



House Journal

SECOND SPECIAL SESSION, 2009

1st Day

Tuesday April 14, 2009

The House of Representatives of the Sixteenth Northern Marianas Commonwealth Legislature convened its First Day, Second Special Session on April 14, 2009, at 2:35 p.m., in the House Chamber on Capitol Hill, Saipan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

The Honorable Arnold I. Palacios, Speaker of the House, presided.

A moment of silence was observed.

The Clerk called the roll and nineteen members were present. Representative Edward T. Salas was absent and excused.

ADOPTION OF JOURNALS

NONE

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

H. B. No. 16-239: To amend P.L. 16-32 Section 608(a) (and P.L. 15-126) to require the Secretary of Finance to remit employer retirement contributions to the Retirement Fund.

Offered by: Rep. Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero

Referred to: Committee of Ways and Means

H. B. NO. 16-240: To amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, and for other purposes.

Offered by: Rep. Stanley T. Torres

Referred to: Committee of Commerce and Tourism

(At this time, Representative Yumul stepped out of the Chamber.)

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Are there any resolutions for introduction from the members? None. I have an unnumbered House Joint Resolution to introduce this afternoon. A House Joint Resolution to call for a joint session of the Legislature to receive the Governor's State of the Commonwealth Address. It is introduced by me and Representative Apatang and I certainly welcome members to co-sponsor. I would like to ask your indulgence to place this on today's Resolution Calendar and the Senate will act on it tomorrow.

There was no objection on the floor to place H. J. R. No. 16-26 on today's Resolution Calendar for action.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Representative Aldan, do you have a resolution?

Representative Aldan: No.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Okay.

MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR

GOV. COMM. 16-352: (4/1/09) Submitting the Proposed Budget for FY 2010.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Short recess.

The House recessed at 2:40 p.m.

RECESS

The House reconvened at 2:40 p.m.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: The Governor's submission of the proposed budget for FY 2010 I hope that the members of the Committee on Ways and Means begin looking at the budget and begin deliberating. Are there any other statements? Vice Speaker, recognized.

Representative Deleon Guerrero: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if you already covered this, we have a communication regarding a letter to the President of the United States.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: It is on Other Communications.

Representative Deleon Guerrero: Okay, then I no further comments. Thank you.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Ready. Representative Sablan recognized.

Representative Sablan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is on the Governor's Communication before we move forward. I just wanted to express my disappointment with the budget that was submitted on April 1st. First of all, the fact that it once again reflects an employer contribution rate that is far below the actuarial rate. Some of the members who are present here were also present at the meeting of the retiree association last night and the fact that this government has been paying less what it owes number one, and then in the past several years has not been paying a penny at all even at the reduced rate, has certainly become a very major concern for the retirees and for all us as it should. I would like to ask the Committee to prioritize paying down the Retirement Fund at the actuarial rate and reflecting that in this budget. The FY 2009 budget was in many ways, a compromise budget, it did not have to be at 11% and there is no way why we should repeat that mistake this time around. The same goes for austerity measures and I could not help but notice that there is no downsizing plan at all that is reflected in this budget and that is perhaps something that this Legislature should also prioritize and maybe this would warrant the creation of a special committee that would do a number of things but in conjunction with the budget process. On a final note we did have meeting informally with some representatives from Workforce Investment Agency (WIA) and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and they talked about options for government employees who would face the prospects of furloughs or layoffs in the coming or in the near future. There are programs that are available with funding that would place those employees in the private sector are our challenges to make sure that the "WIA" especially and "OPM" are

properly funded to facilitate that transition and I think that should also be prioritized in this FY 2010 Budget. Thank you.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Thank you. I wish the Chair of Ways and Means Committee was here when you were making your statement, but we will make sure that he takes those into consideration. Are there any more comments on the Governor’s Communication? Ready.

There being no further discussions under Governor’s Communication the House move forward to Senate Communications.

SENATE COMMUNICATIONS

SEN. COMM. 16-146: (4/1/09) Transmitting a certified copy of S. R. NO. 16-33, “A Senate Resolution to recognize and congratulate the Tinian High School JROTC Academic Team for their achievement in advancing to the college options Foundation’s 2009 JROTC Leadership and Academic Bowl Finals”, which was adopted by the Senate. [For info]

There were no discussions under Senate Communications the House moved forward to Other Communications.

HOUSE COMMUNICATIONS

NONE

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE JUDICIAL BRANCH

NONE

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE NMI DELEGATE

NONE

COMMUNICATIONS FROM DEPARTMENTS & AGENCIES

NONE

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

MISC. COMM. 16-70: (3/4/09) From the Governors of U.S. Territories requesting President Obama’s support for additional flexibility in the administration of the provisions of the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund that apply to the insular areas.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: I now recognized the Vice Speaker.

Representative Deleon Guerrero: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, last night I was listening to the MCV news cast and the subject of the news topic was this letter that is included on the Agenda, dated March 4, to President Obama from the Governor’s of the four Territories. I have two comments. One, there appears to be a concern that the signature for our Governor was not signed by our Governor and I believe the Governor’s PIO was interviewed and the Governor, himself, admitted that he did not sign this letter – this is an important letter it requests that the Stabilization Fund be rather than the Secretary of Education disbursing the funds that it be given to the Secretary of the Interior. So it is an official document and want to raise the issue to confirm whether in fact, he did

sign or not and if not, who did? In my interpretation this is nothing short of a forgery – Mr. Reyes, did say that the Governor was supportive of the letter, but that allow anybody else other than the Governor to affix his signature representing the Commonwealth. The second issue is, the request itself whether the Secretary of Interior should be the authority to disburse the funds to the CNMI rather than the Secretary of Education. Personally, I feel that this \$8 million – the funds ought to go through the Secretary of Education to the CNMI, but that is my own personal feelings – I am more concerned about the legality of this document if in fact this signature was not signed by the Governor. I just wanted to raise that for the record, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Thank you. Are there any more comments? Representative Apatang recognized.

