Most Americans, probably are unaware that for decades rural letter carriers have used their own transportation to deliver the mail. This includes rural letter carriers who today drive their own vehicles in good weather and bad, in all seasons, in locations that can range from a canyon bottom to mountain top, ocean view to bayou. Rural letter carriers drive over 3 million miles daily and serve 24 million American homes over 66,000 rural and suburban routes. The mission of rural letter carriers has changed little over the years, but the type of mail they deliver has changed substantially—increasing to over 200 billion pieces a year. And although everyone seems to be communicating by email these days, the Postal Service is delivering more letters than at any time in our nation's history. During the next decade, however, we know that will change.

Electronic communication is expected to accelerate even faster than it has in the last five years. Some of what Americans send by mail today will be sent online. According to the General Accounting Office (GAO), that will include many bills and payments. In its study, U.S. Postal Service: Challenges to Sustaining Performance Improvements Remain Formidable on the Brink of the 21st Century, dated October 21, 1999, the GAO reports that the Postal Service's core business—letter mail—will decline substantially. As a result, the revenue the Postal Service collects from delivering First-Class letters also will decline.

While the Internet will eventually reduce the amount of letter mail rural letter carriers deliver, the Internet will present some new opportunities for delivering parcels. Rural letter carriers have for decades delivered the packages we order from catalogs, and now they deliver dozens of parcels every week that were ordered online. For some rural and suburban Americans the Postal Service still remains the only delivery service of choice. Today, the Postal Service has about 33 percent of the parcel business. However, if the Postal Service is as successful as it hopes in attracting more parcels, that could create a problem for rural carriers. Most items ordered by mail are shipped in boxes that, once filled with packing materials, can be bulky—so bulky, in fact, that many rural letter carriers already see the need for larger delivery vehicles.

In exchange for using their own vehicles, rural letter carriers are reimbursed for their vehicle expense by the Postal Service through the Equipment Maintenance Allowance (EMA). Congress recognized this unique situation in tax legislation as far back as 1988. That year Congress intended to exempt EMA from taxation through a specific provision for rural letter carriers in the Technical and Miscellaneous Revenue Act of 1988 (TAMRA). This provision allowed rural mail carriers to compute their vehicle expense deduction based on 150 percent of the standard mileage rate for their business mileage use. Congress passed this law because using a personal vehicle to deliver the U.S. Mail is not typical vehicle use. Also, these vehicles have little resale value because of their high mileage and most are outfitted for right-handed driving.

As an alternative, rural letter carrier taxpayers could elect to use the actual expense method (business portion of actual operation and maintenance of the vehicle, plus depreciation). If the EMA exceeded the actual vehicle expenses, a deduction was allowed only to the extent that the sum of the shortfall and all other miscellaneous itemized deductions exceeded two percent of the taxpayer’s adjusted gross income.

The Taxpayers Relief Act (TRA) of 1997 further simplified the taxation of rural letter carriers. TRA provides that the EMA reimbursement is not reported as taxable income. That simplified taxes for approximately 120,000 taxpayers, but the provision eliminated the option of filing the actual expense method for employee business vehicle expenses. The lack of this option, combined with the effect the Internet will have on mail delivery, specifically on rural letter carriers and their vehicles, is a problem we must address.

Expecting its carriers to deliver more packages because of the Internet, the Postal Service already is encouraging rural letter carriers to purchase larger right-hand drive vehicles, such as sports utility vehicles (SUV). Large SUVs can carry more parcels, but also are much more expensive to operate than traditional vehicles—especially with today’s higher gasoline prices. So without the ability to use the actual expense method and depreciation, rural carriers must use their pay to cover vehicle expenses. Additionally, the Postal Service has placed 11,000 postal vehicles on rural routes, which means those carriers receive no EMA.

All these changes combined have created a situation contrary to the historical Congressional intent of using reimbursement to fund the government service of delivering mail, and also has created an inequitable tax situation for rural letter carriers. If actual business expenses exceed the EMA, a deduction for those expenses should be allowed. I believe we must correct this inequity, and so I am introducing a bill that would reinstate the deduction for a rural letter carrier to claim the actual cost of the business use of a vehicle in excess of the EMA reimbursement as a miscellaneous itemized deduction.

