



# Congressional Record

PLENARY PROCEEDINGS OF THE 17<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND REGULAR SESSION

## House of Representatives

Vol. 4

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

No. 71

### CALL TO ORDER

*At 4:00 p.m., Deputy Speaker Linabelle Ruth R. Villarica called the session to order.*

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

### NATIONAL ANTHEM

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). Everyone is requested to rise for the singing of the National Anthem.

*Everybody rose to sing the Philippine National Anthem.*

### PRAYER

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). Please remain standing for a minute of silent prayer and meditation.

*Everybody remained standing for the silent prayer.*

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

### ROLL CALL

REP. MATUGAS. Mme. Speaker, I move that we call the roll.

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

The Secretary General will please call the roll.

*The Secretary General called the roll, and the result is reflected in Journal No. 71, dated March 6, 2018.\**

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. The roll call shows that 207 Members responded to the call.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). With 207 Members present, the Chair declares the presence of a quorum.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

### APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL

REP. MATUGAS. Mme. Speaker, I move that we approve Journal No. 70 dated March 5, 2018. I so move, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; Journal No. 70 is hereby approved.

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

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

The Secretary General will please read the Reference of Business.

### REFERENCE OF BUSINESS

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

### BILLS ON FIRST READING

House Bill No. 7294, entitled:

“AN ACT AMENDING SECTION 300 (FORMERLY ARTICLE 286) OF PRESIDENTIAL DECREE NO. 442, AS AMENDED, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE ‘LABOR CODE OF THE PHILIPPINES’ AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES”

By Representative Zubiri

TO THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT

\* See ANNEX (printed separately)

House Bill No. 7297, entitled:  
 “AN ACT INCREASING THE BED CAPACITY OF QUIRINO MEMORIAL MEDICAL CENTER FROM FIVE HUNDRED (500) BEDS TO ONE THOUSAND (1,000) BEDS AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR IT AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES”  
 By Representatives Belmonte (F.), Crisolago, Castelo, Banal, Vargas and Belmonte (J.C.)  
 TO THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH

House Bill No. 7298, entitled:  
 “AN ACT PROVIDING MEDICAL SCHOLARSHIPS TO ALL DESERVING STUDENTS AND REQUIRING ALL MEDICAL GRADUATES TO SERVE IN A GOVERNMENT PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICE OR HOSPITAL”  
 By Representative Sy-Alvarado  
 TO THE COMMITTEE ON HIGHER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

House Bill No. 7299, entitled:  
 “AN ACT PROVIDING FOR AN ACROSS THE BOARD INCREASE OF TWELVE THOUSAND PESOS (P12,000.00) TO THE BASIC SALARY OF ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”  
 By Representative Sy-Alvarado  
 TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

House Bill No. 7300, entitled:  
 “AN ACT EXTENDING FOR ANOTHER TWENTY-FIVE (25) YEARS THE FRANCHISE GRANTED TO INSULAR BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC. UNDER REPUBLIC ACT NO. 7964, ENTITLED, ‘AN ACT GRANTING THE INSULAR BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC. A FRANCHISE TO INSTALL, OPERATE AND MAINTAIN BROADCASTING STATIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES’ ”  
 By Representative Romualdo  
 TO THE COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE FRANCHISES

House Bill No. 7301, entitled:  
 “AN ACT INCREASING THE BED CAPACITY OF THE BATANGAS MEDICAL CENTER IN THE CITY OF BATANGAS, FROM FIVE HUNDRED (500) BEDS TO ONE THOUSAND (1000) BEDS, UPGRADING THE SERVICE FACILITIES AND PROFESSIONAL HEALTH

CARE THEREIN, AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”  
 By Representative Mariño  
 TO THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH

House Bill No. 7304, entitled:  
 “AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE PHILIPPINE MARINE CORPS, DEFINING ITS POWERS AND FUNCTIONS, APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES”  
 By Representatives Alvarez (P.) and Fariñas  
 TO THE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SECURITY

House Bill No. 7305, entitled:  
 “AN ACT ABOLISHING THE PHILIPPINE AEROSPACE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, REPEALING FOR THE PURPOSE PRESIDENTIAL DECREE (P.D.) NO. 286, AS AMENDED BY P.D. NOS. 346 AND 696”  
 By Representative Alvarez (P.)  
 TO THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ENTERPRISES AND PRIVATIZATION

RESOLUTIONS

House Resolution No. 1742, entitled:  
 “A RESOLUTION URGING THE COMMITTEE ON GOOD GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO CONDUCT AN INQUIRY AND/OR INVESTIGATION IN AID OF LEGISLATION ON THE ANOMALOUS SUPPLY AND DELIVERY AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO BY DUTY FREE PHILIPPINES CORPORATION (DFPC) WITHOUT UNDERGOING THE REQUIRED PUBLIC BIDDING, AS WELL AS THE HIGHLY SUSPICIOUS AND IRREGULAR EXTENSIONS OF THE TERMS OF THESE CONTRACTS, THREE (3) YEARS PRIOR TO THEIR RESPECTIVE EXPIRATIONS, IN AN APPARENT CASE OF MIDNIGHT DEALS BY THE PREVIOUS OFFICERS OF DFPC”

By Representatives De Vera, Uybarreta, Belmonte (R.), Montoro, Gonzales (A.D.), Salo, Salon, Lacson, Pineda, Romero, Villarín, Bondoc, Bravo (A.), Bertiz, Belaro, Lopez (M.L.), Co, Panganiban, Dalipe, Teves, Defensor and Garbin  
 TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

House Resolution No. 1743, entitled:  
 “A RESOLUTION CONGRATULATING SOPHIA SEÑORON, VARSITY CHAMPION

DEBATER OF SAN BEDA UNIVERSITY, FOR BEING CROWNED THE FIRST EVER MISS MULTINATIONAL BESTING SOME FIFTY OTHER CANDIDATES DURING THE CORONATION FINALS AT THE HISTORIC KINGDOM OF DREAMS IN GURUGRAM, INDIA ON FEBRUARY 26, 2018”

By Representative Castelo  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

House Resolution No. 1744, entitled:

“RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE IMMEDIATE IMPLEMENTATION OF FREE PUBLIC TERTIARY EDUCATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH UNIVERSAL ACCESS TO QUALITY TERTIARY EDUCATION ACT AND THE REFUND OF ALL COLLECTED TUITION AND OTHER SCHOOL FEES FOR THE SECOND SEMESTER OF ACADEMIC YEAR 2017-2018”

By Representatives Elago, Brosas, Casilao, Castro (F.L.) and De Jesus  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON HIGHER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

House Resolution No. 1745, entitled:

“RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT TO REVIEW THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 1086, RECOMMEND MEASURES TO SECURE THE SHELTER AND LIVELIHOOD OF AROUND 6,000 POOR HOUSEHOLDS IN VITAS, TONDO, MANILA WHO ARE UNDER THE THREAT OF DISPLACEMENT, AND RECOMMEND TO THE NATIONAL HOUSING AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SAID EXECUTIVE ORDER PENDING THE REVIEW BY THE LOWER HOUSE”

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

House Resolution No. 1746, entitled:

“A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN ITS CONTINUED SUPPORT TO THE PHILIPPINE OLYMPIC COMMITTEE UNDER ITS NEW LEADERSHIP”

By Representative Roa-Puno  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON YOUTH AND SPORTS DEVELOPMENT

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Message dated February 27, 2018, informing the House of Representatives that the Senate on February 26, 2018 adopted Senate Joint Resolution No. 6, entitled:

“JOINT RESOLUTION DECLARING JANUARY 17 OF EVERY YEAR AS JAMES LEONARD TAGLE GORDON DAY, A SPECIAL NON-WORKING HOLIDAY IN THE CITY OF OLONGAPO AND THE SUBIC BAY FREEPORT ZONE IN RECOGNITION OF THE ACHIEVEMENTS, CONTRIBUTIONS AND HEROISM OF JAMES LEONARD TAGLE GORDON”

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

TO THE COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF LAWS

## COMMUNICATIONS

Letter dated January 18, 2018 of Dan M. Jusay, Municipal Mayor, Municipality of Catmon, Province of Cebu, submitting the Report on Fund Utilization and Status of Program/Project Implementation for the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter of 2017 of the Assistance to Disadvantaged Municipalities under the Local Government Support Fund.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Letter dated February 14, 2018 of Eduardo M. Año, Officer-in-Charge, Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG), submitting the Statement of Allotments, Obligations and Balances (SAOB) of the Office of the Secretary, DILG, as of January 31, 2018.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Email dated February 21, 2018 from the Provincial Engineering Office, Province of Ilocos Norte, submitting the Scanned Physical and Financial Report of CMGP Projects for the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter of 2017.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND HIGHWAYS

