



# Congressional Record

PLENARY PROCEEDINGS OF THE 17<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND REGULAR SESSION  
*House of Representatives*

Vol. 3

Monday, September 25, 2017

No. 28

## CALL TO ORDER

*At 4:00 p.m., Deputy Speaker Ferdinand L. Hernandez called the session to order.*

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The session is now called to order.

## NATIONAL ANTHEM

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

*Everybody rose to sing the Philippine National Anthem.*

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). Please remain standing for the prayer to be led by Rep. Elisa “Olga” T. Kho from the Second District of Masbate.

*Everybody remained standing for the Invocation.*

## INVOCATION

REP. KHO. Let us bow our heads and feel the presence of the Lord.

Almighty God, all knowing and ever present,

We give You thanks and praise for the gift of another day of legislative work and we pray that You will help us rejoice and be glad in it.

We are gathered in Your name, O God, to again perform our sacred duty and we pray for the leaders of this Chamber, so that they may lead us with wisdom, humility and grace.

We pray, O Lord, for all our fellow legislators here, for You to help us bear the responsibility of our legislative powers as a call to public service and a sacred trust.

Help us to remember ourselves, not along partisan political alignments, but first and foremost, as Filipinos.

We pray, O God, to think about the effects of those measures that we will deliberate and vote on,

and consider the voices of those whom we represent and consult with because each one of us will be their voices.

May we remember to protect the interest of those who have less in life and focus on their needs, so that they will have more in law.

May we also learn from the differences and disagreements among ourselves in this Chamber and understand that we see things differently from our human perspective.

Finally, O God, help us to trust You as we seek to be faithful to Your call, for us to serve the common good and honor You in all we say and do in this session.

For Yours is the kingdom, the power and the glory forever, O Lord.

Amen.

## ROLL CALL

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mr. Speaker, I move that we call the roll.

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

The Secretary General will please call the roll of Members.

*The Secretary General called the roll, and the result is as follows, per Journal No. 28, dated September 25, 2017:*

## PRESENT

Abaya	Albano
Abayon	Alejano
Abu	Almario
Abueg	Almonte
Acop	Alonte
Acosta	Alvarez (F.)
Advincula	Alvarez (P.)
Agarao	Amante
Aggabao	Amatong
Aglipay-Villar	Andaya

Aquino-Magsaysay	Del Rosario	Mangudadatu (S.)	Salon
Aragones	Deloso-Montalla	Mangudadatu (Z.)	Sambar
Arenas	Dimaporo (M.K.)	Marcoleta	Sandoval
Atienza	Enverga	Marcos	Santos-Recto
Aumentado	Erice	Mariño	Sarmiento (C.)
Bagatsing	Eriguel	Marquez	Sarmiento (E.M.)
Banal	Ermita-Buhain	Martinez	Savellano
Barzaga	Escudero	Matugas	Sema
Bataoil	Espina	Mellana	Siao
Bautista-Bandigan	Espino	Mending	Silverio
Belaro	Estrella	Mercado	Singson
Belmonte (J.C.)	Evardone	Mirasol	Suansing (E.)
Benitez	Fariñas	Montoro	Suansing (H.)
Bernos	Fernando	Noel	Suarez
Biazon	Ferrer (L.)	Nogralles (J.J.)	Tambunting
Billones	Ferriol-Pascual	Nogralles (K.A.)	Tan (A.)
Biron	Flores	Ocampo	Tan (M.)
Bolilia	Fortun	Ong (E.)	Tejada
Bondoc	Fortuno	Ong (H.)	Teves
Bordado	Garbin	Ortega (P.)	Tiangco
Bravo (A.)	Garcia (G.)	Ortega (V.N.)	Ting
Bravo (M.V.)	Garcia (J.E.)	Pacquiao	Tinio
Brosas	Garin (R.)	Paduano	Tolentino
Bulut-Begtang	Garin (S.)	Palma	Treñas
Calderon	Gasataya	Pancho	Tugna
Calixto-Rubiano	Gatchalian	Panganiban	Ty
Caminero	Geron	Panotes	Umali
Canama	Go (A.C.)	Papandayan	Unabia
Casilao	Go (M.)	Pichay	Ungab
Castelo	Gonzaga	Pimentel	Unico
Castro (F.L.)	Gonzales (A.P.)	Pineda	Uy (R.)
Castro (F.H.)	Gonzales (A.D.)	Plaza	Uybarreta
Cayetano	Gonzalez	Primicias-Agabas	Vargas
Celeste	Gullas	Quimbo	Vargas-Alfonso
Cerafica	Hernandez	Radaza	Velasco
Cerilles	Herrera-Dy	Ramirez-Sato	Velasco-Catera
Chavez	Hofer	Ramos	Velo
Chipeco	Jalosjos	Relampagos	Vergara
Co	Javier	Roa-Puno	Villafuerte
Cojuangco	Kho	Rodriguez (I.)	Villanueva
Collantes	Khonghun	Rodriguez (M.)	Villarica
Cortes	Labadlabad	Romualdo	Villarin
Cortuna	Lacson	Roque (H.)	Violago
Cosalan	Lagman	Sacdalan	Yap (A.)
Crisologo	Lanete	Sagarbarria	Yu
Cua	Laogan	Sahali	Zamora (M.C.)
Cuaresma	Lazatin	Salceda	Zamora (R.)
Cueva	Leachon	Salimbangon	Zubiri
Dalipe	Lee	Salo	
Datol	Limkaichong		
Daza	Lobregat		
De Jesus	Lopez (M.L.)		
De Venecia	Loyola		
De Vera	Maceda		
Defensor	Malapitan		
Del Mar	Mangoang		

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

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

The Floor Leader is recognized.

#### APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mr. Speaker, I move that we approve Journal No. 27, dated September 20, 2017.

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

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mr. Speaker, I move that we now proceed with the Reference of Business. For this purpose, may we request that the Secretary General be directed to read the same.

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

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

#### REFERENCE OF BUSINESS

*The Secretary General read the following House Bills and Resolution on First Reading, Messages from the Senate, Communications and Committee Report, and the Deputy Speaker made the corresponding references:*

#### BILLS ON FIRST READING

House Bill No. 6419, entitled:

“AN ACT ESTABLISHING A BASIC EDUCATION SCHOOL IN EVERY INDIGENOUS PEOPLES COMMUNITY IN THE COUNTRY AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

By Representative Belaro  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION AND CULTURE

House Bill No. 6420, entitled:

“AN ACT PRESERVING INDIGENOUS GAMES OF THE PHILIPPINES”

By Representative Belaro  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON YOUTH AND SPORTS DEVELOPMENT

House Bill No. 6421, entitled:

“AN ACT RECTIFYING ERRORS STATED IN HISTORY TEXTBOOKS BEING USED IN OUR SCHOOLS”

By Representative Belaro  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION AND CULTURE

House Bill No. 6422, entitled:

“AN ACT ESTABLISHING AN EDUCATION COMMITTEE IN EVERY BARANGAY IN THE COUNTRY TO ENSURE THAT ALL SCHOOL AGE CHILDREN ENTER THE SCHOOL SYSTEM AT KINDERGARTEN AGE AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL UPON COMPLETION OF GRADE 10 AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

By Representative Belaro  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION AND CULTURE

House Bill No. 6423, entitled:

“AN ACT MANDATING ALL STUDENTS IN STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES (SUCs) RECEIVING SCHOLARSHIP, GRANTS, OR SUBSIDY FROM THE GOVERNMENT TO RENDER AT LEAST ONE YEAR OF RETURN SERVICE IN THE PHILIPPINES FOR EVERY YEAR OF FREE TUITION/SCHOLARSHIP GRANT AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES”

By Representative Nieto  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON HIGHER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

House Bill No. 6424, entitled:

“AN ACT REQUIRING OPERATORS OF AMUSEMENT OR THEME PARKS AND ADVENTURE OR EXTREME SPORTS FACILITIES TO INSTITUTIONALIZE SAFETY MEASURES AND SECURE COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL LIABILITY INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR THEIR CLIENTS”

By Representative Siao  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON GAMES AND AMUSEMENTS

House Bill No. 6427, entitled:

“AN ACT CONVERTING THE CONSOLACION NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL (LARAY EXTENSION) IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF CONSOLACION, PROVINCE OF CEBU INTO AN INDEPENDENT NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TO BE KNOWN AS THE NANGKANATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

By Representative Cortes  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION AND CULTURE

House Bill No. 6428, entitled:

“AN ACT ESTABLISHING A LAND

TRANSPORTATION OFFICE (LTO)  
DISTRICT OFFICE IN THE MUNICIPALITY  
OF MAMBURAO, OCCIDENTAL  
MINDORO AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS  
THEREFOR”

By Representative Cortuna  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

RESOLUTION

House Resolution No. 1325, entitled:

“RESOLUTION URGING THE HOUSE OF  
REPRESENTATIVES TO STRONGLY  
CONDEMN AND CONDUCT AN  
INVESTIGATION, IN AID OF LEGISLATION,  
ON THE ALLEGED HAZING-RELATED  
DEATH OF 22-YEAR OLD FIRST YEAR  
UNIVERSITY OF SANTO TOMAS (UST)  
LAW STUDENT HORACIO TOMAS  
CASTILLO III”

By Representative Elago  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

ADDITIONAL COAUTHORS

Rep. Alfredo A. Garbin Jr. for House Bills No. 4344 and 4703;

Rep. Lawrence H. Fortun for House Bills No. 3886, 3891, and 5672;

Rep. Enrico A. Pineda for House Bill No. 2871;

Reps. Noel L. Villanueva, Sherwin N. Tugna, Marlyn L. Primicias-Agabas, Pablo C. Ortega, Eric D. Singson, Cristina “Chiqui” Roa-Puno, Christopher V.P. de Venecia, Enrico A. Pineda, Ferdinand L. Hernandez, Arthur R. Defensor Jr., Milagrosa “Mila” T. Tan, Jose L. Atienza Jr., and Roy M. Loyola for House Bill No. 6251;

Rep. Manuel Jose “Mannix” M. Dalipe for House Bills No. 4, 5241, 6136, and 6286;

Rep. Ricardo “RJ” T. Belmonte Jr. for House Bill No. 6136;

Rep. Noel L. Villanueva for House Bill No. 180;

Rep. Joey Sarte Salceda for House Bill No. 4113;

Rep. Micaela S. Violago for House Bill No. 6076;

Reps. Alberto T. Ungab, Isagani S. Amatong, Cesar V. Sarmiento, Wilfredo S. Caminero, and Scott Davies S. Lanete, M.D. for House Bill No. 5745;

Rep. Carmelo “Jon” B. Lazatin II for House Bills No. 6009, 6077, and 6296;

Rep. Eleanor C. Bulut-Begtang for House Bill No. 6027;

Rep. Raneo “Ranie” E. Abu for House Bills No. 2716 and 5836;

Rep. Christopher V.P. de Venecia for House Bills No. 554 and 6251;

Rep. Salvador B. Belaro Jr. for House Bill No. 6261;

Rep. Sol Aragon for House Bills No. 4115, 5213, and 5985;

Rep. Rozzano Rufino B. Biazon for House Bills No. 55 and 356;

Rep. Estrellita B. Suansing for House Bill No. 6390;

Rep. “Kuya” Jose Antonio R. Sy-Alvarado for House Bills No. 5949, 5950, 6367, 6368, 6369, 6370, and 6371;

Rep. Edgar Mary S. Sarmiento for House Bill No. 2286;

Reps. Juliet Marie D. Ferrer, Fredenil “Fred” H. Castro, and Alejandro Y. Mirasol for House Bill No. 4670;

Rep. Robert Ace S. Barbers for House Bill No. 2286;

Rep. Delphine Gan Lee for House Bill No. 5487;

Rep. Federico “Ricky” S. Sandoval II for House Bills No. 3468, 5164, and 5523; and

Rep. Ma. Lucille L. Nava, M.D. for House Bills No. 5454 and 6251.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Message dated September 18, 2017, informing the House of Representatives that the Senate on even date passed Senate Bill No. 1483, entitled:

“AN ACT MANDATING THE SECRETARIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE, NATIONAL ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, AND DEPARTMENT OF BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT, AND THE GOVERNOR OF THE BANGKO SENTRAL NG PILIPINAS, TO APPEAR BIANNUALLY BEFORE A JOINT CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE TO REPORT ON THE STATUS AND DIRECTIONS OF THE FISCAL AND MONETARY POLICIES OF THE STATE”

in which it requests the concurrence of the House of Representatives.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Message dated September 20, 2017, informing the House of Representatives that the Senate on even date passed Senate Bill No. 1584, entitled:

“AN ACT POSTPONING THE OCTOBER 2017 BARANGAY AND SANGGUNIANG KABATAAN ELECTIONS, AMENDING FOR THE PURPOSE REPUBLIC ACT NO. 9164, AS AMENDED BY REPUBLIC ACT NO. 9340, REPUBLIC ACT NO. 10632, REPUBLIC ACT NO. 10656, AND REPUBLIC ACT NO. 10923, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES”

in which it requests the concurrence of the House of Representatives.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

COMMUNICATIONS

Letter dated 24 July 2017 of Enrique A. Tayag, OIC-Assistant Secretary, Office for Policy and Health Systems, Department of Health, submitting the 2016 Progress Report detailing the accomplishments of the Department in the implementation of Republic Act No. 9502.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH

Letter dated August 3, 2017 of Michael G. Aguinaldo, Chairperson, Commission on Audit, furnishing the House of Representatives with copies of the 2016 Annual Audit Reports on the following government agencies:

1. Anti-Money Laundering Council;
2. Bureau of Customs;
3. Bureau of Internal Revenue;
4. Bureau of Local Government Finance;
5. Bureau of the Treasury – National Government;
6. Bureau of the Treasury – Proper;
7. Central Board of Assessment Appeals;
8. Department of Budget and Management;
9. Department of Finance;
10. Government Procurement Policy Board - Technical Support Office;
11. Insurance Commission;
12. Legislative-Executive Development Advisory Council;
13. Municipal Development Fund Office;
14. National Economic and Development Authority;
15. National Tax Research Center;
16. Philippine National Volunteer Service Coordinating Agency;
17. Philippine Statistical Research and Training Institute;
18. Philippine Statistics Authority;
19. Privatization and Management Office;
20. Procurement Service;
21. Public-Private Partnership Center of the Philippines;
22. Securities and Exchange Commission; and
23. Tariff Commission.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Letter dated 8 August 2017 of Atty. Jose Jobel V. Belarmino, OIC, Deputy Administrator for Administrative, Finance and AFCSD, Light Rail Transit Authority (LRTA), submitting a Report of Utilization of Operating Subsidy for the Second

Quarter of CY 2017 issued to the LRTA pursuant to the Special Provision of Republic Act No. 10924.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

2016 Annual Report of the Philippine Charity Sweepstakes Office per letter dated 9 August 2017 of Jose Jorge E. Corpuz, Chairman.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON GAMES AND AMUSEMENTS

Letter dated August 9, 2017 of Michael G. Aguinaldo, Chairperson, Commission on Audit, furnishing the House of Representatives with copies of the 2016 Annual Audit Reports and Management Letters on the following government agencies:

- A. Consolidated Annual Audit Reports
  1. Department of Public Works and Highways;
  2. Road Board (MVUC Funds);
  3. Department of Transportation; and
  4. Department of Tourism.
- B. Individual Annual Audit Reports
  1. Department of Energy;
  2. Energy Regulatory Commission;
  3. Metropolitan Manila Development Authority;
  4. Intramuros Administration;
  5. National Parks Development Committee;
  6. Toll Regulatory Board;
  7. Civil Aeronautics Board;
  8. Office of Transportation Cooperatives; and
  9. Office for Transportation Security.
- C. Management Letters
  1. Maritime Industry Authority; and
  2. Philippine Coast Guard.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

CY 2016 Annual Audit Report on the Catanduanes State University, Virac, Catanduanes per letter dated August 11, 2017 of Imelda B. Alcantara, State Auditor III, OIC/Audit Team Leader, Audit Group NGS-State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) and Other NGS Stand-Alone Agencies, Commission on Audit.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Letter dated August 15, 2017 of Leticia J. Perez, State Auditor IV, Audit Team Leader, Audit Team R5-02, Audit Group NGS - State Universities and Colleges, Commission on Audit, furnishing the House of Representatives with a copy of the 2016 Annual Audit Report on the Camarines Norte State College, Daet, Camarines Norte.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Letter dated August 15, 2017 of Zaldy S. Villa,

Governor, Province of Siquijor, submitting the July 31, 2017 Accomplishment Report for the Larena – Basac – Maria Provincial Road funded under the KALSADA Program, now CMGP.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS  
AND HIGHWAYS

National Accounts of the Philippines 1st Quarter 2015 to 2nd Quarter 2017 of the Philippine Statistics Authority.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

2016 Annual Report of the Philippine Institute for Development Studies.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC  
AFFAIRS

Annual Audit Report on the Sorsogon State College, Sorsogon City for the year ended December 31, 2016.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

#### COMMITTEE REPORT

Report by the Committee on Legislative Franchises (Committee Report No. 391), re H.B. No. 6431, entitled:

“AN ACT GRANTING BOHOL CHRONICLE RADIO CORPORATION A FRANCHISE TO CONSTRUCT, INSTALL, ESTABLISH, OPERATE AND MAINTAIN RADIO BROADCASTING STATIONS IN THE PROVINCE OF BOHOL”

recommending its approval in substitution of House Bill No. 5504

Sponsors: Representatives Alvarez (F.), Yap (A.), Relampagos, Bravo (A.), Enverga, Vargas-Alfonso, Madrona, Marcoleta, Garbin, Pancho, Tejada, Acosta, Savellano, Daza, Cortes, Tugna, Bertiz, Violago, Vargas, Caminero, Montoro and De Vera

TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mr. Speaker, at this juncture, may we acknowledge the presence of our guests in the gallery. From the Camarines Norte State College, we have: Dr. Rusty G. Abanto, Mr. Jesse Opeña, Mr. John Mark Benamira and Angela Pioquinto. With them are the relatives of the Hon. Marisol C. Panotes, to wit: Atty. Wilfrido E. Panotes Jr., Mrs. Elnora P. King, Mr. Rene Panotes-Pabico, Mrs. Estelita Z. Pabico, Councilor Rocchi Z. Pabico, Mr. Didio Z. Pabico, Mr. Christopher Panotes and Atty. Marissa Panotes. They

are the guests of the distinguished Representative from the Second District of Camarines Norte, the Hon. Marisol C. Panotes.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). Please stand to be acknowledged. Welcome to the House of Representatives. *(Applause)*

The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mr. Speaker, we also have in the gallery the Political Science students of the Arellano University, all 50 of them. They are the guests of the Hon. Manuel Jose “Mannix” M. Dalipe, Representative from the Second District of Zamboanga City.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). Please stand to be acknowledged. Welcome to the House of Representatives. *(Applause)*

The Floor Leader is recognized.

#### NOMINAL VOTING ON H.B. NO. 5745 ON THIRD READING

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mr. Speaker, at this juncture, I move that we vote on Third Reading on House Bill No. 5745 and direct the Secretary General to read the title of the measure, and call the roll for nominal voting.

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

*Thereupon, the Secretary General read the title of the measure, printed copies of which were distributed to the Members on September 21, 2017 pursuant to Section 58, Rule X of the House Rules.*

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 Chair directed the Secretary General to call the roll for nominal voting. Thereafter, pursuant to the Rules of the House, a second roll call was made. The result of the voting on Third Reading on the aforesaid measure is as follows, per Journal No. 28, dated September 25, 2017:*

#### *Affirmative*

Abaya	Abueg
Abayon	Acharon
Abu	Acop

Acosta	Cuaresma	Lopez (C.)	Sagarbarria
Advincula	Cueva	Lopez (M.L.)	Sahali
Agarao	Dalipe	Maceda	Salceda
Aggabao	Datol	Malapitan	Salo
Aglipay-Villar	Daza	Mangaoang	Salon
Alejano	De Venecia	Mangudadatu (S.)	Sambar
Almonte	De Vera	Mangudadatu (Z.)	Sandoval
Alonte	Defensor	Marcoleta	Santos-Recto
Alvarez (F.)	Del Mar	Marcos	Sarmiento (C.)
Alvarez (P.)	Deloso-Montalla	Mariño	Sarmiento (E.M.)
Amante	Dimaporo (M.K.)	Marquez	Savellano
Amatong	Enverga	Martinez	Sema
Andaya	Erice	Matugas	Siao
Aquino-Magsaysay	Eriguel	Mellana	Silverio
Aragones	Ermita-Buhain	Mending	Singson
Arenas	Escudero	Mercado	Suansing (E.)
Aumentado	Espina	Mirasol	Suansing (H.)
Bagatsing	Espino	Montoro	Suarez
Baguilat	Estrella	Nava	Tambunting
Banal	Evardone	Noel	Tan (A.)
Barzaga	Fariñas	Nogralles (J.J.)	Tan (M.)
Bataoil	Fernando	Nogralles (K.A.)	Tejada
Batocabe	Ferrer (L.)	Ong (E.)	Teves
Bautista-Bandigan	Ferriol-Pascual	Ong (H.)	Tiangco
Belaro	Flores	Ortega (P.)	Tugna
Belmonte (J.C.)	Fortun	Ortega (V.N.)	Ty
Benitez	Fortuno	Pacquiao	Umali
Bernos	Garbin	Paduano	Unabia
Biazon	Garcia (G.)	Palma	Ungab
Billones	Garcia (J.E.)	Pancho	Unico
Biron	Garin (R.)	Panganiban	Uy (J.)
Bolilia	Garin (S.)	Panotes	Uy (R.)
Bondoc	Gasataya	Papandayan	Uybarreta
Bordado	Geron	Pichay	Vargas
Bravo (A.)	Go (A.C.)	Pimentel	Vargas-Alfonso
Bravo (M.V.)	Go (M.)	Pineda	Velasco
Bulut-Begtang	Gonzaga	Plaza	Velasco-Catera
Calderon	Gonzales (A.P.)	Primicias-Agabas	Veloso
Calixto-Rubiano	Gonzales (A.D.)	Quimbo	Vergara
Caminero	Gonzalez	Radaza	Villafuerte
Canama	Gullas	Ramos	Villanueva
Castelo	Herrera-Dy	Relampagos	Villarica
Castro (F.H.)	Hofer	Roa-Puno	Villarín
Cayetano	Javier	Robes	Violago
Celeste	Kho	Rodriguez (I.)	Yap (A.)
Cerifica	Khonghun	Rodriguez (M.)	Yap (V.)
Cerilles	Labadlabad	Romualdo	Yu
Chavez	Lacson	Roque (H.)	Zamora (M.C.)
Chipeco	Lagman	Sacdalan	Zubiri
Co	Lanete		
Cojuangco	Laogan	<i>Negative</i>	
Collantes	Lazatin		
Cortes	Leachon	Brosas	Elago
Cosalan	Lee	Casilao	Tinio
Crisologo	Limkaichong	Castro (F.L.)	Zarate
Cua	Lobregat	De Jesus	

*Abstention*

None

REP. BROSAS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). Honorable Brosas is recognized.

