

664-0991

Article X I, Sec. 4 (f) - After this  
Constitution has been in effect for at least 12 yrs,  
the Corporation shall be dissolved & its functions shall  
30TH DAY - 2ND CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION be transferred  
JULY 17, 1985 to the executive br. of  
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE gov't.  
COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION NO. 60

The Chair recognized Delegate King.

Delegate King: Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to move to adopt Recommendation No. 60. This recommendation is a joint committee recommendation -- Government Institution and Personal Rights and Natural Resources.

The motion was seconded. The Chair recognized Delegate Nabors.

Delegate Nabors: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion to amend Committee Recommendation No. 60. On page 2, line 19, I would like to move that we strike "may" and insert "will". On line 20, I would like to strike "may" and insert "must". And on line 21, after "government" I would like to place a period "." and strike the remainder of the sentence. (He repeated his motion.)

The motion was seconded. The Chair recognized Delegate King.

Delegate King: Mr. President, I would like to say that I disagree with the amendment for the Committee Recommendation No. 60 that was made by our colleague, Delegate Nabors. I believe that we should have (give) the Legislature the flexibility to see whether it is necessary to dissolve the function of the MPLC right away. If it is not necessary we should have (give) the Legislature the flexibility to allow the MPLC to continue if necessary to complete their function.

Chair Manglona: Is that all?

Delegate King: Yes, unless there's a question.

The Chair recognized Delegate Torres.

Delegate Torres: Yes, I can see Delegate King's concern, but I think, in all fairness, since we are the process removing the office of the Mayor and although it wouldn't be effective until four years after the ratification. I think we should also consider seriously eliminating public corporation or MPLC for the fact that we know how things have been going; and we have a very good idea as to how things have been operating and we should really make a determination whether or not we should transfer its function to another agency in the convention. We shouldn't give the Legislature room to play around with this thing. And I agree with the amendment that maybe we should dissolve it or will dissolve it and have its functions transferred to another agency. And I think

the delegates have experienced living under the Marianas Public Land Corporation for seven years and for seven years we should have a pretty good idea as to whether or not it's serving its purpose. Thank you.

The Chair recognized Delegate Nabors.

Delegate Nabors: Mr. Chairman, I made this motion in the interest of complying with the fathers of our Constitution who thought ten years was sufficient for the MPLC to complete its work. And it was they who put the provision there -- indications at the public hearing -- they indicated that their work should be completed in ten years. Under this measure, they have additional funding that should allow them to do their survey, mapping and complete their job. I think by putting this provision in the constitution will urge them to double their efforts to make certain that they finish their work. And in the event that they do not finish their work then they will have to change hats and move down to an executive department of land management under the Governor and finish their work. I don't see that anyone is going to be disadvantaged or penalized, but the constitution envisioned ten years to complete your job. If you don't complete it, then you go down under the Governor in an executive department and finish it. Thank you.

Delegate Limes yield the floor to Delegate King.

Delegate King: Mr. Chairman, based on the Public hearing, the land management or the land commission stated that their job has not been completed due to lack of funds, also the lands and survey. If we're going to transfer this MPLC without having the Legislature assist the function of this agency we are just going to transfer the incomplete job, I think we're going to end up with lots of problems....

The Chair recognized Delegate Nabors on point of information.

Delegate Nabors: Mr. Chairman, did MPLC indicate how many years they need to finish their job?

Delegate King: They did indicate, but ....

Delegate Nabors: May I ask how many years they needed to finish their job?

Delegate King: The flexibility that they ask that the Legislature should have the authority to review and assist whether or not they complete the job. One example, like here at the Con Con, we're give 30 days, but we didn't complete it in 30 days. Then we asked the Legislature to grant us an additional 5 days. So let the Legislature have that flexibility. I don't think that the delegates here should come up with a specific date and say that MPLC is going to finish within 10 days. I think the Legislature should be given the authority to make an assessment and see whether such agency should be closed appropriately or accordingly.

The Chair recognized Delegate Nabors on point of information.

Delegate Nabors: How much is the current budget of MPLC?

Delegate Mafnas: For the current fiscal year?

Delegate Nabors: Yes.

Delegate Mafnas: \$2 million.

Delegate Nabors: How much do they need?

Delegate Mafnas: \$2 million.

Delegate Nabors: I'm sorry. I thought Delegate King indicated that they have not or that they are behind in their work because of lack of budget. My question is, how much budget do they need?

