

Editorial

A termite in court

IF THERE is one agency that must constantly balance the public's right to information and the need to protect sensitive documents and information, that will be the court. The CNMI courts, specifically the Superior Court, has so far succeeded in keeping that delicate balance. But one person, even a rank-and-file employee, can destroy that balance to the detriment of both the public and the court. We are concerned this is what will happen if a certain court employee is not transferred to a position least exposed to the public.

Under Presiding Judge Alexandro C. Castro the local press enjoyed access to court records, except those involving juveniles and files placed under seal by court order. With due respect to Castro, who has maintained good rapport with the press since his days as prosecutor and attorney general, we even exercise self-restraint when we get hold of confidential information about certain cases. We have always believed that respect works both ways and that Castro and his staff deserved appreciation for their cooperation with the press.

There is one person in the Superior Court whose rude manner and undesirable attitude toward the press has not changed since the days when the court was still known as the Commonwealth Trial Court. We tried diplomacy, flattery and even indifference, to no avail.

The water went over the pail, so to speak, when the clerk's office was transferred to the old law library. Before they moved, that person told a writer and one from another paper while we were looking at some court files: "Enjoy yourselves, media, because you cannot do that anymore when we moved to the new office."

At the new office, a reporter who was trying to look at some files was told by the same person: "You're always at our backs."

Castro has designated other people to take care of the press's needs. We appreciate the efforts by these two, as well as the other deputy clerks, to help us do our job. The problem is that the problem employee of the court cannot always be avoided, mainly because case files go from one hand to another.

We don't believe that any policy memorandum from Castro can change this person's attitude toward us and the public. We believe that the best thing to do is to assign that person to a position in the judiciary where there is no contact with the public. How about the Law Revision Commission, or the law library (provided that the law clerks are not placed under that person's authority).

We really hope Castro will give that person another job away from us, away from people. For our sake, for the court's sake, for the public's sake.

On My Mind

by Ruth L. Tighe

Last week's column noted that how one votes is nobody's business, but that I would, nonetheless, share how I expect to vote on the 19 amendments to the CNMI Constitution. Doing so would not only give others information about the amendments, but also clarify my own thinking.

Though more than one hundred changes are being proposed, they have been bundled into only 19 amendments - one for each article of the "new" constitution that will result.

Thus, on March 4, only a vote on the 19 amendments will be on the ballot - even though many changes are contained in each amendment.

In last week's column, I wrote that I would probably vote "no" to Amendment #1, and would definitely vote "no" to Amendments #2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. For those interested, copies may be obtained from the paper directly, or from myself. To continue:

I intend to vote "no" to Amendment #7, which amends Article VII, Eligibility to Vote. I have no objection to the one new section added to this amendment that would prohibit anyone convicted of a felony from holding elected office or any appointed office that requires legislative confirmation.

But I do have a problem with the deletion, from this Article, of the provision giving the legislature the authority to define domicile and residence for voting purposes. It was apparently deleted on the grounds that the legislature has already acted on this.

Yet laws can change, and if there is no provision in the Constitution giving this authority to the legislature, an argument could be raised as to whether the legislature even had this authority. A firm believer in "better safe than sorry," I am not comfortable with the deletion.

I intend to vote "no" to Amendment #8, which amends Article VIII, Elections. The proposed amendment would delete the section giving the legislature the authority to define and determine election procedures for the same reason as was used in amendment #7 - that the legislature has already done so. And I have the same problem as I do with the deletion in #7: laws can change, and if there is no provision in the Constitution giving this authority to the legislature, an argument can be made as to whether

the legislature even had this authority to begin with.

I intend to vote "no" to Amendment #9, which amends Article IX, Initiative, Referendum and Recall. While at first glance it seems that the main change to this article makes it easier to recall elected public officials - to which I'd have no objection - a closer reading reveals several problems.

First of all, the proposed amendment would require a recall vote to be put to the voters 90 days after the attorney general certifies it, but puts no limit on how long the attorney general takes to certify it. As it now stands, specific deadlines are set: the attorney general must certify a recall petition in time to get it on the ballot of the next regular general election, or of a special election provided by law.