REP. BROSAS. Yes, Mr. Speaker, my vote is “No” and I would like to explain my vote later.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The Lady will be given three minutes to explain your vote later.

REP. BROSAS. Thank you.

REP. CASILAO. Mr. Speaker, my vote is “No” and I would like to explain my vote.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). Noted, the Gentleman will be given three minutes after the voting.

REP. CASTRO (F.L.). Mr. Speaker, my vote is “No.”

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). Noted, the Gentleman will be given three minutes after voting.

REP. DE JESUS. G. Ispiker, ang boto ko po ay “No” and I will be submitting my written explanation later. Thank you.\*

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). Noted.

REP. ELAGO. Mr. Speaker, my vote is “No” and I will be submitting a written explanation of my vote. Thank you.\*

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). Noted.

#### RESULT OF THE VOTING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The result shows 216 affirmative votes, 7 negative votes, and no abstention.

House Bill No. 5745 is approved on Third Reading.

#### EXPLANATION OF VOTES

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). Representative Brosas is recognized. You are given three minutes to explain your vote.

#### REP. BROSAS EXPLAINS HER VOTE

REP. BROSAS. Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my fellow Representatives, this Representation registers a negative vote on House Bill No. 5745 or the Coconut Farmers and Industry Development Trust Fund Act. We remain firm on our stand on and commitment to the return of the Coco Levy Funds plundered by the Marcos dictatorship from the farmers.

As one of the primary authors of House Bill No. 557, An Act Creating the Genuine Small Coconut Farmers’ Fund Act of 2016, the GWP or the Gabriela Women’s Party-List stands that the multibillion Coco Levy Fund scam was a huge injustice to the victims. And we continue to rub salt into the wounds of these farmers by creating a law preventing them direct involvement in the usage and utilization of this Fund thru House Bill No. 5745.

Ferdinand Marcos, the dictator and plunderer, amassed a total of P9.8 billion from 1971 to 1983. Said amount was used by him and his cohorts in the purchase of coconut oil mills, shares in the San Miguel Corporation or SMC and have now reached the estimated increment of P200 billion.

The great injustice to our farmers continued when the government entered into agreements with the Cojuangco’s maintaining 24 percent of SMC shares from the Coco Levy Fund instead of returning the amount to farmers and helping them in the development of the coconut industry.

In 2014, the Supreme Court asserted its 2012 and 2001 decisions, proclaiming the multibillion Coco Levy Funds as open finances that ought to benefit the coconut ranchers from whom the assets initially came. In June 2015, the High Court issued a temporary restraining order against the enactment of Aquino’s Executive Orders No. 179 and 180, planning to privatize the Coco Levy Funds. This government continues to malign farmers by its non-acknowledgment of their struggle and denial of the social justice they have been fighting for.

Gabriela Women’s Party-List believes that this measure does not address the interest of the coconut farmers and the coconut industry. This will only pave the way to more corruption and injustice to the sector it aims to protect. We remain firm on our stand that farmers are not just mere beneficiaries in this case, but they are the owners of the Fund. It is the fruit of their sweat and tears in the farms, and the enjoyment of said fruits was denied of them by the dictator and plunderer.

Being owners of the Fund, they should have direct involvement on how the money that was stolen from them should be used to help and propagate their industry. The Ad Hoc Committee, through House Bill

\* See ANNEX (printed separately)

No. 5745, denies the farmers such basic and essential right. It is composed mainly of a lot of departments including nine representations from the coconut farmers who will basically make plans for the coconut farmers. And there is this Trust Fund composed of the DA, the DOF, the DTI and the NEDA, together with the representatives from the coconut farmers, thereby involving many agencies and departments while the main beneficiaries should be the ones to decide on what will matter to them and their priorities. Amidst these, the complicated process of accreditation by the Philippine Coconut Authority or PCA, and later to be shortlisted by the PCA also, and eventually appointed by the President for representation of coconut farmers, leads to further compromise of the decision-making or direct involvement of the coconut farmers. And still, there is the Privatization and Management Office or the PMO which is retained in the Bill to further facilitate the assets of coco levy.

So, Mr. Speaker, my vote is “No” on House Bill No. 5745.

Thank you very much.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). Representative Casilao is recognized. You can explain your vote for three minutes.

#### REP. CASILAO EXPLAINS HIS VOTE

REP. CASILAO. Maraming salamat, Mr. Speaker.

Sa mahabang panahon ng pakikibaka ng mga masang magsasaka ng niyugan para maibalik ang perang ito, nais naming sabihin na ninakawan na naman tayo sa ikalawang pagkakataon.

The Supreme Court ruling in favor of the farmers, sa mga magniniyog, para maibalik ang perang ito, tila nahulog na lang ito sa batas na inaprubahan ng Kongresong ito, hindi para doon sa benepisyong ating mga magsasaka kung hindi para doon sa industriya lamang.

Mr. Speaker, hindi kinikilala ng batas na ito, ng House Bill No. 5745, na ang inhustisyang idinulot ng pandarambong ng coco levy mula sa mga maliliit na magsasaka sa niyugan, ang mga pangako nito, ang mga probisyon ay hindi kasingkahulugan ng pagbibigay hustisya sa mga naging biktima. Bagkus, ito ay pag-ulit sa karanasan, na kung saan, ang pondong ito ay hinoldap o ninakaw. Wala itong inilalakong aktwal o kongkretong benepisyong para sa mga maliliit na magsasaka kung hindi ang mga token o pakunswelong probisyon.

Gaya ng aking sinabi, Mr. Speaker, sa malaking pera, kung magbibigay man ang panukalang batas na ito ng P20 billion, saan po gagamitin ang P80 billion?

Again, this Representation, Mr. Speaker, para itong

buto na paglalawayan lamang ng ating mga magniniyog na magsasaka habang sa likod nito ay nakaambang gamitin ito sa ibang kaparaanan o sa maling gamit na naman. Hindi ito demokratiko dahil ang komite na bibigyang kapangyarihan para magdetermina ng programang panggamit sa pondong ito ay nakapaloob pa rin ang isang ad hoc na mas makapangyarihan sa itinatang komite kung saan mayroong mga kinatawan ang ating mga magsasaka.

Sa hinaharap, Mr. Speaker, mariin pa ring sisingilin ng mga magniniyog ang perang ito bagamat ang panukalang batas, House Bill No. 5745, ay naipasá na, sa ibang kaparaanan, igigiit pa rin ng mga magniniyog ang tunay na karapatan nila sa pondo nitong ninakaw sa panahon ng diktadura, kaya’t patuloy pa ring igigiit sa anumang kaparaanan ng mga magniniyog na maibalik, in a genuine form, ang assets at ang pondong ito sa totoong nagmamay-ari.

Maraming salamat, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). Honorable Lagman is recognized.

REP. LAGMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was informed that my affirmative vote was recorded. I confirm my affirmative vote and I reserve my right to file, in writing, the explanation for my “Yes” vote.\*

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The manifestation is duly noted.

#### APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 5745 ON THIRD READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). With 216 affirmative votes, 7 negative votes, and no abstention, House Bill No. 5745 is approved on Third Reading.

The Floor Leader is recognized.

#### NOMINAL VOTING ON H.B. NO. 6276 ON THIRD READING

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mr. Speaker, I move that we vote on Third Reading on House Bill No. 6276 and direct the Secretary General to read the title of the measure and call the roll for nominal voting.

I so move.

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

*Thereupon, the Secretary General read the title of*

\* See ANNEX (printed separately)

*the measure, printed copies of which were distributed to the Members on September 20, 2017, pursuant to Section 58, Rule X of the House Rules.*

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 6276, entitled: AN ACT ENSURING THE CONTINUOUS AND UNINTERRUPTED TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRICITY, THE PROTECTION OF THE INTEGRITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, AND THE PROMOTION OF PUBLIC SAFETY, AND PROVIDING PENALTIES IN VIOLATION THEREOF.

*The Chair directed the Secretary General to call the roll for nominal voting. Thereafter, pursuant to the Rules of the House, a second roll call was made. The result of the voting on Third Reading on the aforesaid measure is as follows, per Journal No. 28, dated September 25, 2017:*

*Affirmative*

Abaya	Benitez	Cua	Lee
Abayon	Bernos	Cuaresma	Limkaichong
Abu	Biazon	Cueva	Lobregat
Abueg	Billones	Dalipe	Lopez (C.)
Acharon	Biron	Datol	Lopez (M.L.)
Acop	Bolilia	Daza	Maceda
Acosta	Bondoc	De Jesus	Malapitan
Advincula	Bordado	De Venecia	Mangaoang
Agarao	Bravo (A.)	De Vera	Mangudadatu (S.)
Aggabao	Bravo (M.V.)	Defensor	Mangudadatu (Z.)
Aglipay-Villar	Brosas	Del Mar	Marcoleta
Alejano	Bulut-Begtang	Deloso-Montalla	Marcos
Almonte	Calderon	Dimaporo (M.K.)	Mariño
Alonte	Calixto-Rubiano	Elago	Marquez
Alvarez (F.)	Caminero	Enverga	Martinez
Alvarez (P.)	Canama	Erice	Matugas
Amante	Casilao	Eriguel	Mellana
Amatong	Castelo	Ermita-Buhain	Mending
Andaya	Castro (F.L.)	Escudero	Mercado
Aquino-Magsaysay	Castro (F.H.)	Espina	Mirasol
Aragones	Cayetano	Espino	Montoro
Arenas	Celeste	Estrella	Nava
Aumentado	Cerafica	Evardone	Noel
Bagatsing	Cerilles	Fariñas	Nogralas (J.J.)
Baguilat	Chavez	Fernando	Nogralas (K.A.)
Banal	Chipeco	Ferrer (L.)	Ong (E.)
Barzaga	Co	Ferriol-Pascual	Ong (H.)
Bataoil	Cojuangco	Flores	Ortega (P.)
Batocabe	Collantes	Fortun	Ortega (V.N.)
Bautista-Bandigan	Cortes	Fortuno	Pacquiao
Belaro	Cosalan	Garbin	Paduano
Belmonte (J.C.)	Crisologo	Garcia (G.)	Palma
		Garcia (J.E.)	Pancho
		Garin (R.)	Panganiban
		Garin (S.)	Panotes
		Gasataya	Papandayan
		Geron	Pichay
		Go (A.C.)	Pimentel
		Go (M.)	Pineda
		Gonzaga	Plaza
		Gonzales (A.P.)	Primicias-Agabas
		Gonzales (A.D.)	Quimbo
		Gonzalez	Radaza
		Gullas	Ramos
		Herrera-Dy	Relampagos
		Hofer	Roa-Puno
		Javier	Robes
		Kho	Rodriguez (I.)
		Khonghun	Rodriguez (M.)
		Labadlabad	Romualdo
		Lacson	Roque (H.)
		Lagman	Sacdalán
		Lanete	Sagarbarria
		Laogan	Sahali
		Lazatin	Salceda
		Leachon	Salo

Salon	Unabia
Sambar	Ungab
Sandoval	Unico
Santos-Recto	Uy (J.)
Sarmiento (C.)	Uy (R.)
Sarmiento (E.M.)	Uybarreta
Savellano	Vargas
Sema	Vargas-Alfonso
Siao	Velasco
Silverio	Velasco-Catera
Singson	Veloso
Suansing (E.)	Vergara
Suansing (H.)	Villafuerte
Suarez	Villanueva
Tambunting	Villarica
Tan (A.)	Villarin
Tan (M.)	Violago
Tejada	Yap (A.)
Teves	Yap (V.)
Tiangco	Yu
Tinio	Zamora (M.C.)
Tugna	Zarate
Ty	Zubiri
Umali	

*Negative*

None

*Abstention*

None

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 6276  
ON THIRD READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). With 223 affirmative votes, no negative vote and no abstention, House Bill No. 6276 is approved on Third and final Reading.

The Floor Leader is recognized.

NOMINAL VOTING ON H.B. NO. 6314  
ON THIRD READING

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mr. Speaker, I move that we vote on Third Reading on House Bill No. 6314 and direct the Secretary General to read the title of the measure, and call the roll for nominal voting.

I so move.

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

*Thereupon, the Secretary General read the title of*

*the measure, printed copies of which were distributed to the Members on September 20, 2017, pursuant to Section 58, Rule X of the House Rules.*

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 6314, entitled: AN ACT GRANTING STREAMTECH SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGIES INC. A FRANCHISE TO CONSTRUCT, INSTALL, ESTABLISH, OPERATE AND MAINTAIN TELECOMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS THROUGHOUT THE PHILIPPINES.

*The Chair directed the Secretary General to call the roll for nominal voting. Thereafter, pursuant to the Rules of the House, a second roll call was made. The result of the voting on Third Reading on the aforesaid measure is as follows, per Journal No. 28, dated September 25, 2017:*

*Affirmative*

Abaya	Biron
Abayon	Bolilia
Abu	Bondoc
Abueg	Bordado
Acharon	Bravo (A.)
Acop	Bravo (M.V.)
Acosta	Brosas
Advincula	Bulut-Begtang
Agarao	Calderon
Aggabao	Calixto-Rubiano
Aglipay-Villar	Caminero
Alejano	Canama
Almonte	Casilao
Alonte	Castelo
Alvarez (F.)	Castro (F.L.)
Alvarez (P.)	Castro (F.H.)
Amante	Cayetano
Amatong	Celeste
Andaya	Cerifica
Aquino-Magsaysay	Cerilles
Aragones	Chavez
Arenas	Chipeco
Aumentado	Co
Bagatsing	Cojuangco
Baguilat	Collantes
Banal	Cortes
Barzaga	Cosalan
Bataoil	Crisologo
Batocabe	Cua
Bautista-Bandigan	Cuaresma
Belaro	Cueva
Belmonte (J.C.)	Dalipe
Benitez	Datol
Bernos	Daza
Biazon	De Jesus
Billones	De Venecia

De Vera	Mangudadatu (S.)	Siao	Uy (R.)
Defensor	Mangudadatu (Z.)	Silverio	Uybarreta
Del Mar	Marcoleta	Singson	Vargas
Deloso-Montalla	Marcos	Suansing (E.)	Vargas-Alfonso
Dimaporo (M.K.)	Mariño	Suansing (H.)	Velasco
Elago	Marquez	Suarez	Velasco-Catera
Enverga	Martinez	Tambunting	Veloso
Erice	Matugas	Tan (A.)	Vergara
Eriguel	Mellana	Tan (M.)	Villafuerte
Ermita-Buhain	Mending	Tejada	Villanueva
Escudero	Mercado	Teves	Villarica
Espina	Mirasol	Tiangco	Villarin
Espino	Montoro	Tinio	Violago
Estrella	Nava	Tugna	Yap (A.)
Evardone	Noel	Ty	Yap (V.)
Fariñas	Nogralas (J.J.)	Umali	Yu
Fernando	Nogralas (K.A.)	Unabia	Zamora (M.C.)
Ferrer (L.)	Ong (E.)	Ungab	Zarate
Ferriol-Pascual	Ong (H.)	Unico	Zubiri
Flores	Ortega (P.)	Uy (J.)	
Fortun	Ortega (V.N.)		
Fortuno	Pacquiao	<i>Negative</i>	
Garbin	Paduano		
Garcia (G.)	Palma	None	
Garcia (J.E.)	Pancho		
Garin (R.)	Panganiban	<i>Abstention</i>	
Garin (S.)	Panotes		
Gasataya	Papandayan	None	
Geron	Pichay		
Go (A.C.)	Pimentel		APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 6314
Go (M.)	Pineda		ON THIRD READING
Gonzaga	Plaza		
Gonzales (A.P.)	Primicias-Agabas		THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez).
Gonzales (A.D.)	Quimbo		With 223 affirmative votes, no negative vote, and no
Gonzalez	Radaza		abstention, House Bill No. 6314 is approved on Third
Gullas	Ramos		and final Reading.
Herrera-Dy	Relampagos		The Floor Leader is recognized.
Hofer	Roa-Puno		
Javier	Robes		NOMINAL VOTING ON H.B. NO. 6315
Kho	Rodriguez (I.)		ON THIRD READING
Khonghun	Rodriguez (M.)		
Labadlabad	Romualdo		REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mr. Speaker, I move
Lacson	Roque (H.)		that we vote on Third Reading on House Bill No.
Lagman	Sacdalan		6315 and direct the Secretary General to read the
Lanete	Sagarbarria		title of the measure, and call the roll for nominal
Laogan	Sahali		voting.
Lazatin	Salceda		I so move.
Leachon	Salo		
Lee	Salon		THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). Is
Limkaichong	Sambar		there any objection? ( <i>Silence</i> ) The Chair hears none;
Lobregat	Sandoval		the motion is approved.
Lopez (C.)	Santos-Recto		
Lopez (M.L.)	Sarmiento (C.)		<i>Thereupon, the Secretary General read the title of</i>
Maceda	Sarmiento (E.M.)		<i>the measure, printed copies of which were distributed</i>
Malapitan	Savellano		<i>to the Members on September 20, 2017, pursuant to</i>
Mangaoang	Sema		<i>Section 58, Rule X of the House Rules.</i>

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 6315, entitled: AN ACT GRANTING THE VOLUNTEER LIFECARE MINISTRIES, INC. A FRANCHISE TO CONSTRUCT, INSTALL, ESTABLISH, OPERATE AND MAINTAIN NONCOMMERCIAL RADIO BROADCASTING STATIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

*The Chair directed the Secretary General to call the roll for nominal voting. Thereafter, pursuant to the Rules of the House, a second roll call was made. The result of the voting on Third Reading on the aforesaid measure is as follows, per Journal No. 28, dated September 25, 2017:*

*Affirmative*

Abaya	Bondoc	Elago	Mariño
Abayon	Bordado	Enverga	Marquez
Abellanosa	Bravo (A.)	Erice	Martinez
Abu	Bravo (M.V.)	Eriguel	Matugas
Abueg	Brosas	Ermita-Buhain	Mellana
Acharon	Bulut-Begtang	Escudero	Mending
Acop	Calderon	Espina	Mercado
Acosta	Calixto-Rubiano	Espino	Mirasol
Advincula	Caminero	Estrella	Montoro
Agarao	Canama	Evardone	Nava
Aggabao	Casilao	Fariñas	Noel
Aglipay-Villar	Castelo	Fernando	Nogralas (J.J.)
Alejano	Castro (F.L.)	Ferrer (L.)	Nogralas (K.A.)
Almonte	Castro (F.H.)	Ferriol-Pascual	Ong (E.)
Alonte	Cayetano	Flores	Ong (H.)
Alvarez (F.)	Celeste	Fortun	Ortega (P.)
Alvarez (P.)	Cerafica	Fortuno	Ortega (V.N.)
Amante	Cerilles	Fuentebella	Pacquiao
Amatong	Chavez	Garbin	Paduano
Andaya	Chipeco	Garcia (G.)	Palma
Aquino-Magsaysay	Co	Garcia (J.E.)	Pancho
Aragones	Cojuangco	Garin (R.)	Panganiban
Arenas	Collantes	Garin (S.)	Panotes
Aumentado	Cortes	Gasataya	Papandayan
Bagatsing	Cosalan	Geron	Pichay
Baguilat	Crisologo	Go (A.C.)	Pimentel
Banal	Cua	Go (M.)	Pineda
Barzaga	Cuaresma	Gonzaga	Plaza
Bataoil	Cueva	Gonzales (A.P.)	Primicias-Agabas
Batocabe	Dalipe	Gonzales (A.D.)	Quimbo
Bautista-Bandigan	Datol	Gonzalez	Radaza
Belaro	Daza	Gullas	Ramos
Belmonte (J.C.)	De Jesus	Herrera-Dy	Relampagos
Benitez	De Venecia	Hofer	Roa-Puno
Bernos	De Vera	Javier	Robes
Biazon	Defensor	Kho	Rodriguez (I.)
Billones	Del Mar	Khonghun	Rodriguez (M.)
Biron	Deloso-Montalla	Labadlabad	Romualdo
Bolilia	Dimaporo (M.K.)	Lacson	Roque (H.)
		Lagman	Sacdalán
		Lanete	Sagarbarria
		Laogan	Sahali
		Lazatin	Salceda
		Leachon	Salo
		Lee	Salon
		Limkaichong	Sambar
		Lobregat	Sandoval
		Lopez (C.)	Santos-Recto
		Lopez (M.L.)	Sarmiento (C.)
		Maceda	Sarmiento (E.M.)
		Malapitan	Savellano
		Mangaoang	Sema
		Mangudadatu (S.)	Siao
		Mangudadatu (Z.)	Silverio
		Marcoleta	Singson
		Marcos	Suansing (E.)

Suansing (H.) Uybarreta  
 Suarez Vargas  
 Sy-Alvarado Vargas-Alfonso  
 Tambunting Velasco  
 Tan (A.) Velasco-Catera  
 Tan (M.) Veloso  
 Tejada Vergara  
 Teves Villafuerte  
 Tiangco Villanueva  
 Tinio Villarica  
 Tugna Villarin  
 Ty Violago  
 Umali Yap (A.)  
 Unabia Yap (V.)  
 Ungab Yu  
 Unico Zamora (M.C.)  
 Uy (J.) Zarate  
 Uy (R.) Zubiri

*Negative*

None

*Abstention*

None

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 6315  
 ON THIRD READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez).  
 With 226 affirmative votes, no negative vote, and no  
 abstention, House Bill No. 6315 is approved on Third  
 and final Reading.

The Floor Leader is recognized.

NOMINAL VOTING ON H.B. NO. 6317  
 ON THIRD READING

REP. NOGRALES (J.) Mr. Speaker, I move that  
 we vote on Third Reading on House Bill No. 6317  
 and direct the Secretary General to read the title of the  
 measure, and call the roll for nominal voting.

I so move.

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

*Thereupon, the Secretary General read the title of  
 the measure, printed copies of which were distributed  
 to the Members on September 20, 2017, pursuant to  
 Section 58, Rule X of the House Rules.*

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No.  
 6317, entitled: AN ACT GRANTING THE MAGNUM.

AIR (SKYJET) INC. A FRANCHISE TO ESTABLISH,  
 OPERATE AND MAINTAIN DOMESTIC AND  
 INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT SERVICES.

