

Date:	September 16, 2016
Time Started/Ended:	2:45PM-5:01PM
Venue:	A1206
Presided By:	Janine Angelo
Prepared By:	Lara San Buenaventura

1. Attendance

Name	Unit	Committee	Remarks
Janine Angelo	CATCH2T17	Chief Legislator	Present
Isaac Ngo	EDGE2014	NatAff	Present
Sandy Cabrieto	EDGE2015	STRAW	Present
Maximilian Co	FAST2013	RnP	Present
Margarette Amper	FAST2014	STRAW	Excused Absent
Pio Alfonso	FAST2015	RnP	Present
Anna Canlas	BLAZE2016	NatAff	Present
Tatsuya Sato	BLAZE2017	STAW	Present
Czarina Chan	BLAZE2018	NatAff	Present
Hannah Tuason	68TH ENG	Rnp	Present
Hazel Chung	69TH ENG	NatAff	Late
Victoria Lagera	70TH ENG	STRAW	Present
JP Crisostomo	FOCUS2014	STRAW	Present
Coleen Velasco	FOCUS2015	RnP	Present
Hiraya Mendez	EXCEL2016	RnP	Present
Patricia Cruz	EXCEL2017	STRAW	Present

Andrew Militante	EXCEL2018	RnP	Present
Angela Lumba	STC	NatAff	Present
Roy Loyola	STC		Late
Luigi Dino	CATCH2T19	NatAff	Present
Christian Silan	CATCH2T18	STRAW	Present

2. Preliminaries

Item	Details
2.1. Opening Prayer	2:47PM: Mr. Ngo leads the opening prayer followed by the Roll Call by Ms. San Buenaventura
2.2. Approval of the Agenda	<p>1.1 2:45PM: Ms. Angelo explains the agenda for this LA session and suggests that the committee voting for chairpersons should be moved as two LAs have not taken the LA exam yet.</p> <p>1.2 2:47PM: Ms. Mendez motions to amend the agenda to remove the voting for committee chairpersons.</p> <p>1.3 2:49PM: Motion is carried.</p> <p>1.4 2:49PM: Mr. Sato motions to approve the agenda.</p> <p>1.4 2:49PM: Agenda is amended.</p>

3. Agenda Proper

Item	Details
------	---------

<p>3.1. Announcement of the LA Exam Top Notcher</p>	<p>3.1 2:49PM: Ms. Angelo announces the LA Exam top notchers as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Ms. Czarina Chan 2.) Mr. Andrew Militante 3.) Ms. Hazel Chung 4.) Ms. Janina Lagera 5.) Ms. Hannah Tuason 6.) Ms. Nicole Cruz 7.) Mr. Pio Alfonso 8.) Ms. Anna Canlas 9.) Ms. Hiraya Mendez 10.) Mr. JP Crisostomo
<p>3.2. Committee Allocations</p>	<p>3.2 2:50PM: Ms. Angelo announces the Committee Allocations as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Rules and Policies Committee <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Hiraya Mendez 2.) Andrew Militante 3.) Hannah Tuason 4.) Coleen Velasco 5.) Pio Alfonso 6.) Max Co II. Students Rights and Welfare <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Nicole Cruz 2.) Sandy Cabrieto 3.) JP Crisostomo 4.) Nina Lagera 5.) Christian Silan 6.) Tatsuya Sato III. National Affairs <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Luigi Dino 2.) Czarina Chan 3.) Hazel Chung 4.) Anna Canlas 5.) Isaac Ngo 6.) Angela Lumba