Representative Apatang: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If what the Vice Speaker is saying about the signature issue here is true, then that is something to be alarmed about. Because we only voted for one Governor here and I wonder if there is another Governor somewhere else for the Commonwealth. This is very serious – whoever is signing for the Governor and it is not authorized by him that is something that needs to be looked at. There is only one representative in Washington and that is Congressman Gregorio “Kilili” Sablan and the Governor is here and if he did not sign this letter then this is a serious issue and needs to be looked into. Thank you.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Thank you. Are there any other members that want to comment on this? I think all of us are concerned. I believe there are two issues here, one is the signature of the Governor, himself, particularly sending it to the United States President and the genuine signature of our Chief Executive to the White House should be a genuine signature it should not be written by anybody else. How and why this happened, is beyond comprehension. I just cannot understand how. The other issue here is the funding that the Department of Education our Public School System (PSS) is applying for – I am not sure whether the Governor has submitted the application for federal assistance under this Stabilization Fund - I hope he has submitted the application. It is my understanding when talking with our Congressional Delegate that because of the positions of the four Governors of the Territories the funding for our educational system has been delayed by almost a month. He has informed us that for example the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico had already received its funding for the education department and so did a lot of other States and because of this letter requesting to funnel the \$48 million to the Department of Interior rather than the Department of Education going directly to our PSS has unnecessarily delayed us from getting this funding. I hope though that it is my understanding that the Governor had already signed off on the grant agreement. Representative Quitugua, recognized.

Representative Quitugua: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, there is a purpose for giving the Secretary of Education the disbursement authority for the education stabilization funds – and I am greatly concerned of channeling this money to the Secretary of Interior. There is going to be more politicking on this funding and it is going to create an issue with our educational institution which is, PSS and the Northern Marianas College (NMC). I understand that they have submitted their application and I also understand that many of the States have received their education stabilization funds and we have not received ours here. PSS and NMC are still waiting to receive these funds. Channeling it through the Department of Interior and having the Secretary of Interior and the Governor of each territory have the discretion on these funds is going to affect the priorities of our educational institutions here, PSS and NMC. That is one of my great concerns of this letter. Thank you.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Representative Benavente, recognized.

Representative Benavente: Mr. Speaker, if you noticed the letter was actually written back in March, over a month ago and it is my understanding that this particular request has been denied and the process of the funds will go through the Department of Education – was it not that the understanding from this mornings discussions?

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: No, it has not been officially denied not according to the Congressional Delegate. It is still there – their response to this letter has not been officially transmitted. Representative Hofschneider, recognized.

Representative Hofschneider: Just an observation, Mr. Speaker about the legitimacy of the signature of the CNMI Governor. If in fact, the Governor of the US Virgin Islands, if in fact the Governor of Guam, and if in fact the Governor of American Samoa are all legitimate signatories then it behooves one to think that these three gentlemen would allow this document to have a forged signature of the Governor of the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas. It is farfetched that the three esteemed Leaders of the respective territories would allow such a document to reach the most honorable President of the United States, Barack Obama with the forgery in terms of the signature of the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas – our Governor, it is something to think about.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Thank you. Did we have enough on the issue? Representative Quitugua, recognized.

Representative Justo S. Quitugua: We can look at the signature of the Governor under the Governor’s Communication – Gov. Comm. 16-352 versus the signature that is on Misc. Comm. 16-70 and you can tell that the two signatures are not the same. Thank you.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Thank you. Well, like what the Vice Speaker said that the PIO of the Governor admitted that it was not the Governor’s signature. Ready.

There being no further discussions under Other Communications the House moved forward to Reports of Standing Committees.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

S. C. R. NO. 16-79: Reporting on H. B. NO. 16-132, entitled, “To authorize the Marianas Visitors Authority to regulate tour operators and tour guides by amending 4 CMC § 2103; and for other purposes.” *Your Committee on Commerce and Tourism recommends passage of the bill in the form of H. B. NO. 16-132, HD1.*

S. C. R. NO. 16-82: Reporting on H. B. NO. 16-146, entitled, “To establish Village and Agricultural Homestead Program for the Islands of Sarigan, Alamagan, Pagan, and Agrigan; and for other purposes.” *Your Committee on Natural Resources recommends passage of the bill in the form of H. B. NO. 16-146, HS1.*

S. C. R. NO. 16-83: Reporting on H. B. NO. 16-15, entitled, “To amend Title 1 CMC § 8365 to establish that the Northern Marianas Retirement Fund receive its tax revenue from the hotel occupancy tax and alcoholic container tax directly into a special fund within the Department of Finance.” *Your Committee on Ways and Means recommends passage of H. B. NO. 16-15.*

S. C. R. NO. 16-84: Reporting on H. B. NO. 16-225, entitled, “To amend 4 CMC § 1503(a)(5) to reduce the license fee for pachinko slot machines; and for other purposes.” *Your Committee on Ways and Means recommends passage of H. B. NO. 16-225.*

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Floor Leader, recognized.

Floor Leader Camacho: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A motion to adopt S. C. R. NO. 16-79: Reporting on H. B. NO. 16-132.

The motion was seconded.

S. C. R. NO. 16-79: Reporting on H. B. NO. 16-132, entitled, “To authorize the Marianas Visitors Authority to regulate tour operators and tour guides by amending 4 CMC § 2103; and for other purposes.” *Your Committee on Commerce and Tourism recommends passage of the bill in the form of H. B. NO. 16-132, HD1.*

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: The motion is for the adoption of S. C. R. NO. 16-79 it has been seconded. Discussion on the motion? Representative Sablan, recognized.

Representative Sablan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just an update since the last session I believe the members agreed to hold off on voting on this committee report until comments could be submitted from the Marianas Visitors Authority (MVA) and I think the Department of Commerce as well. The Management Director for MVA has just returned from off-island but I was corresponding with his Acting Director and one of their first comments was that they had submitted a letter offering recommendations with respect to the previous version of the bill, H. B. No. 16-132, and that none of those comments were apparently incorporated into this version of the bill. So I am not sure - it is not clear to me that – that has been even received by the Committee, but they ask that the Committee consider that and they are still working on now that Mr. Tenorio has returned they are working on revisions that have come out with House Draft 1 and should be submitting that as well. The same with the Department of Commerce, Secretary Ada has just returned from off-island and it is my understanding that his staff was also preparing comments on this Committee Report and the amended version of the bill.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Thank you. Representative Reyes, recognized.