*The Chair directed the Secretary General to call  
 the roll for nominal voting. Thereafter, pursuant to the  
 Rules of the House, a second roll call was made. The  
 result of the voting on Third Reading on the aforesaid  
 measure is as follows, per Journal No. 28, dated  
 September 25, 2017:*

*Affirmative*

Abaya Brosas  
 Abayon Bulut-Begtang  
 Abellanosa Calderon  
 Abu Calixto-Rubiano  
 Abueg Caminero  
 Acharon Canama  
 Acop Casilao  
 Acosta Castelo  
 Advincula Castro (F.L.)  
 Agarao Castro (F.H.)  
 Aggabao Cayetano  
 Aglipay-Villar Celeste  
 Alejano Cerafica  
 Almonte Cerilles  
 Alonte Chavez  
 Alvarez (F.) Chipeco  
 Alvarez (P.) Co  
 Amante Cojuangco  
 Amatong Collantes  
 Andaya Cortes  
 Aquino-Magsaysay Cosalan  
 Aragonos Crisologo  
 Arenas Cua  
 Aumentado Cuaresma  
 Bagatsing Cueva  
 Baguilat Dalipe  
 Banal Datol  
 Barzaga Daza  
 Bataoil De Jesus  
 Batocabe De Venecia  
 Bautista-Bandigan De Vera  
 Belaro Defensor  
 Belmonte (J.C.) Del Mar  
 Benitez Deloso-Montalla  
 Bernos Dimaporo (M.K.)  
 Biazon Duavit  
 Billones Elago  
 Biron Enverga  
 Bolilia Erice  
 Bondoc Eriguel  
 Bordado Ermita-Buhain  
 Bravo (A.) Escudero  
 Bravo (M.V.) Espina

Espino	Mirasol	Teves	Velasco-Catera
Estrella	Montoro	Tiangco	Veloso
Evardone	Nava	Tinio	Vergara
Fariñas	Noel	Tugna	Villafuerte
Fernando	Nogralles (J.J.)	Ty	Villanueva
Ferrer (L.)	Nogralles (K.A.)	Umali	Villarica
Ferriol-Pascual	Ong (E.)	Unabia	Villarin
Flores	Ong (H.)	Ungab	Violago
Fortun	Ortega (P.)	Unico	Yap (A.)
Fortuno	Ortega (V.N.)	Uy (J.)	Yap (V.)
Fuentebella	Pacquiao	Uy (R.)	Yu
Garbin	Paduano	Uybarreta	Zamora (M.C.)
Garcia (G.)	Palma	Vargas	Zarate
Garcia (J.E.)	Pancho	Vargas-Alfonso	Zubiri
Garin (R.)	Panganiban	Velasco	
Garin (S.)	Panotes		
Gasataya	Papandayan	<i>Negative</i>	
Geron	Pichay		
Go (A.C.)	Pimentel	None	
Go (M.)	Pineda		
Gonzaga	Plaza	<i>Abstention</i>	
Gonzales (A.P.)	Primicias-Agabas		
Gonzales (A.D.)	Quimbo	None	
Gonzalez	Radaza		
Gullas	Ramos		
Herrera-Dy	Relampagos		
Hofer	Roa-Puno		
Javier	Robes		
Kho	Rodriguez (I.)		
Khonghun	Rodriguez (M.)		
Labadlabad	Romualdo		
Lacson	Roque (H.)		
Lagman	Sacdalan		
Lanete	Sagarbarria		
Laogan	Sahali		
Lazatin	Salceda		
Leachon	Salo		
Lee	Salon		
Limkaichong	Sambar		
Lobregat	Sandoval		
Lopez (C.)	Santos-Recto		
Lopez (M.L.)	Sarmiento (C.)		
Maceda	Sarmiento (E.M.)		
Malapitan	Savellano		
Mangaoang	Sema		
Mangudadatu (S.)	Siao		
Mangudadatu (Z.)	Silverio		
Marcoleta	Singson		
Marcos	Suansing (E.)		
Mariño	Suansing (H.)		
Marquez	Suarez		
Martinez	Sy-Alvarado		
Matugas	Tambunting		
Mellana	Tan (A.)		
Mending	Tan (M.)		
Mercado	Tejada		

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 6317  
ON THIRD READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). With 227 affirmative votes, no negative vote, and no abstention, House Bill No. 6317 is approved on Third Reading. The Floor Leader is recognized.

NOMINAL VOTING ON H.B. NO. 990  
ON THIRD READING

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mr. Speaker, I move that we vote on Third Reading on House Bill No. 990 and direct the Secretary General to read the title of the measure, and call the roll for nominal voting.

I so move.

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

*Thereupon, the Secretary General read the title of the measure, printed copies of which were distributed to the Members on September 20, 2017, pursuant to Section 58, Rule X of the House Rules.*

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 990, entitled: AN ACT SEPARATING THE CITY OF CALAMBA FROM THE SECOND LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT OF THE PROVINCE OF LAGUNA TO CONSTITUTE THE LONE LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT OF THE CITY OF CALAMBA.

*The Chair directed the Secretary General to call the roll for nominal voting. Thereafter, pursuant to the Rules of the House, a second roll call was made. The result of the voting on Third Reading on the aforesaid measure is as follows, per Journal No. 28, dated September 25, 2017:*

*Affirmative*

Abaya	Camenero	Fortun	Ortega (P.)
Abayon	Canama	Fortuno	Ortega (V.N.)
Abellanos	Casilao	Fuentebella	Pacquiao
Abu	Castelo	Garbin	Paduano
Abueg	Castro (F.L.)	Garcia (G.)	Palma
Acharon	Castro (F.H.)	Garcia (J.E.)	Pancho
Acop	Cayetano	Garin (R.)	Panganiban
Acosta	Celeste	Garin (S.)	Panotes
Advincula	Cerafica	Gasataya	Papandayan
Agarao	Cerilles	Geron	Pichay
Aggabao	Chavez	Go (A.C.)	Pimentel
Aglipay-Villar	Chipeco	Go (M.)	Pineda
Alejano	Co	Gonzaga	Plaza
Almonte	Cojuangco	Gonzales (A.P.)	Primicias-Agabas
Alonte	Collantes	Gonzales (A.D.)	Quimbo
Alvarez (F.)	Cortes	Gonzalez	Radaza
Alvarez (P.)	Cosalan	Gullas	Ramos
Amante	Crisologo	Herrera-Dy	Relampagos
Amatong	Cua	Hofer	Roa-Puno
Andaya	Cuaresma	Javier	Robes
Aquino-Magsaysay	Cueva	Kho	Rodriguez (I.)
Aragones	Dalipe	Khonghun	Rodriguez (M.)
Arenas	Datol	Labadlabad	Romualdo
Aumentado	Daza	Lacson	Roque (H.)
Bagatsing	De Jesus	Lagman	Sacdalán
Baguilat	De Venecia	Lanete	Sagarbarria
Banal	De Vera	Laogan	Sahali
Barzaga	Defensor	Lazatin	Salceda
Bataoil	Del Mar	Leachon	Salo
Batocabe	Deloso-Montalla	Lee	Salon
Bautista-Bandigan	Dimaporo (M.K.)	Limkaichong	Sambar
Belaro	Duavit	Lobregat	Sandoval
Belmonte (J.C.)	Elago	Lopez (C.)	Santos-Recto
Benitez	Enverga	Lopez (M.L.)	Sarmiento (C.)
Bernos	Erice	Maceda	Sarmiento (E.M.)
Biazon	Eriguel	Malapitan	Savellano
Billones	Ermita-Buhain	Mangaoang	Sema
Biron	Escudero	Mangudadatu (S.)	Siao
Bolilia	Espina	Mangudadatu (Z.)	Silverio
Bondoc	Espino	Marcoleta	Singson
Bordado	Estrella	Marcos	Suansing (E.)
Bravo (A.)	Evardone	Mariño	Suansing (H.)
Bravo (M.V.)	Fariñas	Marquez	Suarez
Brosas	Fernando	Martinez	Sy-Alvarado
Bulut-Begtang	Ferrer (L.)	Matugas	Tambunting
Calderon	Ferriol-Pascual	Mellana	Tan (A.)
Calixto-Rubiano	Flores	Mending	Tan (M.)
		Mercado	Tejada
		Mirasol	Teves
		Montoro	Tiangco
		Nava	Tinio
		Noel	Tugna
		Nogralés (J.J.)	Ty
		Nogralés (K.A.)	Umali
		Ong (E.)	Unabia
		Ong (H.)	Ungab

Unico Villanueva  
 Uy (J.) Villarica  
 Uy (R.) Villarin  
 Uybarreta Violago  
 Vargas Yap (A.)  
 Vargas-Alfonso Yap (V.)  
 Velasco Yu  
 Velasco-Catera Zamora (M.C.)  
 Veloso Zarate  
 Vergara Zubiri  
 Villafuerte

*Negative*

None

*Abstention*

None

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 990  
 ON THIRD READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez).  
 With 227 affirmative votes, no negative vote and no  
 abstention, House Bill No. 990 is approved on Third  
 Reading.

The Floor Leader is recognized.

NOMINAL VOTING ON H.B. NO. 6311  
 ON THIRD READING

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mr. Speaker, I move that  
 we vote on Third Reading on House Bill No. 6311  
 and direct the Secretary General to read the title of the  
 measure, and call the roll for nominal voting.

I so move.

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

*Thereupon, the Secretary General read the title of  
 the measure, printed copies of which were distributed  
 to the Members on September 20, 2017, pursuant to  
 Section 58, Rule X of the House Rules.*

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill  
 No. 6311, entitled: AN ACT INCREASING THE  
 BED CAPACITY OF THE NARRA MUNICIPAL  
 HOSPITAL IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF NARRA,  
 PROVINCE OF PALAWAN FROM TEN (10) TO  
 ONE HUNDRED (100) BED CAPACITY, AND  
 NAMING IT AS THE GOVERNOR ALFREDO  
 MENDOZA ABUEG, SR. MEMORIAL HOSPITAL  
 AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR.

*The Chair directed the Secretary General to call  
 the roll for nominal voting. Thereafter, pursuant to the  
 Rules of the House, a second roll call was made. The  
 result of the voting on Third Reading on the aforesaid  
 measure is as follows, per Journal No. 28, dated  
 September 25, 2017:*

*Affirmative*

Abaya Caminero  
 Abayon Canama  
 Abellanos Casilao  
 Abu Castelo  
 Abueg Castro (F.L.)  
 Acharon Castro (F.H.)  
 Acop Cayetano  
 Acosta Celeste  
 Advincula Cerafica  
 Agarao Cerilles  
 Aggabao Chavez  
 Aglipay-Villar Chipeco  
 Alejano Co  
 Almonte Cojuangco  
 Alonte Collantes  
 Alvarez (F.) Cortes  
 Alvarez (P.) Cosalan  
 Amante Crisologo  
 Amatong Cua  
 Andaya Cuaresma  
 Aquino-Magsaysay Cueva  
 Aragones Dalipe  
 Arenas Datol  
 Aumentado Daza  
 Bagatsing De Jesus  
 Baguilat De Venecia  
 Banal De Vera  
 Barzaga Defensor  
 Bataoil Del Mar  
 Batocabe Deloso-Montalla  
 Bautista-Bandigan Dimaporo (M.K.)  
 Belaro Duavit  
 Belmonte (J.C.) Elago  
 Benitez Enverga  
 Bernos Erice  
 Biazon Eriguel  
 Billones Ermita-Buhain  
 Biron Escudero  
 Bolilia Espina  
 Bondoc Espino  
 Bordado Estrella  
 Bravo (A.) Evardone  
 Bravo (M.V.) Fariñas  
 Brosas Fernando  
 Bulut-Begtang Ferrer (L.)  
 Calderon Ferriol-Pascual  
 Calixto-Rubiano Flores

Fortun	Ortega (P.)	Unico	Villanueva
Fortuno	Ortega (V.N.)	Uy (J.)	Villarica
Fuentebella	Pacquiao	Uy (R.)	Villarin
Garbin	Paduano	Uybarreta	Violago
Garcia (G.)	Palma	Vargas	Yap (A.)
Garcia (J.E.)	Pancho	Vargas-Alfonso	Yap (V.)
Garin (R.)	Panganiban	Velasco	Yu
Garin (S.)	Panotes	Velasco-Catera	Zamora (M.C.)
Gasataya	Papandayan	Veloso	Zarate
Geron	Pichay	Vergara	Zubiri
Go (A.C.)	Pimentel	Villafuerte	
Go (M.)	Pineda		
Gonzaga	Plaza	<i>Negative</i>	
Gonzales (A.P.)	Primicias-Agabas		
Gonzales (A.D.)	Quimbo	None	
Gonzalez	Radaza		
Gullas	Ramos	<i>Abstention</i>	
Herrera-Dy	Relampagos		
Hofer	Roa-Puno	None	
Javier	Robes		
Kho	Rodriguez (I.)		
Khonghun	Rodriguez (M.)		
Labadlabad	Romualdo		
Lacson	Roque (H.)		
Lagman	Sacdalán		
Lanete	Sagarbarria		
Laogan	Sahali		
Lazatin	Salceda		
Leachon	Salo		
Lee	Salon		
Limkaichong	Sambar		
Lobregat	Sandoval		
Lopez (C.)	Santos-Recto		
Lopez (M.L.)	Sarmiento (C.)		
Maceda	Sarmiento (E.M.)		
Malapitan	Savellano		
Mangaoang	Sema		
Mangudadatu (S.)	Siao		
Mangudadatu (Z.)	Silverio		
Marcoleta	Singson		
Marcos	Suansing (E.)		
Mariño	Suansing (H.)		
Marquez	Suarez		
Martinez	Sy-Alvarado		
Matugas	Tambunting		
Mellana	Tan (A.)		
Mending	Tan (M.)		
Mercado	Tejada		
Mirasol	Teves		
Montoro	Tiangco		
Nava	Tinio		
Noel	Tugna		
Nogralés (J.J.)	Ty		
Nogralés (K.A.)	Umali		
Ong (E.)	Unabia		
Ong (H.)	Ungab		

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 6311  
ON THIRD READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez).  
With 227 affirmative votes, no negative vote, and no  
abstention, House Bill No. 6311 is approved on Third  
Reading.

The Floor Leader is recognized.

NOMINAL VOTING ON H.B. NO. 5777  
ON THIRD READING

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mr. Speaker, I move that  
we vote on Third Reading on House Bill No. 5777  
and direct the Secretary General to read the title of the  
measure, and call the roll for nominal voting.

I so move.

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

*Thereupon, the Secretary General read the title of  
the measure, printed copies of which were distributed  
to the Members on September 21, 2017, pursuant to  
Section 58, Rule X of the House Rules.*

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill  
No. 5777, entitled: AN ACT STRENGTHENING  
THE NATIONAL AND LOCAL HEALTH AND  
NUTRITION PROGRAMS FOR PREGNANT AND  
LACTATING WOMEN, ADOLESCENT GIRLS OF  
REPRODUCTIVE AGE AND TEENAGE MOTHERS,  
INFANTS AND YOUNG CHILDREN IN THE FIRST  
1,000 DAYS, AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS  
THEREFOR.

*The Chair directed the Secretary General to call the roll for nominal voting. Thereafter, pursuant to the Rules of the House, a second roll call was made. The result of the voting on Third Reading on the aforesaid measure is as follows, per Journal No. 28, dated September 25, 2017:*

*Affirmative*

Abaya	Caminero	Fortun	Ortega (P.)
Abayon	Canama	Fortuno	Ortega (V.N.)
Abellanos	Casilao	Fuentebella	Pacquiao
Abu	Castelo	Garbin	Paduano
Abueg	Castro (F.L.)	Garcia (G.)	Palma
Acharon	Castro (F.H.)	Garcia (J.E.)	Pancho
Acop	Cayetano	Garin (R.)	Panganiban
Acosta	Celeste	Garin (S.)	Panotes
Advincula	Cerfica	Gasataya	Papandayan
Agarao	Cerilles	Geron	Pichay
Aggabao	Chavez	Go (A.C.)	Pimentel
Aglipay-Villar	Chipeco	Go (M.)	Pineda
Alejano	Co	Gonzaga	Plaza
Almonte	Cojuangco	Gonzales (A.P.)	Primicias-Agabas
Alonte	Collantes	Gonzales (A.D.)	Quimbo
Alvarez (F.)	Cortes	Gonzalez	Radaza
Alvarez (P.)	Cosalan	Gullas	Ramos
Amante	Crisologo	Herrera-Dy	Relampagos
Amatong	Cua	Hofer	Roa-Puno
Andaya	Cuaresma	Javier	Robes
Aquino-Magsaysay	Cueva	Kho	Rodriguez (I.)
Aragones	Dalipe	Khonghun	Rodriguez (M.)
Arenas	Datol	Labadlabad	Romualdo
Aumentado	Daza	Lacson	Roque (H.)
Bagatsing	De Jesus	Lagman	Sacdalan
Baguilat	De Venecia	Lanete	Sagarbarria
Banal	De Vera	Laogan	Sahali
Barzaga	Defensor	Lazatin	Salceda
Bataoil	Del Mar	Leachon	Salo
Batocabe	Deloso-Montalla	Lee	Salon
Bautista-Bandigan	Dimaporo (M.K.)	Limkaichong	Sambar
Belaro	Duavit	Lobregat	Sandoval
Belmonte (J.C.)	Elago	Lopez (C.)	Santos-Recto
Benitez	Enverga	Lopez (M.L.)	Sarmiento (C.)
Bernos	Erice	Maceda	Sarmiento (E.M.)
Biazon	Eriguel	Malapitan	Savellano
Billones	Ermita-Buhain	Mangaoang	Sema
Biron	Escudero	Mangudadatu (S.)	Siao
Bolilia	Espina	Mangudadatu (Z.)	Silverio
Bondoc	Espino	Marcoleta	Singson
Bordado	Estrella	Marcos	Suansing (E.)
Bravo (A.)	Evardone	Mariño	Suansing (H.)
Bravo (M.V.)	Fariñas	Marquez	Suarez
Brosas	Fernando	Martinez	Sy-Alvarado
Bulut-Begtang	Ferrer (L.)	Matugas	Tambunting
Calderon	Ferriol-Pascual	Mellana	Tan (A.)
Calixto-Rubiano	Flores	Mending	Tan (M.)
		Mercado	Tejada
		Mirasol	Teves
		Montoro	Tiangco
		Nava	Tinio
		Noel	Tugna
		Nogralas (J.J.)	Ty
		Nogralas (K.A.)	Umali
		Ong (E.)	Unabia
		Ong (H.)	Ungab

Unico Villanueva  
 Uy (J.) Villarica  
 Uy (R.) Villarin  
 Uybarreta Violago  
 Vargas Yap (A.)  
 Vargas-Alfonso Yap (V.)  
 Velasco Yu  
 Velasco-Catera Zamora (M.C.)  
 Veloso Zarate  
 Vergara Zubiri  
 Villafuerte

*Negative*

None

*Abstention*

None

-

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 5777  
 ON THIRD READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez).  
 With 227 affirmative votes, no negative vote, and no  
 abstention, House Bill No. 5777 is approved on Third  
 Reading.

The Floor Leader is recognized.

NOMINAL VOTING ON H.B. NO. 6389  
 ON THIRD READING

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mr. Speaker, I move that  
 we vote on Third Reading on House Bill No. 6389  
 and direct the Secretary General to read the title of the  
 measure, and call the roll for nominal voting.

I so move.

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

*Thereupon, the Secretary General read the title of  
 the measure, printed copies of which were distributed  
 to the Members on September 21, 2017, pursuant to  
 Section 58, Rule X of the House Rules.*

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 6389,  
 entitled: AN ACT UPGRADING THE SERVICES AND  
 FACILITIES OF THE LA UNION MEDICAL CENTER  
 IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF AGOO, PROVINCE OF  
 LA UNION BY INCREASING ITS BED CAPACITY  
 TO THREE HUNDRED (300) AND ESTABLISHING  
 A TRAUMA CENTER THEREIN, AUTHORIZING  
 THE INCREASE OF ITS PERSONNEL, AND  
 APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR.

*The Chair directed the Secretary General to call  
 the roll for nominal voting. Thereafter, pursuant to the  
 Rules of the House, a second roll call was made. The  
 result of the voting on Third Reading on the aforesaid  
 measure is as follows, per Journal No. 28, dated  
 September 25, 2017:*

*Affirmative*

Abaya Caminero  
 Abayon Canama  
 Abellanos Casilao  
 Abu Castelo  
 Abueg Castro (F.L.)  
 Acharon Castro (F.H.)  
 Acop Cayetano  
 Acosta Celeste  
 Advincula Cerafica  
 Agarao Cerilles  
 Aggabao Chavez  
 Aglipay-Villar Chipeco  
 Alejano Co  
 Almonte Cojuangco  
 Alonte Collantes  
 Alvarez (F.) Cortes  
 Alvarez (P.) Cosalan  
 Amante Crisologo  
 Amatong Cua  
 Andaya Cuaresma  
 Aquino-Magsaysay Cueva  
 Aragones Dalipe  
 Arenas Datol  
 Aumentado Daza  
 Bagatsing De Jesus  
 Baguilat De Venecia  
 Banal De Vera  
 Barzaga Defensor  
 Bataoil Del Mar  
 Batocabe Deloso-Montalla  
 Bautista-Bandigan Dimaporo (M.K.)  
 Belaro Duavit  
 Belmonte (J.C.) Elago  
 Benitez Enverga  
 Bernos Erice  
 Biazon Eriguel  
 Billones Ermita-Buhain  
 Biron Escudero  
 Bolilia Espina  
 Bondoc Espino  
 Bordado Estrella  
 Bravo (A.) Evardone  
 Bravo (M.V.) Fariñas  
 Brosas Fernando  
 Bulut-Begtang Ferrer (L.)  
 Calderon Ferriol-Pascual  
 Calixto-Rubiano Flores

Fortun  
 Fortuno  
 Fuentebella  
 Garbin  
 Garcia (G.)  
 Garcia (J.E.)  
 Garin (R.)  
 Garin (S.)  
 Gasataya  
 Geron  
 Go (A.C.)  
 Go (M.)  
 Gonzaga  
 Gonzales (A.P.)  
 Gonzales (A.D.)  
 Gonzalez  
 Gullas  
 Herrera-Dy  
 Hofer  
 Javier  
 Kho  
 Khonghun  
 Labadlabad  
 Lacson  
 Lagman  
 Lanete  
 Laogan  
 Lazatin  
 Leachon  
 Lee  
 Limkaichong  
 Lobregat  
 Lopez (C.)  
 Lopez (M.L.)  
 Maceda  
 Malapitan  
 Mangaoang  
 Mangudadatu (S.)  
 Mangudadatu (Z.)  
 Marcoleta  
 Marcos  
 Mariño  
 Marquez  
 Martinez  
 Matugas  
 Mellana  
 Mending  
 Mercado  
 Mirasol  
 Montoro  
 Nava  
 Noel  
 Nograles (J.J.)  
 Nograles (K.A.)  
 Ong (E.)  
 Ong (H.)