Secondly, the proposed amendment deletes the phrase "by persons qualified to vote in the Commonwealth" in two subsections because the legislature has defined who is qualified to vote. Once again, as in Amendments #7 and #8, I am uncomfortable with the deletion from the constitution of provisions for legislative authority.

I shall probably vote "no" to Amendment #10, which amends Article X, Taxation and Finance. Mathematics, figures, budgets, are not one of my strong points, and I'd be inclined to merely abstain on this amendment, simply because I do not understand all its implications.

But I am not at all comfortable with the provision, in Section 4, that makes it easier to impose a tax on owner-occupied single family residential, agricultural, or unimproved real property. The proposed amendment would lower the required votes to approve such a tax from 3/4 of the votes cast to a mere majority.

I shall probably vote "no" to Amendment #11, which amends Article XI, Public Lands. This is another of those articles for which so many changes have been proposed - in this case 24 - that it is difficult to comprehend their impact without far more information and discussion.

The amendment would establish a number of "permanent preserves" - a

Continued on page 8



NICK LEGASPI
Editor

Published by PACIFIC STAR, INC.
P.O. Box 5815 CHR8, Saipan, MP 96950
U.S.A.
Tel. (670) 288-0746 • Fax (670) 288-0747

Subscription rates: One year-\$60.00 • Six months-\$35.00
Off island-twice local rates

On my...

from page 4

...d idea, in principle - but I worry about declaring all public land more than 500 feet above sea level a preserve. Wouldn't that include Capitol Hill?

Other parts that make me uncomfortable: the amendment would delete both the requirement that members of the "Marianas Land Bureau" be of Northern Marianas descent, and that they be able to speak Chamorro or Carolinian. Board members would be limited to a single term.

It would also change public land leases to 40 years as a given (rather than the present twenty-five year term).

It would make a number of changes to the provisions for a Marianas Public Land Trust.

The related Schedule on Transitional and Related Matters would void any leases of public land made after August 4, 1995 that did not comply with the requirements of the "new" Article XI.

I intend to vote "no" to Amendment #12, which amends Article XII, restrictions on Alienation of Land. Although the proposed change to Section 5, returning the percent of local ownership required in corporations to 51% is probably good, other proposed changes are not.

The chief concern with this Article is the change of phrase from "void ab initio" to "voidable," which considerably decreases the penalty for violating Article XII.

The amendment also proposes that children be allowed to acquire long term interests in land by inheritance or gift even if they are not of Northern Marianas descent, provided they've been adopted by six years of age.

On the other hand, it would delete all adopted children from the definition, in Section 4, of persons of Northern Marianas descent.

I am not comfortable, either, with the constitutional requirement that a separate office be established to deal with Article XII problems and issues, as the amendment proposes.

to be continued....

* * *

It may be better than a soap opera about the posturing and polemics of the Hillbloom probate case - but there is at least one lesson to be learned as well: the importance of keeping one's will up-to-date. And the more that is at stake, the more important it is.

Land sales, mortgages, etc.

Following are the documents involving real property which were registered with the Court Recorder's office on Jan.15 - 19