<p>3.3. Resolution calling for the Release of the Manifesto on the Burial of Ferdinand Marcos at the Libingan ng MgaBayani</p>	<p>3.3.1 2:52PM: Mr. Militante motions to proceed to the discussion of the next agenda.</p> <p>3.3.2:52PM: The motion is carried.</p> <p>3.3.3. 2:53PM: Ms. Cruz explains why they condemn the burial of Marcos in the Libingan ng mgaBayani. She mentioned that there were more than 70, 000 human rights violations, billions of dollars looted from public funds, among others. As an academic institution, we cannot let these atrocities pass by; a human rights violator, a thief, a liar, be buried in the Libingan ng mgaBayani. She explains that out of the 11 deceased presidents, 7 are not buried there. She explained that a co-author, Mr. Jason Dizon, wrote a letter addressed to the Legislative Assembly that Ms. Mendez would now read.</p> <p>3.3.4 2:55PM: Ms. Mendez reads the letter from Mr. Jason Dizon. In the letter, Mr. Dizon stated that he writes not as a member of this university nor a representative of the groups he once led, but as the grandson of a journalist who once felt the brutality of the Marcos regime. He started off by stating the privilege of the USG Legislative Assembly to have such assembly, something they would not have had if it were 1972. The act of speaking against the government was met with violent suppression. Students were kidnapped, tortured, killed. We cannot forget the students who had to face the wrath of Marcos. Now, we can freely speak and write against Malacanang. Which is why, I encourage you to pass this resolution. The government is on the brink of honouring a man who is responsible for this cruel legacy. With his burial, it will be forever etched that Marcos is a hero; the exact person who he was. You are the representatives of the students; everything you do is done in their name. They are viciously stereotyped as privileged elites; apathetic to the issues of this country; I encourage you to change that. You honour the people who have sacrificed their lives to enjoy these freedoms today. In this way, standing up against Ferdinand Marcos one last time, we help build our ideal society, one that is with freedom and justice. Marcos in the Libingan ng mgaBayani.</p>
--	--

3.3.5. 2:59PM: Ms. Chan quotes the resolution that states “we the students of this university strongly rejects the burial of Marcos in the Libingan ng mgaBayani.” and questions the basis of the authors on the stands of students regarding this topic.

3.3.6. 3:00PM: Ms. Mendez explains that they consulted some students and that it is already assumed that Marcos is not a hero. The only problem in this university is that we do not have a stand. Ms. Mendez asked the body if they have ever seen a student defend Marcos online. She reiterated that the only current stand is the silence. She said that as LA representatives, it is important for us to voice out the opinions of their batchmates.

3.3.7. 3:01PM: Mr. Militante requests the proponents to stay in front and discuss the resolution by part.

3.3.8. 3:01PM: Motion carried.

3.3.9. 3:02PM: Mr. Sato motions to discuss the resolution by part.

3.3.10. 3:02PM: Motion carried.

3.3.11. 3:03PM: Ms. Cruz reads the resolution. The first paragraph contains the facts of what happened during the Marcos regime. Ms. Cruz says that the 2nd paragraph states the stance that they have put which is condemning the burial of Marcos.

3.3.12. 3:04PM: Mr. Militante asks a question regarding the 2nd paragraph that says the stand is from the students of De La Salle University. He questions if the manifesto considered the people who are Marcos supporters or those who do not share the same sentiments were heard. Mr. Militante stated that in the end, manifestos do not only represent the students of DLSU but the administration and its faculty and staff as well.

3.3.13. 3:05PM: Mr. Sato questions Mr. Militante if he is aware of Article 3 Section 10 of the USG Constitution.

3.3.14. 3:05PM: Mr. Militante asks Mr. Sato to expound on the Section.

3.3.15. 3:06PM: Mr. Sato stated the constitution article which says that the USG should have an independent stand not dictated by any sector.

3.3.16. 3:07PM: Mr. Militante agrees that LA Representatives must know that Article however, it is the USG logo and DLSU logo that is placed in manifestos that must consider the administration and the faculty. He stated that nonetheless, even without the administration and the faculty, the body should consider students who are in favour of the burial or those who are relatives of Marcos. Mr. Militante reiterates the importance of hearing their opinions prior to creating this manifesto. He explains that despite the entire LA agreeing that he has done terrible things during his time as president, he has also provided the Philippines with development such as medical institutions and power plants. Mr. Militante states that manifesto is very attacking towards Marcos and quotes the manifesto as it starts with “we the students” despite not having consulted majority of the students.

3.3.17. 3:10PM: Ms. Mendez explains that if they will ask each and every student, they should have conducted a plebiscite. She also said that if they conducted such, the manifesto will not be approved by October 18. She also reiterated that the last plebiscite they conducted was a failure and if they ought to get the opinions of each and every student then they need to do that and this manifesto would not be passed on time. Ms. Mendez tackled a second issue that if the resolution is passed, it would “hurt the feelings of other people” then as a majority floor that we should speak on behalf of the majority. She questions why the LA should be afraid to tackle the Marcos issue if there are some people who might be insulted. Her third point is that they consulted their constituents through Facebook. It is also the majority floor’s burden that a lump sum of people exist for them not to push through with this resolution and the proponents gave them ample time for that since Wednesday. Ms. Mendez also stated that despite Marcos providing the country with development, this is not the point.