Ortega (P.)  
 Ortega (V.N.)  
 Pacquiao  
 Paduano  
 Palma  
 Pancho  
 Panganiban  
 Panotes  
 Papandayan  
 Pichay  
 Pimentel  
 Pineda  
 Plaza  
 Primicias-Agabas  
 Quimbo  
 Radaza  
 Ramos  
 Relampagos  
 Roa-Puno  
 Robes  
 Rodriguez (I.)  
 Rodriguez (M.)  
 Romualdo  
 Roque (H.)  
 Sacdalan  
 Sagarbarria  
 Sahali  
 Salceda  
 Salo  
 Salon  
 Sambar  
 Sandoval  
 Santos-Recto  
 Sarmiento (C.)  
 Sarmiento (E.M.)  
 Savellano  
 Sema  
 Siao  
 Silverio  
 Singson  
 Suansing (E.)  
 Suansing (H.)  
 Suarez  
 Sy-Alvarado  
 Tambunting  
 Tan (A.)  
 Tan (M.)  
 Tejada  
 Teves  
 Tiangco  
 Tinio  
 Tugna  
 Ty  
 Umali  
 Unabia  
 Ungab

Unico  
 Uy (J.)  
 Uy (R.)  
 Uybarreta  
 Vargas  
 Vargas-Alfonso  
 Velasco  
 Velasco-Catera  
 Veloso  
 Vergara  
 Villafuerte

Villanueva  
 Villarica  
 Villarin  
 Violago  
 Yap (A.)  
 Yap (V.)  
 Yu  
 Zamora (M.C.)  
 Zarate  
 Zubiri

*Negative*

None

*Abstention*

None

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 6389  
 ON THIRD READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez).  
 With 227 affirmative votes, no negative vote, and no  
 abstention, House Bill No. 6389 is approved on Third  
 Reading.

The Floor Leader is recognized.

PRIVILEGE HOUR

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mr. Speaker, today being  
 a Monday, and pursuant to our rules, I move that we  
 open the Privilege Hour.

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

The Chair declares a Privilege Hour.

REP. NOGRALES (J.). Mr. Speaker, I now move  
 that we recognize the honorable Lady from the Second  
 District of Camarines Norte, the Hon. Marisol C.  
 Panotes, who shall avail of the Privilege Hour.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

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

Rep. Marisol Panotes is recognized.

PRIVILEGE SPEECH OF REP. PANOTES

REP. PANOTES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a man  
 who has achieved a full measure of greatness.

This year's observance of National Heroes' Day

probably is as grandiose as in the past. Much has been said about heroes. I also have my hero to tell, but has been opted to defer to a more appropriate day talking about it. Wenceslao Q. Vinzons Sr. is my hero and I find that today is the best time to talk about him. September 28, two days from now, would have been his 107th birthday, if only heroes were allowed to live longer.

Once in the past, a young man from the province of Camarines Norte, Wenceslao Q. Vinzons Sr., stood his ground against a formidable enemy, the invading Japanese imperial forces. Despite inevitable defeat, he faced the superior enemy with armed resistance. The message was clear, this war will be fought not with superior firepower alone but with the courage of men noble in spirit. He had nothing in hand but in his soul, his love for country, his fine intellect and his dignity.

Wenceslao Q. Vinzons Sr. was endearingly known as “Bintao” even in his childhood days. With his wife, Liwayway Gonzales, a Journalism graduate from the University of the Philippines, he raised a family of five, namely: Wenceslao Jr. who became Governor of Camarines Norte; Grace and Ranie who all survived the war; and, Alexander and Aurora who were casualties of war.

He finished his secondary education at the Camarines Norte High School and graduated as Valedictorian. He entered the University of the Philippines in 1927, and joined the Upsilon Sigma Phi, an organization of UP scholars and campus leaders. Later, he became a member of the UP debating team and at one time as editor of the Philippine Collegian in 1931, and president of the student council of the same year. Today at the UP Diliman Campus is the UP Vinzons Hall which serves as the University Student Center, named after and dedicated to Wenceslao Q. Vinzons Sr. It is a tribute to true student leadership.

Bintao strongly opposed western imperialism as espoused in his Malaysia Irredenta where he envisioned a federation of the Philippines, Malaya, Indonesia, and a remote group of islands of Polynesia into a Republic of Malaysia. Moreover, he founded an association of students from these countries advocating closer understanding and unity among themselves. It was known as the Pan-Malayan association which exhibits strong similarity of vision to what is now the ASEAN which adheres to strong determination and cooperation among members. Bintao may have lived ahead of his time, visualizing as early then one vision, one identity, one community—the ASEAN.

Bintao graduated with honors from the UP College of Law in 1933, took the Bar Exams in the same year and placed third.

In the corridors of this institution, the Congress of the Philippines, Bintao once walked almost eight decades ago. He was an Assemblyman representing the Lone District of Camarines Norte. He was a colleague from another time, a legislator just like you and me.

Tender in age, he was the youngest among the framers of the 1935 Constitution. Also, he was elected Provincial Governor of the province, likewise, the youngest elected. He co-founded, with Arturo Tolentino, the Young Philippines Party which advocated the grant of Philippine Independence from American rule.

The outbreak of the war heightened the patriotism in Bintao. He organized the first resistance forces in the country. Knowing the importance in war of grains reserve, he led the confiscation of the rice and corn warehouses in the province. Undaunted by the might of the Japanese Imperial Army, Bintao plotted the recapture of the Provincial Government Office and fearlessly held it for 25 days. He ordered the confiscation of explosives stored in the province, and gold mines for use against enemy. Inspired by his victories, many guerrilla movements followed and similarly staged guerrilla attacks against the invaders.

Bintao was victorious but he incurred the ire of the Japanese high command. He was marked for liquidation and the price of his bravery, a brutal death. Betrayed and captured, Bintao was paraded in the whole town, shamed and forced to switch his allegiance to the enemy, but he refused. Together with his father, they were murdered. Shortly after, his wife Liwayway, and two of his children, Alexander and Aurora, suffered the same fate. In his family, only three survived to live after the war—Wenceslao Jr., Ranie and Grace.

The contemporary Filipino inherits a legacy from Bintao’s heroism. His burning love for country radiates fortitude in the face of struggles. Bintao bravely pursued the resistance, not for victory alone but as a duty to fulfill.

In Marawi today, where our sovereignty as a nation is threatened, our brothers in uniform walked the same path with Bintao. Many had sacrificed. Many had fallen. Many are like Bintao. His fine intellect is an ally of patriotism. The young Bintao knew that love for country could better flourish among learned people. His leadership had anchored towards the strong belief that the direction of his generation and generations to follow must be towards nurturing values and education. With his wisdom, the concept of a genuine land reform was an advocacy; likewise, the rights of women for suffrage, righteous labor and local government autonomy.

Our Seventeenth Congress gave meaning to the ideals of Bintao on education. When R.A. No. 10931, or the Free Tuition Fee Act, was passed into law, it realized a giant step towards unrestricted education, an opening of doors to learning for all. Moreover, our concerted efforts to genuinely deliver the youth out of poverty through K to 12 education, are a manifestation of our mission aligned to Bintao’s. While this may not be enough, it is a welcome move, a directed step towards attaining our desired educational goals.

He was a man of dignity. The government is eternally in the crossroad of corruption and values, a crossroad of danger and opportunities. It will take a leader with the dignity of Bintaos to discern the right road to take. Today, the war against corruption is taking a big leap towards a bolder approach. With the signing of Executive Order No. 2, or the Freedom of Information, it has provided for an efficient and effective deterrence against corruption. Going back in time, there was an interesting footnote during Bintaos's years as a student. He spearheaded a big protest against legislators for enacting a self-serving law increasing their salaries.

As leaders, I invite you to look deeper into the life of Bintaos, a fellow legislator from a bygone time, a man with a burning love for the country, was of fine intellect and, above all, dignity.

During the celebration of National Heroes' Day on August 28, I was delighted to read the speeches of our leaders of the different barangays, towns, municipalities and cities all over the country about the heroes of the nation. Indeed, heartwarming messages were shared, dedicated for the keepers of the Filipino soul. Many are worthy of time for personal deeper reflection.

Bintaos is a local hero from Camarines Norte. Why is he not a hero of national stature, the likes of Jose Maria Panganiban who also hailed from Camarines Norte, or Gregorio del Pilar who died very young in the Philippine-American War? Did Bintaos die young or die early in battle? I do not have the answers. What I do know, heroes die for the country.

Today, I confess an emptiness in my heart, widened as I learned more about the heroic life of Bintaos. Why emptiness? Perhaps because his story has not come to a fair end, that Bintaos's life has become a mist in history.

I end this privilege speech on a sad note. I lament, as others do, that what is left of his mortal remains in his final resting place is beyond visit and homage, lost in a place undisclosed, in a grave unmarked. It is lost somewhere in the mountains alongside the Maharlika Highway in the town of Labo. But what truly saddens me, as again many do, is the disturbing thought of losing Bintaos into oblivion, that decades from now, Bintaos's bravery and love for country will fade from our hearts and minds.

So, what is to be done? Much, so much. I will give my share to keep Bintaos's memories alive. I ask for yours, too. Together, let us emulate and keep in posterity what Bintaos stood for— love for country.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that tomorrow I will file a Bill declaring September 28 every year as Special Non-Working Public Holiday in the whole province of Camarines Norte to commemorate his birth anniversary every year, so that a grateful tribute will be heaped on his memory as those who take pride in

having known him and shared his battles, and to remind our people of his gallantry and firm defiance to reach for his dream of a Philippines free from tyranny and oppression.

Bintaos is my hero. He is your hero, too.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, my dear colleagues. *(Applause)*

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that we refer the speech of Rep. Marisol C. Panotes to the Committee on Rules.

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

The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker I now move that the Gentleman from the Lone District of Baguio City, the honorable Rep. Mark O. Go, be recognized to avail of the Privilege Hour.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

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

Rep. Mark Go of the Lone District of Baguio City is hereby recognized.

#### PRIVILEGE SPEECH OF REP. GO (M.)

REP. GO (M.). Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleagues, Ladies and Gentlemen.

Today, I rise to speak on a pressing concern which arises from this humble Representation's study which, I believe, is shared by many of our colleagues here present. I am referring to the existing relationship between labor and management, its seemingly adversarial and conflicting relationship.

In a paper written by Gigette S. Imperial, former Executive Director of the Institute for Labor Studies or ILS of the Department of Labor, entitled: "Understanding Philippine Labor Policies", and in it the latter said, and I quote: "There have been initiatives to amend the Labor Code since early 1990s to make it more responsive to the demands of the times. But not much has been accomplished after four Congresses."

I am afraid, echoing the same observation, that only a drop from the ocean has changed the landscape of employment. The ideal, as envisioned in the Constitution, in the Labor Code, and in some pieces

of social legislation, has yet to see its full counterpart in reality. When work is considered to be the “best prize that life has to offer,” I must think nothing is worth more preserving than the source of it, the capitalist employer. And nothing is worth more protecting than the force behind every business profit, the industrious worker. Striking this balance, the so-called Aristotelian “median” or the “middle way” has been a movement within a legislative framework, especially in the Philippine context, of creating a cooperative relationship between an employer and an employee.

How do we speak, however, of this relationship? Is it more like an onerous contract in its strictest legal sense or a mutual partnership in its most personal connotation? Has every employer talked to his or her employee or has it always been a “blind engagement” or a “distant affair,” made to work or to survive by the creative fiction of law?

A cursory review of the past is suggestive and telling of how the relationship between an employer and an employee has evolved from a simple consensual partnership into a mechanical and legalistic arrangement. History has created a certain image of the employer-employee relationship. Through the years, these two parties have been at adverse sides as the interest of one could never be the same with that of the other.

This view is resultant from the beginnings of modern industrial society, which can be directly related to the rise of the Industrial Revolution that occurred in the late 1700s to the early 1800s in Britain. Before machines and technology became a big part of the booming economy, businesses and trades were rather small and more intimate, with manufacturing often done in people’s homes. This setup made the relations between the employer and the employee simpler and cooperation easier.

Upon the boom of businesses during the Industrial Revolution, the conflicts between the two parties became more apparent. The interests of the employers and the employees became divorced and distant. Grim workplaces, low wages, and long working hours were tolerated and stomached by workers. Profit was but the sole motivation of the employers, at the expense of the labor force. The vulnerable workers obviously grunted, murmured and groaned.

Akin to the foregoing, no less than the Supreme Court has made this stamping preference over the plight of workers in the Philippines in its decision in *Ditan vs. POEA* in December of 1990, wherein the mandate of the law is that all doubts in the interpretation and implementation of the provisions of the Labor Code and its Implementing Rules and Regulations should be resolved in favor of labor. It stated:

Under the policy of social justice, the law bends over backward to accommodate the interests of the working class on the humane justification that those with less privileges in life should have more privileges in law.

On the other hand, in the case of *Philippine Telegraph and Telephone Company vs. NLRC*, the court said:

Thus, when conflicting interests of labor and capital are to be weighed on the scales of social justice, the heavier influence of the latter should be counterbalanced by the sympathy and compassion the law must accord the underprivileged worker.

Without hesitation, these pronouncements are salutary at most, reflective of our State policy to protect labor. I could not dispense, however, the observation that although the obligatory character of protecting labor takes preference, the well-meaning employer will take it as an unfavorable axiom that in a labor dispute, he is always regarded as the “mighty one with vast powers,” and thus, he has nothing to lose. Interestingly, on the other side, the prejudiced worker, seeking justice and equity in a tribunal, finds himself at the end of the tunnel wondering, “Is this the only light they can let me see?”

Mr. Speaker, my dear colleagues, friends, our existing legal framework within which the relationship between the employer and the employee is made to work is not enough to sustain the ideal enjoyment of fruits of capital and labor. Our labor laws are, in fact, written like “I am the employer, and I have an interest to protect” and “I am an employee, and you must respect my right, too.” The space in between is widely technical. Philosophically, this has become an issue—is the letter of the law constrictive or does it liberate the spirit of labor relationship?

Former Director Gigette Imperial noted, and I quote:

Some sectors describe the Philippine labor market as rigid or inflexible. When asked what exactly they mean, I get the impression that they view labor policies as very protective of workers, and labor management relations are so dictated by rules to the point of being legalistic.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to my point, and may I invite all of you to consider the possibility of initiating a paradigm shift of looking anew at the relationship between an employer and an employee. How about writing into a contract of employment the element

of partnership, which is not to be written as a law, but will come as a government's impetus to support the capitalist employers and the industrious workers?

Admittedly, the tension that is created in adversarial labor laws, in which our case is more or less the same with that of the United States of America, must find an alternative relief in some labor relations model which has been proven to work. Three decades ago, Marcia Cavens of the United States wrote, and I quote:

Many American business companies tried to copy the harmonious-labor-management-relations model of the Japanese. The Americans saw it as a viable example of how to excel in the international market. Some did oppose the application of these cooperative labor practices in the United States, claiming that cultural differences are insurmountable. Japanese-style labor relations, however, have been implemented in the United States, either by conscious imitation, or through similar, domestically developed systems termed quality of work life and participative management programs. Eventually, the Americans began to value "labor-management cooperation" as a way to "improve morale, solve problems in production, or deal with employee grievances."

Unlike the Japanese, the United States American employees and employers depend on their legal rights to protect their respective positions and to resolve disputes. From a Japanese perspective, this focus on individual legal entitlements as enforced by adjudication erodes group harmony because it makes the individual's welfare more important than that of the group. It determines winners and losers rather than encouraging compromises.

Concurrently with the Americans, our labor perspective is a deep-seated Western influence. The elaborate emphasis on individual rights, for instance, is protected in numerous clauses of a labor agreement implies our expectant attitude for an inevitable conflict, and its resolution in a legal battle. Whatever the outcome, it is usually the end of the story, and the labor bond between employers and employees is irrevocably strained.

Again, it is my belief, backed up with personal experience, that there is a middle ground through which labor relations shall be satisfactorily demonstrated. The Japanese cooperative labor-management

relationship for me is the middle ground between extremisms of employers' dominance and workers' activism.

I was a human resource practitioner for 21 years. I worked for a semi-conductor company and one of the things that we strongly pushed was the creation of an environment that is conducive to working where our employees at the same time were treated as part of the company, and where organizational success was considered to be employees' success. We worked as a team and made things happen.

I believe that employees, whatever maybe the nature of their work and levels in the company, should be treated as partners of success with their employers. They must be nurtured with just treatment and fair recognition, together with the provision of training opportunities for self-development and increased competencies.

Labor relations, then, must be faithfully relational. Workers must be taken as people, and not just simply tools of production. Like the Japanese, we may well begin to consider our culture as a stepping stone of refining and redefining our understanding of labor relations. Our value on family is one, and thus, truly, relationships must be based on trust and other emotional ties.

What is interesting to note in the Japanese-style of maintaining quality of labor relations is its deep respect for the philosophy that "wisdom and character are gained through the passage of time." Relatively, this guarantees lifetime employment for employees.

Mr. Speaker, my dear colleagues, friends, our view then of the relations between the labor sector and the management side should shift from one that is adversarial towards one that is moving towards a healthy cooperation. This policy on cooperative or collaborative labor relations should be pursued as an urgent advocacy.

As the primary policy-making body of the government in the field of labor and employment, the Department of Labor and Employment has the capability to carry out this innovation. I must stress, however, that this cannot be done without the assumption of an unequivocal attitude to move out from the technical and legalistic tone of a labor contract.

Look, as to date, there have been approximately 40,000 labor cases that are yet to be resolved. On this note, notwithstanding the provisions of the Labor Code, we must be ready to embrace employment governed by the separation of laws on the books from law in reality. It means that there is a representation of friendship and trust between the employer and the employee, rather than an emphasis on clause after clause of specific performance obligations.

Director Imperial again said:

The problem with the labor portfolio is that a decision would rarely make both clients happy. Even decisions arrived at through tripartite mechanisms or social dialogue are often questioned by either party as favoring the other one. Worse, a policy that would favor employed workers is also criticized by being biased against unemployed workers. It is a damned-if-you-do-and-damned-if-you-don't situation. Indeed, this makes labor policy-making and administration more interesting and challenging.

If our government envisions that every Filipino must have gainful employment, then it should lobby, for example, to enthrone management to encourage workers to contribute their ideas for improving company operations, a policy which appears to accomplish two things: one, increased participation motivates workers to take initiative and do the best job possible because they have a fuller personal investment in the company's success; and two, both efficiency and the product quality improve through suggestions made by all levels of employees. From this creative collaboration, management and labor will have no reason not to perfect a profit sharing agreement.

Cooperation among labor, management and government, as the three main stakeholders of gainful employment, will go a long way in the road towards national development as positive outcomes of such practice will have an impact on our economy. We deem it proper to start the shift. According to Gidgette Imperial, there are three major issues regarding Philippine labor policies: one, they are based on the standards of highly developed markets which is not congruent with the country's level of development; two, labor policies are highly regulatory and protective of workers' rights which is not suitable for a country with a huge labor surplus; and three, labor policies tend to be pro-employed rather than employment-oriented, therefore aggravating the unemployment problem.

Mr. Speaker, lest I get misinterpreted, this is not about taking vested rights and benefits away from labor. On the contrary, this will foster better working conditions and a more peaceful environment for workers. An adversarial system such as the one we have today is the one that encourages the proverbial killing of the hen that lays the golden eggs. How do we all benefit from the hen and her golden eggs? First, while social justice has been often defined as giving those who have less in life and more in law, it does not mean to say that we do so at the expense of capital. Let us not forget Section 2, Article XIII of the Constitution which says that "The promotion of social justice shall include the

commitment to create economic opportunities based on freedom of initiative and self-reliance." Social justice does not mean stealing from the rich and giving to the poor. If we continue interpreting social justice as an entitlement for those who have less in life, we are badly fostering a culture of dependence.

Second, there is no doubt in my mind that the plight of workers should be addressed and rightly so, the Labor Code secured the rights of employees and shifted the burden of disproving labor abuses to the employer. All the employee needs to do is to file a complaint; he need not furnish any evidence to support his claim. This is anchored on the premise that the employer has in his own possession and disposal, vital documents necessary for the case and the complainant will not have access to these while relations are strained. Let me, however, point out that the bias to labor afforded by the present Labor Code should only apply if there is an equipoise. To think otherwise would cause discrimination to industry and this will discourage any employer to do business. The interpretation in favor of labor should happen only if there is doubt or if the employer and the employee are on the same legal footing. It should never be interpreted to mean that employers are presumed wrong.

Third, injustice in the workplace should not be defined as "inequality of wealth between the employer and the employee." Injustice happens when there is a wrongdoing or when rights are trampled. To punish employers or presume that they are against giving employees their due, simply because they have the capital, will wreak havoc on investments. Employers and employees should be treated as partners, sailing in the same boat going towards the same destination.

Fourth, the State recognizes the right of labor and that is why it is interested in looking after their welfare. In fact, labor contracts are not mere personal pacts between the employer and the employee. These contracts allow for a wide interventionist role on the part of the government to see to it that it is fair.

Let us recall however that Article XIII, Section 3 of the Constitution says:

The State shall regulate the relations between workers and employers, recognizing the right of labor to its just share in the fruits of production and the right of enterprises to reasonable returns to investments, and to expansion and growth.

Clearly, this is not just labor who should be afforded rights but also enterprises.

Finally, it is not only employers who have responsibilities toward their employees, but both parties in a labor contract have duties and responsibilities. The

Constitution recognizes this on Article XIII, Section 3. It states:

The State shall promote the principle of shared responsibility between workers and employers, and the preferential use of voluntary mode in settling disputes, including conciliation, and shall enforce their mutual compliance therein to foster industrial peace.

The employer can also find himself at the mercy of the employee. The truth is, the success of the capital venture rests heavily on the employees.

Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of Congress, these are the fundamental changes in the approach we are proposing. I therefore submit these concerns to the appropriate committees, particularly the Committees on Labor, and Trade and Industry because I consider them to be dormant, and thus need to be reactivated. In the exercise of our oversight function, we may look into and review the mandate and organizational structure of the Department of Labor and Employment, and also of our Labor Code which was enacted in 1974. I believe that with this reference to the foregoing committees, the eventual shedding of light on the matter shall go on as a matter of course and shall sprout as an organic development of an honest and deliberative pursuit of what needs to be changed in the labor landscape of the Philippines.

Thank you very much at magandang gabi po sa inyong lahat.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, since no Member wishes to interpellate or speak against the measure, I move that we refer the speech of the Hon. Mark O. Go to the Committee on Rules for appropriate action.

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

The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, I now move that we recognize the Gentleman from the Party-List MAGDALO, Rep. Gary C. Alejano to avail of the Privilege Hour.

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

The Hon. Gary Alejano from the MAGDALO Party-List is hereby recognized.

## PRIVILEGE SPEECH OF REP. ALEJANO

REP. ALEJANO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My esteemed colleagues and our countrymen, a pleasant day to everyone.

I rise in connection with the issues affecting the West Philippine Sea.

Just last Saturday, two Vietnamese nationals were killed and five others were arrested in an encounter with the Philippine Navy in the West Philippine Sea. According to initial reports, the Vietnamese fishermen, who were seen illegally fishing in the waters of Bolinao, Pangasinan, tried to evade arrest, which led to a chase. This gave us a picture of the dangers and tension in the West Philippine Sea due to overlapping territorial claims and competition over resources.

Incidents such as the encounter between Vietnamese fishermen and the Philippine forces happened because there is no clear direction in handling situations surrounding the West Philippine Sea issue. This underscores the importance and urgency of having a comprehensive strategy in the West Philippine Sea, a strategy that would provide guidance to all stakeholders on the issue. Unfortunately, what we are seeing so far under the Duterte administration is a strategy of silence, inaction and subservience.

Have we also shifted from being allied to Vietnam, especially on the issue of the Spratly's Islands or a multi-lateral approach to being allied with China against Vietnam?

