers lalung-lalo na iyong mga maliliit na coconut farmers? Halimbawa ho dito sa usapin sa panukalang batas, iyong Chapter VI, Section 22, na i-privatize iyong Coconut Levy Assets, Mme. Speaker, Mr. Sponsor.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, dito po sa

Section 22, nakalahad po dito na iyong Committee po ang magdedetermina, iyong Trust Fund Committee shall determine the coconut levy assets that shall be privatized and/or retained. Kasi po dito po sa pondong ito, gusto ko lang pong linawin na out of the almost P100 billion Coco Levy Fund, P75 billion is in the form of cash and securities, Mme. Speaker, and P62 billion of this is deposited in the Bureau of the Treasury, but not earning interest. Hindi po nagkakainteres itong pera na ito, itong P65 billion, matagal na—and another P13 billion deposited in the banks, I mean, in the form of securities that earn interests, and another P20 billion, more or less P20 billion, comprising of Coco Levy Assets, at ito pong mga Coco Levy Assets na ito ay ito po iyong mga coconut, coco mills. I think, mayroon ...

REP. ZARATE. Ilan ho ba, Mme. Speaker, Mr. Sponsor, ang coco mills na kaugnay rito na puwedeng, or other assets, real assets, real properties, na can be subject to privatization and how will this specifically benefit our specifically small coconut farmers?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Kagaya nga po noong P75 billion na cash, kung saka-sakali pong ma-privatize po itong mga coconut mills na ito at ma-realize, maging cash ito eh magiging—it shall form part of the Coco Levy Funds—okay, which kagaya nga po noong nasabi namin, this will become a perpetual fund of P10 billion fund, when this House Bill becomes a law; a jumpstart fund amounting to P10 billion, iyon po ang initial na pondo na kaagad-agad na maitutulong sa ating mga magsasaka. Iyon pong P65 billion plus, kapag na-privatize o kapag nabenta iyong mga Coco Levy Assets, more or less with the value of P20 billion ay magiging parte pa rin po iyan ng Coco Levy Funds, so P65 billion plus, let us say P20 billion, P85 billion which will become a perpetual fund of which only the interest income will be used for the programs as indicated in the plan, Mme. Speaker.

REP. ZARATE. Thank you, Mme. Speaker, Mr. Sponsor.

Malinaw ho kasi rito sa panukalang batas na talagang ang framework ng batas na ito doon sa usapin ng real assets or real properties na kasama dito sa pondong ito ay pribatisasyon kaagad. Bakit ho hindi nailagay dito sa panukalang batas na ito na imbes na pribatisasyon ang tunguhin, hindi ho ba mas mainam na itong mga asset na ito ay mapakinabangan muna or dapat pakinabangan ng ating maliliit na magniniyog dahil sila naman talaga ang nangangailangan ng mga ganitong asset na sa mahabang panahon ay ipinagkait nga sa kanila?

Malinaw dito sa Chapter 6, kasi isang buong chapter ang inukol dito sa pribatisasyon, ang framework kaagad

ng batas na ito ay i-privatize, ibigay na iyan, ibalik iyan sa kamay ng mga kapitalista at hindi—ibenta siya at iyong bentang iyon na iyong pakikinabangan daw ng mga maliliit na mga magsasaka or ng industriya, Mme. Speaker, Mr. Sponsor.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, hindi po kaagad-agad mapa-privatize ito kasi po ang nakalagay po dito sa panukalang batas na ito under Section 22, “The committee shall determine, ...” meaning, the committee which is the Coconut Industry Trust Fund Committee shall determine “the Coconut Levy Assets that shall be privatized and/or retained.”

So meaning, if the committee finds it that all of the assets shall be retained, then they shall be retained. So, depende pa rin po sa magiging pag-aaral ng Trust Fund Committee kung ito bang mga Coco Levy Assets na ito ay ipa-privatize o ire-retain, Mme. Speaker. So, hindi po automatic na mapa-privatize kagaya po ng sinasabi ng ating kagalang-galang na Representante na galing po sa BAYAN MUNA, Mme. Speaker.

REP. ZARATE. Wala hong debate doon, Mme. Speaker, na parang binigyan nga ng poder ang komite dito. Pero, dahil nga nakalagay kaagad dito na ang framework, pribatisasyon, ako ay nagtataka bakit hindi sinabi halimbawa sa panukalang batas na ito na ang mababawing Coco Levy Assets ay papakinabangan ng mga maliliit na mga magsasaka? Kung hindi na ito kapakinabangan ng mga maliliit na magsasaka ay diyan siguro muna natin i-entertain na i-privatize ito.

At any rate, malinaw, Mme. Speaker, na ang framework nga ay pribatisasyon at sa karanasan natin, Mme. Speaker, G. Isponsor, sa mga nakaraang panahon na nagpasá tayo ng batas dito, na sinasabi natin, ipinapangako natin na kapag na-privatize ang mga batayan, utilities, for example, kagaya ng assets ng National Power Corporation na nasa ilalim ng EPIRA ay sinabi na kapag ito ay na-privatize, magmumura ang kuryente. Hanggang ngayon, pasan-pasan ng mamamayang Pilipino ang mahal na kuryente dahil nasa kamay na ng kapitalista na ang tunguhin lamang ay ganansiya sa ating mga mayor na assets sa kuryente. Ganun din ang mangyayari dito sa panukalang batas na ito, sa halip na sa kapakinabangan ng mga maliliit na magniniyog, itong halimbawa, coco mills, na puwedeng tumulong para mapa-improve iyong kanyang kita ay ibigay nang buong-buo, ibenta ngayon sa mga private entities—sa kapitalista.

