



# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETEENTH NORTHERN MARIANAS COMMONWEALTH LEGISLATURE

SECOND REGULAR SESSION 2015

## LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

Sixth Day, Second Regular Session

Wednesday, September 30, 2015

The House of Representatives of the Nineteenth Northern Marianas Commonwealth Legislature convened its Sixth Day, Second Regular Session on Wednesday, 30th of September 2015, at 10:46 a.m., in the House Chamber on Capitol Hill, Saipan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

The Honorable Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero, Speaker of the House, presided.

A moment of silence was observed.

### ROLL CALL

The Speaker recognized the Clerk for the roll; the Clerk having completed the roll announced to the Speaker that all 20 members were present.

The Speaker announced that a quorum has been established.

*The Chair recognized Floor Leader Camacho; Floor Leader Camacho moved for the suspension of the Rule on the Dress Code; the motion was seconded by several members; the Chair open the floor for discussion; there being no discussions the motion was carried by voice vote. There was no "nay" vote.*

### PUBLIC COMMENTS

During this time the Chair opened the floor to members of the public who wishes to make any comments on items on the day's agenda.

*Public comments were presented by individuals, on H. B. No. 19-95.*

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Being no further comments from the Public, we will now move on to Item 15, under the Order of Business, Resolution Calendar, and I recognize the Floor Leader.

### ADOPTION OF JOURNALS

*None*

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

*House Bills: None*

*House Local Bills: None*

*House Legislative Initiatives: None*

**INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS**

*House Resolutions: None*

*House Joint Resolutions: None*

*House Commemorative Resolutions: None*

*House Concurrent Resolutions: None*

**MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR**

*None*

**SENATE COMMUNICATIONS**

*None*

**HOUSE COMMUNICATIONS**

*None*

**COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE JUDICIAL BRANCH**

*None*

**MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS**

*None*

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

*None*

**REPORTS OF SPECIAL AND CONFERENCE COMMITTEES**

*None*

**RESOLUTION CALENDAR**

*Floor Leader Camacho moved for the adoption of H. RES. NO. 19-31; the motion was then seconded by several members; the Chair opened the floor under discussion. The Chair recognized the Vice Speaker Rafael S. Demapan.*

**H. RES. NO. 19-31:** A House Resolution Congratulating the Republic of China (Taiwan) on the occasion of its One Hundred Fourth (104<sup>th</sup>) National Day or “Double-Tenth National Day”.

Representative Rafael S. Demapan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did managed to communicate with Sophia from the Taipei Office and inquired on the concern raised by our Representative as indicated on line 3, which states: **“BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the House of Representative supports Taiwan to join the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and to sign Bilateral Investment Agreement...”. I was able to talk with her and said that TPP is sort of an agreement with other countries; it is almost like the WTO and others; but on this it has to do with more of Trans-Pacific Partnership. I was able to get some information from her and said they are not actually willing to become of the TPP member but would like to sign the trade investment framework agreement known as TIFA. As you look at the resolution TIFA is sort of an arrangement. So with that I thought I briefly explain or clarify; but more so this is sort of an investment agreement with other countries; for example maybe support like the one in “Made in America” export with fundamental labor rights with other countries; *guiya esti ilelek’hu kulan guaha arek’la-mento gi halom i lugat-ñiha yangin guaha export guatto for example China kulan esta guaha siha arrangement how to make sure na ma protetehi lakkue enao just made in America but even other countries with the US; kulan guaha enao na klassen understanding kosaki siña ha guaha mas arek’la-mento para esti i whatever products they have and also shares technologies and other things.* Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you, Vice Speaker. Are there any further discussions on the resolution? Representative Roman C. Benavente, recognized.

Representative Roman C. Benavente: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If there is no objection; I am kind of leaning on supporting the resolution; but there is a concern that we have to look into that because we are looking at a nation that is – we are trying to involve ourselves in a nation that has to deal with the State Department in the National level. I do not know what is the ramifications and the agreements with the US Government between Taiwan and whatnot with regards to that effect; I know there are a lot of restrictions on the Commonwealth with regards to foreign countries and foreign affiliations on other countries. And that is a concern that I am just questioning myself and I am also asking other members to look into that and see how clarity can be best approached with regards to the intent of the resolution. Thank you.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you. To respond recognized the Vice Speaker.

Representative Rafael S. Demapan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the Representative and this is why I had mentioned earlier that Taiwan is not actually willing to participate in the TPP because it requires a higher standard; all that they actually wanted to do is to sign that trade investment framework agreement which is a lower part. *Esti i TPP i Presidenti Amerika si Obama signed those agreement with other countries; hu komprende hafa ile’lekmu because you are thinking about China also and Taipei yan todu ayo siha i hafa na arrangement I just thought I point that out Mr. Speaker. Thank you.*

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you. Representative Benavente, do you yield at this time? Okay, now recognized Representative Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero.

Representative Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will support the resolution but I do want to clarify one thing. I am wondering why this resolution is not reviewed by the Legal Counsel? And I would like to ask the Legal Counsel is there a reason why he did on review the resolution? Thank you.

*The Chair recognized Legal Counsel John F. Cool.*

Legal Counsel John F. Cool: It was not submitted to me for approval.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Continue, Representative Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero.

Representative Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero: John, if you did not get a chance to review this as you are required what is your stand; I do not know if you had read it; and I am furthering the concern that Representative Benavente brought up is our relationship; I would like to hear from the Legal Counsel absent the review maybe the explanation of the Legal Counsel would suffice I will support the resolution if the Legal Counsel concurs and advise that we act on it. Thank you.

Legal Counsel John F. Cool: I have seen it and read it; actually I have reviewed it I just did not sign it because I do not think it was submitted for signature. I have checked with the State Department website concerning the relationship between the United States and Taiwan and they approved activities with Taiwan particularly those that do not necessarily require statehood as a condition to being in part of the agreement and that is the agreements that we are talking about here; are ones that Taiwan would be a permissible participant. So I did not see anything fairly wrong with the resolution. But there is a very long extensive statement from the US State Department about the relationship.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Vice Speaker, recognized.

Representative Rafael S. Demapan: Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. Just quickly we did approve a similar resolution last year and I just thought I inform the members. Thank you.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Are there any further discussions from the members? Ready.