3.3.18. 3:12PM: Ms. Mendez pointed out that Marcos as a president did these, but he also floundered, corrupted, and murdered. She also said that they have enough credible data from different government institution.

3.3.19. 3:13PM: Mr. Militante said that the if data that were gathered were all for the burial, then this would not be a controversial issue. He said that the fact that it is a controversial issue, means that there are people for and against it. He also pointed out that 2 days is not an ample time. He said that the Minority floor should have consulted them while writing the resolution or at least told them that there is a resolution being written about it so that they could have consulted their batchmates about it.

3.3.20. 3:14PM: Ms. Mendez said that she consulted some of her friends and constituents about this issue and said that Mr. Militante should have done the same thing if he truly wants to know the side of the other students. She said that Mr. Militante is not getting the point that consulting each student would require a plebiscite and that the it would not be submitted on time.

3.3.21. 3:15PM: MrMilitante explained that it does not have to be every single person in DLSU. He said that the students who have an opposing stand regarding the manifesto should be included. Mr. Militante pointed out that there is exactly one month before the deadline and it will be sufficient enough to get their opinion.

3.3.22. 3:16PM: Ms. Mendez said that the Manifesto is important and should be passed as soon as possible. She stated that UP, Ateneo de Manila and Ateneo de Naga already released their stand while UST is also releasing theirs soon. Ms. Mendez told Mr. Militante that he should have asked people or his batchmates and reiterated that his batchmates chose him to represent them. Ms. Mendez said that it means that Mr. Militante'sbatchmates understand what kind of personal ideology he posses and that he has a capacity to represent them in a political decision.

3.3.23. 3:19PM: Ms. Canlas pointed out that in line with what Mr. Sato said, the USG constitution also states that the Legislative Assembly should properly represent the students. Ms. Canlas explained that what Mr. Militante is trying to say is that the sample size that was used to conclude that all Lasallians are all against the burial. She questions if the proponents have enough data to show the floor with a sample size good enough to be considered as DLSU's stand on the issue.

3.3.24. 3:20PM: Ms. Mendez said that it is stated in the LA manual that consulting students or constituents does not necessarily mean conducting surveys. She said that according to the manual it can be personal or through facebook chat. Ms. Mendez said that the argument present is against the reason why they are elected as the Legislative Assembly. According to her, the LA is elected to represent the students and come up with a respective response instead of having direct plebiscites for each problem. Ms. Mendez also opened up that she was not consulted about the Kidapawan Massacre but she was okay with it because it was the logical and ethical stand to have.

3.3.25. 3:22PM: Ms. Velasco said that she herself has encountered students whom she have consulted who are for the burial of Marcos in the Libingan ng mgaBayani. She was asked how their side would be represented in the manifesto.

3.3.26. 3:23PM: Ms. Mendez reiterates that if they were to represent some of the students then they can compare it at least but given that this is only a minority of the students. She asked Ms. Velasco if she was for the burial of Marcos in the Libingan ng mgaBayani and she said no. Ms. Mendez made that point because if the stand of 15 students is the stand of every social issue then nothing would happen.

3.3.27. 3:25PM: Mr. Alfonso asks that if this manifesto is passed, can the proponents say that they have objectively represented the entire student body as it was assumed that people are against it. However, he explains the possibility that people kept silent because they felt they would be criticised by others.

3.3.28. 3:26PM: Ms. Mendez asked if Mr. Alfonso asked his batchmates.

3.3.29. 3:26PM: Mr. Alfonso said that they would not be for the burial however he knows people who would keep silent.

3.3.30. 3:26PM: Ms. Mendez reiterates that if they keep pushing for the opinion of the minority in this, we should not base this on the answers of the majority. This calls for an ethical and logical answer. Ms. Mendez said that she agrees that this is objective because they have credible sources cited in the manifesto.

3.3.31. 3:28PM: Mr. Sato says that the topic and the questions are already going circular.

3.3.32. 3:28PM: Mr. Militante pointed out that the LA should still consult the students because it is very important.