At any rate, I will go to another point, Mme. Speaker. Gusto ko lang ilinaw muli. Sinasabi kanina ng ating kagalang-galang na Sponsor na natitiyak naman ang interes ng mamamayan dahil doon sa Trust Fund Committee ay 9 nga, out of 16 ang membership ng mga representante ng mga magniniyog. Sinasabi rin niya,

kung bilangan lang, panalo na ang siyam kumpara sa lima ng gobyerno at kahit na magsama pa ang dalawang representante ng industriya ay pito lang sila, laban sa siyam. Iyan po ay madaling sabihin, pero alam po natin na kung sino iyong nasa poder ay may impluwensiyang puwedeng gawin niya para sa pagdating ng mga botohan, ang interes palagi noong mga nasa poder ang namamayani. Gusto ko lang balikan din ang probisyon sa Section 21, noong Ad Hoc Committee, Mme. Speaker. Mahalaga ito dahil itong Ad Hoc Committee, kahit na sinasabi ng ating kagalang-galang na Sponsor ay ang kanilang papel lang naman ay gumawa ng plano, napakalawak po ng kanilang poder. Sila ang magbabalangkang ng plano—paano ba ang tutunguhin ng pondong ito? Ang una ko hong katanungan, ilang taon ho ba mananatili itong Ad Hoc Committee na ito, Mme. Speaker, G. Sponsor?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, itong Ad Hoc Committee na ito ay mananatili lamang hanggang sa pagbalangkang ng plano, Mme. Speaker. So, wala namang nakalagay dito sa batas na ito na mananatili sila hanggang nandoon po ang Trust Fund Committee, Mme. Speaker.

REP. ZARATE. Iyon nga ho ang ating pinangangambahan, dahil noong sinuri natin ang probisyon na ito ay parang magiging katulad ito doon sa terminong palaging binabalik-balik ng ating kagalang-galang na Sponsor in perpetuity. Kaya mukhang misnomer ang sinasabing ito ng Ad Hoc Committee dahil kung susuruin ho natin, talagang in perpetuity, nandiyan iyang Committee na iyan at hindi siya Ad Hoc, at iyon ang ating pinangangambahan. Dahil dominado ito ng mga kinatawag nasa gobyerno at ng nasa industriya at kahit sabihin pa natin na nandiyan pa rin iyong siyam na miyembro or kinatawan ng magniniyog, out of 23 ay 11 iyong nasa government agencies, mayroong dalawang nasa coconut industry, that is already 13 out of—kontra sa siyam. At hindi ho—iyan ho ang unang punto natin na gusto nating linawin ng kagalang-galang na Sponsor dahil hindi ho itong Ad Hoc. Malinaw po na ang sinasabi rin dito na sa Section 21, kung papayagan po ay babasahin ko, ang papel daw ng Komiteng ito na Ad Hoc ay:

It shall prepare every ten (10) years a medium-term plan of programs, activities, and projects which shall be funded out of the Trust Fund and which shall be known as the Coconut Farmers and Industry Development Plan. The Plan shall be consistent with the Philippine Development Plan and it shall be subject to mandatory review every year.

Sa bawat sampung taon po, gagawa ng plano ang

Ad Hoc Committee. So, walang katapusan, habang nandiyan iyong pondo ng Coconut Levy Fund, nandiyan iyang komite na iyan at siya iyang may poder, siya iyong magbabalangkang ng plano at kung ano ang tutunguhin nitong pondong ito. At sinabi nga ho natin na kontrolado ito noong mga kinatawag nasa gobyerno, na sila ang mayorya, Mme. Speaker, Mr. Sponsor.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, kaya nga po dito, dito sa Section 21 na ito, inilagay na po natin kung ano po iyong mga kailangan. Kaya nakalagay po dito na, “In the formulation of the plan, the Ad Hoc Committee shall be guided by the following objectives.” Binasa ko na po ito kanina at lahat po ng gagawin dito sa plano na ito ay dapat mayroong obdyektiba na tulungan ang ating magsasakang magniniyog, Mme. Speaker.

REP. ZARATE. Wala ho tayong debate, Mme. Speaker, Mr. Sponsor, sa usapin na mayroon hong nakalagay na guiding principles.

Ang tanong ko po, dahil sinasabi ninyo kanina na hindi naman hanggang sa hanggan, mananatili itong Ad Hoc Committee na ito, dahil nga Ad Hoc. By the term “Ad Hoc,” pansamantala. Sabi ninyo, kapag nakagawa na sila ng plano, tapos na ang kanilang papel kaya hindi makokontrol noong mga nasa gobyerno at noong nasa industriya na mangingibabaw sila sa siyam na miyembro na galing sa magniniyog ang paggagawa ng plano.

Pero kung atin ho ngang babasahin ito ay in perpetuity, nandiyan iyong komite na iyon at sila ang may poder, dahil every 10 years, kailangang magbalangkang sila ng mga bagong plano at every year, nire-review ang planong ito. Sino ho ba ang magre-review ng planong ito? Hindi po ba ang komiteng ito rin, itong Ad Hoc Committee dahil kailangang tingnan nila kung ang planong ginawa nila noong nakaraang 10 taon ay tama pa ba pagsapit nang ika-20 taon na maitatag itong pondong ito, Mme. Speaker, Mr. Sponsor?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, the plans shall be submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee to the Trust Fund Committee. Kaya nga po ang magbabalangkang po ng plano ay iyong ating Ad Hoc Committee at ang mag-i-implemanta ng plano ay iyong ating Trust Fund Committee, Mme. Speaker.

REP. ZARATE. Wala din naman po tayong debate muli diyan.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Tama po iyong sinasabi ng ating kasama na sa pagkalahad po noong Section 21 ay maaari ngang iyong Ad Hoc Committee ay mananatili kasi nga po every 10 years mayroon silang planong gagawin, Mme. Speaker.

REP. ZARATE. Kung magkaganoon po, huwag nating i-mislead ang ating mga mamamayan lalo na ang ating mga magniniyog na ito ay Ad Hoc. Tapatin na ho nating sabihin na mayroong komite rito na dominado nang 11 miyembro na nagmumula sa iba't ibang ahensya ng gobyerno na siyang magbabalangkang ng batas. Dahil itong komite naman na ito ay habang nagfo-formulate sila, I presume, ang komiteng ito ay magbobotohan kung okay na ba ang nabalangkang nilang plano para sa 10 taon. Kapag nagbobotohan iyan, iyong siyam na nominal representatives from the coconut farmers ay talagang dominado sila dahil 11 iyong members ng komite na iyan na galing sa gobyerno at dalawa galing sa industriya, et cetera.