Number	Date	Grantor	Grantee	Type
96-0117	1-15	Absalon Victor Waki	Martin G.E. Pangelinan	QC
96-0118	1-15	Charles A. Manglona	Yuichiro Kanimura	L
96-0119	1-15	Yuichiro Kanimura	Yaeko Maeda	L
96-0120	1-16	CTB	Manuel Q. Camacho	R
96-0121	1-16	Manuel Q. Camacho	CTB	M
96-0122	1-16	Edward A. Villagomez	BOS	M
96-0123	1-16	Jessie A. Apatang et al	BOS	M
96-0124	1-16	Melvin M. Manglona et al	BOS	M
96-0125	1-16	Thomas M. Manglona et al	BOS	M
96-0126	1-16	Jerome T. Atalig et al	BOS	M
96-0127	1-16	Jesus W. Torres	BOS	M
96-0128	1-16	Paul A. Santos	BOS	M
96-0129	1-16	Ana M. Rosario et al	Amanda B. Manglona et al	C
96-0130	1-16	Ana M. Rosario et al	Amanda B. Manglona et al	WD
96-0131	1-16	Francisco DLG. Camacho et al	Cathryn C. Villagomez	DG
96-0132	1-16	Auria A. Borja et al	Consolacion B. Muna	QC
96-0133	1-16	Elbert B. Quitugua	Floyd Okamura	QC
96-0134	1-16	Elbert B. Quitugua	Stephen Okamura	QC
96-0135	1-16	BOS	Pedro Tomokane et al	R
96-0136	1-16	BOG	Pedro Tomokane et al	R
96-0137	1-16	Pedro Tomokane et al	BOG	M
96-0138	1-16		Thomas Ramangmau	A
96-0139	1-17	Isabel Cabrera	Ana C. Nahas	PA
96-0140	1-17	Balbino I. Rogolofoi	Kun Il Hong	L
96-0141	1-17	Nancy Reyes	Felixberto Reyes	PA
96-0142	1-17	Felixberto/Nancy Reyes	BOG	M
96-0142	1-17	Ana D. Castro	BOG	M
96-0143	1-17	Elizabeth S. Raman	Jaime Salas	L
96-0144	1-17	US SBA	J. Raymond Carpenter et al	R
96-0145	1-17	CDA	Edwin Hofschneider et al	R
96-0146	1-17	SMI	Global Manufacturing Inc.	A
96-0147	1-17	SMI	Global Manufacturing Inc.	A
96-0148	1-18	C. E. White et al	Douglas Alan Brennan et al	S
96-0149	1-18	Melvin I. Prennan et al	NMHC	M
96-0150	1-18	Ernest Patrick Cruz et al	NMHC	M
96-0151	1-18	Niizeki Int'l. Saipan Co.	Wendy's Saipan Inc.	A
96-0152	1-18	Meridian Land Surveying	Martin Sablan/DPL	Map
96-0153	1-18	Marianas Management Corp.	Hong Seung Bae	L
96-0154	1-18	Eusebio A. Manglona	Martin S. Atalig	WD
96-0155	1-18	Baldobino A. Manglona	Martin S. Atalig	WD
96-0156	1-19	Maria T. Sablan	Juana T. Huffman	DG
96-0157	1-19	Charles D. Jordan et al	Niizeki Int'l Saipan Co. Ltd.	M
96-0158	1-19	MDEVCO et al	Niizeki Int'l Saipan Co. Ltd.	M

Continued on page 9

Document types abbreviations: M - mortgage, WD - warranty deed, DG - deed of gift, DP - deed of partition, QC - quitclaim deed, DS - deed of sale, CC - certificate of compliance, DO - determination of ownership, L - lease, (t) - termination or cancellation, A - amendment, assignment and affidavit, D - deed, decree, E - easement, RM - release of mortgage, ARP - assignment of rental payments, DE - deed of exchange, QCDE - quitclaim deed of exchange, CS - certificate of sale, O - option, OC - option contract, DC - deed of conveyance, CD conveyance deed, DT - deed of trust, EsC - estoppel certificate, J - judgement, O - order, I - injunction, WE - writ of execution, LP - lis pendens, N - notice, DD - deed of final distribution, S - stipulation, WS&L - warrant, seizure and lien, GPD - grant of public domain, CL&M - consolidation of loans and mortgages and DRC - deed of conveyance.

Letters

Guerrero explains amendments

OPEN LETTER TO THE VOTERS ABOUT COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

In the January 19, 1996 issue of the Pacific Star, Ms. Ruth Tighe provided her reasons for voting against Amendments 1 through 6 as proposed by the Constitutional Convention delegates. Ms. Tighe's reasons are, as she says, the product of her own thinking, but they are aimed at influencing voters. For that reason, let me add some facts to the debate.

Amendment #1: Amendment #1 deals with Article 1 on Personal Rights.