Delegate King: I'm not saying that they're lack of budget. I'm saying that the Land Management or the Land Commission and the Lands and Survey. Those are the agencies that lack budget and they cannot complete their function.

The Chair recognized Delegate Torres on point of information.

Delegate Torres: Yes, Delegate King is so concern about flexibility. Well, if you look at (f) carefully, there is the flexibility there for at least 10 years, not at most, but at least 10 years. So I believe the flexibility is there. We just have to be decisive whether or not we want this thing terminated. If we say "may", that will show our undecisiveness because the flexibility is there already.

Delegate King: But we have to identify who is the appropriate people or agency to make the decision. And I think that by giving it to the Legislature, it's the appropriate branch to make the decision.

The Chair recognized Delegate Tenorio on point of information.

Delegate Tenorio: The ten years that is written down here is ten years from the inception of this constitution. So what this means is that Public Lands Corporation has three more years of life span.

The Chair recognized Delegate Torres on point of information.

Delegate Torres: Well, that may be the interpretation, but we can stretch that out further because it says here "at least ten years". It doesn't say "at most ten years".

Delegate Mafnas: May I respond to the question posed by Delegate Nabors as to how many more years do they need to accomplish their job? According to MPLC in addition to the remaining years, they will require approximately 4 to 5 more years.

Delegate Nabors: Point of information. What are they doing? And what are they suppose to do?

Delegate Mafnas: Plenty.

Delegate Nabors: "Hafa nai?" Number 1.

Delegate Mafnas: They have about 100 land cases that have yet to be settled.

Delegate Nabors: That's Land Commission's responsibility.

Delegate Mafnas: No, no, not adjudicated, Delegate Nabors. May I proceed and probably when I'm finish Delegate Nabors will cool down? I know it's very hot. Mr. Chairman, I think MPLC has been chastised unjustly. We asked specifically whether the intent of the constitution when MPLC was created is being met. Surely enough the reason for the creation of MPLC was because of land problems that occurred many, many years ago. And when you deal with the land problems, this is one of the most sensitive problems, and people will dislike you forever should you decide contrary to their expectations. It's a sensitive matter or issue and I think they have been unfairly chastised. I am also a strong proponent to dissolve MPLC immediately. My reason for that was that I was ignorant of the problems that they are encountering of the complexity of the problems. However, after reviewing their reports and listening to their testimonies, I agree that perhaps a good compromise rather than to extend the life of MPLC to five more years will be to reduce the requirement of votes in the Legislature wherein MPLC will be dissolved or the functions will be transferred to the executive branch. It was stated during public hearings that they will not have any problem if it is let to continue its functions as stated in the constitution ten years after the effective date of the constitution. I would strongly oppose the provision where it says that it will require 2/3 votes of the legislature because I know that 2/3 will be almost, if not impossible, to obtain. I urge the members and I know that Delegate Nabors is concern about this and some of you are perhaps equally concern -- I believe that on the tenth year if the legislature sees or there is continuous public outcries that MPLC continues to abuse its authority and continues to ignore its duties and responsibilities, I'm sure that the Legislature will act accordingly and we will be able to get a majority vote rather than 2/3 votes. I know that some of the practices of MPLC are not acceptable to many of us. For example, Delegate Nabors indicated about the appraisal report. They could have gotten the appraiser over from Honolulu to here rather than to send nine members to Honolulu. Fellow delegates, I agree with that. I know that some of the problems are there in MPLC -- are not really problems, but personality problems. Some of the people in MPLC you cannot talk to. They think that they own the place. but let's not base our decision on that that just because they are the people that are not acceptable to us. The corporation is doing its best. Reports are issued on annual basis. And I ask the members to leave MPLC as

stated in the constitution and let the legislature decide on the 10th year. If MPLC must be transferred, I am sure that the Legislature will decide accordingly. Thank you.

The Chair recognized Delegate Limes.