So, iyon ho siguro ang dapat linawin dito, hindi ho ito Ad Hoc. This is a permanent committee dominated by government agencies that will formulate plans, at napakalawak po ng planong puwede nilang gawin. "The plan shall provide ..."—kung babasahin ko pa, "...indicative funding requirement or allocation for the implementation of any and all of the programs and projects to be funded by the Jumpstart Fund and Trust Income." It also says, "that for projects which are recurring or to be implemented on a regular basis, the allocations shall indicate the annual fund that may be required to implement the projects and," et cetera, et cetera.

So, malawak ho ang papel ng Ad Hoc Committee na ito. Kahit ho sabihin natin na kung anuman ang kanilang mapagplanuhan ay ibabato nila ito doon sa Trust Fund Committee, remember, the members of the Trust Fund Committee are also members of this Ad Hoc Committee. Kaya, sigurado rin na kapag ibinato na ito ng Ad Hoc Committee doon sa Trust Fund Committee, lusot na lusot din ito, Mme. Speaker, Mr. Sponsor.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, gusto ko lamang pong linawin na ito pong plano ay totoo na gagawin ng Ad Hoc Committee.

Pero ito pong plano ay ibibigay o isa-submit sa ating Trust Fund Committee. Ang mag-iimplementa po nito ay iyong Trust Fund Committee at hindi naman po itong Ad Hoc Committee.

Kagaya nga po ng sinasabi ng ating kagalang-galang na Representante na galing sa BAYAN MUNA, ito pong Ad Hoc Committee na ito, kung sakaling mananatili man siya habang nandiyan po iyong pondo, lahat po ng gagawing plano nitong Ad Hoc Committee na ito ay para lamang sa ating mga magsasaka.

Kaya nga po, nandito na po iyong guidelines kung ano po ang puwede nilang ilagay doon sa plano. Kaya kahit sino pa po ang umupo dito sa Ad Hoc Committee na ito, they will be guided by the provisions of Section 21 in the fourth paragraph, letters A, B, C, D and E,

hindi po sila puwedeng tumuligsa dito sa mga guiding principle na nandito po sa Section 21, Mme. Speaker.

REP. ZARATE. At any rate, Mme. Speaker, malinaw naman po ang aking naipunto rito, na talagang kahit na tingnan lang natin, parang simple lang iyong komposisyon sa pagpapalano, talagang nasa—ang tingin ng Representasyong ito, nasa disadvantageous na posisyon ang ating mga magsasaka ng niyog dahil kahit na sabihin pa ngang ad hoc ito, hindi naman masyadong malaki ang poder nito dahil nasa Trust Fund Committee ang tunay na poder. Kitang-kita rito, na saan ba nagmumula ang implementasyon ng isang plano, kundi, dito sa binabalangkang na plano ng so-called Ad Hoc Committee, na, actually, it is a permanent committee.

Kaya ang una ko nga pong punto kanina, ang malinaw na tutunguhin talaga nito ay pribatisasyon. At sa huli, ang pinapangambahan po natin ay ang mangyari na hindi ho para sa kapakinabangan ng maliliit, lalung-lao na ng mga maliliit na magniniyog, ang tutunguhin nitong ating panukalang batas.

Maraming salamat, Mme. Speaker. Maraming salamat po sa ating butihing Sponsor.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Maraming salamat.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. GARCIA (J.). Mme. Speaker, may we recognize our next interpellator, the Congressman from the First District of Tarlac, Rep. Carlos O. Cojuangco.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Hon. Charlie Cojuangco from the First District of Tarlac is recognized.

REP. COJUANGCO. Good afternoon, Mme. Speaker. Would my colleague yield to a few questions?

REP. PANGANIBAN. I would gladly accept some clarifications from the Representative from the First District of Tarlac, Mme. Speaker.

REP. COJUANGCO. Mme. Speaker, yesterday, I was privy to the exchange of discussion between the honorable Sponsor and our colleague from ANAKPAWIS, wherein our colleague from ANAKPAWIS, several times during his interpellation, mentioned the word to describe the Coco Levy Funds as "stolen" or in Tagalog, "nakaw."

So, I take this opportunity to put on record or present to the record what the Supreme Court stated in its decision giving final resolution on said levy funds, to quote-unquote, "the Coconut Levy Funds are clearly affected with public interest."

Another paragraph states:

To avoid misunderstanding and confusion, this Court will even be more categorical and positive than its earlier pronouncements: the Coconut Levy Funds are not only affected with public interest; they are, in fact, *prima facie* public funds.

Nowhere in these statements is the word “stolen” or “nakaw” imputed.

Prima facie public funds, to my definition, means an informed decision that they are public funds. In other words, for the public good, for the public interest, for the public use, for the public benefit, but nowhere does it say “nakaw” or “stolen.”

So, Mme. Speaker, with the permission of our distinguished Sponsor, may I have that put on the record.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Sponsor will respond.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, I have also in my hand the decisions quoted by the good Representative from the First District of Tarlac, and it is true, it is nowhere mentioned, in all the long lines of decision made by the Supreme Court, that those funds are nakaw or stolen, Mme. Speaker. It simply says that those funds are owned by the government in trust for all coconut farmers and ordered reconveyed to the government, Mme. Speaker.

REP. COJUANGCO. Mme. Speaker, will my statements be included in the record?

REP. PANGANIBAN. I guess it is already recorded, Mme. Speaker. I do not have any argument with respect to the recording of the statement of ...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). What is the pleasure of the Gentleman from Tarlac?

REP. COJUANGCO. No, that is it, Mme. Speaker. As long as the Sponsor does not have any objection, I may proceed to my other questions.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). Then please proceed.

REP. COJUANGCO. Thank you.