*There being no discussions the motion was carried by voice vote, there was no “nay” vote.*

*There being no further resolution on Calendar the Chair moved to Item 16, Bill Calendar and recognized the Floor Leader.*

## **BILL CALENDAR**

*Floor Leader moved for the passage on First and Final Reading H. B. No. 19-95, HD1, entitled, A Bill for an Act to clarify the powers of the Commonwealth Casino Commission and to make needed changes to the Commonwealth Code given the unique regulatory oversight of the Casino Industry in the Commonwealth; and for other purposes.; the motion was then seconded by several members; the Chair opened the floor under discussion; the Chair recognized Representative Angel A. Demapan.*

**H. B. No. 19-95, HD1** entitled: A Bill for an Act to clarify the powers of the Commonwealth Casino Commission and to make needed changes to the Commonwealth Code given the unique regulatory oversight of the Casino Industry in the Commonwealth; and for other purposes. [*See S. C. R. NO. 19-32*]

Representative Angel A. Demapan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and colleagues since the introduction of House Bill 19-95, we have had the opportunity to conduct a thorough review of the provisions and legislative intent of the measure. At the outset the goal of this legislation focused on two underlying factors number one, securing funding for the Casino Commission staff to continue working and executing their duties; two to address the concerns of the commission relative to the provisions of the open government act. Mr. Speaker and colleagues the amendments that I will offer today ensure that these two concerns are addressed and protected. Furthermore with the grace of additional time to work and the amendments the commission seized the opportunity to provide comments to this body for consideration and because their input is valuable to this body, the concerns of the commission were reviewed and considered to the fullest extent possible in the amendments I will offer. In addition to their

concerns the amendments I will offer also take into account concerns of local businesses, like farmers and ranchers and food and beverage providers who look forward to the potential opportunities of offering their goods to the casino licensee in the hopes of realizing potential positive multiplier effects of what is poised to become the largest economic stimulator of our commonwealth. The amendments also take into account the constitutional responsibility of the legislature to appropriate funds and to enact legislation necessary to structure the affairs of the government and to safeguard the livelihood of our people. Mr. Speaker and colleagues the current structure of having the exclusive licensee paying for the operations of their own regulator is outright questionable, but now we have arrived here to formally established this mechanism has a regulatory fee albeit still a bit questionable that the licensee funds its own regulator. The amendments when offered and admitted become the product of this body, as is the case in other legislation, I am aware that there may be members who have other amendments they would like to offer for consideration, I certainly look forward to subsequent amendments so that we can deliberate and make informative decisions before final passage of this measure. The substitute version I will offer in no way preempts any further amendments from being made by any member who wishes to do so, in this regard Mr. Speaker, I now offer a floor amendment in the form of a substitute bill for House Bill 19-95, HD1, so move, thank you Mr. Speaker

*The motion was seconded by Representative Ogumoro. The Chair opened the floor for discussion and recognized Representative Ralph N. Yumul.*

Representative Yumul: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just for clarification, I believe two amendments were given; which one would that be?

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: You are talking about that first day when it was passed out? That was given out but it was not offered and it was not seconded and if you recalled we adjourned but before adjourning I asked the Floor Leader to withdraw the motion on the passage of House Bill 19-95, so it was never officially offered. So this is the only one that is now offered and seconded.

Representative Yumul: Understood, Mr. Speaker, I never threw it I just held onto it, so I was not too sure if it was the same one again...

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Can I ask if copies have been made available to the members?

Representative Angel A. Demapan: Mr. Speaker copies have been available and for clarification the amendment officially offered on the floor is now dated 9/30/2015.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Okay, Members please take note of that. The official substitute would be House Bill 19-95 HD1, HS1, dated September 30. Are we clear on that and make sure we all have the right copy. Let us continue under discussion can I ask maybe to the mover to just go over the substitute perhaps summarize the main points of it.

Representative Angel A. Demapan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To summarize the substitute there are some provisions in here that remain from HD1 but significant differences pertain to provisions of the funding increase - the funding after five years the lapse funds are subject to appropriation by the legislature redefining the casino service providers basically addressing the indirect service providers and the persons employed as gaming versus non-gaming. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you for that summary. Recognized, Representative Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero.

Representative Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is a very brief summary for a lot of amendments, but can we go section by section on what you are amending in particular so that we go step by step, thank you.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: As the mover recognize Representative Angel A. Demapan.

Representative Angel A. Demapan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I cut short the summary because I was under the impression that there was going to be questions by section, but since there is a question to cover all the sections then we will proceed on that manner. Section 3, on page 2...

Representative Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero: Mr. Speaker, can we have a short recess?

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Do you still wish to have the mover go section by section?

Representative Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero: I do but, I think sense that we probably need a short recess...

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: First or after the overview?

Representative Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero: Before.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Are there any objection for a short recess.

*There were no objections on the floor the House stood recess.*

*2-The House recessed at 11:35 a.m.*

*RECESS*

*The House reconvened at 1:50 p.m.*

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: This session is now back to order prior to our lunch break we left off on item 16 of our order business, the bill calendar, a motion was offered by the Floor Leader for the adoption of House Bill 19-95, HD1, subsequently, Representative Angel Demapan, had introduced an amendment in the form of HS1, a motion was already offered and seconded and we were under discussion, we passed out copies and the last request made by Representative Lorenzo Deleon Guerrero was to go over the substitute, section by section; since then over lunch, we have had a chance to go over it; and I wanted to find out if the members still want to go over section by section; Representative Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero?

Representative Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero: For myself, I do.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: If that is the consensus of the members I like would like to ask the mover Representative Angel Demapan to go over it already.

Representative Angel A. Demapan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. The first change of HS1 shows up on Section 3, page 2, line 17, the words “new subsections e and f”. And “e” and “f” are shown on page 3 starting at line 1 ending at line 16. I would like to point out that the new subsection “f”, was formally a part of Section 3 (b) in HD1, and is now separated as a different item. Still on page 3, Section 4, is similar to HD1 with the inclusion of language specific to the funds that come from Section 2306, and it