Delegate Limes: (inaudible) of the action of the members of the MPLC. (inaudible) the Carolinian people that were denied public lands for so long. Again, the experience that happened not too long ago but exchanging some of the land on Tinian versus some of the very, very high (inaudible) of land on the island. This is one reason why perhaps the members should be scrutinized. The MPLC itself has a commission (inaudible) the intention is okay. But some of the actions they have taken is very wrong. And hopefully that this thing will never happen again. I appreciate the second paragraph of the committee recommendation of their understanding of how (inaudible). I sat in that public hearing as an audience and I saw a friction between one agency of the government versus MPLC. It shows that there is no cooperative effort between these two agencies. Why? Perhaps it must be attitude (inaudible), but again because of their comments made it seems that one agency is much powerful than the other. The agency which the (inaudible) for information or other needed response. It seems as it's no longer in existence. I don't mind the (inaudible) if the word of these people are really honest to goodness. I have lots of friends who have been talking to me last night whether the abolishment of MPLC is done -- I said not yet. It hasn't been put up to first reading yet. They said throw that out. I said, wait a minute, it's not that easy because there are other things that have to be done. Mr. Chairman, I will just be kidding myself if I support this committee recommendation because it bothers my conscience. I will not vote for this committee recommendation. Thank you.

Chair Manglona: Delegate Limes, the discussion we are having now is on the proposed amendment by Delegate Nabors. So let's limit our discussion to that proposed amendment. I just would like to clarify that. Delegate Inos?

Delegate Inos: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a clarification because I'm not so clear on the amendment. I am sensitive to the needs of the corporation as stated by Delegate Mafnas, however, I would just like to clarify one thing by dissolving within ten years and be placed under the Executive Branch, wouldn't they be able to follow up with the functions that they have? I'm just curious on this. Wouldn't they be able to complete their task under the Executive Branch if they dissolve within three years?

Delegate Mafnas: May I reply to that because I had the opportunity to participate in the hearing? (The Chair recognized him.) they claimed that under the present set up they are independent. The Governor does not interfere with their decision and they also claim that if it's transferred there will be probably political pressures coming from all directions and they indicated that even now (end of

tape). ...and asked how come this is not done. Why don't you go ahead and approve the land exchange. Why don't you go ahead and issue a homestead permit to award homestead lots or give homestead lots? So they feel that with the time that they have they can accomplish whatever unfinished business remaining without the political pressure. Did I answer your question?

Delegate Inos: Yes, Delegate Mafnas. I just happen to think of one thing in terms of transferring their functions, and I'm seriously thinking of the amendment that Delegate Nabors brought up to the floor. I noticed that if they will be transferred under the Executive branch that means that they will be under the Civil Service.

Delegate Mafnas: If they are transferreing to the Executive Branch some perhaps of the positions will be under Civil Service. The Executive Director will not be. Chairman Lizama or Esquire Lizama will not be under the Civil Service, but yes and no.

Delegate Inos: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No further question.

The Chair recognized Delegate Nabors.

Delegate Nabors: Mr. Chairman, I asked earlier and was answered as precisely what is the function of the Marianas Public Land Corporation? I know that they are in charge of issuing homesteads. Now, what else? I have gone through the Constitution very, very carefully and I cannot find a clear, succinct delegation of duty of the Marianas Public Land Corporation. I'd like to have that answer.

Delegate Mafnas: Will you kindly refer that to the former Chairman of MPLC, the acting Chairman?

Delegate Nabors: I'd be delighted. Delegate Tenorio?

Delegate Tenorio: If I can find my copy of the Constitution. One of the more important functions of the Public Land Corporation is the management and disposition of public lands. And that's a very tall order. Also, they work to resolve some of the land problems that occur between the public and the government where a lot of -- I'm sorry between the private and the government where a lot of people are claiming lands that they own previously, previous to the war or after the war, land problems that haven't been solved yet. The Legislature is giving the Public Land Corporation more functions to perform. They passed a law on the homestead compensation act and the homestead act as well as the homestead waiver act. A lot of these -- there may be other functions that may be provided by the Legislature in order to solve some of the unique land problems of the Commonwealth.

Delegate Nabors: Thank you, Delegate Tenorio.

The Chair recognized Delegate Lizama.