Report on Fund Utilization and Status of Program/Project Implementation for the Quarter ended December 2017 of Juliet B. Dano, Municipal Mayor, Municipality of Sevilla, Province of Bohol of the Assistance to Disadvantaged Municipalities under the Local Government Support Fund.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Report on Fund Utilization and Status of Program/Project Implementation for the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter 2017 of Fernando B. Estavilla, Municipal Mayor, Municipality of Garcia, Province of Bohol of the Assistance to Disadvantaged Municipalities under the Local Government Support Fund.  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

#### COMMITTEE REPORTS

Report by the Committee on Information and Communications Technology (Committee Report No. 644), re H.B. No. 7321, entitled:  
“AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE ‘NO CALL AND NO TEXT REGISTRATION’ SYSTEM, PROVIDING PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS THEREOF”  
recommending its approval in substitution of House Bills Numbered 929, 2556, 2874, 2907, 3629 and 4241  
Sponsors: Representatives Yap (V.) and Abaya  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Report by the Committee on Higher and Technical Education (Committee Report No. 645), re H.B. No. 6724, entitled:  
“AN ACT CHANGING THE NAME OF LUPON SCHOOL OF FISHERIES IN LUPON, DAVAO ORIENTAL, INTO THE DAVAO ORIENTAL POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE”  
recommending its approval without amendment  
Sponsors: Representatives Hofer and Almario  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Report by the Committee on Health and the Committee on Appropriations (Committee Report No. 646), re H.B. No. 7327, entitled:  
“AN ACT INCREASING THE BED CAPACITY OF VALENZUELA MEDICAL CENTER IN THE CITY OF VALENZUELA, FROM TWO HUNDRED (200) TO FIVE HUNDRED (500) BEDS, AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”  
recommending its approval in substitution of House Bill No. 3666  
Sponsors: Representatives Tan (A.), Martinez and Nograles (K.A.)  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

#### ADDITIONAL REFERENCE OF BUSINESS

#### RESOLUTION

House Concurrent Resolution No. 14, entitled:  
“CONCURRENT RESOLUTION AMENDING HOUSE BILL NO. 6104, ENTITLED ‘AN ACT CONVERTING THE LICOP ELEMENTARY

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

By Representatives Durano and Almario  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

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

REP. MATUGAS. Mme. Speaker, before we proceed, we would like to acknowledge the presence of the guests of the Hon. Luisa Lloren Cuaresma, Representative of the Lone District of Nueva Vizcaya. They are from the Liga ng mga Barangay, Bambang Chapter, Province of Nueva Vizcaya headed by Barangay Captain Norvie Gamboa.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). Please stand up. Welcome to the House of Representatives. *(Applause)*  
The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mme. Speaker, also, we would like to acknowledge the presence of the guests of the Hon. Leopoldo N. Bataoil, Representative of the Second District of the Province of Pangasinan. *(Applause)* They are the barangay secretaries, together with Mayor Ramil Ventenilla and Norberto Macaraeg.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). Welcome to the House of Representatives. *(Applause)*  
The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. MATUGAS. Mme. Speaker, we would also like to acknowledge the presence of the guests of the Hon. Emmanuel F. Madrona, Lone District of Romblon, the teachers from the District of San Andres, Romblon, Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). Please stand up to be recognized. Welcome to the House of Representatives. *(Applause)*  
The Majority Leader is recognized.

#### NOMINAL VOTING ON H.B. NO. 7179 ON THIRD READING

REP. MATUGAS. Mme. Speaker, I move that we vote on Third Reading on House Bill No. 7179 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. Villarica). 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 March 1, 2018, pursuant to Section 58, Rule X of the House Rules.*

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 7179, entitled: AN ACT GRANTING PHILIPPINE CITIZENSHIP TO MAYLEEN TING.

*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 reflected in Journal No. 71, dated March 6, 2018.*

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 7179  
ON THIRD READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). With 190 affirmative votes, no negative vote and no abstention, House Bill No. 7179 is approved on Third Reading. The Majority Leader is recognized.

NOMINAL VOTING ON H.B. NO. 7176  
ON THIRD READING

REP. MATUGAS. Mme. Speaker, I move that we vote on Third Reading on House Bill No. 7176 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. Villarica.). 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 March 1, 2018, pursuant to Section 58, Rule X of the House Rules.*

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 7176, entitled: AN ACT SEPARATING THE SAN EMMANUEL NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL – ANNEX IN BARANGAY SAN PABLO, TACURONG CITY, PROVINCE OF SULTAN KUDARAT FROM THE SAN EMMANUEL NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL, CONVERTING IT INTO AN INDEPENDENT NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TO BE KNOWN AS SAN PABLO NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL 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 reflected in Journal No. 71, dated March 6, 2018.*

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 7176  
ON THIRD READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). With 199 affirmative votes, no negative vote and no abstention, House Bill No. 7176 is approved on Third Reading.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

NOMINAL VOTING ON H.B. NO. 7178  
ON THIRD READING

REP. MATUGAS. Mme. Speaker, I move that we vote on Third Reading on House Bill No. 7178 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. Villarica). 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 March 1, 2018, pursuant to Section 58, Rule X of the House Rules.*

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 7178, entitled: AN ACT ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL IN BARANGAY TAMBO, PARAÑAQUE CITY, TO BE KNOWN AS TAMBO NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL 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 reflected in Journal No. 71, dated March 6, 2018.*

REP. TINIO. Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). What is the pleasure of the Hon. Antonio L. Tinio?

REP. TINIO. I vote “Yes,” Mme. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). Yes, it is noted.

\* See ANNEX (printed separately)

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 7178  
ON THIRD READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). With 203 affirmative votes, no negative vote and no abstention, House Bill No. 7178 is approved on Third Reading.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I move that the Secretariat be directed immediately to transmit to the Senate the recently approved Bills on Third Reading. I so move, Mme. Speaker.

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

The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, before we resume, we would like to acknowledge the presence of the guests of the Hon. Jocelyn Sy Limkaichong of the First District of Negros Oriental. They are from Shizuoka, Japan: the Mate Law Firm and One Corporation. May I request that they be acknowledged.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). Welcome to the House of Representatives. (*Applause*)

The Majority Leader is recognized.

CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. NO. 120

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we consider House Resolution No. 120, contained in Committee Report No. 611, as reported out by the Committee on Cooperatives Development.

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

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

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

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

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Resolution No. 120, entitled: A RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COMMITTEE ON COOPERATIVES DEVELOPMENT TO CONDUCT AN INQUIRY, IN AID OF LEGISLATION, ON THE ALLEGED VIOLATIONS IN THE CONTRACTS BETWEEN OIL PALM

PLANTATION COOPERATIVES IN SOUTHERN PALAWAN AND AGUMIL PHILS., INC. WHICH PUT COOPERATIVES IN HUGE DEBTS AND DISPLACED FARMERS FROM THEIR OWN LANDS.

ADOPTION OF H. RES. NO. 120

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we adopt House Resolution No. 120.

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

CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. NO. 882

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we consider House Resolution No. 882, contained in Committee Report No. 638, as reported out by the Committee on Good Government and Public Accountability.

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

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

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

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

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Resolution No. 882, entitled: RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COMMITTEE ON GOOD GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY TO CONDUCT AN INQUIRY, IN AID OF LEGISLATION, IN REGARD TO THE USE BY THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT OF ILOCOS NORTE OF ITS SHARES FROM THE EXCISE TAXES ON LOCALLY MANUFACTURED VIRGINIA-TYPE CIGARETTES OR THE SPECIAL SUPPORT FUND UNDER REPUBLIC ACT NO. 7171 FOR A PURPOSE OTHER THAN THOSE PROVIDED FOR BY THE SAID LAW, IN ITS HIGHLY IRREGULAR PURCHASE OF MOTOR VEHICLES MADE THROUGH CASH ADVANCES WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF PUBLIC BIDDINGS FOR THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF SIXTY SIX MILLION FOUR HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND PESOS (PHP 66,450,000.00).



## ADOPTION OF H. RES. NO. 882

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we adopt House Resolution No. 882.

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

## CONSIDERATION OF THE FINDINGS AND RECOM. IN CTTEE. RPT. NO. 638 ON H. RES. NO. 882

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we consider the findings and recommendations contained in Committee Report No. 638 on House Resolution No. 882.

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

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

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

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Resolution No. 882, entitled: RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COMMITTEE ON GOOD GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY TO CONDUCT AN INQUIRY, IN AID OF LEGISLATION, IN REGARD TO THE USE BY THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT OF ILOCOS NORTE OF ITS SHARES FROM THE EXCISE TAXES ON LOCALLY MANUFACTURED VIRGINIA-TYPE CIGARETTES OR THE SPECIAL SUPPORT FUND UNDER REPUBLIC ACT NO. 7171 FOR A PURPOSE OTHER THAN THOSE PROVIDED FOR BY THE SAID LAW, IN ITS HIGHLY IRREGULAR PURCHASE OF MOTOR VEHICLES MADE THROUGH CASH ADVANCES WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF PUBLIC BIDDINGS FOR THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF SIXTY SIX MILLION FOUR HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND PESOS (PHP 66,450,000.00).