Four months ago, I reported in this Chamber the harassment of Chinese Navy forces against our fishermen in the Union Bank, an atoll located in the center of Spratly's Islands. More recently, I also shared before this Body the incursions of Chinese flotilla in Sandy Cay near Pag-asa Island, an area controlled by the Philippine government in the West Philippine Sea. We did not hear any of these incidents being reported by concerned government agencies considering the seriousness and public interest on the matter. It is only when these incidents had already gone public that we heard their statements, unfortunately, only to downplay them.

Just recently, the DFA Secretary, no less, said that the presence of Chinese military and fishing vessels near Pag-asa Island does not mean anything. However, this Representation strongly believes otherwise. First, the number of Chinese military and fishing vessels spotted in the area is highly unusual and concerning. Second, the Chinese vessels were in close proximity to Pag-asa Island, allowing them easy access to survey structures and the movement of our troops there. Third, the Chinese vessels conducted aerial reconnaissance and even prevented the ship of the Bureau of Fisheries and

Aquatic Resources from going near our sand bars in Pag-asa Island. Is this not intimidation and aggression by Chinese forces?

Now, can we tell our fishermen that the presence of a Chinese flotilla does not mean anything? Can we tell that to our fishermen who, by mere sight of gigantic Chinese vessels, scamper in fear? I do not think that it is what our fishermen and the Filipino people in Pag-asa Island are hoping to hear from our government.

There have been harassment incidents against our fishermen, yet we hear nothing. Some of them are being prevented to fish in the waters of the West Philippine Sea freely, yet we hear nothing. Filipino fishermen, mga kababayan po natin sila, are the ones taking the brunt of Chinese intimidation and aggression in the area, yet we hear nothing. What we have here is a deliberate concealment of the real situation in the West Philippine Sea. The Duterte administration is either giving us silence or merely downplaying the situation. This in spite of the many pronouncements of the administration that our fishermen can already go back and fish in the West Philippine Sea.

Despite the continued incidence of Filipino fishermen being harassed by the Chinese Coast Guard and Navy, no action has been done by our government to address them. The most recent instance was the Union Bank incident when Chinese Navy fired shots into the air and intimidated Filipino fishermen. The incident is an affront to the rights of Filipino fishermen in that area given that the Union Bank is well within the Exclusive Economic Zone of the Philippines. Despite obvious aggression by Chinese forces, the Philippine government has yet to file any form of diplomatic protest. *Kung mayroon man po, wala tayong naririnig.*

Last year, there was also a series of incidents where our fishermen were prevented by Chinese Coast Guard vessels from entering the lagoon in the Scarborough Shoal or the Panatag Shoal. This happened for a number of months soon after the arbitral ruling was issued saying that both Filipino and Chinese fishermen have fishing rights over the area. However, the President chose to set aside the arbitral ruling resulting in greater disadvantage for our fishermen.

Scarborough Shoal remains in the same situation at present. The mouth of the lagoon is guarded by a Chinese Coast Guard vessel. *Wala pong makakapasok doon na mangingisdang Filipino.* Access to the lagoon is of huge importance because it provides refuge to our fishermen during harsh conditions at sea. However, the Philippine government chooses not to file any diplomatic protest to raise the alarming actions of Chinese forces once more. *Ang lagoon inside the Panatag Shoal ay napakaimportante dahil ito ay around 124 nautical miles from Zambales, at kung masama po ang panahon, wala po silang sisilungan kung hindi*

*babalik sa mainland. Dahil ang ating mangingisda ay hindi naman po mayayaman, ang kanilang resources na inipon sa panggasolina, sa pagkain nila, at sa pambayad sa mga sumasama sa kanila ay masasayang lamang kung basta-basta silang babalik sa mainland at hindi makakasilong sa loob ng lagoon.*

From its very name, a diplomatic protest is a non-provocative and non-aggressive manner to convey concerning matters to another sovereign nation. At the very least, a note verbale would have sufficed. Instead, this administration is giving us intangible assurances to just trust them as they try to veer away public attention from the West Philippine Sea.

It appears that what China wants, the Philippines does. Take for instance the decision of President Duterte to declare Scarborough Shoal as a marine sanctuary turning it to a “no-fishing zone.” At first glance, it seems to be an appropriate action, but here is the catch: President Duterte could forbid our own fishermen from fishing in the Scarborough Shoal. However, could he ask the fishermen from China and other countries to do the same and compel them to respect the unilateral decision to make Scarborough Shoal a marine sanctuary? The decision of the President effectively supports and even strengthens the Chinese Coast Guard’s blockade in Scarborough Shoal. This is in fact an act of subservience being packaged to the public as marine environmental protection. This is an act to favor China’s intentions in the area.

Another case is the rehabilitation of Pag-asa Island, ang ating pinakamalaking isla sa Spratlys Group of Islands. The Duterte administration has announced its plan to start immediately the rehabilitation of the said island, particularly the improvement of the airstrip and other facilities there. *Sa ngayon po, kinain na ng dagat and ating airstrip doon at nanganganib na hindi malapagan ng ating mga eroplano.* For 2017, there is an estimated amount of P1.9 billion allotted for the rehabilitation of Pag-asa Island. Nine months have passed and only three months are left before 2017 ends, but the projects have not even started. What is the reason behind the delay in the rehabilitation efforts? Is the Philippine government being prevented by China? Is the government deliberately delaying the rehabilitation to appease China, *habang ang mga barracks at facilities sa ating mga isla ay naaagnas na?*

There have been speculations that the recent presence of Chinese flotilla and the flight over the islands of Pag-asa that they have conducted are to discourage the planned construction in Pag-asa Island. That is not a remote possibility especially after Chinese forces have tried to challenge even our top brass defense and military officials from entering Pag-asa Island.

Even more alarming, Mr. Speaker, is the information which I received that our Armed Forces were advised not to conduct aerial reconnaissance over the Scarborough

Shoal or the Panatag Shoal. Huwag na po tayong mag-conduct ng overflight sa ating sariling area. However, since this would be tantamount to dereliction of duty, the compromise was to limit aerial reconnaissance to once a month. This is a clear indication that China is preventing us from asserting our presence in the West Philippine Sea. Moreover, this is an affront to the mandate of our Armed Forces from performing their duty which is to protect the integrity of our territory.

We could wait further on how the rehabilitation plan would map out in the succeeding months. However, given the recent developments or the lack thereof on the rehabilitation of Pag-asa Island, it seems that the Philippines is once again being subservient to the dictates of China.

Instead of strategy of silence, inaction and subservience, what this Representation demands is a clear and comprehensive strategy on the West Philippine Sea. Ang strategy ang magbibigay ng liwanag kung ano ang direksyon ng ating bansa lalung-lalo na sa ating stakeholders diyan sa area na iyan simula sa ating Philippine Navy, Philippine Coast Guard, PNP Maritime, local government officials, our lawmakers, at lalung-lalo na sa ating mga mangingisda. Ito po ang magbibigay ng direksyon sa kanila. Kung wala po ito, lahat po ay confused as to what they are going to do there.

Government officials would say that matters are being discussed in the bilateral consultation mechanism that the Philippines and China are adopting. The question is, do the closed-door meetings or talks at the higher level reach the stakeholders on the ground facing the daily situation? They would also usually say that there are confidential matters that should not be compromised and released to the public. Mr. Speaker, we are not demanding for details. What we want is for us to be provided something first for public consumption. All these considerations and challenges could be addressed if we have a comprehensive strategy in the West Philippine Sea.

We are going to deal with the West Philippine Sea issue for many years from now given the number of parties involved and the high stakes in it. The West Philippine Sea is a long-term issue that requires a clear and sustainable strategy.

No one is asking for a war. We do not want war with China for that matter. We do not want war with anybody else. Thus, I do not understand why the President keeps on bringing up the issue of going to war when all we want is to ensure that our national interests are given utmost consideration. I tell you, my colleagues, even China right now does not want to go to war with anybody else. The point here is that we should make use of non-military and non-aggressive means to protect our fellow countrymen and to assert our rights according to international laws.

The recent budget deliberations have revealed further that asserting our claims in the West Philippine Sea is not a priority of this administration. The budget for 2018 does not include the rehabilitation of islands; the procurement of surveillance equipment for maritime domain awareness; support for our fishermen, fishermen who are going to the West Philippine Sea; higher budget for our Philippine Coast Guard; and increased defense spending for our Armed Forces.

Congress is given the opportunity, through the national budget, to set the direction and programs of the government. Let us make use of this opportunity to protect our national interests. Amid the territorial dispute, this Representation sees the importance of having a budget earmarked for the protection of our territories in the West Philippine Sea, as well as in the Philippine Rise.

The call for a budget allocation for the West Philippine Sea and the Philippine Rise is not only in response to the on-going territorial dispute. There is actually a long-term benefit in improving our presence and protecting our territories there, as both have immense economic potentials as well. It is stated that the wealth or the potential wealth available in those areas is equal to seven times of the wealth we have on land.

I would like to share what our Secretary of National Defense said when asked on the rapid development of Chinese-occupied Subi Reef. And I quote, "A grudging admiration for the Chinese for their resolve and single-mindedness to bolster their claims, I wish we had the same," end of quote.

This Representation wishes the same. The only difference with that of the Chinese is that, I wish to assert our claims, our national interest through peaceful and non-aggressive, non-military means while respecting international laws.

With that, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, maraming salamat at magandang hapon po sa inyong lahat.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, there being no Member who wishes to interpellate or speak against the measure, I move that we refer the speech of the Hon. Gary Alejano to the Committee on Rules for its appropriate action.

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

The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, I now move that the Gentleman from the Party-List SAGIP, Rep. Rodante

D. Marcoleta, be recognized to avail of the Privilege Hour.

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

The Hon. Rodante D. Marcoleta from SAGIP Party-List is hereby recognized.

#### PRIVILEGE SPEECH OF REP. MARCOLETA

REP. MARCOLETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to confront one of the fast-emerging ironies of our time. Either we address it promptly with firm resolve, or we end up becoming victims of our own collective act.

During the floor deliberations on the budget of the Commission on Human Rights, this Representation, out of disbelief and frustration, moved for a thousand peso budget for the CHR. The facts that triggered it are on record.

During the interpellation, this Representation asked whether the CHR, on its own, ever conducted an investigation of possible human rights violations committed by the murderers of the SAF 44 which, by far, is the most revolting, the most virulent, and the most despicable human face of brutality that blackened the image of our country in recent memory. The CHR replied without any tinge of remorse that the massacre is not within its jurisdiction. It was also asked, Mr. Speaker, whether the CHR, on its own, ever conducted an investigation on the extent of human rights violations that may have been committed against the civilian population of Marawi City in the aftermath of the Maute rebellion. The CHR replied without any tinge of remorse that the crisis in Marawi is not within its jurisdiction. It was also asked, Mr. Speaker, whether the CHR, on its own, ever conducted an investigation on possible human rights violations on the families and victims of the Abu Sayyaf banditry that has already become an industry, to the complete ridicule and mockery of our law enforcement. The CHR replied without any tinge of remorse that these do not fall within the jurisdiction of the CHR.

Mr. Speaker, is the CHR correct in saying that it has no jurisdiction to investigate possible human rights violations in areas where there is armed conflict or when private parties are involved? Is it true that the CHR was created merely to look into the abuses of State actors or State agents such as the soldiers and the policemen? Does the CHR honestly believe that private parties, especially the enemies of the State, are not capable of committing human rights abuses?

To answer these questions, may I draw your attention to slide no. 1. Slide no. 1, please. (Slide presentation)

May I read this slide, Mr. Speaker:

Article XIII, Section 18, paragraph 1 of the 1987 Constitution states:

“The Commission on Human Rights shall have the following powers and functions: (1) Investigate, on its own or on complaint by any party, all forms of human rights violations involving civil and political rights;”

Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker—“all forms of human rights violations involving civil and political rights.”

When the Constitution stated “all forms of human rights violations,” did the Constitution limit the CHR’s power of investigation only to the abuses of the police and the military or other State actors? Did this clear and plain provision of the Constitution exclude the private armed groups or private parties from the investigative function of the CHR? Does this provision grant the CHR the right to choose whom to investigate? Does this provision grant the CHR the right to narrow the scope of its functions? I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that a Grade VI pupil can correctly answer these questions in the negative.

Mr. Speaker, there is a basic principle or maxim in statutory construction that even law students are familiar with: “When the language of the law is clear and explicit, there is no room for interpretation, there is only room for application.” Human rights are frequently mentioned but rarely understood. What are human rights, Mr. Speaker? In the case of *Simon, et al., versus Commission on Human Rights*, G.R. No. 100150, January 5, 1994, the Supreme Court had the occasion to take judicial notice of the broad definition of human rights as culled from the Unassembled Symposium on Human Rights in the Philippines sponsored by the University of the Philippines in 1977.

May I draw your attention to slide no. 2. I will read this slide, Mr. Speaker:

Human rights include civil rights such as right to life, liberty and property; freedom of speech of the press, of religion, academic freedom; political rights such as the right to elect public officials, to be elected to public office, to form political associations; and social rights such as the right to education, employment and social services.

The term “civil rights” has been defined to include the rights of property, marriage, equal protection of the laws, freedom of contract, or rights appertaining to person by virtue of his citizenship, or to rights capable of being enforced, or redressed in his civil action.

These, Mr. Speaker, are precisely the rights I had in mind when I asked the CHR if it has conducted an investigation on its own on the possible abuses of human rights in the wake of the Mamasapano incident, the Maute rebellion and the atrocities of the Abu Sayyaf bandits. At the very least, Mr. Speaker, I expected that the CHR went to the evacuation centers where the people of Marawi took temporary shelters and right there, it documented those whose homes were destroyed, those who were unable to go to schools, those whose livelihoods were shattered, those whose employment were severed, those who were unable to access social services and those whose right to dignity were either curtailed or denied. At the very least, Mr. Speaker, I was expecting the CHR to have replied that they visited the families of the fallen SAF 44 or the families terrorized by the Abu Sayyaf and documented the extent to which their human rights have been violated in whatever form.

Mr. Speaker, everybody heard the CHR's firm and unrepenting answer to this Representation. They condemned these barbaric atrocities, and that was all they did because the tragic events that I mentioned were allegedly outside their jurisdiction. Let us now uncover this deception of the Commission on Human Rights, an arrogance that it has managed to conceal for 30 years.

Let me draw your attention to slide no. 3, one of the CHR's infographics. Let me read, Mr. Speaker:

Kapag bahagi ng gobyerno ang nag-abuso ng tao, ito ay isang human rights violation. Puwede itong i-report sa CHR.

Kapag sibilyan o pribadong tao ang nang rape, pumatay at iba pa, ito ay krimen. Sa pulis ka dapat pumunta.

This is a classic example of a false dilemma fallacy in the study of logic. Please note that the two options in slide no. 3 are entirely different but are being connected by a fallacy. In the first premise, which is all about human rights violations, the private parties, who just the same are capable of committing human rights violations, were removed by falsely connecting them directly to the second premise. The second premise is not about human rights. It is all about common crimes that can be committed by anyone, whether State actors or private parties, and whose acts should all be reported to the police.

Bakit halatang itinago ang bahagi ng pribadong tao na nakagagawa rin ng pang-aabuso sa karapatang pantao? Bakit nagpalusot sa pangalawang saknong at mga krimen naman ang ginawang sangkalan o pantakip? The truth is, Mr. Speaker, this is not a mere fallacy. Through these infographics, the CHR desecrated our fundamental law by surreptitiously amending the Constitution and got away with it.

Many netizens have fallen prey to this deception. For many days, this Representation was crucified in the social media in their mistaken belief that the thousand peso budget was meant to abolish the CHR. Even the mainstream media, like one Vergel Santos of Rappler who chose to salivate than ratiocinate, rode the bandwagon that further muddled the issue and, in the process, only exposed their ignorance. But it is another story, Mr. Speaker, when public figures themselves known for their intellectual capacity and competence to discuss important public issues, are the ones blinded by this simple and unsophisticated contraption.

Let me give notable examples, Mr. Speaker.

In between breaks during the taping in "Bawal ang Pasaway", Mrs. Winnie Monsod mentioned about the intent of the framers of the Constitution—her husband being one of them—in insisting on the CHR's alleged mandate of investigating the abuses of the soldiers and policemen and other State actors, to the exclusion of private groups or individuals. Mr. Randy David, in his September 17, 2017 column in the Philippine Daily Inquirer, blabbered that the clause "all forms of human rights violations" as written in the Constitution was confined only to the massive human rights violations of the police and the military, believing that such was borne out of the deliberations of the Constitutional Commission. Are the two esteemed professors of the University of the Philippines correct, Mr. Speaker?

May I invite your attention to slides no. 4, 5 and 6, which texts form part of the records of the deliberations of the Constitutional Commission of 1986, and I read:

MR. MAAMBONG. This may not be true throughout the country, but I am much distressed because this has not happened before in Cebu. Will this be considered part of the job of the Commission, for example, to investigate this wholesale killing of police officers and military personnel going on not only in Cebu but all over the country?

MR. SARMIENTO. Committed by whom? Do we have the suspects?

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Sarmiento here is the older brother of our colleague, the Hon. Cesar Sarmiento. To continue:

MR. MAAMBONG. That is the queer thing about it. I looked over the statistics and found out that since 1984, those killed, whether police officers, military officers, columnists or newspapermen, were shot in the head. Nobody has been arrested or charged in court; nobody has ever been convicted because these are crimes which

are supposed to be committed by people whom we do not know anything about. They attribute it to the Sparrow Unit of the New People's Army but even this is not clear. This is happening not only in the province of Cebu but in other provinces. This is what I mean by wholesale killing of military personnel and police officers. And so, I ask if these should be investigated by the Commission on Human Rights.

MR. SARMIENTO. I agree with Commissioner Maambong.

MR. MAAMBONG. Thank you.

Slide no. 5:

BISHOP BACANI. That is why, before, I thought that they were all members of the committee. My point was to ask the committee even before any voting takes place to show how many of them agree with the opinion of Commissioner Garcia, so we would know really the sense of the committee. But it is now very clear that the committee's sense is really the same as it was yesterday, and Commissioner Garcia, therefore, even though he is a member of the sponsoring panel, is not in accord with the committee.

MR. FOZ. Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT. Commissioner Foz is recognized.

MR. FOZ. It is the sense of the committee that when we use the term "private parties", we really want to make it clear that aside from those mentioned in the enumeration, all other parties may be offenders or violators of human rights and, of course, it is so general that it covers even the amendment of Commissioner Ople when it says, "THOSE WHO MAY BE ENGAGE IN ACTS OF REBELLION OR INSURRECTION AGAINST THE STATE".

MR. OPLE. Thank you very much.

MR. FOZ. And this was precisely raised by Commissioner Nieva yesterday during the interpellations and it was very clear.

MR. OPLE. With that categorical reiteration of the definite intent of the committee, I now would like to accept the amendment to my amendment by Commissioner De Castro.

May I repeat that, Mr. Speaker—"MR. OPLE. With that categorical reiteration of the definite intent of the committee, I now would like to accept the amendment to my amendment by Commissioner De Castro."

They voted, Mr. Speaker—34 votes in favor; none against; one abstention.

Slide no. 6:

MR. MONSOD: With all due respect to the opinion of Commissioner Garcia, who is not a member of the committee, the position of this committee is what is stated in the report – that it would include offenses by government and military officials as well as private parties. Our acceptance of the proposal of Commissioner De Castro is merely to give flexibility to Congress and the Commission to determine the priorities of their work; but in terms of the scope, the committee report is very clear.

REP. MARCOLETA. I believe, Mr. Speaker, what these slides showed today completely debunked the myth that the CHR was intended only to go over the abuses of the agents of the State. *Res ipsa loquitur*.

Apart from the two UP professors I mentioned earlier, my adviser in my doctoral dissertation at UP National College of Public Administration and Governance emailed me a few days ago to inform me that he now finds it difficult to work with me in my dissertation "Given the Wrong Fit of Where We Stand on Certain Issues." In the statement he helped write for the NCPAG community, it said in part, which I quote:

Have we lost our sense of history? It is disappointing to witness our lawmakers, who have been elected under this right-based Constitution, to use the power of the majority weaken the institution that is constitutionally mandated to uphold the rights of all citizens, particularly the weak, and the desperate.

What an irony, Mr. Speaker. This institution never advocated the abolition of the CHR. We just wanted it to remain loyal to the command of the Constitution.

May I ask, Mr. Speaker, did my adviser violate my human right to pursue higher academic learning under the aegis of academic freedom? Will Chairman Gascon, on his own, investigate the UP-NCPAG in Diliman?

Noong nakaraang linggo, lumuhod po ang mga tala. Nakipagkita po sa ating Speaker ang mga pinuno ng tatlong ahensiya na binigyan natin ng budget na tig-isang libong piso bawat isa. Nakiusap silang tatlo sa ating Majority Leader at Chairman ng Appropriations Committee upang maging tulay sa ating Speaker. Kagaya po ng nauulat na sa mga pahayagan, naging

makabuluhan ang pag-uusap. Sumang-ayon ang mga pinuno ng mga ahensiyang ito sa layunin ng Kapulungang ito na paglingkuran ng tapat ang mga mamamayan. Sa panig naman po ng CHR, sumang-ayon po ito na talimahin ang kanyang tungkulin ng walang labis, walang kulang—walang pinipili o itinatangi. Ang kaganapang ito, Mr. Speaker, ay maituturing na isang ganap na tagumpay ng ating mga mamamayan. Isang libong piso lang pala ang susi upang magbalik-loob ang CHR sa ating Saligang Batas.

Before I end, I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the formality of restoring the budget of the CHR, we should ask them to dismantle the deceptive infographics that have misled our people for so long a time. Considering that this act of arrogance summarily violated the rights of our people, I equally hope that Mr. Gascon also finds the humility in his heart to apologize to our people.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and distinguished colleagues. (*Applause*)

REP. DEL MAR. Mr. Speaker. .

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). Thank you, Representative Marcoleta for your very emotional speech.

REP. DEL MAR. Will the Gentleman, the Honorable Marcoleta, yield to some questions?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. The speaker wishes to retire to his seat.

Mr. Speaker, I move to recognize the Gentleman from Cebu, Rep. Raul V. Del Mar, for his interpellation.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The Honorable Del Mar is recognized.

REP. DEL MAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to know if the Gentleman, the Honorable Marcoleta, would yield to some questions and reservations.

REP. MARCOLETA. It is my honor, Mr. Speaker.

REP. DEL MAR. Before asking any question, we are not exchanging microphones here with Congressman

Marcoleta. I sat there to interpellate him who was on my left side. Now, he goes to the right side where I was, which I was using, so, that is why you see me here as if I am the one who delivered the privilege speech and not the Honorable Marcoleta.

Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman's interpellation, I think, was very brief because as we started replying to his questions, it was first the Chairman to whom I deferred to answer the Gentleman's questions, and I was continuing with some of my own questions, or with my own replies, I mean, but the Gentleman made a motion to reduce the amount of the budget of the CHR to P1, 000. That is why several of our Members wanted to object to the motion, and so did I, of course, but because of constraints on time, as per the Rules Committee headed by the honorable Majority Leader Fariñas, only three of us were recognized. There were so many who were going to interpellate yet, but that was what was agreed upon to save time and so, we did that.

