



# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 3

Wednesday, November 21, 2018

No. 32

## CALL TO ORDER

*At 3:00 p.m., Deputy Speaker Prospero A. Pichay Jr. called the session to order.*

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

## NATIONAL ANTHEM

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Everybody will please rise to sing the Philippine National Anthem.

*Everybody rose to sing the Philippine National Anthem.*

## PRAYER

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Everybody will please remain standing for a minute of silent prayer.

*Everybody remained standing for the silent prayer.*

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

REP. PIMENTEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to defer the calling of the roll.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is a motion to defer the calling of the roll. Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. PIMENTEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to defer the approval of the Journal.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is a motion to defer the approval of the Journal. Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

## SUSPENSION OF SESSION

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

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). The Chair suspends the session for one minute.

*It was 3:03 p.m.*

## RESUMPTION OF SESSION

*At 3:06 p.m., the session was resumed.*

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

The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. PIMENTEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that we now proceed to the Reference of Business.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is a motion to proceed to the Reference of Business. Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

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

## REFERENCE OF BUSINESS

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

## BILLS ON FIRST READING

House Bill No. 8589, entitled:

“AN ACT REPEALING REPUBLIC ACT NO. 10912 ALSO KNOWN AS ‘CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2016’ AND OTHER RELATED ISSUANCES, GUIDELINES, AND MEMORANDUMS”

By Representative Herrera-Dy  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON HIGHER AND  
TECHNICAL EDUCATION AND THE  
COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND  
PROFESSIONAL REGULATION

INSTITUTIONALIZING MECHANISMS  
FOR IMPLEMENTATION THEREOF AND  
FOR OTHER PURPOSES”

By Representative Pico  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND  
EMPLOYMENT

House Bill No. 8592, entitled:

“AN ACT INSTITUTING THE FARMERS  
AND FISHERFOLK ENTERPRISE  
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM OF THE  
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND  
FOR OTHER PURPOSES”

House Bill No. 8597, entitled:

“AN ACT TO PROVIDE A NATIONAL FOLIC  
EDUCATION PROGRAM TO PREVENT  
BIRTH DEFECTS”

By Representative Panganiban  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE  
AND FOOD AND THE COMMITTEE  
ON AQUACULTURE AND FISHERIES  
RESOURCES

By Representative Pico  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH

House Bill No. 8593, entitled:

“ANACTAMENDINGPERTINENTPROVISIONS  
OF REPUBLIC ACT NO. 9257 OTHERWISE  
KNOWN AS THE EXPANDED SENIOR  
CITIZENS ACT OF 2003, RELATIVE TO THE  
PROVISIONS ON THE CONTRIBUTION TO  
THE COMMUNITY, AND PRIVILEGES FOR  
THE SENIOR CITIZENS, AND FOR OTHER  
PURPOSES”

House Bill No. 8598, entitled:

“AN ACT EXPANDING THE DEFINITION  
OF A BOOK AND THE BENEFITS  
ATTENDANT THERETO, AMENDING  
FOR THIS PURPOSE REPUBLIC ACT NO.  
8047, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS AN ACT  
PROVIDING FOR THE DEVELOPMENT  
OF THE BOOK PUBLISHING INDUSTRY  
THROUGH THE FORMULATION AND  
IMPLEMENTATION OF A NATIONAL  
BOOK POLICY AND A NATIONAL BOOK  
DEVELOPMENT PLAN”

By Representative Cagas  
TO THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SENIOR  
CITIZENS

By Representative Pico  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION  
AND CULTURE

House Bill No. 8594, entitled:

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

House Bill No. 8599, entitled:

“AN ACT ENHANCING THE PHILIPPINE  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT  
SYSTEM, STRENGTHEN PUBLIC  
PARTICIPATION THEREIN, AND FOR  
RELATED PURPOSES”

By Representative Dalipe  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION  
AND CULTURE

By Representative Pico  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL  
RESOURCES

House Bill No. 8595, entitled:

“AN ACT ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL HIGH  
SCHOOL IN BARANGAY LANDANG  
GUA, ZAMBOANGA CITY TO BE KNOWN  
AS SACOL ISLAND NATIONAL HIGH  
SCHOOL AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS  
THEREFOR”

House Bill No. 8600, entitled:

“AN ACT CREATING THE MAGNA CARTA OF  
BARANGAY NUTRITION SCHOLARS AND  
APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR”

By Representative Dalipe  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION  
AND CULTURE

By Representative Pico  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL  
GOVERNMENT

House Bill No. 8596, entitled:

“AN ACT PROVIDING FOR A MAGNA CARTA  
OF WORKERS IN INFORMAL ECONOMY,

House Bill No. 8601, entitled:

“AN ACT INCREASING THE COMPENSATION  
OF THOSE UNJUSTLY DETAINED AND  
TRANSFERRING THE BOARD OF CLAIMS  
FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
TO THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN  
RIGHTS, AMENDING FOR THE PURPOSE  
REPUBLIC ACT NO. 7309”

By Representative Pico  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF  
LAWS

House Bill No. 8602, entitled:

“AN ACT PROVIDING A BAN ON DUMPING  
OF SEWAGE SLUDGE AND INDUSTRIAL  
WASTE INTO THE SEA”

By Representative Pico  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON ECOLOGY

House Bill No. 8603, entitled:

“AN ACT TO ESTABLISH AN INFANT  
MORTALITY PROGRAM TO REDUCE THE  
RATE OF INFANT MORTALITY IN THE  
COUNTRY, PROVIDING FUNDS THEREFOR  
AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES”

By Representative Pico  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH

House Bill No. 8604, entitled:

“AN ACT DEFINING THE CRIME OF SEXUAL  
INFIDELITY AND PROVIDING PENALTIES  
THEREFOR, AMENDING FOR THE  
PURPOSE ARTICLE 333 (ADULTERY),  
ARTICLE 334 (CONCUBINAGE) AND  
ARTICLES 344 AND 345 OF TITLE ELEVEN,  
BOOK II OF ACT NO. 3815, AS AMENDED,  
OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE REVISED  
PENAL CODE”

By Representative Pico  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF  
LAWS

House Bill No. 8605, entitled:

“AN ACT CONSIDERING RICE OR CORN  
HOARDING AND PROFITEERING  
DURING OR ON THE OCCASION OF ANY  
CALAMITY OR EMERGENCY DECLARED  
AS SUCH BY THE PRESIDENT AS  
EQUIVALENT TO ECONOMIC SABOTAGE,  
PARTLY AMENDING FOR THE PURPOSE  
REPUBLIC ACT NO. 7581, OTHERWISE  
KNOWN AS THE PRICE ACT, AND FOR  
OTHER PURPOSES”

By Representative Pico  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF  
LAWS

House Bill No. 8606, entitled:

“AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE FORESTLAND  
BOUNDARY OF THE PROVINCE OF LA  
UNION”

By Representative Ortega (V.N.)  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL  
RESOURCES

House Bill No. 8607, entitled:

“AN ACT MANDATING FOOD SERVICES TO  
PROVIDE A HEALTH AND NUTRITION  
MENU FOR THEIR FOOD ITEMS”

By Representative Gatchalian  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH

House Bill No. 8608, entitled:

“AN ACT CREATING THE PHILIPPINE RISE  
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (PRDA),  
DEFINING ITS POWERS AND FUNCTIONS,  
PROVIDING FUNDS THEREFOR AND FOR  
OTHER PURPOSES”

By Representative Gatchalian  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT  
REORGANIZATION AND THE COMMITTEE  
ON NATURAL RESOURCES

House Bill No. 8609, entitled:

“AN ACT AMENDING R.A. 7170, OR OTHERWISE  
KNOWN AS THE ‘ORGAN DONATION ACT  
OF 1991, AND IMPLEMENTING A SYSTEM  
OF DEEMED CONSENT’”

By Representative Gatchalian  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH

House Bill No. 8610, entitled:

“AN ACT EXPANDING THE COVERAGE OF,  
AND IMPOSING STIFFER PENALTIES  
FOR, THE CRIME OF REVELATION  
OF SECRETS, AMENDING FOR THE  
PURPOSE ARTICLES 291 AND 292 OF ACT  
NO. 3815, AS AMENDED, OTHERWISE  
KNOWN AS THE ‘REVISED PENAL  
CODE’”

By Representative Marcoleta  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF  
LAWS

House Bill No. 8611, entitled:

“AN ACT PROVIDING FOR THE BAN OF  
AERIAL SPRAYING OF PESTICIDES AND  
OTHER HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES AND  
FOR OTHER PURPOSES”

By Representative Pico  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON ECOLOGY

## RESOLUTIONS

House Resolution No. 2307, entitled:

“RESOLUTION URGING THE HOUSE OF  
REPRESENTATIVES TO REQUIRE THE  
APPEARANCE AND PARTICIPATION  
OF DEPARTMENT OF BUDGET AND  
MANAGEMENT SECRETARY BENJAMIN  
DIOKNO IN THE QUESTION HOUR

## REGARDING THE 2019 ELECTION BUDGET”

By Representative Suarez  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

House Joint Resolution No. 33, entitled:

“JOINT RESOLUTION EXPANDING THE COVERAGE OF THE LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE TO MONITOR AND OVERSEE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE VISITING FORCES AGREEMENT WITH THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO INCLUDE OTHER DEFENSE AND STATUS OF FORCES AGREEMENTS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES CONCURRED WITH BY THE SENATE, AMENDING FOR THE PURPOSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 02”

By Representatives Belmonte (F.), Espino, Biazon, Acharon, Abellanos and Suarez

TO THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

## COMMUNICATIONS

Report of the Highway Patrol Group, Philippine National Police (PNP) for CY 2018 entitled “The 1<sup>st</sup> 100 Days”.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ORDER AND SAFETY

Letters dated October 30 and November 8, 2018 of Salvador C. Medialdea, Executive Secretary, Office of the President, Malacañang, transmitting two (2) original copies each of the following Republic Acts which were signed by President Rodrigo Roa Duterte:

1. R.A. No. 11109, entitled:

“AN ACT RENEWING FOR ANOTHER TWENTY-FIVE (25) YEARS THE FRANCHISE GRANTED TO MANILA BROADCASTING COMPANY UNDER REPUBLIC ACT NO. 7816, ENTITLED ‘AN ACT GRANTING THE MANILA BROADCASTING COMPANY A FRANCHISE TO CONSTRUCT, INSTALL, OPERATE AND MAINTAIN RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTING STATIONS WITHIN THE PHILIPPINES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES’ ”;

2. R.A. No. 11110, entitled:

“AN ACT EXTENDING FOR ANOTHER TWENTY-FIVE (25) YEARS THE FRANCHISE GRANTED TO BRIGHT STAR BROADCASTING NETWORK CORPORATION UNDER REPUBLIC ACT NO. 7295, ENTITLED ‘AN ACT GRANTING THE BRIGHT STAR BROADCASTING

NETWORK CORPORATION A FRANCHISE TO CONSTRUCT, INSTALL, OPERATE AND MAINTAIN FOR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTING STATIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES’ ”;

3. R.A. No. 11111, entitled:

“AN ACT EXTENDING FOR ANOTHER TWENTY-FIVE (25) YEARS THE FRANCHISE GRANTED TO VANGUARD RADIO NETWORK COMPANY, INC. UNDER REPUBLIC ACT NO. 7529, ENTITLED ‘AN ACT GRANTING VANGUARD RADIO NETWORK COMPANY, INC. A FRANCHISE TO CONSTRUCT, INSTALL, OPERATE AND MAINTAIN RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTING STATIONS IN THE ISLAND OF LUZON AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES’, AS AMENDED BY REPUBLIC ACT NO. 8069”;

4. R.A. No. 11112, entitled:

“AN ACT CREATING A BARANGAY TO BE KNOWN AS BARANGAY POBLACION 2 IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF VILLANUEVA, PROVINCE OF MISAMIS ORIENTAL”;

5. R.A. No. 11113, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING MARCH 24 OF EVERY YEAR A SPECIAL NONWORKING HOLIDAY IN THE CITY OF LIGAO, PROVINCE OF ALBAY, IN COMMEMORATION OF ITS FOUNDING ANNIVERSARY”;

6. R.A. No. 11114, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING DECEMBER 8 OF EVERY YEAR A SPECIAL NONWORKING HOLIDAY IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF AGOO, PROVINCE OF LA UNION, TO BE KNOWN AS ‘AGOO DAY’ ”;

7. R.A. No. 11115, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING JUNE 16 OF EVERY YEAR A SPECIAL NONWORKING HOLIDAY IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF VILLANUEVA, PROVINCE OF MISAMIS ORIENTAL, IN COMMEMORATION OF ITS FOUNDING ANNIVERSARY, TO BE KNOWN AS ‘ARAW NG VILLANUEVA’ ”;

8. R.A. No. 11116, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING SEPTEMBER 17 OF EVERY YEAR A SPECIAL NONWORKING HOLIDAY IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF LOS BAÑOS, PROVINCE OF LAGUNA, IN COMMEMORATION OF ITS FOUNDING ANNIVERSARY AND THE ANNUAL BAÑAMOS FESTIVAL”;

9. R.A. No. 11117, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING JULY 4 OF EVERY YEAR

A SPECIAL NONWORKING HOLIDAY IN THE PROVINCE OF LANA O DEL NORTE, IN COMMEMORATION OF ITS FOUNDING ANNIVERSARY, TO BE KNOWN AS ‘ARAW NG LANA O’ ”;

10. R.A. No. 11118, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING MAY 22 OF EVERY YEAR A SPECIAL NONWORKING HOLIDAY IN THE PROVINCE OF GUIMARAS IN COMMEMORATION OF ITS ANNIVERSARY AS A PROVINCE”;

11. R.A. No. 11119, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING APRIL 3 OF EVERY YEAR A SPECIAL NONWORKING HOLIDAY IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBAY, INCLUDING THE CITIES THEREIN, IN COMMEMORATION OF ITS FOUNDING ANNIVERSARY, TO BE KNOWN AS ‘ALBAY DAY’ ”;

12. R.A. No. 11120, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING SEPTEMBER 2 OF EVERY YEAR A SPECIAL NONWORKING HOLIDAY IN THE PROVINCE OF IFUGAO, IN COMMEMORATION OF THE SURRENDER OF GENERAL TOMOYUKI YAMASHITA, COMMANDER OF THE JAPANESE IMPERIAL ARMY IN THE PHILIPPINES, IN KIANGAN, IFUGAO”;

13. R.A. No. 11121, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING NOVEMBER 2 OF EVERY YEAR A SPECIAL NONWORKING HOLIDAY IN THE PROVINCE OF MISAMIS OCCIDENTAL, IN COMMEMORATION OF ITS FOUNDING ANNIVERSARY, TO BE KNOWN AS ‘ARAW NG MISAMIS OCCIDENTAL’ ”;

14. R.A. No. 11122, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING SEPTEMBER 21 OF EVERY YEAR A SPECIAL WORKING HOLIDAY IN THE CITY OF CEBU AND THE ENTIRE PROVINCE OF CEBU, INCLUDING ITS HIGHLY URBANIZED AND COMPONENT CITIES, TO BE KNOWN AS ‘CEBU PRESS FREEDOM DAY’ ”;

15. R.A. No. 11123, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING NOVEMBER 15 OF EVERY YEAR A SPECIAL NONWORKING HOLIDAY IN THE PROVINCE OF OCCIDENTAL MINDORO IN COMMEMORATION OF ITS FOUNDING ANNIVERSARY”;

16. R.A. No. 11124, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING SEPTEMBER 7 OF EVERY YEAR A SPECIAL NONWORKING HOLIDAY IN THE CITY OF CAVITE, PROVINCE OF CAVITE, IN

COMMEMORATION OF ITS FOUNDING ANNIVERSARY”;

17. R.A. No. 11125, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING JUNE 17 OF EVERY YEAR A SPECIAL NONWORKING HOLIDAY IN THE PROVINCE OF AGUSAN DEL SUR IN COMMEMORATION OF ITS FOUNDING ANNIVERSARY”;

18. R.A. No. 11126, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING NOVEMBER 22 OF EVERY YEAR A SPECIAL NONWORKING HOLIDAY IN THE PROVINCE OF SULTAN KUDARAT IN COMMEMORATION OF ITS FOUNDING ANNIVERSARY”;

19. R.A. No. 11127, entitled:

“AN ACT PROVIDING FOR THE REGULATION AND SUPERVISION OF PAYMENT SYSTEMS”;

20. R.A. No. 11128, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING JULY 4 OF EVERY YEAR A SPECIAL NONWORKING HOLIDAY IN THE CITY OF CADIZ, PROVINCE OF NEGROS OCCIDENTAL, IN COMMEMORATION OF ITS CHARTER DAY ANNIVERSARY”;

21. R.A. No. 11129, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING JUNE 27 OF EVERY YEAR A SPECIAL NONWORKING HOLIDAY IN THE CITY OF EL SALVADOR, PROVINCE OF MISAMIS ORIENTAL, IN COMMEMORATION OF ITS CHARTER DAY ANNIVERSARY, TO BE KNOWN AS ‘ARAW NG EL SALVADOR’ ”;

22. R.A. No. 11130, entitled:

“AN ACT DECLARING DECEMBER 1 OF EVERY YEAR A SPECIAL NONWORKING HOLIDAY IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF PADRE GARCIA, PROVINCE OF BATANGAS, IN COMMEMORATION OF ITS FOUNDING ANNIVERSARY AND THE ANNUAL ‘KABAKAHAN FESTIVAL’ ”; and

23. R.A. No. 11131, entitled:

“AN ACT REGULATING THE PRACTICE OF CRIMINOLOGY PROFESSION IN THE PHILIPPINES, AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR, REPEALING FOR THE PURPOSE REPUBLIC ACT NO. 6506, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS ‘AN ACT CREATING THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR CRIMINOLOGISTS IN THE PHILIPPINES’ ”.