Delegate Lizama: Mr. Chairman, maybe I could expound on the answer that was given by Delegate Tenorio. Delegate Tenorio mentioned the most significant function of the Marianas Public Land Corporation - the two categories. The Management and the disposition of public lands. In the category of Management, Public Land has leases that it has to manage. It also has permit grants that it has to manage. In the category of disposition, Public Land has to be involve to a great extent in land exchanges for public purposes. That may be questionable at times. Now with respect to disposing public lands for the use by the government, government units -- unit orgnizations, public land has that function. So if an agency, for example, makes a request for a public land so that it could build its empire then Public Land would see that that will be a necessary thing to provide. In the acquisition for the, for example, the Rota road projects, that's another area where it actually falls under land exchange program because it's for public purposes. But it certainly falls under the so-called "disposition" because we have to dispose public land in order to acquire private lands. In a situation where it involves short exchange matters -- this is where private individuals have acquired a vested interest in a contract situation and Public Land has to deal with that. In a short exchange situation, the private individual was offered five hectares and he was not given five hectares. Now Public Land is going through the process of trying to accomplish or fulfilling the contractual obligation that the former government had entered into. Now the other one is the -- this is a very touchy issue now, and Delegate Limes expressed his concern on that matter, the taking of private lands 25 years ago, 30 years ago, 35 years ago and now people are coming back after having failed to make a claim on their land takings. Now that is really an aread that this convention wasn't able to deal with, but the same time the government hasn't been able to deal with except for the law that was passed on the homestead compensation act. You're aware of that. And that's part of the function of the Marianas Public Land Corporation.

Delegate Nabors: Thank you, Delegate Lizama and Delegate Tenorio. Colleagues, if you listen very carefully -- at the delineation of responsibilities of the Marianas Public Land Corporation, it will be abanduntly clear to you that there is no way and not ten years, not twenty years, not thirty years that they can ever complete their job -- the Management and dispostion of public lands. My God, that could last for a hundred years. So who are we fooling? We are spending \$2 million a year for that? I'll take a contract for a less than a third and do twice as good. Now, the resolution of land problems as was explained in the public hearing is the responsibility of the land commission. Every time I've gone to the MPLC with a land problem I'm told promptly that we didn't create that problem. the problem was created before we got here and it is not our responsibility. Go to the Land Commission. I even recommended that they should have the land commission as an adjunct of their activities so that an individual who goes there with the problem can be directed next door. Go next door and explain your problem, they will adjudicate it and come back here and if you found that we took your property, we'll exchange it. No! They are

told, "Oh, you have to go up to Capitol Hill to the Land Commission." That's an additional responsibility and hardship on the people who have problems. They go up to Capitol Hill and talk to Mr. Ruak, Mr. Ruak will say, "Oh, I'm sorry, I don't have budget. I have no surveyors on my staff, therefore, I cannot entertain your problem either." Colleagues, we are spending an enormous amount of money and we are not serving the people with the problem. And we must address this problem in this convention. We cannot sweep it under the carpet and forget it. If we don't, the people are going to blame you and I'm going to help point fingers. Seriously. I've been dealing with these problems since 1965. I wrote a letter to Peter Coleman and told him that he could acquire all the private properties and the roads on Saipan for \$20,000 in 1967. You know what it's going to cost today? Seriously, we must address the land problems in this island. MPLC is not set up to do this. The Land Commission was set up specifically for this purpose. They are not able to do it because the Legislature is not providing budget. Lands and Surveys are busy approving private subdivision maps all day and do no survey for the benefit of the public. In my opinion, if you got \$2 million budget a year you should be able to hire surveyors, but resolving land disputes is not one of your functions. And if the Legislature is continually giving responsibilities to MPLC, it will never, ever be dissolved. Now, you know, a lot of people say, "Well, Nabors, you're just mad because MPLC didn't give you \$5 a square meter for your land in Tinian." Well, let me tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen, there are six landowners remaining and we have just received an offer of \$12 a square meter. So thank God for Romisher. I doubled my money.

Delegate Pangelinan: Who paid you that \$12, the government?

Delegate Nabors: The Government is going to exchange lands and they will be sold for \$12 a square meter.

Delegate Pangelinan: Everybody got that deal too.

Delegate Nabors: Right. I didn't tell the military to come in and take my land in Tinian.

Delegate Mafnas: Oh, you have a land in Tinian?

Delegate Nabors: Oh, yes. Bula. I detest the fact that MPLC employees as well as employees of other public corporations are receiving salaries disproportionate to salaries received by other employees....

Delegate Pangelinan: Mr. Chairman, are we still discussing the amendment?

Chair Manglona: Yes.

Delegate Pangelinan: Does that have any substance to the amendment?



Delegate Nabors: I want them to be dissolved in three years so we can save public money. Yes.

Delegate Pangelinan: Mr. Chairman. (The Chair recognized her.) I understand the complexity involve with the responsibilities of the Marianas Public Land Corporation. Whether the Corporation at the end of ten years is dissolved and the Executive Branch assume the responsibilities of land, it still doesn't guarantee that the Executive Branch will do a better job. I still feel safer with the present system where there is board of directors, at least.

