

commend Susan Daniels, Kenneth Nibali of the Social Security Administration and the experts from SSA for their willingness to travel from Baltimore to participate in the meeting. I am encouraged by their willingness to consider issuing new guidelines to the personnel in the SSA field offices regarding brachial plexus injuries.

We must work to ensure that everyone who meets the guidelines for receiving SSI has the opportunity to apply for the benefits and be given a fair hearing. I look forward to seeing the new guidelines from SSA, and I am eager to continue working with the Social Security Administration on this issue.●

SEQUENTIAL REFERRALS—S. 225 AND S. 400

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 225 and S. 400 be sequentially referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. I further ask consent that if these bills are not reported out of the Banking Committee by November 2, the bills then be automatically discharged from the committee and placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. I ask unanimous consent that a letter to Senator LOTT relative to the two bills, S. 225 and S. 400, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, October 26, 1999.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LOTT: We respectfully request that unanimous consent be sought so that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs may be granted a sequential referral of the "Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 1999" (S. 400) and the "Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 1999" (S. 255). These bills have been referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, although they contain housing provisions which are under the express jurisdiction of the Banking Committee.

If S. 400 and S. 225 are not reported out by the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs by November 2, 1999, such bills will be automatically discharged from the Committee.

Thank you for your consideration.

PHIL GRAMM,
Chairman, Committee
on Banking, Housing
and Urban Affairs.

WAYNE ALLARD,
Chairman, Sub-
committee on Housing
and Transportation.

BEN NIGHTHORSE
CAMPBELL,

Chairman, Committee
on Indian Affairs.

PAUL SARBANES,
Ranking Member,
Committee on Banking,
Housing and
Urban Affairs.

JOHN F. KERRY,
Ranking Member, Sub-
committee on Housing
and Transportation.

DANIEL INOUE,
Vice Chairman, Com-
mittee on Indian Af-
fairs.

MULTIDISTRICT, MULTIPARTY, MULTIFORUM TRIAL JURISDICTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 341, H.R. 2112.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2112) to amend title 28, United States Code, to allow a judge to whom a case is transferred to retain jurisdiction over certain multidistrict litigation cases for trial, and to provide for Federal jurisdiction of certain multiparty, multiforum civil actions.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Multidistrict Jurisdiction Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION.

Section 1407 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the third sentence of subsection (a), by inserting "or ordered transferred to the transferee or other district under subsection (i)" after "terminated"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(i)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), any action transferred under this section by the panel may be transferred, for trial purposes, by the judge or judges of the transferee district to whom the action was assigned to the transferee or other district in the interest of justice and for the convenience of the parties and witnesses.

"(2) Any action transferred for trial purposes under paragraph (1) shall be remanded by the panel for the determination of compensatory damages to the district court from which it was transferred, unless the court to which the action has been transferred for trial purposes also finds, for the convenience of the parties and witnesses and in the interests of justice, that the action should be retained for the determination of compensatory damages."

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to any civil action pending on or brought on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is about to pass S. 1748, the Multi-District Jurisdiction Act of 1999, and H.R. 2112, as amended by the Hatch-Leahy sub-

stitute during its consideration in the Senate Judiciary Committee. Our substitute amendment is the text of S. 1748, the Multi-District Jurisdiction Act of 1999, which the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and I, along with Senators GRASSLEY, TORRICELLI, KOHL, and SCHUMER, introduced last week. Our bipartisan legislation is needed by Federal judges across the country to restore their power to promote the fair and efficient administration of justice in multi-district litigation.

Current law authorizes the Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation to transfer related cases, pending in multiple Federal judicial districts, to a single district for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings. This makes good sense because transfers by the Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation are based on centralizing those cases to serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and to promote efficient judicial management.

For nearly 30 years, many transferee judges, following circuit and district court case law, retained these multidistrict cases for trial because the transferee judge and the parties were already familiar with each other and the facts of the case through the pretrial proceedings. The Supreme Court in *Lexecon Inc. v. Milberg Weiss Bershad Hynes & Lerach*, 523 U.S. 26 (1998), however, found that this well-established practice was not authorized by the general venue provisions in the United States Code. Following the *Lexecon* ruling, the Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation must now remand each transferred case to its original district at the conclusion of the pretrial proceedings, unless the case is already settled or otherwise terminated. This new process is costly, inefficient and time consuming.

The Multi-District Jurisdiction Act of 1999 seeks to restore the power of transferee judges to resolve multidistrict cases as expeditiously and fairly as possible. Our bipartisan bill amends section 1407 of title 28 of the United States Code to allow a transferee judge to retain cases for trial or transfer those cases to another judicial district for trial in the interests of justice and for the convenience of parties and witnesses. The legislation provides transferee judges the flexibility they need to administer justice quickly and efficiently. Indeed, our legislation is supported by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, the Judicial Conference of the United States and the Department of Justice.

In addition, we have included a section in our bill to ensure fairness during the determination of compensatory damages by adding the presumption that the case will be remanded to the transferor court for this phase of the trial. Specifically, this provision provides that to the extent a case is tried