TO THE ARCHIVES

Report of Honorable Dante Roberto P. Maling, Acting Secretary General, House of Representatives,

on enrolled bills, submitted to the Office of the President, for His Excellency's consideration and signature, pursuant to the provision of Rule VI, Section 18, Par. (h) of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

1. House Bill No. 1924, entitled:  
"AN ACT CONVERTING THE LAND TRANSPORTATION OFFICE – MEDELLIN EXTENSION OFFICE INTO A REGULAR DISTRICT OFFICE AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR";
2. House Bill No. 4065, entitled:  
"AN ACT ESTABLISHING A REGULAR DISTRICT OFFICE OF THE LAND TRANSPORTATION OFFICE (LTO) IN THE CITY OF PANABO, PROVINCE OF DAVAO DEL NORTE AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR";
3. House Bill No. 5568, entitled:  
"AN ACT ESTABLISHING A LAND TRANSPORTATION OFFICE (LTO) SATELLITE OFFICE IN TICAO ISLAND, PROVINCE OF MASBATE AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR";
4. House Bill No. 5627, entitled:  
"AN ACT ESTABLISHING A LAND TRANSPORTATION OFFICE (LTO) DISTRICT OFFICE IN THE CITY OF VALENCIA, PROVINCE OF BUKIDNON AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR";
5. House Bill No. 5953, entitled:  
"AN ACT ESTABLISHING A LAND TRANSPORTATION OFFICE (LTO) DISTRICT OFFICE IN THE CITY OF SIPALAY, PROVINCE OF NEGROS OCCIDENTAL AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR";
6. House Bill No. 5955, entitled:  
"AN ACT ESTABLISHING AN EXTENSION OFFICE OF THE LAND TRANSPORTATION OFFICE (LTO) IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF NARRA, PROVINCE OF PALAWAN AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR";
7. House Bill No. 5992, entitled:  
"AN ACT CONVERTING THE SATELLITE OFFICE OF THE LAND TRANSPORTATION OFFICE (LTO) IN THE CITY OF BAYUGAN, PROVINCE OF AGUSAN DEL SUR, INTO A REGULAR DISTRICT OFFICE, AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR";
8. House Bill No. 6202, entitled:  
"AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE SOUTH COTABATO STATE COLLEGE IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF SURALLAH, PROVINCE OF SOUTH COTABATO,

INTEGRATING THEREWITH THE SURALLAH NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL SCHOOL LOCATED IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF SURALLAH, PROVINCE OF SOUTH COTABATO, AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR";

9. House Bill No. 7179, entitled:  
"AN ACT GRANTING PHILIPPINE CITIZENSHIP TO MAYLEEN TING";
10. House Bill No. 7180, entitled:  
"AN ACT GRANTING PHILIPPINE CITIZENSHIP TO FATHER JULIAN C. MAZANA";
11. House Bill No. 7388, entitled:  
"AN ACT GRANTING PHILIPPINE CITIZENSHIP TO BRUCE DONALD MCTAVISH";
12. House Bill No. 5556, entitled:  
"AN ACT RENEWING FOR ANOTHER TWENTY-FIVE (25) YEARS THE FRANCHISE GRANTED TO ISLA COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, INC., PRESENTLY KNOWN AS INNOVE COMMUNICATIONS, INC., AMENDING FOR THE PURPOSE REPUBLIC ACT NO. 7372, ENTITLED 'AN ACT GRANTING THE ISLA COMMUNICATIONS CO. A FRANCHISE TO INSTALL, OPERATE AND MAINTAIN TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES WITHIN THE TERRITORY OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES AND INTERNATIONAL POINTS AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES'"; and
13. Consolidated Senate Bill No. 1537 and House Bill No. 5777, entitled:  
"AN ACT SCALING UP THE NATIONAL AND LOCAL HEALTH AND NUTRITION PROGRAMS THROUGH A STRENGTHENED INTEGRATED STRATEGY FOR MATERNAL, NEONATAL, CHILD HEALTH AND NUTRITION IN THE FIRST ONE THOUSAND (1,000) DAYS OF LIFE, APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES".

#### COMMITTEE REPORTS

Report by the Committee on Ways and Means (Committee Report No. 934), re H.B. No. 8618, entitled:  
"AN ACT AMENDING SECTIONS 141, 142 AND 143 OF REPUBLIC ACT NO. 8424, AS AMENDED, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE NATIONAL INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1997"  
recommending its approval in substitution of House Bills Numbered 4839, 8286 and 8334  
Sponsor: Representative Suansing (E.)  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Report by the Committee on Youth and Sports Development (Committee Report No. 936), re H.B. No. 8626, entitled:

“AN ACT PRESERVING THE INDIGENOUS GAMES OF THE PHILIPPINES”

recommending its approval in substitution of House Bill No. 6420

Sponsors: Representatives Estrella and Belaro

TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Report by the Committee on Muslim Affairs (Committee Report No. 937), re H.B. No. 8627, entitled:

“AN ACT REQUIRING HOSPITALS, MEDICAL CLINICS, AND OTHER FACILITIES TO RELEASE A CADAVER IN THEIR POSSESSION WITHIN TWENTY-FOUR (24) HOURS FROM TIME OF DEATH TO THE FAMILY OR RELATIVES IN RECOGNITION OF RELIGIOUS PRACTICES AND TRADITIONS, AMENDING FOR THE PURPOSE REPUBLIC ACT NO. 9439 ENTITLED ‘AN ACT PROHIBITING THE DETENTION OF PATIENTS IN HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CLINIC ON GROUNDS OF NONPAYMENT OF HOSPITAL BILLS OR MEDICAL EXPENSES’ ”

recommending its approval in substitution of House Bill No. 2953

Sponsor: Representative Sema

TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

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

#### CONSIDERATION OF R.B.H. NO. 15

##### *Continuation*

REP. GONZALES (A.P.). Mr. Speaker, under the Calendar of Unfinished Business, I move that we resume the consideration of Resolution of Both Houses No. 15, submitted by the Committee on Constitutional Amendments. For this purpose, may I ask that the Secretary General be directed to read only the title of the measure.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. Resolution of Both Houses No. 15, entitled: RESOLUTION OF BOTH HOUSES PROPOSING THE REVISION OF THE

1987 CONSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES.

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

#### PERIOD OF SPONSORSHIP AND DEBATE

REP. GONZALES (A.P.). Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary status of the Resolution is that it is in the period of sponsorship and debate. I move that the Chairperson of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, the Hon. Vicente “Ching” S.E. Veloso of the Third District of Leyte, be recognized to sponsor the same.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is a motion to recognize Congressman Veloso, the Chairman of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, to continue with his sponsorship.

Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

Congressman Veloso, you are recognized to proceed with your sponsorship speech.

#### SPONSORSHIP SPEECH OF REP. VELOSO

REP. VELOSO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just a one-minute backgrounder, Mr. Speaker. On September 17, 2018, the Committee on Constitutional Amendments approved its draft Constitution. The proposed draft was filed with the Bills and Index Service on September 19, 2018 as Resolution of Both Houses No. 15, which we call now as R.B.H. No. 15. It underwent First Reading and was referred to the Committee on the same day. On September 24, 2018, the Committee approved the measure as contained in Committee Report No. 881. The same was duly transmitted to the Committee on Rules also on the same day and thereafter, it was considered for sponsorship in the Plenary on October 8, 2018. After the last sponsorship speech was delivered on October 10, 2018, the House in plenary session ordered the recommitment of the measure to the Committee for amendment. On November 12, 2018, the Committee approved the new Committee Report or the recommitted Committee Report in order to introduce perfecting amendments, as instructed by the Plenary. The new Committee Report was refiled on even date and denominated as Committee Report No. 923. On the same day, the measure was transmitted to the Committee on Rules for its inclusion in the Order of Business.

Mr. Speaker, this procedure that we are adopting and pursuing now is the procedure contemplated by the Committee for the enactment of bills. We have, as the

authority here, Rule XX, Section 142 thereof which says that:

Section 142. Form of Proposals and Procedure for Adoption. – Proposals to amend or revise the Constitution shall be by resolution which may be filed at any time by any Member. The adoption of resolutions proposing amendments to or revision of the Constitution shall follow the procedure for the enactment of bills.

Again, this is provided for in Section 142, Rule XX of the House Rules.

Mr. Speaker, for orderly interpellation, let me point out that what we have, Resolution of Both Houses No. 15, is a working draft and thus, will give the entire Body the opportunity to not only ask what this is all about, but even to introduce later, after the interpellation, proposed amendments.

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that as Chairman—I have been here only for about three months—we are working or we will be deliberating on the working draft that we had inherited from the previous leadership. Also, we have lined up the Sponsors who will answer questions from our distinguished colleagues. For example, we have as Sponsors, Cong. Micaela S. Violago and Cong. Tricia Nicole Q. Velasco-Catera; and on the matter of economic and federal aspects of the draft, we have Cong. Dakila Carlo E. Cua. We are aware that, as is the case in all proceedings—administrative, judicial, quasi-judicial and legislative—the Sponsors will be answering only questions that are germane, that are relevant to what we have in the draft.

The panel headed by this Representation, Mr. Speaker, is now prepared for interpellation.

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

REP. FORTUN. Mr. Speaker, I move that we recognize Rep. Florida “Rida” P. Robes of the Lone District of San Jose del Monte for her manifestation.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Congresswoman Robes, you are recognized. Please proceed.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker, before we proceed, parliamentary inquiry.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). What is the nature of your parliamentary inquiry?

REP. ATIENZA. May we be enlightened as to what we are going to discuss right now? Is it the mode of changing, is it the question of whether we need a constitutional change or not—what, in effect? Because I have here a copy but it does not answer my question.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Congressman Veloso, please respond.

REP. VELOSO. The question is the mode. We will function here, Mr. Speaker, as a constituent assembly pursuant to Article XVII, Section I of the Constitution.

REP. ATIENZA. Naiintindihan ko po iyon, Mr. Speaker. Ang tanong ko po ay, ang pakay ba natin dito sa proposal na ito ay baguhin ang ating Saligang Batas?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). The Sponsor will kindly respond.

REP. VELOSO. We are coming up with proposed revisions, Mr. Speaker, as contradistinguished from a plain amendment. Revisions—marami po ang tinatalakay dito sa proposed changes ng Constitution.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Congressman Atienza, are you satisfied with the answer?

REP. ATIENZA. So, we are just about to revise the Philippine Constitution?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). We are going to discuss ...

REP. ATIENZA. Discuss the revisions?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). ... certain revisions of the Constitution but we do not have, you know, ...

REP. ATIENZA. Yes. We agree—I agree that we should revise many portions of the Constitution.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Yes.

REP. ATIENZA. But at this point in time, we should make sure that we have a quorum today to even attempt to open up this subject. Mag-roll call muna tayo at kung ma-establish natin na may quorum tayo, magtuloy po tayo rito sa napakaselang paksa ng pagbabago ng ating Saligang Batas.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). We are not going to make decisions, there will be no motions, but we are going to discuss ...



REP. ATIENZA. Then we move that we now call the roll before we even start talking about the Constitution.

REP. FORTUN. Mr. Speaker.

#### SUSPENSION OF SESSION

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). The session is suspended for one minute.

*It was 3:22 p.m.*

#### RESUMPTION OF SESSION

*At 3:47 p.m., the session was resumed.*

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

The Majority Leader is recognized.

#### ROLL CALL

REP. MARCOLETA. Mr. Speaker, I move to call the roll of Members.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). 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. 32, dated November 21, 2018.\**

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. The honorable Speaker is present.

Mr. Speaker, the roll call shows that 170 Members responded to the call.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). With 170 Members responding to the call, the Chair declares the presence of a quorum.

Before I recognize the Majority Leader, let me remind all the Members that we start the plenary session at 3:00 p.m. so that we can transact more business. Please come on time.

Thank you.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

#### CONSIDERATION OF R.B.H. NO. 15

##### *Continuation*

REP. FORTUN. Mr. Speaker, I move that we resume the consideration of Resolution of Both Houses No. 15, under Committee Report No. 923, as reported out by the Committee on Constitutional Amendments.

For this purpose, I move that we request the Secretary General to read only the title of the Resolution.

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

The Secretary General is requested to read only the title of the Resolution.

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. Resolution of Both Houses No. 15, entitled: RESOLUTION OF BOTH HOUSES PROPOSING THE REVISION OF THE 1987 CONSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES.

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

#### PERIOD OF SPONSORSHIP AND DEBATE

REP. FORTUN. Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary status is that we are in the period of sponsorship and debate. Before the Honorable Robes makes her manifestation, Mr. Speaker, I move that we recognize the other Sponsors of Resolution of Both Houses No. 15 contained in Committee Report No. 923, namely: Dep. Majority Leader Wilter “Sharky” Wee Palma II, Vice Chairman Corazon T. Nuñez-Malanyaon, Vice Chairman Dakila Carlo E. Cua, Rep. Alfredo “Albee” B. Benitez, Rep. Tricia Nicole Q. Velasco-Catera and Rep. Micaela S. Violago.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). The status, before I suspended the session, was that I already recognized the honorable Congresswoman Robes to make a manifestation.

REP. FORTUN. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I now move that we recognize the Hon. Florida “Rida” P. Robes.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). The Honorable Robes, kindly proceed with your manifestation.

REP. ROBES. Good afternoon, dear Speaker, and of course, our colleagues.

First, I would like to make a manifestation on the Resolution of Both Houses No. 15 proposing the revision of the 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines. On a personal note, while I was reading the draft of the Resolution, tinanong ko sa aking sarili kung kailangan nga bang palitan ang ating 1987 Constitution. Ang nasa isip ko, ako po ay nanggaling sa Lungsod ng San Jose del Monte at napakaraming mahihirap

\* See ANNEX (printed separately)

dito. Naisip ko rin na kapag ang ating Konstitusyon ay mapapalitan o mababago, mabibigyan ng tugon ang bawat interes ng mga mahihirap. Nakita po natin kung anuman ang mayroon tayo ngayon, ang rural areas ay sadyang naghihirap at ang urban areas ay sadyang yumayaman.

Mr. Speaker, challenges such as the concentration of economic growth in the National Capital Region will become even more complex in the near future as the number of educated and highly skilled Filipinos will increase thereat, whereas job opportunities will decrease elsewhere in the Republic. As such, we must develop the capabilities of our local governments so that they could adjust accordingly to this changing economic landscape. As I have said, I am really working for this economic change.

Political parties should perform important roles in a representative government such as ours, other than being the springboard for political careers. They should be at the forefront in terms of formulating public policies and expressing the aspirations of Filipinos through meaningful platforms of the government. Thus, the Constitution must pave the way for the return of the two-party system, and strengthen the foundation of Philippine political parties.

Mr. Speaker, sa ngalan po ng Lungsod ng San Jose del Monte, I really believe that we all work for the common good of our people. Sa ngalan po ng ating nakitang mga puwedeng baguhin sa ating 1987 Constitution, I would like to make this manifestation and support this.

