



Journal  
of the  
House of Representatives

SEVENTEENTH CONGRESS  
FIRST REGULAR SESSION  
2016 - 2017

JOURNAL NO. 77  
Wednesday, March 1, 2017

Prepared by the  
JOURNAL SERVICE  
Plenary Affairs Bureau

**JOURNAL NO. 77**  
**Wednesday, March 1, 2017**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Pursuant to Section 15(h), Rule IV of the amended Provisional Rules of the House, Deputy Majority Leader Gerald Anthony “Samsam” V. Gullas Jr. called the session to order at 4:00 p.m.

**NATIONAL ANTHEM AND PRAYER**

Pursuant to Section 73, Rule XI of the amended Provisional Rules of the House, the Members sang the National Anthem and thereafter, observed a minute of silent prayer.

**MOTION OF REP. GONZALES (A.D.)**

Thereupon, Representative Aurelio “Dong” D. Gonzales Jr. moved for the deferment of the Roll Call.

**OBJECTION OF REP. ATIENZA**

Rep. Jose L. Atienza Jr. raised his objection to said motion.

**SUSPENSION OF SESSION**

Thereafter, the Chair *motu proprio* suspended the session at 4:02 p.m.

**RESUMPTION OF SESSION**

The session resumed at 4:52 p.m. with Deputy Speaker Raneo “Ranie” E. Abu presiding.

**ROLL CALL**

On motion of Rep. Juan Pablo “Rimpy” P. Bondoc, there being no objection, the Chair directed the Secretary General to call the Roll and the following Members were present:

Abad  
Abaya  
Abayon  
Abellanosa  
Abu  
Abueg  
Acop  
Acosta  
Adiong  
Agarao

Aggabao  
Albano  
Alejano  
Almario  
Almonte  
Alonte  
Alvarez (F.)  
Alvarez (P.)  
Amante  
Amatong  
Andaya  
Angara-Castillo  
Aragones  
Arbison  
Arcillas  
Arenas  
Atienza  
Aumentado  
Bag-ao  
Bagatsing  
Banal  
Barzaga  
Bataoil  
Batocabe  
Bautista-Bandigan  
Belaro  
Belmonte (F.)  
Belmonte (J.C.)  
Belmonte (R.)  
Benitez  
Bernos  
Bertiz  
Biazon  
Billones  
Bolilia  
Bondoc  
Bordado  
Bravo (A.)  
Bravo (M.V.)  
Brosas  
Calderon  
Calixto-Rubiano  
Caminero  
Campos  
Canama  
Cari  
Casilao  
Castelo  
Castro (F.L.)  
Castro (F.H.)  
Catamco

Celeste  
Cerafica  
Chipeco  
Co  
Cortes  
Cortuna  
Cosalan  
Cuaresma  
Dalipe  
Daza  
De Jesus  
De Venecia  
De Vera  
Defensor  
Del Mar  
Dimaporo (M.K.)  
Duavit  
Dy  
Enverga  
Erice  
Ermita-Buhain  
Espina  
Estrella  
Eusebio  
Fariñas  
Fernando  
Ferrer (J.)  
Ferrer (L.)  
Flores  
Fortun  
Fortuno  
Garbin  
Garcia (G.)  
Garcia (J.E.)  
Garcia-Albano  
Garin (R.)  
Garin (S.)  
Gasataya  
Geron  
Go (M.)  
Gonzaga  
Gonzales (A.P.)  
Gonzales (A.D.)  
Gonzalez  
Gullas  
Hernandez  
Herrera-Dy  
Hofer  
Jalosjos  
Javier  
Labadlabad  
Lagman  
Lanete  
Laogan  
Lazatin  
Leachon  
Limkaichong  
Lobregat  
Lopez (B.)  
Lopez (C.)  
Lopez (M.L.)  
Macapagal-Arroyo  
Madrona  
Malapitan  
Manalo  
Mangaoang  
Mangudadatu (Z.)  
Marcoleta  
Marcos  
Mariño  
Marquez  
Martinez  
Matugas  
Mellana  
Mendoza  
Mercado  
Mirasol  
Montoro  
Nava  
Nieto  
Noel  
Nograles (K.A.)  
Nolasco  
Nuñez-Malanyaon  
Oaminal  
Ocampo  
Olivarez  
Ortega (P.)  
Ortega (V.N.)  
Pacquiao  
Palma  
Pancho  
Panganiban  
Panotes  
Papandayan  
Pimentel  
Pineda  
Plaza  
Primicias-Agabas  
Quimbo  
Radaza  
Ramirez-Sato  
Ramos  
Relampagos  
Revilla  
Roa-Puno  
Robes  
Rocamora  
Rodriguez (I.)  
Rodriguez (M.)  
Roman  
Romualdo

Roque (H.)  
 Roque (R.)  
 Sacdalan  
 Sagarbarria  
 Sahali  
 Salimbangon  
 Salo  
 Salon  
 Sambar  
 Sandoval  
 Santos-Recto  
 Sarmiento (C.)  
 Sarmiento (E.M.)  
 Savellano  
 Sema  
 Siao  
 Silverio  
 Singson  
 Suansing (E.)  
 Suansing (H.)  
 Suarez  
 Tambunting  
 Tan (A.)  
 Tejada  
 Teves  
 Tiangco  
 Ting  
 Tinio  
 Treñas  
 Tugna  
 Tupas  
 Turabin-Hataman  
 Ty  
 Umali  
 Ungab  
 Unico  
 Uy (J.)  
 Uy (R.)  
 Uybarreta  
 Vargas  
 Vargas-Alfonso  
 Velasco-Catera  
 Veloso  
 Vergara  
 Villanueva  
 Villaraza-Suarez  
 Villarica  
 Villarin  
 Violago  
 Yap (A.)  
 Yap (M.)  
 Yap (V.)  
 Yu  
 Zamora (R.)  
 Zarate  
 Zubiri

With 229 Members responding to the Call, the Chair declared the presence of a quorum. (See also Appendix 1)

#### **MANIFESTATION OF REP. ATIENZA**

Recognized by the Chair, Rep. Atienza stated for the record that more than enough Members were on the floor to constitute a quorum and the count of the Secretariat was accurate and surprisingly jibed with his count.

#### **REMARKS OF REP. BONDOC**

Rep. Bondoc stated that it is the count of the plenary tellers that is used as the official count in determining a quorum.

#### **DEFERMENT OF THE CONSIDERATION OF THE REFERENCE OF BUSINESS**

On motion of Rep. Bondoc, there being no objection, the Body deferred the consideration of the Reference of Business.

#### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS: COMMITTEE REPORT NO. 47 ON HOUSE BILL NO. 4727**

On motion of Rep. Bondoc, there being no objection, the Body resumed consideration on Second Reading of House Bill No. 4727, as embodied in Committee Report No. 47 and reported out by the Committee on Justice.

Upon direction of the Chair, the Secretary General read the title of the Bill, to wit:

“AN ACT IMPOSING THE DEATH PENALTY ON CERTAIN HEINOUS CRIMES, REPEALING FOR THE PURPOSE REPUBLIC ACT NO. 9346, ENTITLED 'AN ACT PROHIBITING THE IMPOSITION OF DEATH PENALTY IN THE PHILIPPINES', AND FURTHER AMENDING ACT NO. 3815, AS AMENDED, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE 'REVISED PENAL CODE', AND REPUBLIC ACT NO. 9165, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE 'COMPREHENSIVE DANGEROUS DRUGS ACT OF 2002'.”

