

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

on embryo research, it is clear that Congress has prohibited all funding of "research in which" embryos are destroyed or discarded. Simply stated, the taxpayer funding of research which relies on the intentional killing of human beings would violate the law.

Using federal funds for such an unlawful practice is anathema to the people of the United States. Already eight states have enacted laws that make destructive embryonic research illegal. According to a 1995 Tarrance poll, 74 percent of Americans oppose the use of tax dollars for human embryo experimentation while 64 percent indicate "very strong" opposition. In addition, Bill Clinton, whose commission has not recommended the use of federal funds for destructive embryo research, issued a statement in December 1994 opposing the use of federal funds "to support the creation of human embryos for research purposes." While the American people are quite evenly polarized on the issue of abortion, a majority of the population oppose the use of tax dollars to fund lethal research on human embryos.

Furthermore, scientists have confirmed there is no medical necessity for embryonic stem cell research. Those who thought embryonic stem cells were the only or best hope for organ repair have been proven wrong. Recent advancements have led scientists to consider an alternative, adult-derived stem cells. According to D. Josefson's article in the *British Medical Journal*, new research suggesting that adult nerve stem cells "can de-differentiate and reinvent themselves" as blood-producing stem cells "means that the need for fetal cells as a source of stem cells for medical research may soon be eclipsed by the more readily available and less controversial adult stem cells." The Wall Street Journal article by L. Johannes entitled, "Adult Stem Cells Have Advantage Battling Disease," states that adult "precursor" or stem cells "may prove much more useful to medical science" than cells obtained by killing human embryos—that is, preborn human boys and girls. While scientists used to be concerned that there were no known adult stem cells for some critical organs, Harvard Medical School researcher Evan Y. Snyder now thinks "we will find these stem cells in any organ that we look."

Mr. Speaker, killing preborn babies for tissue harvest is never justified. The logic of this practice is not unlike that of the Third Reich, where torture was rationalized for medical research. It is something no civilized nation should condone, much less fund with the tax dollars of conscientious, disapproving Americans. I defy anyone in this chamber to look me in the eye and say that the deliberate taking of a new life, a unique and growing human being, is a justifiable sacrifice for the curiosity of science. When there are non-lethal alternatives, I defy anyone to tell the American people they have no choice but to pay for these experiments in defiance of their conscience, the law, and the more fundamental principles of human dignity.

## SCHOOL VIOLENCE AND TEEN VIOLENCE

### HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1999

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the RECORD this statement by high school students from my home State of Vermont, who were speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people today. I believe that the views of these young people will benefit my colleagues.

#### REGARDING SCHOOL VIOLENCE

(On behalf of Sarah Mayer, Jessica Normand and Colleen McCormick)

Jessica Normand: Set aside the accusations, the anger and the 20-20 hindsight about the massacre of twelve students and one teacher at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, on April 20th. The fact remains that Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold's disturbed states of mind are the result of problems that our society has a responsibility to acknowledge and change.

This event has broken the already damaged national spirit, but it has brought to our attention the moral decline in American society. The lack of spiritual guidance among the nation's youth that was once thought to be politically correct has only made it easier for young Americans to feel lost. Why did Eric Harris believe so strongly that life held no value, and why did Dylan Klebold feel so alone that he followed the demonic beliefs of his friend? These are the questions America must ask itself. Parents, teachers, administrators, friends, relatives, religious leaders, and especially our government need to take an active role in the lives of young Americans if future tragedies like the one at Columbine High are to be avoided.

Sarah Mayer: Why is it that prayer is forbidden in public schools, yet at the memorial service for those who died in Littleton, the theme of every speech was that the only way to heal such a wound was through faith in God and prayers of the spiritual community?

My fellow classmates and I at Rice Memorial High School are privileged to have prayer in our everyday lives. We feel that teaching kids about their spirituality gives them a stronger moral base to make better decisions throughout their lifetime. An anonymous student from a Catholic high school once said, "We do not kill together because we pray together."

Colleen McCormick: Kids need to be able to differentiate between fantasy and reality. But can they do this when video games like Doom, which teaches children how to kill people, are readily available? In order to curb the availability of those games, greater restrictions need to be placed on the Internet and sale of home games. Although the Internet has a lot faster communication and is an effective learning tool, it has also made unhealthy influences such as pornography and deadly games to be at the fingertips of the young.

The media is another aspect of our society that needs to be more careful about what images they present to children in this country. While freedom of the press is a trademark right of Americans, perhaps that right needs to be restricted in terms of violence and sex.

Our proposal is that legislation be passed to more strictly enforce the age limits at movie theaters, and all television channels be required to rate their shows according to a government rating system.

Jessica Normand: Besides the media and schools, the most important influence every

child has are their parents. As a society, we need to implore all parents to be involved in their children's lives, and to keep track of the outside influences, such as the Internet and the harmful media we mentioned earlier.

Sarah Mayer: Kids need to understand that this isn't a video game, it's life, and there is no reset button.

Thank you.

#### REGARDING TEEN VIOLENCE

(On behalf of Alicia Prince)

ALICIA PRINCE: I am Alicia Prince, here to speak on reducing teen violence.

I think we are all ready affected by what happened in Littleton. It has definitely given me the passion to come up here to say it.

I am originally from East Los Angeles, California, and I experienced firsthand the type of violence that happens throughout our neighborhoods, communities, and in our schools. I think that firearms are a really big part of that, and I think that that should be discussed. I'm not antigun; I understand peoples' rights to carry firearms, private collectors, and households as well. But when they're in the wrong hands, there is trouble, there is a problem there. And a child's hands are the wrong hands, and there is no reason why they should even be accessible.

My specific suggestion would be that there is absolutely no reason why every gun in this country, in this state, cannot be locked up, and ammunition locked up separately. There is no reason to have a loaded gun in your car, in your house. I understand where it is an issue in big cities. But it is not an issue where you have to carry a 9 millimeter strapped to your ankle and walk into a school in Vermont.

I think that this also goes to a deep-rooted problem of the way our parenting is in this society. Too many times, I have seen people perpetuate these cycles of poverty and violence because they just don't know any better. They don't know how to direct children in a different direction, because that's the way they have been taught. I think that mandatory parenting classes are absolutely essential. It is very important, and no harm can be done in it. I think it should be mandatory, and I think it is very important that parents know how to take care of their kids and know how to prevent this from happening.

There is no reason why these kids, especially in Littleton, should not have been—you know, this couldn't have gone unnoticed. Okay? They were in the garage five hours, you know, working on bombs, and they had it written in diaries. This was accumulating for the past year and a half before it was, you know, executed. And I think that that is a direct, you know, obvious thing, that the parenting is just not happening adequately enough.

I am also a ward of the state. I am a foster kid. And all of the foster parents in which I live in their homes, every gun that is in their house and ammunition must be locked up separately. There is no reason it should not be done in every other house throughout this country.

So my two main suggestions would be, really good family counseling. Parents need to know how to create safe families, so that a teenager or a child has a sense of safety and belonging in their home and in school, instead of having to fight or shoot their way out of safety in school or in the community. And I think it is absolutely ludicrous this is happening when we have every power of preventing it.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS. Thank you, Alicia.