3.3.33. 3:29PM:Ms Canlas questions the sources Ms. Mendez said. Ms. Canlas reiterates that these sources should NOT be the basis of the manifesto because they are representing the students, and not the government

3.3.34. 3:30PM: Ms Mendez explained that the sources they got were tangible documents.

3.3.35. 3:30PM:Ms Cruz pointed out that there are already on going oral arguments present in the courts.

3.3.36. 3:31PM:Mr Sato explains that they did not dismiss the consultation. He said that they are presenting the manifesto to ask the LA's sentiments and to discuss its content.

3.3.37. 3:31PM: Mr. Dino said that the topic is just going in circles. He explained that if the majority floor wants a survey, the 16,000 students of DLSU cannot be consulted. He also compared it to the elections held a month ago, that the students almost did not want to vote then.

3.3.38. 3:32PM: Mr. Ngo clarifies that both the Majority and minority floor are on the same floor of being against the burial. He explains that all the Majority floor is asking is for a quantitative data that would support the manifesto's claim. Mr Ngo said that they need an appropriate sample size.

3.3.39. 3:33PM: Mr. Alfonso said that it is not the same with the elections because in here, their opinions are involved.

3.3.40. 3:34PM: Mr. Sato said that the last set of majority floor leaders also did not consult 2/3rds of the student body for the manifestos that they passed.

3.3.41. 3:34PM: Mr. Militante stated that there was also a time when the last set of majority floor leaders did a manifesto, the minority floor also demanded for more data to support their claim and they did come back the week after with more data.

3.3.42. 3:45PM: Mr. Ngo explains that having a month left, it is enough time to conduct a survey. He gave emphasis that this manifesto is important and it will really affect a lot of people.

3.3.43. 3:46PM: Ms. Mendez says 2/3rds of the students would amount to approximately 10,667 students. One month to conduct the survey. If we don't get enough students then this would not be a timely manifesto nor would it be relevant. 10,667 students and she reiterates that they cannot survey 10,667 all the time. We are representatives not mere consultants. We cannot do this each and every time. We should not call ourselves representatives in this case, but consultants.

3.3.44. 3:46PM: Mr. Crisostomo asks if Ms. Mendez believes this is a controversial topic and proceeds to explain that because it is a controversial topic, there will be students that agree and do not agree thus needing surveys. 2/3rds is too much but in statistics, 400 out of 16000 is enough.

3.3.45. 3:47PM: Ms. Tuason addresses the entire majority floor with concerns and explains that in elections we entrusted the kind

of leadership we embody. We embody the kind of representation that the students want. In this principle, we need to give the elections respect. Yes, we agree on the lack of time for plebiscites. As student representatives, we are expected to come up with swift decisions. We are all immobilized and incapacitated because of the time but this manifesto is on a matter of urgency and principle, not just going against what everyone feels.

3.3.46. 3:48PM: Mr. Dino explains that last elections, we barely passed 50% + 1. He questions if we'll be able to reach 66% for surveys if we could barely get 50% + 1 in the elections.

3.3.47. 3:48PM: Mr. Militante reiterates Mr. Crisostomo's point of having 400 students as an ample sample size and that's the sample size they used for university break surveys and other USG surveys which is not as big as 16000 or 3000 people that Ms. Mendez has mentioned. Mr. Militante reiterates that with the kind of thinking wherein LAs are voted because the students like how they think, how they speak, then we should not conduct surveys but they voted for us because we could represent them properly because we have the ability to reach out to them and hear them out and then decide for them including our own opinion. Mr. Militante proposes the surveying of 400 students and compares it to the survey of the university break that only took two days. He urges that there is bound to be someone who is against the stand of the LA who would voice out their concerns and with what they say we can incorporate it in the manifesto. We can change the words, but without being able to reach out, we won't be able to perfectly represent what their thoughts are.

3.3.48. 3:50PM: Ms. Mendez says that 21 people in the LA with 20 people consulted would reach the quota right away. She agrees that if the majority floor is asking for 400 people to survey then they should vote on the resolution itself.

3.3.49. 3:51PM: Ms. Chan motions to lay the resolution on the table.

3.3.50. 3:51PM: Ms. Angelo asks for those for and against laying the resolution on the table. She concludes with 10 For and 9 Against, thus laying the resolution on the table.