Before the Body could proceed with its deliberations, the Chair recognized Rep. Atienza for a manifestation, upon Rep. Bondoc’s motion.

### MANIFESTATION OF REP. ATIENZA

Rep. Atienza recalled that in the previous day's session, he, together with Rep. H. Harry L. Roque Jr. and several other Members, had insisted on a nominal voting on the last proposed amendment of Rep. Bondoc because they wanted to have a count of *ayes* and *nays* that would be more definite, reliable, and faithful to the Body's real sentiment. He asked for Rep. Bondoc's position on Section 116 on "Nominal Voting" of the House Rules and pointed out that in the past, the Body had conducted nominal voting on measures on Second Reading. He opined that the Chair should get the Body's decision on nominal voting and adhere to the requirement of one-fifth of the Members present, so that the proceedings will be proper, orderly, and credible.

Rep. Bondoc cited Section 115 on "Manner of Voting" of the House Rules which provided that the House shall divide if the Speaker doubted the result of the voting or if a motion to divide the House was carried. He stressed that the results were clear during the votations that had already been conducted; this, as he enjoined the Members and audience from using the microphone or joining in the voting, respectively, during the proceedings. He thus concluded that there was still no need to go into nominal voting but assured Rep. Atienza that the Majority would accede thereto if it was called for.

Thereupon, the Chair recognized Rep. Roque (H.).

### MOTION OF REP. ROQUE (H.)

Rep. Roque reiterated his motion for nominal voting on Rep. Bondoc's last proposed amendment, which motion the Presiding Officer did not act on during the previous session day. He pointed out that Section 116 of the House Rules provided that if a Member moved for nominal voting, the Body should determine if there was a supporting vote of one-fifth of the Members present.

### MANIFESTATION OF REP. DAZA

Rep. Raul A. Daza sought recognition from the Chair, but the latter asked that Rep. Bondoc be allowed to first respond to the query of Rep. Roque (H.). Rep. Daza then reserved his right to reply to Rep. Bondoc, and the Chair said that he could do so at the proper time.

### REMARKS OF REP. BONDOC

In response to Rep. Roque (H.), Rep. Bondoc pointed out that the latter's motion was lost in the previous day's proceedings. Nevertheless, he said that he

will entertain appropriate motions during the period of amendments.

### QUERY OF REP. ROQUE (H.)

At this point, Rep. Roque asked what the House had last voted on for *viva voce* voting when he raised the issue of nominal voting during the previous day's session.

Rep. Bondoc replied by saying that the parliamentary status was that the Chamber was deliberating on Second Reading on House Bill No. 4727, as amended, and was ready to consider individual amendments thereon. He pointed out that he had directed the Secretariat the previous day to prepare a clean copy of the instant Bill with the amendments that he proposed and were approved on the floor, engrossed therein.

Rep. Roque sought clarification on Rep. Bondoc's proposal of two amendments the previous day during which Reps. Atienza and Edcel C. Lagman made an observation that the Body was entertaining individual amendments without the benefit of a clean copy of the Bill. He also asked whether the Body will go back to the provisions that had already been discussed.

Rep. Bondoc stated that the parliamentary status was that the Body was considering House Bill No. 4727, of which a clean copy had already been provided to each Member; and that Rep. Roque could propose amendments because the period of individual amendments was already open.

On motion of Rep. Bondoc, the Chair then recognized Rep. Reynaldo V. Umali, the Chairperson of the Committee on Justice, to consider individual amendments from the Members.

### MANIFESTATION OF REP. DAZA

Before the Body proceeded with the individual amendments, on motion of Rep. Bondoc, the Chair recognized Rep. Daza who cited traditional practice and read into the records Section 116 of the House Rules; Section 16(4), Article II of the Constitution; and pages 400-401 of Dr. Inocencio Pareja's *Rules of the House of Representatives*. He concluded that all of these confirm that a motion for nominal voting could be made by any Member and should be approved by one-fifth of the Members present in order to be conducted. He emphasized that it was a constitutional right of a Member to make a motion for nominal voting and it was a constitutional duty of the House to respect the constitutional provision.

**REMARKS OF REP. BONDOC**

Rep. Bondoc said that Rep. Daza's points were well-taken, and will be applied at a proper time at the wish of the plenary.

Thereafter, upon motion of Rep. Bondoc, the Chair recognized Rep. Umali to consider individual amendments to House Bill No. 4727.

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF DEPUTY SPEAKER ANDAYA**

Recognized by the Chair upon Rep. Bondoc's motion, Rep. Rolando G. Andaya Jr. proposed (1) on page 1, lines 1-21, to delete Sections 1, 2, and 3; (2) on page 2, to delete lines 1-6; and (3) to amend the title of the Bill to read as follows: "AN ACT IMPOSING THE DEATH PENALTY ON CRIMES ENUMERATED UNDER REPUBLIC ACT NO. 9165, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE 'COMPREHENSIVE DANGEROUS DRUG ACT OF 2002'."

Rep. Umali said that he could not accept the amendment because the focus of the Bill was just to amend the penalty and increase it from *reclusion perpetua* to death. This, he said, was consistent with what the Code of Crimes Committee was working on to change the nomenclature of the penalties to be imposed under the Revised Penal Code and/or special laws which will be incorporated in the Code of Crimes. He clarified that they were not only amending the Dangerous Drugs Act but proposing a new law that seeks to reimpose the death penalty on heinous crimes for compelling reasons as defined by the Constitution.

**APPEAL OF DEPUTY SPEAKER ANDAYA**

In explaining his proposed amendment, Rep. Andaya cited (1) Republic Act (RA) No. 7659 which restored capital punishment; first used the phrase "heinous crime" and defined it; and listed 13 major crimes under the coverage of heinous crimes; and (2) RA No. 9346 which merely repealed the imposition of the death penalty and did not repeal the definition of "heinous crime" nor the 13 major crimes. He then stressed that inasmuch as House Bill No. 4727 followed the template of RA No. 7659 and did not repeal it, there would be an absurd situation where both measures shared the same definition of "heinous crime" but one covered only one crime while the other covered 13. He explained how House Bill No. 4727 failed the test of the constitutional provision on the equal application of the law; and urged the Body to make it a stand-alone law.

**REMINDER FROM THE CHAIR**

At this point, the Chair reminded Deputy Speaker Andaya that he had already consumed his five minutes to explain his amendment.

**APPEAL OF DEPUTY SPEAKER ANDAYA (Continuation)**

Rep. Andaya concluded that if the title, definition, and standards of heinous crime under House Bill No. 4727 will be left as is, more crimes might be included by the Bicameral Conference Committee contrary to what had been agreed upon in the House.

Rep. Umali held that there was no distinction as regards the heinous crimes enumerated in the two measures. He explained that the only difference was that in House Bill No. 4727, the Constitution provided for compelling reasons for the imposition of the death penalty for heinous crimes, which was the war on drugs. He pointed out that in the future, the death penalty on other heinous crimes could be reimposed should there be compelling reasons to do so. He also gave his assurance that during the Bicameral Conference, the House panel will not agree to include additional crimes in the bill.

**MANIFESTATION OF DEPUTY SPEAKER ANDAYA**

Rep. Andaya appealed to the Body and requested that he be allowed to explain his amendment.