Amendment #1 deletes the provision with respect to victims of crime. The Legislature has already provided two laws that protect victims of crime. This is a legislative matter, not a constitutional one. We need flexibility in this area, not the permanence of a constitutional provision. Our constitution should not be littered with legislative provisions. That is why we elect a legislature, and they have done a good job in this area. Ms. Tighe says she will vote against Amendment #1 because of this deletion, but she does not point out any aspect of the protection of victims of crime that needs a constitutional provision, and the Convention found that there was none.

We hope Ms. Tighe will reconsider. The experienced government prosecutor who took the time to testify before the Convention explained that a legislative solution was preferred. The prosecutors are the ones most directly affected by the willingness of victims of crime to come forward. They have day to day experience with this problem. The Convention also heard testimony that a comprehensive review of the criminal laws was underway. When this revision is presented to the legislature, there will be an additional opportunity for the legislature to address any needs for improvement.

Amendment #1 proposes a new provision that proclaims the right to life. This new provision is constitutionally sound and it is broad in scope, protecting life from conception through old age. Ms. Tighe says she is "not comfortable"

with this right to life provision in Amendment #1 that replaces the former narrow provision. She does not acknowledge that if Amendment #1 is defeated, there remains only a provision on abortion that has been declared by the Attorney General to be unconstitutional and cannot be enforced. Ms. Tighe's solution would be to leave the Commonwealth with no protection in this area. The Convention addressed this problem in consultation with all interested parties. The Convention's proposed amendment would provide a framework for protection against abortion as well as euthanasia, assisted suicides, and other life threatening practices. The Commonwealth should have this policy in its constitution.

Your elected Con-Con delegates urge you to vote "yes" on Amendment #1.

Amendment #2: Amendment #2 deals with Article 2 on the Legislative Branch.

Amendment #2 reduces the size of the legislature in order to reduce costs and make the legislative process more efficient. Ms. Tighe says that while she favors reducing the House from 18 to 13, she is not in favor of reducing the Senate from 9 to 6. She provides no reasons for this distinction. The Convention spent a great deal of time considering proposals to amend Article 2. Most of the proposals from the public dealt with this article. The size of the legislature is a matter of considerable importance. The cost of a large legislature is substantial, and there is no indication that a larger legislature does a better job for the taxpayers. The Convention delegates believed that 13 members of the House could provide the necessary representation of the people.

Similarly, the Convention delegates believed that two Senators from each island could do just as effective a job in representing the island interests as three Senators from each island. In the U.S. Senate, two senators from each state perform the same function for the individual states. Even if each of these senators is from a different party, on matters affecting their home state, they typically pull together. So here in the Marianas as well, the Senators from the individual islands will pull together when representing their island interests. Ms.

Tighe does not explain why, if the United States can get along with two senators from each state, the Commonwealth cannot get along with just two senators from each island.

Amendment #2 also provides a four year term and island-wide election for the House. This is a very important change. Our legislature is hampered because its members represent very small areas on Saipan and must run for office every two years. This leads to a budget that includes unnecessary "improvements" in various election districts so that the incumbent members can show, at the next election, that they did something for their constituents. By lengthening the term, we will have lower election costs, more time for thoughtful consideration of legislation from an island-wide perspective, less impact of business lobbyists, and more qualified legislators.

The Convention is proposing an important balancing feature in Amendment #9. If the voters are dissatisfied with the performance of the House members, they can recall them in a special election. Recall is made much easier than under the current Constitution. Only 20% of the voters need to sign a petition, and once the petition has been certified by the Attorney General as having the necessary number of signatures, it goes to the voters in 90 days. This is much more responsive government than we have now. If a majority of the voters disapprove of the job being done by any Representative, he or she will be out of office in six months.

Your elected Con-Con delegates urge you to vote "yes" on Amendment #2.

Amendment #3: Amendment #3 deals with Article 3 on the Executive Branch.

Amendment #3 contains important reforms for the budget process, to ensure that there is a balanced budget based on fair revenue projections. It provides that in the event of a budget impasse, public funds shall be spent in an orderly way for necessary public services. It protects against the exercise of emergency powers by the governor in an excessive way, protects the independence of the attorney general, protects against lengthy appointments of "acting" heads of executive branch departments, and strengthens the provisions for

indigenous affairs. None of these reforms are difficult to understand, and each one responds to the needs of the Commonwealth for a better executive branch.