<p>3.4 Request for Special Session</p>	<p>3.4.1. 3:51PM: Mr. Sato asked how the Legislative Assembly plans to go about the previous resolution discussed as it has been laid on the table. He also requested for a special session as soon as possible because as time passes by, the resolution will be useless.</p> <p>3.4.2. 3:52PM: Ms. Angelo informed the LA that she plans to have a special session by Wednesday.</p> <p>3.4.3. 3:52PM: Mr. Sato requested for the session to be moved on Monday as two days should be enough to consult and ask for surveys.</p>
--	---

<p>3.5. Resolution calling for the Release of the Manifesto on the recent Davao Blast Incident</p>	<p>3.5.1. 3:52PM: Mr. Silan motions to proceed to the discussion of the next agenda.</p> <p>3.5.2. 3:53PM: Motion carried.</p> <p>3.5.3. 3:54PM: Mr. Sato explains the rationale of pushing for this manifesto wherein Lasallians would want the people or the press to have a set of directions with regards to the incident. He explains that government actions should be what is normally permitted by the law. Mr. Sato also addresses the citizens of the country wherein people should not spread false information or rumors about the incident and should not politicize the issue. He also calls upon the media to only relay information that is true, valid, and unbiased.</p> <p>3.5.4. 3:56PM: Mr. Sato motions to discuss the resolution by paragraph.</p> <p>3.5.5. 3:56PM: Motion carried.</p> <p>3.5.6. 3:57PM: Mr. Sato explains the manifesto on the recent Davao Blast Incident.</p> <p>3.5.7. 3:57PM: Mr. Crisostomo states the importance of using words that are easily understandable instead of highfalutin words in order for the message to come across efficiently.</p> <p>3.5.8. 3:58PM: Mr. Sato asks the body for any revisions they might have regarding the wording of the resolution.</p> <p>3.5.9. 3:58PM: Ms. Chan suggests to change a word to aggravation.</p> <p>3.5.10. 3:59PM: Ms. Tuason says that writing cannot be compromised as this is the style of writing of the proponents.</p> <p>3.5.11. 4:00PM: Ms. Canlas expresses the importance of using simple words so the students can properly understand it.</p> <p>3.5.12. 4:00PM: Mr. Sato discusses the second paragraph while the first paragraph is being amended.</p> <p>3.5.13. 4:01PM: Ms. Canlas requests to have the word kowtow changed.</p> <p>3.5.14. 4:02PM: Mr. Alfonso suggests to replace the word kowtow to blind obedience.</p> <p>3.5.15. 4:02PM: Ms. Chan reads the new line and motions to change the word kowtow to blind obedience.</p> <p>3.5.16. 4:03PM: Ms. Tuason reads the dictionary to explain the meaning of kowtow.</p> <p>3.5.17. 4:04PM: Mr. Crisostomo explains that the reason for the manifesto is not to impress not express.</p> <p>3.5.18. 4:04PM: Ms. Chan reads the new line and change the word kowtow to blind obedience and motions to change the word.</p> <p>3.5.19. 4:05PM: Motion carried.</p> <p>3.5.20. 4:07PM: Mr. Sato explains the next paragraph of the resolution.</p> <p>3.5.21. 4:07PM: Mr. Sato cites a friendly amendment to change capital letter E from explosion to a lower caps letter e.</p> <p>3.5.22. 4:08PM: Ms. Cabrieto cites a friendly amendment to</p>
--	---

change capital letter A in authorities to lower caps letter a.

2.5.23. 4:08PM: Mr. Silan motions to have the word pernicious changed to destructive.

3.5.24. 4:09PM: Mr. Sato explains the next paragraph of the resolution.

3.5.25. 4:09PM: Ms. Cabrieto cites a friendly amendment to change the capital P in people to lower caps letter p.

3.5.26. 4:10PM: Mr. Militante questions the whereas statement of the resolution.

3.5.27. 4:10PM: Mr. Sato explains that the whereas statement is placed to support the stand in condemning the politicking in this incident.

3.5.28. 4:11PM: Mr. Silan motions to remove the whereas statement regarding Senator Richard Gordon.

3.5.29. 4:11PM: Motion carried.

3.5.30. 4:12PM: Ms. Angelo cites a friendly amendment to change PLAR no. 2016-01-01 to 2016-01-02.