Representative Reyes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This was discussed last session and Representative Sablan’s concern has to do with something with MVA – I did talk to Mr. Perry Tenorio about this bill. Mr. Tenorio’s concerns are not with the Committee Report it is on the bill itself - which is a provision that pretty much – we had discussed this at length Mr. Speaker in the Committee level about tasking the College to develop the materials. It was decided by the Committee to just give it over to the MVA instead of the college just to reduce the number of people to be involved and lessen the confusion so to speak. So that is the only concern that the Director of MVA has according to my conversation with him this morning. Another comment that I had received via email is from a Mr. Roger Ludwick, a good friend of mine – it said that it will put him out of business because there is a provision on the bill, again, it is not on the Committee Report, however it is mentioned that you need to have \$50,000 to engage yourself in such a business, but Mr. Speaker this is a Committee Report and these all can be addressed when we have the bill placed on the Calendar for discussion on the

floor. I ask the members of this body to adopt Committee Report 16-79, the concerns expressed by Representative Sablan can be addressed when we have the bill on the Calendar. Thank you.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Are you ready to make those amendments when we go into the bill?

Representative Reyes: We are just trying to adopt the Committee Report today, am I correct?

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: That is correct.

Representative Reyes: All the others will be taken into consideration, however, Mr. Speaker as I said we will debate this on the floor on one concern of MVA – as far as the Department of Commerce, truly, this bill was pushed to me by the Department of Commerce, Mr. Ada himself. Thank you.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Representative Sablan, recognized.

Representative Sablan: Thank you. Just to clarify that was one of the concerns that MVA brought to our attention, but in their January 2009 letter another major concern that was not considered and still is recommended for passage in the Committee Report is, Section 5 of the bill, which spells out certain requirements for business licensing for tour guides and operators and that is also – I looked back at the history of the bill and previous Committee Reports, it is provisions like that were actually objected to very strongly by the tour industry back in the Thirteenth Legislature and again when similar versions of the bill came up and that is another major concern that was raised by MVA and also by other tour guides and operators and again that is still in the Committee Report. So – and I am not sure if the Department of Commerce would have any additional comments on it, but what I had suggested prior to this session with the Chairman and I am still certainly willing to do this as a member is to work on the Committee Report after I receive the additional comments on these revisions and submit a substitute report for this body to consider.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Before I recognize further discussions let the Chair take a short recess.

The House recessed at 3:03 p.m.

RECESS

The House reconvened at 3:04 p.m.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: I apologize I just had to ask two members of the Thirteenth Legislature to kind of refresh my memory on this piece of legislation. It seems that I remembered this piece of legislation being introduced in the Thirteenth Legislature. If there are no objections can I share my experience?

There was no objections on the floor.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: It seems like this is going to be a policy call because MVA has always had the same objection and that being that the college – we turn over all these training towards college and have them be certified and all that and if I recall the legislation that was introduced by then Representative Frank Aldan who was the Chairman of Commerce and Tourism at the time, I

believe it made it out of the House but it did not make it out of the Senate. So it is going to be a policy decision on the members on this Committee Report. Representative Sablan, recognized.

Representative Sablan: If I could also just clarify because I did look back at Frank Aldan's Committee Report as well and again the major objection then and today it is not with the issue of certifying the tour guides and making them take these classes and so on. The issue has been with, like with business licensing requirements that has been pretty consistent and that is still being recommended for passage in this Committee Report and MVA had comments, other Tour Guides wanted to submit comments and I do not think we had a chance to consider that. That is the only reason and I think that the major issue is, are we making it harder for local businesses to operate as tour guides and operators with all of these additional requirements and is it necessary. But the heart of this bill is not an objection so much whether or not tour guides should be certified I think that is pretty straight forward. The objections is to the requirements for business licensing that includes like a minimum investment of \$50,000 – Section 5 in particular was mentioned by MVA and tour guides that have taken a look at this have also said that Section 5 is an issue. But again it is recommended for passage in the Committee Report which is why I would suggest that we allow for additional comments and review and then I would be happy to assist with developing a substitute report.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Representative Reyes, recognized.

Representative Reyes: I will yield to the Vice Speaker, Mr. Speaker.

Representative Deleon Guerrero: Mr. Speaker, if I may respond to the concern that she has raised. The compelling reason for enacting this piece of legislation was because at that time there was a lot of fly by night tour operators and those tour operators were actually not just in some cases cheating the tourist that were coming here, but also ruining the reputation of the CNMI, not to mention doing things like, coming up with their own interpretation of historic sites or coming up with new names for sites. The intent of this bill was to certify so that we have consistent information going out, so we have valid operators here. Now, the \$50,000 issue should not be an issue. One, if one has a company and has two vehicles or vans and employs two operators immediately he would qualify for the \$50,000 threshold – and we actually did the businesses a favor by reducing it from what was originally \$150,000 requirement down to \$50,000 to consider local operators – legitimate tour guide operators (*End of Tape 1, side A*)(*Start of Tape 1, side B*) it is not the issue and it should not. Now as far as the business licensing it conforms to current business license requirements of the Commonwealth. So there is really no significant departure in this bill that would make it different from as oppose to any other business to secure a business license. The other thing it requires is that – that they are legit, they maintain bank accounts, they have insurance and they get an MVA approve certificate showing that they are complying with this Act so it is not unreasonable Mr. Speaker and it does intend to do what – to address the problems that we have experienced in the past. Thank you.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Representative Hofschneider, recognized.

