DANIEL K. INOUYE, HAWAII
ERNEST F. HOLINGS, SOUTH CAROLINA
PATRICK J. LEAHY, VERMONT
TOM HARKIN, IOWA
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, MARYLAND
HARRY REID, NEVADA
HERB KOHL, WISCONSIN
PATTY MURRAY, WASHINGTON
BYRON L. DORGAN, NORTH DAKOTA
DIANNE FEINSTEIN. CALIFORNIA
RICHARD J. DURBEN, LLINOIS
TIM JOHNSON, SOUTH DAKOTA
MARY L. LANDRIEU, LOUISIANA
JACK REED, RHODE ISLAND

TED STEVENS, ALASKA
THAD COCHRAN, MISSISSIPPI
ARLEN SPECTER, PENNSYLVANIA
PETE V. DOMENICI, NEW MEXICO
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND, MISSOURI
MITCH MCCONNELL, KENTUCKY
CONRAD BURNS, MONTANA
RICHARD C. SHELBY, ALABAMA
JUDD GREGG, NEW HAMPSHIRE
ROBERT F. BENNETT, UTAH
BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, COLORADO
LARRY CRAIG, IDAHO
KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, TEXAS
MIKE DEWINE, OHIO

TERRENCE E. SAUVAIN, STAFF DIRECTOR STEVEN J. CORTESE, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6025 www.senate.gov/~appropriations

May 7, 2002

Mr. Brent Madison Reed 1636 Seventh Avenue Huntington, West Virginia 25703

Dear Mr. Reed:

Thank you for your letter regarding the legality of the ratification of the Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and other issues concerning the propriety of the federal income tax. I appreciate learning of your interest in this issue.

Regarding the constitutionality of the 16th Amendment, you may be interested to know about *United States v. Sullivan*, 274 U.S. 259 (1927). In this case a bootlegger was prosecuted for his failure to file an income tax return. He claimed that the privilege against compulsory self-incrimination afforded him a complete defense because filing a return would have tended to incriminate him by revealing the unlawful source of his income. Speaking for the U.S. Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes rejected this claim on the grounds that it amounted to "an extreme if not an extravagant application of the Fifth Amendment." The Court further maintained that "[i]f the form of return ... called for answers that the defendant was privileged from making he could have raised the objection in the return, but could not on that account refuse to make any return at all."

I hope this information is helpful.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Robert C. Byrd

RCB:jw

ROBERT C. SYRD. WEST VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN

DANIEL K. INOUVE, HAWAII
FMIEST F. HOLLINGS, BOUTH CAROLINA
PATRICK J. LEAHY, VERMONT
TOM HARRIN, KOWA
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, MARYLAND
HARRY REID, NEVADA
HERB KORL WISCONSIN
PATTY MURRAY WASHINGTON
BYRON L. DORGAN, NORTH DAKOTA
DIANNE FEINSTEIN, CALIFORNIA
RICHARD J. DURBEN, ILLINOIS
TIM JOHNSON, SOUTH DAKOTA
MARY L. LANDRIEL, LGUIZLANA
JACK REEG, RHODE ISLANO

TED SYEVENS, ALASKA
THAD COCHPAN, MISSIGNPH
ARLEN SYECTER, PENNSYLVANIA
PETE V. DOMENICI, NEW MEXICO
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND, MISSOURI
MITCH MCCONNELL KENTUCKY
CONRAD BURNS, MONTANA
RICHARD C. SHELBY, ALABAMA
JUDO GREGG, NEW HAMPSHIRE
ROBERT F. BENNETT, UTAH
BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL COLORACO
LARRY CRAIG, IDAHD
KAY SAILEY MUTCHISON, TEXAS
MIKE DEWING, OHIO

TERRENCE E. BAUVAIN, STAFF DIRECTOR STEVEN J. CORTESE, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6025
www.senate.gov/-appropriations

May 17, 2002

Mr. Jeffrey A. Burdette 113 Rosehill Acres Scott Depot, West Virginia 25560-9421

Dear Mr. Burdette:

Thank you for your letter regarding the legality of the ratification of the Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and other issues concerning the propriety of the federal income tax. I appreciate learning of your interest in this issue.

Regarding the constitutionality of the 16th Amendment, you may be interested to know about *United States v. Sullivan*, 274 U.S. 259 (1927). In this case a bootlegger was prosecuted for his failure to file an income tax return. He claimed that the privilege against compulsory self-incrimination afforded him a complete defense because filing a return would have tended to incriminate him by revealing the unlawful source of his income. Speaking for the U.S. Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes rejected this claim on the grounds that it amounted to "an extreme if not an extravagant application of the Fifth Amendment." The Court further maintained that "[i]f the form of return ... called for answers that the defendant was privileged from making he could have raised the objection in the return, but could not on that account refuse to make any return at all." I hope this information is helpful.

Further, I realize that my response appears to be delayed. Due to safety measures recently instituted as a result of the anthrax contamination of the mail systems in the Senate and Washington, D.C., please be advised that mail processing is continuing to experience delays. I hope these delays do not unduly inconvenience you.

With kind regards, I am

RCB:jw

PAGE 03

BJ77305L8

2772787 ps: 14 304757272

Sincerely yours,