**MOTION OF REP. BONDOC**

After saying that Deputy Speaker Andaya had already been given time to do so, Rep. Bondoc moved that the Body proceed with the voting on Rep. Andaya's appeal. He explained that an *aye* vote will sustain Rep. Andaya's proposed amendment and a *nay* vote meant support for the Sponsor's decision to reject the same.

Rep. Bondoc also requested his colleagues not to use the microphone, and the audience to allow the Congressmen to vote properly.

**VIVA VOCE VOTING ON DEPUTY SPEAKER ANDAYA'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

Thereupon, the Chair called for a *viva voce* voting on Rep. Andaya's proposed amendment; and with the majority of the Members voting against it, the same was lost.

**MOTION OF DEPUTY SPEAKER ANDAYA**

Rep. Andaya moved for a nominal voting on his proposed amendment.

## DIVISION OF THE HOUSE

In order to determine if one-fifth of the 229 Members present or 46 Members supported the motion for nominal voting on Deputy Speaker Andaya's proposed amendment, on motion of Rep. Bondoc, there being no objection, the Body proceeded to the division of the House. With majority voting against the motion, the same was lost.

On motion of Rep. Bondoc, the Chair then recognized Rep. Ramon V. A. "Rav" Rocamora.

## REMARKS OF REP. LAGMAN

Before Rep. Rocamora could present his amendments, however, the Chair recognized Rep. Lagman who stressed that the individual amendments should be considered on a page-by-page and line-by-line basis and not by prior registration. Observing that the Body had finished with page 1 of the Bill, he said that he should have the floor because he had amendments on page 2, line 14 of the measure, unless there were anterior amendments.

Rep. Bondoc initially thanked Rep. Lagman for his amendments and surmised that the latter, in helping perfect the instant measure, will vote in favor of the measure. To make the proceedings easier to understand, he then sought Rep. Lagman's indulgence to allow the Members who had enlisted for the presentation of their individual amendments while he assured him that he will be recognized to present his own proposals at the proper time.

Rep. Lagman reiterated his previous statements and invoked traditional practice as well. He added that Rep. Bondoc was not at liberty to state that he was in favor of the measure because he was proposing amendments.

## REMARKS OF THE CHAIR

At this point, the Chair stated that as previously moved by Rep. Bondoc, he will first recognize Rep. Rocamora and that at the proper time, he will recognize Rep. Lagman.

## REMARKS OF REP. ROCAMORA

Rep. Rocamora opined that the Body should observe proper procedure by starting with earlier pages, pointed out that his amendment was on page 3 while that of Rep. Lagman was on page 2, and said that he will yield to his colleague.

## REMARKS OF THE CHAIR

For orderly proceedings, the Chair asked the Body to allow Rep. Bondoc to follow the sequence in the aforesaid list.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REP. LAGMAN

On motion of Rep. Bondoc, the Chair recognized Rep. Lagman who initially stated that his proposed amendments will not be in support of House Bill No. 4727.

He thereafter proposed on page 2, line 14, to insert the words "*RECLUSION TEMPORAL TO*" before the phrase "*RECLUSION PERPETUA*" and to delete the words "*TO DEATH*" after the phrase "*RECLUSION PERPETUA*," such that the line will read "*RECLUSION TEMPORAL TO RECLUSION PERPETUA*."

The Sponsor stated that the Committee could not accept the same.

## APPEAL OF REP. LAGMAN

Rep. Lagman then appealed to the Sponsor. Given five minutes by the Chair to explain his amendment, he cited the following conventions which the Philippines was a signatory of: (1) the Second Optional Protocol to the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) which contained a commitment not to reimpose the death penalty, (2) international jurisprudence and the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties which declared that a State could not use its domestic law and Constitution to renege on or violate its treaty undertakings, and (3) the 1988 UN Drug Convention which did not prescribe the death penalty on drug-related offenses. He added that the International Narcotics Control Board had consistently advised countries against the death penalty on drug-related offenses because capital punishment violated the right to life and because it was not the solution to the drug problem that was actually triggered by socio-economic factors. He also said that the proponents of House Bill No. 4727 failed to conclusively present compelling reasons why death should be imposed as the maximum penalty on the "importation of dangerous drugs and/or controlled precursors and essential chemicals."

## MOTION OF REP. BONDOC

Rep. Bondoc stated that Rep. Lagman was appealing the Sponsor's rejection of his proposed amendment. He then moved for *viva voce* voting and explained that an *aye* vote will sustain the amendment while a *nay* vote, which the Majority was asking for, will defeat the same.

### **VIVA VOCE VOTING ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REP. LAGMAN**

Thereupon, the Chair called for a *viva voce* voting on the proposed amendment of Rep. Lagman, and with majority of the Members voting against it, the same was lost.

### **MOTION OF REP. LAGMAN**

Thereupon, Rep. Lagman moved for nominal voting under Section 116 of the House Rules.

### **DIVISION OF THE HOUSE**

On motion of Rep. Bondoc, there being no objection, the Body proceeded to a division of the House; and with only a few Members rising in favor of the motion for nominal voting, the same was lost.

Thereafter, on motion of Rep. Bondoc, the Chair recognized Rep. Rocamora for his amendments

### **MANIFESTATION OF REP. LAGMAN**

Rep. Lagman manifested however that he had an anterior amendment on page 2, saying that Rep. Rocamora's amendment was on page 3.

### **MANIFESTATION OF REP. ROCAMORA**

Upon Rep. Bondoc's query, Rep. Rocamora stated that he would yield the floor to the Members for anterior amendments.

### **PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REP. MARCOLETA**

On motion of Rep. Bondoc, the Chair then recognized Rep. Rodante D. Marcoleta who proposed on page 1, line 11, after the phrase "rule of law," to delete the phrase "and the need to rationalize and harmonize the penal sanctions" so that the paragraph will read as follows: "TOWARDS THIS END, AND IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE, PUBLIC ORDER AND THE RULE OF LAW, THE CONGRESS FINDS COMPELLING REASONS TO IMPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY ON HEINOUS CRIMES COMMITTED BY OFFENDERS WHO ARE A CONTINUOUS THREAT TO SOCIETY."

He explained that the amended version of House Bill No. 4727 which pertained only to drug-related cases was not a product of rationalizing and harmonizing penal sanctions because the entire Revised Penal Code or Act No. 3815 was eliminated. He added that

in the caucuses that he had attended on the measure, the dropping of all of the crimes and retention only of drug cases was a product of consensus-building.

### **REMARKS OF REP. BONDOC**

Rep. Bondoc asked Rep. Marcoleta to propose his amendments first and appeal the same after the Sponsor's acceptance or rejection thereof.

### **PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REP. MARCOLETA (Continuation)**

Rep. Umali said that the Committee could not accept Rep. Marcoleta's amendment. He explained that the Committee was in fact harmonizing the penal sanctions because this was the direction of the Code of Crimes Committee that was working on the Code of Crimes to replace the Revised Penal Code, as well as the consolidation therein of all special laws.

### **APPEAL OF REP. MARCOLETA**

In appealing the Sponsor's decision, Rep. Marcoleta asked how the Committee rationalized and harmonized the penal sanctions by simply reducing the number of crimes punishable under the Revised Penal Code and concentrating only on drug-related cases. He maintained that his proposal would make the provision more consistent and even simple to defend.