Representative Hofschneider: Briefly, Mr. Speaker, I think there is two distinctions of tour operators and tour guides. In relation to tour guides, as we proceed into the future I think that to keep emphasizing historical war relicts for instance on the Beach Road and yet market the Commonwealth or Saipan for instance for younger generations whereby in particular Japanese for instance – they do not want to be reminded of what happened here they know it in their hearts and

they know their history. The point is that we need to ensure that appropriate training or education is provided for tour guides and that they also have an understanding of, and are versed in the history in the people and the cultures – they are the spokespeople of the people that live here and call themselves Chamorros and Refalawaash and others that have determined permanently that the CNMI is their homeland. To have this that we have encountered in the Thirteenth Legislature particularly, a raft of “*flight-by-nights*” operators that take tourist around the island and indiscriminately describing historical sites that are inaccurate and do not have any meaning for any visitors. But I think that there are also legitimate concerns raised, Mr. Speaker and members by the Vice Speaker that we need to make a sense of tour operators. I often run into small buses – eight, ten, twelve passengers that are unmarked and are carrying passengers and we do not know whether they are legitimate for instance. Now, the legitimate ones proudly paint their company name on the vehicles and this is quite disconcerting if there is no consistent rule of how visitors are to be treated. For instance, I can share one concern that was raised by legitimate Korean and Japanese Tour Operators here in the Commonwealth that I have met with, and they said most of them come in, set up shop illegitimately and when they make enough money they fold they leave the island and we have known this for quite awhile maybe the \$50,000 is an significant departure from the current rate, but we have to be mindful that when the application of the federal immigration comes – what, January would again affect how these foreign companies are to be treated and operate. So there is that, again, the idea of revisiting maybe, the Foreign Investment Act and they can be a legitimate through that or entities to be reserve for US citizens but that is going to be a difficult departure. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Are there any more comments? Last comment, Representative Reyes.

Representative Reyes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just so that you all know I think it was last year there was guy that was driving a van that went head-on with a tree was not licensed, the guy is not legitimately working for such a tour agency but yet he is doing this on his own illegally. So these are the things that we are trying to shut-down because it does happen – two or three weeks ago I do not know if any of the others attended the forum that was sponsored by Coastal Resources Management (CRM) on the water sports activities. The major concerns that I was approached with is, and by the way I was a guest speaker, is all this so-called show-buys and these are people that are not licensed to transact, they are not legitimate and they are milking these tourists and as a result it portrays a bad image not just to the people through the operators but to the whole community of CNMI over all. So these are the concerns that I have heard that was raised by the people in the industry in the business themselves. We are just trying to help them out. Thank you.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: We had enough discussions. Are we ready for the question?

Several members voiced ready and the motion to adopt S. C. R. NO. 16-79 was carried by voice vote.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Floor Leader, recognized.

Floor Leader Camacho: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A motion to adopt S. C. R. NO. 16-82: Reporting on H. B. NO. 16-146.

The motion was seconded.

S. C. R. NO. 16-82: Reporting on H. B. NO. 16-146, entitled, “To establish Village and Agricultural Homestead Program for the Islands of Sarigan, Alamagan, Pagan, and Agrigan; and for other purposes.” *Your Committee on Natural Resources recommends passage of the bill in the form of H. B. NO. 16-146, HSI.*

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: The motion is to adopt S. C. R. NO. 16-82 it has been seconded. Discussion on the motion? Representative Hofschneider, recognized.

Representative Hofschneider: Mr. Speaker and members, I think that opening the Northern Islands particularly, Sarigan, Alamagan, Pagan, and Agrigan for agricultural homesteads and village homesteads is a real possibility. If for all of us that have physically set foot on those islands I think that you will agree with what I am going to say. First of all, Sarigan is not an appropriate island for village or agricultural homesteads and again if you have set foot on the island of Sarigan you would unequivocally agree that it is quite, if not extremely difficult to establish village or agricultural homestead. So I, Mr. Speaker, would caution the Committee Report and the bill to include the island of Sarigan more importantly it was decimated by wild goats and pigs and the Department of Lands and Natural Resources (DLNR) with the assistance of the Defense Department as a mitigation program for Farallon De Mendinilla the eradication program was for all intent and purposes to allow the natural flora to flourish back again and it has – the vegetation has come back but physically the island is unsuitable for village nor agricultural homesteads. I think in perpetuity of usage for purposes of agricultural we can allow coffee bean plantation for instance those are suitable, but permanent establishment and deeds to be granted to individuals is totally out of the question. So that has to be reworked and reference that. I think that we can allow coffee bean plantations for instance “coca” those are very suitable for the islands, but the island is more than 30 degrees inclined and very few areas that are flat areas and rocky loose boulders and there is no realistic sign of potable water on the island it is small. I think that the intention of preserving it and perhaps a common use agricultural is feasible and like I said – but I think Mr. Speaker to allow someone on behalf of this legislation to allow the establishment of village and agricultural homestead is inviting a tremendous liability on the government. Alamagan, Agrigan, and Pagan are one of the most beautiful islands in the world and I think that the future establishment and the intention here is quite subtle is the Forth Senatorial District establishment which is, perhaps ready with the right impetus and economic support and intentions for those islands it is quite fitting and I will support looking for economic potential particularly, Pagan which has a landing field, the bay is very suitable for cruise ships or larger vessels and it is not too far from the monument that has recently been inked by the former President Bush. So it has a tremendous economic potential and to open it up for agricultural and village homestead I think is a good idea but caution on the respect of the liability that we are inviting on behalf of the government. Because when you open it up legally you are bound and you cannot turn a blind-eye on those people that have gone up by way of this law inviting them to establish village or agricultural homesteads. Thank you.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Are there anybody else? Representative Sablan, recognized.

Representative Sablan: Thank you. On the Committee Report, may I ask the Committee if comments from the Department of Public Lands (DPL) were solicited or received and also if there was ever any public hearings on this bill?

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Representative Tebuteb, recognized.

Representative Tebuteb: Yes, the Committee did receive comments from the Department of Public Lands. I am trying to remember when the public hearing was conducted because the Committee has conducted quite a few number of public hearings but I cannot specify the date but we did conduct public hearings on this bill – and it was very favorable.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Thank you. Representative Sablan, you still have the floor.