Maraming salamat po.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Thank you for that manifestation.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. FORTUN. Mr. Speaker, the next Member to interpellate is Rep. Jose “Lito” L. Atienza Jr. of BUHAY Party-List.

I move that he be recognized, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Your Honor, Congressman Atienza, you are recognized to make your interpellation on the Resolution of Both Houses No. 15.

REP. ATIENZA. Maraming salamat po, Mr. Speaker, Majority Leader.

To the distinguished Sponsor of the measure, we would like to clarify very important matters in discussing the changes in the Constitution. With the kind permission of the Sponsor, we would like to ask him questions.

REP. VELOSO. Willingly, Mr. Speaker.

REP. ATIENZA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unang-una po, ito po bang panukalang ito ang siyang ating pagbabasehan ng pagbabago ng ating Saligang Batas kasama na po ang pagbabago ng ating sistema from a unitary to federalized system? Are you putting both issues together in this measure, or are we treating them separately, distinctly, and at different times?

REP. VELOSO. The proposal, Mr. Speaker, is, dito sa Resolution of Both Houses No. 15, naipasok na structurally ang magiging pigura ng pamunuan natin at saka iyong different functions ng bawat agency.

REP. ATIENZA. Samakatuwid, tatanggapin natin na itong ating pinag-uusapan ay makapagbabago ng ating Saligang Batas at makapagbabago ng ating sistema ng gobyerno, all in one instance?

REP. VELOSO. Yes, insofar as it concerns the Constitution, Mr. Speaker.

REP. ATIENZA. We noticed that this particular proposal carries the automatic adoption of a federalized system of government for our country and to this Representation, that is an issue that has not even been ventilated properly. So, para bang kapag bumoto ka dito sa dokumentong ito, ikaw ay pumapayag na maging federalized ang Pilipinas. Ganoon po ba ang ating pagkakaintindi?

REP. VELOSO. Article XII, Mr. Speaker, contains provisions na nagsasaad—for example, in the case of the Visayas, kapag nagkasundo ang local government units within Regions VI, VII and VIII na sila ay bubuo na ng isang federal state, they will file a petition in Congress, at iyong Congress naman ang magbibigay ng pahintulot para maging federal state itong Regions VI, VII and VIII. Ito ay nasa Article XII natin. Then, if Congress approves it, ibabalik ito sa mga tao, sa voters ng Regions VI, VII and VIII, for them to ratify this in a plebiscite.

REP. ATIENZA. May we be informed, Mr. Speaker, as to the assumption that shifting to a federalized system is a measure that is acceptable to our people and to the sectors that we are representing in this Congress. Or, they are merely assuming it because they would like to assume it? Mayroon po ba tayong pinagbabasehan dito?

REP. VELOSO. Mr. Speaker, I will be talking from experience. Region VIII is the second poorest region in the Philippines. We are only next to the ARMM. Napakahirap talaga ng mga probinsiya sa buong Leyte and Samar islands. Ang problemang ito is brought about by a centralized government na nasa 1987 Saligang Batas natin. Dalawa po ang puwedeng

puntahan namin—we will come up with the model ng Marawi, kung saan magkakagulo muna sa buong Leyte at Samar para mapansin kami ng central government, or ang pag-asa namin, we will constitute ourselves into a federal state. Ngayon, iniisip naming mga taga-Region VIII, since Leyte is just in front of Cebu, maganda kung makasama namin ang Region VII sa Region VIII, but kawawa naman ang Region VI. So, ngayon, pinag-uusapan na ang federalism sa buong Regions VI, VII and VIII.

In relation to the question, it is not an assumption. This is not an assumption. Every time I go back to my province, pinag-uusapan talaga namin na ang pag-asa namin is federalism. Malayo kami sa NCR. Ang NCR, for example, tinitingnan namin sa budget, it has been said that 65 percent of our proposed budget ay ginagastos sa NCR, at 35 percent ang pinaghahati-hatian na lang ng the rest of Luzon, Mindanao and Visayas. Napaka-unfair. Again, uulitin ko, Mr. Speaker, this is not a plain assumption. Ito po ay katotohanan. Hindi ko lang maintindihan kung bakit hindi ito lumalabas sa survey.

REP. ATIENZA. Salamat po sa paglalahad ng ating Sponsor na sa rehiyon niya ay sinasagot niya na naiintindihan at tinatanggap ng kanyang mga kasakop sa Region VIII ang pagbabago. He is assuring us that in his region, this issue is settled. So, all we need to do now is ask the people from Region VIII on whether they likewise reflect the sentiments of the Gentleman, but we will get to that later.

At this point, we would like to ask many questions on the general principles of revising the Philippine Constitution. Since the Gentleman had already mentioned one, which is very important and relevant, iyon po bang sinasabi ninyong will be changed in the system, where those in Region VIII will be given more authority to rule themselves according to their own thinking and in their own capacity, did you mention that in the regions, the regional governments shall be given more powers under the federalized system?

REP. VELOSO. Mr. Speaker, sinabi ko lang po na—let me come up with a predicate. When I was attending the Committee hearings, pinag-usapan po namin that the proposed revised Constitution should already come up with a definitive description kung sino at ilan ang magiging states natin. My proposal then was—panahon pa ito ni Chairman Oging Mercado—kung okay naman ang Republic of the Philippines na iisang state lang, why do we not come up with just three states—Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao. The three states—Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao—would be more manageable at hindi ganoon ka-gastos. Then, someone came up with the proposal na ang NCR, which was supposed to be treated not as a state but parang nasa Washington,

D.C., ay gawin na ring federal state. Umabot pa nga itong Puno Committee Report suggesting na magkaroon tayo ng 18.

The proposal of the Speaker, Article XII, solved the problem kasi napakaganda, magaling. Kung hindi man lang maaayos natin ito ngayon, let there be a continuing process of coming up with a federal state by coming up with what we have now in Article XII. Kung gusto ng component local government units na maging isang state, all they have to do is to file a petition in Congress, aaksiyunan favorably ng Congress at pagkatapos, iyan ay ibabalik sa mga tao dahil magkakaroon tayo ng plebisito. There will be a continuing process instead of the readily defined number of states at kung sino-sino ang states na ito.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker, we would like to engage the Gentleman in clarifying principles of general application in the Constitution because when we talk about specifics, it may take one year for me to ask all the questions and for you to answer all of them.

You mentioned that Region VIII is biased towards a federalized system. You did mention that, and I asked the Gentleman why they would prefer a federalized system over the present unitary system that we have been practicing since the beginning of the Philippine government.

REP. VELOSO. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the Republic of the Philippines—noon, may mga nakikita kami na mga Senador representing Visayas, particularly Samar and Leyte. Ngayon, Mr. Speaker, and I am now 72 years old, wala pa akong nakikita o walang nananalo na Senador galing mula sa Leyte and Samar. In fact, pagdating sa Visayas, iisa na lang ang Senador ng Visayas. Bakit? Kasi ang NCR ay 15 million voters na sila. Kami sa Region VIII ay mga two million lang kami. As long as we do not have this federal system of government, magpapatuloy ito, at alam po naman natin na pagdating sa budgeting, ang representation ng both Senate and the House ang nananaig.

Uulitin ko po, Mr. Speaker, wala kaming pag-asa na makapagpanalo man lang ng Senador dahil kulang na kulang po ang aming boto para pumili ng kahit isang Senador. Ngayon, the imbalance in the selection of Senators is reflected in the imbalance of the benefits being enjoyed or that filter down to the local government units.

REP. ATIENZA. We agree with the Gentleman that there is a lack of representation in the Senate, especially for the past three or four decades. Again, that is a problem that can be addressed by restoring the two-party system in the country so that proper and effective representation is assured in every election of Senators in the country. Hindi po kailangang baguhin ang sistema diyari. Bigyan natin ng katiyakan na ang

representasyon ay magiging balanced. Ang partido noon ang siyang pumipili ng kandidato at tinitiyak nito na mayroong Muslim, mayroong Bisaya, mayroong taga-Metro Manila, mayroong taga-Luzon. Iyan po ang sistema bago tayo napunta dito sa ating kinaroroonan.

The multi-party system is no party. Actually, the system has to be changed. I agree on that issue, but the solution is not to dismantle the whole thing and build a federalized system in the hope that representation will now be adequate. Hindi po ba ang sagot sa kahirapan ay tagumpay ng ekonomiya? Would you agree with me on that?

REP. VELOSO. Not totally, Mr. Speaker. Nandito sa proposed revision natin, R.B.H. No. 15, ang two-party system, but that is not an end-all solution. Within the party, makikita mo—kasi naabutan ko pa iyong two-party system, ang Nacionalista vs. Liberal—within the Nacionalista Party, mas marami talaga ang nasa Luzon compared sa Visayas and Mindanao. We are solving a lot of problems with a two-party system, but on who will be representatives in the House and in the Senate, that is an entirely different matter, Mr. Speaker. This cannot be resolved by the two-party system.

REP. ATIENZA. Before we engage the Gentleman in that particular issue, as this Representation explained already, in our Philippine political activities, when we had a correct system—the system today is not the democracy as we practiced it before martial law. The multi-party system emanated from the desire of the leadership then to control all political activities in the country. Mali po iyon, kaya I join you in your efforts to correct the political situation, but again, sabi ko nga sa inyo, babalikan ko lamang iyong isyu na ito ang pag-asa ng mga taga-Region VIII, that because they will be given regional autonomy, they believe that they can do better therein than in the present economic condition. Tama po ba iyon?

REP. VELOSO. Ulitin ko po, I have to be very brief in my answer, two-party system.

REP. ATIENZA. Hindi po, iba po iyong two-party system. Ang sabi ko nga po ay kalimutan muna natin iyon.

REP. VELOSO. Okay.

REP. ATIENZA. Babalikan ko po iyong ekonomiya. Ang sentimyento ng mga taga-Region VIII, ang sabi ninyo, for the record, ay dahil sa hindi sila napapansin at kinukulang sila sa pagkakataon sa ekonomiya.

REP. VELOSO. Hindi po sa ...

REP. ATIENZA. Tama po naman ang sentimyentong iyon. I agree with that.

REP. VELOSO. Hindi sa hindi napapansin pero wala po kaming representasyon, Mr. Speaker.

REP. ATIENZA. Wala kayong?

REP. VELOSO. Representasyon sa Senado.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker, let me point out to the Body today, let me put on record that the issue of development does not lie in the hands of the national government alone. Let me remind the Gentleman that in the present Constitution, the 1987 Constitution, it is enshrined therein that the principle of local autonomy should be given to all provinces, even to municipalities and barangays. They should enjoy and demand local autonomy. If we define autonomy, malinaw po ang ibig sabihin niyan—independence. It is the power to decide on your own, to develop on your own. Hindi po kino-control ng Maynila iyan. Sumunod lang tayo sa Konstitusyon ngayon, baka magbago pa ang isip ninyo na hindi na kailangang baguhin ang sistema as it is already provided for in the present Constitution.

REP. VELOSO. Maikling sagot, Mr. Speaker.

REP. ATIENZA. Do you agree with that or not?

REP. VELOSO. Maikling sagot lang po, Mr. Speaker.

REP. ATIENZA. Opo.

REP. VELOSO. Nasa Konstitusyon, may Local Government Code nga tayo, ibinaba ang power pero wala namang pera.

REP. ATIENZA. Ang tanong ko po sa inyo, do you agree that it is also enshrined in the present Constitution that local autonomy is protected and should be given by the national government?

REP. VELOSO. More than that, gagawin nating federal state kung susundin natin ang ating Congress.

REP. ATIENZA. Am I telling a story, or are you agreeing with me?

REP. VELOSO. Kapag sinabi ko pong you are telling a story ay siguradong hindi ako nag-a-agree diyan, mahirap sagutin iyan. We can have another day to debate, iyong hindi po tayo makakaistorbo sa mga kasamahan natin. On the question of the Local Government Code, nasa Konstitusyon nga natin pero

tingnan po ninyo ang mga mali, and only a federal system of government can solve those problems, Mr. Speaker.

REP. ATIENZA. Iyon po ang aking hinihintay na sagot sa kanya—only the federal system will provide the solutions. Hindi po tayo puwedeng sumang-ayon doon, Mr. Speaker, dahil sa ating Saligang Batas, nakasulat na po doon that the State shall ensure local autonomy. Why are we not exercising the intention of this Constitution? Now, you come here and say that we must change this Constitution. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but on that point, I would like to clarify that the present Constitution does not need to be changed if the issue is one of local development. If the mayors and the governors will assert their rights, they can develop on their own.

REP. VELOSO. Mr. Speaker.

REP. ATIENZA. I know whereof I speak.

REP. VELOSO. Mr. Speaker.

REP. ATIENZA. Lahat po ng iniisip ko para sa Maynila noong ang inyong lingkod ay ang alkalde dito ay kinontra ng national government. Hindi ko po sila pinakinggan at sinunod ko ang prinsipyo ng local autonomy at ginawa ko ang sa tingin ko ay tama. Tinakot ako ng demanda pero hindi po sila nakapagdmanda sapagkat mali sila at tama ang interpretation namin that local autonomy is already granted by this present Constitution. So, we do not need to dismantle the unitary system, but we need a unifying figure. If we were to study Philippine history and the Filipino character, we need a unifying President while local government units develop themselves using the power of autonomy given to them.

REP. VELOSO. Ang sagot ko lang po, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution mandates that the State shall ensure that, but hindi nae-ensure ito. Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that regional inequalities continue to be widespread and some regions are experiencing slower growth in recent years. Development gaps between the NCR and other regions continue to increase, with the poverty rate in Mindanao being 10 times higher than that of the NCR.

Very brief answer, Mr. Speaker.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the last two sentences.

REP. VELOSO. Uulitin ko po, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). The Sponsor will kindly speak louder so that the Gentleman will hear.

REP. VELOSO. Mr. Speaker, tama po na nasa Constitution that the State shall ensure na talagang mabuhay ang local autonomous areas, but experience tells us otherwise. Dito nga sa binabasa kong World Bank 2018 Report, sinasabi na regional inequalities continue to be wide and some regions are experiencing slower growth in the recent years. Development gaps between NCR and other regions continue to increase with poverty rate in Mindanao being 10 times higher than that of NCR. Ito po ay galing sa World Bank Report 2018, pagpapatunay na despite the provisions sa ating Saligang Batas ng 1987, wala pong ma-enjoy na growth ang ating mga kanayunan outside the NCR.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker, ang sinasabi po ng ating Sponsor ang problema ngayon ay dahil sa hindi pagpapatupad ng ating Saligang Batas. The World Bank never said the reasons Mindanao and big portions of the Visayas are deprived, it did not analyze it from any point, especially the political. It just said that the regions are being left out—that is correct. Not only regions, Mr. Speaker, but like here in Metro Manila, there are many municipalities and also in Luzon, there are many cities thereat that are still undeveloped. Why? Because the local government units therein have not persisted in using the powers that were given to them already. Kanila na po iyan. And you say that the money is not given to them, then, ipaglaban po natin. Dapat ang pera ay naibibigay din sa lokal. Ipinaglaban po namin iyan sa IRA. Nandiyan po si Governor Mandanas ngayon at nagtagumpay po naman kami sa Korte Suprema. Sinabi ng Korte Suprema, ibigay iyong naipon na kulang-kulang na P200 billion na bahagi ng local government units. Nanalo po iyong kaso ni Governor Mandanas na sinuportahan namin.

REP. VELOSO. After a long, long ...

REP. ATIENZA. Ang ibig sabihin ay kailangan po ipaglaban sa loob ng sistema. Hindi tayo susuko. Pagkatapos, bigla na lang natin babaguhin dahil hindi nangyayari ang gusto natin? Iyon pong pangangailangan na magkaroon tayo ng Pangulo na talagang magbibigay diin sa kabuluhan at kahulugan na prinsipyo ng local autonomy at susunod sa ating Saligang Batas, kailangan po natin iyan—a President who will provide a share of the VAT because the VAT should be shared with the local government units. They have not shared one centavo of the VAT.

REP. VELOSO. Mr. Speaker, early on, I clarified na itong panel namin is composed of Members and Vice Chairmen who are supposed to answer interpellations on a specific expertise. May I now yield the floor to the Hon. Wilter “Sharky” Wee Palma II.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). The Honorable Palma, you are recognized. Please proceed.

REP. PALMA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Perhaps you should cite a provision in the Constitution which can actually answer the query of Congressman Atienza: What is the guarantee that if we pass this new Constitution, the local government units will develop? If you will read its Section 5, it is exactly the same as that in the 1987 Constitution. So, what kind of taxes can we levy?

