

H. Res. 565. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the importance of mammograms and biopsies in the fight against breast cancer; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. WALSH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. SABO, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H. Res. 566. A resolution expressing the sense of House of Representatives that the President and the Senate should take the necessary actions to prevent the sale or diversion of Great Lakes water to foreign countries, business, corporations, and individuals until procedures are established to guarantee that any such sale is fully negotiated between and approved by the governments concerned; to the Committee on International Relations.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. DAVIS of Florida introduced A bill (H.R. 4678) to authorize conveyance of each of two National Defense Reserve Fleet vessels to The Victory Ship, Inc., located in Tampa, Florida; which was referred to the Committee on National Security.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 303: Mrs. CHENOWETH and Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington.  
 H.R. 519: Mr. CAMPBELL.  
 H.R. 902: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. KASICH, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. BALLENGER.  
 H.R. 1126: Mr. JENKINS  
 H.R. 1197: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1441: Ms. STABENOW.  
 H.R. 1521: Mr. ROGAN.  
 H.R. 1891: Mr. SPENCE.  
 H.R. 2020: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.  
 H.R. 2450: Mr. BURR of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 2549: Mr. STUMP.  
 H.R. 2635: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H.R. 2733: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, and Mrs. EMERSON.  
 H.R. 2914: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.  
 H.R. 2938: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.  
 H.R. 3032: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. KANJORSKI.  
 H.R. 3081: Mr. EVANS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. QUINN, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. FATTAH.  
 H.R. 3134: Mr. DIXON, Mr. TORRES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALALRD, and Mr. MARTINEZ.  
 H.R. 3234: Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado.  
 H.R. 3251: Mr. MILLER of California and Mr. BILBRAY.  
 H.R. 3448: Mr. OLVER.  
 H.R. 3514: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.  
 H.R. 3572: Mr. BALDACC and Mr. JONES.  
 H.R. 3632: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.  
 H.R. 3792: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 3794: Mr. BENTSEN.  
 H.R. 3795: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 3831: Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 3855: Mrs. HARMAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. GILLMOR, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. DEUTSCH.  
 H.R. 3861: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.  
 H.R. 3895: Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 3925: Mr. TURNER and Mr. LEACH.  
 H.R. 3949: Mr. LAMPSON.  
 H.R. 3990: Ms. STABENOW.  
 H.R. 3991: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mrs. CAPPS.  
 H.R. 4019: Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. MARTINEZ.  
 H.R. 4080: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.  
 H.R. 4121: Mr. TALENT.  
 H.R. 4127: Mr. HILLIARD.  
 H.R. 4151: Mr. DOYLE.  
 H.R. 4167: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan and Mr. RAHALL.  
 H.R. 4214: Mr. DIXON, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. PALLONE.  
 H.R. 4220: Mr. BONIOR.  
 H.R. 4280: Mrs. KELLY.  
 H.R. 4293: Ms. FURSE.  
 H.R. 4311: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
 H.R. 4332: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. SCARBOROUGH.  
 H.R. 4339: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. METCALF.  
 H.R. 4340: Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
 H.R. 4353: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H.R. 4358: Mr. ACKERMAN.  
 H.R. 4376: Mr. FORBES.  
 H.R. 4402: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. BLILEY.  
 H.R. 4403: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. STUPAK.  
 H.R. 4421: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. ENSIGN, and Mr. MANZULLO.  
 H.R. 4446: Mrs. NORTUP.  
 H.R. 4449: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. McINNIS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. DICKEY.  
 H.R. 4450: Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 4455: Mr. GOODE and Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 4465: Mr. LATOURETTE.  
 H.R. 4467: Ms. PELOSI.  
 H.R. 4504: Mr. THOMPSON.  
 H.R. 4513: Mr. DREIER.  
 H.R. 4527: Mr. MENENDEZ.  
 H.R. 4538: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
 H.R. 4567: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. ENSIGN, and Mr. NADLER.  
 H.R. 4574: Mr. CHRISTENSEN.  
 H.R. 4590: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. CARSON, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. SHAYS.  
 H.R. 4591: Mr. HILLIARD.  
 H.R. 4621: Mr. REGULA, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. FROST, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. MCHUGH.  
 H.R. 4627: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. MATSUI.  
 H.R. 4634: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. METCALF, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mrs. MORELLA.  
 H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.  
 H. Con. Res. 274: Mr. GINGRICH.  
 H. Con. Res. 281: Mr. DEFAZIO.  
 H. Con. Res. 295: Mr. JEFFERSON.  
 H. Con. Res. 299: Mr. SMITH of Oregon.  
 H. Con. Res. 328: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
 H. Res. 460: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.  
 H. Res. 519: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

#### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3789

OFFERED BY: MR. CONYERS

AMENDMENT No. 1: Page 7, strike lines 11 through 21 and insert the following:

“(f) If, after removal, the court determines that no aspect of an action that is subject to its jurisdiction solely under the provisions of section 1332(b) may be maintained as a class action under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the court shall remand the action to the State court from which the action arose. Upon remand of the action, the period of limitations for any claim brought by any member of the proposed class in any future class action or individual action shall be tolled for the period of time provided under Federal or State law, or for the period of time that the removed action was pending in Federal court, whichever period is longer. The remand of the action shall be without prejudice to the reallocation of any such claim in any State court in a class action that may meet applicable class certification requirements. The removal provisions of section 1453 shall apply after remand to any renewed State court class action described in the preceding sentence, and if the renewed action is removed to Federal court, the Federal court shall determine whether the renewed action meets the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.”.

H.R. 3789

OFFERED BY MR. DOGGETT

AMENDMENT No. 2: Page 5, line 3, strike the quotation marks and second period.

Page 5, insert the following after line 3:  
 “(4) Paragraph (1) and section 1453 shall apply to a State only if such State, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, enacts a statute that—  
 “(A) is adopted in accordance with procedures established by that State’s Constitution for enactment of a statute;  
 “(B) does not conflict with that State’s Constitution, as interpreted by that State; and  
 “(C) declares that paragraph (1) and section 1453 shall apply to that State.”.

H.R. 3789

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 3: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. STUDY OF CLASS ACTIONS.

Within 12 months of the date of enactment of this Act, the Judicial Conference of the United States, in consultation with the National Center for State Courts, shall conduct a study of Federal and State class actions, which study shall include—

(1) identification of the number of class actions being brought and maintained in Federal and State courts;

(2) the extent to which class action rules are collusively misused or manipulated by either plaintiffs or defendants in a manner which denies any of the parties the right to fairness and due process; and

(3) the extent that changing Federal law to allow for removal to Federal court in any case where any one member of a plaintiff class and any one defendant are citizens of different States, and eliminate the \$75,000 amount in controversy requirement of section 1332 of title 28, United States Code, would have on—

(A) the workload of the Federal judiciary and the civil docket backlog in the Federal courts; and

(B) possible delays in the resolution of class actions.

Upon completion of the study, the Judicial Conference of the United States shall submit a report to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate, which shall include any recommendations for changing class action rules at the Federal or State level.