

jumping through the administrative and judicial hurdles that currently exist in order to be allowed to use their property. It is relief that is long overdue, and which can be remedied through passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I appreciate the support of the bill offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST].

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE REFORM OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

(Mr. MCINNIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I have this opportunity today to talk about the Internal Revenue Service. As we know, it is great gratitude that I express to the White House, and thank the President for changing his mind, thank him for coming on board with this Republican majority here, and frankly being helped by a lot of Democrats, to force reform in the Internal Revenue Service. This is a charge that has been led by the Republican Party. It is a charge that will be seen through by the Republican Party. Now it is a charge that is going to be supported by the White House.

Why do we need reform in the Internal Revenue Service? Because that is one of the few exceptions in the judiciary process in this country where you are assumed guilty and you have to prove yourself innocent. That is one of the agencies the gentleman from Texas, Mr. ARCHER, who should receive lots of merit and lots of commendation for his leadership on this, is going to change.

It is about time that the Internal Revenue Service, when they come to your house, you are assumed innocent until the IRS proves you guilty. There are some other very basic and fundamental reforms that we are going to put through on the Internal Revenue Service. This is a great day for the taxpayers of this country. Finally they are going to have accountability from the Federal Government that works for them.

THE PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS IMPLEMENTATION ACT

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule that was

just considered. I want to thank the Committee on Rules, particularly the gentleman from New York, Chairman SOLOMON, for the very fair approach that has been taken on this bill. The rule will allow full and open debate on a policy dispute of great significance. Again, I offer my appreciation and my support.

What is the policy dispute that is at the center of H.R. 1534? It comes down to this: Do Members of this body want to interfere for the first time with the most basic sorts of local zoning decisions? I say we should not do that, that any problems that exist with local zoning procedures ought to be remedied by State law, not by the intrusion of Federal judges.

I am more than a little bit surprised to see some of my more conservative colleagues throwing overboard their professed belief in Federalism to allow Federal judges to intrude early on in these extremely local matters.

This is not just my view. I do not stand alone in the well of this House. The bill is opposed by the National Governors' Association, by 40 States Attorneys General, including Attorney General Lundgren of California, Attorney General Vacco of New York.

The list goes on and on. It is opposed by the Judicial Conference of America, chaired by Chief Justice Rehnquist of the Supreme Court of the United States; it is opposed by the National League of Cities; by the U.S. Conference of Mayors; by all the environmental groups who, incidentally, are going to double score this bill, because of the significance of what is being proposed. The list of opponents of H.R. 1534 goes on and on. I think it is very important for all of my colleagues to really give full focus to what is being proposed.

I am not sure how anyone could claim with a straight face that this bill is "noncontroversial"; anything but. The manager's amendment represents a decided improvement in the bill, but it does not remedy the fatal flaw. The bill still would let Federal judges interfere with far more local zoning decisions. Think about that. Do we want everything kicked upstairs to the Federal Government, where all decision-making is made here? I think the answer to that is clearly no.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] has expired.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, my substitute, the Boehlert substitute, is the only way to correct that flaw, because it would eliminate the portion of the bill dealing with local zoning laws.

Let me reemphasize what we are talking about. We are talking about local decisions made in local commu-

nities on whether or not, for example, to deny a permit for building in an area, if when that permit were granted it would bring in unnecessary intrusion in terms of heavy traffic, where adequate infrastructure does not exist. It happens in our home towns every single day.

Do we want decisions made for us in our home towns by Washington, DC in every single zoning issue? I think the answer is clearly no, so we have to deal with it in a different way.

We would expedite Federal court access for property owners with a claim against a Federal agency. I think that is very appropriate. I urge support of the rule and support for the Boehlert substitute. I thank the Chair for being so indulgent.

PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 271 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill, H.R. 1534.

□ 1127

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1534) to simplify and expedite access to the Federal courts for injured parties whose rights and privileges, secured by the U.S. Constitution, have been deprived by final actions of Federal agencies, or other Government officials or entities acting under color of State law; to prevent Federal courts from abstaining from exercising Federal jurisdiction in actions where no State law claim is alleged; to permit certification of unsettled State law questions that are essential to resolving Federal claims arising under the Constitution; and to clarify when Government action is sufficiently final to ripen certain Federal claims arising under the Constitution, with Mr. SNOWBARGER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE].

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1534 is about Congress' duty to implement the 5th and 14th amendments to the Constitution. The U.S. Constitution protects individuals from having their private property "taken" by the Government without receiving just compensation.

To file a claim of a violation of that fundamental right, plaintiffs encounter several high obstacles which must be