REP. BONDOC. Mme. Speaker, I move that we adopt the findings and recommendations contained in Committee Report No. 638 on House Resolution No. 882.

## ADOPTION OF FINDINGS AND RECOM. IN CTTEE. RPT. NO. 638 ON H. RES. NO. 882

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

The findings and recommendations contained in Committee Report No. 638 on House Resolution No. 882 are adopted.

## CONSIDERATION OF THE FINDINGS AND RECOM. IN CTTEE. RPT. NO. 611 ON H. RES. NO. 120

REP. BONDOC. Likewise, Mme. Speaker, I move that we consider the findings and recommendations contained in Committee Report No. 611 on House Resolution No. 120.

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

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

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

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Resolution No. 120, entitled: A RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COMMITTEE ON COOPERATIVES DEVELOPMENT TO CONDUCT AN INQUIRY, IN AID OF LEGISLATION, ON THE ALLEGED VIOLATIONS IN THE CONTRACTS BETWEEN OIL PALM PLANTATION COOPERATIVES IN SOUTHERN PALAWAN AND AGUMIL PHILS., INC. WHICH PUT COOPERATIVES IN HUGE DEBTS AND DISPLACED FARMERS FROM THEIR OWN LANDS.

REP. BONDOC. Mme. Speaker, I move that we adopt the findings and recommendations contained in Committee Report No. 611 on House Resolution No. 120.

## ADOPTION OF FINDINGS AND RECOM. IN CTTEE. RPT. NO. 611 ON H. RES. NO. 120

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

The findings and recommendations contained in Committee Report No. 611 on House Resolution No. 120 are adopted.

\* See MEASURES CONSIDERED (printed separately)

The Majority Leader is recognized.

CONSIDERATION OF H.B. NO. 6973

*Continuation*

PERIOD OF SPONSORSHIP AND DEBATE

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, under the Calendar of Unfinished Business, I move that we resume the consideration of House Bill No. 6973, as contained in Committee Report No. 572, submitted by the Committee on Metro Manila Development. For this purpose, may I ask that the Secretary General be directed to read only the title of the measure. I so move, Mme. Speaker.

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

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

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 6973, entitled: AN ACT ENHANCING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE METROPOLITAN MANILA COUNCIL IN FORMULATING POLICIES, RULES, REGULATIONS, AND IN ENACTING ORDINANCES FOR METRO MANILA, AMENDING FOR THE PURPOSE REPUBLIC ACT NO. 7924, ENTITLED, "AN ACT CREATING THE METROPOLITAN MANILA DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, DEFINING ITS POWERS AND FUNCTIONS, PROVIDING FUNDS THEREFOR AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES."

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

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, the parliamentary status of the Bill is that it is in the period of sponsorship and debate. I move that the Hon. Bayani F. Fernando, the Vice Chairperson of the Committee on Metro Manila Development, be recognized.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). The Hon. Bayani Fernando is recognized.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I move to suspend session for a few minutes.

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

*It was 4:42 p.m.*

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

*At 4:43 p.m., the session was resumed.*

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

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we recognize the Gentleman from the Lone District of Navotas, the Hon. Tobias "Toby" M. Tiangco, for his interpellation.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). The Honorable Tiangco of Navotas is recognized.

REP. TIANGCO. Mme. Speaker, is the honorable Sponsor willing to continue the interpellation that we left last week?

REP. FERNANDO. Mme. Speaker, I am ready for interpellation.

REP. TIANGCO. Mme. Speaker, the issue at hand when we suspended the interpellation last week was the analogy of the Sponsor that in Congress, when we vote, whatever is voted upon by the majority is carried and approved. The honorable Sponsor's analogy was that in the Metro Manila Council, the mayors, once they approve or once the majority of the mayors approve an ordinance, as envisioned by the law, it becomes a law. What I was explaining at that time were two things, Mme. Speaker: number one, an ordinance passed by any local government unit cannot be implemented outside the territorial boundary of that local government unit. So, for example, even if nine out of 17 in the Metro Manila Council approved an ordinance, it cannot be implemented in the other eight that did not approve it simply because implementing it in the eight other LGUs means that the ordinance of the local government unit which approved it, is now going beyond the boundary of that local government unit. But the argument of the honorable Sponsor was the analogy to Congress, so, my explanation at that time, Mme. Speaker, was that the mayors are not elected as legislators. The mayors are elected as chief executives and so, they do not have legislative power. While we are elected as legislators and that is why whatever we vote upon, if it is the majority, then it is carried. So, I would like to ask the honorable Sponsor on the provision of a law that he can cite which gives the mayors legislative power. What provision of a law can he cite that states that the ordinance can be implemented beyond the political boundary of a certain LGU, Mme. Speaker?

REP. FERNANDO. Mme. Speaker, that issue had been debated and discussed in the Committee, in the technical working group, and in this hall on so many occasions and exactly, that is what we are trying to cure if ever there is something wrong with the Bill or with the law that created the MMDA. In the Metro Manila



Council where mayors were given the authority to enact ordinances on some matters of metro-wide impact, that would also affect other communities. That has been the issue and somehow, this measure that we are proposing—it is actually in the last discussion where we accepted the fact that if ever the mayors do not have that legislative power to enact ordinances, that is why we have this measure. We are now presenting to a collegial group of mayors—the mayors as a collegial body will prepare and submit for approval of the 17 local governments of Metro Manila—so, it is not the mayors actually approving but the mayors actually preparing and submitting a proposal to the 17 local governments—and the sanggunians will decide by voting, and the procedure is such that a simple majority would decide or will approve any measure.

That is actually an answer to the problem of Metro Manila now. We need to have laws that would affect greater Manila. We have local governments and they are actually so protective of their local autonomy. So, we may have all the laws for the locals but as the Gentleman said, we cannot apply an ordinance of a certain city to another city and that is accepted. How then can we enact ordinances that will create harmony, that can unify things, that can solve conflicts between local governments, and for these to become enforceable? We thought of this where we have the mayors sitting, talking about a problem which is of common interest to everybody and they will propose the measure, and the procedure is just the same, similar to how mayors would present any agreement entered into, where any contract or any commitment is presented to their local government units for ratification and once ratified by their councils, it commits the whole local government to such; otherwise, the commitment of the mayor is nulo, it is nothing.

So, this is the purpose of this Bill, plain and simple, where we want to have unity in Metro Manila. We want to have unified laws so people can understand easily, so people can follow. We need ordinances to have our garbage disposed off properly. We need ordinances so we will have clean esteros and riverways. We need all these. We need to improve our traffic where we are now in crisis, but no local government at this point, though how much local autonomy it exercises, can solve the traffic of Metro Manila, as we need to have one traffic law for Metro Manila. We have to have a unified action to solve this problem as it is no longer local but metro-wide, and that is exactly why this Chamber created the MMDA, well, what we call the MMDA Bill. Actually, if I may clarify, the MMDA Bill stops short of explaining what local autonomy means and that has been the crux of the matter. That has been what we have been talking about for so many hours in this Chamber now—what is local autonomy? Local autonomy is your power to enact ordinances or to do what you want on purely a local matter, on what is the concern of a certain locality.

That is local autonomy and that itself is the boundary of local autonomy. That is its limit.

Mme. Speaker, I handled the MMDA for eight years and I did find much difficulty. As admitted by no less than the authors of the MMDA Bill of 24 years ago, they said that it was short of something and that makes it so confusing and ineffective. I was a victim of that very law because, no matter how much I tried, and I am being blamed now for everything that this metropolis is suffering from, there is that law which we want now to correct if we can, and it is only through this means that I know that we can do it. If anybody has any better idea, please come up with it because 24 years is too long and not one single idea has ever prospered in this very hall. Now, this is a challenge to all and mind you, in the eight years of my being the Chairman of the Metro Manila Council, I never had a single quorum in any meeting of that Council because the mayors—I could not blame them, we cannot blame them—are engrossed with so many problems, with their local concerns.

So, now, this Bill will actually engage the 287 councilors of Metro Manila—287 councilors of the 17 sanggunians of Metro Manila and the 17 vice mayors. Maybe these young men would have the time now, and the 17 vice mayors—they are young and energetic—I think we can get fresh ideas from them. We will now get them involved—to get this metropolis on its feet and to get us all to live in harmony.

Thank you very much.

REP. TIANGCO. Mme. Speaker, I would like to ask the honorable Sponsor, when he was Chairman of the MMDA for eight years, did he propose or request any bill from Congress? The honorable Sponsor is saying that his hands were tied because he could not make laws or implement ordinances that impose penalties on those who would violate. So, my question is, if the MMDA did not have that power at that time, within the eight years that the honorable Sponsor was Chairman, what were the bills that he proposed to Congress to solve traffic, flooding, garbage and other problems of Metro Manila?