Ms. Tighe is opposed to these important reforms because the guaranteed budget for the public auditor has been deleted, along with all other guaranteed budgets. She thinks this will make the public auditor a "political football". The Convention delegates considered this viewpoint carefully during their deliberations. They concluded that guaranteed funding does not guarantee independence. Only high quality appointments can do that. The public auditor function is important, but no more so than the attorney general who prosecutes public officials, the public safety officers who investigate crimes, and the courts who hear cases against public officials. None of these agencies have guaranteed budgets.

Your elected Con-Con delegates urge you to vote "yes" on Amendment #3.

Amendment #4: Amendment #4 deals with Article 4 on the Judicial Branch.

Amendment #4 is of great importance. It provides equal status for the judicial branch with the legislative branch and the executive branch. The Commonwealth Supreme Court was created by statute and could be abolished by statute. It is not covered by the current Constitution.

Amendment #4 provides that judges are appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the Senate for an initial term of six years in the Superior Court and 12 years in the Supreme Court. After the initial term, the question whether to retain a judge is put on the ballot for the people to decide. This is a non-partisan question and the judges are not permitted to campaign. This way of deciding whether judges should be retained is used in many places in the States. The current members of the courts proposed this plan and endorse it. The House of Representatives has also endorsed it.

Ms. Tighe says the 12 year term for Supreme Court "seems excessive." But she doesn't recognize that Supreme Court justices generally

Continued on page 6

Torres hits new extension 'Nakamoto' land lease

REPRESENTATIVE Stanley T. Torres said yesterday it was no surprise that Nakamoto Development requested another lease extension from the government for public land after failing to meet their obligations under the agreement.

"It's the same thing that happened last year. Then Nakamoto requested a one-year extension to get his act together. The one year is up, and he still doesn't have it together," Torres said.

Nakamoto Development, and earlier Nakamoto Enterprises, has sought to build a nineteen-storey hotel resort on public beachfront property in the Garapan Samoan Housing Area for over five years.

Torres has long claimed that Nakamoto is just a broker who does not have the necessary resources to ensure the completion of the project. Torres said Nakamoto happened upon the project by chance while working as a bank clerk in Japan, and is attempting to use CNMI public land means for personal riches without investing his own capital.

Torres reiterated his concerns for the government dealing with such a middleman.

"If anything goes wrong, Nakamoto personally does not have the assets to guarantee the project. Meanwhile, prime beachfront property is tied-up without any benefit to the public," Torres remarked. "If our government insists on building a hotel there, then we should work directly with a reputable hotel organization. Let's go to the people who have the money, the same group that Nakamoto seeks."

"You think our government would have learned something from Nakamoto's failures in the past," he said. "This is just like the AIBIC fiasco which wasted prime public land in San Antonio for years."

Torres, who has recommended that Nakamoto use private property for the project, has also objected to the environmental impact of the proposed 450-room on the small piece of property located in the heart of Japan.

He pointed out that the public land in San Roque which is leased to World Corporation is sitting idle and would also be a good location for Nakamoto's proposed project.

Letter... from page 5

have experience in the Superior Court before they are elevated to the appellate court. They have to survive an initial six year term in the lower court, and can be replaced after that term if they are not performing well. It is important for the Commonwealth to have stability on the appellate court and to encourage consistency in decisions.

Ms. Tighe also worries about the ballot question on retaining judges becoming a "popularity contest". But she should concede that allowing the people to determine whether a judge should be retained serves important interests in a democracy. The voters should have a say in the choice of all officials who make important decisions affecting the public welfare. Elections also foster the independence of the judiciary, who are retained by the people and who are not obligated to officials in the executive branch or the legislature.