Representative Sablan: Thank you. I would just be concern then if there were comments received and a public hearing was conducted that those comments have at least not as far as I can tell are not noted at all in the Committee Report. Perhaps, that means that the Committee Report is not complete but I think especially given the timing as members are aware there has been quite a bit of controversies stirred up with respect to the proposed homestead project and Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) clearing going on right now in Marpi and a lot of the concern has been raised about whether or not that place Marpi is suitable for a homestead, why was there not more public outreach and opportunity for comments before the clearing commenced, why that place when there is no infrastructure and if the government is not presently providing basic infrastructure for communities that are existing on our three islands, and I think that those same questions would be raised by this proposal to establish a homestead program in the Northern Islands. Which would be all the more reason why if there were comments received it should be incorporated in this Committee Report.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Thank you. Representative Benavente, recognized.

Representative Benavente: First of all, many years back there was a thriving communities in those different islands if I am not mistaken until this day there are still people that are on Alamagan and Pagan I am not sure which other island, the population was quite large. There is an opportunity for our people if they wish to do so live up there and as I say they currently do. I think the difference here is that we are trying to then legalize the stay on those islands by providing homestead lots where these individuals may take residence and live there if they wish to do so. I would disagree with the comments that we add on liability because whether they are there without homesteads or without residency or they are with residency the government's responsibility for any individual living in any of those islands will be the same. Again, this just goes back to giving the legitimate titles and land for these individuals who wish to go up there and stay in that property. Thank you.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Representative Babauta, recognized.

Representative Babauta: I guess, Mr. Speaker I was going to say something but my distinguished colleague kind of took it away from me so I have nothing other than to request that we support this Committee Report. Thank you very much.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: You must be from Precinct II. Representative Quitugua, recognized.

Representative Justo S. Quitugua: Mr. Speaker, it was just last week that I was in conversation with a resident from the Northern Islands and this person was here not because he wanted to be here, but he was relocated from Pagan and has been here for many years and cannot claim any land here. He applied for a property here he was given the *arendo* in Marpi. He farmed and raised animals for eight years and then he was told by Public Lands to relocate to another place and he has been in that place for two years now. So he was wondering when is the government going to give him a property so he can settle his family and farm and raise animals if he wishes to do to feed his family. This request came from the Northern Islands Mayor and the families of those who are still residing in the

Northern Islands. If we are talking about liabilities the liabilities are greater now for the government allowing these people to be in the Northern Islands, but if you are residing in your own property the greater liability is yours and not the governments because it is your private property. But if you are staying in a government property then the greater liability is the governments because the government allowed you to stay in a government property. So the residents there are just asking – we have been there my grandfather lived and died there and we are still living in the government’s property. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Ready.

Several members voiced ready and the motion to adopt S. C. R. NO. 16-82 was carried by voice vote. Representative Sablan voted no on the adoption of S. C. R. NO. 16-82.

Representative Benavente: Privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: State your privilege.

Representative Benavente: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I felt the need to do this because every time I would attend the Senate Session the Senate President would always take the time to recognize my presence sitting in the Gallery and so I would like at this time Mr. Speaker to recognize the Senate President of the Senate sitting in our Gallery here.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: I am sorry Mr. President, you came in incognito so welcome Mr. President. Floor Leader, if there is no objection can we go down to the Resolution Calendar to take care of one Resolution.

There was no objection on the floor to move forward to the Resolution Calendar.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL AND CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

NONE

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NONE

RESOLUTION CALENDAR

H. J. R. NO. 16-26: A House Joint Resolution to call for a Joint Session of the Legislature to receive the Governor’s State of the Commonwealth Address.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Floor Leader, recognized.

Floor Leader Camacho: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A motion to adopt H. J. R. NO. 16-26 in reference to the State of the Commonwealth Address.

The motion was seconded.

H. J. R. NO. 16-26: A House Joint Resolution to call for a Joint Session of the Legislature to receive the Governor’s State of the Commonwealth Address.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: The motion is for the adoption of H. J. R. NO. 16-26 and was seconded. Discussion on the motion. Representative Benavente, recognized.

Representative Benavente: Mr. Speaker, I am just reading it now and I apologize for that, but are we going to be requesting our Congressional Delegate to also offer the State of the Washington Address?

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Yes.

Representative Benavente: We are, okay then, I yield.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Let us take a short recess.

The House recessed at 3:30 p.m.

RECESS

The House reconvened at 3:32 p.m.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: We are back to plenary session are there any further discussions? Representative Sablan, recognized.

Representative Sablan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to find out why the Joint Session that we are proposing is scheduled so late. Is there a particular reason for that? It is normally earlier than the end of May.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Let me answer that. We had planned to have it on the first week of May, but we had also asked our Congressional Delegate if he would like to give us a report. Apparently, he has a conflict for the first week of May. So he requested that it be a week after Memorial Day because he was going to be here and be available to make it. So it was to accommodate him. Ready.

There being no further discussions the motion to adopt H. J. R. No. 16-26 was carried by voice vote.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Representative Hofschneider, recognized.

Representative Hofschneider: Move to adjourn.

(Laughter)

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: I am going to overrule that motion. Floor Leader, recognized.

Floor Leader Camacho: Mr. Speaker, since that is the only Resolution I assume we are back we are back to Reports of Standing Committees?

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Let us go back to Agenda Item 12, please.