is basically reinstating the delineation of how the funds from 2306 are supposed to be spent as agreed from the beginning. And the next amendment shows up on page 7, Section 5 (g); Section 5 (g) is a new section which states that the unexpended funds from the CCCRF at the end of a fiscal year for the first five years from the year of issuance of exclusive casino license issued by the commonwealth lottery commission shall be appropriated by the legislature at the end of the 5th year for purposes said fourth in 4CMC 2307 (a) through (d). For the members information the reason why we inserted this provision is this is kind of a supplemental safeguard because as you recalled that after the execution of the license agreement part of the payment terms was for the licensee to pay the first and fifth year and so we do not expect the \$15,000,000 payment on the fifth year and this provision will provide a supplemental safeguard that in the event the commonwealth still needs that amount of funding to meet its obligations such as the settlement fund obligation. Section (h) is after the first five years any unexpended funds at the end of each fiscal year shall be transferred to a special account for appropriation by the legislature and so forth. This is a follow-up of Section (g) meaning after the fifth year after we have resolved the supplemental safeguards for that fifth year payment then the licensee begins paying again from year six forward which means unexpended funds after the fifth year will no longer have to be withheld for that supplemental purpose and can now be appropriated by the legislature. The remainder of page 7 is unchanged; on page 8 Section 8, line 11 deals with section 2312 (b) of Title 4 specifically defining casino employees to be employees of the licensee that deal with casino gaming activities. We now move to Section 9 on page 10, the amendment there is to strikeout schools that teach gaming including playing dealing or other techniques in the definition of casino service provider. The changes to Section 10 include a reinserting the notwithstanding clause as it pertains to the open government act as the Casino Commission in their comments sought assistance to ensure that this provision is in here to protect the confidentiality of certain documents and records that will be in their possession. On page 12, Section 11, line 17, this is the provision reinserted on line 23 that says including legal counsel and other professionals; this is something that the Assistant AG testified this morning on his behalf as an employee of the AG's Office that is something that the AG does not agree with. As the mover of this amendment, I take the position that this provision states that the Executive Director may hire, this provision does not direct the Executive Director to hire and is up for legal interpretation should it become law, in addition to that I would also like to say that this is an area of concern for the Casino Commission to not be able to have its own in-house counsel because of the complexity of their duties and responsibilities; this morning is a classic example where their own legal counsel essentially removes his hat and speaks on behalf of AG's Office and changes his interest, his position; the scenario here that is problematic and of great concern is when the Casino Commission makes a decision or takes any action or determination that may be in conflict with the opinion or position of the Attorney General's office who would defend the position of the Casino Commission given that their employee or their legal counsel is an employee of the office of Attorney General. Finally the other area of concern here is the legal counsel is an employee of the office of Attorney General whose salary is funded by the commonwealth Casino Commission there is a little bit of an inadequacy that exists on that arrangement. After that the next amendment shows up and Section 13 page 13 line 22; Section 13 is a new addition which further defines the casino regulatory fee and as I explained in my opening introductory statement for this amendment is that the casino regulatory fee is now capped by this provision but is already capped or was agreed upon in the existing regulations promulgated by the Casino Commission. I would like to point to Section (c) there is a non-refundable credit provision. This is an incentive that is inserted here similar to what was done the last time we had a very huge industry here. This revision is inserted because of the concerns that I raised on the issue of having the licensee fund the operations of their own regulator, so basically what this non-refundable credit would do is pertaining to BGR taxes only if the licensee ends up paying exceeds \$20,000,000 in BGR taxes in a given year then this non-refundable credit says that they can restate back the \$3,000,000 that was given as a regulatory fee as a non-refundable credit meaning \$17,000,000 of their BGRT will remain remitted to the commonwealth. I would like to note that in order for the licensee to exceed \$20,000,000 in BGRT the licensee must have spent at least \$1,000,000,000 in the

commonwealth at that point when any business in the commonwealth is expanding \$1,000,000,000 we can assert that there is a tremendous amount of economic revenue being generated within the economy that returns to the operations of the government through various forms of taxes and multiplier effects such as contracts with construction companies and other subcontracts that they may enter into; but the amount there is that this non-refundable credit cannot kick-in unless the licensee expends \$1,000,000,000. The remainder Section 14 and 15 come from HD1; page 16 and 17 everything else come from HD1. I yield, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you Chairman Demapan for the explanation. We will continue under discussions; any discussions at this time? Can I make something before somebody raises their hands; just a clarification on the issue raised by our Attorney General regarding the one provision here under Section 11, which provides that they may hire legal counsel and other professionals. We have heard this morning in the testimony that the Attorney General has publicly come out and opposed this position, I wanted to ask our legal counsel can the commission hire legal counsel outside of the AG without the Attorney General's approval even if it is provided for under this bill?

Legal Counsel John F. Cool: What the bill would do is create a conflict because it could be interpreted as allowing or empowering the commission to hire their own legal counsel without the approval of the Attorney General. The Constitution provides that the Attorney General was supposed to be the one that provides legal services to the Executive Branch; in the absence of this provision the Casino Commission can request to the Attorney General that they be allowed to hire their own legal counsel; this has been done in the past with autonomous corporations and agencies; it was done with the Civil Service Commission; it was done with the Commonwealth Healthcare Corporation; so it is something that the Attorney General can do absent any statutory provision empowering the commission to hiring an attorney.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: It does not require that a legal counsel be hired; it says they may and so I was under the assumption I guess that even if they were to hire that the Attorney General's office would still have to approve that hire; and if they do not approve it then they cannot hire.

Legal Counsel John F. Cool: That would be the way to interpret this provision and consistent with the constitution is that although it empowers the commission to hire a legal counsel they cannot hire a legal counsel without the approval of the Attorney General pursuant to the Constitution; and the Attorney General's authority to provide legal services; but it does create a conflict because the commissioners could say that this gives us the authority to hire legal counsel absent the approval of the Attorney General.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you, Counsel. Any other discussions at this time, I think we will get back to this issue later. If there is none, I think because of what the legal counsel had just mentioned and I wanted to ask the mover if he is willing to offer a subsidiary amendment while we are on this to maybe strikeout legal counsel but leave the other professionals in; incase it is warranted. Recognized, Representative Angel Demapan.

Representative Angel A. Demapan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and if I may like to pose a question for legal counsel.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Continue.

Representative Angel A. Demapan: Counsel I would like to ask if we can insert language in here that says including the legal counsel, and then insert some languages that says with the approval of the Attorney General or something that is consistent with the constitutional provision.

Legal Counsel John F. Cool: Inserting language may hire a legal counsel subject to the approval of the Attorney General; that would cover it also.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: I think that will be better, go ahead.

Representative Angel A. Demapan: Thank you, Speaker and thank you, legal counsel. At this time I would like to move for that amendment and absent a written floor amendment at this time, I would like to ask the legal counsel to use the Elmo for the members that we see the effectuation of that amendment.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: About a simple four word “with the approval of the Attorney General”.

Representative Angel A. Demapan: Yes Mr. Speaker at this point I move to include a subsidiary amendment to include the words with the approval of the Attorney General following the word counsel so moved.

*The motion was seconded by several members.*

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Just as a point of order since we did not adopt the prior substitute yet are we in order counsel to offer subsidiary? Okay, thank you. It is a short amendment and I think we can do without it. Please restate it again so that members are clear

Representative Angel A. Demapan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker the amendment is to add the language with the approval of the Attorney General after the word counsel on line 1 of page 13.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you is everybody clear on the amendment?