REP. FERNANDO. Mme. Speaker, I made this proposal, exactly this bill, and I proposed this to answer Metro Manila concerns in this Congress during my time as Chairman because the courts have actually given some kind of or came up with a legislation, a law, as you call it, that actually renders the MMDA inutile, the MMC. That was why I had made this proposal long before and the records of this Congress would show that. If I can recall the year, maybe in 2006 or 2007, I made this and I submitted this proposal to this Congress.

REP. TIANGCO. Mme. Speaker, from my understanding, the honorable Sponsor is referring

to a bill that gives the MMDA the power to make ordinances. I would fully understand if it was not acted upon by Congress because it is unconstitutional. The honorable Sponsor was saying that his hands were tied because of rulings by the court, but the honorable Sponsor has not mentioned that no less than the Supreme Court had already stated in so many instances that the MMDA does not have lawmaking powers. So, what the honorable Sponsor is asking Congress to do now is to pass a law or a bill that is unconstitutional, and I will explain why it is unconstitutional. It is very clear in the 1987 Constitution, Article X, Section 1:

The territorial and political subdivisions of the Republic of the Philippines are the provinces, cities, municipalities and barangays. There shall be autonomous regions in Muslim Mindanao and the Cordilleras as hereinafter provided.

Section 2 of the same Article X states that “The territorial and political subdivisions shall enjoy local autonomy.”

So, it is not the mayors that are protecting local autonomy. That is enshrined in the Constitution and so, even if or no matter how good the intention of the good Sponsor is, we are bound by the limits of the constitutional provisions. There is no way we can give legislative power to a non-political subdivision.

So, may I ask the honorable Sponsor, is the MMDA a political subdivision?

REP. FERNANDO. Mme. Speaker, that question has been raised in this Congress when they passed, when they created that MMDA Law 24 years ago and there were discussions on this matter, but I am not privy to all these things. Actually, what I submitted then, we proposed to this Congress is exactly what we have now before us, is the same thing. The only thing that the proposition never asked is to give the MMDA the right to enact. In any case, it will be presented to the local governments for ratification.

In one of the technical working group meetings, a councilor objected to that and he—she, it was a she who said, “What? You cannot ratify anything that has not been approved.” Well, the Committee took that seriously and accepted it. So, eventually, it is not the local government sanggunian that is going to ratify, but it is going to approve, and that is what came out in this Bill that we are now actually discussing. We have given up that thought of having the MMDA—the Metro Manila Council, the mayors—to have that legislative power. We have given that up long ago, Your Honor.

REP. TIANGCO. Mme. Speaker, I will get direct to the point: is the MMDA a political subdivision or not?

REP. FERNANDO. According to the former Speaker Sonny Belmonte, he said that the question was raised and actually, somebody opined that it is a political subdivision because I also remember that we had some kind of a plebiscite when Metro Manila was created. For the information of the younger ones in here, Metro Manila was carved out from the towns of Rizal Province, and Marikina was part of it and we were asked to vote in that plebiscite. I thought the only requirement to become a political subdivision was an approval in a plebiscite and it was. But I understand that it never passed the acceptance of this Congress when they made that MMDA Law.

So, to that question, I would say, let us leave it at that. I think it is already out of the question because this Bill is not even asking for the Metro Manila Council to have that legislative power. We had given it up long ago.

REP. TIANGCO. Mme. Speaker, but it is in the title and in various sections that they want the Metro Manila Council and the Metro Manila Development Authority to be able to enact ordinances and enacting ordinances is a legislative power. So, I do not understand how the author can claim that there is no legislative power when enacting ordinances is a legislative power. So, if the honorable Sponsor is saying that they had given up on the legislative power, then what is the definition of the honorable Sponsor of the phrase “enacting ordinances”? Is that not a practice of legislative power, Mme. Speaker?

REP. FERNANDO. Mme. Speaker, I must admit that there may be many things that need to be corrected, and we have agreed in the last meeting that we will do that in the process of amendments. All those words “enacted” and “enactment” will be replaced by some other word which we may decide later on in the process of amendments, but at least the spirit is there. It is never giving the Metro Manila Council, the mayors, that legislative power to enact—we will change those things. As a matter of fact, I saw that late—it was too late when I saw what was already published, where the last or one of the last paragraphs would say, “the approved ordinances of the sanggunians will still be approved by the local, by the Metro Manila Council”—that is all wrong.

In the process of amendment, I will raise that issue, and that the right word for it is “promulgation.” After the Council has voted and a decision is made, the Metro Manila Council will simply promulgate the enacted ordinance, meaning that the Metro Manila Council will just promote the idea, make it public and get it implemented. That basically would probably solve these inconsistencies.

REP. TIANGCO. Mme. Speaker, the word “promulgate” is even worse than the phrase “enacting an ordinance” because to “promulgate” means you will implement an ordinance enacted illegally because, in the

first place, the body which enacted the ordinance has no legislative power. What the honorable Sponsor wants to do now is to implement or promulgate an ordinance which was enacted by a body without legislative power.

Going back to the previous argument of the honorable Sponsor, when he was saying that there was a plebiscite, I think he was referring to the MMC or the Metro Manila Council which, at that time, was headed by the former First Lady Imelda Romualdez Marcos. I am not sure if there was a plebiscite at that time but assuming, for the sake of argument, that there was a plebiscite that happened, Mme. Speaker, the MMC had already been superseded by the 1987 Constitution which gave local autonomy to local government units. After the 1987 Constitution, the Local Government Code was enacted; and after the Local Government Code was enacted, then the law creating the MMDA was enacted. Anyway, the MMD Committee, the Committee on Metro Manila Development staff is with the honorable Sponsor and I hope they had time to print out the decision of the Supreme Court in *Bel-Air vs. MMDA*. It had clearly stated thereat, and I will read:

Clearly, the MMDA is not a political unit of government. The power delegated to the MMDA is that given to the Metro Manila Council to promulgate administrative rules and regulations in the implementation of the MMDA's functions. There is no grant of authority to enact ordinances and regulations for the general welfare of the inhabitants of the metropolis. This was explicitly stated in the last committee deliberations prior to the bill's presentation in Congress.

May I request the honorable Sponsor to ask the MMD Committee staff to print out the decision of the Supreme Court. If what I am saying is not accurate, then they can point it out, but if they will not disprove this citation, then it is very clear that we cannot pass this Bill because, again, of the power being given to the MMDA to enact ordinances. It is even worse if they will promulgate or implement an ordinance that is enacted by a body which does not have legislative power, Mme. Speaker.

REP. FERNANDO. Mme. Speaker, on that first question of promulgating, the dictionary defines "promulgate"—"promote or make widely known an idea or cause," as in "These objectives have to be promulgated within the organization." "Publicize, spread, communicate, propagate, disseminate, broadcast, promote, preach"—that is one definition. The other definition in the dictionary is "to put a law or decree into effect by official proclamation"—that is promulgation; it is not actually enacting in spite of the definition in the dictionary.

So, I would say, anent then to the next question, that was what I said earlier, where not only the Supreme Court but many courts where the MMDA withheld and had to save itself. Actually, there was some kind of judicial legislation and so, because of that, we have already given up. We are not asking—and may I repeat—we are not asking the Metro Manila Council to have legislative power to enact ordinances. That is why we are giving it to the local governments which have that power—legislative power. The sanggunians, the councils with their vice mayors, they are by law authorized to make ordinances and they will be the ones to do that.

One thing more: this Congress can give that power to whoever. That is the little I know of the law. This Congress can give that power and that is why we are here. If we vote "yes" to it, then we give that right to all the local governments of Metro Manila, and I think that will be the start. We can move forward with it. We are not—and I want to repeat—we are not or this measure is not asking to give the mayors, the Metro Manila Council, for that authority. It is that simple.

REP. TIANGCO. Mme. Speaker, I would like to beg to disagree with the honorable Sponsor. The court did not do any judicial legislation. It is an accepted legal principle that the rulings of the Supreme Court become part of the laws of the land. In the case of the *MMDA vs. Bel-Air*, the Supreme Court simply interpreted and even cited the constitutional provision with regard to local autonomy. With regard to the definition of "promulgate" as read by the honorable Sponsor, I agree, "promulgate" can mean "to put a law in effect." The question is, what is the basis of that law? Is it a legal basis or not?

The honorable Sponsor has argued that Congress can give the power to the MMDA, that Congress can give powers to the MMDA within the bounds of the Constitution, but Congress cannot give powers to any body that is beyond or against a constitutional provision. The constitutional provision is very clear: "The territorial and political subdivision shall enjoy local autonomy." Again, this means that you cannot implement an ordinance outside its political boundary.

Earlier, the honorable Sponsor agreed—may I ask the honorable Sponsor that, if Navotas passes an ordinance, can it be implemented in Malabon?

REP. FERNANDO. Certainly not, Your Honor, Mme. Speaker.