REP. PALMA. Mr. Speaker, Manong Lito Atienza, what we are trying to point out here is that nandiyan po iyong local autonomy ng local government units. However, because of the system itself—I will give an example just to drive a point. In the system of taxation, the situs of taxation provides that, for corporations, kung saan iyong head office nila ay doon po sila magbabayad. Yet, a lot of the corporations we have here in the Philippines transact business in areas other than where the principal office of these corporations is located. Ang nangyayari po, nagta-transact sila ng business perhaps sa region ko, perhaps sa region ng other colleagues natin, pero pagdating sa revenue generation, wala pong iniwan na revenue ang korporasyon dahil ang binabayaran po nila na taxes ay kung saan po andoon ang head office nila.

Fortunately or unfortunately, they are, most of the time, located in the NCR kaya po ang nangyayari sa atin ngayon—tama po si Hon. Lito Atienza in saying that in the Constitution, the Local Government Code in particular provides that each local government unit must exercise local autonomy. Kaya lang po, within the whole system itself, medyo nagkakaroon tayo ng disparity. Doon po tayo nagkakaroon ng kaunting difference.

To answer also the queries of the Gentleman, ang provision po natin dito sa proposed federal form of Constitution is, nakalagay na mayroong revenue-generation power ang ating mga estado, kumbaga, tatanggalan na natin ang ibang aspeto ng revenue power ng national government at ibibigay ito sa mga estadong bubuuin po natin later on.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker, the Sponsor is elaborating on the present Internal Revenue Code—the manner of collection and how to utilize this collection. This is a defect in the present Internal Revenue Code that can be addressed by Congress. Pag-usapan natin iyan at baguhin natin iyan para nakaklaro na sa pagkolekta ng buwis, iyong bahagi para sa lokal ay maiiwan na agad under the principle of local autonomy in the present Constitution. Hindi po kailangang sunugin natin ang bahay dahil may depekto po lang iyong ilang

mga pasilyo. Ang bubong ay tumutulo pero ire-repair natin iyong bahay. The point is that they want to revise the whole Constitution and in fact, to shift to another form of government because of the defects that they are saying. I agree that these are defects, but the solution is not to change the unitary form but to remove all these problems that are emanating from what we are seeing now.

Kailangan po ng local government ang lahat ng pondo na iginagarantiya ng Saligang Batas. Mapalad tayo dahil nagkaroon tayo ng Pangulong katulad ng ating Speaker ngayon. Siya lang ang katangi-tanging nagbigay ng share ng IRA na hindi ka kailangan na luluhod at mamamalimos sa Malacañang because of the automatic release of the IRA. The point is, hindi lang po IRA ang nilalayan ng Saligang Batas dahil ang koleksiyon sa pier, ang koleksiyon sa VAT na binanggit ko na sa inyo, ang koleksiyon sa airport, sa lahat ng buwis ay kailangan may bahagi ang local government units kung iginagalang natin ang prinsipyo ng local autonomy.

Therefore, will the Gentleman agree that the principle of local autonomy is one of the main premises of this document?

REP. PALMA. Yes, Mr. Speaker. That is one of the premises. In fact, it is more than the local autonomy as enshrined by the 1987 Constitution because as a federal state, it elevates now the status of local autonomy. The fiscal autonomy exercised by the local government units will now be elevated to something greater. Ito po iyong sinasabi namin na kapag nagkaroon na po tayo ng federal states within the Philippines, mae-elevate po natin iyong fiscal autonomy ng ating mga LGUs.

REP. ATIENZA. Would the Gentleman somehow agree that changing the system now could give us bigger problems eventually, while changing the laws now is a safer process?

REP. PALMA. I cannot stipulate on that yet, Mr. Speaker. My sincere apologies for that, but the thing is, what we are trying to propose now is something that will make this Constitution, the 1987 Constitution, a little bit better than what we have right now.

We understand that the 1987 Constitution or maybe, perhaps a lot of us understand that this was reactive to the previous regime. The 1987 Constitution was created precisely as a reaction to the previous administration, the dictatorship regime. In fact, most of the provisions in the Constitution right now are on limitations. Wala pong nilagay na powers but rather limitations; naka-negative list po ang karamihan ng provisions dito. When we speak of the 1987 Constitution, and when people ask, “What is the power of the State in imposing taxes,” ang

sagot po natin lagi diyan, “Walang specific provision ang Constitution natin, the 1987 Constitution, that gives the State the power to tax a certain item.” What is found in the 1987 Constitution are limitations on the taxing power of the State.

In fact, sinabi ko nga po na limitations halos ang provisions na nasa 1987 Constitution—the limit on the police power, the limit on the martial law power, the limit on the calling-out powers of the President—nagkaroon po tayo ng negative list. Whereas the federal constitution that we are proposing now provides the exact powers, although kinopya din namin iyong ibang provisions of the 1987 Constitution that we in the Committee found to be applicable naman at hindi nakakasira sa ating pamamalakad ng ating gobyerno. Ang ginagawa lang po namin is to take the good side of the 1987 Constitution and perhaps, propose some provisions that will make our Federal Constitution better.

REP. ATIENZA. Mayroon po bang masa-cite ang kagalang-galang na Sponsor, a specific provision in this document that is different from what we are discussing on the power of the local government units to tax and to collect and to provide themselves the share in all the funds from the national collection? Mayroon po bang provision dito na kakaiba roon?

REP. PALMA. Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, mayroon pong naka-enumerate insofar as the revenue power of the federal states. My apologies, hinahanap ko lang po.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask for a one-minute suspension. I just need time to provide this to the Honorable Atienza.

REP. ATIENZA. Mr. Speaker, the problem is that we were just given this document, and I am sure that the other Members also share the same sentiment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Atienza). May I? Honorable Atienza, if you will read through this document, I think most of the amendments are only found in Article X, or rather, in Article XII which is the Local Governments and Federal States. Basically, diyan lang talaga ang amendments. All the rest are almost the same. Very vague lang iyong taxation scheme kaya that is what we should be enlightened on. For example, what taxes can the local government unit collect? Hindi natin alam iyan because Section 5, Article XII is exactly the same as the 1987 Constitution, which reads:

Each local government and federal state shall have the power to create its own sources of revenues and to levy taxes, fees, and charges subject to such guidelines and limitations as Congress may provide.

It says, “as Congress may provide,” then there is no local autonomy because nandiyan pa rin ang phrase “as Congress may provide.”

REP. ATIENZA. Doon po papunta iyong aking observation. Hindi po pinalalakas ang local autonomy dito at pinahihina pa nga dahil babalik na naman ang local government units sa Kongreso for us to act.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). It is not really a total amendment or change of the Constitution. I think we can simply say that there are only amendments to basically the local government units and the federal states. Iyon lang ang dinagdag—ang federal states.

REP. ATIENZA. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, we are elaborating on the issue of taxation. If we listen to the Gentleman, he just said it, this document provides for all the provisions that you are seeking. I disagree with that because malabo pa rin dito dahil wala naman po tayong ma-cite na talagang provision that defines kung ano ang share ng local, ano ang pamamaraan ng koleksiyon, saan pupunta ang pera, national o local, ano ang sharing. Wala po dito. Ito po ay dokumento na nagbibigay ng general principles din. So, do not say that this document now will be a big change from the old Constitution as it is practically the same. So, it will depend really, again, on the ones executing the intentions of this document, similar to the way that all Presidents had misinterpreted the 1987 Constitution, and I will repeat it—all Presidents except our Speaker. The Speaker knew, when she was the President, that local autonomy has to be respected. Pero iyong koleksiyon sa Malampaya, koleksiyon sa excise taxes, koleksiyon sa sin taxes, koleksiyon sa mining para kang bumubunot ng bayawak sa lungga, apat na paa ang kumontra. Sapagkat ang national government—tama kayo kanina, nauna si Congressman Marcoleta, na-devolved iyong trabaho pero iyong pera ay hawak pa rin ng national government. So that is the anomalous situation that we should address.

There is nothing wrong with the 1987 Constitution except for some provisions which we can agree with and agree on. The general principles of the 1987 Constitution are all anchored on one basic principle for developing the country—local autonomy. Kung iyon din po naman ang nilalayan nito ay bakit naman natin bibiyak-biyakin pa ang Pilipinas? Pairalin na lang natin iyong totoong local autonomy and encourage the local government units to handle their own finances because they are empowered to do so, and we will see a lot of development all over the Philippine islands without dismantling it, without segmentizing it. Bibigyan pa natin ng iba’t ibang mga Kongreso, Senado, Executive Department ang lahat ng rehiyon, gagastos ng malaki ang gobyerno at ang taumbayan. Baka dumating ang

panahon, hiwa-hiwalay na tayo dahil sasabihin noong isang rehiyon, “Kami maunlad pero kayo mahirap, maiwan na kayo diyan.”

As I understand world history, federalizing came into the picture when the wealthy regions of different countries decided to band together to strengthen their economic power, but never a poor country. Poor regions bonding together that will not guarantee its success in the economy. Tayo, wala na po tayo sa picture pagdating ng panahon na ang mga tao ay magsisiklab, maaaring sa isang digmaang sibil, sapagkat ayaw na nila ang sistemang ito. At this point in time, again, I will reiterate that I do not want to monopolize the time. Lahat po ng katanungan ko ay hindi ko pa nauumpisahan—political, economic and, again, on the provisions of federalization and so, I reserve the right to go back and interpellate further just to give others an opportunity. Magtanong kayo, liwanagin ninyo sa isipan ninyo kung ang panukalang ito ay dapat nating ituloy sa pag-uusap, o maaari nating pag-aralan muna sapagkat ngayon lamang ibinigay ito sa atin. I cannot expect all of you to be aware of what we are debating on. Nagkataon lang na mayroon akong mga pagsisikap earlier para makita ko po iyong kamalian na ating pinapasok ngayon.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would want to be given the opportunity to interpellate further later on, as we do not expect to approve this anyway in one sitting.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Thank you, Your Honor, for that intelligent interpellation.

REP. PALMA. Thank you, Your Honor.

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

REP. FORTUN. Mr. Speaker, before the next interpellator, may we acknowledge the presence of the guests in the gallery of Rep. Lianda B. Bolilia of the Fourth District of Batangas. They are members of the Sangguniang Barangay of Macalamcam-A, Rosario, Batangas headed by Punong Barangay Edwin Sarmiento.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Will the guests of the Honorable Bolilia stand up to be recognized. Welcome to the House of Representatives.

REP. FORTUN. Mr. Speaker, may we also acknowledge the presence of the guests in the gallery of Reps. Dale “Along” R. Malapitan of the First District of Caloocan City and Virgilio S. Lacson of MANILA TEACHERS Party-List. They are barangay officials of Zone 15 of the First District of Caloocan

City headed by Punong Barangay Romy Rivera of Barangay 171; and Punong Barangay Cris Contreras of Barangay 170.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Will the guests of the Honorable Malapitan and the Honorable Lacson please rise to be recognized. Welcome to the House of Representatives.

REP. FORTUN. Mr. Speaker, may we also acknowledge the presence of the guests of Representative Lacson and they are Ms. Maria Carla Denise S. Lacson and Mr. Michael Anthony Kennedy.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Will the guests of Congressman Lacson please rise to be recognized. Welcome to the House of Representatives.

REP. FORTUN. Lastly, Mr. Speaker, may we also acknowledge the presence of the guests of Rep. Romero “Miro” S. Quimbo. They are Liberal Party members from Banay-banay, Davao Oriental: former Mayor Eva T. Geollegue and Ms. Abigail Caminero.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Will the guests of Cong. Miro Quimbo please rise to be recognized. Welcome to the House of Representatives.

REP. FORTUN. Mr. Speaker, next to interpellate is Rep. Antonio L. Tinio of ACT TEACHERS Party-List. May I move that Representative Tinio be recognized.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). The Honorable Tinio, please proceed with your interpellation.

REP. TINIO. Maraming salamat, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, of course, iyong pagbabago ng Konstitusyon, specifically iyong pagbabago ng Konstitusyon tungo sa isang pederal na porma ng gobyerno, ang isa sa mga idineklara ni Pangulong Duterte na prayoridad ng kanyang presidency, ng kanyang administrasyon. Ang intindi namin, pangunahing nilalaman noong sinasabi niya noong panahon ng kampanya na “change is coming,” ganoon, so, federalism daw. Kaya naman ang tugon ng Kongresong ito ay may mga bills na na-file sa Kamara ang ating mga kasamahan at naglunsad ng maraming mga hearings ang kasalukuyang Komite, ang Committee on Constitutional Amendments, kaugnay nito and in fact, may mga sub-committee hearings pa nga na saklaw ang iba’t ibang mahahalagang bahagi ng Konstitusyon mula sa political system, sa economy, the general principles, and so on and so forth. Natatandaan ko pa rin, noon iba pa ang Chairman at ang kasalukuyang Chairman ay Vice-Chairman pa, na may mga draft na ipinamahagi sa mga miyembro ang Komiteng ito, at sa



mga draft na iyon ay may mahahalagang bahagi kung saan maraming artikulo at seksyon ng draft Constitution na iyon ay nagpapatungkol sa pederalismo.

In fact, iyong pangunahing rationale kung bakit kailangang baguhin ang Konstitusyon ay dahil daw kailangan ng bansa ang pederalismo. Iyon na nga, at naririnig natin ang mga argumento na iyon ang solusyon daw sa kahirapan, lalo na sa mga rehiyon katulad ng Region VIII, kung saan galing iyong former Chairman at kasalukuyang Chairman ng Committee, Region VIII-Eastern Visayas Region. Ang isang dahilan daw kung bakit mahirap sila ay dahil sa ang kasalukuyang unitary form of government ay minomonopolisa ng central government o ng national government ang resources, partikular ang Maynila o Metro Manila. Narinig na po natin iyan. Informally, the phrase often used is “Imperial Manila.” Dahil sa dominance of Imperial Manila over the regions kaya daw sila ay naghihirap. Kaya ang ini-offer na solusyon ay ang pederalismo para daw maging mas pantay ang distribution and sharing of national wealth and resources, including public funds.

Noon pa man ay hindi na tayo sumasang-ayon sa ganoong pagtingin. Hindi sa porma ng gobyerno mauugat ang regional inequality. Whether unitary or federal, kung mananatili iyong, sa kasalukuyan, unequal distribution of wealth in the first place, including land, for example, iyong failure of land reform programs, iyong lack of national industrialization, et cetera, whether federal o unitary tayo ay mananatili ang kahirapan. Iyon po ang pananaw natin. Ang point ko lang, ina-articulate ko dito iyong unang rationale at justification ng kasalukuyang administrasyon ni Pangulong Duterte at ng Kongresong ito kung bakit daw urgent iyong pangangailangan na baguhin ang Konstitusyon. Ngayon, finally, sa ilalim ng bagong Speaker, Speaker Arroyo, naglabas na ng committee report ang Committee on Constitutional Amendments at ito nga ang tinatalakay natin ngayon. Ngayong tinitingnan ko iyong nilalaman ng bagong proposed Constitution na ito, halos mahigit sa isang pahina lang iyong tungkol sa pederalismo—ayan, two pages pero, actually, it is barely two pages, Mr. Speaker. So, parang option na lang ngayon ang pederalismo, sa halip na detalyadong pagtalakay sa kung ano ba ang magiging istruktura ng gobyerno na pederal, ano ang magiging kapangyarihan ng federal government, ano ang magiging itsura o istruktura ng local government, ano ang mga kapangyarihan nito. Iyong tanong kanina in terms of taxation—ano ang taxation powers ng federal government as compared to the local governments—wala na rito. So, all we have is in Article XII. I believe, iyon na nga, na basically ang sinasabi dito, kung may mga probinsiya na gustong maging federal state, they can do so. Mag-a-apply sila sa Congress and Congress will pass a law. In other words, parang in a way you

can liken it to the current process with respect to the Bangsamoro Basic Law.

REP. PALMA. Yes.

REP. TINIO. Parang ganoon ang itinatakda ng Konstitusyon na ito. So, iyon po ang unang tanong ko sa mga proponents. Akala ko ba pederalismo ang pangunahing layunin nito, bakit ngayon it is more like an option or even an afterthought. “Anyare?” sabi nga ng mga kabataan. Anyare sa pederalismo? Could you explain?