*Several members voiced “yes”.*

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: John it is okay we can do without Elmo today. The motions has been offered and seconded this a subsidiary motion; any discussions at this time; are we ready for the vote on the subsidiary motion;

*Several members voiced “ready”. There being no discussions on the subsidiary amendment offered by Representative Angel A. Demapan was carried by voice vote. There was no “nay” vote.*

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Okay are there any further discussions on the motion this would be on the substitute as offered by Representative Angel A. Demapan. Recognized, Representative Vinson Sablan and then the Minority Leader.

Representative Vinson F. Sablan: I will yield to the Minority Leader first.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Representative Vinson Sablan yields to the Minority Leader.

Representative Ramon A. Tebuteb: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask your indulgence Mr. Speaker and Members, given that there were a lot of comments submitted this morning by the commissioners on the voluminous rules and regulations now we have a new substitute offered by Representative Demapan I believe to some extent I am counting perhaps about five that may have deviated from the original proposed bill that the committee had reported out from; some of the comments also made by all the commissioners lead me to understand that these issues are complex and that while I borrow their words that these are voluminous and now in just a short period of time we are able to perhaps take care of the concerns raised by the Assistant Attorney General this morning and then that the opportunity and I am assuming that your leadership had the opportunity to review these proposed changes from the original proposed change submitted by the commissioners or the commission my number I counted about 19 and so with that I am going to ask on behalf of the minority that you allow us a certain time with Legal Counsel John Cool to go over now what is being proposed that is on the floor. Thank you.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you Minority Leader; do you want to offer any comments, Representative Sablan?

Representative Vinson F. Sablan: No, Mr. Speaker I just want to see what the action of our Minority Leader; if you are going to grant the request or not, I can give comments after.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: The Chair will hold a short recess.

*3-The House recessed at 2:10 p.m.*

*RECESS*

*The House reconvened at 3:34 p.m.*

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: We now return back to our session; we left off on Item 16 the Bill Calendar. The latest motion was for a floor amendment offered by Representative Angel Demapan House Bill 19-95 HD1; the substitute would be in the form of HS1; every member should have a copy of it; we were under discussion prior to our recess and now we return back and let us continue under discussion; and will now recognize Representative Vinson Sablan.

Representative Vinson F. Sablan: Thank you, Speaker. I was going to throw in my comments during recess but I wanted to be on record. After three days and three documents, I am still trying to gather my final thoughts on this bill. Three days, three documents, with major amendments, also an unconstitutional concern from the AG; Commission comments to an unofficial version of the bill, which they stated their concerns; I just feel this is a clear indication that we are not providing the Commission the version that they can work with in the best interest of the CNMI. There are concerns from all directions and I know it is because of the live training facility, we are trying to rush a bill to regulate because there is a casino operation going on right now opposed to the initial plan of a 2000 room and a \$2 Billion Dollar investment. Personally I do not feel comfortable supporting any version today. I do not feel it is fair for me to make a decision without a clear conscience and all the information I need; and with the complexity of this bill, I am unable to digest all the information in such little time; all the changing information. I will support any version of any separate version of a bill that would take and safeguard employees, the staff of the commission, but with all the other

provisions, it is very complex, I feel that it is only fair for us to take the time and find a middle ground; layout all of the concerns, and it is not going to take an hour; it would probably take more; but I am just stating my concerns and how I feel; I need a clear conscience on the bill. And this is for the record, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you, Representative Sablan. Are there any further comments? I recognize the Minority Leader.

Representative Ramon A. Tebuteb: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you members and Mr. Speaker for considering the request the minority had requested; and after careful consideration on the process, I feel that the one hour is certainly not enough; the concerns in our short meeting; the legal issues were raised and we feel that perhaps if there is one major concern to take care of the employees then we have an amendment and perhaps I will ask maybe Representative Attao to go in on that end.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you Minority Leader. The Minority Leader yields to Representative BJ Attao.

Representative Attao: Thank you Mr. Speaker and thank you again to you Mr. Speaker and to the members for allowing us to sit down and deliberate amongst ourselves in regards to House Substitute 1 as introduced by our good colleague Angel Demapan. Mr. Speaker these were the words that were brought up during the presentation of the commission and as members of the legislature is to take care of the employees. One week ago today House Bill 19-95 was included in an emergency session using the fact that the employees of the commission is an urgent matter to include it in the session that we were going to act on the budget as an emergency declaration; and with that the commissioners continuously during public comment brought up the concerns of the staff; we as members of the legislature continued to do that. And here we are today still deliberating on the contents of the bill just like on a committee level. I along with other members had a lot of concerns and questions but be it as it may it was reported out for passage and I signed off on the committee report with the understanding that the other concerns we brought up during session; with the substitute version I believe now it raises more concerns prior to just the members of the legislature the members of the committee the House Bill 19-95 is a product of the commission; now with this version the commission will have concerns in addition to us in the minority block that have been given a little time to review a product that took the majority two days to upon. With that being said and a different version is presented one thing is constant in our deliberations and our hallway conversations and inclusive of the commissioners and that is the staff. This is not the budget coming from a conference committee where it is a yes or a no we can act on this bill separately bringing up different versions in other sessions. It has been said a couple times that this did bill was deliberated on was presented since May; the bill number is 19-19-95 it is not 19-5. It did not go through the lengthy process of deliberation within the committee within this body; so it is an injustice to the legislation there is more questions now and concerns for the commission for the members of the minority block and maybe some of the members of the majority. Therefore I move for a subsidiary motion to substitute the version introduced by our good colleague Angel Demapan to take care of the staff of the commission first so move. Have copies readily available for the members to review.

Speaker: Can you pass out copies please. A motion has been offered and seconded for a subsidiary motion I do not know if this is just an amendment or in a form of another substitute. Let us take a short recess for copies to be passed out.

*4-The House recessed at 3:40 p.m.*

*RECESS*

*The House reconvened at 3:50 p.m.*

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: We now return back to our session. Under discussion is a subsidiary motion offered by Rep BJ Attao; copies have been made and members have had a chance to look at it; let us now go into discussions, recognize Chairman of Ways and Means.

Representative Antonio P. Sablan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A quick review of the subsidiary substituted offered by colleague Attao, is basically provisions that are included in the substituted offered by Representative Demapan. Although that the past few days the employees of the commission has been one of the grounds for the request for the legislation, we have to be mindful that we have an industry and we have as part of the enabling legislation that allowed for the industry; we also created the commonwealth Casino Commission and in that enabling legislation will also passed on the commission the critical responsibility of ensuring that the industry is monitored and operated properly. And as part of those, it does require that they do hire also we are trying to provide them with the source of revenue to do just that. But this is not just providing them with the mechanism to support and carry out their mandated responsibilities this is more than just paying people; this is providing funds in making sure that the funds are available to do background checks for those employees that are going to be hired in the near future; to make sure that equipment's are properly procured and all that, so with that, again a quick review of the proposed amendment before us is basically an extract from the original substitute. So with that we look beyond using employees as an excuse to divert our attention to the bigger picture of trying to provide the necessary resources for the commission to operate. We all talk about that the need to ensure that this industry, a critical industry, is monitored properly. I just do not understand why we are being so apprehensive about doing just that. I think we owe it to the community to ensure that this industry is run properly. And critical to that effort is the commission itself so with that and with all due respect to the mover, I ask our colleagues to put their support behind the original substitute as offered by Representative Demapan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I yield.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you, Representative Sablan. Are there any further discussions? Recognized, Representative Yumul.

