1995, under a unanimous-consent request.

The Civil Justice Reform Act of 1990 set up two programs to study various innovative programs in court management. One program involves so-called pilot courts, and the other involves what are referred to as demonstration districts. Those court programs were originally established for a 3-year period, with the studies conducted over a 4-year period and the resulting reports transmitted to Congress by December 31, 1995. The Rand Corp. has been carrying out the study of the pilot courts, while the Federal Judicial Center is conducting the study of the demonstration districts.

Last year, the pilot court programs were extended for an additional year, and the Rand Corp. received a 1-year extension for its study of those courts. That extension was included in the Judicial Amendments Act of 1994. Through an oversight, however, no extension was included for the demonstration districts.

S. 464 would grant the same 1-year extension for the demonstration districts as was granted for the pilot courts. This will make the two programs and their studies consistent so that the final reports can be directly compared. That was the intent behind the deadlines that were established when the two study programs were set up. This legislation will restore that end. Also, the extension of the deadline will improve the study, since more cases will be complete and included in the study.

Finally, this 1-year extension will entail no additional cost since the demonstration districts are planning to continue the programs under study in any event. S. 464 represents a sound judicial housekeeping proposal and I urge my colleagues' support for it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from California in supporting this bill, because it will help our Federal courts achieve greater efficiency and effectiveness.

The demonstration program that is the subject of this bill, involves five Federal district courts, that have been experimenting with various case management systems, and forms of alternative dispute resolution, since the program was established 4 years ago. At the same time, there is a parallel pilot court program, which is testing certain principles of litigation management and cost-and-delay reduction. These programs are testing a number of systems, in a manner that will permit the Federal judiciary to compare their relative effectiveness.

As the gentleman from California has explained, we extended the pilot program last year for 1 additional year, with a 1-year extension for the study that will evaluate that program. We inadvertently failed, however, to grant a similar extension to the demonstration program. This bill will restore the demonstration program to the same time line that applies to the pilot program, making the two programs more directly comparable, and improving the studies of both programs, by ensuring that an additional year of court experience, is included in those studies. Thus, passage of S. 464 will enable our Federal courts to get the full benefit of these studies.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 464.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 464, the Senate bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CLARIFYING RULES GOVERNING VENUE

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 532) to clarify the rules governing venue, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 532

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. VENUE.

Paragraph (3) of section 1391(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking ''the defendants are'' and inserting ''any defendant is''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 532 which is a technical corrections bill that was introduced by Senator HATCH and passed the Senate on March 30, 1995, under a unanimous-consent request. It is based on a proposal by the Judicial Conference of the United States to correct a flaw in a venue provision, section 1391(a) of title 28 which governs venue in diversity cases. Section 1391(a) has a fallback provision—subsection (3)—that comes into play if neither of the other subsections confers venue in a particular case. Specifically, subsection (3) provides that venue lies in ''a judicial district in which the defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction at the time the action is commenced, if there is no district in which the action may otherwise be brought.''

The defect in this fallback provision is that it may be read to mean that all defendants must be subject to personal jurisdiction in a district in order for venue to lie. Under this reading, there would be cases in which there would be no proper venue. S. 532 would eliminate this ambiguity and I urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has explained the purpose of this bill, a technical amendment to ensure that in multidefendant cases, there is at least one Federal district where venue is proper.

The problem with the venue statute as it is currently written is that it is possible to read the language in such a way that there could be no Federal district court where venue is proper in some multidefendant cases. This bill resolves the ambiguity in that language, and ensures that venue requirements will not defeat the ability to bring a civil action in Federal court if subject matter and personal jurisdiction are available.

The Judiciary Committee heard testimony on behalf of the Judicial Conference of the United States supporting this bill. Having identified the ambiguity in the current venue provisions, it is important that we amend the language to ensure that there is at least one Federal district court where venue is proper in multidefendant cases. S. 532 achieves that end, and I urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill S. 532.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 532, the Senate bill just considered.