

HOWARD P. WILLENS
Law Office of William M. Fitzgerald
P. O. Box 909
Saipan, MP 96950

Tel: 670/234-7241
Fax: 670/234-7530

DATE: February 22, 1996

Number of pages in this transmission: 4
If all pages are not received, please call the number above.

TO: Alicia Guerrero
Fax 235-0842

FROM: Howard P. Willens


MESSAGE

Alicia: Here are some questions for this evening's Govendo show. CAUTION: the individual questions should be cut up and put on separate pieces of paper before they are handed out to willing questioners. We do not want anyone to see the entire list except us.

It may be that Ruth Tighe will back out of the session.

Barbara Hunt called and we will put at no charge three of our ads at the three breaks in the Govendo show.

Let me know your reactions.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Alicia Guerrero', written in a cursive style.

QUESTIONS FOR RUTH TIGHE, PARTICIPANT IN GOVENDO TALK SHOW
February 22, 1996

Q: (In Chamorro) I really believe that we should respect the recommendations of our 27 elected Con-Con delegates.

(In English): Ms. Tighe, do you think that your recommendations to vote NO on nearly all of the 19 proposed amendments should be given any weight by the voters compared to the recommendations of 27 elected delegates from the community?

Q: In a recent article, you said that you oppose proposed Amendment Number 18 because you believed that it made amendment of the Constitution in the future more difficult.

Isn't it true that the proposal makes it easier to get a popular initiative on the ballot?

Do you support the current constitutional provision that requires BOTH a Commonwealth-wide majority and a two-thirds majority in two of the three senatorial districts?

Are you aware that many lawyers think that this provision violates the U.S. Constitution and that is why the delegates proposed a 60% Commonwealth-wide vote to approve all future amendments?

Q: Why have you refused to meet with the staff of the Post Convention Committee despite repeated invitations? Isn't it possible that you might have changed your mind if you had talked to them in advance?

Q: Have you and Mr. Woodruff been conferring together about the articles that each of you is writing about the proposed amendments? Do you and Mr. Woodruff disagree about any of the proposed 19 amendments? Do you have any different views?

Q: Ms. Tighe: in your recent article in Umanidat you criticized our young people who earn a living bagging groceries in our supermarkets. Do you really think that this is a major problem in the community ?

Q: Ms. Tighe: you have opposed Amendment #7, which would bar convicted felons from serving in public office. Do you support having convicted criminals serve in high office, as has happened in Guam?

Q: Ms. Tighe: you have opposed Amendment #10, which would impose a strict program for reducing the Commonwealth deficit. Do you have any better method to propose to reduce the deficit? Do you consider this an important matter for the voters to address?

Q: Ms. Tighe: you have opposed Amendment #6, which would over 7 years limit the spending of Commonwealth funds, raised principally in Saipan, from being used to pay the employees of the Mayors and the Municipal Councils. There are reports that there are about 80-100 employees on both Rota and Tinian who have almost nothing to do.

Do you know whether this figure is accurate?

Why do you think that Commonwealth funds should be used for the salaries of all these people on these small islands?

QUESTIONS FOR STEVE WOODRUFF, PARTICIPANT IN THE GOVENDO
TALK SHOW -- February 22, 1996

Q: Mr. Woodruff: why should we listen to your views as compared with the recommendations of 27 delegates elected from the community, who put politics aside, and worked hard to propose practical solutions for real problems in the community?

Q: Mr. Woodruff: you have opposed Amendment #7, which would bar convicted felons from serving in public office? Do you want convicted felons to serve in public office?

Q: Mr. Woodruff: you have opposed Amendment #10, which would impose a real deficit reduction program? Don't you think it is important to limit government spending, especially in the Executive Branch, so long as we have a deficit here in the Commonwealth?

Q: Mr. Woodruff: why are you opposed to giving each legislator the same amount of money for office expenses? Do you really think it is fair to minority members to give them substantially less than the majority members receive?

Q: Mr. Woodruff: are you opposed to the expansion of the Legislative Bureau proposed by Amendment #2 that would permit the Bureau to hire more and better qualified professionals to help the legislators?

Q: Mr. Woodruff: do you think it is lawful for members of the Legislature to use public funds to pay the utility bills of their constituents? Is this practice presently prohibited by law?

Q: Mr. Woodruff: why do you think that each legislator needs \$200,000 or more for office expenses each year? Are you aware of any legislator since 1985 who has ever hired a lawyer or other professional with the money made available for office expenses?

Q: Mr. Woodruff: why do you think the voters rejected House Legislative Initiative 9-1 last November that would have given each legislator \$200,000 or more for office expenses?

Q: Mr. Woodruff: do you think that Commonwealth funds should be used to pay for the salaries of the employees of the Mayors and Municipal Councils who have nothing to do with the delivery of Commonwealth public services? Don't you think that some limitation should be placed on the use of Commonwealth funds for these purposes? Do you know how many people are employed by the Mayors and Municipal Councils in the three senatorial districts?