REP. TIANGCO. So, "certainly not." So, how can you implement an ordinance passed in eight local government units in the local government unit that did not approve it if earlier you said that you cannot implement an ordinance over and above and beyond the political boundary of an LGU? So, how can it be possible, Mme. Speaker, because I asked whether I

can implement—when an ordinance passed in Navotas can be implemented in Malabon, but it cannot be? So, definitely, the reason is that it is beyond its political boundary. So now, assuming nine out of the 17 local governments passed an ordinance, how can you implement it in the LGUs that did not pass the ordinance without violating their local autonomy? For example, a city council, the council of one LGU passed an ordinance contrary to the ordinance passed by the majority, which one will prevail in that LGU, Mme. Speaker?

REP. FERNANDO. Mme. Speaker, I think that issue has been answered before. It is no longer a question of an ordinance of Malabon being implemented in Navotas, but this ordinance was not made by Malabon but was made by all sanggunians of Metro Manila as a collegial body. This is a collaborative decision of the 17 municipalities. It is not the decision only of Malabon because these ordinances as defined in the measure will only be involved in metro-wide concerns and not only with an individual local government. It may concern the whole of Metro Manila, all the local governments. It is not local anymore, it is a collegial body that decides on it. One thing nice with this is that the local government being given that authority to vote, carries with it the responsibility. For every authority, there is an equal responsibility—there is always a responsibility and that responsibility now will make things work because now, the local governments will be involved.

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

The Bill states that only bills within the mandate of the MMDA will be passed through this means, not anything outside of its mandate, and the mandate of MMDA is that those which involve metro-wide needs and so, it is defined. It will not involve just a particular city but that which affects neighbors, and it can actually settle conflicts between local governments. To give an example of this local governance, where local autonomy is not really absolute, the city of Pasig, if you will remember, got into trouble when it passed a tax law that was not harmonized with that in the other communities in the region. The court actually asked Pasig City to return all the money collected. That is one example. You just cannot do that, on your own, and though it is a tax measure that will be applied only for Pasig, they have to contend or they have to harmonize these things with those in a bigger community outside of its territorial boundaries.

The other thing, zoning—the local government can propose zoning for their own community but it needs the approval of the MMDA. For what purpose? To harmonize it with the adjacent communities, the other cities, because you might end up approving, let us say, a slaughterhouse right beside a commercial center, or

a slaughterhouse right beside a hospital in the adjacent community. That needs to be harmonized and so, you see that local autonomy is not absolute, that there are limits to it. It is limited by something and this law will settle those things. It can harmonize those things. It can settle disputes. It can save us from so much trouble because, at least there is this Council that is so organized and in place, that will do such function more effectively.

REP. TIANGCO. Mr. Speaker, may I know from the honorable Sponsor the exact title of the case of the city of Pasig so that I can see what the decision really stated. I totally agree with the honorable Sponsor that local autonomy is not absolute because local autonomy is subject to the limitations of the provisions of the Constitution, in the same manner that any bill or law we pass is limited by the provisions of the Constitution. That is what I am exactly trying to say to the honorable Sponsor, that the Constitution does not allow a non-political subdivision like the MMDA to have a legislative power such as enacting ordinances. Earlier, the honorable Sponsor mentioned a collegial body. What was he referring to when he stated the words “collegial body”? What are you referring to? Can I know what the author is exactly referring to as a collegial body that can enact ordinances?

REP. FERNANDO. Mr. Speaker, if I remember, the dictionary defines “collegiality” as “having equal rights to vote, equal authority and responsibility.” I think that is how the dictionary defines “collegiality.” A collegial body votes on something that commits everybody to the whim or the wish of the majority. That is how it works, I guess.

REP. TIANGCO. No, what I mean, Mr. Speaker, first of all, I will reiterate—the staff is at the back of the honorable Sponsor and I hope they can let me know the title of the case of the city of Pasig so that I can research on why its ordinance was declared null and void by the court. I know the definition of collegial. What I am asking is, which collegial body that the honorable Sponsor is referring to, is it the Metro Manila Council?

REP. FERNANDO. Mr. Speaker, the Metro Manila Council is one collegial body. Now, this assembly, or we call it an “assembly,” but this voting right that will be given to the local sanggunian makes them a collegial body. They are given that authority to vote, to choose, to decide, and that is a collegial body. That is actually as simple as I can say it.

REP. TIANGCO. Mr. Speaker, if my understanding is correct, what the honorable Sponsor means is that

the Council, if given the authority by the sanggunian, if the sanggunian votes, then that sanggunian, that LGU is committed to that ordinance. Is my understanding correct, honorable Sponsor?

REP. FERNANDO. All the sanggunians will be committed to that decision of the majority because they are given equal authority and then, they also have to share equally in the responsibility. That goes with it, that responsibility.

*At this juncture, Deputy Speaker Singson relinquished the Chair to Deputy Speaker Linabelle Ruth R. Villarica.*

Hindi pupuwede diyan na komo nag-“no” ka, hindi ka na kasali. Hindi puwede iyon, na exempted ka pag nag-“no” ka, hindi ganoon. Whether you voted “yes” or “no,” but the decision says we have to do it, that all of us will have to do it, then so be it. We all have to do it. Iyan lamang ang paraan para magkaroon ng pagkakaisa ang Metro Manila. Exactly, iyan ang kailangan natin kasi sa ngayon, napakadali para sa isang mayor na magsabing “Ayaw ko.” Kapag nagsabi siyang “Ayaw ko,” wala nang magagawa ang sinuman kasi ayaw niya. They do not even have the time to discuss this among themselves. I know this for a fact as I was a mayor for nine years and I never had the opportunity to talk for at least an hour on anything about Metro Manila, on the problems of Metro Manila.

So, iyan ang ating sad fact that we need you to know. The Gentleman was also a mayor in Metro Manila, but I think I can count on my fingers the few times that he attended the meetings of the Council, and so with the other mayors, up to this day. I am sorry to say that. I myself, I only went there when I was in the mood to see some mayors not for anything serious, but more to socialize with the other mayors. That is why this time, let us get some other good materials—to have or put some time in the interest of the metropolis. Patulungin natin sila. Ang babata ng mga konsehal natin, may magagaling na ideas iyan, and I think they can even do some work to get things to happen. Let us get them involved kasi masyado nang busy ang mga mayor. The problems of the local governments are too big, I know that, at ubos ang oras dito kasi napakaraming gagawin. Tanggapin na natin iyon pero hindi naman natin puwedeng pabayaang ang Metro Manila and so, ito na ang ating gamitin, and I could not think of any better idea than this.

REP. TIANGCO. Mme. Speaker, earlier, the honorable Sponsor mentioned that when he was the Chairman, mabibilang niya sa kamay niya kung ilang beses ho ako nag-attend at sa tingin ko, lagpas naman ho sa sampu iyong pag-attend ko. The most important

thing is, the Gentleman later on also admitted that when he was mayor, he seldom attended. That is the reason I did not attend so much when he was the Chairman. When he was mayor, he was not also attending and so, I was just following what the leader was doing when he was mayor. That was what I was doing, Mme. Speaker.

Anyway, okay, just to simplify—Metro Manila is not a political subdivision. If we can pass this law or bill that a political subdivision can make ordinances or laws, then, Mme. Speaker, bakit pa kailangan ng probinsiya? Bakit pa kailangan ng governor? Bakit pa kailangan ng vice governor? Bakit pa kailangan na may bokal kung pupuwede naman pala iyong style ng Metro Manila na kung ano ang pagbotohan ng mga mayors noong mga siyudad, iyon ang masusunod? Kung ganoon, makakamernos pa ho ang national na gobyerno dahil walang governor, walang vice governor, walang bokal. Ang mangyayari, iyong mga mayors, uupo sila in a council at boboto, at kung ano ang pagbotohan doon sa council nila, iyon ang masusunod. Puwede naman pala iyon, so what is the difference? Why then do we have to create provinces if we can do it the way the honorable Sponsor wants it to be done? What is the difference of Metro Manila compared to the other provinces? That is, precisely, what I am trying to point out, Mme. Speaker, that only provinces have legislative power because it is so provided in the Constitution. The MMDA or Metro Manila is not a political subdivision; it is a coordinative body which does not have political power.

So, I will simplify. I hope the honorable Sponsor gives me a categorical answer. If the honorable Sponsor, Mme. Speaker, believes that by the majority vote of the local governments, in a votation of local government units, they can pass an ordinance, bakit pa natin kailangan ang probinsiya? Bakit pa natin kailangan ang governor? Bakit kailangan pa natin ang vice governor? Bakit kailangan pa ng bokal? That is, precisely, my point because it cannot be done, but if the honorable Sponsor thinks otherwise, then I want an explanation why the provinces cannot do it and they have to create a province in order to have legislative and police powers, Mme. Speaker?