### **MOTION OF REP. BONDOC**

Rep. Bondoc stated that Rep. Marcoleta was appealing the Sponsor's rejection of his proposed amendment. He then moved for a *viva voce* voting and explained that an *aye* vote will sustain the amendment while a *nay* vote, which the Majority was asking for, will defeat the same.

### **VIVA VOCE VOTING ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REP. MARCOLETA**

Thereupon, the Chair called for a *viva voce* voting on the proposed amendment of Rep. Marcoleta, and with majority of the Members voting against it, the same was lost.

### **MANIFESTATION OF REP. DAZA**

At this point, Rep. Daza manifested his desire to propose an amendment.



### REMARKS OF REP. BONDOC

In the interest of order, Rep. Bondoc appealed to the Members to register their amendments with the Majority Leader.

### REMARKS OF REP. DAZA

Rep. Daza clarified that he had already registered and had explained his amendment to a member of the Committee on Rules.

### QUERY OF REP. BONDOC

Rep. Bondoc then asked Rep. Rocamora if he would like to give way to Rep. Daza.

### REMARKS OF REP. ROCAMORA

Rep. Rocamora answered that other Members like Reps. Lagman and Tom S. Villarín also wanted to introduce amendments.

### REMARKS OF THE CHAIR

The Chair suggested that the Members who would like to propose amendments to course their requests through the Majority Leader.

### PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REP. VILLARIN

Recognized by the Chair on motion of Rep. Bondoc, Rep. Villarín proposed on page 2, lines 13-14, 28, and 41, to retain the phrase “life imprisonment” and to delete the phrase “*RECLUSION PERPETUA TO DEATH.*”

Rep. Umali did not accept the proposed amendment.

### APPEAL OF REP. VILLARIN

Given five minutes to explain his appeal, Rep. Villarín initially said that the substitute Death Penalty Bill was a radical departure from the original measure that was hastily deliberated and passed by the Committee on Justice. He inquired on the basis for removing the crimes enumerated in the original House Bill No. 4727 from the ambit of the death penalty. He opined that as raised by Deputy Speaker Andaya, the imposition of the death penalty on drug-related cases only would be violative of the Constitutional clause on the equal protection of the law because the measure would allow a distinction between drug-related and non-drug-related heinous crimes. Invoking Section 28 of the House Rules, he averred that the Committee on Dangerous

Drugs did not deliberate on the measure even though it had authority over all matters directly relating to the production, manufacture, use, and trafficking of illegal and prohibited drugs, controlled precursors, and essential chemicals. He stressed that the Committee should first define the nature of the crimes punishable under the Dangerous Drugs Act before reimposing the death penalty.

Rep. Villarín subsequently pointed out that House Bill No. 4727 did not define and identify what precursors and essential chemicals were. He relayed the Philippine Chemistry Community’s position that although it recognized the drug menace, it opposed the provisions that equated dangerous drugs with precursors and essential chemicals whose use was also important in industry, agriculture, health, education, and research. He also cautioned that the measure would criminalize legitimate users of said chemicals, raise the cost of goods and damage the economy, and provide many opportunities for corruption. He asked the Sponsors to rethink the measure and recommit it to the Committee on Dangerous Drugs.

### VIVA VOCE VOTING ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REP. VILLARIN

Thereupon, the Chair called for a *viva voce* voting on the proposed amendment of Rep. Villarín, and with majority of the Members voting against it, the same was lost.

### REMARKS OF REP. DAZA

On motion of Rep. Bondoc, the Chair next recognized Rep. Daza who said that he had already explained his amendment to the Committee on Rules and asked for a five-minute recess to likewise explain it to the Sponsor.

### REMARKS OF REP. BONDOC

Remarking that Rep. Daza was free to approach any of the Sponsors, Rep. Bondoc recognized Rep. Rocamora to present his amendments on the floor.

### MANIFESTATION OF REP. LAGMAN

Rep. Lagman manifested his desire to present anterior amendments on page 2 of the measure; and the Chair recognized him upon Rep. Bondoc’s motion and with Rep. Rocamora’s indulgence.

### QUERY OF REP. LAGMAN

To the query of Rep. Lagman on the triple x-marks in the February 28, 2017 draft of the Bill, Rep. Umali

clarified that no changes were made in the previous bill or substitute bill; and that said marks, in accordance with the regular practice when no amendments were being introduced, meant a reiteration of the provisions in the Dangerous Drugs Act that were not amended. The former however maintained that ordinarily and traditionally, said marks represented the deletion of certain provisions; and that existing provisions should be reflected in the measure if they were being reiterated.

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

Rep. Umali then clarified that the following paragraph, which Rep. Lagman particularly asked about, was inappropriate for discussion in the period of amendments because it was found in the previous and abandoned version of the Bill: "The maximum penalty provided under this Section shall be imposed upon any person, who, unless authorized by this Act shall import or bring into the Philippines any dangerous drugs and or controlled precursor and essential chemicals for the use of the diplomatic passport, diplomatic facilities or any other means involving his or her official status intended to facilitate the unlawful entry of the same. In addition, the diplomatic passport shall be confiscated and cancelled."

#### **PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REP. LAGMAN**

Subsequently, Rep. Lagman proposed on page 2, line 28, to insert the phrase "*RECLUSION TEMPORAL TO*" before the words "*RECLUSION PERPETUA*" and to delete the words "TO DEATH" after the phrase "*RECLUSION PERPETUA*" such that the line will read as follows: "PENALTY OF *RECLUSION TEMPORAL TO RECLUSION PERPETUA*."

*Whereupon, Deputy Speaker Singson relinquished the Chair to Deputy Speaker Abu.*

The Sponsor objected to the proposed amendment as this was inconsistent with the purpose and even the title of the bill.

#### **APPEAL OF REP. LAGMAN**

Appealing to his colleagues to reject the Sponsor's position on his amendment, Rep. Lagman initially said that the proponents failed to unequivocally and conclusively present the existence of compelling reasons for imposing the death penalty for heinous crimes. He added that they did not assert that the sale, trading, administration, dispensation, delivery, distribution, and transportation of dangerous drugs and/or controlled precursors and essential chemicals would satisfy the

stringent conditions of the Constitution for the imposition of the death penalty.

Rep. Lagman then said that the Philippines committed to eliminate the death penalty when it ratified the ICCPR and that it had already abolished the death penalty in 2006 when it signed the Second Optional Protocol to said convention in 2007. He added that the United Nations had also declared that the death penalty could not be imposed on drug-related offenses.

Finally, Rep. Lagman stressed that the death penalty was an abhorrent and punitive punishment that defied the sanctity of life; and pointed out that Pope Francis had stated said that the sanctity of life extended even to the criminal.

#### **MOTION OF REP. BONDOC**

Rep. Bondoc stated that Rep. Lagman was appealing the Sponsor's rejection of his proposed amendment. He then moved for *viva voce* voting and explained that an *aye* vote will sustain the amendment while a *nay* vote, which the Majority was asking for, will defeat the same.

#### **VIVA VOCE VOTING ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REP. LAGMAN**

Thereupon, the Chair called for a *viva voce* voting on the proposed amendment of Rep. Lagman, and with majority of the Members voting against it, the same was lost.

#### **REMARKS OF REP. LAGMAN**

Rep. Lagman remarked that he will not pursue the fact that the Chair had a misappreciation of the *aye* and *nay* votes. He temporarily yielded the floor to Rep. Rocamora to present his proposals, subject to his prior amendments on page 2 of the Bill.