These levy funds that have been deposited for several years now with the Department of Finance, pending the creation of this Bill that we are debating so that they may properly dispose of or use the funds for and in behalf of the coconut farmers, are these only

from one coconut levy or are these from several other levies? In other words, which levy did these funds come from?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, from the findings of the Supreme Court, the Coconut Levy Assets or Coconut Levy Funds refer to: (1), the shares of stock in the UCPB determined to be owned by the government; (2) the CIIF Oil Mills Group; (3) the CIIF Holding Companies; and the (4) converted SMC Series “1” Preferred Shares, Mme. Speaker. And the Coco Levy Funds refer to various funds generated from levies, taxes, charges, and other fees exacted or imposed pursuant to or in connection with the sale of copra or its equivalent coconut products. This refers to any and all of the following: number one, the Coconut Investment Fund created under Republic Act No. 6260; the Coconut Consumers Stabilization Fund, later renamed as the Coconut Industry Stabilization Fund created under Presidential Decree No. 276; the Coconut Industry Development Fund created under Presidential Decree No. 582; the Coconut Industry Investment Fund created pursuant to Presidential Decree No. 1468; and the Coconut Reserve Fund under Presidential Decree No. 1468 and Presidential Decree No. 1842, Mme. Speaker.

So, these funds were collected, starting in 1971 until 1982, and since then, the initial fund was P100 million. And now, the fund, the total amount we are talking about, from P100 million, it is now about P95 billion broken down into cash and securities of P75 billion and Coco Levy Assets of P20 billion, Mme. Speaker.

REP. COJUANGCO. So, Mme. Speaker, from P100 million, it became P90 plus billion.

I think that is a lot of addition; that is not nakaw. Would the honorable author agree?

REP. PANGANIBAN. When the funds were collected, I was only six years old, Mme. Speaker, so I do not know whether the funds are stolen or not. But again, as it is now, from P100 million or P200 million, it became P100 billion and hindi ko alam kung nanakaw ba ito o hindi dahil lumaki po, Mme. Speaker.

REP. COJUANGCO. Okay. Mme. Speaker, I was going to ask Your Honor or I am going to ask the author, what about these other levies? Republic Act No. 2282, Republic Act No. 1369, Republic Act No. 1145, Republic Act No. 471, Republic Act No. 5, and the Commonwealth Act of 518—these are all legislations creating funds prior to the administration of Ferdinand E. Marcos. To my recollection, but I do not have the exact headings with me, there have also been some levies created after EDSA I. Does the Sponsor know if any of these, or what is the disposition of any of these funds? Can these funds be added to the funds that we

are going to legislate for allocation and use for the coconut farmers?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, as regards the funds mentioned by the distinguished Gentleman from the First District of Tarlac, this Bill only covered the funds referred to in the decisions of the Supreme Court, Mme. Speaker, and did not include the funds collected as Coco Levy Funds, as mentioned by our colleague, Mme. Speaker.

REP. COJUANGCO. Thank you.

My last question, Mme. Speaker, is, if we will recall, the final settlement between the U.S. government and our World War II veterans, it took decades, in fact, generations, for those funds to finally reach their rightful beneficiaries. Part of the problem is probably political, but also a big part of it was the lack or the problem of verification of actual and genuine veterans.

In this case, we also have a big fund for disposition for the coconut farmers. When this levy was created in 1971, the definition for what was a coconut farmer then was one who owns the trees and the laborers that were taking care of the trees. After EDSA, the definition was, what was added to the definition was, all farmers—the original definition for coconut farmers plus add all farmers tilling coconut lands. Therefore, there is a big jump in the qualified persons that can avail of the benefits of this fund. So, may I inquire from the author how the committee or the Ad Hoc Committee in the Bill will go about identifying who are the rightful beneficiaries of that.

REP. PANGANIBAN. As it is now, Mme. Speaker, the list of coconut farmers and coconut farmers' organizations is with the Philippine Coconut Authority.

Therefore, the government agency that is mandated to identify the beneficiaries of this fund shall be those listed in the roster of coconut farmers and coconut farmers' organizations under the Philippine Coconut Authority, Mme. Speaker.

REP. COJUANGCO. Thank you, Mme. Speaker. Thank you, distinguished Sponsor.

With that, I make a closing statement urging all my colleagues to review the provisions of this Bill and put politics and other issues aside. Maybe we can work for the expeditious passage of this Bill so that our coconut farmers will not have to wait as long as our Filipino veterans of World War II did.

Thank you, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). Thank you, Representative Cojuangco. The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. GARCIA (J.). Mme. Speaker, the next Member who wishes to interpellate is the Gentleman from the First District of Zamboanga, Rep. Celso L. Lobregat.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Gentleman from the First District of Zamboanga, the Hon. Celso Lobregat is recognized.

REP. LOBREGAT. Mme. Speaker, I would just like to ask the Sponsor if he would be willing to answer a few questions from this Representation.

REP. PANGANIBAN. I am more than willing, Mme. Speaker.

REP. LOBREGAT. Mme. Speaker, during the interpellation of Congressman Cojuangco, he mentioned that there was—he mentioned that these levy funds were stolen o ninakaw.

I would like to ask, how much was the collection of the levy funds? How much funds were collected out of the levy funds?

REP. PANGANIBAN. The Coco Levy Funds were collected from 1971 to 1982, Mme. Speaker. It started at P100 million and then it went up to P2 billion, Mme. Speaker, at that time, Mme. Speaker.

REP. LOBREGAT. So, the Gentleman is talking of P2 billion. If I am not mistaken, the Sponsor said the amount of the Coco Levy Funds now is approximately P95 billion?

REP. PANGANIBAN. That is true, Mme. Speaker. I have here with me a letter coming from the Bureau of Treasury stating that the fund is indeed P75 billion in the form of cash and securities, and P20 billion in the form of Coco Levy Assets, Mme. Speaker.

REP. LOBREGAT. So, kung may ninakaw, dapat wala nang pondo. Pero iyong pondo na iyon, iyong P2 billion, ang halaga ng P2 billion is now P95 billion. Perhaps, this is the best investment that the government ever made. I say government because it took a long time to decide whether these were private funds or public funds. But finally, the Supreme Court made this decision that these are public funds. But these are public funds supposed to be used only for the benefit of the coconut farmers and the coconut industry. Am I correct to say it?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, the decision of the Supreme Court categorically said that these funds are “owned by the government in trust for all the coconut farmers, and ordered reconveyed to the government,” Mme. Speaker.