Delegate Nabors: Thank you. May I continue now, Mr. Chairman?

Chair Manglona: Yes, you may.

Delegate Nabors: I am distressed over the fact that when the Tinian land money came out, the employees of MPLC all increased their salaries and got themselves a four year contract up through 1988 in the event that the Legislature was going to abolish their positions. If they get a toothache, they have a private insurance plan. They can get on the plane and go to Guam and get the dentist down there to look into their mouths. Other government employees, no way. At my expense? I go into the MPLC office and they say, "hafa?" "Hafa na hafa." Good Morning, Mr. Nabors, what can I do for you. "Karahu". I'm paying your salary. There were many instances where the MPLC has done good work. And I applaud them for the job they are doing in the homesteading area. While on Rota, my heart was just thrilled of the good job that Delegate Mundo is doing down there. On Tinian, the homesteading program is very excellent, but the first con con thought that ten years will be sufficient for them to complete their job and I think it is our responsibility to see to it that it's done. Now if we allow the Legislature to try and muster a 2/3 vote and mind you, in the analysis at page 152 the Governor can veto even after you get 2/3 vote. So where are we? Back to square one. The one compromise that I think might be acceptable, is to also make an amendment on line 19 to strike "10" and insert "12". The effect of that would be to give the MPLC a total of five more years. If at the public hearing they thought they need an additional four or five, let's give them five more years, but absolute cut off. If we do not make an absolute cut off, I guarantee you the third con con would be wrestling with the same problem. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chair Manglona: Delegate Nabors, did you just amend your proposed amendment again?

Delegate Nabors: Yes. On line 19, strike "10" and insert "12".

Chair Manglona: On Page 2?

Delegate Nabors: On page 2.

The Chair recognized Delegate Lizama on point of information.

Delegate Lizama: Delegate Nabors, don't you think the word "must" should be replaced by the word "shall"?

Delegate Nabors: Alright.

Delegate King: Point of information. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make correction that the joint committee amended the 2/3 to simple majority.

Chair Manglona: Is that in this committee recommendation?

Delegate King: yes.

Chair Manglona: Would you point out that specific page?

Delegate King: Page 2, line 21.

Chair Manglona: That's the one you proposed to delete, Delegate Nabors, on line 21.

Delegate King: So can I...

Chair Manglona: Before I give you the floor, may I ask Delegate Mendiola if....

Delegate Mendiola: I will wait until the main motion is up.

The Chair recognized Delegate Villagomez.

Delegate Villagomez: I oppose the motion to amend, and I move to the previous question.

The motion was seconded.

Chair Manglona: It's been moved and seconded that we entertain the previous question. Let me get this straight again. Delegate Nabors proposed to amend Committee Recommendation No. 60 on page 2, line 19, the word "10" should be "12" and the word "may" should be changed to "shall". On line 20, the word "may" to "shall" and on line 21, insert a period after "government" and delete the rest of that sentence.

The Chair recognized Delegate Lizama.

Delegate Lizama: Before we vote on this amendment, I just would like to say just one thing. (The Chair told him to make it brief.) I think I will not oppose the amendment for the reason that I have some experience that indicate to me that I think five years will be sufficient for most of the MPLC work to be accomplished.

The motion on the amendment was voted on by voice vote. There was a division. The Chair called for the raising of hands (twice). The motion was defeated by one vote. Delegate Mafnas requested for a five minute recess.

The Committee of the Whole reconvened after five-minute recess.

Delegate Nabors: Question to the Committee on Personal Rights and Government Institutions. (The Chair recognized him) Mr. Chairman, I'd like to direct my attention if I could please to page 4, beginning on line 18. "The corporation shall receive all monies from public land...and shall transfer these monies after the end of the fiscal year to the Marianas Public Land Trust." Question: Why are you going to hold these public funds for the end of the fiscal year?

Chair Manglona: Are you addressing that to the Committee on Governmental Institutions or the Personal Rights and Natural Resources?

Delegate Nabors: Masea.

Delegate Mafnas: Will you kindly address that to the former chairman of the Public Land Corporation? Or acting Chairman?

The Chair recognized Delegate Tenorio.

Delegate Tenorio: I'm not a chairman, Delegate Mafnas.

Delegate Mafnas: Acting.

