

into one, no less illegal corporation. The head of one of these corporations was originally paid \$200,000 dollars per year—as much as the President of the United States. Reports have come out about sweetheart deals between government contractors and their State government friends, who have access to huge amounts of easy universal service money.

This FCC prompted our inquiry into this issue. As our study continues, it reveals that a number of federal agencies have been given, or discovered on their own, the power to tax.

Congress has given taxing authority to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Because these taxes are within statutory parameters, we have less concern with them than others, but they are still taxes and an important principle is at stake: no taxation without representation. The Constitution gives the taxing power only to Congress. In practice, we see a direct correlation between an agency having taxing authority and the agency overspending taxpayer dollars. Congress must retain the power of the purse.

More egregious examples are those where agencies have spontaneously discovered the power to tax. We categorize the FCC's telecommunications tax as such, and note two taxes, past and proposed, on Internet domain name registration. Mr. Speaker, just when we thought we had protected the internet from taxation with Internet Tax Freedom Act, we discover new taxes right under our noses. The first, sponsored by the National Science Foundation, collected more than \$60 million before a federal judge put a stop to it. The second, under the aegis of the Commerce Department, proposes to charge \$1 per Internet domain name per year. I would like to know what Commerce Department official stands to be voted out of office if he or she sponsors an increase in this tax.

Finally, we note with dismay that the Administration's electricity legislation proposes a tax as high as \$3 billion to be imposed by the Secretary of Energy. Federal agency taxation appears to be a popular trend in some circles.

Washington special interest groups seem to be able to unite around one thing: taking money from taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, special interests who feed at the federal trough are already geared up to accuse the Republican Congress of cutting funding for education and health care if any attempt is made to rein in the FCC. They will cynically frame the issue as a matter of federal entitlements for sympathetic causes and groups.

But the most sympathetic group is the American taxpayer, whose money is being taken, laundered through the Washington bureaucracy, and returned (in dramatically reduced amounts) for purposes set by unelected Washington poohbahs. This is why we must require the FCC, and all agencies, to get the approval of Congress before setting future tax rates.

Should tax dollars be used for federal programs? In what amounts? Or should Americans spend what they earn on their own, locally determined priorities? Requiring Congress to review any administrative taxes would answer this question.

My bill would create a new subchapter within the Congressional Review Act for mandatory review of certain rules. The portion of any agency rule that establishes or raises a tax

would have to be submitted to Congress and receive the approval of Congress before the agency could put it into effect. In essence, the Act would disable agencies from establishing or raising taxes, but allow them to formulate proposals for Congress to consider under existing rulemaking procedures. It is a version of a bill introduced and ably advocated for by Mr. HAYWORTH. He joins me today as a leading cosponsor of this bill.

Once submitted to Congress, a bill noting the taxing portion of a regulation would be introduced (by request) in each House of Congress by the Majority Leader. The bill would then be subject to expedited procedures, allowing a prompt decision on whether or not the agency may put the rule into effect. The rule could take effect once a bill approving it was passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President. If the rule were approved, the agency would retain power to reverse the regulation, lower the amount of the tax, or take any otherwise legal actions with respect to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, the cry of "no taxation without representation" has gone up in the land before, and today we are hearing it again. Congress must not allow a federal agency comprised of unelected bureaucrats to determine the amount of taxes hardworking Americans must pay. While preserving needed flexibility, the Taxpayer's Defense Act will allow Congress alone to determine the purposes to which precious tax dollars will be put.

#### TAXPAYER'S DEFENSE ACT

### HON. J.D. HAYWORTH

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1999

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the Taxpayer's Defense Act, which Mr. GEKAS and I are introducing today, would establish a system to allow Congress, and only Congress, to approve new taxes before they take effect. Before an administrative tax could be imposed on the American people, an agency would submit the rule or regulation to Congress. The Majority Leaders in both the House and Senate would introduce the bill by request. The bill would then be subjected to expedited procedures and the rule could not go into effect until an approval bill was passed by the House and Senate and signed by the President. It is important to note that this legislation would only affect future administrative taxes, not those currently in effect.

I believe the constitutional precedent for this legislation is clear. Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the "power to lay and collect taxes." It doesn't give unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats this power; it gives only Congress this power. Moreover, the Constitution's "separation of powers" doctrine ensures that each branch of government would have one specific duty. By delegating legislative powers to unelected officials, we are allowing the executive branch to become both the maker and enforcer of our nation's laws, which is in direct violation of the Founders' intent. By enacting the Taxpayer's Defense Act, Congress would once again restore accountability to federal taxation and reduce the hidden taxes that are being imposed on the American taxpayer.

While administrative taxation hasn't been used often, it is used increasingly to circumvent the legislative process. One of the most troubling administrative taxes is the Federal Communications Commission tax on long distance telephone service, which is also known as the Gore tax. Every telephone caller in the United States is subjected to this tax, which raises approximately \$2.5 billion annually. Other regulatory agencies are also doing an end run around Congress, including the Commerce Department's \$1 tax on every Internet domain name. The National Science Foundation has tried a similar approach by authorizing a \$30 tax on registration of domain names on the Internet. Fortunately, a federal judge ended this illegal tax, but not before taxpayers shelled out \$60 million. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, through the Agricultural Marketing Service, has also gotten into the game with taxation of food commodities in order to fund advertising a promotion of commodities.

The point is simple: Americans can't hold unelected executive branch employees accountable for administrative taxation. However, Americans can hold their representatives accountable for these taxes if we once again require Congress to vote on all of these administrative taxes. The Taxpayer's Defense Act would achieve this goal.

In December 1773, American colonists boarded three British ships in Boston harbor and emptied chests of tea into the sea. This event, which we all know as the Boston Tea Party, celebrated American opposition to taxation without representation. That is why the Constitution specifically states that Congress shall have the power to tax. I urge this Congress to once again make Congress accountable for all taxation by passing this important legislation.

#### EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH: UNLAWFUL, UNACCEPTABLE, UNNECESSARY

### HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's National Bioethic Advisory Commission recommended the United States government fund the practice of killing human embryos for research purposes. On top of the release of the Commission's report, the Health and Human Services General Counsel has advocated the use of federal funds in using the destroyed embryos for research purposes. Mr. Speaker, funding destructive embryonic research with tax dollars is unlawful, unacceptable to the American people, and unnecessary since recent advancements reveal viable stem cell alternatives in adults.

Mr. Speaker, in 1995 Congress successfully added the Dickey/Wicker amendment to FY 1996 Labor/HHS appropriations bill. Each year since then, Congress has reaffirmed this crucial amendment as part of our law. The Dickey/Wicker amendment prohibits the use of federal funds for the creation of a human embryo for research purposes or for research in which an embryo is "destroyed, discarded or knowingly subjected to risk of injury or death." While HHS has tried to rewrite the current law