REP. LOBREGAT. But to be used for the benefit of the coconut farmers, solely for the coconut farmers and the coconut industry?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Yes, Mme. Speaker. It says, “shall be reconveyed to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, which, as We previously clarified, shall ‘be used only for the benefit of all coconut farmers and for the development of the coconut industry.’ ” Mme. Speaker, I quoted the decision of the Supreme Court, Mme. Speaker.

REP. LOBREGAT. For the record, I would like to state that COCOFED was very, very active in the Supreme Court case and even in the temporary restraining order. And for the record, I would like to state that former Congresswoman Maria Clara Lorenzo Lobregat was the President of COCOFED. And I would also like to ask the Sponsor, among the programs of COCOFED was the scholarship program. Is that correct?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Yes, Mme. Speaker.

REP. LOBREGAT. And that scholarship program was the most complete scholarship program, as it did not only include free tuition, not only included free miscellaneous and other fees, it also included even boarding and transportation allowance.

This was unheard of in any scholarship program. Is that correct?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Yes, Mme. Speaker. This was tackled in the Committee meeting, Mme. Speaker.

REP. LOBREGAT. I would just like to put that on record because, you know, many times I meet people that proudly say, “Thank you to COCOFED. I was a COCOFED scholar.” Many of these people are now holding key positions not only in the government but also in the private sector.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, that is why in Section 21 of the proposed House Bill, we are trying to bring back the old, I mean, social protection of COCOFED because we have included here that the social protection programs shall include: (1) social services such as life, medical and accident insurance coverage of the coconut farmers; (2) scholarship for the benefit of the deserving descendants of the coconut farmers; and (3) livelihood programs, Mme. Speaker, precisely because this is an inspiration of the COCOFED scholars.

REP. LOBREGAT. Thank you very much. If I did

not rise today, I think the former Congresswoman who passed away in 2004, I think she would be turning in her grave if I did not stand up and put on the record what I manifested.

So, Mme. Speaker, Mr. Sponsor, thank you very much for acknowledging the deeds that COCOFED did for the coconut farmers.

Thank you.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). Thank you, Congressman Lobregat.

The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. GARCIA (J.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we recognize the next interpellator from ANAKPAWIS Party-List, the Hon. Ariel “Ka Ayik” B. Casilao.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Hon. Ariel Casilao from ANAKPAWIS Party-List is recognized.

REP. CASILAO. Mme. Speaker, thank you.

This is not an interpellation because I have already availed of my interpellation period. However, this is a clarification and manifestation in lieu of the recent mention of the Party-List which I represent, by our colleague, with regard to the term “nakaw.”

One, yes, it is correct and I agree that not in any writing of the Supreme Court ruling was there any mention that the fund was declared stolen or nakaw. Again, hindi po ito usaping nakabatay iyong pagsisikap ng ating Party-List ng mga magsasaka, ng mga magniniyog sa usapin ng—doon sa Supreme Court ruling. In fact, nagpapasalamat nga ang ating mga magniniyog. But let us be refreshed historically. In the accounts of our history, remember that the Supreme Court ruling based the ruling on the recovery suits filed by different petitioners. Let me be clear. Never in my interpellation speech have I imputed any family name nor any person being attributed to the Supreme Court ruling.

The term “nakaw” is a political term struggled for decades ng ating mga magniniyog. Dahil nga doon sa pondo mula noong 1971, dahil sa batas na ipinasá na magpapatupad ng coconut levy at mandatory na kinokolektahan ang ating mga magsasaka at mga magniniyog. Ngunit ang pondong ito ay in-invest sa iba’t ibang mga investment later on, when the Supreme Court ruled and clarified that these investments should be returned back for public use especially that it is declared a public fund at dapat po ay maibalik sa ating mga magniniyog. In fact, it is very clear within this hall, in the streets, that the ultimate clamor of our farmers, ng ating mga magniniyog ay maibalik sa kanila ang kinolekta at ginamit.

Ang sistematikong paggamit and misuse of that

fund is what is being interpreted or decided by the Supreme Court, Mme. Speaker.

Kaya po, I would not like to quarrel with any Member of this House, pero hayaan po natin na malinaw po ang pinakaesensiya ng Supreme Court ruling, panlipunang katarungan, social justice, which for the longest time was denied to our coconut farmers. Iyong kampanya at ang sigaw po nila na maibalik ito sa pamamaraan ng enabling law na ating ginagawa ngayon, iyon po ang tinutukoy natin na huwag naman sanang maulit na ipagkait sa kanila. This Representation would repeatedly term “huwag naman po sanang ipagkait sa kanila na maibalik nang todo sa pamamaraan ng ating panukalang batas na iaapruba.”

That will be all, Mme. Speaker. Thank you very much.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. GARCIA (J.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we recognize the Gentleman from the First District of Albay, Rep. Edcel C. Lagman, for his interpellation.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The distinguished Gentleman from the First District of Albay, the Hon. Edcel Lagman, is recognized.

REP. LAGMAN. Thank you, Mme. Speaker.

I am in agreement with many Members of this House, who would like to see soonest the disposition and utilization of the Coconut Levy Funds for the direct benefit of small coconut farmers who have waited for 40 years to be the real and actual beneficiaries of the fund. If this Bill is consistent with this objective, then I will not rise to interpellate, but I see some provisions which are ambivalent or should be clarified or may not be consistent with the objective. Hence, I rise to interpellate.

Mme. Speaker, may I request, may we know whether the distinguished Sponsor would yield to a series of questions?

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, I would gladly yield to any clarification from the distinguished Gentleman from Albay.

REP. LAGMAN. Thank you, Mme. Speaker, and distinguished Sponsor.