REP. FERNANDO. Mme. Speaker, Metro Manila is a special administrative region according to the Constitution, so, it was not this Congress which—Congress was a part of making this happen and we are so unfortunate that it does not have an elected governor and a provincial board. So, in its place, this could be our provincial board, but better still—I know that provinces also do have problems within their provincial boards and with their relationships with other local governments. They do have problems, but this one will get the local government legislators to be part of the whole decision-making. I am hoping that if this happens, this can be a good model for all communities, for all the provinces,

or for all these federal states that they are thinking of. This may be a good model.

So, who knows? Let us give it a try and if it comes out good, maybe, we will have then contributed to the betterment of this country. Let us give it a try. Wala namang mawawala sa atin. Nandiyan na ang mga konsehal, and they will not be receiving any additional salaries or benefits from this. Nandiyan na iyong mga vice mayor doing their functions, and they will do this without additional benefits. Walang mawawala sa atin at wala namang mawawala sa atin sapagkat wala pang nabuong Metro Manila Council hanggang sa ngayon. For 24 years, walang nabuo. Iyon lamang, very specific in its mandate, in the MMDA Law that the MMDA shall create a single-ticketing system for Metro Manila, but that never happened. What do we have now after 24 years? Seventeen different traffic laws for Metro Manila, and may I repeat the consequence of this: our motorists, everybody gets confused because each city has its own regulations and in that confusion, the poor motorists, the poor road users cannot do anything and the best they know on how to save themselves from this is kotong—magbayad na lang and so, that is very prevalent in this city. Nakakahiya, nakakaawa tayo.

So, this traffic is proof enough that we may need this. This may not be the only thing that can improve this traffic, but I think that this would be one good thing which we could start with. This has been envisioned by Congress in this same hall that passed that MMDA Law that, by now, after 24 years, we should have perfected a traffic system in Metro Manila that is covered by laws and through those laws, we would have molded the mind, the character, the discipline of our people. In the absence of these laws, what do we have? What do we have now? The most undisciplined people on the road.

Kaya tayo, now we suffer. Subukan natin ito at baka naman pupuwede para sa ating lahat, even for the Congressmen from other communities though you may be from far away in Sulu or far away in the Visayas, from where we are. We are all here in Metro Manila, where the bulk of our people, at least once in their lives, will set foot on this metropolis. Let this metropolis be the model for the country. Let this be the model because the best people in this country are all here in Metro Manila, at dito sa atin ay dapat matuto ang buong bansa. Tayo, we should take the lead and in leading, we have to give the right example for everybody.

So, ito pakiusap ko na lang na whatever the infirmities that you may see on this measure, at least, let us give it a try. Hindi naman ito ngayon lang nangyari. Hindi ngayon lang na sinimulan ito. I myself had eight years to try to make good of that MMDA Law passed 24 years ago, but it never worked. So somehow, let us try. Nakakahinayang, because that MMDA law, for the information of everybody, hinugot pa iyan sa karanasan,

maybe 35, 40 years ago, from the inception of Metro Manila, dumating ang Metro Manila Authority. Before that, during the time of President Marcos, they had this Metro Manila administered by no less than the former First Lady Imelda Marcos. Alam ba ninyo, ultimong the language that we are using in the MMDA, to this day, hinugot pa iyan from this institution. It has been that long with us. Iyong mga ginagawa ng MMDA ay hindi lang ngayon nag-umpisa iyan pero iyan ang karanasan ng buong Metro Manila, karanasan sa mahabang panahon.

Ako ay nanghihinayang. Wala naman tayong binabago doon sa lahat ng ginawang magaling ng mga nakaraang namuno sa ating ahensiya na ito kapag kayo ay pumunta sa MMDA. Ang unang-una kong ginawa noong ako ay umupo, isinabit ko sa mabuting lugar ang litrato ng ating First Lady Imelda Marcos and from then on, I expressed the intent to continue with the good things that it had started and we improved on them and we did try our best. Hindi ko o hindi namin kinakalimutan ang nakaraan. Ganoon pa man, though how good these framers and these ideas are, still, we need this legislation. We need this measure so that, at least, by this time, we will have something good happening.

REP. TIANGCO. Mme. Speaker, there is no argument that the honorable Sponsor, and I think everyone in these august halls of Congress, wants better traffic regulations, better garbage collection, flood mitigation, but we have a sworn duty to uphold the Constitution. What I am only pointing out, Mme. Speaker, is that the provisions being introduced in this Bill are contrary to the provisions of the Constitution. The Constitution has given a solution, and the Constitution has stated, under Article X, Section 11, that we can create a special metropolitan political subdivision subject to a plebiscite. So, iyon ho, kaya ang sinasabi lang natin dito is, gawin natin ito ng tama—either mag-plebisito tayo or habang wala pa ho iyong plebisito, Mme. Speaker, kung ano man iyong ordinansa na gustong ipasa ng Metro Manila Council, bakit hindi ho nila dalhin dito sa Kongreso dahil mayroon tayong Metro Manila Development Committee, at doon sa komite na iyon, instead na itong Bill na gustong ipasa, kung ano iyong batas na kailangan nilang i-implement para magkaroon ng single ticketing system.

Bakit hindi ho maghain ang MMDA ng isang proposed bill dito sa Kongreso para magkaroon ng single ticketing system sa Metro Manila? Kapag tayo ho ang nagpasa noon, ipinasa ho dito at ipinasa ng Senado, ng Kongreso, magiging batas ho iyan sa Metro Manila at wala tayong pagtatalunan sa implementation. Wala ho tayong pagtatalunan dito.

Iyon lang ho ang hindi ko maintindihan, Mme. Speaker, dahil iyon ho ang tamang proseso. Kaya nga



kanina ay naitanong ko ho kung mayroong ganoong proposal, specific proposal ang ating honorable Sponsor noong siya ay Chairman ng MMDA. Kung noong siya ho ay Chairman ng MMDA at hindi niya mapatupad iyong single ticketing system, bakit hindi ho siya nag-propose ng batas na magpapatupad ng single ticketing system sa Metro Manila? Iyon ho ang aking tanong. Iyon ho ang tamang prosesong dapat gawin para maipatupad iyan nang walang kuwestiyon regarding constitutionality. So, bakit hindi ho siya nag-propose ng ganoong klaseng batas kung iyon pala ho ang problema?

REP. FERNANDO. Mme. Speaker, ito ang sabi sa batas: "Install and administer a single ticketing system, fix, impose and collect fines and penalties for all kinds of violations of traffic rules and regulations, whether moving or non-moving in nature, and confiscate and suspend or revoke driver's licenses in the enforcement of such ..." and so on and so forth. We were mandated to put it up. So, I did not feel the need for me to belabor this Congress to pass a law because it had already given us that work, that assignment. I need not belabor Congress to do that.

Now that I am in Congress, I can see that this Congress can really be so busy attending to so many things, to matters that are of importance and so, that is why I proposed this. As I said earlier, I proposed this same measure—I proposed it during my time in looking for a way to make that Council to be more effective. I was looking for a way and I did propose that. Kung hindi ko nakuhang mapapayag ang Kongreso noon, siguro, ay dahil hindi ko alam how Congress worked at that time. If I had been a Congressman before ako naging Chairman, siguro, I would have been a better Chairman of the MMDA because I would have known the ways to go through the maze of Congress to get a law passed. Anyway, that was a job for the MMDA given by this Congress and so, I did not feel the need to give it back for us to work on.

REP. TIANGCO. Mme. Speaker, the question I raised was based on the statement of the honorable Sponsor that he could not implement the single ticketing system, but based on what he read, that it is within the powers of the MMDA. So, which is which?

Kaya ko lang naman ho naitanong kung bakit hindi niya na-propose iyon dahil ang sabi niya ay hindi niya ma-implement ito pero doon ho sa kanyang binasang probisyon, nasa mandate pala ng MMDA iyon. So, kung nasa mandate pala ng MMDA iyon, bakit hindi ipinatupad?

REP. FERNANDO. Pinatutupad po namin. I made a complete system to effect a single ticketing system for Metro Manila pero walang naniwala doon kung hindi MMDA mismo. Exactly, kung anong ginagawa

ng MMDA noon, iyon ang single ticketing system, to which the 17 local governments of Metro Manila, the 17 mayors of Metro Manila disagreed to have. So, I do not think I was remiss in my duty but sorry, I have my limitations. I could not convince them. So, I had to try some other means, and up to this day that I am no longer responsible for that agency, I am still fighting for it because I know that it is the best for our community.

I owe this to our people. So, I am here, not for me dahil hindi naman ako magiging Chairman ng MMDA forever, matanda na ako but, at least, I have been working on this. Wala akong makukuha rito kaya, ano, intindihin nalang natin ito, ang measure na ito. Alam ko, there is another Congressman from Metro Manila who has a good study—to make the post of the Chairman of Metro Manila to have the rank of governor by being elected—nasa kanya iyon. But, you know, I think he has been trying to get this Congress to agree on it and for too long, wala pa ito hanggang ngayon. I do not know if it has ever been formally submitted to the Plenary of this Congress but it is with him, he has shown it to me. I have no objection to it. I do not know but I do not think I could do it in this Congress to have, at least, a governor elected for Metro Manila, mukhang malaking job for a neophyte Congressman like me.