In the next few years, more and more Americans will use the Internet to get their news and information, as well as receive and pay their bills. But mail and parcel delivery by the United States Postal Service will remain a necessity for all Americans—especially those in rural and suburban parts of the nation. Therefore, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill and ensure fair taxation for rural letter carriers.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today, along with my good friends from Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. MORAN, and the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. SENSENIBRENNER, the Class Action Fairness Act of 2001.

The Taxpayers Relief Act of 1997 corrected a serious flaw in our federal jurisdiction statutes. At present, those statutes forbid our federal courts from hearing most interstate class actions—the lawsuits that involve more money and touch more Americans than virtually any other litigation pending in our legal system.

The class action device is a necessary and important part of our legal system. It promotes efficiency by allowing plaintiffs with similar claims to adjudicate their cases in one proceeding. It also allows claims to be heard in cases where there are small harms to a large number of people, which would otherwise go unaddressed because the cost to the individuals suing could far exceed the benefit to the individual. However, class actions have been used with an increasing frequency and in an uncontrolled manner, thereby defeating the interests they were intended to serve.

In recent years, state courts have been flooded with class actions. As a result of the adoption of different class action certification standards in the various states, the same class might be certifiable in one state and not another, or certifiable in state court but not in federal court. This creates the potential for abuse of the class action device, particularly when the case involves parties from multiple states or requires the application of the laws of many states.

For example, some state courts routinely certify classes before the defendant is even served with a complaint and given a chance to defend itself. Other state courts employ very lax class certification criteria, rendering virtually any controversy subject to class action treatment. There are instances where a state court, in order to certify a class, has determined that the law of that state applies to all claims, including those of purported class members who live in other jurisdictions. This has the effect of making the law of that state applicable nationwide.

The existence of state courts which broadly apply class certification rules encourages plaintiffs to forum shop for the court which is most likely to certify a purported class. In addition to forum-shopping, parties frequently exploit major loopholes in federal jurisdiction statutes to block the removal of class actions that belong in federal court. For example, plaintiffs' counsel may name parties that are not really relevant to the class claims in an effort to destroy diversity. In other cases, counsel may file federal law claims or inadequately state the amount of damages claimed to ensure that the action will remain in state court.

Another problem created by the ability of state courts to certify class actions which adjudicate the rights of citizens of many states is that oftentimes more than one case involving the same class is certified at the same time. In the federal court system, those cases involving common questions of fact may be transferred to one district for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.

With these class actions pending in state courts, however, there is no corresponding mechanism for consolidating the competing suits. Instead, a settlement or judgment in any of the cases makes the other
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Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Hugh Lee Grundy, a man who has devoted a lifetime of hard work and dedication to America’s Armed Forces in Southeast Asia. Mr. Grundy is the retired President of Air America, an organization that served a special and undercover purpose for our nation’s Central Intelligence Agency and allied countries in Asia and throughout the world. Hugh Grundy of Crab Orchard, Kentucky spent 50 to 60 years in the active world of aviation, and I am truly proud to stand here today and honor him here in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Grundy was born at Valley Hill, Kentucky on the Grundy family farm, which he now owns and operates. Mr. Grundy raised and showed saddle horses at state and county fairs while growing up. Throughout his schooling, he worked on his family’s farm and showed promise, rising to the position of assistant General Manager. He learned to fly light planes in Central Kentucky in his teenage years. Mr. Grundy attended Aeronautical School in California and eventually became a teacher there. He then worked for Pan American Airlines.

Mr. Grundy faithfully served his country in various capacities for more than 30 years. During World War II, Mr. Grundy served his country as an Engineering Officer and Air Crew Member. He reached the rank of Major in the United States Army in 1943. At the close of World War II, Mr. Grundy exchanged active duty for the reserves and returned to Pan American. Later he was transferred to Shanghai, China to work for the China National Aviation Corporation.

Mr. Grundy served concurrently as President of Air America, Air Asia, and Civil Air Transport from 1954 to 1976. As President of Air America, Mr. Grundy commanded over 10,000 men and women serving in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand. Mr. Grundy came out of retirement twice in order to return to preside over Southern Air Transport, a company based in Miami, Florida.

In June of 2001, the CIA presented Mr. Grundy with two citations, one in his capacity as President of Civil Air Transport and Air America, and one to him personally. This was the second time Mr. Grundy was given recognition by the CIA, the first being a medal for Honorable Service upon the occasion of his retirement from Air America.

Today I rise, Mr. Speaker, to salute Mr. Grundy for his commitment to aviation, his service to our country, and his patriotic leadership throughout the years.