The proposed amendments to Article 4 place rulemaking power with respect to the judicial branch in the Supreme Court. This means that the three justices of the Supreme Court can approve rules for the admission and discipline of lawyers, the duties of court officials, and administrative matters for the courts. This is no breach of the separation of powers of the three branches. The legislature has a similar right to make its own rules. For example, Article 2, Section 5(b) provides that bills are confined to one subject except appropriation bills. But the way the legislature goes about complying with that requirement is up to it, and is not subject to judicial review. Similarly, under Article 2, Section 13(a), each house of the legislature is the final judge of the election and qualifications of its members. This is not subject to judicial review unless the legislature allows it. Ms. Tighe thinks that allowing the courts to provide for their own rules is a reason to vote against Amendment #4. She says that the states do not do it this way. That is wrong.

Your elected Con-Con delegates urge you to vote "yes" on Amendment #4.

Amendment #5: Amendment #5 deals with Article 5 on the Washington Representative.

Amendment 5 declares the fundamental importance to the people of the Commonwealth of obtaining representation in the United States Congress. It maintains all the powers of the current Washington

Representative until Congress grants the Commonwealth a non-voting delegate, and provides for an automatic transition when that happens.

Ms. Tighe wants to vote against this provision because the impeachment provision has been moved to Article 2 and consolidated there. She is concerned that if Amendment #2 is defeated, there will be no impeachment available against the Washington Rep. She makes a similar point with respect to the governor and lieutenant governor who are covered by Amendment #3. The Convention was very careful in this regard. It provided in Article 9 an easier way for the people to remove the Washington Rep (and the Governor and Lieutenant Governor) with a recall vote. The Convention delegates intended that most questions about the removal of an elected official would be decided by the people rather than by the legislature.

Ms. Tighe is also concerned about the civil service exemption for the employees of the Washington Rep's office. She says that "having voted 'no' to Article III, that exemption would not now apply unless I also vote 'no' to the amendment to Article V." That is flat wrong. The amendments affecting the civil service are not included in Amendment #3 on Article 3. They are included in a separate Amendment #16 covering only the civil service.

Ms. Tighe is also concerned because the seven-year residence requirement has been deleted and thinks this is a reason to vote against the proposed amendment. The U.S. Supreme Court has been steadily finding such long residence requirements to be unconstitutional and unenforceable. The Con-Con delegates thought that the voters could exercise their judgment responsibly at the polls to decide whether a candidate had resided in the Commonwealth long enough to be a good representative in Washington.

Your elected Con-Con delegates urge you to vote "yes" on Amendment #5.

Amendment #6: Amendment #6 deals with Article 6 on local government.

Amendment #6 revises the current system of local government to give defined and enlarged powers to the mayors and municipal councils over local matters. It specifies that Commonwealth funding for local governments will be kept at the 1996

level for 1997 and 1998, and limits the number of local government employees paid from Commonwealth funds. These changes are quite easy to understand.

Ms. Tighe opposes these important new approaches. She says she thinks this is a large change and deserves more public input. The Con-Con delegates had a great deal of public input. They held hearings on these proposals on all three islands, debated 42 separate proposals on local government, issued reports to the public stating the reasons for adopting certain of these proposals, and had several days of floor debates which were televised. Changes need to be made to our system of local government so that it will work better and be more effective in meeting the needs of the community. The changes proposed in Amendment #6 are practical and directed at specific current problems.

Ms. Tighe refers to the proposed amendment process for the constitution. This allows amendment of the constitution at any time by popular initiative. The Convention delegates propose to make amendment of the Constitution easier by reducing the number of signatures on a petition from 50% down to 30% of the registered voters. The Convention delegates restricted future constitutional conventions so that the next one would be held in 25 years instead of in 10 years as at present. The delegates believed that reliance on the legislature to pass necessary laws and reliance on the people to generate needed constitutional amendments was better than having frequent constitutional conventions.

Your elected Con-Con delegates urge you to vote "yes" on Amendment #6.

Sincerely,
Herman T. Guerrero
Chair, Post Convention Committee

**FOR SALE
FORD
TAURUS**

**1989 MODEL, V-6,
3.8 ENGINE,
COLOR BLACK
\$6,500 or best offer
Call Gil at 235-9441**