First, may we request the distinguished Sponsor to summarize in essence the ruling of the Supreme Court with respect to the Coconut Levy Funds on the nature of the fund, its disposition and utilization for the enlightenment and information of the very few Members who are still in the Chamber.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Mme. Speaker, in the long line of cases decided by the Supreme Court, it is very clear that the Supreme Court declared and finally adjudicated that the Coco Levy Funds were public funds and were to be used for the benefit of coconut farmers and the development of the coconut industry. And so, therefore, the fund should revert to the ownership of the government in trust for the coconut farmers and the development of the coconut industry, Mme. Speaker. However, in the past administration of then President Noynoy Aquino, two executive orders, Executive Orders No. 179 and 180, were signed by then President Benigno Aquino. It provided for the administrative guidelines for the inventory and privatization of the Coco Levy Funds, and provided for the administrative guidelines for the reconveyance and utilization of the Coco Levy Assets for the benefit of the coconut farmers and the development of the coconut industry, consistent with the decision of the Supreme Court.

Unfortunately, these Executive Orders No. 179 and 180 were not implemented because of a temporary restraining order issued by the Supreme Court in which the Supreme Court said that the temporary restraining order was issued on the ground on the alleged grave abuse of authority when the said Executive orders were signed without the approval of Congress and Sandiganbayan. Meaning, an enabling law, the Supreme Court requires on that TRO an enabling law for the disposition of the Coco Levy Assets. That is why we have crafted this House Bill, this measure, precisely for the utilization of the Coco Levy Assets, Mme. Speaker.

REP. LAGMAN. In other words, Mme. Speaker, aside from the Supreme Court's declaring that the Coco Levy Funds are public in nature, and remnants of the funds should be reconveyed to the government and that this should be disposed or utilized for small coconut farmers, there is also a Supreme Court issuance that Congress must legislate on the utilization and disposition of the funds. May we know exactly what the Supreme Court said in that TRO and whether that TRO graduated or became a decision of the Supreme Court, or what is the status of the TRO?

REP. PANGANIBAN. As of today, Mme. Speaker, the TRO has not yet been lifted. I mean it is still subsisting, Mme. Speaker. But I would like to take exception from the statement of the distinguished colleague. Nowhere in the decision of the Supreme Court does it state that it is to be used for the benefit of small coconut farmers. The Supreme Court did not distinguish. It said that the funds were public funds and are to be used for the benefit of coconut farmers and the development of the coconut industry, Mme.

Speaker. I am sorry, Mme. Speaker, I do not have the full copy, I mean, the copy of the decision of the Supreme Court in the TRO case, but we have discussed this in the Committee and verified the decision in the TRO that Executive Orders No. 179 and 180 could not be implemented because it was without the approval of Congress, Mme. Speaker. So, in essence, the Supreme Court wanted an enabling law for the disposition of the Coco Levy Funds, Mme. Speaker.

REP. LAGMAN. I have no quarrel with the distinguished Sponsor with respect to his interpretation that the TRO required legislation and not a mere Executive fiat. But, just for purposes of having a clear background on the TRO, may we know what happened to the principal petition. What was the disposition of the Supreme Court?

REP. PANGANIBAN. When EO 179 and EO 180 were signed into law—I mean the Executive orders were signed by President Aquino—COCOFED questioned the Executive orders, Mme. Speaker. Therefore, the Supreme Court came out with a temporary restraining order—I mean restraining the implementation of Executive Order No. 179 and Executive Order No. 180 because of the absence of the approval of Congress, Mme. Speaker.

REP. LAGMAN. Well, I can understand that, Mme. Speaker, but my question is, what happened to the principal petition because a TRO is only incidental to a petition? The Court has to resolve the main petition. May we know whether the distinguished Sponsor would know what happened to the principal petition of COCOFED.

REP. PANGANIBAN. Since the TRO is not yet lifted, Mme. Speaker, the principal case is still pending before the Supreme Court.

REP. LAGMAN. Well, that is an assumption, Mme. Speaker. But, can we get a certification from the Supreme Court that the principal case is still pending?

REP. PANGANIBAN. We will do that, Mme. Speaker.

REP. LAGMAN. Because we will have to clear very well our basis for this proposed legislation.

Mme. Speaker, this Bill gives Congress, both the Senate and the House, the opportunity to really make a categorical legislative statement on how these funds should be utilized irrespective of the decision of the Supreme Court because it is now within the plenary power of Congress to make such legislation. So, it is in this sense that we are saying that Congress should be able to see through the situation of our poor

coconut farmers who have waited so long and that the beneficiaries should principally be the small coconut farmers.

I will have to pursue this in my subsequent interpellation, Mme. Speaker. But considering the importance of this measure and the meager attendance, do you think, Mme. Speaker, that we should continue? I think more Members of the House should be able to listen to the explanation and answers of the distinguished Sponsor.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. BONDOC. Mme. Speaker, Your Honor, we enjoin our colleague, the Honorable Lagman, to continue with his interpellation. The absence or presence of our colleagues here who have seen the Business for the Day leads us to conclude that they are thoroughly satisfied with the way the issue has been discussed in the Committee and they have no further questions in plenary.

We are reserving this time for our colleagues who have further questions to ask the Sponsor, so we plead with our esteemed colleague to continue to ventilate his issues and the Sponsor is very willing to reply.

REP. LAGMAN. Well, I will only continue, Mme. Speaker, if this Chamber has the authority to conduct business.

REP. BONDOC. Once again, Mme. Speaker, we plead with our colleague to allow us to continue because quorum was met earlier in the day. The Reference of Business was performed and our colleagues were given a chance to see the Business for the Day. Their non-presence in the hall only indicates that they are conducting their business as Representatives through other venues. And we are really giving this time—the Committee on Rules will most gladly wait for our colleague for him to be able to ventilate his questions regarding the legislation being considered. So, once again, we plead with our esteemed colleague to continue with his interpellation.

REP. LAGMAN. Quorum, Mme. Speaker, can be established upon roll call but absence of a quorum can be challenged at any time during the proceedings of the House.

Considering the absence of a quorum, I move for the adjournment.

SUSPENSION OF CONSIDERATION OF H.B. NO. 5745

REP. BONDOC. Mme. Speaker, Your Honor, we plead with the Gentleman from Albay to allow us to

finish some administrative matters; whereupon, we will already adjourn session. So, by his leave, Mme. Speaker, we will now suspend the consideration for the time being of House Bill 5745, contained in Committee Report No. 262.

