



SECOND NOR ERN MARIANAS CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION
SAIPAN, CM 96950

Telephone
6517/6572

Officers

Man T. Guerrero, President
Rita M. Gallo, 1st Vice President
Luis M. Cing, 2nd Vice President
Maria T. Pangelinan, 3rd Vice President
William B. Nabors, Convention Secretary
Juan T. Lizama, Floor Leader

Legal Opinion No. 30

Date: July 7, 1985

Members

Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero
Alfonzo Igisomar
David L. Igitol
Rita H. Inos
Benusto R. Kaipat
Esteven M. King
Luis M. Limes
Jesus P. Malnas
Paul A. Mangiona
James M. Mendiola
Aniceto H. Mundo
Felicidad T. Ogunoro
Karl T. Reyes
Joaquin A. Tenorio
Francisco Tomokane
William S. Torres
Ramon G. Villagomez
Ignacio Villanueva

MEMORANDUM

TO : Attorney General JOEL
FROM : Chairman, Committee on Governmental Institutions
SUBJECT: Delegate Proposals Nos. 51-85, 52-85, and 211-85.


Taken together, these delegate proposals do not intend to give the Governor veto authority over positions of substantive bills, a power which would be inconsistent with the Covenant, as noted in Legal Opinion No. 21.

However, a legal opinion is required as to what impact the addition of the word "part" would have on the Governor's veto authority, the appropriateness of such a change legally, and the relationship with the change proposed by Delegate Proposal No. 211.

For example, would this give the Governor authority to veto anything he choses in an appropriation bill, including a single sentence or part of a sentence in a section? Our understanding of the present language of the Constitution is that the Governor has authority to veto whole sections or any number of items in an appropriation bill. Is this correct, and what is the meaning of the word "section" as used in the Constitution and why was it included? Can the word "section" be construed to include veto authority over individual subsections, paragraphs, and clauses, etc.? Is the word "section" included to permit the Governor to veto groups of items appropriated? The Analysis implies the Governor can only veto amounts and not other parts of the bill, but this is not entirely clear and has not always been the practice of the Governor.

Please expedite this opinion as the Committee is ready to act on these proposals.

Thank you for your assistance.


Lorenzo I. DL. Guerrero

xc: Con-Con President



SECOND NORTH' N MARIANAS CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION
SAIPAN, CM 96950

Telephone
6517/6572

Officers

91
Guerrero, President
A. Calvo, 1st Vice President
David M. Cing, 2nd Vice President
Maria T. Pangolinan, 3rd Vice President
William B. Nabors, Convention Secretary
Juan T. Lizama, Floor Leader

Legal Opinion No. 30

Date: July 7, 1985

Members

Lorenzo I. Deleon Guerrero
Monzo Iqisomar
David L. Igitol
Rita H. Inos
Benusto R. Kaipat
Esteven M. King
Luis M. Ljmes
Jesus P. Mafnas
Paul A. Manolona
James M. Mendiola
Aniceto H. Mundo
Felicidad T. Oquimoro
Karl T. Reyes
Joaquin A. Tenorio
Francisco Tomokane
William S. Torres
Ramon G. Villagomez
Ignacio Villanueva

MEMORANDUM

TO : Attorney General
FROM : Chairman, Committee on Governmental Institutions
SUBJECT: Delegate Proposals Nos. 51-85, 52-85, and 211-85.

Taken together, these delegate proposals do not intend to give the Governor veto authority over positions of substantive bills, a power which would be inconsistent with the Covenant, as noted in Legal Opinion No. 21.

However, a legal opinion is required as to what impact the addition of the word "part" would have on the Governor's veto authority, the appropriateness of such a change legally, and the relationship with the change proposed by Delegate Proposal No. 211.

For example, would this give the Governor authority to veto anything he choses in an appropriation bill, including a single sentence or part of a sentence in a section? Our understanding of the present language of the Constitution is that the Governor has authority to veto whole sections or any number of items in an appropriation bill. Is this correct, and what is the meaning of the word "section" as used in the Constitution and why was it included? Can the word "section" be construed to include veto authority over individual subsections, paragraphs, and clauses, etc.? Is the word "section" included to permit the Governor to veto groups of items appropriated? The Analysis implies the Governor can only veto amounts and not other parts of the bill, but this is not entirely clear and has not always been the practice of the Governor.

Please expedite this opinion as the Committee is ready to act on these proposals.

Thank you for your assistance.

Juan T. Lizama, Esq.

xc: President, ConCon