

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,005,549,328,561.45. We've added \$7,378,672,279,648.37 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.3 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

FUNDING FOR ALZHEIMER'S RESEARCH

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to appropriate an additional \$200 million to the National Institutes of Health for research on Alzheimer's disease.

More than five million Americans currently have Alzheimer's disease. Today, someone develops Alzheimer's every 67 seconds and by 2050, it will be every 33 seconds.

Alzheimer's is the most expensive disease in America. Unless action is taken, the cost of Alzheimer's will total \$1.2 trillion in 2050, and Medicare and Medicaid spending on Alzheimer's will increase 500 percent.

My mother-in-law battled this disease, so I appreciate how devastating it can be to patients and their loved ones.

The bipartisan National Alzheimer's Project Act (NAPA) was passed by Congress unanimously.

NAPA called for the creation of a National Alzheimer's Plan, which has resulted in some notable accomplishments. However, scientists and researchers must have the necessary funds to carry out the blueprint set forth in the Plan.

Congress provided an additional \$100 million in Alzheimer's research for fiscal year 2014, yet we continue to underinvest.

To address a disease of this magnitude, we must further our commitment by increasing funding for Alzheimer's research by \$200 million in fiscal year 2015.

HISTORICAL RECORD OF POLITICAL STATUS ISSUE IN AMERICAN SAMOA

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, the following information on the political status of American Samoa.

[Press Release, Oct. 2, 2006]

FALEOMAVAEGA TESTIFIES BEFORE POLITICAL STATUS COMMISSION

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that he testified before the American

Samoa Political Status Commission in a hearing held on Saturday, September 29, 2006 at BYU-Hawaii in Laie, Hawaii.

I believe the work of this commission is critical for American Samoa's political future, Faleomavaega said. I am honored to provide input as the commissioners deliberate our political status options.

In my opinion, before we get too far ahead of ourselves in examining our political options we need to look inward to resolve some lingering ambiguities regarding our current territorial status. Currently, American Samoa's political relationship with the United States is governed by the two Treaties or Deeds of Cession signed in 1900 (Tutuila) and 1904 (Manua). These documents provide no clear protections for our culture, no clear guidance for our relationship with the United States, and no expression of political unity between our own islands.

To me, it makes sense that we should address these issues first before we can develop a roadmap for our future. Otherwise, unresolved questions will always remain regarding our internal (Tutuila and Manua) and external (with the United States) political relationships.

One source of ambiguity in these documents is that, in a Samoan context, this was understood to be a treaty of cession, rather than a deed of cession. In the Samoan version of these documents, our chiefs used the term *feagaiga*, which means treaty, but in the English version, the word treaty is never mentioned. To our Samoan chiefs this treaty relationship meant that Samoans would maintain a measure of autonomy the terms of the agreement allowed the U.S. the right to use the land and the harbor, in exchange for providing protection against hostile nations. Viewed as a deed, however, this agreement would have meant that the chiefs were giving over the land as well as their sovereignty over the land. The problem inherent in this ambiguity is that a deed of cession offers our people something less than the sovereign status that a treaty would provide, and in fact the term deed implies ownership of property rather than a sense of the rights and privileges of a sovereign people.

Another source of ambiguity related to these two treaties/deeds is that they were negotiated separately between the United States and each of the island groups. Because these two instruments were two separate acts, by themselves they did not unite American Samoa into one political entity. Therefore, the fact remains that to this day, there is no officially declared political union between the island groups of Tutuila and Manua, only separate understandings with the United States.

Furthermore, despite what others may have said was the understanding in the past, these treaties do not provide for the protection of the basic rights of American Samoa's people. While these two treaties have proven instrumental in providing stability to the people of American Samoa for the past 106 years, the deeds do not cover many of the most basic issues of concern for our people, such as citizenship, immigration, international trade and commerce, national security, marine and communal property rights, or membership in international organizations, to name a few. Rather than being instruments that express some vague obligation on the part of the United States to protect our culture, I see these two treaties as asserting United States sovereignty over our lands and our lives.

While the Deeds of Cession still stand as the basis upon which American Samoa can claim a political relationship with the United States, there is still some confusion even within the United States government as to the effect of these two treaties. A review

of the U.S. Department of State listing of U.S. treaties in force makes no mention of any treaty existing between the United States and the island groups of Tutuila and Manua.

Also, as a current conflict in federal law illustrates, the U.S. Congress has its own problems in defining the U.S. relationship with American Samoa. The U.S. Congress approved these documents under the 1929 Ratification Act (48 U.S.C. 1661). Section 1661 states as follows:

Until Congress shall provide for the government of such islands, all civil, judicial, and military powers shall be vested in such person or persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct; and the President shall have power to remove said officers and fill the vacancies so occasioned. (emphasis added)

Congress did not ratify the 1900 and 1904 Deeds until 1929, and then delegated its constitutional authority to administer the territory to the President, who transferred the administration of American Samoa to the Secretary of the Navy, primarily because the U.S. wished to establish a naval station in Pago Pago Bay.

In 1951, President Truman transferred the administration of American Samoa to the Secretary of the Interior. The transfer of all administrative, judicial, and military authority from the Congress to the President has not been amended since 1929. Notwithstanding this 1929 law delegating authority over the territory to the President, in 1984 Congress passed a bill, signed into law by the President (Pub. L. 98-213, codified at 48 U.S.C. 1662a), that now requires congressional approval of any amendment to the territory's constitution. In view of this new law, several questions and problems are now being raised. First, why does American Samoa now require Congressional approval of any amendments to its territorial constitution when Congress never expressly approved the territorial constitution to begin with? Second, there are several provisions in our territorial constitution that would raise serious constitutional issues that Congress has not yet addressed. In fact, it is questionable if Congress would approve such provisions in light of the U.S. Constitution. Unfortunately, Congress has never fully examined the contradictions between these two statutes.

The question here is whether the territorial constitution should be subject to congressional or presidential authority. If the authority is congressional, the 1929 law should be amended to rescind the authority delegated to the President; if the authority is presidential, the 1984 law should be rescinded and the approval of changes to our constitution should be returned to the complete authority of the President via the Secretary of the Interior. In either case, we have to face the fact that our present constitution and our current measure of sovereignty are nothing more than an extension of the presidential power of the Secretary of the Interior.

As we discuss our possible options in our quest for a greater measure of self-government, where are we now in our relationship with the United States? American Samoa is described as an unorganized and unincorporated territory of the United States. American Samoa is considered unorganized because since 1929 Congress has not officially organized a government for the separate island kingdoms of Tutuila and Manua under one organic act. Our territory is unincorporated because, according to Supreme Court decisions regarding the constitutional rights of insular territories, Congress has never intended to incorporate American Samoa into the Union.