So, iyan ang ano ko sa inyo, at least ito, baka sakali ay mailusot pa natin ito pero to have a plebiscite for Metro Manila, mukhang it is a big undertaking, and it may take—siguro, kung sakali, itong federalism, if they would have some ideas, then, siguro iyon na ang mag-ano. In the meantime, we cannot just sit and watch, and we have to do something about this traffic in Metro Manila, at least. This traffic, ano, talagang everybody is affected by this.

So, ito lang, and with the passage of this measure, I think we can really get the MMDA to be more effective, which is actually what is envisioned by this measure. It is not the MMDA but the MMC that will work and that will make the MMDA, its executive arm, to be more effective.

Iyon ang aking—na sana sa atin, ang pakiusap na lang talaga because maraming ano, mahirap nating ma-ano ang lahat ng bagay sapagkat 24 years is too long a time for experimentation. Alam ko, nanghihinawa na ang maraming tao dahil wala tayong magawa, but we have to do something about it.

REP. TIANGCO. Mme. Speaker, I will go to Section 6, letter (E), on page five, lines 19 to 22 of the proposed Bill. It states, and I will quote: "IT MAY ARBITRATE ANY CONFLICT OR ISSUE ARISING FROM ANY ORDINANCE, RULE, REGULATION, POLICY OR STANDARD BETWEEN OR AMONG THE CITY AND MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS."

Sa pagkakaalam ko ho, Mme. Speaker, ang puwede lang magdesisyon sa kahit anong conflict between local

government units ay ang korte. So, ang question ko ho sa ating honorable Sponsor, paano ho kung magkaiba ang desisyon ng korte at saka ng MMDA, alin ho ang masusunod?

REP. FERNANDO. I think, like anything else, it is the court, finally. If the MMDA fails to arbitrate, then it goes to court, the final arbitrator of things. So, I think that has no question.

REP. TIANGCO. Okay. So, next ho, sa page eight, letter (E) of Section 6-A, lines one to four: “AFTER THE RECEIPT OF THE PROPOSAL, THE *SANGGUNIAN* SHALL EITHER APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE THE PROPOSED ORDINANCE *IN TOTO* WITHOUT ANY AMENDMENT.”

Paano naman ho gagawin noong sanggunian iyan, hindi ho ba may public hearing? Kung base ho doon sa public hearing ng mga konsehal o ng sanggunian ng isang lungsod, ang mabuti para sa constituents noong lungsod na iyon ay hindi “yes” or “no,” kung hindi mayroong ibang mas mabuti, bakit naman ho lilimitahan? Kung ang Kongreso nga ay hindi pupuwedeng limitahan ng “yes” or “no,” bakit naman natin nililimitahan na ang puwede lang gawin noong sanggunian is to approve *in toto* without any amendment? So, that again is a violation of fiscal autonomy.

Kaya nga ho tayo nagkakaroon ng public hearing, kaya nagkakaroon ng public hearing ang konseho ng isang siyudad para marinig ang constituents nila. Ngayon, kung base sa mga public hearing, hindi naman “yes” or “no” ang makakabuti sa siyudad at mayroong ibang revisions o amendments na dapat gawin doon sa ordinansang proposed ng MMDA, bakit naman sila lilimitahan doon lang sa “yes” or “no”?

REP. FERNANDO. Mme. Speaker, on the same section, item (B), it says:

THE MEMBERS OF THE METRO MANILA COUNCIL SHALL COORDINATE AND CONSULT WITH THEIR RESPECTIVE LOCAL GOVERNMENT UNITS AND OFFICES AND THE PUBLIC TO DETERMINE THAT THE MATTER PRESENTED TO THE METRO MANILA COUNCIL IS RELEVANT AND OF METRO-WIDE APPLICATION. THE RESULT OF THE METRO-WIDE CONSULTATION SHALL BE PRESENTED TO THE METRO MANILA COUNCIL, WHICH MAY OPT TO FORM A TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP AS IT DEEMS NECESSARY ON ISSUES ARISING FROM THE CONSULTATIONS.

In addition, on letter (C) of the same section, it states: “AFTER DUE AND DILIGENT CONSULTATIONS AND DELIBERATIONS, THE METRO MANILA COUNCIL SHALL VOTE ON THE PROPOSAL AND APPROVE IT BY THE MAJORITY VOTE OF ITS VOTING MEMBERS.”

That approval would mean that if approved, it will now go for decision by the local sanggunians. It should not be mistaken that the vote of the Council is the enacting law—no, it is just voting, the Council is voting. It means that it is acceptable to the Council and once acceptable to the Council, it is forwarded to the local government units, the sanggunian. So, actually, it is here in the process that any concern of the local government can be presented to the Council during the deliberations. There would be time for it because for one, their mayors are actually informed about all these things and their mayors, if they find the need to consult the sanggunians, they may do so and present their idea or objection, or whatever, to the Metro Manila Council for consideration.

So, there will be diligent efforts to get the best ideas to come out. In any concern of the local government, if a mayor thinks its local government is not involved in such things or it is not necessary to be involved in such activity, the mayor may ask from the Council, before it is put to a vote, that it be exempt from that ordinance that is being envisioned. That is in the process and so, it is not actually an overnight thing, that it will be approved without the knowledge of these people who are going to finally vote on it.

The idea of having them to vote “yes” or “no” and no further amendment—because if we will subject it to another round of amendments, it will never end because there are 287 councilors in Metro Manila—it means 287 minds to contend with, and so, we will never have anything passed in that manner.

So, I think that this procedure actually came as a result of the technical working group meetings which we have formed and actually, the mayors sent their representatives to this technical working group, and it is also with the participation of the vice mayors—the President of the Vice Mayors League and the participation of the League of Councilors of Metro Manila—in this technical working group where they had a hand in the formulation of these rules.

REP. TIANGCO. Mme. Speaker, what I am trying to point out is, kahit ano namang ipapasa noong mayor doon sa Council, may karapatan sila—nasa Council ang karapatan na i-amend iyon o magbase doon sa kanilang public hearing. Ang ating Sponsor ay naging mayor ho. Wala namang ipinasa ang mayor doon sa kanyang sanggunian na puwede niyang sabihin, “yes or no lang kayo dito, hindi ninyo puwede itong amyendahan.” Kaya nga nagkakaroon ng public hearing, kaya nga mayroong

Council, ito ay para magkaroon ng pinakamabuting ordinansa para doon sa siyudad na iyon. So, there is no way na pupuwede mong sabihin sa Council na “yes” or “no” lang at hindi pupuwedeng amyendahan. So, kung mayroon hong probisyon sa batas na alam iyong ating honorable Sponsor, sana ho malaman ko at saka kanina pa ho ako nanghihingi, mayroon na ba iyong Secretariat noong case doon sa Pasig, kung ano ho iyong title noon?

REP. FERNANDO. Hindi ko ho matandaan, but ...

REP. TIANGCO. Hindi ho, mayroon ho kayong mga staff diyan sa likod, puwede naman ho nilang i-check ito.

REP. FERNANDO. Opo, paki-check nga. Na-check ba ninyo? The only thing I can remember, Mme. Speaker, about that is the tax—the Revenue Officer of Pasig eventually became the Revenue Officer of Quezon City.

REP. TIANGCO. Sorry, Mme. Speaker, I was not listening.

REP. FERNANDO. That is as far as I can remember on that case.

REP. TIANGCO. What is the title of the case?

REP. FERNANDO. It is actually the tax code of Pasig. Remember, during the nineties, Marikina was the first to pass a tax ordinance and it was followed then by Pasig. Those tax measures then were big issues in Metro Manila and the whole country. So, I think many people had been aware of that, but that was not exactly the decision. It was the law—the tax law of Pasig was not harmonized with those of the other communities.

REP. TIANGCO. Mme. Speaker, anyway, I will research on that decision of the court but if it is a tax code, I am just assuming that the tax code, maybe, was declared void. As they could not tell me the title, I am just assuming, maybe it was over and above what the Local Government Code was allowing and, of course, if it is over and above what the Local Government Code is allowing, it will be declared null and void by the court. The tax code that the honorable Sponsor mentioned is a good example that you cannot have a uniform ordinance in the whole of Metro Manila, na sasabihin mo lang “yes” or “no” dito. The tax code case proves na kaya nga kahit magkakatabi ay iba-iba iyong taxes

because these are based on a public hearing, so, hindi talaga pupuwede.

Anyway, the Majority Leader has signaled me that I have to stop. I just want to correct something— hindi ho approved ang lahat ng mayors sa Bill na ito. Based on my understanding, isang mayor lang ang nag-express ng full support sa Bill na ito.

So, since my attention was called by the Majority Leader, I will yield to the pleasure of the Majority Leader, Mme. Speaker.

