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class actions moot. This creates an incentive for each class counsel to obtain a quick settlement of the case without an opportunity for the defendant to play the various class counsel against each other and drive the settlement value down. The loser in this system is the class member whose claim is extinguished by the settlement, at the expense of counsel seeking to be the one entitled to recovery of fees.

Our bill is designed to prevent these abuses by allowing large interstate class action cases to be heard in federal court. It would expand the statutory diversity jurisdiction of the federal courts to allow class action cases involving minimal diversity—that is, when any plaintiff and any defendant are citizens of different states—to be brought in or removed to federal court.

Article III of the Constitution empowers Congress to establish federal jurisdiction over diversity cases—cases where citizens of different States. The grant of federal diversity jurisdiction was premised on concerns that state courts might discriminate against out of state defendants. In a class action, only the citizenship of the named plaintiffs is considered for determining diversity, which means that federal diversity jurisdiction will not exist if the named plaintiff is a citizen of the same state as the defendant, regardless of the citizenship of the rest of the class. Congress also imposes a monetary threshold—now $75,000—for federal diversity claims. However, the amount in controversy requirement is satisfied in a class action only if all of the class members are seeking damages in excess of the statutory minimum.

These jurisdictional statutes were originally enacted years ago, well before the modern class action arose, and they now lead to perverse results. For example, under current law, a citizen of one state may bring in federal court a simple $75,001 slip-and-fall claim against a party from another state. But if a class of 25 million product owners lives in all 50 states, the class is collectively worth $300 billion against the manufacturer, the lawsuit usually must be heard in state court.

This result is certainly not what the Framers had in mind when they established federal diversity jurisdiction. Our bill offers a solution by making it easier for plaintiff class members and defendants to remove class actions to federal court, where cases involving multiple state laws are more appropriately heard. Under our bill, if a removed class action is found not to meet the requirements for proceeding on a class basis, the federal court would dismiss the action without prejudice and the action could be refiled in state court.

In addition, the bill provides a number of new protections for plaintiff class members including a requirement that notices sent to class members be written in "plain English," and provide essential information that is easily understood. Furthermore, the bill provides judicial scrutiny for settlements that provide class members only coupons as relief for their injuries, and bars approval of settlements in which class members suffer a net loss. The bill also includes provisions that protect consumers from being disadvantaged by living far away from the courthouse. These additional consumer protections will ensure that class action lawsuits benefit the consumers they are intended to compensate.

This legislation does not limit the ability of anyone to file a class action lawsuit. It does not change anybody's rights to recovery. Our bill specifically provides that it will not alter the substantive law governing any claims as to which jurisdiction is conferred. Our legislation merely closes the loophole, allowing federal courts to hear big lawsuits involving truly interstate issues, while ensuring that purely local controversies remain in state courts. This is exactly what the framers of the Constitution had in mind when they established federal diversity jurisdiction.

I urge each of my colleagues to support this very important bipartisan legislation.
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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, earned scholarship, 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 1946. 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 presidency of 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.
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Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, for the past year, the energy markets in California have been in a state of turmoil that has produced periodic blackouts, soaring prices for electricity and natural gas and a deep uncertainty about energy supplies for the future. In addition to those serious concerns, there have been a wide range of charges that energy suppliers are engaging in illegal collusion to fix market prices and gouge consumers.

Earlier this year, on January 22nd, I asked the General Accounting Office, our non-partisan and highly professional source for detailed information on many subjects, to investigate what was happening in California and to provide an overview of information on prices and impacts on consumers, producers and electricity providers. I also requested information on the causes of price increases and problems with the reliability of energy supplies. Finally, I requested evaluation of actions taken by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the state of California, and other parties involved.

Although GAO has been able to provide preliminary information regarding California’s supply, demand, and market problems, there has been a significant problem in obtaining the detailed market information necessary for comprehensive analyses or evaluation. GAO interviews with these market participants have yielded only general information and it is unclear at this time whether FERC has in its possession comprehensive market data.

In short, Mr. Speaker, at a time when Congress is wrestling with the complex and highly technical issues involved in both the California market and national energy supply, our own expert agency has limited access to the information it needs to provide analysis of what is happening and recommendations on what should be done to change federal laws and regulations.

In creating the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) in 1977 under the Department of Energy Organization Act, Congress did not explicitly address the Comptroller General’s (GAO’s) authority to request and subpoena information from any body subject to FERC jurisdiction. Today, I am introducing legislation to correct this problem by making clear that the GAO and the Comptroller General have the authority to request