I so move, Mme. Speaker.

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

The Dep. Majority Leader is recognized.

RECONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 5758 ON SECOND READING

PERIOD OF AMENDMENTS

REP. DEFENSOR. Before we part ways, Mme. Speaker, yesterday, we approved on Second Reading House Bill No. 5758, entitled: AN ACT SEPARATING THE BOKOD NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL–DAKLAN EXTENSION IN BARANGAY TUBLAY CENTER, MUNICIPALITY OF LA TRINIDAD, PROVINCE OF BENGUET FROM THE BOKOD NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL, CONVERTING IT INTO AN INDEPENDENT NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TO BE KNOWN AS DAKLAN NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR.

To introduce some amendments, Mme. Speaker, I move that we reconsider the approval on Second Reading of the said measure.

I so move, Mme. Speaker.

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

REP. DEFENSOR. With that, Mme. Speaker, I move that we open the period of amendments to consider the following individual amendments.

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

INDIVIDUAL AMENDMENTS

REP. DEFENSOR. Mme. Speaker, I move to amend Section 1 of the Bill to read as follows:

“Section 1. The Bokod National High School–Daklan Extension in Barangay DAKLAN, Municipality of BOKOD, province of Benguet is hereby separated from the Bokod National High School and converted into an independent national high school to be known as Daklan National High School.”

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

REP. DEFENSOR. And, Mme. Speaker, I move to amend the title of the Bill to read as follows:

“AN ACT SEPARATING THE BOKOD NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL–DAKLAN EXTENSION IN BARANGAY DAKLAN, MUNICIPALITY OF BOKOD, PROVINCE OF BENGUET FROM THE BOKOD NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL, CONVERTING IT INTO AN INDEPENDENT NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TO BE KNOWN AS DAKLAN NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL, AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR.”

I so move, Mme. Speaker.

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

REP. DEFENSOR. Mme. Speaker, I move that we close the period of amendments.

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

REP. DEFENSOR. Mme. Speaker, I move that we approve on Second Reading House Bill No. 5758, as amended.

VIVA VOCE VOTING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). There is a motion for the approval of House Bill No. 5758, as amended, on Second Reading.

As many as are in favor, please say *aye*.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. *Aye*.

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

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 5758, AS AMENDED, ON SECOND READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The *ayes* have it; House Bill No. 5758 is approved on Second Reading.

The Floor Leader is recognized.

CONSIDERATION OF H.B. NO. 5792 ON SECOND READING

PERIOD OF SPONSORSHIP AND DEBATE

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, under the

Calendar of Business for the Day, I move that we consider House Bill No. 5792, contained in Committee Report No. 277, as reported out by the Committees on Science and Technology, Ways and Means, and Appropriations.

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

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

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

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

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 5792, entitled: AN ACT INSTITUTIONALIZING THE BALIK SCIENTIST PROGRAM AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, I move that we open the period of sponsorship and debate.

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

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, I move that the Chairperson of the Committee on Science and Technology, Representative Aumentado, be recognized to begin the sponsorship of the measure.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Chairperson of the Committee on Science and Technology, the Honorable Aumentado, is recognized.

SPONSORSHIP SPEECH OF REP. AUMENTADO

REP. AUMENTADO. Thank you, Mme. Speaker. Mme. Speaker, the Committee on Science and Technology respectfully reports out in this august Body Committee Report No. 277 on House Bill No. 5792, entitled: AN ACT INSTITUTIONALIZING THE BALIK SCIENTIST PROGRAM AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR.

The measure is one of the legislative agenda to leverage science, technology and innovation included in the Philippine Development Plan for 2017-2022, prepared by the National Economic and Development Authority. As a brain-gain initiative of the Philippine government, the Balik Scientist Program of the Department of Science and Technology seeks to encourage highly trained overseas Filipino scientists and technologists/experts and professionals to return to the Philippines and share their expertise for the acceleration of the scientific agro-industrial and economic development of the country.

Established in 1975, the program served as a tool for strengthening the country's scientific and technological human resources through the transfer of diverse new knowledge and expertise. These Balik Scientists have been instrumental in providing solutions to national concerns.

Thank you, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). Thank you, Hon. Erico Aristotle Aumentado. The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, there being no Member who wishes to interpellate or speak against the measure, we move therefore to terminate the period of sponsorship and debate.

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

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, I move that we open the period of amendments.

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

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, there being no Committee amendments, I move that we now proceed to consider the individual amendments.

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

REP. NIETO. Mme. Speaker.

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, I move that we recognize Hon. John Marvin "Yul Servo" C. Nieto for his individual amendment.

* See MEASURES CONSIDERED (printed separately)

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Honorable Nieto is recognized.

INDIVIDUAL AMENDMENTS

REP. NIETO. Thank you, Mme. Speaker, I move for an amendment on page 2, on line 20 of the Bill, to delete the word “thirty” after the word “least,” and insert the word FIFTEEN.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the amendment is approved.

The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. PIMENTEL. May we ask the Sponsor if he is amenable to the individual amendment of Representative Nieto.

REP. AUMENTADO. As Chairman and author of the Bill, I accept the proposed amendments.

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker.

REP. NIETO. Mme. Speaker, number two: On page three, on line 18 of the Bill, include another phrase to be read as follows: (8) FREE ACCIDENT AND MEDICAL INSURANCE.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). May we hear from the distinguished Sponsor.

REP. PIMENTEL. Again, Mme. Speaker, may we know from the Sponsor if he is amendable to the individual amendment of Representative Nieto.

REP. AUMENTADO. As Chairman and author of the Bill, I accept the proposed amendment.

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, I move that we recognize Rep. Edward Vera Perez Maceda of the Fourth District of Manila for his individual amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Honorable Maceda is recognized.

REP. MACEDA. Yes, thank you, Mme. Speaker.

Just a minor amendment on page three of line 35 of the Bill, to insert semicolon (;). It is more of a typographical error, between the words “sale” and “one,” so as not to—so the fluidity of the phrase and the entire provision as regards the whole law will not be subject to misrepresentation in the future. I hope that the Chairman and my co-principal author would accede to this proposed amendment.