3.5.31. 4:15PM: Mr. Sato motions to amend the first sentence of the first paragraph to “frustrations can only be kept up to a certain limit”.

3.5.32. 4:16PM: Motion carried.

3.5.33. 4:16PM: Mr. Silan questions line 17.

3.5.34. 4:17PM: Ms. Mendez explains the whereas statement.

3.5.35. 4:17PM: Ms. Tuason explains that this is an important whereas statement.

3.5.36. 4:18PM: Mr. Militante motions to proceed to voting procedure.

**RESULT: 16-0-0 PLAR 2016-01-02 Resolution 2016-02
September 16, 2016**

3.6. Other matters.

3.6.1. 4:20PM: Mr. Silan motions to proceed to the discussion for other matters.

3.6.2. 4:20PM: Mr. Militante motions to recede.

3.6.3. 4:21PM: Motion to amend to include the National Affairs Committee as a sponsor in the resolution.

3.6.3. 4:21PM: Motion carried.

RESULT: 16-0-0 September 16, 2016

3.6.4. 4:22PM: Ms. Cabrieto motions to proceed to the discussion of other matters.

3.6.5. 4:23PM: Ms. Angelo asks if the USG Executive Board namely Mr. Laqui and the LA Secretary should be included in the LA group.

3.6.6. 4:24PM: Mr. Sato asks for the reason behind it and the benefit of having Mr. Laqui in the group.

3.6.7. 4:25PM: Ms. Canlas explains that it is okay for Mr. Laqui to be part of the group to oversee and check everything.

3.6.8. 4:25PM: Mr. Sato doesn't see the need for it as the Legislative Assembly is autonomous and the LA secretary should be the one updating the Executive Board as they are from the Executive Branch.

3.6.9. 4:26PM: Ms. Tuason explains that it is just a principle of self-reliant.

3.6.10. 4:26PM: Mr. Sato explains that he does not have to be there as it is not in the manual.

3.6.11. 4:26PM: Mr. Militante explains that Mr. Laqui has the right to see what is going on in the LA.

3.6.12. 4:27PM: Mr. Sato reiterates that the LA should be autonomous from the Executive Branch.

3.6.13. 4:27PM: Ms. Canlas explains that Mr. Laqui is there to see posts but needs the Chief Legislator's permission to post anything.

3.6.14. 4:28PM: Motion to go back to parliament procedure.

3.6.15. 4:28PM: Motion carried.

3.6.16. 4:28PM: Mr. Militante motions to invite Mr. Laqui on the floor.

3.6.17. 4:29PM: Motion carried.

3.6.18. 4:30PM: Ms. Tuason questions why Mr. Laqui needs to oversee the LA group.

3.6.19. 4:32PM: Mr. Laqui states that he does not understand why this is considered as an issue.

3.6.20. 4:33PM: Ms. Mendez explains the need for there to be a separation from the Executive Branch to the Legislative Branch.

3.6.21. 4:34PM: Mr. Laqui reiterates that there will be a separation from the Legislative branch and the Executive Branch. It is just him overseeing everything. He will be working with Ms. Angelo to ensure that everything is going well.

3.6.22. 4:36PM: Ms. Lumba asks why Mr. Laqui does not wait for Ms. Angelo to report to him instead of being in the group.

3.6.23. 4:38PM: Motion to dismiss Mr. Laqui from the floor.

3.6.24. 4:38PM: Motion carried.

3.6.25. 4:42PM: Ms. Angelo explained the possibility of having a special session on Monday.

3.6.26. 4:43PM: Mr. Sato asks what would happen if the LA could not gather 400 respondents.

3.6.27. 4:43PM: Mr. Ngo explains that the evaluation should be a yes or no question backed up by why.

3.6.28. 4:44PM: Mr. Militante explains that both floors have the same stand.

3.6.29. 4:45PM:Mr Sato asked what if the survey won't reach 400 respondents, he asked what would happen.

3.6.30. 4:45PM: MsCabrieto said that she gathered around 20 respondents already, if it will be added to what the minority floor gathered, 400 respondents will be possible within 2 days.

3.6.31. 4:46PM: Mr Sato asked what the content of the survey should be

3.6.32. 4:47PM: Ms Mendez suggested that the survey should be simple only. She said that it should only contain if the student is for or against and why and just collate the data after.