#### **PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REP. ROCAMORA**

Upon recognition by the Chair, Rep. Rocamora stated that he was against the reimposition of death penalty but was introducing an amendment to forestall any infirmities in the Bill in case it was approved. He then proposed to delete the entire Section 25 on the "Qualifying Aggravating Circumstances in the Commission of a Crime by an Offender under the Influence of Dangerous Drugs."

The Sponsor rejected the amendment because the same was the existing provision of the law and because the instant Bill, as stated in the title itself, was

imposing the death penalty and not amending the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act. He said that it was more proper to present the proposal during the amendment of the latter.

Thereupon, the Chair granted Rep. Rocamora five minutes to explain his amendment.

#### **APPEAL OF REP. ROCAMORA**

Rep. Rocamora held that the Body could lawfully amend the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act because the title of the proposed measure spoke about increasing punishment by imposing the death penalty.

He also explained the difference between aggravating and mitigating circumstances by saying that the former referred to drinking in order to embolden oneself to commit a crime and the latter referred to being in a state of drunkenness when committing a crime. He stressed that in the mitigating circumstance, the person was not in full control of his faculties. He said that he wanted to remove the use of dangerous drugs as a qualifying aggravating circumstance in the commission of the crime because (1) the drug user was a victim who was not in his right mind and could not be deemed to be more perverse in the commission of the crime and (2) the drug pusher was the real criminal.

#### **MOTION OF REP. BONDOC**

Rep. Bondoc stated that Rep. Rocamora was appealing the Sponsor's rejection of his proposed amendment. He then moved for *viva voce* voting and explained that an *aye* vote will sustain the amendment while a *nay* vote, which the Majority was asking for, will defeat the same.

#### **VIVA VOCE VOTING ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REP. ROCAMORA**

Thereupon, the Chair called for a *viva voce* voting on the proposed amendment of Rep. Rocamora, and with majority of the Members voting against it, the same was lost.

#### **REMARKS OF REP. BONDOC**

With the permission of the Chair, Rep. Bondoc recognized Rep. Roque (H.) for his amendment.

#### **PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REP. ROQUE (H.)**

Rep. Roque proposed to make an amendment in Section 6 on page 5 of the Bill and asked for five minutes to explain it.

#### **MANIFESTATION OF REP. LAGMAN**

Rep. Lagman manifested his desire to propose an amendment on page 2 of the Bill; and Rep. Roque (H.) yielded the floor to him.

#### **PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REP. LAGMAN**

Subsequently, Rep. Lagman proposed on page 2, line 41, to insert the phrase "*RECLUSION TEMPORAL TO*" before the words "*RECLUSION PERPETUA*" and to delete the words "*TO DEATH*" after the phrase "*RECLUSION PERPETUA*" such that the line will read as follows: "*PENALTY OF RECLUSION TEMPORAL TO RECLUSION PERPETUA.*"

#### **MANIFESTATION OF REP. DAZA**

At this point, Rep. Daza manifested his desire to introduce an anterior amendment.

#### **PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REP. LAGMAN (Continuation)**

Rep. Umali said that in order to save time, he would like to register an omnibus rejection on any proposition to delete the phrase "death penalty" because it would defeat the purpose and intent of House Bill No. 4727.

Rep. Lagman said that Rep. Bondoc did not reject his reservation to present an anterior amendment on page 2 of the Bill. He opined that it was improper to make an omnibus rejection of individual amendments that had not yet been introduced because these should be treated individually as presented or introduced by the Members. He said that he did not hear the Sponsor's rejection of his amendment.

However, Rep. Umali reiterated his omnibus rejection of any and all matters that will amend the death penalty by way of deleting the same. He pointed out that the Body had already considered page 1 of the Bill where Section 3 entitled "Imposition of Death Penalty; Heinous Crimes Defined" was found; and there was no objection to said provision.

At this point, the Chair stated that Rep. Umali had rejected the proposed amendment of Rep. Lagman; and gave the latter five minutes to explain his appeal thereon.

#### **APPEAL OF REP. LAGMAN**

Rep. Lagman emphasized that there could be no omnibus coverage for individual amendments because

the Members had different versions of their amendments; and that individual amendments should be based on a per line and per page basis, according to the traditional practice of the House.

He likewise emphasized that the families of victims of heinous crimes and involuntary disappearances including his own, were not seeking vengeance nor wishing death on the perpetrators of crimes but were asking for justice. He added that according to Pope Francis, vengeance was not justice.

#### **MOTION OF REP. BONDOC**

Rep. Bondoc stated that Rep. Lagman was appealing the Sponsor's rejection of his proposed amendment. He then moved for *viva voce* voting and explained that an *aye* vote will sustain the amendment while a *nay* vote, which the Majority was asking for, will defeat the same.

#### **VIVA VOCE VOTING ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REP. LAGMAN**

Thereupon, the Chair called for a *viva voce* voting on the proposed amendment of Rep. Lagman, and with majority of the Members voting against it, the same was lost.

#### **SUSPENSION OF SESSION**

At 6:48 p.m., the Chair *motu proprio* suspended the session.

#### **RESUMPTION OF SESSION**

The session resumed at 6:48 p.m.

On motion of Rep. Bondoc, the Chair recognized Rep. Roque (H.) to propose his amendments; but before the latter could do so, the Chair recognized Rep. Lagman for an anterior amendment on page 3.

#### **PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REP. LAGMAN**

Subsequently, Rep. Lagman proposed on page 3, line 2, to insert the phrase "*RECLUSION TEMPORAL TO*" before the words "*RECLUSION PERPETUA*" and to delete the words "*TO DEATH*" after the phrase "*RECLUSION PERPETUA*" such that the line will read as follows: "*PENALTY OF RECLUSION TEMPORAL TO RECLUSION PERPETUA.*"

Rep. Umali registered his continuing omnibus rejection of Rep. Lagman's proposed amendment and asked for a ruling thereon, reiterating the reasons for the same and explaining that it was clearly dilatory.

#### **APPEAL OF REP. LAGMAN**

Given five minutes, Rep. Lagman explained that the principal reason for his proposed amendment was because the death penalty was an abhorrent kind of punishment that should not find any justification for reinclusion in the penal system. He added that it destroyed the sanctity of life; and was not a solution to criminality, poverty, inequity, and the flawed and corrupt pillars of justice like the police establishment and the prosecutorial and judicial systems. He reiterated that the United Nations Drug Convention, of which the Philippines was a signatory, did not prescribe the death penalty for drug-related cases but only imprisonment.

#### **REMARKS OF REP. BONDOC**

At this point, Rep. Bondoc said that the Majority supported Rep. Umali's omnibus motion to reject any amendment that sought to change the nature of House Bill No. 4727.

#### **REMARKS OF THE CHAIR**

The Chair sustained the position of the Majority.

#### **QUERY OF REP. ATIENZA**

Upon recognition by the Chair, Rep. Atienza asked for a definition of the term "omnibus rejection" as he remarked that it was the first time he had heard of it. He said that the acceptance of the term in parliamentary procedure could set a bad precedent because it would mean that the Members could no longer air their views on specific matters, and doing so could be misconstrued as an effort to railroad the instant Bill. He said that the Body could deliberate on the Bill for as long as possible as long as the Members were allowed to air individual amendments. He asked the Sponsor to reject the amendments in a manner provided for by the Rules.