The House returned back to the Reports of Standing Committees.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

S. C. R. NO. 16-79: Reporting on H. B. NO. 16-132, entitled, “To authorize the Marianas Visitors Authority to regulate tour operators and tour guides by amending 4 CMC § 2103; and for other purposes.” *Your Committee on Commerce and Tourism recommends passage of the bill in the form of H. B. NO. 16-132, HD1.*

S. C. R. NO. 16-82: Reporting on H. B. NO. 16-146, entitled, “To establish Village and Agricultural Homestead Program for the Islands of Sarigan, Alamagan, Pagan, and Agrigan; and for other purposes.” *Your Committee on Natural Resources recommends passage of the bill in the form of H. B. NO. 16-146, HS1.*

S. C. R. NO. 16-83: Reporting on H. B. NO. 16-15, entitled, “To amend Title 1 CMC § 8365 to establish that the Northern Marianas Retirement Fund receive its tax revenue from the hotel occupancy tax and alcoholic container tax directly into a special fund within the Department of Finance.” *Your Committee on Ways and Means recommends passage of H. B. NO. 16-15.*

S. C. R. NO. 16-84: Reporting on H. B. NO. 16-225, entitled, “To amend 4 CMC § 1503(a)(5) to reduce the license fee for pachinko slot machines; and for other purposes.” *Your Committee on Ways and Means recommends passage of H. B. NO. 16-225.*

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Floor Leader, recognized.

Floor Leader Camacho: Mr. Speaker a motion to adopt S. C. R. NO. 16-83 reporting on H. B. NO. 16-15.

The motion was seconded.

S. C. R. NO. 16-83: Reporting on H. B. NO. 16-15, entitled, “To amend Title 1 CMC § 8365 to establish that the Northern Marianas Retirement Fund receive its tax revenue from the hotel occupancy tax and alcoholic container tax directly into a special fund within the Department of Finance.” *Your Committee on Ways and Means recommends passage of H. B. NO. 16-15.*

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: The motion is to adopt S. C. R. NO. 16-83 and was seconded, discussion on the motion? Ready.

There being no discussion the motion to adopt S. C. R. NO. 16-83 was carried by voice vote.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Floor Leader, recognized.

Floor Leader Camacho: Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. A motion to adopt S. C. R. NO. 16-84 reporting on H. B. NO. 16-225.

The motion was seconded.

S. C. R. NO. 16-84: Reporting on H. B. NO. 16-225, entitled, “To amend 4 CMC § 1503(a)(5) to reduce the license fee for pachinko slot machines; and for other purposes.” *Your Committee on Ways and Means recommends passage of H. B. NO. 16-225.*

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: The motion is for the adoption of S. C. R. NO. 16-84 in reference of H. B. NO. 16-225 was seconded. Discussion on the motion? Representative Hofschneider, recognized.

Representative Hofschneider: May I just ask the simplest question, why? I mean, if Mr. Speaker the logic is pachinko slot machine is not making money and there is a public outcry to reduce and contain instruments of gambling, would it not be consistent with public view to allow it to a natural death by attrition? There has to be an impact to the revenue as we speak. At a minimum what is the impact and where is it that the Administration is going to supplement the loss of revenue by reducing the fees two-thirds and a 66% reduction? There is fiscal and social impact to this legislation. Can I get answers?

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Are you---

Representative Hofschneider: That was the questions that I would like to have answers to. Both the fiscal impact to the current crisis that we are experiencing in terms of the revenue shortfall and anticipating somehow down the line and by this body an austerity call. In the same token, there is a tremendous public outcry to contain poker machines and instruments of gambling on the island. Now, it does not necessarily apply for Rota and Tinian and I do not expect any outcry from the Representatives of Rota and Tinian because they have a Casino initiative approved by the people themselves, but in terms of the impact overall on the island of Saipan contributing to the General Fund and then anticipating a legislation before us to call for an austerity is a double-whammy.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: The Chairman of Ways and Means – but perhaps the author who is a member of the Ways and Means Committee could also to clarify that.

Representative Hocog: Point of clarification, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: State your clarification.

Representative Hocog: Is the pachinko slot any different with the poker machines?

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Yes.

Representative Hocog: So in essence what pachinko machine is in existence in the CNMI other than poker machines? Mr. Speaker, if a pachinko slot machine license is different from the poker license fees then I do not see the need to reduce anything when there is no pachinko slot machine.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Representative Hofschneider, you still have the floor.

Representative Hofschneider: Yes, Mr. Speaker, is it the chicken or the egg kind of question. Everybody is waiting at the door for the floodgate to open once the fee has been reduced to \$2,000.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Representative Reyes, recognized.

Representative Reyes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did recall receiving a correspondence from a Japanese guy a few days ago. Apparently, we do not have any pachinko machines here right now like what you see in Japan. The idea here is to accommodate a business person that is ready to dump in about \$300,000 just for licenses to operate pachinko which is different from the slot machine. To my knowledge, we do not have any pachinko machines as you have asked. I was just going to go to my office and look at that letter that – or somebody operating the pachinko here but this guy is ready to come in here and pay up to \$300,000 in licensing fees to get the pachinko started. I am just going to look for that letter.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Okay. Representative Hocog, recognized.

(End of Tape 1, side B)

(Start of Tape 2, side A)

Representative Hocog: My question for clarification, Mr. Speaker because if the pachinko slot machine falls under the license of the poker then I think the amount is mistakenly put in this bill. But if a particular slot machine like the marble type of pachinko – the real pachinko machine that they use in Japan is calling for such, then for myself, it will not offset the license fee on the senatorial that we depend on to assist our dialysis patients and other immediate social programs in the First Senatorial District. But I guess if it is a different category I rest my case.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Representative Sablan, recognized.

Representative Sablan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it is really critical that we be completely honest with ourselves as to the true intent of this bill and that is to generate revenue for this government by encouraging more gambling in our community and we should all be well aware of the social and economic impacts of poker in this community. The fact that countless families have been destroyed by addiction and this bill would only encourage that. It is a bit misleading in the Committee Report, it suggest that one reason for lowering the fees and encouraging the proliferation of pachinko slot machines in the CNMI would be to provide an additional source of entertainment for our tourists. We already been down that road with poker that is how it was sold to us in the beginning that it would be a source of entertainment for tourists something else to do, destination enhancement perhaps, and we all know that it did not turn out as it had been promised and the only people who were really affected by this were our own citizens and our families. I think that the fact that there was no public hearing on this bill, the fact that there has been no serious consideration of the social and economic impacts of this bill if signed into law, should warrant us sending this back to Committee - there should be a public hearing on this. Poker is already controversial as it is, it has already affected so many people in this community we should not be that desperate for money and take into account the quality of life that will be further impacted if we fast track this bill.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Thank you. Are there any more? Representative Babauta, recognized.