After that, the motion was put to a vote right away. There was even a misunderstanding in the counting of or in hearing of the *ayes* and *nays*, which was the mode of voting that was first used. When the Majority Leader asked for the *aye* votes and the *nay* votes—the vote for reducing the budget from P671 million to just P1,000—which is a ridiculous amount—it seemed to many of us that there were many more *ayes* than *nays*.

In other words, the motion would have been killed already, Mr. Speaker, if that was the vote that was called for the Rules Committee to decide on, but the Majority Leader, of course, stepped in and said that we should have another voting of *ayes* and *nays*. So that was done but still, there was no agreement on which side won. That is why the Majority Leader rose up and asked that the voting be done by standing up. When we had the vote on the approval of the motion to reduce the amount, I could see from where I was sitting that, originally, there were only a few Members who were standing up but after the Majority Leader began looking around, like magic—those who did not rise immediately, started to rise and so, that was what happened. We are not questioning the voting and we are, in fact, explaining how it went so that fact is fact, and it will be factual. So, that is how the vote went, 119 or so for the motion, and 32 only for those who were against the approval of the motion; and so, the motion won.

REP. MARCOLETA. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if I am being interpellated here. I thought ...

REP. DEL MAR. In the same way as we listened to the Gentleman's speech, Mr. Speaker, we also should be able to narrate what happened before we go to the main questions. Since the honorable Gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is so eager to say some more, let me first ask

the speaker if what he is insisting on, his position insofar as the work of the CHR is concerned, was to the effect that the CHR is not doing its job, that the CHR is not protecting the rights of the State forces whose rights were violated, but only the individuals whose rights were violated by the State forces. Is that the main proposition, Mr. Speaker?

REP. MARCOLETA. I asked several questions, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I drew the attention of the Sponsor to whether the first paragraph of Section 18, Article XIII of the Constitution is known to them, and they answered in the positive, in the affirmative. And because it is so simple—"Investigate, on its own or on complaint by any party, all forms of human rights violations involving civil and political rights"—so I asked the question, if they did investigate on their own possible violations of human rights in the Maute rebellion, in the Abu Sayyaf atrocities, and also the Mamasapano incident. I asked if there might have been possible violations of civil and political rights. So, the answer I got to all these three questions was "It is not in our territory; that is not our job." But it does not say so in the Constitution, and the Constitution is very clear, it is very simple. It does not demarcate, it does not limit, it does not give you the option to customize the service that you would like to give or to do. It simply says, "all forms of human rights," that is in paragraph (1); and in paragraph (3), "all persons."

So, wala pong sinisino, walang itinatangi, and because of that frustration, I was not even getting answers. What the Gentleman said, and I can still recall, was that the CHR condemns these atrocities in the strongest terms. I recall also that I said yes, everybody can condemn it but that does not fulfill your mandate in the Constitution. I think this is all recorded, Mr. Speaker.

REP. DEL MAR. Mr. Speaker, I was the one answering the questions.

REP. MARCOLETA. Yes.

REP. DEL MAR. When the Gentleman asked if the CHR was protecting and condemning, and working and investigating the abuses of human rights, he asked me, "Is this for everyone whose human rights were violated?" I distinctly recall answering, "Yes." Then he asked me, "Who has political rights?" I said that everyone has political—has human rights. So, Mr. Speaker, does the Gentleman remember that?

REP. MARCOLETA. We can go by the records, Mr. Speaker.

REP. DEL MAR. Okay. That the Gentleman even ...

REP. MARCOLETA. What the Gentleman said was that it is not within their jurisdiction—the CHR, of course, as he was answering for and on behalf of the CHR. I can see Chairman Gascon was murmuring at the Gentleman's back, and the Gentleman was getting his answers. He was articulating them before the floor and so, I assumed that the Gentleman was only following his answers. I cannot blame the Gentleman, Mr. Speaker, because he was the one standing up and the Chairman was the one murmuring at his back.

REP. DEL MAR. Mr. Speaker ...

REP. MARCOLETA. I thought that those were not your answers but those were the answers fed to the Gentleman by the Chairman who was standing behind him. I could see both of them when I was ...

REP. DEL MAR. Yes, that is right. That was the case, and I told him, even of the official records of the two of us talking about it, I said that was the way I went through the replies, by deferring first to the principal involved whom the Gentleman was attacking, the Chairman himself. So that the Sponsor, the interpellator will not be misinterpreted, that is why we deferred to that procedure that I explained to the Gentleman, that they will give their answers first through me and then, I will follow it up with my own answers. But I could not do that since he already made his motion which cut the deliberations and had us go to voting on the motion that he made.

Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman will remember that I said "Yes, everyone has human rights." He said, "Even the President?" That is what the Gentleman asked me and I said, yes.

REP. MARCOLETA. Mr. Speaker, I cannot assume the arrangement that he had with the Chairman as he was at the Gentleman's back. The Gentleman was answering and the Chairman was whispering in his ears, and so, I assumed that they were united in formulating the answers to my questions.

REP. DEL MAR. Yes.

REP. MARCOLETA. The Gentleman said clearly that it is not within the jurisdiction of the CHR because they are only after the State actors and State agents. The infographics showed it well, Mr. Speaker, that this is the stand of the CHR, which stand is against the Constitution. I said that they even surreptitiously amended the Constitution and so, I think the CHR is liable. How on earth did they amend the Constitution? When the Constitution says "all forms of human rights violations," it does not limit. The Constitution did not grant ...

REP. DEL MAR. Okay, Mr. Speaker, I get him.

REP. MARCOLETA. ... the CHR any prerogative or any right to choose which is supposed to be investigated.

REP. DEL MAR. Yes, that is his position, Mr. Speaker, but as I told the Gentleman, had he not stopped the interpellation, then I was going to supplement the answers made by the Chairman which needed to be clarified for everyone's understanding. But that is okay or we will end up talking about ...

REP. MARCOLETA. If that is the Gentleman's explanation, Mr. Speaker, he should not have depended on him alone. He should have spoken his heart. He should have defended the budget the way he thought it should be defended, but what happened was, the Gentleman was entirely dependent on him, getting his answers from him. Now, the Gentleman is explaining that he was just articulating and was just serving as a mouthpiece for the CHR. Well, I cannot blame the Gentleman, Mr. Speaker, if that was the choice that he made but in explaining that, that is not the point now, Mr. Speaker. I already raised my point here. I was so frustrated and in utter disbelief that the CHR can turn its back against the very Constitution that created it. That is the whole point. The thousand peso budget cannot be measured by the value, Mr. Speaker. The strong message there should have been the point, but he did not realize the point. I was crucified by the netizens. I do not blame them. I blame all the people who have that capacity, the intellectual capacity to explain to our people, but they never did. Ano ba ang ginawa nila?

REP. DEL MAR. Yes, Mr. Speaker, as I already stated earlier, I was going to answer—to ask questions on the Gentleman's privilege speech. That was the method that the Sponsor adopted in the replies to the questions, that the answers of the principals, the Chairman of the CHR, had to be short, crisp answers because I was going to supplement them at that point already. As the Gentleman would probably remember, Mr. Speaker, I was already going to elaborate or supplement or clarify the issues that he brought up in his deliberation, in his questions.

So, let me proceed now, Mr. Speaker, to the gist of his privilege speech this evening. I commend the Gentleman for being ready with the PowerPoint presentation, but I do not know if my sight is very good, and same with everybody's sight, but we could not read the points the Gentleman presented in his slides because they were very minute and not readable, Mr. Speaker. So, I hope that he will understand that I could not follow his speech and the actual statements and graphics used in his PowerPoint presentation because

they could not be read. So, maybe next time, Mr. Speaker, when the Gentleman has a privilege speech, I would recommend, as a friend to the Gentleman, that if he wants his graphics and slides not only to be understood but to be read, then, maybe, Mr. Speaker, he should improve on that.

REP. MARCOLETA. Mr. Speaker, I will personally undertake to give clean copies of the slides for the benefit of my good friend, the Sponsor of the CHR.

REP. DEL MAR. Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I am interpellating now and sad to say, I cannot touch those points raised in his slides because they were unreadable. We cannot, and even if these will be shown again, I know that my colleagues will agree but let this pass, Mr. Speaker, because what is done is done. Let me just point out that the reply made by this Representation was that everyone has human rights, and that being the case, any individual whose human rights are being violated, as this is within the mandate of the CHR, this must be investigated because human rights must be promoted on the part of all and everybody.

So, let me just...

REP. MARCOLETA. But that was not the position ...

REP. DEL MAR. No, I do not think...

REP. MARCOLETA. ... taken by the Gentleman's principal, ...

REP. DEL MAR. .. but let me focus, Mr. Speaker...

REP. MARCOLETA. ... it was the other way around.

REP. DEL MAR. ... on the Gentleman's main complaint which was that the CHR should have investigated the human rights violations committed by the Maute rebels, the Abu Sayyaf and the rebel forces in Mamasapano. While it is true that violations of the human rights of any person, whether you are a rebel or an officer, a police or a soldier must be investigated, but in the course of these events, Mr. Speaker, there is actual shooting, there is an actual war.

So, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, when there is actual shooting to and from, everyone is shooting, each side is shooting at the other and so, what are you talking about? Do you want it investigated when it has already been adequately defended? By "adequately defended"—mean that the rights of each party have been defended by his force alone or the forces of his companions who are shooting at the rebels and the rebels in return are shooting at the police and military forces.

So, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, when a private person is being defended or assisted by the CHR, when that is committed by the police and the soldiers, we do not complain about that, we complain it to—it is the other way around when the rights of the police and military who are in a shooting war should be investigated by the CHR. How can you ask the CHR to come in with their investigation when that has been settled by forces on each side, when there is not only a violation of human rights but there is also a violation of life? Everyone is trying to kill each other. So, in that sense, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker, you do not expect the CHR, after the shooting, to investigate those who were killed or those who were harmed by the rebel forces and proceed against the rebel forces because the rebel forces are to be dealt with by the military and police forces who were engaged in that shooting war. So, I cannot comprehend, Your Honor, that while it is true that there is no question that with private individuals whose human rights are being violated when they are shot in cold blood, that should be investigated. We do not complain about that, Your Honor, but when it is the other way around, ...

REP. MARCOLETA. Mr. Speaker, ...

REP. DEL MAR. ... we have to speak ...

REP. MARCOLETA. Mr. Speaker, I did not say that the CHR will investigate during the shooting war. I did not even suggest that the CHR ...

REP. DEL MAR. ... so after war, Mr. Speaker.

REP. MARCOLETA. ... should investigate immediately after the shooting war. The CHR can make an investigation at their convenience.

REP. DEL MAR. I think ...

REP. MARCOLETA. I said in my privilege speech that I was expecting the CHR to, at least, visit some of the evacuation centers, and that it is the CHR's duty to enlist and request the assistance of every department. It is in the Constitution—for every office, every bureau to assist the CHR in the performance of its functions. They could have gotten to the evacuation centers. That is what I said.

Hindi ko naman po sinabing, “Hulihin mo iyong Maute,” o “Hulihin mo iyong mga Abu Sayyaf.” Hindi naman nila trabaho iyon, that is not the responsibility of the CHR. Iyon lamang po ang tingnan nila, kung may pinuntahan po ba iyong families? Tanungin nila baka naman po may mga human rights violations. Iyon po iyong tinatanong natin, otherwise, bakit po ninyo sinasabi na “shooting war.” Mayroon po ba kaming sinabing ganoon? Wala po kaming sinasabing ganoon

but, at least, mag-imbetiga kayo doon sa paraan na kaya at alam nila sapagkat ito po iyong tuntunin talaga nila. Hindi po namin sinabi kailanman na sila po ang manghuli. Hindi ho nila gawain iyon. Ito po iyong pinag-uusapan.

REP. DEL MAR. But it is ...

REP. MARCOLETA. The very issue, the only issue here, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, is the insistence of the CHR to make a dividing line that they should only investigate the State agents and State actors and the rest ay hindi na sila kasali. Hindi po ito ang nasa Constitution. That is why I am saying that they even surreptitiously amended the Constitution. They cannot do that. Maliwanag po iyon. Na-point out ko iyong provision na iyon. Ito lamang po iyong isyu at wala tayong ibang pinagtatalunan, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor.

REP. DEL MAR. Your Honor, Mr. Speaker, I really cannot see the practicality or the possibility of the CHR, after the shooting war in one of these three incidents, going to the rebel side and investigating them for the acts that they committed against our soldiers and police. Even if the other way around is true, Mr. Speaker, it is beyond investigation. So, what do you want? Is it not enough protection for our soldiers and police that they go together and they are fighting the rebels or the criminals together? You still want—and that is the best way to deal with this kind of incidents, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker—when the shooting war is finished, you go to the Maute group, you go to the Abu Sayyaf and investigate them. What are you trying to say here, Your Honor? There is no question that everyone has human rights but you have to be practical, factual and truthful in the exercise by the CHR of its investigative powers. You cannot expect them to—after a battle, let us say that there is war, after one episode, the Mamasapano incident, after that, they go to the rebels, to the Abu Sayyaf side and investigate them. So, that is where ...

REP. MARCOLETA. Mr. Speaker, I did not say anything ...

REP. DEL MAR. ... they cannot ...

REP. MARCOLETA. ... about the CHR going to the rebels or the Maute group or the MILF or any of the perpetrators in Mindanao. I did not say that. Nobody did.

REP. DEL MAR. So, what you are saying, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker, ...

REP. MARCOLETA. What we said, Mr. Speaker, ...

REP. DEL MAR. ... is that you go to our forces who have been—to the dead, but we can no longer get statements from them. Those who were injured, you get statements from them on who committed these atrocities to them, and you expect to ask that and get an answer when it is very clear that both sides are killing each other because there is a shooting war going on. So, this, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker, you have to be practical. There is no choice on who the CHR will protect and defend in the violation of their human rights, but you can see, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker, that in case of a shooting war, you do not need any CHR, you do not need anyone else. What you need are your own forces also and it is a complete war where you do not ask one side, “Who shot at you? Who injured you?” Then, they will make a report and investigate it. So, you would want to go to the person who is guilty, but how can you do that?

So, let us talk about practical things and practical occasions, that not in every occasion can you protect the human rights of everyone. There are exceptions to the rule in situations like, or even in the case of the police and the criminals when they are engaged in an exchange of fire in times of police operation. So, after that shooting, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker, you cannot investigate one side or the other side. To investigate is to help them, to assist them. You can no longer assist more than they are being assisted by their comrade in arms. So, I guess that is where we see that it is really unfair to expect the CHR to investigate deaths, injuries and violation of human rights against the police or the armed forces who suffered as a result of a skirmish or battle that happened, Your Honor. Mr. Speaker.

So, let us go back to the point that you are emphasizing, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker. Let us go to the President. You asked if the President has human rights. Of course he has. Well, who would violate—why are you not investigating the human rights of the President? Are you kidding, Your Honor? We must be joking here. When there is an attempt to abuse the human rights of the President, you are gone. When you will even just begin attempting that, you are already dealt with. So, outside—the President does not need the CHR or any private institution—UN-sponsored or anything—to protect him against the criminals and the rebels because the CHR cannot do even one-fifth of what the forces of the government can do, which is available to the President, to annihilate those who are trying to kill him. That is why, you know, your reducing the budget of the CHR to P1, 000 is a violation of the Constitution. You are citing a violation of the Constitution, but this is a violation...

REP. MARCOLETA. Mr. Speaker, we are not getting anywhere as ...

REP. DEL MAR. ... because the CHR,...

REP. MARCOLETA. ... he is not answering...

REP. DEL MAR. ... let me finish, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker.

REP. MARCOLETA. ... but he is asking questions that I cannot reply to.

REP. DEL MAR. I did reply to your questions.

REP. MARCOLETA. No. You have to ask questions so I can reply. We are not getting anywhere. When I say something, you say a different thing.

REP. DEL MAR. So do you, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker. You started one thing, you go to another. Do you expect your interpellator as not able to do something that you are doing?

REP. MARCOLETA. You are not conducting an interpellation. You are making a privilege speech.

REP. DEL MAR. No.

REP. MARCOLETA. I do not know where to start. Will I be the one questioning you or you are questioning me?

REP. DEL MAR. I want to answer your question that the CHR is violating the Constitution.

REP. MARCOLETA. I delivered my privilege speech, Mr. Speaker. I am entitled to be asked on the extent to which I delivered it. That is the point of interpellation. I am not being interpellated on the basis of what I said on this floor. The Honorable Del Mar, Mr. Speaker, is saying something that is not within the context of my privilege speech and so, there is no meeting of the minds.

REP. DEL MAR. Constitutional violation is one context that you were talking about. You said that the CHR is violating...

REP. MARCOLETA. Kaya naman pala, talagang ganoon. Paano ninyo idedepensa kung ganyan kayong magdepensa?

REP. DEL MAR. ... the Constitution.

REP. MARCOLETA. So, it is either you just articulated Chairman Gascon's way of telling you to answer or it is you yourself answering those questions which I propounded on the floor. It does not make any difference at all.

REP. DEL MAR. Mr. Speaker.

REP. MARCOLETA. You were saying before that you were merely getting the answers from your principal, but now you are saying that you were not given the chance to speak.

REP. DEL MAR. That is because you made a motion.

REP. MARCOLETA. I do not know your arrangement. It is not for me to assume that your arrangement is this or that. That is improper, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor. Whatever arrangement you have with Chairman Gascon,...

REP. DEL MAR. Whatever, Your Honor.

REP. MARCOLETA. ... it is up to you. So, if you answered ...

REP. DEL MAR. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor,...

REP. MARCOLETA. ... by getting his statements, that is your lookout.

REP. DEL MAR. ... if the Gentleman wanted to be interpellated further, why did he make that motion? So, the Sponsor can no longer reply to the questions he was asking. Going back to the violation of the Constitution, is it a violation—is it not a violation...

REP. MARCOLETA. You chose to answer by getting the answer from him. You wanted to clarify, I did not know about that. So, what is the problem? It is your problem, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, because you were getting the answers purely from him. You were not answering them on your own. Now, you are saying that you were unable to answer but it is your problem, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker, because you just obtained the answers from him. He was whispering at your back.

REP. DEL MAR. Your Honor, Mr. Speaker, that is what I already explained, that I will give him the chance to say his short reply and I will go on to answer it lengthily. So, because of the lack of opportunity, you denied this—I am not saying that you denied my human right to interpellate, but this is the Gentleman's attitude—and that if I mention one point, you will mention so many points, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker. Whatever question I ask you here is not out of context.

Let us go to the violation of the Constitution. Does the Gentleman, Mr. Speaker, not think that our reducing the budget of the CHR to P1, 000 is a violation of the Constitution?

REP. MARCOLETA. What did I violate, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, in recommending a thousand

pesos for their budget? Will you point the exact provision in the Constitution that I violated?

REP. DEL MAR. Okay. The CHR is a creation of the Constitution. Now, if you are going to abolish it, then you need a constitutional amendment, not a law. In this case, ...

REP. MARCOLETA. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, ...

REP. DEL MAR. ... what you are trying to do, Mr. Speaker, ...

REP. MARCOLETA. ... you were asking me ...

REP. DEL MAR. I am, and you said ...

REP. MARCOLETA. ... whether or not I violated the Constitution. I was asking you to please point out ...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). May I remind both Gentlemen not to speak at the same time. One at a time, please.

REP. DEL MAR. Okay. May I ...

REP. MARCOLETA. Mr. Speaker, I was being asked whether in recommending a thousand pesos as budget of the CHR, I violated the Constitution. I threw the question back to him, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, as to what provision of the Constitution did I violate when I recommended a P1,000 as budget for the CHR.

REP. DEL MAR. I will explain it in a very simple, short answer.

REP. MARCOLETA. What provision?

REP. DEL MAR. The CHR is a creation of the Constitution. If you want to abolish it, you must amend the constitutional provision on the creation of the CHR.

REP. MARCOLETA. Here we go again, Mr. Speaker.

REP. DEL MAR. Just wait, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker. That is why you are not ...

REP. MARCOLETA. I did not say I wanted to abolish the CHR.

REP. DEL MAR. No. That is why, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker ...

REP. MARCOLETA. Who said so?

REP. DEL MAR. The trouble with the Gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is that he does not allow me to give a little explanation, unlike this Representation giving him all the time to explain, answer, make his observations.

So, let me go to my point that, being created by the Constitution, the CHR cannot be abolished; and giving P1,000 only, reducing the budget of the CHR to P1,000 only is practically abolishing it. What do you expect? How can you make the office function of P1,000? That is not even enough salary for a day for two janitors. So, this, in effect, abolishes the CHR which is against the Constitution. So, that is not, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying—I am not giving you a long reply or a ...

REP. MARCOLETA. So, what is the question? What is the question?

REP. DEL MAR. The question is, if you think that the CHR is violating the Constitution, is it not that your motion is to abolish the CHR which is a creation of the Constitution? It can only be abolished by amending the Constitution. Why? Mr. Speaker, giving P1, 000 is, in effect, an abolition of the office.

REP. MARCOLETA. That is your view, Mr. Speaker.

REP. DEL MAR. It is all right with the ...

REP. MARCOLETA. I respect your view, Mr. Speaker.

REP. DEL MAR. It is all right with the other two, the Commission on ...

REP. MARCOLETA. I said I recommended a thousand pesos to deliver a strong message because your principal is trying to amend—as a matter of fact, it already amended the Constitution by selecting its duty, by making a point that only the State actors are supposed to be investigated and the non-State actors, even the enemies of the State, the CHR has nothing to do with them.

So, because that was the answer and I think they deserve a budget, that would serve that purpose. Did you get it, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor?

REP. DEL MAR. Yes, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor.

REP. MARCOLETA. That was the message.

REP. DEL MAR. Yes, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker.

REP. MARCOLETA. We are not supposed to quantify the value of a thousand pesos. The message is there. The message is very clear. Do not kill the

messenger, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor. It was a message. Unfortunately, that message did not reach your principal, he was at your back, Mr. Speaker.

REP. DEL MAR. The message that you are trying to deliver is that the CHR has not done its job.

REP. MARCOLETA. I proved that, Mr. Speaker.

REP. DEL MAR. That it is not ...

REP. MARCOLETA. And he proved it also.

REP. DEL MAR. ... investigating those ...

REP. MARCOLETA. He came over and asked for an audience with the Speaker and our Majority Leader was so kind enough to bridge them. And in that meeting, they realized that they were not really doing their job. When they agreed to look into and go back to the mandate of the Constitution, to be obedient and loyal to the command of the Constitution that created it, we restored their budget, Mr. Speaker.

REP. DEL MAR. Mr. Speaker.

REP. MARCOLETA. It is as simple as that.

REP. DEL MAR. It is the position of this Representation that the CHR has been doing its job. What you point out as not investigating the private individuals who commit human rights violations against the police and the soldiers, and even the rebels, is because, Your Honor, in the case of the private individuals whose rights are being abused by whoever, the military or the police, they have no resources within their means or any office which can help them except the CHR which can investigate, file cases, and prove them. They have been filing and investigating cases also.