At this point, the Chair asked whether Rep. Atienza was only asking for the definition of the term "omnibus rejection" and was not appealing the ruling of the Chair, to which the latter replied in the affirmative.

#### **POINT OF ORDER OF REP. ATIENZA**

Rep. Atienza thereupon asked from what book on elementary rules was the term "omnibus rejection" obtained; and said that he was raising a point of order to guide their discussion.

Rep. Umali quoted Merriam-Webster Dictionary's definition of the word "omnibus" and reiterated that he had made his motion for an omnibus rejection on any amendment by way of deletion of the words "death

penalty” because such was inconsistent with the intent and purpose of the Bill. He remarked tht Rep. Lagman merely recited the same reasons behind his proposed amendments.

Rep. Atienza then said that Rep. Umali was stating his position and opinion on the matter and did not cite the rules that he was basing his motion on.

#### **RULING OF THE CHAIR**

Subsequently, the Chair declared that Rep. Atienza was out of order because the Sponsor was not violating any rules.

#### **POINT OF ORDER OF REP. ATIENZA** (Continuation)

Rep. Atienza reiterated that Rep. Umali did not cite the rules governing on the motion for “omnibus rejection.”

#### **REMARKS OF REP. BONDOC**

With the permission of the Chair, Rep. Bondoc clarified that Rep. Atienza raised a point of information and not a point of order which should normally accompany the rule or process being broken. He remarked that he did not interrupt Rep. Atienza even if the Body was in the process of voting on Rep. Lagman’s proposed amendment on page 3 which the Sponsor rejected.

#### **MOTION OF REP. BONDOC**

Rep. Bondoc then stated that Rep. Lagman was appealing the Sponsor’s rejection of his proposed amendment. He then moved for a *viva voce* voting and explained that an *aye* vote will sustain the amendment while a *nay* vote, which the Majority was asking for, will defeat the same.

#### **REMARKS OF REP. ATIENZA**

Rep. Atienza sought to be recognized by the Chair and cited Section 104 of the House Rules. When Rep. Bondoc said that he will entertain the query after the voting on Rep. Lagman’s appeal, he added that he wanted clarificatory answers; the Body should not reject questions on the floor; and he will insist on a continuing objection if the Sponsor insisted on an omnibus rejection.

#### **REMARKS OF REP. BONDOC**

Rep. Bondoc stressed that the Sponsor had attempted to answer the query of Rep. Atienza on what an omnibus objection was; and that they should let the Body decide thereon.

#### **VIVA VOCE VOTING ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REP. LAGMAN**

Thereupon, the Chair called for a *viva voce* voting on Rep. Lagman’s amendment; and with the majority of the Members voting against it, the same was lost.

#### **REMARKS OF REP. ATIENZA**

Rep. Atienza questioned the statement of the Chair on the result of the voting and asked for a nominal voting thereon.

#### **MANIFESTATION OF REP. VILLARIN**

Rep. Villarín sought recognition on a point of order.

#### **REMARKS OF REP. BONDOC**

Rep. Bondoc stated that under Section 115 of the House Rules, a motion for nominal voting shall be carried if one-fifth of the Members present voted for it.

#### **DIVISION OF THE HOUSE**

Thereafter, on motion of Rep. Bondoc, there being no objection, the Chair called for a division of the House, and with only a few Members voting in favor of the motion for nominal voting, the same was lost.

#### **POINT OF ORDER OF REP. ATIENZA**

Rep. Atienza however stated that the Chair did not even ask those who were against nominal voting. Rep. Bondoc clarified that there was no need to count the same because the one-fifth requirement has not been met.

Thereupon, on motion of Rep. Bondoc, the Chair recognized Rep. Lagman to propose further amendments.

#### **POINT OF ORDER OF REP. LAGMAN**

However, Rep. Lagman rose on a point of order and asked how the Body could establish the one-fifth vote of the Members when there was no count of those who rose in favor of nominal voting.

**MANIFESTATION OF REP. LAGMAN**

Rep. Lagman sought to be recognized by the Chair before the Body proceeded with nominal voting.

**DIVISION OF THE HOUSE**

Thereupon, on motion of Rep. Bondoc, there being no objection, the Chair called for a division of the House anew and the Chair directed the Secretariat to count the Members who will rise. With the Chair declaring that only 23 Members stood up in favor of the motion for nominal voting, the motion was lost.

**POINT OF ORDER OF REP. LAGMAN**  
(Continuation)

Upon recognition by the Chair, Rep. Lagman pointed out that the Body needed to determine how many Members were present on the floor in order to accurately say that one-fifth thereof had approved or rejected the motion for nominal voting. He observed that the number of Members had greatly diminished after the Roll Call. He asked that the Body put the House in order.

Rep. Bondoc said that inasmuch as 229 Members were present during the Roll Call, 46 Members were required to meet the one-fifth vote requirement. He thereafter stressed that he wanted to make use of the time to enable the Members to propose their amendments to perfect the instant measure.

Thereafter, on motion of Rep. Bondoc, there being no objection, the Chair recognized Rep. Lagman to propose his amendments.

**MOTION OF REP. LAGMAN**

Rep. Lagman clarified that he was not yet proposing any amendment and asked the House leadership not to derogate the Rules by the pretext that it was giving everybody the opportunity to introduce individual amendments. He instead moved for a second Roll Call because there were less than 200-plus Members in the Session Hall at that moment.

**OBJECTION OF REP. BONDOC**

Rep. Bondoc objected to the motion, saying that such was taking time away from amendments.

**MANIFESTATION OF REP. ATIENZA**

Rep. Atienza expressed support for Rep. Lagman's motion as he observed that only around 127 Members were present.

**REMARKS OF MAJORITY LEADER FARIÑAS**

Rep. Rodolfo C. Fariñas remarked that it was apparent that what was being done was not merely to introduce honest-to-goodness amendments. He emphasized that the Bill was for the reimposition of the death penalty and the Body had already approved Section 3 thereof entitled, "Imposition of Death Penalty; Heinous Crimes Defined"; but the proposed amendments were seeking to change the penalty to the penalty of *reclusion temporal* to *reclusion perpetua* and could go on and on.

In view thereof, Rep. Fariñas joined Rep. Lagman's motion to call the Roll and said that he will thereafter move to terminate the period of amendments.