Representative Yumul: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the author for offering this amendment; I do support some of the amendments made by Chairman Demapan. May be it is buying time, it is a big industry, and I do not understand anything about how the casino works. The sole issue here is ensuring that the commission and its employees run and if it is buying us time to understand then I am actually for it. I am willing to take the advice of Commissioner Sablan that we go down and present to us because not all of us has actually had the privy to see what they do; and I think it is justified; if it buys us a month's time I think it is warranted, and I do not think it is going to hurt the industry; it is a new industry; it is a live-training facility; we ourselves are training our enforcement so we can understand. As a member of the minority, I am not against changing I just want to make sure that if we do plan to amend Public Law 18-56 as offered by Vice Speaker Demapan, then let us look at it carefully and fix everything. We do not want to keep coming back and to fixing the bill; it is an industry that is alive now and we have to basically be careful of what we do and I am sure there will be changes in the future and I would like to sit down with the commission and understand the industry a lot better; I do not speak for the whole minority but at

least for myself to be comfortable with amending Public Law 18-56, then I am for it, and I think buying time at least a month if we are all in agreement, I am okay with that. I yield, thank you Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you, Representative Yumul. Are there any further discussions? Recognized, Representative Roman Benavente.

Representative Roman C. Benavente: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Looking at this bill there are very much concerns on a lot of these issues. I know the original casino bill has gone through the hurdle and there are so many amendments but despite the fact we are facing one right now that is in front of us. And knowing the fact that this bill was just put into place to establish the authority of the commission, I agree with that, but we also have to think we are only establishing a training facility; we have not gotten to the main opening of the facility. When we start out the bill we started at \$40,000 for the commission and then - we pass the bill everybody was agreeable to that effect and now we have not gotten to the main - we have not matured yet with regards to the process and development of the casino industry yet. Yet we are asking for an additional \$65,000. I look at the employees that are hired and I feel that they will be in the front line and I feel that they should be afforded and accorded with the amount of money that is really needed because they are the ones who are facing the public and community as they work in their respective duties, So like I said, I have nothing against in raising the salaries of the commission, but I want to see maturity, I want to see progress, I want to see something tangible to know that we realizing so much money with regards to casino and then from there we can look at it and evaluate; we should what they call cost analysis with regards to the operation and establishment of the commissions salary and the operations of establishment of the employees of the Casino Commission. I do not know if the Casino Commission and the chairman of the commission has that in placed with regards to that effect, but to just blankly come up with this kind huge amount of money without any cost analysis or any type of tangible numbers or something to realize how much we are operating and how much work we are gaining it is a basic business concept and Mr. Speaker, that is one of the major concern that I have – we are only on the training session right now the training stage; we would like to see if the casino opens in its full force and effect on its entire operation down in Garapan I would not question the commission or I would not question this body if somebody decided that okay let us put up what is tangible for them. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you. Are there any other members, recognize the Vice Speaker.

Representative Rafael S. Demapan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am hearing some of the concerns raised by Representative Benavente and perhaps when we get to the original substitute I would like to comment on that, but I wanted to ask the mover with all due respect, what is the difference on his version now and the version on House Substitute 1 on the usage of the funding for the commission; was there any flexibility or not?

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Recognize, Representative Attao.

Representative Attao: Vice Speaker, yes this will allow the commission to pay the employees through the collections of the fees that they impose beyond what is left over from the original \$2 Million Dollars. I believe it was mentioned in that meeting that they will be funded only until second week of November may be early December, so this will allow them to use those funds to be

able to continuously pay their employees from the fees that they impose; that is this version strictly for that purpose, no additional stuff to it.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Continue, Vice Speaker.

Representative Rafael S. Demapan: I just wanted to further clarify because of what we have on House Substitute setting a rate \$3 Million and anything beyond that of course would go to local appropriation if needed. On your version was there any flexibility beyond \$3 Million.

Representative Attao: Mr. Vice Speaker, the \$3 Million is an additive version and if you look at the \$3 Million Dollars now that you brought it up, that is putting a cap. Should this industry after the second or third year the commission might be able to collect more than \$3 Million Dollars, but we are setting a cap. So if the number of employees and this was justified in their explanation two Fridays ago that they are not just going to be imposing fees for the employees here or the other connected entities, it will allow them to collect fees for the ones outside of the commonwealth by putting \$3 Million Dollars then we capping their negotiating or collections powers. We are putting a blueprint of here is \$3 Million Dollars and here is a bunch of license and okay you want to work we will sign off; that is what we are doing here. By giving them the flexibility this \$3 Million can go beyond within the first to two in a half - three years assuming that the industry is complete the first phase of the industry is complete by the year that it says it is going to be complete. By excluding the portion for the personnel we can come back and sit so we understand what it is going to intel as the industry grows and they have done the training I am sure you have mentioned in the committee meeting that you saw parts of it and therefore it is for that purpose that the \$3 Million should have not even be there in the first place. But you brought it up it is not in the substitute. Thank you.

Representative Rafael S. Demapan: One last time Mr. Speaker. First of all I am not refuting the fact that the industry will continue to grow and the commission will need additional funds to make sure that they carry out their obligation as mandated by the statute. However it is my understanding that there was an understanding and also in regards to their regulatory regulations fees that \$3 Million will be, of course, every year would go to the commission with an annual 5% and because of that understanding this is why we came to this provision; making sure that the legislature would also be apprised of their operations and making sure that should they need additional funding of course they would have to go to the legislature for any appropriation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you, Vice Speaker. Are there any further discussions? Recognize, Representative Angel Demapan.