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, may we know from the Sponsor whether he is amenable to the individual amendment of Representative Maceda.

REP. AUMENTADO. As Chairman and author of the Bill, I accept the proposed amendment.

REP. MACEDA. We have no further individual amendments, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, there being no other individual amendments, I move that we close the period of amendments.

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

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, may I now move for the approval on Second Reading of House Bill No. 5792, as amended.

VIVA VOCE VOTING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). There is a motion for the approval of House Bill No. 5792, as amended, on Second Reading.

As many as are in favor, please say *aye*.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. *Aye*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). As many as are against, please say *noy*. (*Silence*)

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 5792, AS AMENDED, ON SECOND READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The *ayes* have it; House Bill No. 5792, as amended, is approved on Second Reading.

CONSIDERATION OF H.B. NO. 5750 ON SECOND READING

PERIOD OF SPONSORSHIP AND DEBATE

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, I move that we consider House Bill No. 5750, contained in Committee Report No. 265, as reported out by the Committee on Public Order and Safety.

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

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

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

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

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 5750, entitled: AN ACT DEFINING THE OFFENSES OF DISCHARGE OF FIREARMS AND INDISCRIMINATE FIRING OF FIREARMS AND PROVIDING STIFFER PENALTIES THEREFOR, AMENDING FOR THE PURPOSE ARTICLE 254 OF ACT NO. 3815, AS AMENDED, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE “REVISED PENAL CODE”, AND REPUBLIC ACT NO. 10591, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS “THE COMPREHENSIVE FIREARMS AND AMMUNITION REGULATION ACT.”

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, I move that we open the period of sponsorship and debate.

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

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, I move that the Chairperson of the Committee on Public Order and Safety be recognized to begin the sponsorship of the measure.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the Committee Chairman of Public Order and Safety, the Hon. Romeo Acop, is recognized.

REP. ACOP. Thank you, Mme. Speaker. As my sponsorship speech, may I move that the Explanatory Note of the substitute bill, House Bill No. 5750, be considered as the sponsorship speech, Mme. Speaker.

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

The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, there being no

Member of the House of Representatives who wishes to interpellate or speak against the measure, I therefore move for the closing of the sponsorship and debate.

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

The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, I move that we open the period of amendments.

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

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, there being no Committee amendments, I move that we now proceed to consider the individual amendments.

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

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, there being no individual amendments presented to this Body, therefore, I move that we close the period of amendments.

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

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, therefore, I move for the approval on Second Reading of House Bill No. 5750.

VIVA VOCE VOTING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). There is a motion for the approval of House Bill No. 5750 on Second Reading.

As many as are in favor, please say *aye*.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. *Aye*.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). As many as are against, please say *no*. (*Silence*)

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 5750 ON SECOND READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). The *ayes* have it; House Bill No. 5750 is approved on Second Reading. The Floor Leader is recognized.

* See MEASURES CONSIDERED (printed separately)

REP. PIMENTEL. Mme. Speaker, I move that we consider House Bill No. 5828.

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

REP. PIMENTEL. I withdraw the motion, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). Mr. Floor Leader, the motion is withdrawn.

APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL

REP. GARCIA (J.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we approve Journal No. 5 of the last session, August 1, 2017.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). Is there any objection to the motion to approve the Journal? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

REP. GARCIA (J.). Mme. Speaker, I move for the change of referral of the following measures:

1. House Bill No. 450 re ordaining the promotion of social enterprises to alleviate poverty, establishing for the purpose the Poverty Reduction Through Social Entrepreneurship (PRESENT) Program and providing incentives and benefits therefor, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship Development to the Committees on Small Business and Entrepreneurship Development, and Poverty Alleviation;

2. House Bill No. 527 re establishing the National Coastal Greenbelt Program, from the Committee on Natural Resources to the Special Committee on Climate Change;

3. House Bills No. 1105, 1839, 2307 and 4729 re ordaining the promotion of social enterprises to alleviate poverty, establishing for the purpose the Poverty Reduction Through Social Entrepreneurship (PRESENT) Program and providing incentives and benefits therefor, from the Committee on Poverty Alleviation to the Committees on Small Business and Entrepreneurship Development, and Poverty Alleviation;

4. House Bill No. 3046 re transferring the capital and seat of government of the province of Rizal from Pasig City to Antipolo City, province of Rizal, from the Committee on Revision of Laws to the Committee on Local Government;

5. House Bill No. 3539 re promoting soil and water conservation technologies and approaches for sustainable land management, from the Committee on Natural Resources to the Committee on Agriculture and Food;

6. House Bill No. 3686 re the Philippine Genetically Modified Organism (GMO) Labeling Act, the “Right-To-Know-Act,” requiring the mandatory labeling and regulation of food which are GMOs or containing substances derived from GMOs and those produced by genetic engineering technologies, from the Committee on Health to the Committee on Trade and Industry;

7. House Bill No. 4737 re renaming the portion of radial road 10 traversing the city of Manila as the Mayor Gemiliano Lopez Boulevard, from the Committee on Transportation to the Committee on Public Works and Highways;

8. House Bills No. 5381 and 5714 re penalizing and preventing the use of motorcycles or scooters in the commission of crimes through the use of bigger plate numbers and identification marks, regulation of backriders and for other purposes, from the Committee on Public Order and Safety to the Committees on Transportation, and Public Order and Safety; and

9. House Bill No. 5839 re penalizing and preventing the use of motorcycles or scooters in the commission of crimes through the use of bigger plate numbers and identification marks, regulation of backriders and for other purposes, from the Committee on Transportation to the Committees on Transportation, and Public Order and Safety.

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

The Floor Leader is recognized.

ADJOURNMENT OF SESSION

REP. GARCIA (J.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we adjourn session until Monday, August 7, 2017, at four o'clock in the afternoon.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Garcia, G.). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the session is adjourned until Monday, August 7, 2017, at four o'clock in the afternoon.

It was 6:39 p.m.