So, Your Honor, that is why you only premise the violation of the CHR on the point that they do not investigate the violations of human rights committed by the murderers, the rebels, the, whatever, the Mautes, the Abu Sayyaf and the Mamasapano rebels. So that is the point, Your Honor.

They explained that the focus was on your complaint. They explained to our leadership that they have been doing that. They have not been remiss in performing their duties and obligations under this. But, of course, there is a preponderance of investigations that they are conducting on the other side because that is where most of the abuses of human rights of private individuals are being committed by the police.

REP. MARCOLETA. Mr. Speaker, we are going in circles. The Constitution says that the CHR should

investigate on its own or on complaint by any party all forms ...

REP. DEL MAR. They are doing that, Your Honor.

REP. MARCOLETA. ...all forms of human rights violations.

REP. DEL MAR. You are asking that, they are doing that. They replied, they are doing that.

REP. MARCOLETA. Does that give them the option to select a particular group of people?

REP. DEL MAR. They are not selecting a particular group of people.

REP. MARCOLETA. Does that give them the option to limit their jurisdiction?

REP. DEL MAR. In these circumstances, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker, there are more human rights abuses that can be helped by the CHR; but in the case where the rebels are the ones committing the killing of the forces and we say violations of human rights, why is it that they are not being investigated? How can you investigate, as I told you, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker, when they are not only being investigated, they are being shot at, they shoot each other. So, after the shooting is done, you expect an investigation to help in any manner?

REP. MARCOLETA. We are not on the same page. We are not on the same page, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor. I am sorry. We have been explaining ....

REP. DEL MAR. Yes, you have been explaining.

REP. MARCOLETA. ...adequately about this.

REP. DEL MAR. You cited one and I said they have done that already.

REP. MARCOLETA. It is not for the CHR to apprehend rebels, insurgents, criminals or the enemies of the State.

REP. DEL MAR. Precisely.

REP. MARCOLETA. It is not the function of the CHR ...

REP. DEL MAR. Your Honor, that is our point.

REP. MARCOLETA. What I was trying to point out, please.

REP. DEL MAR. There is no need to investigate.

REP. MARCOLETA. What I was trying to point out, please, is, if it follows the command of the Constitution, it is the duty of the CHR to investigate all forms of human rights, only human rights violations. We are not talking of common crimes. They cannot do this, only the police can do this. Are we explaining ourselves here clearly? Because we have been in circles, we have been here a thousand times, but, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how to explain it even further. Iyon pong pinag-uusapan lang natin ay may mga possible human rights violations. Kanina po, na-define ko what are civil rights, what are political rights, what are social rights. Ito lamang po ang pinag-uusapan. Hindi po natin sinasabi na ang mandadakip ng ganito o kaya hindi po natin inuutusan ang CHR na nagbabarilan, mag-investigate, hindi po ganoon.

REP. DEL MAR. Hindi nga but ...

REP. MARCOLETA. They can choose their time.

REP. DEL MAR. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor.

REP. MARCOLETA. Provided that they can discharge ...

REP. DEL MAR. You were the one who went to such extent as to deal with these occasions—the Abu Sayyaf, the Maute rebels and the criminals who have violated the human rights of our forces. So, by saying non-State, non-State is private, Your Honor.

REP. MARCOLETA. So, kapag non-State po, hindi sila puwedeng mag-imbetiga, iyon po ang sinasabi ninyo?

REP. DEL MAR. You can still do that within constraints.

REP. MARCOLETA. Teka muna, hindi ho tayo nagkakaintindihan.

REP. DEL MAR. If it is a shooting war, there is no need to investigate. Why should you investigate when ...

REP. MARCOLETA. Wala po kaming sinasabi na kapag shooting war, mag-imbetiga. Kanina ko pa po ipinapaliwanag eh.

REP. DEL MAR. That is why, but you always ...

REP. MARCOLETA. Pinipilit po ninyong dalhin doon ang usapin. Kahit isa, wala po kaming sinabi na

kapag nagkabarilan, pupunta kaagad doon ang CHR. Kailan po namin sinabi iyon? We did not say anything about that. Ang sinasabi po namin, in the wake of these atrocities, iyan, nangyari na po iyan, halimbawa, wala bang katungkulan ang CHR na mag-imbetiga? Baka sakali pong may mga human rights violations banda rito, banda riyan, kalapit natin, this is the job. You receive evidence, document these transgressions, document these violations—hindi po kayo iyong manghuhuli. Iyon po ang sinasabi ko kanina pa. Pabalik-balik na po tayo dito. Napakalinaw na po siguro iyong usapin dito pero huwag po ninyong binabalik-balik doon. Wala po kaming sinabi. Even in my privilege speech, hindi ko po sinabi na manghuhuli po ng rebelde ang CHR o mag-iimbetiga sa kasalukuyang nagbabarilan. Hindi po ganoon iyong trabaho niya. Hindi ko po maintindihan bakit ipinipilit po ninyong ....

REP. DEL MAR. Yes, Your Honor.

REP. MARCOLETA. ... ikutan nang ikutan iyon eh, hindi po tayo matatapos. Baka umabot ho tayo ng alas dose ng gabi rito.

REP. DEL MAR. No, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker. So, you are asking that after there is a cessation of fire and there is a momentary no skirmishes, you go to the soldiers ...

REP. MARCOLETA. Nasa kanila na po iyon, Mr. Speaker. They can take their sweet time.

REP. DEL MAR. You are expecting them to go to their soldiers after their human rights have been violated and you ask them, "Oh, who shot you?" How can you do that? And then he will say, "It is the Maute rebels, it is the Abu Sayyaf." Then, okay, after completing the investigation, you expect them to investigate now the offenders.

REP. MARCOLETA. Sino pong nagsabi na iimbetigahan nila ang Abu Sayyaf? Kanina ko pa po sinasabi ...

REP. DEL MAR. That is right, Your Honor. Kanina mo pa sinasabi but you are on one side of the question only.

REP. MARCOLETA. Hindi po tungkulin ng CHR na pumunta sa Abu Sayyaf para imbestigahan sila.

REP. DEL MAR. That is precisely what is wrong with you, Your Honor. This Representation has allowed you to go left and right, front and back, sideways in your interpellation, in your answers, but you do not allow this Representation to ask questions on related issues

pertaining to what you brought up. That is the question here, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker.

REP. MARCOLETA. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, I think I will ask your help, because I have made myself very, very clear. I did not touch on anything that the Gentleman is asking me.

REP. DIMAPORO (M.). Mr. Speaker, point of order.

REP. MARCOLETA. I am not sure I can be of further help.

REP. DIMAPORO (M.). Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). What is the point of order?

REP. DIMAPORO (M.). I would just like to inquire if there is a time limit because I would like to interpellate also the Honorable Marcoleta.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, the time for the Privilege Hour has long expired already. Based on our clock, it is already more than one hour—it is already one hour and 28 minutes.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). So, we will probably remind the Honorable Del Mar to wrap up. I will give him two minutes to wrap up his question to Gentleman Marcoleta.

REP. DEL MAR. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, two minutes is too short to ask some more questions related to the privilege speech of the Honorable Marcoleta. But, I have been known in Congress to respect rules and procedures, and so if you can give me only two minutes, I will not insist, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor.

So, let me just say that, please do not expect, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker, the CHR to be not as active.

Probably, I was not there but you brought it up that when they were before the Speaker and the Majority Leader, he was submissive and he was too agreeable. He even admitted something that the CHR is already doing. How do you expect, Your Honor, the leadership to return the budget originally proposed by this Honor? In fact, Mr. Speaker, as the Sponsor of the budget of the CHR, how do you expect them to have an aggressive stance when facing our leaders who were predisposed already to increasing the deduction

perhaps, the same amount that was sponsored here by this Representation, in the amount of P678 million, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker?

So, thank you, thank you for the opportunity and the time you have given me. I have so many questions to be answered but, as usual, I bow to the leadership of the House in the matter of proceedings.

Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you, Your Honor, Honorable Marcoleta, for also answering as much as you could the questions of this Representation.

REP. MARCOLETA. Salamat po din sa inyo. Salamat po, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, before we recognize the next interpellator, I move that the Privilege Hour be extended for another 15 minutes to allow the next interpellator, the Gentleman from the First District of Lanao del Norte, Rep. Mohamad Khalid Q. Dimaporo, to interpellate the Sponsor.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

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

REP. DIMAPORO (M.). Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). We now recognize the Honorable Dimaporo.

REP. DIMAPORO (M.). Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On behalf of the Region of Lanao, which has been ravaged by war, almost half of the year, am I correct in my understanding of the position, as mentioned in the privilege speech of the Honorable Marcoleta, that the Commission on Human Rights has failed the evacuees who are living in the evacuation centers, spread across Iligan City, Lanao del Norte and Lanao del Sur?

REP. MARCOLETA. Mr. Speaker, that actually was expected by this Representation when I asked the question of whether or not the CHR, in the aftermath of the Maute rebellion, conducted on their own any investigation of possible human rights violations on the civilian population in Marawi City. I was expecting that they would have answered that they have visited some evacuation centers and, from there, they were able to document cases or manifestations of violations of human rights. For example, they could have pinpointed or listed the children who may have failed to go to their classrooms, their education has been disturbed, or employees not having gone to their employers and their

means of livelihood, the houses that were destroyed, and the dignity they are supposed to be entitled to, because of the rebellion, everything. But, I was disappointed that the CHR would say that it is not within their jurisdiction. If that was their answer, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, how else will they be able to implement or give flesh to that provision in the Constitution if they will turn their back against their function?

REP. DIMAPORO (M.). Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Honorable Marcoleta because, on behalf of the people who are living in the evacuation centers, nobody is defending their dignity, their right to education (*Applause*), their right to decent meals, their right to toilets and sanitation. The truth of the matter is, if we properly look at the conduct of the Commission on Human Rights, and they are not doing their duty in evacuation centers there in the Lanao region, P500 million is a more deserving budget for the Commission on Human Rights.

I only wish that when we deliberated on their budget, we could have properly investigated the depth, the details of what are they asking from us. But, because of the, I guess, the typhoon, the urgency of the time at hand, the deliberations moved so fast.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to, again, commend the Honorable Marcoleta for bringing the issue of human rights in evacuation centers here in the plenary. Thank you, Honorable Marcoleta.

That is the last to my interpellation.

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

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, there being no other interpellators, I move that we refer the speech of the Honorable Marcoleta and the interpellation thereon to the Committee on Rules for its appropriate action.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that we now recognize the Lady from the Party-List GABRIELA, Rep. Emmi A. De Jesus, for her interpellation.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

REP. DE JESUS. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, this is not an interpellation.

REP. MATUGAS. To avail of the Privilege Hour, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved. The Hon. Emmi De Jesus of GABRIELA Party-List is now recognized.

#### PRIVILEGE SPEECH OF REP. DE JESUS

REP. DE JESUS. Maraming salamat po, Mr. Speaker.

As we are all gathered here today, outside our halls, there are millions of Filipinos who are suffering due to a largely invisible but very deadly predicament, and that is malnutrition. The situation of child malnutrition in the Philippines is very alarming. According to the 8th National Nutritional Survey released in 2013, approximately one out of 10 children under five years old is too thin for his age or what is called “wasted” and one out of three children is too short for age or called “stunted.”

Malnutrition has many severe effects such as more child deaths, higher incidences of sicknesses and deficits in growth, intellectual and productivity. Stunting, which is one of the adverse effects of malnutrition in the first 1,000 days of life, from pregnancy to two years old, does not affect only physical development, but also mental development which later on affects the productivity of the malnourished child as an adult. It is high time to end this cycle of malnutrition. The government’s response to malnutrition is concretized in the Philippine Plan of Action for Nutrition 2017 to 2022. This serves as a roadmap on how different stakeholders work together to eradicate malnutrition.

I participated in the PPAN launch and one message resonated with me—nutrition is everyone’s concern. We all have a part to play in addressing the triple burden of malnutrition—undernutrition, overnutrition and micronutrient deficiency.

As the budget for next year is about to be approved, let us not take for granted our very important role of ensuring sufficient and justified budgetary allocations for nutrition through the appropriations section of our respective bills as well as the budgets of the government agencies.

Last May, I participated in a Nutrition Budget Policy Forum organized by the Child Rights Network which is headed by Philippine Legislators’ Committee on Population and Development. To share with you some key insights from that forum: number one, according to a UNICEF study on the costs of undernutrition and the business case for nutrition investment in the Philippines, which is to be launched later this year, \$4.5 billion or P220 billion per year is lost due to the effects of undernutrition such as stunting, anemia and iodine deficiency. This is equivalent to 1.5 percent of

the Philippine GDP in 2015. This P220 billion per year is the cost of doing nothing or conducting business as usual.

Number two, it is time for us to move beyond doing business as usual and move towards scaling up our actions. This means increasing investments for nutrition programs and ensuring that primary health workers such as Barangay Nutrition Scholars and Barangay Health Workers who are needed to implement the programs have security of tenure, fixed compensation and benefits.

Numbers three, sufficient investments in the most effective and affordable nutrition interventions are critical to achieving desired nutritional outcomes. According to the UNICEF study, for every dollar invested in nutrition interventions, around \$12 in foregone earnings or health expenditures due to undernutrition can be saved. More importantly, the value of lives saved and improved is immeasurable.

Number four, the effectiveness of nutrition interventions is more strongly felt at the local level. In the same way that we diligently monitor the budget during deliberations, we should exercise the same vigilance in ensuring that the budget are utilized accordingly and felt by the people in the communities.

Number five, nutrition is not just a health concern. It is also an economic, social and political concern. Nutrition budgets are not only lodged with the Department of Health but also with other members of the National Nutrition Council such as the Department of Social Welfare and Development, the Department of Education, the Department of Labor and Employment, and the Department of Agriculture. We should be critical in assessing how the various agencies concretize their commitments for nutrition in their respective line items and whether their chosen programs are the most efficient and cost-effective.

To my colleagues in Congress, let us not turn a blind eye to the millions of children suffering from malnutrition. Let us do our best to ensure that there are enough budget allocations and human resource for nutrition and health programs. Let us invest in the future of our country.

Maraming salamat po, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that we refer the speech of the Hon. Emmi A. De Jesus to the Committee on Rules for its appropriate action.

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

The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, I now move to recognize the gentleman from the First District of Lanao del Norte, Rep. Mohamad Khalid Q. Dimaporo, to avail of the Privilege Hour.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved. The Hon. Mohamad Khalid Q. Dimaporo, First District, Lanao del Norte, is hereby recognized.

#### PRIVILEGE SPEECH OF REP. DIMAPORO (M.)

REP. DIMAPORO (M.). Auzu bilahi minashaytan niraheem. Bismillah hirahman niraheem. Mr. Speaker, colleagues, assalamalaykum warakmatullahi wabarakato.

For decades, the region of Mindanao can be characterized as a region of war—war against the MNLF, war against the MILF, war against the BIFF, war against the ISIS, war against the Abu Sayyaf, and war against the Maute. Peace may be elusive in our region, but it is not impossible. And for Muslim Filipinos, President Rodrigo Roa Duterte made it very clear that in his administration, “there will be a homeland for the Bangsamoro.” Currently, believers of the Bangsamoro are pinning their hopes on the Seventeenth Congress for the incumbent administration to deliver what its predecessor could not. It has been more than 30 years since the MILF endeavored on their armed struggle. The coming months will soon determine if that struggle can finally end.

To begin with, some credit the Moro struggle to precolonial times, when the indigenous Muslim tribes of the Philippine archipelago fought against their invaders and colonizers, the monarchy of Spain. They continued to battle against the oppression of the American rule, then subsequently, against the control of centralist Manila. To date, the modern-day struggle for independence is attributed to the rise of the Moro National Liberation Front.

The MNLF believes that Mindanao and the island of Palawan belong to the Moro people. In precolonial times, these were Muslim-dominated regions, and because of colonization and migration of Philippine nationals, the Muslim population quickly became the minority. The MNLF championed the cause to return Mindanao to the Moros. This culminated in the Tripoli Agreement in 1976, where 13 provinces were subjected to a plebiscite. Those with a majority vote supporting autonomy made up the current territorial composition of the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao.

When the MNLF signed a peace agreement with the national government, a breakaway group, the Moro Islamic Liberation Front picked up the cudgels to fight for true autonomy and thus began their jihad for the establishment of a Bangsamoro identity and territory.

The fight for their cause progressed as follows: in 1977, Hashim Salamat parted ways with Nur Misuari and the MNLF. He, with 57 former MNLF officers, established the Moro Islamic Liberation Front in 1984. When the MNLF signed a peace agreement with the Ramos administration, the MILF continued their rebellion against the Philippine government, emphasizing not only independence from the Philippine Republic but also the establishment of an Islamic state and full application of Shariah Law.

The strength of the MILF was first displayed in the year 2000 when Abdullah Goldiano Makapaar bin Sabbar or “Commander Bravo” of the MILF came down from Camp Bilal, Munai and occupied the municipal hall of Kauswagan and the Iligan-Pagadian national highway, all in the province of Lanao del Norte. This prompted President Joseph Ejercito Estrada to declare an all-out war against the MILF.

The 2000 all-out war military campaign started with the clearing of the MILF in Lanao del Norte and the fall of Camp Bilal, in Munai, soon followed by the battle of Matanog, Maguindanao where the 6th Infantry Division was tasked to clear the Narciso Ramos highway from 1,000 entrenched MILF fighters. After their success, the Armed Forces of the Philippines continued by capturing satellite MILF camps around Lake Lanao and Camp Bushra, the second largest MILF base. The all-out war was concluded in July 2000 with the fall of Camp Abubakar and the symbolic raising of the Philippine flag by President Estrada.

During the Arroyo administration, the government returned to the negotiation table to discuss a peace settlement. In 2008, the Arroyo administration reached a breakthrough in the stalled peace negotiations and signed the Memorandum of Agreement for Ancestral Domain. Unfortunately, the MOA-AD received political backlash. Rallies opposing the agreement were held across Mindanao. On August 4, 2008, the Supreme Court issued a TRO against the MOA-AD. As a consequence, war broke out again in Mindanao. The MILF converged in the interior municipality of Munai, Lanao del Norte. When enough troops had amassed from Lanao del Sur, they marched down, with the contingent of 500 heading to the coastal town of Kauswagan and a force of 300 towards the coastal town of Kolambugan. Utilizing guerrilla tactics, they burned down homes, attacked and killed civilian populace, and took hostages to secure their safety as they retreated back to the interior. The 2008 MILF attack at Lanao del Norte resulted in more than 110,000 evacuees. Similar attacks occurred in the provinces of North Cotabato and Sarangani.

The all-out war during the Estrada administration and the MOA-AD attacks during the Arroyo administration displayed the MILF’s military capability to bring strife

to the region of Mindanao. War not only caused undue harm to the civilian population, but also was exhaustive on the national budget. So, as soon as he was declared the overwhelming winner of the 2010 Presidential elections, the coming President-elect of the Philippines ensured the MILF leadership of his sincerity to craft a peace agreement within his term of office.

In the administration of President Benigno Aquino III, on October 15, 2012, the Philippine government signed a Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro, which paved the way to the crafting of a final peace agreement and the creation of a new political entity called the “Bangsamoro” to replace the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao. The peace initiatives of the Benigno Aquino administration culminated on March 27, 2014 when the government of the Philippines and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front signed the Comprehensive Agreement on the Bangsamoro. This is the final peace agreement that stipulated the decommission of the Bangsamoro Islamic Armed Forces and the surrender of their firearms to a third party, in exchange for the establishment of an autonomous Bangsamoro. The product of which is the Bangsamoro Basic Law which was submitted to the Sixteenth Congress.

The Bangsamoro Basic Law passed the First Reading in the Sixteenth Congress on September 14, 2014. The law would abolish the ARMM and replace it with a new political entity, the Bangsamoro. The Bangsamoro will have more powers, resources and a larger territory. However, the Bangsamoro Basic Law did not pass the Second Reading in the House of Representatives during the Sixteenth Congress. This was largely due to public outcry as a result of the Mamasapano massacre.

On January 25, 2015, three platoons of Special Action Force entered Mamasapano with the objective of capturing Marwan, a bomb expert of Jemaah Islamiyah. The operation ended up in a firefight that left 44 SAF members dead. The BBL lost its popularity and faced possible rejection. The Bangsamoro was not delivered by the Benigno Aquino administration.

Fortunately, towards the 2016 Presidential elections, candidate Rodrigo Duterte committed to support the creation of a Bangsamoro State. Rodrigo Roa Duterte won the elections by a landslide and became the 16th President of the Republic of the Philippines.

In November 2016, President Duterte signed an Executive Order reconstituting the Bangsamoro Transition Council with the intention of making a more inclusive version of the BBL. On July 17, 2017, the Bangsamoro Transition Council completed its task and submitted a new draft of the BBL to Malacañang.

The 2017 SONA message of the President quickly mentioned the BBL in three paragraphs. The President is quoted as follows:

In our sustained effort to achieve just and lasting peace for a unified nation, we are pursuing an inclusive peace process, promoting the participation of all stakeholders, including those conflict-affected areas. We took steps to promote inclusiveness in the Bangsamoro Transition Commission in expanding its membership through Executive Order No. 8 which I signed in November last year. By giving representation to indigenous peoples, women, children and sultanates, and key stakeholders in the drafting of the Bangsamoro Basic Law, we ensure a Bangsamoro government that truly reflects the aspirations of our Muslim brothers and sisters, as well as our indigenous brethren.

To the dismay of those who anticipated the passage of the BBL in 2017, the SONA message of the President lacked a sense of urgency. Fortunately, both the Senate President and the House Speaker committed that the BBL will be identified as priority legislation when Congress opened its Second Regular Session.

Since the adjournment of our last session on September 20, 2017, last week, no Representative has sponsored the Bangsamoro Basic Law as submitted by the Bangsamoro Transition Council. Instead, there are three versions of the BBL filed in the Seventeenth Congress: House Bill 092 – the refiled BBL from the Sixteenth Congress; House Bill 6121 – the Senate version of the BBL from the Sixteenth Congress; and House Bill 6263 – the Non-Expansionist version of Lanao del Norte.

The treatment of the Bangsamoro Basic Law directly affects the province of Lanao del Norte as it has long been a victim of war between the Moros and the national government. We have seen war against the MILF, and supposedly achieved peace in the Ramos administration, only to continue waging war with a different Moro group, and an attempt to reach another peace settlement.

Now, in our second cycle of the peace agreement, why is peace with the Moros so elusive? In my attempt to understand their mindset, I believe the ideology for a Bangsamoro homeland is based on the argument that the Spanish never conquered areas of Mindanao and had no right to turn it over to the Americans as part of the Philippine archipelago. The fight for a Bangsamoro territory is a fight for sovereignty apart from the Philippine government. Unfortunately, sovereignty cannot be given to a subnational unit in a unitary form of government, the current form of government of the Republic of the Philippines.