Representative Angel A. Demapan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to touch a little bit on the \$3 Million Dollar cap. If you recall the Commonwealth Casino Commission submitted a budget to the legislature for FY 2016 in the amount of \$2.6 Million Dollars for personnel and operations, clearly they need an amount below \$3 Million Dollars to fulfill the operational and personnel needs. The \$3 Million Dollar figure was decided by the commonwealth Casino Commission not us and it was included in their regulations. And there needs to be, from this point, from the stand point of this substitute version that I offered we stand with the \$3 Million Dollar figure because there is a need to be a structure for fees. We cannot just leave the authority to set fees open-ended and we cannot just leave any agency with the authority to create new fees as they go and as they please; that is just not investor conducive strategy or mechanism in any government and regardless of who the investor is. The Commonwealth has a duty and we as leaders of the Commonwealth have a duty to provide for a

stable and structured system. And in so, doing this provision provides an avenue to create a stable and structured system. We cannot wake up one day and decide that today I feel I want to charge this new fee or today I want to increase yesterday's fee. There needs to be a stabilized and structured system that is the impetus for putting this provision into the substitute version. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you, Representative Demapan. Are there any further discussions? Recognize Representative Roman Benavente.

Representative Roman C. Benavente: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Alluding to both the understanding of Chairman Angel Demapan and Representative Attao the point that I am seeing here on the amendment version by Representative Attao it does not pose a limit, although it does not say there is no structure. The way the casino bill is formulated it is already structured; it is what we call a sole-source casino almost like a franchised program. And you cannot say that there is any structure but why limit the CNMI the authority and the benefit to earn additional money aside from that not single-handedly overthrowing it because if we do that we are going to court. But why limit if they set a standard and set a figure and the amount that is tangible for any category of operations of casino why do we have to limit it; why do we have to limit when the CNMI can still avail to more income; this is for our future generations. Each and every one of you has kids and grandkids that have to worry about this kind of situation. If we can make the best of what we have now; I did not support the casino in beginning but right now I am working to make it the best we can to avail for whatever resource that is available to make it better for our future generations not us; Mr. Speaker and to each and one of you, I want to make this clear that this is not about you and me; this is for our future. What happens ten – twenty years from now did we make a good decision or did we screw up for our kids. That is all Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you, Representative Benavente. Is there anybody else, Vice Speaker?

Representative Rafael S. Demapan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The concerns raised by Representative Benavente is addressed in Public Law 18-56; what we are discussing here are on regulated fees only. I yield Mr. Speaker

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you, recognized Representative BJ Attao.

Representative Attao: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just for the earlier comments made by our Chairman of Ways and Means, I am not using the employees as a regards to push this legislation, I believe that had happened when we tried to include it in the emergency session. Just to take some words from Representative Ogumoro earlier today, that we should sit down and work together, we take care of the staff right now; sit down with the commission and see where our line fits so we can work on a legislation that is going help them. This legislation is not only fixing the stuff for the commission it is also amending Public Law 18-56 with regards to other stuff. So with that being said, Mr. Speaker, I am ready to vote, thank you.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you. Before we move to vote the chair would like to chime in on the discussion do the members want me to step down or I can do it from here, any objections?

*There was no objection raised on the floor.*

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you. Just to weigh on this issue. As I see it both versions do address the issue of providing funding for the gaming commission for the employees there should be no debate about that both do that; so either one you go for the employees will be paid. The difference as everybody is well aware is that the version by Representative Angel Demapan goes beyond that and I think that is the difference here in position is the Minority Bloc feels that maybe we are not ready they are not ready to go there yet; the leadership as you know is. So it will be a policy decision whichever way we go. But in looking at that you know I do have to stress that the gaming commission also presented to this body other important issues. One big issue is the security issue and that is not included in Representative Attao's version. They need to be able to I guess it be exempted from the Open Government Act so that plans for how revenues are being how it changes hands from here to the bank where the security plans are and so forth things like that may be subject to crime. And Representative Demapan's version addresses that issue which is something we should keep in mind now. The other one again regarding the concern about the \$3 Million Dollar cap there is a provision in there for an annual increase whether it is 5% I think it is 10% under their current regulations per year. So if it is \$3 Million next year they will get \$330 Million and so they get a \$300,000 increase every year so that should address the concern for now about making sure they have the capacity to do what they need. Now let us say it is not, two, three years down the line let us say there is a need to go and investigate in Hong Kong or wherever and they do not have enough money; under Representative Demapan's version they are treated as an agency sort of like an autonomous agency and with autonomous agencies their budget are going to be submitted through the Governor's budget submission to this body for approval for disapproval or for modification if in fact they need more; that will be the process to which they can justify to this body the need to get more money. And the legislature can then act accordingly so it is really not like they will not be able to they stock with the \$3 Million there is a provision an annual increase and there is a provision that in the event that they need more the legislature can take that into consideration and similar to other agencies. And again going further there are other things in here such as, it prohibits certain activities by the gaming commissioners I think that is important; it prescribes who are employees of the casino who needs to be licensed that is important; and another important thing which kind of looks further down the road is to earmark funds for the fifth year, I think that is very important because in the fifth year and we should not be thinking about it in the third or fourth year about how do we replenish the \$15 Million Dollars that we advanced; doing it now; and it may not be enough, but at least it provides for it and not doing that now I think is not wise policy. So the gists of my comments are that these other things that Representative Demapan's version intends to do I do not see it as controversial really. If anything it really takes a cautious position I think and it does restrict a lot of what the gaming commissioners wanted to do, but I think that is the policy on our part and then if the need arises if they need to be given the authority to review indirect services then maybe we can, but that would be like starting strict and then maybe opening it up if the need arises rather than allowing them everything and then trimming down, that is the approach as I see it. And so I will rest and with that are we ready for the vote?

*Several members voiced ready. There being no further discussions the Chair called for the vote; there was a division on the floor the Chair recognized the Clerk for the roll.*

*The Clerk called the roll on the motion offered by Representative Attao with the following results:*

Representative Edwin P. Aldan	no
Representative Blas Jonathan “BJ” T. Attao	yes
Representative Anthony T. Benavente	yes
Representative Roman C. Benavente	yes
Representative George N. Camacho	no
Representative Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero	yes
Representative Angel A. Demapan	no
Representative Rafael S. Demapan	no
Representative Joseph Lee Pan T. Guerrero	no
Representative Glenn L. Maratita	no
Representative Felicidad Taman Ogumoro	no
Representative Edwin K. Propst	yes
Representative Antonio P. Sablan	no
Representative John Paul P. Sablan	no
Representative Vinson F. Sablan	yes
Representative Francis S. Taimanao	no
Representative Ramon A. Tebuteb	yes
Representative Edmund Joseph S. Villagomez	yes
Representative Ralph N. Yumul	yes
Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero	no

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: With 9 members voting yes, and 11 members voting no, the motion offered by Representative Attao is defeated. The Chair recognized the Floor Leader. We now go back to the standing motion which is the substitute as offered by Representative Angel Demapan; are there any further discussion on the motion are we ready for the vote? Recognize Representative Propst.