Representative Babauta: No, my good Vice Speaker raised his question first, so I yield back to my Vice Speaker.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Let me recognize, Representative Tebuteb then.

Representative Tebuteb: Then I will yield back to the Vice Speaker.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Go ahead, Representative Tebuteb.

Representative Tebuteb: Well, Representative Hofschneider brought up a very critical question and I am sure everybody asks the same question, why? From my understanding there are differences between a poker machine and the pachinko slot machines – pachinko the game itself. I believe that all of us agree that we need some sort of revenue generating measures and I believe that this is one of them. There are maybe some contentions on the differences of approach that are being done to bring in revenue generating measures – should we sacrifice the social-ill effects over that, I think not – will it be an addiction, well that is a policy and a decision that is going to be individually made. The fees, with the question raised by Representative Hocog are the same with the poker, but as it is, there is none because of the fees and because my understanding on the nature of the games of these two different machines. I will stop for now.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Vice Speaker, recognized.

Representative Deleon Guerrero: Mr. Speaker, I am not a machine player so I would not know the difference, but my understanding is that pachinko machines are popular in Japan I heard that somewhere. Now, I do not know if they opened pachinko machines in the Commonwealth whether it proliferated because there was machines here correct - whether members of our community are into pachinko machines, obviously not, if it was, it would still be around, correct. If the demand is there then I guess the supply would be there, but since this industry has died out or faded away I think it would show that there was no demand by the people, but I would not know either. I do not know of anybody that is into pachinko machines. But I just want to caution Representative Sablan about making inferences about the intent of this bill – I know Representative Tebuteb enough to know and I do not think he has any ulterior motive here to try and get our people to be hooked on this he understands the social ills of gambling just as much as anyone of us here. I was going to pose that question – is our people addicted to this, is that something we should be very concerned about, is it intended for our visitors because one thing that struck me was that the Committee Findings says that, “pachinko slot machines are less popular to the visitors of Commonwealth as a source of entertainment” – when that was the whole purpose of having pachinko slot machines in the beginning was to attract visitors it was intended for tourist entertainment primarily from Japan, as I understood it. So I am not sure could somebody shed some light?

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Let me share, because I have watched at Hafa Adai Hotel where they actually had these pachinko slot machines and to be truthful I did not see anybody playing nor did I see tourists playing either so they finally pulled them out. Back then, the fee was \$1,000 after a while they basically took it away. I remembered that we raised the poker license from \$2,000 in the Thirteenth Legislature to \$6,000. So whether or not it really is going to generate is also questionable to me. We have been down that road we have authorized the slot machines because this is basically slot machines it is not the same as what Representative Hocog is referring to – I think this is a slot machine type. It is going to be a policy call. Representative Apatang, recognized.

Representative Apatang: I just want to clarify whether this is what they call a “*one-armed bandit machine*” – the pull type one it is one arm. I remembered in the past that it was illegal. I do not know why the machines are not here anymore.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Representative Benavente, recognized.

Representative Benavente: Mr. Speaker, it is true that we did have pachinko machines and as a matter of fact the only two legally authorized form of game machine here is the poker and pachinko and when the fees were the same at \$2,000 for pachinko and poker we did have quite a few number but I am not sure what the number that were being operated here on Saipan. When we raised the fees from \$2,000 to \$6,000 it kind of wiped out the business because it was not generating. It generated in poker machines enough to keep the business going and revenues coming, but what had happened it did not have the kind of revenue to be able to afford the \$6,000 fee so it drove the business out (pachinko machines), but it is legal. It is in our books that allow for pachinko machines if we already made that policy decision to allow pachinko machines then maybe we should do what we can to make it work. Otherwise, if we are going to take that the policy decision that it is no good for our islands we should then get it out of our books so we do not have to deal with this. We need to consider that there are times when we need this money and to consider something that would bring back this industry and allow it to raise the revenue because it is in the law and it is legally here already. I do not know if \$2,000 is the magic number I think Representative Reyes mentioned that he received a letter about a possible company that might be able to bring in machines if the fees were reduced. I am not sure what kind of revenues that will generate. But I merely raising the point that it is currently legal it is not like we are starting to legalize something now. This is already legal it is just a matter of making the changes necessary to make it work in this case. Thank you.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Representative Hofschneider, recognized.

Representative Hofschneider: I think that it is fitting that – I was furnished I do not know who furnished me this commitment.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Representative Reyes did.

Representative Hofschneider: This commitment certifying that they are ready to pay \$300,000 if the fees are lowered and in fact in “\$6,000.00 to \$1,000” and not \$2,000 as proposed by the Committee. In all good conscious, Mr. Speaker, I have seen families destroyed and let us not turn a blind eye on this. This community can be quite vibrant in partaking in just about any commercial activity from banking to improving their houses, to sending their kids to school, to meeting and enjoying life to its fullest. We have to acknowledge that there are human weaknesses from alcohol to drugs to gambling and we have this social responsibility charge to ensure that you put a check to those that fall prey is the right word – for us who do not play maybe it is quite hard for us to have a tangible understanding or compassion to those people that have fallen prey and could not pay their banks, their loans, could not provide for their kids, blow a hard worked two week paycheck on poker machines for instance. All we need to do is to take the time and walk into small claims court room and here the impact. To subject ourselves to put it on a scale that this government is need of \$300,000 that is not there today and it is before versus the long term impact of every family and individual who fall prey to this are far more important to me individually speaking and I will not support, Mr. Speaker, such legislation. Thank you.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Representative Raymond Palacios, recognized.