REP. PALMA. Your Honor, Mr. Speaker, ang purpose lang kasi nito is to propose the shift of the form of government. Now, as regards iyong questions po kanina as to the powers of each federal state as to taxation, revenue generating and others, ito po ang sagot—kasi dito, each state, magkakaroon sila ng organic law that provides for the structure of governance doon sa kanilang estado. So, balikan ko lang po iyong question ni Honorable Tinio. Hindi po siya option. This is actually a proposal. People may say na option ito because nagtagal but, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker, we are talking of a Constitution here, so, magtatagal talaga.

In fact, during the first hearings—this Representation was not a member yet of the Constitutional Amendments Committee—nagkaroon po ng maraming, as you have mentioned awhile ago, Honorable Tinio, consultations ang napagdaanan nito, so, dumaan po sa proseso. Iyong nasa harapan po natin ngayong lahat, ito po iyong naging resulta ng mga konsultasyon at ng iba’t ibang mga meetings na ginawa po natin noon. Ito pong tinatalakay natin ngayon ay proposal po to change the form of government that we have right now. So, hindi po siya option, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). May I?

REP. TINIO. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Section 12 is very dangerous because you leave it to Congress to create federal states. Dapat ilagay natin sa Saligang Batas kung ano iyong mga federal states, like if you want to have 12 federal states, ilagay na natin ito because this is dangerous. Imagine, baka lahat ng probinsiya ay mag-a-apply na para magiging federal state.

So, I think what Congressman Tinio is saying, let us incorporate in the Constitution a political subdivision of what would be the states. Just like what the Chairman said, in the original proposal was Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao; then, you have three states. If you divide Luzon into three, you have three states in Luzon; then, maybe, two in Visayas and, probably, three in Mindanao. So, there should be a political subdivision as far as the

federal state is concerned dahil iyong Section 12, aba, baka lahat ng probinsiya po ay mag-apply na maging federal state. That is the provision of Section 12.

REP. PALMA. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Thank you.

REP. PALMA. Mr. Speaker, just to elaborate as well, ang naging proposal po kasi dito sa federal form na ito na Constitution is, naiintindihan po kasi namin na ang transition from this present form of government to the federal form should be gradual and subject to the needs po ng ating mga LGUs. Now, ang visibility of federalism in the provinces will be up to the wisdom of the Congress because iyong gradual transition po will take time but on the brighter side, it will ensure that every local government unit is ready to upgrade to a federal form of government rather than isalang lang natin sa kanila na bigyan natin ng 15 or 12 federal states. So, binigyan po natin ng leeway ang each state po na mabigyan sila muna ng pagkakataon o panahon para sila po ay makapag-upgrade at sila po ay makapaghanda bago po sila magpe-federalize.

REP. TINIO. All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker at G. Sponsor.

Well, to be clear, for the record, ako po, unlike the Deputy Speaker, and I appreciate his intervention, si Speaker ay nanggagaling sa posisyon na—as I know, the Deputy Speaker is, I mean the Honorable Pichay, is a supporter of federalism and so, alam ko iyong pinanggagalingan niya. Let me clarify for the record that I am not a supporter of federalism, so, medyo iba iyong pinanggagalingan ko. To respond to the point of the Sponsor, sabi niya hindi daw option ito. Well, malinaw po sa Article XII, Section 12 ng inyong draft, ang sabi rito: “A federal state may be created in any part of the country upon a petition addressed to Congress x x x.” So, “may be created”—kung magpepetisyon kung sino mang probinsiya o grupo ng mga probinsiya, et cetera. Napakalinaw po noon, option na lang. Okay.

Ano ang punto ko pa rito? Hindi po ako—sabi ko nga, I am against this proposal for federalism so I am not asking that more substantial articles on federalism be incorporated into this draft. Ni-raise ko lang po ang punto na ito para idiin na, sa totoo lang, hindi na pederalismo ang tunay na layunin ng R.B.H. No. 15. Binanggit lang ito dahil iyon ang sinabi ng Pangulo at ng kanyang administrasyon na gusto raw ng bagong Konstitusyon tungo sa pederalismo, pero sa totoo lang, ang inilabas ng Kongresong ito ay hindi talaga layunin ang pagbago ng porma ng gobyerno tungong pederalismo. Kaya nga, option na lang siya at sabi ko nga kanina, halos one page na lang ito. In other

words, this is just a token—these are practically token provisions addressing federalism.

My real point is this: kung hindi pederalismo ang tunay na layunin ng proposed Constitution na ito, ay ano na ang pagbabago na gusto ninyo talagang mangyari? Ngayon, kung ako ang tatanungin, ang sasabihin ko po, at mamaya ay iisa-isahin ko ito, na ang tunay na layunin ng Resolution of Both Houses No. 15, ay ang mga sumusunod: una, term extension; pangalawa, pagtanggap ng anti-dynasty provision; pangatlo, pagtanggap ng term limits ng mga elected officials; pang-apat, and I think this is the most significant, the establishment of a two-party system. Pagkatapos, kung maipapasa ito before May 2019, no election, and the incumbents whether in Congress, the Senate or the local governments, will remain in their positions up to 2022. Iyon ang pangunahing layunin politically, in terms of the political changes that will be introduced.

Sa economics, well, malinaw na rin iyan, ito ay iyong removal of the so-called nationalist economic provisions, principally the restriction on foreign ownership. So, familiar na tayo doon sa bahagi na iyan kasi panahon pa ni President Ramos noong una niyang na-propose ang Cha-cha hanggang kay Pangulong Gloria Arroyo, hanggang kahit sa panahon ni Pangulong Noynoy Aquino, iyan ay constant sa lahat ng mga proposals for the Charter change. Then let me add, mayroon ding mga pagbabago na ini-introduce dito kaugnay sa Bill of Rights, which I will also address. Hindi ba ganoon, Mr. Speaker? If federalism is now merely addressed or treated as an option, then, what are the real changes being proposed here? Hindi ba, Mr. Speaker, iyong mga binanggit ko?

REP. PALMA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Honorable Tinio for pointing out those provisions and items that he mentioned awhile ago.

Mr. Speaker, ang proposal po na ito, we do not treat this one as an option. In fact, that is why I keep on repeating that we are proposing,—this Representation, together with the panel here, is saying that this is a proposal to amend or revise the Constitution. Wala po kaming binabanggit dito na ito po ay optional lamang, na kung bago, samakatuwid, ang mangyayari po ay ginusto lamang ng Kongreso na walang eleksiyon. In fact, there are provisions in this proposed Federal Constitution na nagsasabi na wala nga pong term extension. In fact, mayroong prohibition on the incumbent President not to be allowed to run in the 2022 presidential election. So, mayroong mga limitations po talaga dito na nakalagay sa proposed Federal Constitution.

Let me clarify also na when we say “proposed,” we appreciate also the points of the Honorable Tinio and in fact, we do not reject those opinions, kasi po sa proposal na ito ay sinasabi namin na dapat po tayong lahat ay involved. Kung mayroon po kayong amendments, o

ang mga kasamahan po natin dito ay mayroon mga amendments na gustong i-introduce, o mayroon silang gustong i-raise na mga points, we welcome them kasi hindi po ito iron-clad provisions na ninanais natin na ipasa kaagad. Like we have said, this is a proposal to amend the Constitution, the organic law of the land, kaya we encourage our colleagues here at tatanggapin po namin ang opinions nila kung mayroon man silang mga suggestions to make the provisions of this proposed Federal Constitution better. We very much welcome them po. Kaya po, pasintabi na lang ho, wala po kaming sinasabi na optional lang po ito, at saka hindi po namin sinasabi na may mga kagustuhan po ang Kongreso na mangyari after the submission of the proposed Federal Constitution.

REP. TINIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for that, but I think I have articulated my general critique or at least, the framework of my critique of this proposal, na hindi talaga ito proposal for a Constitution for a federal form of government. Iyong inilabas ng Presidential Commission headed by Justice Puno, ...

REP. PALMA. Si Chief Justice Puno.

REP. TINIO. ... the former Chief Justice Reynato S. Puno, is a proposal para sa federal form of government. Iyon ang proposal. Ito po ay hindi at parang footnote—practically a footnote ang federalism dito, kaya ang tunay na layunin talaga dito is for the establishment of a two-party system and for additional changes that will—let me be frank—essentially allow incumbents to remain in power indefinitely. Ganoon po ang nakikita ko at nagiging prangka po ako dito.

Ngayon, ang sabi nga nila always, “the devil is in the details” and so, let me now go to specific articles and changes that had been introduced. Unfortunately, iyong ibinigay po sa ating draft, iyong R.B.H. No. 15, hindi po malinaw kung alin iyong mga pagbabagong na-introduce sa kasalukuyang Konstitusyon, so, it really requires a close reading and comparison between R.B.H. No. 15 and the current Constitution.

Well, since I have limited time, let me focus or I would like to focus on Article II, Declaration of Principles and State Policies. So, napaka-basic nito, and since I have limited time, I will leave out certain matters. Well, siguro, briefly, halimbawa, Section 6, in our Constitution, of course, this is the Declaration of Principles—we have the principle of the separation of Church and State. Ang sabi sa Section 6, “The separation of Church and State shall be inviolable.” Dinagdagan po ninyo with this sentence: “Relations between them shall be governed by benevolent neutrality.” Since we are talking about constitutional principles, every word added, removed, amended, et cetera, will have major implications for, possibly, future generations, hindi ba?

Kaya kailangan pong i-justify at ipaliwanag ang bawat pagbabago, pagbawas o pagdagdag dito. So, could you explain the addition of this sentence, “Relations between them shall be governed by benevolent neutrality”? Ano po ang intensiyon diyan?

REP. PALMA. I am glad that the Honorable Tinio, Mr. Speaker, has mentioned this particular section because it is true that there is an additional sentence to the principle of the separation between the Church and the State. Ito pong nakalagay na “Relations between them shall be governed by benevolent neutrality,” and what the phrase “benevolent neutrality” simply means is that we are giving an accommodation to the religious sector so that religion may be allowed in government actions pero hindi po natin ili-limit ang kanilang exercise. And because, ang sa atin lang naman dito, the benevolent neutrality allows individuals and groups to exercise their religion without any hindrance from the State. However, ang sinasabi din ng benevolent neutrality is, dapat hindi po papanigan ng gobyerno ang isang relihiyon. The exercise of religious belief may be done without any hindrance from the government, kaya lang hindi rin po puwede na ang Estado will give favor a certain religion.

Because of the 1987 Constitution, mayroon tayong tinatawag na “freedom of religion,” pero mayroon din po tayong tinatawag na “freedom to exercise one’s beliefs” and so, magkaiba po iyan. Freedom of religion is absolute, but the freedom to exercise one’s belief may be controlled or may be, anong tawag dito, puwede pong makialam ang Estado. Iyon lang po ang benevolent neutrality.

REP. TINIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, iyong paliwanag ninyo na benevolent neutrality ay nagpapahulugan na hindi puwedeng panigan o paboran ng Estado ang alin mang o anumang relihiyon.

REP. PALMA. I agree.

REP. TINIO. Actually, sa pagkakaintindi ko, covered na iyan noong principle of separation of Church and State. This is a very old concept, centuries-old, at marami na pong jurisprudence both here and abroad regarding this principle, at saklaw na po iyon. Ngayon, ang concern ko po, since this speaks of relations between them, meaning, the Church and the State, it imposes an obligation on both parties. Kung ang Estado ay kailangan benevolently neutral, parang ang sinasabi ng Konstitusyon na ito, iyong Simbahan ay kailangan din benevolently neutral. Ang ibig sabihin, ang pangamba natin dito, aba, kung mayroon tayong Sister Patricia Fox, na dahil sa tulak ng kanyang paniniwala at kanyang pag-unawa sa Catholic faith,

ay kailangan niyang maging isang advocate para sa mga mahihirap, sa mga inaapi, at advocate din para sa karapatang pantao.

Okay. Let us not use Sister Patricia Fox or any other Catholic, Filipino citizen, kasi baka sabihin dito, “Hoy, you Church worker, you are no longer exercising benevolent neutrality.” Iyon po ang problema ko sa prinsipyong ito na, in fact, this sentence contradicts the previous one. Iyong separation of Church and State, kasi ngayon, through this Constitution, the State is imposing an obligation on the Church or Churches, hindi ba, to remain neutral? Iyon po ang concern natin dito. In fact, my view is that this addition violates and undermines the very principle of separation of Church and State, Mr. Speaker.

REP. PALMA. Mr. Speaker, just to drive a point here on benevolent neutrality, ito ay may jurisprudence na po. In the case of *Estrada vs. Escritor*, Administrative Matter No. P-02-1651, promulgated on June 22, 2006, dito po kinuha iyong concept ng benevolent neutrality. What it simply means, the ruling of the Supreme Court says, is that,

The benevolent neutrality theory believes that with respect to these governmental actions, accommodation of religion may be allowed, not to promote the government’s favored form of religion, but to allow individuals and groups to exercise their religion without hindrance. The purpose of accommodation is to remove a burden on, or facilitate the exercise of, a person’s or institution’s religion.

Now, benevolent neutrality recognizes that the government must pursue its secular goals and interests but at the same time, to strive to uphold religious liberty to the greatest extent possible within flexible constitutional limits. Thus, although the morality contemplated by law is secular, benevolent neutrality could allow for accommodations of morality based on religion, provided it does not offend compelling State interests.

So, ang ginawa lang ng kaso pong ito, Mr. Speaker, Your Honor, is that nilinaw lang po na itong benevolent neutrality theory ay—in fact, iyong concern po ninyo, nabanggit po ninyo si Sister Fox kanina, kaya po mas maganda na nailagay natin ang theory na ito dito sa federal constitution.

The proposed federal constitution will address iyon nga pong vagueness insofar as the relationship between the Church and the State na tulad po sa mga nangyayari previously na mayroong ini-invoke ang isang panig na separation between the Church and the State. Kapag inilagay po natin ang theory na ito, using the definition made by the Supreme Court in its ruling, ito po ay maa-address natin iyong konsepto—kung ano

ba talaga, hanggang saan ba ang limitasyon ng sinasabi nating separation ng Estado saka ng Simbahan?

REP. TINIO. Thank you for that, Mr. Speaker. My quick reply to that is that the jurisprudence cited by the Sponsor applies to the government’s obligation with respect to the separation of Church and State. Ang problema ko dito sa probisyon, the way it was worded, is that it imposes an obligation both on Church and State.

So, hanggang doon na lang po dahil limitado ang aking oras. Marami pa akong gustong talakayin.

Punta po tayo dito sa isang concern po natin. What happened to Section 11 of our Constitution, which states “Section 11. The State values the dignity of every human person and guarantees full respect for human rights”? Iyan ang nasa Konstitusyon natin ngayon na isa sa mga State policies at sa palagay ko ay napakahalaga naman. Pagkatapos, “xxx dignity of every human person and guarantees full respect for human rights”—nawala po ang probisyong ito.

If I may—well, first, let me hear from the Sponsor. Bakit tinanggal po ninyo ito? What happened to this provision?

REP. PALMA. Your Honor, ano pong section po iyon?

REP. TINIO. That is in the current Constitution.

REP. PALMA. Opo, the readings of the Constitution.

REP. TINIO. Section 11 states that “The State values the dignity of every human person and guarantees full respect for human rights.” It is nowhere in our R.B.H. No. 15.

#### SUSPENSION OF SESSION

REP. PALMA. Mr. Speaker, may I move for a minute suspension of the session.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). The session is suspended for one minute.

*It was 5:17 p.m.*

#### RESUMPTION OF SESSION

*At 5:18 p.m., the session was resumed.*

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

The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. FORTUN. Mr. Speaker, I move that we continue with the interpellation of the Honorable Tinio.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Please proceed with your interpellation, the Honorable Tinio.

REP. PALMA. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Tinio has raised a question in relation to Article II, Section 11 of the present Constitution. Ang sagot po namin doon, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a separate sub-article in the present proposed Federal Constitution that elevates the Commission on Human Rights into a constitutional body. Pagkatapos, iyong provision po na sinasabi po ni Honorable Tinio ay nandito po sa Section 10 of the same article.

REP. TINIO. All right, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for that response.

First of all, hindi ko po tinatanong kung anong nangyari sa Commission on Human Rights.

REP. PALMA. Nai-impact lang po.

REP. TINIO. I appreciate that response, so, the second part of the answer is nasa Section 10 na po.