A unitary constitution is exercised by providing power to a central government. The power of the central government may be delegated such as devolution to the

local government units or autonomy for the region of Muslim Mindanao. The power is delegated by virtue of a creation of laws such as Republic Act No. 7160, the Local Government Code; and Republic Act 6734, the Organic Act for the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao. However, the power given can also be taken away by law or by ruling of the Supreme Court.

Jurisprudence with regard to the extent of autonomy can be cited in the case of *Limbona vs. Mangeline, Sema vs. Dilangalen*, and *Kida vs. the Senate*. In the case of *Limbona vs. Mangelin*, the Supreme Court ruled that autonomous governments remain under the jurisdiction of the national courts. The ruling defined the limit of autonomous government's right to self-govern.

In the case of *Sema vs. Dilangalen*, Section 19 of Article VI of Republic Act No. 9054 gave the ARMM the power to create and divide a province, but the Supreme Court overturned that Section in the law and ruled against the creation of the province of Shariff Kabunsuan.

In the case of *Kida vs. the Senate*, the Supreme Court upheld the appointment of a regional governor by the President for an autonomous region which goes against the spirit of autonomy.

These are examples of how the powers of autonomy can be taken back by the central government. This is the reason the Moros continue their fight against the central government. They believe that the Bangsamoro Basic Law will provide them with greater autonomy and achieve their right to self-determination. Much attention has been given to the demands of armed groups in their plight to correct a social injustice. Little attention is given to the position of peace-loving Muslim Filipinos such as our communities in Lanao del Norte.

I remember at the height of the Bangsamoro Basic Law hearings in the last administration, when a team from OPAPP came to Lanao del Norte to discuss the BBL, then from Congress, who were hesitant to enter the province, so they conducted hearings in Cagayan de Oro and Iligan. Then the Senate, with Senator Bongbong Marcos, came to discuss the BBL with local officials.

I kept silent on my stand with the BBL because as Governor, the province is a mere recipient of the laws passed by Congress. I wanted Congress to pass judgment first before I speak, but the Sixteenth Congress never did. Due to political clamor from our 22 mayors, 535 barangay captains and their kagawad, I had to express our stand on the Bangsamoro during a Barangay Congress. As provincial Governor, my position was this: We do not need the Bangsamoro to have peace in Lanao del Norte because we already have achieved peace in our province. The Muslims and Christians of Lanao del Norte already live peacefully among each other, but if our brothers in Islam from the MILF and Lanao del Sur require it, then we will stand united as a

province in support of the Bangsamoro, provided that the people's voice will be heard in a plebiscite.

We keep fighting with one another over control of territory, but as far as the province of Lanao Del Norte is concerned, the prevalence of poverty is our true enemy. What we need from the national government is development. The national government can sign as many peace agreements as they want, but so long as poverty thrives in our region, there will always be social unrest. We cannot have sustainable peace without accelerated economic development. This is the position of peace-loving Filipino citizens from Lanao del Norte.

In our experience, the pursuit for peace is also a pursuit for development. For example, in Lanao del Norte, Kapatagan Valley was once a hot bed of the New People's Army. One of their strongholds was Barangay Suso. Through local initiatives and political will, the barangay was bombarded with government projects such as concrete roads, a water system, a multi-purpose hall, a day care center, a barangay health station, and livelihood programs. The barangay became an example in the province of what we can achieve if we lay down our arms and work together for the benefit of our communities. This approach was replicated in all NPA-influenced barangays until finally, in 2011, we declared Kapatagan Valley free of insurgency.

If the national government is serious about achieving peace in our area, they should give us more than just the Bangsamoro. We will never have peace so long as poverty remains persistent. The national government should strengthen development programs such as the PAMANA Program of the OPAPP which is one of the tools to curb poverty in conflict-affected barangays.

That was our position when I served as provincial Governor. Now, as congressional Representative, I serve our province in a different role in which I would like to reiterate my oath of office:

I, Mohamad Khalid Quibranza Dimaporo, of the province of Lanao del Norte, having been elected as Representative of the First District of Lanao del Norte, hereby solemnly swear that I will well and faithfully discharge to the best of my ability the duties of my present position and of all others I may hereafter hold under the Republic of the Philippines; that I will support and defend the Constitution of the Philippines; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I will obey the laws, legal orders, and decrees promulgated by the duly constituted authorities of the Republic of the Philippines; and that I impose this obligation upon myself voluntarily, without mental reservation or purpose of evasion. So help me God.

As early as now, I can confidently say that I will vote “Yes” for the Bangsamoro. But as my oath of office demands, it must conform to the Constitution of our Republic. I will support any move in the House of Representatives to ensure that the BBL adheres to our Constitution.

The era of the Bangsamoro is close at hand. Its fate in the House of Representatives lies on the decision of Speaker Pantaleon “Bebot” Alvarez and the consensus of the super Majority. The opportune timeline would be for Malacañang to sign before the May 2018 barangay elections. That is seven months in total for the government to deliver.

The Congress has calendared a month of recess between October and November, and another month between December and January. That leaves only five official working months left to approve the BBL in the House and the Senate. Until we begin the House deliberations on the Bangsamoro, this Representation, along with the thousands of Mindanaoans, for and against, affected by the BBL, will wait patiently to see if the dream of a Bangsamoro will remain elusive or be finally delivered.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and my dear colleagues. Assalamu Alaikum Wa Rahmatullahi Wa Barakatuh!

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that we recognize the Gentleman from Zamboanga City, Rep. Celso L. Lobregat, for his interpellation.

REP. LOBREGAT. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The Honorable Lobregat is hereby recognized.

REP. LOBREGAT. May I ask the Representative from Lanao del Norte if he is willing to answer a few questions from this Representation.

REP. DIMAPORO (M.). I am willing, Mr. Speaker.

REP. LOBREGAT. Mr. Speaker, this Representation was very much involved in the deliberations and the discussions of the BBL during the last Congress. When I was Mayor of Zamboanga City, we were three local government units that went to the Supreme Court to ask for a Temporary Restraining Order on the signing of the MOA-AD, and we also asked for the declaration of the MOA-AD as unconstitutional and contrary to law, which the Supreme Court eventually decided on positively.

This Representation was in the Eleventh Congress when Republic Act No. 9054, the legislative measure

that incorporated the 1996 Peace Agreement into law, was approved.

Mr. Speaker, just to make it clear, this Representation is for peace. I, like any other Mindanaoan, wish to see the end of the struggle of the war in Mindanao. I am for peace, I am not anti-peace, but I definitely agree with the Gentleman that whenever the Bangsamoro Basic Law is passed, it should be just, fair, acceptable, feasible, and more importantly, consistent with the Constitution and our existing laws.

I heard the Gentleman say that because of his oath of office as a Congressman, he will support the BBL. However, he put a colatilla that as long as it is within the bounds or helms of the Constitution. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

REP. DIMAPORO (M.). That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

REP. LOBREGAT. When the BBL was drafted by the old BTC, it went through the rigors of the legislative mill in Congress. The Adhoc Committee conducted several hearings throughout the Philippines including Ilocos Norte, the home province of our Majority Leader who was present then when we conducted the hearings there.

Who eventually is to say what is constitutional and what is not, Mr. Speaker?

REP. DIMAPORO (M.). Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that I am not a lawyer by profession. But here in the House of Representatives, I am sure we have a lot of great minds, especially constitutionalists who can answer what is constitutional and what is not. So, I would refrain from answering the question of the Gentleman from Zamboanga City. My personal position is to listen to the deliberations once they start, listen to the arguments of the bright minds here in Congress, and if anybody red flags the BBL that there are provisions that are unconstitutional, I will support any correction that needs to be done to conform with the Constitution.

REP. LOBREGAT. Going back to the predecessor of the BBL which was the MOA-AD, the position of the government then was that the MOA-AD was constitutional and was within the bounds of the Constitution. There were three local government units that really believed that the MOA-AD was unconstitutional. These three local government units were the provincial government of North Cotabato, the city government of Iligan, and the city government of Zamboanga. After the Supreme Court hearings, the Supreme Court said that the MOA-AD was unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, have you read the MOA-AD and compared it to the BBL?

REP. DIMAPORO (M.). Mr. Speaker, I have not read the MOA-AD but read the draft that was submitted to Malacañang last July 17. I have not read the BBL from the Sixteenth Congress.

REP. LOBREGAT. Comparing the MOA-AD and the BBL, there were a lot of similar provisions. Have you read the old BBL and the new BBL, Mr. Speaker?

REP. DIMAPORO (M.). Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I have not read the BBL from the Sixteenth Congress, but I have read the new BBL that has been submitted to Malacañang last July.

REP. LOBREGAT. Mr. Speaker, as soon as the draft BBL was submitted by the BTC, of which I was able to get a copy, I think that it is the same draft, more or less, that will be filed in Congress.

Listening to OPAPP Secretary Dureza, he has always said that we should learn from the lessons of the past, meaning, the past BBL, and hopefully the new BBL will no longer contain the unconstitutional, the controversial or the disadvantageous provisions of the old BBL. Unfortunately, there are many, many provisions that were in the old BBL that are still in the present draft.

Although this Representation and the Gentleman are for peace, Mr. Speaker, I think we will have to be very active and very vigilant to ensure that these provisions do not sift through the final version of the BBL. Does the Gentleman agree, Mr. Speaker?

REP. DIMAPORO (M.). As far as our work here in Congress is concerned, I think we will be violating our oaths of office. That is why I read my oath, to make it clear to the people of Lanao del Norte, that as Governor, I can take whatever law has been approved by Congress and implement it. That is why I was able to say, I support the BBL. But here, as a congressional Representative, I am duty bound by oath to uphold the Constitution.

So, if the Gentleman from Zamboanga City is asking or telling this Representation, who have not read the BBL version from the Sixteenth Congress, nor have read the MOA-AD or kept track of the deliberations of the Supreme Court, if there are any unconstitutional provisions in the BBL which I also heard are present in the new BBL. I think it is our duty then here in the House of Representatives to correct those provisions.

REP. LOBREGAT. Aside from unconstitutional provisions, there should also be the protection of the areas outside of the ARMM. The BBL will not only affect those that will be joining the BBL, but will affect

all the provinces, cities, adjoining or neighboring or the entire Mindanao. Does the Gentleman agree, Mr. Speaker?

REP. DIMAPORO (M.). I agree, Mr. Speaker. The ARMM is, from the point of view of a local chief executive, in the periphery of the ARMM and I think also in Zamboanga City, the ARMM is one of the biggest problems in Mindanao. If there is lack of peace and stability in Mindanao, it is because of the ARMM. If there is kidnapping in Zamboanga City, it is because of the ARMM. If there are kidnappings and Maute and ISIS, and attacks in Lanao del Norte, it is because of the ARMM.

What I spoke of earlier was, is the Bangsamoro Basic Law the silver bullet to cure the ills of the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao? I do not know, Mr. Speaker. Just like when the ARMM was approved, I hope that would be the solution to Muslim Mindanao, but it was not.

Now, we are on our second cycle of a peace agreement, discussing and deliberating the Bangsamoro Basic Law. Once approved, will it improve the standard of living in the ARMM, put an end to all those criminals, those kidnapping syndicates, insurgents in the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao? I do not know. But what I do know, Mr. Speaker, is we have to move forward. It is very difficult for us to be on a stalemate for the years to come. Congress and the national government must move forward, find ways to move forward.

REP. LOBREGAT. Mr. Speaker, I was listening to the Gentleman's speech and he said that he is one of the authors of one of the versions of the BBL. I believe he mentioned non-expansion, meaning, he is not in favor of holding plebiscites to expand the present ARMM. Am I correct, Mr. Speaker?

REP. DIMAPORO (M.). Yes, that is correct, Honorable Lobregat. In my version of the BBL, I deleted all provisions on the expansion of the ARMM territory. Basically, what is the ARMM will be the Bangsamoro.

REP. LOBREGAT. Mr. Speaker, in the present version of the BBL, there will be six plebiscites, one, upon ratification, and a plebiscite every five years for a period of 25 years.

So, if that is the version of the present BBL, instead of promoting peace, it will promote instability at least for a period of 25 years, because you will have the Bangsamoro trying to expand its area of jurisdiction, and you will have the local governments adjacent, surrounding or neighboring the BBL also trying to retain their areas.

If just taking out BBL, if you have a constant struggle between one local government and its neighboring local government, especially on political boundaries, each local government now will really fight tooth and nail so that they will not lose their territory. But, it will be a one-sided fight because under the old BBL and under the new BBL, the Bangsamoro can even extend assistance, projects, and whatever outside its present territory.

So, by pouring in more projects to one municipality or one barangay, the next time that there will be a plebiscite, chances are, that municipality or barangay will be lost from its present political jurisdiction whether in the province, city or municipality, and will be joining the Bangsamoro. Do you not see that as a problem, Mr. Speaker?

REP. DIMAPORO (M.). Yes, Mr. Speaker. As far as the provisions and the details of the Bangsamoro Basic Law, I think, I will leave that to the Committee to deliberate in full detail. But, I do see the point of the honorable Gentleman from Zamboanga City that it will create tensions for the next 25 years.

At the same time also, for us, especially in Lanao del Norte, who are always the ones hit with war with the MILF, one silver lining that we see with the Bangsamoro Basic Law, if it will be fully implemented, is the decommissioning of the Bangsamoro Islamic Armed Forces, that they turn over their guns and their personnel, and join the mainstream Filipino society. If that will be the ultimate objective or result from the peace agreement, and as far as Lanao del Norte is concerned, we will benefit from it. Less armed groups in our boundaries, as far as the politics of keeping barangays or municipalities within our political jurisdiction, well, honestly, that is for the people to decide. And, if I was the Governor of the province, I would also do my part to pour in as many projects as possible to those municipalities in Lanao del Norte.

REP. LOBREGAT. Mr. Speaker, I was once a local government official just like you, but I do not see a difference between my oath of office as a Congressman and my oath of office as a Mayor. My stand will always be consistent in whatever position I hold.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know that you know I was in the room, I was about to leave but I was listening to the discussion between Congressman Marcoleta and Congressman Del Mar about the P1,000 budget. In fact, this Representation was the one that proposed the P1,000 budget for the ERC. But, when I heard you speak about the Bangsamoro, I decided to come down and, more or less, ask you a few questions because I believe that maybe tomorrow, the BBL will be asked, as drafted by the BTC, it will be filed, and soon after, we will be starting our deliberations on the BBL. So, tonight is just a preliminary discussion of what really all

of us will be participating in the next few months. And due to the lateness of the hour, I know I have a lot more questions but, more or less, this is just the beginning of the long road, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, we would like to thank our Representative from Lanao del Norte for his privilege speech and for answering the few questions that I have, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that we refer the speech of Representative Dimaporo and the interpellation of the Honorable Lobregat to the Committee on Rules for appropriate action.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to close the Privilege Hour.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. FARINAS. Mr. Speaker, the House and the Senate have approved on Third Reading House Bill No. 6308 and Senate Bill No. 1584, respectively, regarding the postponement of the October 23, 2017 synchronized barangay and Sangguniang Kabataan elections.

We have been informed that the Committee on Suffrage and Electoral Reforms, through its Chairperson Rep. Sherwin N. Tugna, the Sponsor of House Bill No. 6308, as well as the authors thereof, is in concurrence with the provisions of Senate Bill No. 1584 which adopted mostly the provisions of our own House Bill.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with our rules, I move that we adopt Senate Bill No. 1584 as an amendment to House Bill No. 6308.

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

The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that we proceed to the Additional Reference of Business.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Secretary General will please read the Additional Reference of Business.

#### ADDITIONAL REFERENCE OF BUSINESS

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

#### RESOLUTIONS

House Resolution No. 1326, entitled:

“A RESOLUTION URGING PRESIDENT RODRIGO DUTERTE TO FULFILL HIS PROMISE OF COMPLETING OR EXPEDITING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FREE HOUSING UNITS TO THE VICTIMS OF SUPER TYPHOON YOLANDA”

By Representative Alejano  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

House Resolution No. 1327, entitled:

“A RESOLUTION HONORING AND REMEMBERING THE HEROISM OF CAPTAIN ROMMEL SANDOVAL, COMMANDING OFFICER OF THE 11TH SCOUT RANGER COMPANY, AND PRIVATE FIRST CLASS SHERWIN CANAPI WHO DIED IN THE TOWN OF DANSALAN WHILE IN THE LINE OF DUTY, AND EXPRESSING PROFOUND CONDOLENCES TO THEIR BEREAVED FAMILIES”

By Representative Alejano  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SECURITY

House Resolution No. 1328, entitled:

“A RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE APPROPRIATE HOUSE COMMITTEES TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION, IN AID OF LEGISLATION, ON THE DEATH OF UNIVERSITY OF STO. TOMAS LAW STUDENT HORACIO TOMAS CASTILLO III THRU HAZING WITH THE END IN VIEW OF AMENDING THE PROVISIONS OF REPUBLIC ACT NO. 8049 OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE ANTI-HAZING LAW”

By Representative Alejano  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

House Resolution No. 1329, entitled:

“RESOLUTION URGING THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS TO CONDUCT AN INQUIRY, IN AID OF LEGISLATION, ON THE ALLEGED EXTRAJUDICIAL KILLINGS AND HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS AGAINST THE PEOPLE OF MARAWI DURING THE MARTIAL LAW IN MINDANAO AND THE WORSENING ATTACK AGAINST THE LIVES AND ANCESTRAL LANDS OF BANGSAMORO”

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

House Resolution No. 1330, entitled:

“RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION, IN AID OF LEGISLATION, ON THE HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS COMMITTED AGAINST MEMBERS OF THE COUNTRY’S NATIONAL MINORITIES”

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

House Resolution No. 1331, entitled:

“A RESOLUTION URGING THE COMMITTEE ON OVERSEAS WORKERS AFFAIRS TO INVESTIGATE, IN AID OF LEGISLATION, THE DATA CITED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS (DFA) IN A REPORT IT SUBMITTED TO THE SENATE ON SEPTEMBER 19, 2017 STATING THAT SOME 3,827 FILIPINOS ARE LANGUISHING IN JAILS ACROSS 52 COUNTRIES AND TERRITORIES AS OF THE END OF 2016”

By Representative Castelo  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

House Resolution No. 1332, entitled:

“A RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE TASK FORCE BANGON MARAWI TO PROVIDE A BRIEFING AND PRESENTATION OF THE REHABILITATION PLAN TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MINDANAO AFFAIRS”

By Representative Dimaporo (M.K.)  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

House Resolution No. 1333, entitled:

“RESOLUTION CONGRATULATING AND COMMENDING JU-JITSU FIGHTERS

MARGARITA OCHOA, ANNIE RAMIREZ, JENNANAPOLIS, MARCALEXANDER LIM AND GIAN TAYLOR LEE FOR HONORING THE COUNTRY WITH THEIR GOLD AND SILVER WINS IN THE 5TH ASIAN INDOOR AND MARTIAL ARTS GAMES (AIMAG)”

By Representative Bravo (A.)

TO THE COMMITTEE ON YOUTH AND SPORTS DEVELOPMENT

House Resolution No. 1334, entitled:

“RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRATULATING AND COMMENDING MR. ARIES TOLEDO FOR WINNING THE GOLD AND BRONZE MEDALS IN THE MEN’S DECATHLON AND MEN’S 4x400 METER RELAY EVENTS DURING 29TH SOUTHEAST ASIAN GAMES HELD AT KUALA LUMPUR, MALAYSIA FROM AUGUST 19-31, 2017”

By Representative Suansing (E.)

TO THE COMMITTEE ON YOUTH AND SPORTS DEVELOPMENT

House Resolution No. 1335, entitled:

“A RESOLUTION CONGRATULATING AND COMMENDING JIU-JITSU SPECIALISTS MARGARITA OCHOA AND ANNIE RAMIREZ WHO CAPTURED THE FIRST TWO GOLD MEDALS FOR THE PHILIPPINES IN 5TH ASIAN INDOOR AND MARTIAL ARTS GAMES (AIMAG) HELD IN ASHGABAT, TURKMENISTAN LAST SEPTEMBER 19, 2017”

By Representatives Sambar, Nograles (J.J.) and Nograles (K.A.)

TO THE COMMITTEE ON YOUTH AND SPORTS DEVELOPMENT

House Resolution No. 1336, entitled:

“A RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE PROPER COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO CONDUCT AN INQUIRY, IN AID OF LEGISLATION, ON THE EXTRA-JUDICIAL KILLINGS OF BASIC POLITICAL UNIT OFFICERS IN NUEVA ECIJA”

By Representative Vergara

TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

House Resolution No. 1337, entitled:

“A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PHILIPPINES, TO SUPPORT THE APPEAL OF PRESIDENT RODRIGO ROA DUTERTE

TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR THE RETURN OF THE BELLS OF BALANGIGA THAT WERE TAKEN AS TROPHIES OF WAR BY AMERICAN MILITARY TROOPS IN 1901”

By Representatives Alvarez (P.), Fariñas, Suarez, Evardone and Daza

TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Report by the Committee on Natural Resources (Committee Report No. 392), re H.B. No. 6449, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING THE PASONANCA WATERSHED FOREST RESERVE, LOCATED IN ZAMBOANGA CITY, AS A PROTECTED AREA UNDER THE CATEGORY OF NATURAL PARK AND PROVIDING FOR ITS MANAGEMENT”

recommending its approval in substitution of House Bill No. 124

Sponsors: Representatives Ty, Nograles (K.A.), Cua and Lobregat

TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Report by the Committee on Health and the Committee on Appropriations (Committee Report No. 393), re H.B. No. 6452, entitled:

“AN ACT ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH POLICY FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENHANCING THE DELIVERY OF INTEGRATED MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES, PROMOTING AND PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS UTILIZING PSYCHIATRIC, NEUROLOGIC AND PSYCHOSOCIAL HEALTH SERVICES, AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

recommending its approval in substitution of House Bills Numbered 349, 584, 844, 1040, 1698, 3796, 4101, 4184, 4301, 4686 and 5676

Sponsors: Representatives Tan (A.), Roa-Puno, Quimbo and Nograles (K.A.)

TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that all bills approved on Third Reading be transmitted to the Senate.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

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

RECONSIDERATION OF THE APPROVAL  
OF THE JOURNAL

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, I move for the reconsideration of the approval of Journal No. 27, dated September 20, 2017, in order to introduce a correction. I so move, Mr. Speaker.

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

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, I move for the following correction to Journal No. 27:

On page 13, to correct the result of the voting on House Bill No. 4982, for the SOGIE Bill, from “198” affirmative votes to 199 affirmative votes, so as to include Rep. France L. Castro who was inadvertently marked as not having voted in favor of the Bill.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

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

APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL,  
AS AMENDED

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Body approve Journal No. 27, dated September 20, 2017, as corrected. I so move, Mr. Speaker.

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

ADJOURNMENT OF SESSION

REP. MATUGAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn the session until tomorrow at four o’clock in the afternoon, September 26, 2017. I so move, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Hernandez). The session is adjourned until four o’clock in the afternoon, September 26, 2017.

*It was 8:32 p.m.*