Representative Propst: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this point in time, first of, I would like to thank Representative Angel Demapan as I said earlier some of the concerns we spoke about I really am glad you addressed them and I had mixed feelings about this and I know we need to move forward. But I would like to make a couple of comments and at this point, I would like to offer an amendment to add to your substitute bill. John, if you could pull up 4 CMC subsection 2308 and if we can take a look at that; I am pulling this up because one of the things that I had discussed earlier with a Representative Angel Demapan and my Minority colleagues because the concern that we have not really addressed the problem with gambling addiction. You see I was under the impression that if we have somebody that has a problem with poker addiction or whatever that they would simply to go the Community Guidance Center; I found out that that is not the case and after speaking with the Community Guidance Center it turns out that they only address wellness at the Wellness Clinic that is like depression things and they are able to address addictions, but not gambling addictions, it is only for drug addiction and even with that they only have two counselors, one clinical psychologist on hand; they are very short staffed, underfunded, and overworked. As time goes we are going to see with any industry that deals with gambling an increase in addictions. So with that said, if you look at subsection 2308 we have included LEAC and we have included CHCC Medical referral and land compensation judgments and PSS we have included a lot, but at this point I would like include section (f) to include the Community Guidance Center for funding to address this problem. I think it is the right thing to do at this point because I did look through a Public Law 18-56 and I did not see anything on that and I looked through the license agreement and there is none and so I think if we are going to pass this today at least if we can address this and try at least this is the beginning the first step to help those with gambling addiction. And I want to finish with something that is a concern,

you know initially we were under the impression that that gambling in the CNMI, casino gambling would be a good thing because it is not going to go after locals, whereas poker is primarily used by locals; casinos are different the clientele is going to be tourists but if you see in both papers today and both Variety and Tribune they have full big ads in color – beautiful ads Ladies Night; other days they full page ads; Friday night they were super packed and it is a concern and so I hope we can include this amendment Section (f) to include the Community Guidance Center. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Just to clarify Representative Propst, just to insert (f) and include community guidance center?

Representative Propst: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Just to clarify with John, right now the Community Guidance Center is funded under CHCC or Public Health in particular?

Legal Counsel John F. Cool: I believe it is under Public Health, but I am not sure.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Does the Public Health get its funding from CHCC? According to the current statute it could go towards the Community Guidance Center under subsection (b) meaning Commonwealth Healthcare Corporation. And I am just putting this out just so that we are clear that if the funding as set forth under the Act that one other recipients is the hospital would that earmark can go towards the Community Guidance Center or not; if it cannot then we should insert it in; if it can I do not know if it will be double; I have just been informed that Public Health is a separate entity. I think the proper amendment would be the Community Guidance Center under the Department of Public Health.

Representative Propst: That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Okay a motions has been offered and seconded, under discussion recognize Representative Demapan.

Representative Angel A. Demapan: Mr. Speaker I think we need to clarify further that issue. First of all let me say that the intent of Representative Propst is very noble and it is something that many of us will support, but under the Commonwealth Healthcare Corporation pursuant to their enabling legislation there is a Division of Public Health Services and there is the Hospital Division that fall under the CHCC. Under the Division of Public Health Services the Community Guidance Center falls as another component. So funding earmarked pursuant to 2308 (b) is supposed to be funding that can go to CGC I think the appropriate avenue here to avoid double earmarking for the same entity, is perhaps for the mover to either go by way of resolution or some other legislation that would direct the Chief Executive Officer of CHCC to allocate a certain funding received this provision and 2308 to the Community Guidance Center for the program. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you. And I just got clarification yes, Public Health is a Division under CHCC, so earmarks to CHCC can go towards Public Health.

Representative Ogumoro: The Division of Public Health includes the Community Guidance program and it being the Division of the Commonwealth Healthcare Corporation there is nothing

that prevents the Commonwealth Healthcare Corporation from allocating that money whatever money is there to be able to take care of the problem that has been brought forth by Representative Propst.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you. And I just go further clarification that the Community Guidance Center is a separate division under CHCC and not under Public Health it is the same as Public Health one of the divisions; so again it is a separate division but it is under Commonwealth Healthcare Corporation. But a motion is still standing we are still under discussion, Recognize Representative Yumul.

Representative Yumul: I do not know if I am in line here but I will just wait until we dispose of it.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: I guess to put clarity to this we have just been told that CGC is a division under the Commonwealth Healthcare Corporation; there is an earmark set forth by law to go towards the Commonwealth Healthcare Corporation; I wanted to ask the mover if he still wants to pursue the motion?

Representative Propst: At this time I will withdraw my motion, Thank you.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Let us continued and I now recognize, Representative Yumul.

Representative Yumul: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In line Representative Propst had offered maybe a new subsection (f) and include the SHEFA. I understand we need to train some of our students here that might want to enter the hospitality industry. I am not sure if SHEFA will be implementing a program; I do not know if it is vocational or scholarship and I would like to add that we include SHEFA and those of our people that want to enter into this hospitality can avail to the scholarship and maybe pursue further education not necessarily education but a vocational education in the industry basically. So move.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: A motion has been made and seconded to provide for SHEFA as another recipient of this earmark, under discussion, recognize Representative Aldan.

Representative Aldan: I think Mr. Speaker it would be fair if that funding should go to the CNMI Scholarship and instead of SHEFA. Because under SHEF it only applies to Saipan residents and it does not apply to Rota or Tinian and this is a CNMI bill we are talking about here it is not a local bill. Thank you.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you. Representative Yumul just to clarify, this is earmarking BGRts which are general revenues and normally general revenues would fund Commonwealth Departments and Agencies and not SHEFA; SHEFA is a Saipan only and we have done SHEFA through local delegation funding and so here we would be earmarking general funds to a delegation created entity. And I just want to clarify also. Representative Yumul.

Representative Yumul: Okay, I will withdraw.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Let us continue. Are we ready for the vote on the amendment?

*Several members voiced ready. There being no further discussions the Chair called for the vote; there was a division on the floor the Chair recognized the Clerk for the roll.*

*The Clerk called the roll on the motion offered by Representative Angel A. Demapan with the following results:*

Representative Edwin P. Aldan	yes
Representative Blas Jonathan “BJ” T. Attao	no
Representative Anthony T. Benavente	no
Representative Roman C. Benavente	no
Representative George N. Camacho	yes
Representative Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero	yes
Representative Angel A. Demapan	yes
Representative Rafael S. Demapan	yes
Representative Joseph Lee Pan T. Guerrero	yes
Representative Glenn L. Maratita	yes
Representative Felicidad Taman Ogumoro	yes
Representative Edwin K. Propst	no
Representative Antonio P. Sablan	yes
Representative John Paul P. Sablan	yes
Representative Vinson F. Sablan	no
Representative Francis S. Taimanao	yes
Representative Ramon A. Tebuteb	no
Representative Edmund Joseph S. Villagomez	no
Representative Ralph N. Yumul	no
Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero	yes

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: With 12 members voting yes, and 8 members voting no, the motion offered by Representative Angel A. Demapan is adopted. Short recess.