Section 10, if I may read, in R.B.H. No. 15 states:

The State shall give the highest priority to the enactment of measures that protect and enhance the right of every person to human dignity, reduce social, economic and political inequalities, and remove cultural inequities by equitably distributing wealth and diffusing political power for the common good. It shall promote social justice in all phases of national development.

Ang sinasabi ninyo po ay iyon na ang kapalit?

REP. PALMA. Mayroon po siyang separate— inilipat lang po iyong provision po from Article II of Section 10 ng present Constitution, inilipat lang siya sa ibang provision and it is under the provision of the article that deals with the Commission on Human Rights.

REP. TINIO. Okay. Well, first of all, Mr. Speaker, I question the demotion of that particular section from the General Principle and State Policy to a mere subsection now under the Commission on Human Rights. So, may problema na po tayo doon. So, again, even in Section 10, why was the phrase “guarantees full respect for human rights,” dropped? Alam ninyo po naman na iyong term or phrase “human rights,” again, this has a long history, and it is in international history which encompasses the international commitment of the Philippines in the UN Convention on Human Rights. So, bakit sa ilalim pa ng Duterte administration ay kinukwestyon nga hanggang

sa Internal Criminal Court ang record ng human rights pero ngayon ay nagpo-propose kayo ng Konstitusyon na tatanggalin ang phrase na iyan?

Another point: Nakita ko po mayroong kayong inilipat sa proposal dito, Article III, The Bill of Rights, where you introduced a Bill of Duties, Article IV. I note that Section 3, Article IV of the Bill of Duties states, “Citizens shall at all times respect the life and dignity of every person and uphold human rights.” So, ano po ang problema rito? Ang problema po rito, from a policy of the State guaranteeing full respect for human rights, ngayon ay inililipat ninyo po iyong burden ng pagtaguyod sa human rights sa mamamayan. So, hindi na Estado ang responsable sa pagtiyak ng human rights ng bawat mamamayang Pilipino dahil problema na ito ng ordinaryong mamamayan. Bakit po? Ano pong nangyari dito? Iyong Estado ay walang obligasyon na kilalanin, respetuhin at tiyakin na may human rights ang bawat mamamayan. Burden—problema na ng mamamayan iyong human rights, ang sagot mo. Bakit po ganoon, Mr. Speaker?

REP. PALMA. Mr. Speaker, ang sinasabi po ni Honorable Tinio, he is referring to the Bill of Duties which is imposed by this proposed federal constitution on every citizen of the Philippines. Iyong sinasabi po niya na dapat ay isa pong obligasyon ng Estado natin, it is found under Article XI of the proposed federal constitution which provides for a Constitutional Commission. Now, one of the Constitutional Commissions which shall be independent, ang isa po dito ay the Commission on Human Rights.

In the present Constitution po, the Commission on Human Rights was created by a law. However, the proposed federal constitution, mismo ang Saligang Batas na ito, ang nagsasabi po na ang Komisyon na ito ay isang constitutional body. Ginawa po ito mismo ng federal constitution, which elevates now the status of this Commission.

REP. TINIO. Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I said, okay, iba-ibang usapin pa iyang Commission on Human Rights. However, I am questioning the Declaration of Principles and State Policies. As far as I am concerned, isa sa mga core principles and policies dapat ng kasalukuyang Konstitusyon ay, iyon nga—napakalinaw—the State as guarantor of human rights.

Ngayon, kinukwestyon ko po talaga at dapat baguhin o tanggalin dito iyong ginagawang paglipat ng burden sa mamamayan. Ngayon, kung mayroon, iyan na nga iyong mga nababalita natin, na mayroong military or police involvement, meaning, State forces involved in human rights violations, as these have happened many times in our history. Nilabag ang human rights ng mamamayan pero walang obligasyon ang Estado dito. Ang obligasyon ay problema ngayon ng mamamayan

na maghabol para sa kanyang human rights. Iyon po ang implikasyon nito, Mr. Speaker. So, I will move on. I think I have made my point on this matter.

Now, let me just note. Sa kasalukuyang Konstitusyon, in Section 21 on State Policies, again, na dito mayroong, this is the basis for the current laws and programs on agrarian reform, “The State shall promote comprehensive rural development and agrarian reform.” Nawala na po iyan dito sa State policies ng proposed Constitution. This has been deleted and instead ang sinabi lang dito, “The State shall promote rural development, higher agricultural productivity, and equitable land ownership agreements.” So, again, why delete the mandate on land reform? Huwag po nating sabihing resolbado na ang land question sa Pilipinas. Kamakailan lang nga nangyari iyong massacre sa Sagay, at siyam na magsasaka ang pinatay, usapin iyan ng lupa. Bakit tatanggalin ito? So, let me just hear a justification for this, Mr. Speaker.

#### SUSPENSION OF SESSION

REP. PALMA. Mr. Speaker, can I just confirm with the staff kasi hinahanap lang namin iyong provision sa agrarian reform.

May I ask for a minute suspension of the session.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). The Chair suspends the session for one minute.

*It was 5:27 p.m.*

#### RESUMPTION OF SESSION

*At 5:27 p.m., the session was resumed.*

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

The Majority Leader is recognized.

#### SUSPENSION OF CONSIDERATION OF R.B.H. NO. 15

REP. FORTUN. Mr. Speaker, I move that we suspend the consideration of Resolution of Both Houses No. 15, as contained in Committee Report No. 923.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is a motion to suspend the consideration of Resolution of Both Houses No. 15. Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

REP. TY. Mr. Speaker.

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

REP. ANDAYA. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

REP. TY. Mr. Speaker, may I be recognized.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). I have already ruled that we we will suspend the session, so, I have recognized the Majority Leader.

REP. TY. Motion to adjourn, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Later on, I will recognize the Gentleman but in the meantime, I am recognizing the Majority Leader.

The Majority Leader, please proceed.

REP. ANDAYA. Mr. Speaker, just a manifestation.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Please proceed with your manifestation.

REP. ANDAYA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Members, Section 36 of our rules regarding attendance in meetings:

Every Member of a committee shall be present in all the committee meetings and public hearings unless prevented from doing so by sickness and other unavoidable circumstances duly reported to the concerned committee through the committee secretary. A Member of a committee who incurs three (3) consecutive unexplained absences within a regular session shall forfeit membership in that committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am forwarding to the Committee on Ways and Means headed by Chairman Estrellita “Ging” B. Suansing, a list of 46 Members who have had continuous absences in four consecutive meetings. Let this be a warning to those Members who have exceeded their absences according to Section 36.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Thank you, Majority Leader.

REP. TY. Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Again, let me reiterate that it is our duty, it is our mandate to attend plenary sessions and committee hearings. Again, we are appealing to you, there is now a warning, so, for three consecutive absences, you will be dropped from the membership of that committee.

Thank you.

What is the pleasure of the Gentleman from the LPGMA Party-List?

REP. TY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Due to the lack of quorum, I move that we adjourn the session.

#### SUSPENSION OF SESSION

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). The session is suspended for one minute.

*It was 5:30 p.m.*

#### RESUMPTION OF SESSION

*At 5:33 p.m., the session was resumed.*

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). The session is resumed.  
Cong. Arnel U. Ty is recognized.

REP. TY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Thank you very much.  
The Majority Leader, please proceed.

#### CONSIDERATION OF R.B.H. NO. 15 *Continuation*

#### PERIOD OF SPONSORSHIP AND DEBATE

REP. FORTUN. Mr. Speaker, I move that we resume the consideration of Resolution of Both Houses No. 15, as contained in Committee Report No. 923.

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

Congressman Tinio, the parliamentary status is, you were interpellating the Sponsor.

The Sponsor is recognized.

REP. PALMA. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). So, please proceed.

REP. PALMA. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, the queries of the Honorable Tinio pertains to the agrarian reform provisions in the 1987 Constitution. Ito po ay nalipat po sa Section 22 ng Article II of the proposed Federal Constitution, binago lang po ang wording, Section 22, “The State shall promote rural development, higher agricultural productivity, and equitable land ownership arrangements.” Binago lang po ang pangalan.

REP. TINIO. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, again, I question this—what I consider to be a

demotion of that provision from the General Principles or Principles and State Policies to a more specific article or section in another part of the Constitution.

Let me proceed, Mr. Speaker. Now, I ask what happened to Section 25 of—sorry, Section 26 of the current Constitution. Section 26 states:

The State shall guarantee equal access to opportunities for public service and prohibit political dynasties as may be defined by law.

Ito na po iyong constitutional mandate to ban political dynasties. Sa proposal ay tinanggal po iyon and so, it now just states, “The State shall guarantee equal access to opportunities for public service.” Why do the proponents or Sponsors—why are they asking that the prohibition on political dynasties be deleted?

REP. PALMA. Mr. Speaker, the said provision in the 1987 Constitution stating that “The State shall guarantee equal access to opportunities for public service” is actually found in Section 25, Article II of the proposed Federal Constitution. Admittedly, Mr. Speaker, during the drafting, this Representation was not present, and I must admit that I do not particularly know the reason the second provision, which prohibited political dynasties, was removed in this federal government.

REP. TINIO. Well, in that case, Mr. Speaker, may I ask that the Chairman of the Committee explain for the record why the prohibition has been deleted? I understand and accept the answer that he was not present during the deliberations. So, may I ask the Chairman to explain.

REP. PALMA. Thank you, Your Honor.  
May I ask, Mr. Speaker, to...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Will you yield the floor to the Chairman?

REP. PALMA. Yes, Your Honor, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). The Committee Chairman, Rep. Vicente “Ching” S.E. Veloso, is recognized.

REP. VELOSO. Mr. Speaker, the matter of political dynasty was deliberated upon by the Body, by the Committee rather, and then also by the panel of the Committee. When it reached the Committee for finalization, we came up with a survey on two problems here—term limit and political dynasty. Remember that this matter on anti-political dynasty is only an offspring of term limits. Since we have deleted from the proposed revised Constitution the term limit and this matter of

term limit deletion enjoys almost a unanimous support of the Body, we found it appropriate to no longer come up with a provision on anti-dynasty.

There can be no relevance now on the anti-dynasty provision if we do not have a prohibition against running perpetually. Kapag wala na po ang term limit, hindi na po kailangan ng anti-dynasty. If the Honorable Tinio will verify the accuracy of what I just stated, in fact, lumabas pa sa diyaryo that no less than the Honorable Lagman who is very particular about a lot of things on political provisions in the Constitution, sinabi mismo ni Honorable Lagman, “Let the people decide, huwag na po iyong term limit.” At uulitin ko po, kung wala na iyong term limit, wala na pong relevance ang anti-dynasty.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). I hope that satisfies the Honorable Tinio.

REP. TINIO. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me just say then, that explanation of the Chairman, the Sponsor, mentioned two things: tinanggal daw iyong dynasty kasi tinanggal na rin iyong provision on term limit na nasa Konstitusyon. Wala ng saysay iyong anti-dynasty kung wala iyong term limit. Tama po sila, magkaugnay po talaga iyong dalawa. In the current Constitution, complementary po iyon kaya kung may prohibition sa dynasties ay mayroon din sa term limits. It was meant to implement the principle stated here which we are discussing, namely, that the State shall guarantee equal access to opportunities for public service. So, iyon ang intensiyon ng ating framers ng Constitution—equal access, ang bigyan ang lahat ng pagkakataong makapagsilbi sa gobyerno.

Paano gagawin iyon? Maglagay tayo ng, okay, una, bawal na ang political dynasties. Pangalawa, may term limits para kung manalo ka man, may limitasyon kaya may iba namang makakapasok.

Ngayon, ang nangyayari sa atin, siyempre, nandiyan iyong self-executory iyong term limit, so, ini-implement na iyan. Pero hindi nagpasa ng implementing law or enabling law ang Kongreso sa prohibition ng political dynasties kaya nananatili ang political dynasty, so, ang nangyayari kapag tapos na ang term limit mo, papatakbuhan mo naman ang iyong asawa, kapatid, et cetera. You know, we all know the drill there. This, in effect, undermines the very principle enunciated in the Constitution that the State shall guarantee equal access to opportunities. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I am pointing out the contradiction here. You proposed to retain the principle that the State shall guarantee equal access, yet, you removed the complementary principles and provisions that will ensure the term limit and prohibition on dynasties. Iyon po ang problema ko. Let me just say, kaya po lumalabas na talagang self-serving ang proposal na ito ay dahil alam naman natin na—hindi naman ito sikreto—there are, you know,

numerous political dynasties, not just in Congress, not just in the Senate, but in Malacañang itself. Alam naman natin na ang Presidente mismo ay may dynasty sa local government and so on. Kaya po ang pagtingin o hindi tayo nagtataka na ganyan ang pagtingin ng tao sa Charter change, lalo na kapag tatanggalin ang prohibition on political dynasties. It is just a self-serving move on the part of politicians. That is what I have to say on the matter, Mr. Speaker.

REP. VELOSO. Mr. Speaker, the provision on equal access to get elected as a public official is retained. Puwede kang tumakbo. Ang nawawala doon is kung binabawalan mo ang isang magaling na Kongresista like Congressman Tinio na tumakbo for the fourth time.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Sayang.

REP. VELOSO. Sayang, ang galing-galing ni Congressman Tinio.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). I agree.

REP. VELOSO. Para bang si late Senator Diokno. Sumikat si Senator Diokno at iba pang mga magagaling na mga Senador noon—Padilla, Tolentino, et cetera—dahil wala tayong term limit noon. Kung may term limit na tayo diyan at may kaakibat na anti-dynasty, ang sisikat noon ay si Mrs. Diokno, si Mrs. Tolentino, si Mrs. Padilla. Kaya, to me, as long as we are pursuing democracy, let us eliminate term limit. But for the satisfaction of the Honorable Tinio, kung gusto niya ay puwede naman pong i-propose niya as an amendment later, after the interpellation, na dapat ibalik ang term limit kung gugustuhin. Let them ...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). After your manifestation, considering the fact na last term na ito ni Congressman Tinio, I think I will oppose it because we want him back in Congress.

Please proceed with your next question, Congressman Tinio.

REP. TINIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, kasi I know I have limited time, let me proceed to another, of course, very important article, namely, the Bill of Rights.

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

REP. TINIO. My concern here is Section 1 of the Bill of Rights. In the current Constitution as we know, the current Bill of Rights, Section 1 thereof, states: “No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor shall any person be denied the



equal protection of the laws.” Alam natin, actually, iyong wording niyan, particularly the opening clause which states that “No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law,” is actually taken from the United States Bill of Rights, the Fifth Amendment, which dates back to centuries, to 1791. The very wording is taken from that. Okay, and this is from the Fifth Amendment, in the US Constitution, which covers rights in criminal cases. So, iyong Bill of Rights natin, iyon ang unang-una.

Ngayon, ang gusto ko pong hingan ng paliwanag sa Sponsor, bakit binago ninyo po ito? Now, the very first section, which gives the impression that it is the primordial right, now will be as follows: “Section 1. The natural right to protect oneself shall always be respected by the State.” Could you explain to me why you introduced such a concept? I mean, bago po ito.

REP. PALMA. Hindi, Mr. Speaker.

REP. TINIO. Please explain.

REP. PALMA. Thank you for the question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the first paragraph of Section 1 of the proposed Federal Constitution, which provides that “the natural right to protect oneself shall always be respected by the State,” is actually derived from the present criminal justice system. The present criminal justice system provides, under the Revised Penal Code, the exemptions, in fact, to one’s right to protect oneself.

A situation goes like this, Mr. Speaker. Mayroon tayong tinatawag na “self-defense,” which is justifying the circumstance under Article XIV of the Revised Penal Code. Now, ang ginawa lang po natin dito is, ine-elevate natin itong—parang ang point lang kasi natin dito is, inuna muna natin iyong natural right na dapat i-preserve natin ang sarili natin bago any other right. Hindi naman ini-elevate natin ang ibang right over another right, or over the rights under the Bill of Rights, pero ang sinasabi lang natin dito is, ine-elevate lang natin iyong one’s natural right to protect oneself against any harm coming from externalities. So, ine-elevate lang po natin, nire-recognize lang po natin na mayroon tayong natural right to defend ourselves. Kaya ang ginawa natin sa Section 1, inuna muna natin itong “to protect oneself,” and then pinasok natin ang “No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property x x x,” but in no case at all, Mr. Speaker, na sinasabi natin na mas importante ang sinasabi natin sa first paragraph o first sentence, na ang one’s natural right to protect oneself is higher than the other right to protect against deprivation of life, liberty, and property. Hindi po natin sinasabi iyon.