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

#### SUSPENSION OF CONSIDERATION OF H.B. NO. 6973

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we suspend the consideration of House Bill No. 6973, as contained in Committee Report No. 572, submitted by the Committee on Metro Manila Development.

I so move, Mme. Speaker

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

#### CONSIDERATION OF H.B. NO. 6285 ON SECOND READING

##### PERIOD OF SPONSORSHIP AND DEBATE

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I move now that we consider House Bill No. 6285, contained in Committee Report No. 631, as reported out by the Committee on Revision of Laws.

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

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

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

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

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 6285, entitled: AN ACT DECLARING JANUARY 18 OF EVERY YEAR A SPECIAL NONWORKING

\* See MEASURES CONSIDERED (printed separately)

HOLIDAY FOR ALL KASAMBAHAY IN THE ENTIRE COUNTRY TO BE KNOWN AS “*ARAW NG KASAMBAHAY*.”

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I move that the Chairperson of the Committee on Revision of Laws, the Hon. Marlyn L. Primicias-Agabas, be recognized to begin her sponsorship of the measure.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). The honorable Representative Primicias-Agabas is recognized.

SPONSORSHIP SPEECH OF REP. PRIMICIAS-AGABAS

REP. PRIMICIAS-AGABAS. Thank you, Mme. Speaker.

House Bill No. 6285 seeks to declare January 18 of every year as *Araw ng mga Kasambahay*, a non-working holiday for all the *kasambahay*. Under Section 39 of Republic Act No. 10361, otherwise known as the “Domestic Workers Act” or “*Batas Kasambahay*,” the date upon which the President shall approve the Domestic Workers Act shall be designated as the “*Araw ng mga Kasambahay*.” The Domestic Workers Act was signed into law on January 18, 2013.

“Domestic worker” or “*kasambahay*” as defined under Section 4, paragraph (d) of Republic Act No. 10361 refers to any person engaged in domestic work within an employment relationship such as, but not limited to, the following: general household help, nursemaid or *yaya*, cook, gardener or laundry person, but shall exclude any person who performs domestic work only occasionally or sporadically and not on an occupational basis. The important role that domestic workers play in the growth of the Filipino society cannot be disputed. Domestic workers dedicate their efforts to promote the well-being of their employers. They ensure that the homes they manage are in good and orderly condition. They cook, wash and iron clothes, clean the house and take care of the kids and their pets, among other household duties. With the help of domestic workers, employers have the time and luxury to work and pursue their careers and still manage to have a happy and healthy family.

Setting a special day for the *kasambahay* and declaring it as a non-working holiday for all the *kasambahay* in the whole country is a way of giving due recognition and great appreciation for the invaluable service they render to every home and family. January 18 shall be designated as *Araw ng mga Kasambahay*, when our *kasambahay* is given a work-free day in order for them to attend to the activities that may be organized by the Department of Labor and Employment or to attend their much-needed personal errands.

Mme. Speaker, in view of the foregoing, approval of the Bill is earnestly sought.

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

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, there being no Member who wishes to interpellate or speak against the measure, I move that we terminate the period of sponsorship and debate.

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

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we open the period of amendments.

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

The period of amendments is now open.

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, there being no Committee amendments, I move that we now proceed to consider individual amendments.

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

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, there being no Committee or individual amendments, I move that we close the period of amendments.

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

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we include additional coauthors of House Bills No. 6285, 7005, 7185, 7266, 7233, 7293, 7296 and 7295 as contained in the list to be submitted by the Committee on Rules. I so move, Mme. Speaker.

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

REP. LOPEZ (B.). Mme. Speaker, I move that we vote on Second Reading on House Bill No. 6285.

*VIVA VOCE VOTING*

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). As many as are in favor of House Bill No. 6285, please say *aye*.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. *Aye*.

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

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 6285  
ON SECOND READING

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

House Bill No. 6285 is approved on Second Reading.

CONSIDERATION OF H.B. NO. 7199  
ON SECOND READING

PERIOD OF SPONSORSHIP AND DEBATE

REP. PRIMICIAS-AGABAS. Mme. Speaker, I move now that we consider House Bill No. 7199, contained in Committee Report No. 615, as reported out by the Committee on Legislative Franchises.

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

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

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

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

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 7199, entitled: AN ACT RENEWING FOR ANOTHER TWENTY-FIVE (25) YEARS THE FRANCHISE GRANTED TO THE DELTA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC. TO ESTABLISH, MAINTAIN AND OPERATE RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTING STATIONS WITHIN THE PHILIPPINES UNDER REPUBLIC ACT NO. 7723.

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

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

REP. PRIMICIAS-AGABAS. Mme. Speaker, I move that the Chairperson of the Committee on Legislative Franchises, the Hon. Franz E. Alvarez from the First District of Palawan, be recognized for his sponsorship speech.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). The Hon. Franz Alvarez is recognized to sponsor the measure.

REP. ALVAREZ (F.). Mme. Speaker, may I request that the Explanatory Note of the Bill be considered as the sponsorship speech on the measure.

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

REP. PRIMICIAS-AGABAS. Mme. Speaker, there being no Member who wishes to interpellate or speak against the measure, I move that we close the period of sponsorship and debate.

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

REP. PRIMICIAS-AGABAS. Mme. Speaker, I move that we open the period of amendments.

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

REP. PRIMICIAS-AGABAS. Mme. Speaker, there being no Committee or individual amendments, I move that we close the period of amendments.

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

REP. PRIMICIAS-AGABAS. Mme. Speaker, I move that we vote on Second Reading on House Bill No. 7199.

VIVA VOCE VOTING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). As many as are in favor of House Bill No. 7199, please say *aye*.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. *Aye*.

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

FEW MEMBERS. *Nay*.

\* See MEASURES CONSIDERED (printed separately)

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 7199  
ON SECOND READING

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

House Bill No. 7199 is approved on Second Reading.

CONSIDERATION OF H.B. NO. 7290  
ON SECOND READING

PERIOD OF SPONSORSHIP AND DEBATE

REP. PRIMICIAS-AGABAS. Mme. Speaker, I move now that we consider House Bill No. 7290, contained in Committee Report No. 630, as reported out by the Committee on Public Information.

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

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

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

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

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 7290, entitled: AN ACT CHANGING THE COMPOSITION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR CHILDREN'S TELEVISION, AMENDING FOR THE PURPOSE SECTION 6 OF REPUBLIC ACT NO. 8370, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE "CHILDREN'S TELEVISION ACT OF 1997."

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

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

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

REP. PRIMICIAS-AGABAS. Mme. Speaker, may I request that the Chairperson of the Committee on

Public Information, the Hon. Scott Davies S. Lanete, be recognized for his sponsorship speech.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). The Honorable Lanete is recognized.

REP. LANETE. Mme. Speaker, I move that the Explanatory Note of the Bill be considered as the sponsorship speech on the measure.

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

REP. PRIMICIAS-AGABAS. Mme. Speaker, there being no Member who wishes to interpellate or speak against the measure, I move that we terminate the period of sponsorship and debate.

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

REP. PRIMICIAS-AGABAS. Mme. Speaker, I move that we open the period of amendments.

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

REP. PRIMICIAS-AGABAS. Mme. Speaker, there being no Committee or individual amendment, I move that we close the period of amendments.

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

REP. PRIMICIAS-AGABAS. Mme. Speaker, I move that we vote on Second Reading on House Bill No. 7290.

VIVA VOCE VOTING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Villarica). As many as are in favor of House Bill No. 7290, please say *aye*.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. *Aye*.

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

FEW MEMBERS. *Nay*.



APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 7290  
ON SECOND READING

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

House Bill No. 7290 is approved on Second Reading.

CONSIDERATION OF H. CT. RES. NO. 14

REP. PRIMICIAS-AGABAS. Mme. Speaker, I move that we consider House Concurrent Resolution No. 14.

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

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

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

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

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Concurrent Resolution No. 14, entitled: CONCURRENT RESOLUTION AMENDING HOUSE BILL NO. 6104, ENTITLED "AN ACT CONVERTING THE LICOP ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN BARANGAY LICOP, MATI CITY,

PROVINCE OF DAVAO ORIENTAL INTO AN INTEGRATED SCHOOL TO BE KNOWN AS LICOP INTEGRATED SCHOOL AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR."

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

ADOPTION OF H. CT. RES. NO. 14

REP. PRIMICIAS-AGABAS. Mme. Speaker, I move that we adopt House Concurrent Resolution No. 14.

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

House Concurrent Resolution No. 14 is adopted.

ADJOURNMENT OF SESSION

REP. PRIMICIAS-AGABAS. Mme. Speaker, there being no more matters for the day, I move that we adjourn the session until tomorrow, March 7, at four o'clock in the afternoon. I so move, Mme. Speaker.

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

The session is adjourned until tomorrow, March 7, at four o'clock in the afternoon.

*It was 6:13 p.m.*

\* See MEASURES CONSIDERED (printed separately)