



### Nabors refutes ConCon story

Dear Editor:

For the first time in thirty (30) years, I find it necessary to correct a grave error in the Monday, Feb. 19th edition of the Variety.

At the public hearing held on Tinian on Feb. 12th, I only raised one (1) issue with regards to the proposed Amendment No. 3.

While your story does not carry a by-line, and therefore I do not know who is responsible for misrepresenting me, for the record I would now like to state that I never mentioned Mayor Manglona's name at the public hearing, therefore I could not have indicated the position of the Mayor regarding various other amendments.

Mayor Manglona is quite ca-

pable of articulating his own position regarding the proposed amendments to the CNMI Constitution.

To my knowledge, Mayor Manglona has never advocated the "selling" of homestead lands - only the leasing of lands by those families who are in financial need.

It is not necessary to misrepresent my views, especially when I have only a phone call away. Also, to avoid confusion and being "bitchy", I will not attend any more "educational sessions" of the Con Con.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. NABORS

### Tenorio on Woodruff, Part II

Dear Editor:

Let me continue with my point about the Senate Legal Counsel's failure to meet his citizen's duties about the criticism's he is now pouring forth.

First, we sent the Senate Legal Counsel notices of our public hearings. The hearing on the Legislative Branch was held on June 22, 1995. I was there. The Senate Legal Counsel offered no views, no testimony, no papers. Other people showed up so we could question them about their views.

The Senate Legal Counsel never offered his views at that time so he could be questioned in public. Speaker Benavente, Congressman Santos, Congressman Hofschneider, and Senator Hocog all came and testified, but no Senate Legal Counsel.

Here's what Senator Hocog told us at that public hearing: "I would like to first say that I am in full support of downsizing the membership of the legislature as currently proposed by this Convention. I'm a proponent of small government... With that, the current size of the legislature and the proposal presented by the Convention, reducing the Senate from 9 to 6, I'm for it." No Senate Legal Counsel there to contradict the Senator in public. I wonder why not?

Second, we sent the Senate Legal Counsel notices of our public meetings at which all citizens were invited to discuss the Constitution. We had many such meetings during and

discussion with the voters where he could be questioned in a give and take discussion. I wonder why not?

Third, we were in session for 60 days, from June 5 through August 3, 1995. We considered the legislative branch at many committee meetings and sessions. Not until very late in the Convention process does the Senate Legal Counsel now claim to have communicated his views to us.

We received only two letters I referred to earlier - one on July 24 and one on August 1. But in any case, why did the Senate Legal Counsel wait until shortly before adjournment to state any views? Where was he for those first 50 days? Our staff when they go to his office to deliver copies of our proceedings say they never can find him in the Legislature building. Maybe extended annual leave?

I hope this paper will publish my letter promptly on Wednesday. I notice that our convention delegates have a hard time getting their letters published when they submit them. My colleague Frances Borja's letter sat on your desk for almost a week before you publish it. You have other letters on the Con-Con that came in before the Senate Legal Counsel's most recent one and that remain unpublished. Yet his letters seem to get published almost as he writes them. Why does that happen?

Sincerely,

HUAN S. TENORIO

Maurice Paruly 2/21/96