REP. TINIO. Well, Mr. Speaker, the concept of self-defense, both in law as well as in ethics and morality, may mahabang kasaysayan po iyan. You can go back

to, for example, St. Thomas Aquinas. In law, in our own jurisprudence, nandiyan na po iyan. You know, you have the right to defend yourself, of course, if you are under threat pero may mga kondisyon, hindi ba? But it is always a matter of defense.

REP. PALMA. Yes, I agree po.

REP. TINIO. Again, it has to go through due process. You have to prove it in court. Kung mayroon ka mang napatay in self-dense, hindi naman automatic iyan na kapag sinabi mo na self-defense, okay na, tanggap na. It is a matter of legal defense. Ang problema natin dito, in the very wording, “the natural right to protect oneself shall always be respected by the State,” there is no mention whatsoever of due process or, you know, legality and so on and so forth. Of course, this discussion on self-defense in the current context is not occurring in a vacuum. Alam naman natin ngayon, iyong konsepto ng self-defense ay—bakit ba iyan natampok? May kinalaman ito sa Tokhang, sa drug war, dahil iyan ang pangunahing argumento at si Pangulong Duterte mismo ang pangunahing tagapagpalaganap nito, nang sinabi niya, “Well, kaya maraming napapatay ang mga pulis sa mga anti-illegal drug operations nila ay because of self-defense. Nanlaban sila and the police are just defending themselves.” So, ang problema po natin dito, this so-called right to self-defense, the unqualified right to self-defense, is being enshrined in the Constitution in the context of the ongoing war on drugs. Kaya nga ako, ang tawag ko rito, ano ba ito, “Tokhang Bill of Rights”? Why is this being elevated as the seemingly primordial right of every Filipino, iyong pong right to self-defense, Mr. Speaker? So, I questioned the insertion of this problematic sentence as the very first line in the Bill of Rights, Mr. Speaker.

Now, let me proceed.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Next question.

REP. TINIO. Yes. My next line will be, well, alam ninyo po ang isang innovation ng R.B.H. No. 15, apart from having a Bill of Rights, it introduces a Bill of Duties. Ngayon lang yata ako nakakita ng Konstitusyon na may Bill of Duties. Sa Bill of Rights ay ginagarantiya ng Estado ang mga sumusunod na karapatan ng mamamayan, so, nandiyan iyan pero ngayon, mayroon namang hinihingi bilang obligasyon ng bawat mamamayan ang Estado sa Bill of Duties. I already mentioned earlier Section 3 and I questioned it. Ito nga iyong nagsasabing “Citizens shall at all times respect the life and dignity of every person and uphold human rights.” So, it now places the burden of upholding human rights on the citizens, not on the State. Binaligtad po ang dapat na kaayusan.

Let me just expound on that further. Bakit po ba sa kasalukuyang Constitution natin, the guarantor of human rights should be the State? Among other things, it is because the State, by agreement of the people, has the monopoly on coercive force or power, hindi ba? Through law and through its instrumentalities such as the police and the military, it is only the State that can legally wield force against its citizens. Supposedly, the idea there is to promote and uphold the greater good dahil nasa kanila ang monopolyo sa paggamit ng dahas. In the past, may kapangyarihan pa ang Estado na pumatay ng mamamayan; there was the death penalty. So, nasa kanya iyan. Kapag indibidwal ang gumamit ng dahas, that is against the law unless it can be justified as a situation of self-defense. So, there is a monopoly of coercive force by the State. Therefore, kailangang may garantiya naman ang mamamayan na hindi siya maaabuso ng Estado.

That is why the burden of upholding human right is on the State and not on the citizens. Iyon lang po ang gusto nating idiin dito. Binabaligtad, winawasak po iyong ganyang kaayusan. So, now, this Bill of Duties, Section 1, reads:

It shall be the duty of every citizen to be loyal to the Republic of the Philippines, honor the Philippine Flag, defend the State, contribute to its development and welfare, uphold the Constitution and obey the laws, pay taxes, and cooperate with the duly constituted authorities in the attainment and maintenance of the rule of law and of a peaceful, just, humane, and orderly society.

Okay, kung hindi tayo maingat sa pagbasa, baka sabihin natin, “Ano naman ang problema?” However, let me point to, for example, the phrase here, “It shall be the duty of every citizen to cooperate with the duly constituted authorities in the attainment and maintenance of the rule of law,” et cetera. It is now a constitutional duty for individuals to cooperate. Ako, ang problema ko dito, ano ang implikasyon nito, Mr. Speaker? Kung halimbawa, mayroon tayong batas, TRAIN Law—maraming mga mahihirap na mamamayan natin, sabi nila, “Naku, ang hirap na po ng buhay,” at pinoprotesta nila ang TRAIN Law. Ang pagra-rally, cooperation ba iyon? Ang pangamba po natin, Mr. Speaker, baka sabihin, “Aba, kayong mga nagra-rally, you are no longer cooperating with the State and with the duly constituted authorities. So, you are now violating your constitutional duty as a citizen.” Ang problema po natin sa Bill of Duties na ito in making cooperation a constitutional duty of every citizen, it is now making dissent unconstitutional. So, bawal na ngayon, unconstitutional na ang pagtutol, Mr. Speaker. Hindi ba ganoon?

REP. PALMA. Mr. Speaker, to respond, hindi po natin pinagbabawalan ng karapatan ang mga mamamayan natin. To give a little bit of a background, our present Constitution, the 1987 Constitution, provides for a Bill of Rights under Article III. Ito pong Bill of Rights natin sa Article III is, actually, a limitation imposed by the Constitution against the State. Itong ginawa po natin sa proposed Federal Constitution, naglagay po tayo ng isang article which contains the Bill of Duties. Ito naman iyong hinihingi ng Estado na kapalit po doon sa mga ipinagbabawal ng Bill of Rights. Now, baka po ma-misinterpret po ako pero dito po, ang ibig lang sabihin nito, the State is not authorized to conduct searches and arrests without any warrant. Iyon po ang example natin.

On the other hand, balikan po natin ang Bill of Duties. Inilagay po natin dito na ang isang indibiduwal, dapat respetuhin din niya ang duly constituted authorities. Meaning, kapag dumaan po sa proseso, kasi nga may nakalagay naman po sa Bill of Rights natin na “No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law x x x,” ang ibig lang sabihin nito kapag ito naman po ay kautusan or ito ay ligal na kautusan, dapat po makipag-cooperate po ang mamamayan dahil po ang nagiging problema natin dito—well, I cannot also deny that mayroon tayong issue on the word “nanlaban” kaya ginagamit iyan as one of the defenses against the State, the same way that the State is using it as a defense against the persons involved in the operations. Kaya po inilagay natin dito na malinaw na “cooperate” lang po. Hindi naman po sinasabi natin na sumunod ka kaagad.

In fact, there is that provision in Criminal Law in the Revised Penal Code na kapag itong mga order po ng ating mga kapulisan, ng ating mga duly constituted officers, ay ilegal, actually po, karapatan po natin na suwayin po ang mga ito. Nakikita po natin na parang idinagdag lang ang Bill of Duties to remind every citizen na ito po ay duty natin, kagaya po ng Section 1, na dapat loyal po tayo lagi sa Republika ng Pilipinas, et cetera. So, apat na seksiyon po ito at kaya nilagay lang natin ito, to remind every citizen of our duties as well to the State.

*At this juncture, Deputy Speaker Pichay relinquished the Chair to Deputy Speaker Munir M. Arbison*

REP. TINIO. Well, Mr. Speaker, ito nga ang concern natin. I am wrapping up my interpellation with respect to the General Principles and the Bill of Rights and Bill of Duties, and what I would say is, far from being improvements or far from considering the proposed changes to be innocuous proposals, in fact, what I am seeing here are dangerous amendments being introduced that will undermine the basic rights and

freedoms guaranteed under our current Constitution. Iyon po ang problema ko rito, Mr. Speaker.

Halimbawa, ito na nga, nabanggit ninyo, kung pagsasama-samahin natin ito, one, iyong elevation ng right of self-defense, and let us say, iyan na nga ang ginagamit ng law enforcement authorities natin ngayon. Pagkatapos, combine this with the Bill of Duties mandating cooperation, ay di parang iyan na ang justification? Hindi nag-cooperate kaya I have a right o manlaban; hindi nag-cooperate kaya I have a right to defend myself. So, iyong tokhang na nagaganap is now going to be purely, totally constitutional. Iyan po ang concern natin dito, that the proposed changes here provide a Constitution that has, or we are seeing, the makings of a police state. This will enable a police state kung sakaling mapahintulutan po ito.

Ngayon, Mr. Speaker, tuloy ako sa Article VII, Political Parties, and I would argue, sinabi ko kanina na hindi na tungkol sa pederalismo ang Konstitusyong ito dahil token na nga lang iyong barely one-and-a-half pages ang discussion sa pederalismo dito. So, ano ang tunay na pagbabago sa sistemang pampulitika na hinahabol o layunin ng R.B.H. No. 15? Palagay ko ito po iyong two-party system.

So, sa Article VII: "The State shall adopt and develop a two-party system as a mechanism of representation and democratic governance x x x." So, gusto po ninyo ng two-party system. Could the Sponsor explain, bakit po ninyo gusto ng two-party system? What is the justification for that? How will that help? Paano iyan makakatulong sa mamamayang Pilipino?

*At this juncture, Deputy Speaker Arbison relinquished the Chair to Deputy Speaker Prospero A. Pichay Jr.*

REP. PALMA. Mr. Speaker, kaya po naisipan ng ating drafters ang two-party system to avoid immobilism. Ang ibig ko lang pong sabihin, kasi ganito, by the nature po ng ating multi-party system, hindi po natin maiwasan na mayroon pong pagkakaiba ang ating mga pananaw pampulitika. Nagkakaroon po ng isang weak executive power or weak legislative power ang ating branches of the government because mayroon tayong kanya-kanyang mga partido na ipinaglalaban natin.

Now, itong proposed na federal form of government kasi, ili-limit natin iyong dalawang ideas, whether you are pro or against, or kagaya ng Estados Unidos po, nakalagay po doon Democrats at Republicans. Ang ipinaglalaban po ng mga politiko ay hindi po iyong personal na ideology, but rather the ideology of a party or, at least, the stand of a party. Being a Democrat or being a Republican does not automatically provide you the individual liberty to impose your individual interest

na gusto mong mangyari sa area mo or sa iyong local government unit. Ang sinasabi po dito is nagkakaroon po tayo ng harmony of ideas insofar as the pinakamababang ahensiya ng gobyerno hanggang sa pinakamataas is concerned. Nagkakaroon po tayo ng isang maliwanag na direksiyon kaya po ini-impose or kaya po isinusulong natin na magkaroon lamang ng dalawang partido sa ating federal form of government.

REP. TINIO. Okay, Mr. Speaker. Let me go into some details regarding this. Ang proposal ninyo po ay two-party system, Article VII. Dalawang partido na lang. Sa bawat eleksiyon, kailangan may dalawang partido na lamang. Now, how do we go about? Paano mararating iyon?

Ang sabi po rito, Article VII, Section 2, subparagraph 3:

The first two dominant parties which garnered most of the electoral seats in the first national elections under this Constitution shall be the official parties that will represent under the two-party system. The Congress shall, by law, thereafter provide for the details and mechanics that will govern the ensuing elections under the new system.

Ang sinasabi po, kunwari eleksiyon, let us say May 2019, iyong dalawang partido na may pinakamaraming naipanalo sa Kongreso at sa Senado, tama po ba?

REP. PALMA. Hindi lamang po sa Senado at Kongreso, pati sa party po.

REP. TINIO. Pati sa local governments?

REP. PALMA. Yes, opo.

REP. TINIO. So, pati sa local governments, iyong top two lamang, iyon na lang ang magiging partido under the two-party system.

REP. PALMA. Opo.

REP. TINIO. Hypothetical na lang po. Ang ibig sabihin, let us say PDP and, I do not know, ...

REP. PALMA. Nacionalista Party, for example.

REP. TINIO. ... Nacionalista Party, NPC, whatever, purely random po. So, henceforth, sila na lang po ang mga partido.

REP. PALMA. Sa proposal po natin, Mr. Speaker, ganoon po ang mangyayari.

REP. TINIO. Sa example ko, ano ang mangyayari sa Liberal Party, Lakas Party, NUP, et cetera? Malulusaw na po sila, ganoon po ba?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). The Honorable Tinio, just to remind you, you have already consumed one hour. Kindly wind up please.

REP. TINIO. Yes, I will wind up, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Thank you.

REP. PALMA. Mr. Speaker, ang sagot po doon, tama po iyon, malulusaw po sila pero hindi naman po sila pinipigilan na umanib sa dalawang partido if they so wish. Kasi po binibigyan po natin sila ng leeway or freedom to choose after the election at kung napili na po ang dalawang partido that are considered dominant parties, para mabuksan na po kung sakali na gustong lumipat ng mga kasamahan natin sa ibang partido na umanib doon sa mga dominanteng partido ngayon. Mayroon pong leeway. Mayroon po silang freedom na gawin po iyon

REP. TINIO. Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me wind up.

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

REP. TINIO. In the Transitory Provisions, Mr. Speaker, I will jump to Article XVII, Section 3. Sabi rito:

The first national and local elections under this Constitution to elect the President, Vice President, senators, representatives, and local officials shall be on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Monday of May 2022. They shall assume office at noon on June 30, 2022.

Ang sinasabi po nito, kung sakaling mapasa natin ito ngayon, mapasa ito ng Senado at maaprubahan sa plebisito bago ng May 2019 national elections, wala na po o hindi na po matutuloy iyong eleksiyon sa May at iyong incumbents ngayon will stay in office until June 2022. Tama po ba?

REP. PALMA. Hindi naman po, Your Honor, kasi if you look at the provision, it merely provides for the time frame when the first election under the new Constitution is going to be made. So, under the 1987 Constitution po, matutuloy po ang eleksiyon natin.

Kaya lang sa bagong Saligang Batas, ang sinasabi lang ho, ang unang eleksiyon niya ay sa 2<sup>nd</sup> Monday of May 2022. So, hindi po tamang sabihin ...

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Thank you.

Congressman Tinio is recognized.

REP. TINIO. Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will have to end my interpellation.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Thank you.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

#### SUSPENSION OF CONSIDERATION OF R.B.H. NO. 15

REP. FORTUN. Mr. Speaker, I move that we suspend the consideration of Resolution of Both Houses No. 15.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is a motion to suspend the deliberation. Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

#### CONSIDERATION OF H.B. NO. 8618 ON SECOND READING

REP. FORTUN. Mr. Speaker, under the Calendar of Business for the Day, I move that we consider House Bill No. 8618, contained in Committee Report No. 934, as reported out by the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). 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. 8618, entitled: AN ACT AMENDING SECTIONS 141, 142 AND 143 OF REPUBLIC ACT NO. 8424, AS AMENDED, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE NATIONAL INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1997.

\* See MEASURES CONSIDERED (printed separately)

REP. FORTUN. Mr. Speaker.

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

#### PERIOD OF SPONSORSHIP AND DEBATE

REP. FORTUN. I move that we open the period of sponsorship and debate and recognize the Hon. Estrellita B. Suansing of the First District of Nueva Ecija to sponsor the Bill.

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

Congresswoman Suansing (E.) is recognized to sponsor the Bill. Please proceed.

#### SPONSORSHIP SPEECH OF REP. SUANSING (E.)

REP. SUANSING (E.). Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, I rise today to sponsor House Bill No. 8618, which seeks to increase the excise tax on alcohol products. Taxation, while being the lifeblood of the government, can be a policy tool for our people's health. It is an inherent power of the State that can compel us to play a part in uplifting the welfare of those who have less in life.

A few days ago, we deliberated on the Universal Health Care Bill in the Conference Committee and many questions revolved on the extent of coverage we can provide, given our limited funds. How do we pay for the P103 billion health premiums of 65.2 million indigent Filipinos? How do we cover the total requirement of P118 billion this year 2019? Levying on the causes of our countrymen's illness is not just judicious but certainly sensible. As one of the principal authors of the Universal Health Care Bill and as Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means pushing for House Bill No. 8618 for higher sin tax collection to fund the former, it is my responsibility to ensure that both proposals are enacted in tandem. I hope that Your Honors can join me in fulfilling the noble intent of House Bill No. 8618 as an initial contribution for our indigents' health insurance premiums. The prices of alcohol products are generally inelastic, thus, increasing their tax rates could be a potent funding source for health care.