*4-The House recessed at 4:40 p.m.*

**RECESS**

*The House reconvened at 4:41 p.m.*

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Speaker: We are back to our session and at this time we will be acting on the main motion as offered by the Floor Leader and this is on House Bill 19-95, HD1, HS1. Are there any further discussions? Madam Clerk please call the roll.

*Several members voiced ready and there being no further discussions the Speaker recognized the Clerk for the Calling of the Roll on the motion to pass on First and Final Reading H. B. NO. 19-95, HD1, HS1 with the following results:*

Representative Edwin P. Aldan	yes
Representative Blas Jonathan “BJ” T. Attao	no
Representative Anthony T. Benavente	no
Representative Roman C. Benavente	yes
Representative George N. Camacho	yes
Representative Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero	yes
Representative Angel A. Demapan	yes

Representative Rafael S. Demapan	yes
Representative Joseph Lee Pan T. Guerrero	yes
Representative Glenn L. Maratita	yes
Representative Felicidad Taman Ogumoro	yes
Representative Edwin K. Propst	no
Representative Antonio P. Sablan	yes
Representative John Paul P. Sablan	yes
Representative Vinson F. Sablan	no
Representative Francis S. Taimanao	yes
Representative Ramon A. Tebuteb	no
Representative Edmund Joseph S. Villagomez	no
Representative Ralph N. Yumul	no
Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero	yes

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: With 13 members voting yes, and 7 members voting no, H. B. NO. 19-95, HD1, HS1 hereby passes the House. The Chair recognized the Floor Leader.

*Floor Leader moved for the passage on First and Final Reading S. B. No. 19-28, entitled, A Bill for an Act to amend 1 CMC §7406 (a), (e) and (g) (3); and for other purposes.; the motion was then seconded by several members.*

**S. B. No. 19-28**, entitled: A Bill for an Act to amend 1 CMC §7406 (a), (e) and (g) (3); and for other purposes. [**S. C. R. NO. 19-30**]

*There Chair opened the floor for discussion; there being no discussions the Chair recognized the Clerk for the roll.*

*The Clerk for the Calling of the Roll on the motion to pass on First and Final Reading S. B. NO. 19-28 with the following results:*

Representative Edwin P. Aldan	yes
Representative Blas Jonathan “BJ” T. Attao	yes
Representative Anthony T. Benavente	present
Representative Roman C. Benavente	yes
Representative George N. Camacho	yes
Representative Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero	yes
Representative Angel A. Demapan	yes
Representative Rafael S. Demapan	yes
Representative Joseph Lee Pan T. Guerrero	yes
Representative Glenn L. Maratita	yes
Representative Felicidad Taman Ogumoro	yes
Representative Edwin K. Propst	absent (during voting)
Representative Antonio P. Sablan	yes
Representative John Paul P. Sablan	yes
Representative Vinson F. Sablan	no
Representative Francis S. Taimanao	yes
Representative Ramon A. Tebuteb	no
Representative Edmund Joseph S. Villagomez	no
Representative Ralph N. Yumul	no
Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero	yes

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: With 14 members voting yes, and 4 members voting no, S. B. NO. 19-28 hereby passes the House. That takes care of our bill calendar. We now move to Miscellaneous Business.

*During this time the Chair directed the House to item 17, Miscellaneous Business.*

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

*None*

### **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS**

*There being no other members being recognized the Chair moved to Item 18, Announcements; recognized Representative Vinson F. Sablan.*

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Representative Vinson F. Sablan: Just for the schedule of the funeral for the late Mayor Flores; it will be at 7:30 am at the Cathedral and mass will be celebrated at 10:30 am. Thank you. Also if we do not meet for session again, the Santa Remedio Tanapag Fiesta is scheduled for next weekend on October 11. It is going to be a lunch fiesta because there is still no power in parts of Feeder 7, so I am inviting everybody in the community to come down and enjoy the traditions of the North side.

Speaker Joseph P. Deleon Guerrero: Thank you. The subject that we have been talking about for the past couple of days regarding the hosting for the line crew, we have confirm a site and that will be at the Carolinian Utt for this Friday from 5 pm to 10 pm, the Sarg will be going around asking for whatever we can put in. We are going to try and take care of the food; it is still in the works right now and I am hoping that the members can maybe get drinks, but we will inform you once we get the green light from Finance. Are there any announcements to be made?

*There being no further announcements the Chair recognized the Floor Leader for adjournment.*

### **ADJOURNMENT**

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

The House adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Journal Clerk  
House of Representatives

---



---

### **APPEARANCE OF LOCAL BILLS**

---



---

**FIRST LEGISLATIVE DAY: 1<sup>st</sup>** Legislative appearance of a local bill is on the day it is introduced.

**SECOND LEGISLATIVE DAY:**

**THIRD LEGISLATIVE DAY:**

H. L. B. NO. 19-35: To appropriate funds specifically allotted to the First Senatorial District under Public Law No. 18-30; and for other purposes. Introduced by REP. GLENN L. MARATITA of Rota, Precinct 7 (*for himself*) on September 28, 2015.

H. L. B. NO. 19-36: To appropriate the Bond Interest Income Earned collected for the First Senatorial District in the amount of Twenty-Eight Thousand dollars (\$28,000.00 USD). Introduced by REP. GLENN L. MARATITA of Rota, Precinct 7 (*for himself*) on September 28, 2015.

H. L. B. NO. 19-38: To amend Section 1(a) of Tinian Local Law 19-4; and for other purposes. Introduced by REP. EDWIN P. ALDAN of Tinian, Precinct 6 (*for himself*) on September 28, 2015.

H. L. B. NO. 19-39: To appropriate funds realized under Public Law No. 18-30 for the Third Senatorial District for the construction of a temporary shelter(s) within the Third Senatorial District. Introduced by REP. BLAS JONATHAN “BJ” T. ATTAO, of Saipan, Precinct 3 (*for himself*, Representatives Anthony T. Benavente, Roman C. Benavente, Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero, Angel A. Demapan, Joseph Lee Pan T. Guerrero, Edwin K. Propst, John Paul P. Sablan, Vinson F. Sablan, Ramon A. Tebuteb, Edmund S. Villagomez, and Ralph N. Yumul) on September 28, 2015.

---