**ROLL CALL**

Thereafter, on motion of Majority Leader Fariñas, there being no objection, the Chair directed the Secretary General to call the Roll and the following Members were present:

Abayon  
Abellanos  
Abu  
Abueg  
Acop  
Acosta  
Acosta-Alba  
Adiong  
Agarao  
Aggabao  
Albano  
Alejano  
Almario  
Alonte  
Alvarez (F.)  
Alvarez (P.)  
Andaya  
Angara-Castillo  
Aragones  
Arbison  
Arcillas  
Arenas  
Atienza  
Aumentado  
Bag-ao  
Bagatsing  
Baguilat  
Banal  
Barbers  
Barzaga

Bataoil  
Batocabe  
Bautista-Bandigan  
Belaro  
Belmonte (F.)  
Belmonte (J.C.)  
Belmonte (R.)  
Benitez  
Bernos  
Bertiz  
Biazon  
Billones  
Bolilia  
Bondoc  
Bordado  
Bravo (A.)  
Bravo (M.V.)  
Brosas  
Calderon  
Calixto-Rubiano  
Caminero  
Campos  
Canama  
Cari  
Casilao  
Castelo  
Castro (F.L.)  
Castro (F.H.)  
Catamco  
Cayetano  
Cerafica  
Chavez  
Chipeco  
Co  
Cortes  
Cortuna  
Crisologo  
Cuaresma  
Dalipe  
Daza  
De Jesus  
De Venecia  
De Vera  
Defensor  
Del Mar  
Del Rosario  
Dimaporo (M.K.)  
Duavit  
Enverga  
Ermita-Buhain  
Espina  
Estrella  
Fariñas  
Fernando  
Ferrer (J.)  
Ferrer (L.)  
Flores  
Fortun  
Fortuno  
Garbin  
Garcia (G.)  
Garcia (J.E.)  
Garcia-Albano  
Garin (R.)  
Garin (S.)  
Gasataya  
Gatchalian  
Geron  
Go (M.)  
Gomez  
Gonzaga  
Gonzales (A.P.)  
Gonzales (A.D.)  
Gonzalez  
Gorriceta  
Gullas  
Hernandez  
Herrera-Dy  
Hofer  
Jalosjos  
Javier  
Khonghun  
Labadlabad  
Lacson  
Lagman  
Lanete  
Laogan  
Lazatin  
Leachon  
Limkaichong  
Lobregat  
Lopez (B.)  
Lopez (C.)  
Lopez (M.L.)  
Macapagal-Arroyo  
Maceda  
Madrona  
Malapitan  
Manalo  
Mangaoang  
Mangudatu (Z.)  
Marcoleta  
Marcos  
Mariño  
Marquez  
Martinez  
Matugas  
Mellana  
Mercado  
Mirasol  
Montoro  
Nava

Nieto  
 Noel  
 Nograles (K.A.)  
 Nolasco  
 Nuñez-Malanyaon  
 Oaminal  
 Olivarez  
 Ortega (P.)  
 Ortega (V.N.)  
 Pacquiao  
 Palma  
 Pancho  
 Panganiban  
 Panotes  
 Papandayan  
 Pimentel  
 Pineda  
 Plaza  
 Primicias-Agabas  
 Quimbo  
 Radaza  
 Ramirez-Sato  
 Ramos  
 Relampagos  
 Revilla  
 Roa-Puno  
 Robes  
 Rocamora  
 Rodriguez (I.)  
 Rodriguez (M.)  
 Roman  
 Romualdo  
 Roque (H.)  
 Roque (R.)  
 Sacdalan  
 Sagarbarria  
 Sahali  
 Salimbangon  
 Salo  
 Salon  
 Sambar  
 Sandoval  
 Santos-Recto  
 Sarmiento (C.)  
 Sarmiento (E.M.)  
 Savellano  
 Sema  
 Silverio  
 Singson  
 Suansing (E.)  
 Suansing (H.)  
 Suarez  
 Sy-Alvarado  
 Tambunting  
 Tan (M.)  
 Tan (S.)

Tejada  
 Teves  
 Tiangco  
 Ting  
 Tinio  
 Treñas  
 Tugna  
 Tupas  
 Turabin-Hataman  
 Umali  
 Ungab  
 Unico  
 Uy (J.)  
 Uybarreta  
 Vargas  
 Vargas-Alfonso  
 Velasco-Catera  
 Veloso  
 Vergara  
 Villanueva  
 Villaraza-Suarez  
 Villarica  
 Villarin  
 Violago  
 Yap (A.)  
 Yap (M.)  
 Yu  
 Zarate  
 Zubiri

With 227 Members responding to the Call, the Chair declared the presence of a quorum. (See also Appendix 1)

#### **MANIFESTATION OF REP. LAGMAN**

At this point, Rep. Lagman sought recognition from the Chair.

#### **REMARKS OF MAJORITY LEADER FARIÑAS**

Rep. Fariñas stated that the parliamentary status was that the Body had called the Roll in response to Rep. Lagman's motion for a second Roll Call and after the Chair announced that 23 Members had voted in favor of nominal voting during the previous division of the House.

#### **MOTION OF MAJORITY LEADER FARIÑAS**

In view thereof, Rep. Fariñas moved for another division of the House and asked the Members who were in favor of a nominal voting on Rep. Lagman's proposed amendment to stand up and those who were against it to remain seated.



The Chair directed the Secretary General to count the number of Members who stood up.

#### **MANIFESTATION OF REP. LAGMAN**

Rep. Lagman sought recognition from the Chair anew.

#### **DIVISION OF THE HOUSE**

There being no objection, the Chair called for a division of the House; and with only 28 Members who stood up, Rep. Lagman's motion for nominal voting was lost.

#### **MANIFESTATION OF REP. LAGMAN**

Rep. Lagman again sought recognition from the Chair.

However, on motion of Majority Leader Fariñas, the Chair recognized Rep. Arnolfo "Arnie" A. Teves Jr. for his proposed amendments.

#### **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF REP. TEVES**

Rep. Teves proposed the following amendments on page 2 of the Bill: (1) on lines 18 to 19 of Section 4, to remove the phrase "regardless of the quantity and purity involved"; (2) on line 23 of Section 11, to insert the word "VALUES"; and (3) on lines 17 to 43, after line 21, to insert the word "VALUES."

#### **SUSPENSION OF SESSION**

The session was suspended at 7:27 p.m., on motion of Majority Leader Fariñas.

#### **RESUMPTION OF SESSION**

The session resumed at 7:31 p.m.

#### **WITHDRAWAL OF REP. TEVES' PROPOSED AMENDMENTS**

Upon resumption of session, Rep. Teves then withdrew his proposed amendments. Rep. Bondoc said this was based on their agreement.

#### **REP. BONDOC'S MOTION TO CLOSE THE PERIOD OF AMENDMENTS**

Thereafter, Rep. Bondoc moved to close the period of amendments on House Bill No. 4727.

#### **MANIFESTATION OF REP. ROQUE (H.)**

Rep. Roque manifested his desire to rise on a point of order.

#### **REMARKS OF THE CHAIR**

The Chair stated that there was a pending motion on the floor to close the period of amendments.

#### **POINT OF ORDER OF REP. ROQUE (H.)**

The Chair then recognized Rep. Roque who said that during the period of amendments, he was about to explain his proposed amendment but gave way to Rep. Lagman. He said that his proposal was an honest-to-goodness one and was not in the nature of one deserving an omnibus objection.

#### **MOTION OF REP. BONDOC**

Rep. Bondoc opined that the point of order of Rep. Roque (H.) was in effect an objection to his motion to close the period of amendments. In view thereof, he moved for a *viva voce* voting thereon and said that an *aye* vote sustained his motion while a *nay* vote sustained the objection thereto.

#### **MANIFESTATIONS OF REPS. LAGMAN AND ATIENZA**

At this point, Reps. Lagman and Atienza sought recognition from the Chair.

However, Rep. Bondoc said that the Body was in the process of voting.

#### **VIVA VOCE VOTING ON REP. BONDOC'S MOTION**

Thereafter, the Chair called for a *viva voce* voting on Rep. Bondoc's motion; and with the *ayes* having preponderance, the Body approved the motion to close the period of amendments.

#### **MANIFESTATION OF REP. LAGMAN**

Rep. Lagman sought the Chair's recognition anew.