House Bill No. 8618 hopes to reduce alcohol drinking, the seventh leading cause of disability and death. The latest global research asserted that the safe level of alcohol drinking is zero, thereby debunking that age-old saying that drinking in moderation can aid in one's well-being. It apparently does not. As the proponent of the tax on sugar-sweetened beverages and as an advocate of healthy living, I personally want alcohol prices to be prohibitive to discourage people, if not to stop them from indulging in drinking, particularly

the poor who do not have the means to pay doctors and buy medicines when they fall ill.

However, one Representative cautioned us not to be the Grinches who steal Christmas. The Committee was reminded to let people celebrate and enjoy life. Arguably, it was a more discreet line of reasoning than the assertion that those who cannot afford intoxicating drinks may turn to illicit and more dangerous products. Acknowledging drinking is part of normal revelry, and that the whole labor force may be affected, but the excise tax rates will only be increased minimally under House Bill No. 8618. The *ad valorem* rate for distilled spirits will go up by two percent and its specific tax by P6.60 in 2019. For beer, the tax per liter will marginally increase by P2.60 in the same year. Given that the last tax hike on the products was made in 2012, through Republic Act No. 10351, we assure you that these rates are fair and may I say, reasonable.

In addition, we simplified the excise tax structure in several ways: 1.) we imposed 15 percent *ad valorem* and a single specific tax of P650 on wines; 2.) we reduced the category in "still wines," from three to two; 3.) we removed the distinction between handcrafted beer and those manufactured in factories; and 4.) we indexed these tax rates to seven percent to take inflation into serious consideration. It is quite ironic, to say the least, that one of the means or solutions preventing and curing the afflictions of alcohol consumption can also be found in the revenues of the causes of such diseases.

For a simpler and more efficient tax structure, better health for our people and wider indigent health coverage, I beseech your support in passing this measure. In return, I assure Your Honors that this law will not be the Grinch, but join me in hoping that we will have sedate Dad Santas come Christmas.

Thank you and good evening.

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

#### SUSPENSION OF SESSION

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

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). The session is suspended for one minute.

*It was 6:14 p.m.*

#### RESUMPTION OF SESSION

*At 6:19 p.m., the session was resumed.*

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

The Majority Leader is recognized.

SUSPENSION OF CONSIDERATION  
OF H.B. NO. 8618

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that we suspend the consideration of House Bill No. 8618 under Committee Report No. 934.

I so move.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is a motion to suspend the consideration of House Bill No. 8618. Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, may we acknowledge the presence of the guests of the Hon. Wes Gatchalian of the First District of Valenzuela. They are the Sangguniang Kabataan Federation members headed by Sangguniang Kabataan Federation President, Chiqui Marie Carreon.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). Kindly rise to be acknowledged. (*Applause*) Thank you very much.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that we take up the Additional Reference of Business, and may we request that the Secretary General be directed to read the same.

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

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

ADDITIONAL REFERENCE OF BUSINESS

*The Secretary General read the following Committee Reports, and the Deputy Speaker made the corresponding references:*

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Report of the Committee on Public Order of Safety and the Committee on Appropriations (Committee Report No. 938), re H.B. No. 8628, entitled:

“AN ACT TRANSFERRING THE PHILIPPINE NATIONAL POLICE ACADEMY (PNPA) AND THE NATIONAL POLICE TRAINING INSTITUTE (NPTI) FROM THE PHILIPPINE PUBLIC SAFETY COLLEGE (PPSC) TO THE PHILIPPINE NATIONAL POLICE (PNP), AMENDING FOR THE PURPOSE SECTIONS 24, 35, 66 AND 67 OF REPUBLIC

ACT NO. 6975, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS ‘THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT OF 1990’, AS AMENDED”

recommending its approval in substitution of House Bills Numbered 3153 and 5787

Sponsors: Representatives Acop, Zamora (M.C.), Alejano and Bataoil

TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Report of the Committee on Energy, the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means (Committee Report No. 939), re H.B. No. 8629, entitled:

“AN ACT INSTITUTIONALIZING AN ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND CONSERVATION PROGRAM”

recommending its approval in substitution of House Bills Numbered 182, 812, 970, 1220, 1527, 2388, 2540, 3040, 5406 and 6642

Sponsors: Representatives Velasco, Zamora (M.C.), Suansing (E.) and Uybarreta

TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Report of the Committee on Legislative Franchises (Committee Report No. 940), re H.B. No. 8630, entitled:

“AN ACT RENEWING FOR ANOTHER TWENTY-FIVE (25) YEARS THE FRANCHISE GRANTED TO ABC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, PRESENTLY KNOWN AS TV5 NETWORK, INC., UNDER REPUBLIC ACT NO. 7831, ENTITLED ‘AN ACT GRANTING ABC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, UNDER BUSINESS NAME ‘ASSOCIATED BROADCASTING COMPANY,’ A FRANCHISE TO CONSTRUCT, INSTALL, OPERATE AND MAINTAIN RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTING STATIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES’ ”

recommending its approval in substitution of House Bill No. 8379

Sponsors: Representatives Alvarez (F.), Quimbo and Romualdo

TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Report of the Committee on Basic Education and Culture (Committee Report No. 941), re H.R. No. 2315, entitled:

“RESOLUTION URGING THE NATIONAL HISTORICAL COMMISSION OF THE PHILIPPINES, THE DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND THE NATIONAL MUSEUM, IN COORDINATION WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT UNITS, TO PRESERVE

AND RESTORE HOUSES OF PHILIPPINE  
HEROES AND PRESIDENTS FOR THE  
PROMOTION OF PHILIPPINE HISTORY  
AND CULTURAL HERITAGE”

recommending its approval in substitution of House  
Resolution No. 1384

Sponsors: Representatives Durano and Savellano  
TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

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

DESIGNATION OF MEMBERS TO THE  
CONF. CTTEES.

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that we take up  
some administrative matters.

Mr. Speaker, I move that we designate the  
following as members of the Conference Committee  
on the disagreeing provisions of House Bill No.  
8552 and Senate Bill No. 1976, on strengthening  
the Philippine Coconut Authority: Reps. Prospero  
A. Pichay Jr., Sharon S. Garin, Jose T. Panganiban  
Jr., CPA, LLB, Vini Nola A. Ortega, Orestes T. Salon  
and Edcel C. Lagman.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There  
is a motion to designate the following Members to the  
Conference Committee on the disagreeing provisions  
of House Bill No. 8552 and Senate Bill No. 1976, on  
strengthening the Philippine Coconut Authority, namely:  
Representatives Pichay, Sharon Garin, Panganiban, Vini  
Ortega, Salon and Lagman.

Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears  
none; the motion is approved.

The Members nominated are so designated.  
The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that we  
designate the following as members of the Conference  
Committee on the disagreeing provisions of House  
Bills No. 4814 and 8554 and Senate Bill No. 2059,  
on enhancing revenue collection by granting amnesty  
on all unpaid internal revenue taxes imposed by the  
national government for Taxable Year 2017 and prior  
years: Reps. Estrellita B. Suansing, Lianda B. Bolilia,  
Cheryl P. Deloso-Montalla, Michael L. Romero, PhD  
and Danilo E. Suarez.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is  
a motion to designate Representatives Suansing, Bolilia,  
Deloso-Montalla, Romero and Suarez as members of the  
Conference Committee on the disagreeing provisions  
of House Bills No. 4814 and 8554 and Senate Bill No.  
2059, on enhancing revenue collection by granting  
amnesty on all unpaid internal revenue taxes imposed

by the national government for Taxable Year 2017 and  
prior years.

Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears  
none; the motion is approved.

The Members nominated are so designated.  
The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, we are in receipt of a  
message from the Senate informing the House that  
the Senate passed with amendments House Bill No.  
5577, mandating the conservation of Gabaldon school  
buildings nationwide. We have been advised that the  
Committee on Basic Education, the Sponsor of the said  
Bill, and the author thereof have no objections to the  
amendments introduced thereto by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with our rules, I move  
that we concur with the Senate amendments to House  
Bill No. 5577.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is a  
motion that we concur with the Senate amendments on  
House Bill No. 5577. Is there any objection? (*Silence*)  
The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

DESIGNATION OF REP. NOGRALES (J.) AS  
CARETAKER OF THE FIRST DISTRICT OF  
DAVAO CITY

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of the  
people of the First District of Davao City, I move that  
we designate Rep. Jericho Jonas B. Nograles of PBA  
Party-List as the legislative caretaker of the First District  
of Davao City.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is  
a motion to designate Congressman Nograles (J.) from  
PBA Party-List as the caretaker of the First District of  
Davao City. Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair  
hears none; the motion is approved.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

DESIGNATION OF REP. ERMITA-BUHAIN AS  
CARETAKER OF THE LONE DISTRICT OF  
LAS PIÑAS CITY

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of the  
people of the Lone District of Las Piñas City, I move  
that we designate Rep. Elenita Milagros “Eileen”  
Ermita-Buhain of the First District of Batangas as  
the legislative caretaker of the Lone District of Las  
Piñas City.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is  
a motion to designate Congresswoman Ermita-Buhain  
as the legislative caretaker of the Lone District of Las

Piñas. Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

DESIGNATION OF REP. DEFENSOR TO THE  
CONF. CTTEE ON H.B. NO. 4814 AND 8554  
AND S.B. NO. 2059

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, I move for the designation of Rep. Arthur R. Defensor Jr. as an additional member to the Conference Committee on the disagreeing provisions of House Bills No. 4814 and 8554 and Senate Bill No. 2059, the titles thereof were read earlier.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is a motion by the Majority Leader. Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

Rep. Arthur Defensor Jr. is so designated.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

OMNIBUS CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILLS  
ON SECOND READING

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to our Rules, I move for an omnibus motion for the consideration of the following House Bills on Second Reading:

House Bill No. 8072, under Committee Report No. 814;

House Bill No. 8073, under Committee Report No. 815;

House Bill No. 8506, under Committee Report No. 912;

House Bill No. 8507, under Committee Report No. 913;

House Bill No. 8508, under Committee Report No. 914;

House Bill No. 8509, under Committee Report No. 915;

House Bill No. 8510, under Committee Report No. 916;

House Bill No. 8531, under Committee Report No. 920; and

House Bill No. 8532, under Committee Report No. 921.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is an omnibus motion for the consideration on Second Reading of House Bills No. 8072, 8073, 8506, 8507, 8508, 8509, 8510, 8531 and 8532. Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

PERIOD OF SPONSORSHIP AND DEBATE

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that we open

the period of sponsorship and debate for the aforesaid Bills.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is a motion to open the period of sponsorship and debate. Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that we consider the respective Explanatory Notes of the Bills as the sponsorship speeches on the said measures.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is a motion to consider the Explanatory Notes of the Bills as the sponsorship speeches on the said measures. Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, there being no Member who wishes to interpellate or speak against the said measures, I move that we terminate the period of sponsorship and debate.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is a motion to terminate the period of sponsorship and debate on the Bills. Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that we open the period of amendments.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is a motion to open the period of amendments. Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, there being no Committee or individual amendment, I move that we terminate the period of amendments.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is a motion to terminate the period of amendment. Is there any objection? (*Silence*) The Chair hears none; the motion is approved.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

OMNIBUS APPROVAL OF HOUSE BILLS  
ON SECOND READING

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that we approve the aforesaid House Bills on Second Reading.



THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). There is a motion to approve the aforesaid House Bills on Second Reading.

VIVA VOCE VOTING

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

The Bills enumerated in the omnibus motion are hereby approved on Second Reading.\*

The Majority Leader is recognized.

SUSPENSION OF SESSION

REP. NOEL. May I ask for a suspension of the session, Mr. Speaker.

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

*It was 6:30 p.m.*

RESUMPTION OF SESSION

*At 6:37 p.m., the session was resumed.*

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

The Majority Leader is recognized.

NOMINAL VOTING ON H.B. NO. 8528  
ON THIRD READING

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that we vote on Third Reading on House Bill No. 8528 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. Pichay). 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 November 15, 2018, pursuant to Section 58, Rule X of the House Rules.*

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 8528, entitled: AN ACT REGULATING THE PRACTICE OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY IN THE PHILIPPINES, AND PROVIDING 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. 32, dated November 21, 2018.*

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 8528  
ON THIRD READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). With 170 affirmative votes, no negative vote and no abstention, House Bill No. 8528 is approved on Third Reading.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

NOMINAL VOTING ON H.B. NO. 8382  
ON THIRD READING

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that we vote on Third Reading on House Bill No. 8382 and direct the Secretary General to read the title of the measure, and call the roll for nominal voting.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Secretary General is directed to read the title of House Bill No. 8529...

REP. NOEL. Eight-three-eight-two, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). House Bill No. 8382.

*Thereupon, the Secretary General read the title of the measure, printed copies of which were distributed to the Members on September 14, 2018, pursuant to Section 58, Rule X of the House Rules.*

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 8382, entitled: AN ACT GRANTING PHILIPPINE CITIZENSHIP TO KITSON SORIANO KHO.

*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. 32, dated November 21, 2018.*

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 8382  
ON THIRD READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). With 170

\* See MEASURES CONSIDERED (printed separately)

\*\* See ANNEX (printed separately)

affirmative votes, no negative vote and no abstention, House Bill No. 8382 is approved on Third Reading.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

NOMINAL VOTING ON H.B. NO. 8529  
ON THIRD READING

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that we vote on Third Reading on House Bill No. 8529 and direct the Secretary General to read the title of the measure, and call the roll for nominal voting.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). 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 November 15, 2018, pursuant to Section 58, Rule X of the House Rules.*

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 8529, entitled: AN ACT REGULATING THE PRACTICE OF SPEECH LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY IN THE PHILIPPINES, AND PROVIDING 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. 32, dated November 21, 2018.*

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 8529  
ON THIRD READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). With 170 affirmative votes, no negative vote and no abstention, House Bill No. 8529 is approved on Third Reading.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

NOMINAL VOTING ON H.B. NO. 8101  
ON THIRD READING

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that we vote on Third Reading on House Bill No. 8101 and direct the Secretary General to read the title of the measure, and call the roll for nominal voting.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). 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 14, 2018, pursuant to Section 58, Rule X of the House Rules.*

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 8101, entitled: AN ACT GRANTING SURVIVORSHIP BENEFITS TO THE DEPENDENT CHILDREN OF A DECEASED RETIRED MEMBER OF THE JUDICIARY WHO IS A SOLO PARENT, OR TO THE SURVIVING PARENTS OR NOMINATED PERSONS OF SUCH DECEASED RETIREE, AMENDING FOR THE PURPOSE REPUBLIC ACT NO. 910, AS AMENDED, 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. 32, dated November 21, 2018.*

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 8101  
ON THIRD READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). With 170 affirmative votes, no negative vote and no abstention, House Bill No. 8101 is approved on Third Reading.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

NOMINAL VOTING ON H.B. NO. 8121  
ON THIRD READING

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that we vote on Third Reading on House Bill No. 8121 and direct the Secretary General to read the title of the measure, and call the roll for nominal voting.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). 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 14, 2018, pursuant to Section 58, Rule X of the House Rules.*

THE SECRETARY GENERAL. House Bill No. 8121, entitled: AN ACT PROVIDING SUPPORT FOR THE SURVIVING SPOUSE AND CHILDREN OF SLAIN JUSTICES AND JUDGES, AMENDING FOR THE PURPOSE REPUBLIC ACT NO. 910, AS

\* See ANNEX (printed separately)

AMENDED, ENTITLED “AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE RETIREMENT OF JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT AND OF THE COURT OF APPEALS, FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE PROVISIONS HEREOF BY THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE INSURANCE SYSTEM, AND TO REPEAL COMMONWEALTH ACT NUMBERED FIVE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SIX”, 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. 32, dated November 21, 2018.*

APPROVAL OF H.B. NO. 8121  
ON THIRD READING

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). With 170 affirmative votes, no negative vote and no abstention, House Bill No. 8121 is approved on Third Reading.

The Majority Floor Leader is recognized.

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Secretary General be directed to immediately transmit copies of the Bills approved on Third Reading to the Senate.

I so move.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Rep. Pichay). The Secretary General is directed to provide copies of the approved Bills on Third Reading to the Senate.

The Majority Leader is recognized.

ADJOURNMENT OF SESSION

REP. NOEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn session until three o'clock in the afternoon of Monday, November 26, 2018.

I so move.

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

The session is adjourned until Monday, November 26, 2018, at three o'clock in the afternoon. Thank you.

*It was 7:01 p.m.*

\* See ANNEX (printed separately)