Delegate Tenorio: I'm not acting either.

Delegate Mafnas: Former.

Delegate Tenorio: I'm just a member. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that the corporation should retain the money that it receives from the Public Lands until the end of the fiscal year so that they can make plans for the following fiscal year. Thank you.

Delegate Nabors: May I continue, Mr. Chairman? (The Chair recognized him) Could I find out how much money -- well, I guess the first question is, are there funds received from the rental of public lands sufficient to sustain the MPLC?

Delegate Tenorio: No. Not what they are receiving now. They may have left over money from previous years, but not at the present time. Not the rate that they are getting money in. They have lots of projects. The homestead development projects cost a lot of money just for planning.

Delegate Nabors: This homestead development project a new activity?

Delegate Tenorio: No, it is not. The corporation has been in this project since its inception. But they are continuing to open up lands for the people of the Northern Marianas. As you know, they have increased the homestead lots in Tinian. And also, they are trying to increase the homestead lots in Sinapalo in Rota and they

are opening up a new homestead subdivision in DanDan area and they are going to increase the number of lots in Koblerville. They are opening up homestead subdivisions at Kagman and also they are developing more lots at Capitol Hill and Navy Hill and also above Mihaville. There are a lot of projects that the MPLC is undertaking right now.

Delegate Nabors: Delegate Tenorio, do you think these could be finish in five years?

Delegate Tenorio: I am not a prophet. I cannot see the future.  
(Laughter)

Delegate Nabors: One final question, Delegate Tenorio. Could I direct your attention to page 5, lines 6, 7, 8, and 9 and ask if you could explain at least that language for us? What does it mean?

Delegate Tenorio: We are trying to remove this from this proposal.

Delegate Nabors: I'm sold. I'll help you. I'm sold.

Chair Manglona: Do I hear a second to that motion?

The motion was seconded.

Delegate Tenorio: I think somebody else is going to make a recommendation here that will be more comprehensive.

Delegate Nabors: thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have no further questions.

The Chair recognized Delegate Mendiola.

Delegate Mendiola: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On page 4, lines, 12, 13, and 14, will this be against the coastal resources management?

Delegate Mafnas: Perhaps the question is, will it be in conflict with the authority given to the Coastal Resources Management?

Delegate Mendiola: Right.

Delegate Tenorio: Is that your question? Will it be in conflict with the Coastal Resources Management?

Delegate Mendiola: In conflict with the Coastal Resources Management.

Delegate Tenorio: I think that the Coastal Resources Management does not allow permanent structures within the 150 feet of the high water mark. We are trying to give this authority to Public Land so that only in public land areas they will have that authority. We are also trying to give them flexibility of allowing permanent structures if it is for public purpose only.

Delegate Mendiola: On the same page, page 4, lines 7 and 8, would you give us the reason why -- I mean, this is to the committee, why it was changed from Legislature to five directors?

Delegate Tenorio: I think that the public land and the board of directors in their deliberation could make decision on this aspect of public lands. The staff have the expertise to make determinations on these and make recommendations.

Delegate Mendiola: Did the committee ask the Legislature too?

Delegate Tenorio: No.

Delegate Mendiola: So you based the committee's decision by just asking the MPLC?

Delegate Tenorio: Yes. We're amenable to changes.

Delegate Mendiola: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair recognized Delegate Reyes, but he yielded the floor. He then called upon Delegate Villagomez.

Delegate Villagomez: I was going to respond to the question, but if the answer given by Dr. Tenorio was adequate then I have no answer.

Delegate Mendiola: It is adequate, Mr. Chairman. I'm coming up with an amendment.

The Chair recognized Delegate Pangelinan.

Delegate Pangelinan: I would like the committee to tell me the progress of comprehensive land use plan? If there's any land left?

Delegate Tenorio: The answer to the second question, yes, there is still land leftover. As far as the progress of the land use plan, they are developing budget for that. I think the corporation has probably made plans for that. They are using the fiscal development master plan as a guide to prepare the land use plan.

Delegate Pangelinan: Will this plan be completed, maybe within -- is there any projection as to when this plan will be completed -- probably this year, next year?

Delegate Tenorio: I cannot answer that question definitely. The only thing that I know is that they are working on the plan and they are trying to get consultants to work on it.

Delegate Mafnas moved for the previous question. The motion was seconded. The motion was voted on and carried. Committee Recommendation No. 60 was adopted.