#### **VIVA VOCE VOTING ON THE APPROVAL ON SECOND READING OF HOUSE BILL NO. 4727, AS AMENDED**

On motion of Rep. Bondoc, there being no objection, the Body approved House Bill No. 4727 on Second Reading, as amended, through *viva voce* voting.

**MANIFESTATION OF REPS. LAGMAN,  
ATIENZA AND ROQUE (H.)**

Simultaneously, Reps. Lagman, Atienza and Roque (H.) sought recognition from the Chair.

Rep. Roque also manifested to rise on a point of order, citing Rule 118.

**ADJOURNMENT OF SESSION**

On motion of Rep. Bondoc, there being no objection, the Chair declared the session adjourned until four o'clock in the afternoon of Monday, March 6, 2017.

It was 7:34 p.m.

---

I hereby certify to the correctness of the foregoing.

(Sgd.) **ATTY. CESAR STRAIT PAREJA**  
Secretary General

Approved on March 6, 2017

Congress of the Philippines  
House of Representatives  
Quezon City, Philippines

**MEMBERS' ATTENDANCE****Date: March 01 and 01, 2017**

ABAD	BELMONTE (R.)	DEFENSOR
ABAYA	BENITEZ	DEL MAR
ABAYON	BERNOS	DEL ROSARIO
ABELLANOSA	BERTIZ	**** DELOSO-MONTALLA
ABU	BIAZON	***** DIMAPORO (A.)
ABUEG	BILLONES	DIMAPORO (M.K.)
**** ACHARON	**** BIRON	DUAVIT
ACOP	BOLILIA	***** DURANO
ACOSTA	BONDOC	DY
ACOSTA-ALBA	BORDADO	**** ELAGO
ADIONG	BRAVO (A.)	ENVERGA
* ADVINCULA	BRAVO (M.V.)	ERICE
AGARAO	BROSAS	**** ERIGUEL
AGGABAO	**** BULUT-BEGTANG	ERMITA-BUHAIN
***** AGLIPAY-VILLAR	***** CAGAS	***** ESCUDERO
ALBANO	CALDERON	ESPINA
***** ALCALA	CALIXTO-RUBIANO	**** ESPINO
ALEJANO	CAMINERO	ESTRELLA
ALMARIO	CAMPOS	EUSEBIO
ALMONTE	CANAMA	* EVARDONE
ALONTE	CARI	FARIÑAS
ALVAREZ (F.)	CASILAO	FERNANDO
***** ALVAREZ (M.)	CASTELO	FERRER (J.)
ALVAREZ (P.)	CASTRO (F.L.)	FERRER (L.)
AMANTE	CASTRO (F.H.)	**** FERRIOL-PASCUAL
AMATONG	CATAMCO	* FLOIRENDO
ANDAYA	CAYETANO	FLORES
ANGARA-CASTILLO	CELESTE	FORTUN
***** ANTONINO	CERAFICA	FORTUNO
***** ANTONIO	***** CERILLES	* FUENTEBELLA
ARAGONES	CHAVEZ	GARBIN
ARBISON	CHIPECO	GARCIA (G.)
ARCILLAS	CO	GARCIA (J.E.)
ARENAS	***** COJUANGCO	GARCIA-ALBANO
ATIENZA	**** COLLANTES	GARIN (R.)
AUMENTADO	CORTES	GARIN (S.)
BAG-AO	CORTUNA	GASATAYA
BAGATSING	COSALAN	GATCHALIAN
BAGUILAT	CRISOLOGO	GERON
BANAL	***** CUA	***** GO (A.C.)
BARBERS	CUARESMA	GO (M.)
BARZAGA	***** CUEVA	GOMEZ
BATAOIL	DALIPE	GONZAGA
BATOCABE	***** DALOG	GONZALES (A.P.)
BAUTISTA-BANDIGAN	DAZA	GONZALES (A.D.)
BELARO	DE JESUS	GONZALEZ
BELMONTE (F.)	DE VENECIA	GORRICETA
BELMONTE (J.C.)	DE VERA	GULLAS

HERNANDEZ	OLIVAREZ	SINGSON
HERRERA-DY	***** ONG (E.)	SUANSING (E.)
HOFER	* ONG (H.)	SUANSING (H.)
JALOSJOS	ORTEGA (P.)	SUAREZ
JAVIER	ORTEGA (V.N.)	SY-ALVARADO
**** KHO	PACQUIAO	TAMBUNTING
KHONGHUN	**** PADUANO	TAN (A.)
LABADLABAD	PALMA	TAN (M.)
LACSON	PANCHO	TAN (S.)
LAGMAN	PANGANIBAN	TEJADA
LANETE	PANOTES	TEVES
LAOGAN	PAPANDAYAN	TIANGCO
LAZATIN	**** PICHAY	TING
LEACHON	PIMENTEL	TINIO
* LEE	PINEDA	***** TOLENTINO
LIMKAICHONG	PLAZA	TREÑAS
LOBREGAT	PRIMICIAS-AGABAS	TUGNA
LOPEZ (B.)	QUIMBO	TUPAS
LOPEZ (C.)	RADAZA	TURABIN-HATAMAN
LOPEZ (M.L.)	RAMIREZ-SATO	TY
* LOYOLA	RAMOS	UMALI
MACAPAGAL-ARROYO	RELAMPAGOS	* UNABIA
MACEDA	REVILLA	UNGAB
MADRONA	ROA-PUNO	UNICO
MALAPITAN	ROBES	UY (J.)
MANALO	ROCAMORA	UY (R.)
MANGAOANG	RODRIGUEZ (I.)	UYBARRETA
* MANGUDADATU (S.)	RODRIGUEZ (M.)	VARGAS
MANGUDADATU (Z.)	ROMAN	VARGAS-ALFONSO
MARCOLETA	***** ROMERO	* VELARDE
MARCOS	* ROMUALDEZ	* VELASCO
MARIÑO	ROMUALDO	VELASCO-CATERA
MARQUEZ	ROQUE (H.)	VELOSO
MARTINEZ	ROQUE (R.)	VERGARA
MATUGAS	SACDALAN	**** VILLAFUERTE
MELLANA	SAGARBARRIA	VILLANUEVA
**** MENDING	SAHALI	VILLARAZA-SUAREZ
MENDOZA	* SALCEDA	VILLARICA
MERCADO	SALIMBANGON	VILLARIN
MIRASOL	SALO	VIOLAGO
MONTORO	SALON	YAP (A.)
NAVA	SAMBAR	YAP (M.)
NIETO	SANDOVAL	YAP (V.)
NOEL	SANTOS-RECTO	YU
***** NOGRALES (J.J.)	SARMIENTO (C.)	**** ZAMORA (M.C.)
NOGRALES (K.A.)	SARMIENTO (E.M.)	ZAMORA (R.)
NOLASCO	SAVELLANO	ZARATE
NUÑEZ-MALANYAON	SEMA	ZUBIRI
OAMINAL	SIAO	
OCAMPO	SILVERIO	

\* Appeared before/after Roll Call

\*\* On official mission

\*\*\* Attended meetings of CA/HRET/Conference Committee/Committee meetings authorized by Committee on Rules

\*\*\*\* Officially notified the House, through the Secretariat, of their absence

\*\*\*\*\* Absent without notice

(Subject to correction/s that may appear in the Annual Journal)