Representative Raymond Palacios: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to share one point here. One individual approached me and asked me – actually this is what he said, the poker machine is stationary, the poker does not go to your residence and knock on your door and ask you, can you please play me. So why are we blaming the machines? It is the person that should be blamed for going there. We understand that it is an ill-effect it is the same as cockfighting. You go the

cockfight you bet, you play cards, you play *tongest* or whatever form of gambling, it is actually the person – to address its impact we actually need education which is the solution here. But like I said, it is not the machines fault, it is the person that goes there to play, but of course it is our duties and responsibilities to try and provide solutions to balance it out. Let us not point fingers and say, we should take it out. It is the individual's decision whether to gamble or not. If he gambles then he is really putting his family on the line here.

Representative Hofschneider: Point of clarification, Mr. Speaker, quickly.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Very briefly.

Representative Hofschneider: I had a friend who constantly plays and one day he was going to Church and as if a magnet, is pulling his steering wheel he went into the poker place that he constantly goes to. Thank you.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: I am going to have two more, Representative Ralph Torres, recognized.

Representative Ralph Torres: *Parehu ha lokkue yan iyo yangin para un sangan na i atkahot ni gaigi gi tenda nai yan taya lokkue i atkahot ti ma fatto gi guma'mo ni para un fahan lao yangin ma fahan yan bulachu hao nai yan mañufa-hao hayi gai isao? Parehu ha yan hita lokkue ni ta se'sedi ha i atkahot ni para un fahan pues parehu ha yan esti poker ni para ta se'sedi para u fan gaigi yan mas yangin ta ribaha i iyoña annual fees. Parehu ha yan atkahot yan mana baratu siempre mas man gimen ombres pago guaguan loa ma sungon ha' yan mana didide mas i nenkanno' yan mas i atkahot.*

Representative Benavente: Point of clarification, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: State your point.

Representative Benavente: The intent is not to reduce the poker fee. The poker fee will stay at \$6,000 or \$12,000.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: So clarified. Let me recognize Representative Hocog since he has been raising his hands.

Representative Hocog: I guess, Mr. Speaker, the bill in itself is not amending any other gaming entertainment device other than to reduce a piece of entertainment equipment that have been in the warehouse for a pretty long time without utilizing or taking advantage of the law that permits the pachinko slot machines. I guess the reduction of \$2,000 is for that kind of entertainment machine. I can attest that no one in our local community will come and play and try to make money off of that machine because it will not give you a dollar or coins other than like a ball of bearings that will drop with certain prizes that makes it different with the poker machines. That is why I question the reduction of fee initially, is the fact that is the poker machine falls under the definition of pachinko slot and if it is, then I believe it differentiate the type of entertainment machine that has been authorized presently by law and to take advantage of an interested individual properly try to provide entertainment with the Japanese tourists coming into the CNMI. As we all know years back when they first placed this type of gaming entertainment they were a lot of other entertainments before available in the CNMI. I feel very confident that they have seen the market for the tourist to spend their time here particularly in the island of Saipan that receive more tourists within the CNMI. Mr.

Speaker, reducing the fees for this kind of machines if there is an investor that would like to take advantage if such fee is reduced, then I will support this bill, but I understand that what we should do on the poker machine is we think we are making revenue on the license fee but we have failed to also see the other side that operators are reducing the number of machines and that is where we are losing revenue. Particularly, we should also look into that 30% Jackpot fee because it is also hurting the industry. Thank you.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Ready. Representative Sablan, I am going to give you one minute.

Representative Sablan: Mr. Speaker and members, as I recall very vividly from the last election. The Republican Party platform included a commitment to this community that if elected the people who represented that party would undertake an effort to eliminate poker from this community recognizing the blight that it is. Now, if what you meant was that you would replace it with pachinko then perhaps that should have been considered, but a commitment was made and I strongly believe that a commitment will now be breached if we move forward with this bill. Second, for the proponents of this bill who believe that pachinko slot machines will attract more tourists to this island, that right there is even more reason why we should have a public hearing let us at least solicit comments from MVA and see if whether or not this is truly what they meant when they wanted to undertake destination enhancement. Mr. Speaker and members, we might find that encouraging the proliferation of pachinko slot is really not what our people want and it is not what tourists want and we should not move forward with it. That is a more reason to have a public hearing and I so make that motion to send this back to Committee and request a public hearing.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: Ready.

Representative Sablan: Mr. Speaker, I made a motion.

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: There was no second to that motion. This is just a Committee Report, mind you. We can still deliberate on it on the Bill Calendar.

There being no further discussions the motion to adopt S. C. R. NO. 16-84 was carried by voice vote. Speaker Arnold Palacios, Representatives Hofschneider, Dela Cruz, Sablan, and Ralph Torres voted "no" for the adoption and Representative Hocog voted "yes".

Speaker Arnold I. Palacios: What is the indulgence of the members? Floor Leader, motion to adjourn subject to the calle.

BILL CALENDAR

NONE

ANNOUNCEMENT

NONE

ADJOURNMENT

Floor Leader Joseph N. Camacho moved to adjourn subject to the call of the Chair; it was seconded and carried by voice vote.

The House adjourned at 4:07 p.m., subject to the Call of the Chair.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda B. Muña Journal Clerk
House of Representatives

APPEARANCE OF LOCAL BILLS

FIRST APPEARANCE: 1st Legislative appearance of a local bill is on the day it is introduced.

SECOND APPEARANCE:

H. L. B. NO. 16-31: A Local Appropriation Bill for an Act for the Second Senatorial District to appropriate \$15,000.00 from the local license fees collected for pachinko slot machines and poker machines in the Second Senatorial District; and for other purposes. (Rep. Edwin P. Aldan)

H. L. B. NO. 16-32: A Local Appropriation Bill for an Act for the Third Senatorial District to appropriate \$1,500,000.00 from the Developer Infrastructure Tax funds to be collected in Fiscal Year 2010; and for other purposes. (Rep. Rosemond B. Santos)

THIRD APPEARANCE:

H. L. B. NO. 16-30: A Local Appropriation Bill for an Act for the Third Senatorial District to appropriate the lapsed/unobligated funds from Saipan and Northern Islands Legislative Delegation (SNILD) Resolution 15-2; and for other purposes. (Rep. Justo S. Quitugua)