3.6.33. 4:48PM: Ms Angelo also suggested that the LAs will talk on their facebook chat before releasing the survey.

3.6.34. 4:49PM: MrMilitante questions how they will talk about the content if the surveys do not reach the quota.

3.6.35. 4:50PM: Mr Ngo suggested that the survey should just contain a yes or no option and just followed up by a question why.

3.6.36. 4:50PM: Ms Canlas asked if it is okay for the survey to be in google forms.

3.6.37. 4:51PM:MrMilitante cleared out that the Majority floor talked about the resolution and they all agree on the Minority floor's side, which is being against the burial. he explained that the reason why they are pushing for a survey because they want to properly represent the students' opinions. He said that the Majority floor is not for the burial, and that they are clearly against it but they just want to include both sides of the story to the creation of the manifesto. MrMilitante said that they do not want to reject the resolution rather, they just want to make sure that when the resolution is passed, it is already perfect and ready to be passed that is why they are laid on the table.

3.6.38. 4:52PM:Ms Mendez asked what would happen if after the data was gathered, it is seen that majority of the students are for the burial.

3.6.39. 4:52PM: MrMilitante told Ms Mendez that the manifesto can be passed but if the data gathered from the students are showing that the students are for the burial, then they can't claim the manifesto as "we, the students," because that will be saying that we all have the same opinion and stand. MrMilitante cleared

out that it is important to get the students' opinions on this especially this time wherein the students do not see the relevance of the USG anymore.

3.6.40. 4:53PM: Ms. Cruz asked what will happen if the 400 students are for the burial. She asked if this will result to the disapproval of the resolution.

3.6.41. 4:53PM: Mr. Militante said that if the that would be the case, it is the time wherein the LA will formulate the resolution based on Lasallian values. He said that it will be rephrased as "we as Lasallians" instead of "we, the students"

3.6.42. 4:54PM: Ms. Mendez said that if the majority of the students will be for the burial, but the LA will still push through the manifesto, then why was it laid on the table. She said that the resolution being laid on the table means that it is debatable.

3.6.43. 4:55PM: Mr. Sato said that that is exactly their point. He said that this topic about Marcos is not debatable, because it a fact that he killed a lot of people. Mr. Sato explained that they are not asking the students what to say, rather, they are asking the students if this is the right thing to say. He explained that this is the reason why they are pushing for the approval of the resolution.

3.6.44. 4:56PM: Mr. Militante said that since both parties could not find the point of the agreement, he suggested to just talk about it again on Monday, with all the data gathered.

3.6.45. 4:56PM: Mr. Crisostomo said that both parties keep on asking 'what if' and jumping to conclusions. He suggested that they should just wait for Monday, when they have already gathered the data, and make a rational decision about it. He said that what is important for now is to involve the students in the process of making their decision.

3.6.46. 4:57PM: Ms Mendez still questioned that what if all the 400 students are for the burial, and the LA will still push through the manifesto, then what would be the point of asking the students and conducting a survey.

3.6.47. 4:57PM: Ms. Canlas emphasizes the importance of validating the facts especially with regards to the stands of the students.

3.6.48. 4:58PM: Ms. Mendez states that it is controversial for the LA to place lay resolution on the table.

3.6.49. 4:58PM: Mr. Ngo explains that the majority floor is just taking into consideration the aftermath of this manifesto.

3.6.50. 4:59PM: MrMilitante clarifies his previous statement and says that if the 400 students are for the burial, then the resolution would not be a representation of the students, but what values an ideal Lasallian would have.

3.6.51. 4:59PM: Ms. Mendez questions why they can't just reword if that is the problem.

3.6.53. 4:59PM: Mr. Militante states that rewording the point of

view of the manifesto would need information to back it up that cannot just be done now.

3.6.54. 5:00PM: Ms. Cabrieto states that surveys are a credible back-up for the resolution.

3.6.52. 5:00PM: Mr. Sato suggests to realign the resolution to the Lasallian values.

3.6.53. 5:01PM: Mr. Militante wants to give the students a reason to participate in the party. He also explained that the body can discuss the matter outside of the session. Mr. Militante motions to adjourn the meeting.

3.6.54. 5:01PM: Motion carried.

