

glaucoma screening in its study. This amendment was offered to better understand H.R. 3268, which was introduced by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

□ 1445

H.R. 3268 would extend the same glaucoma screening coverage provided by Medicare to Federal employees who are in high-risk populations.

The studies conducted by OPM under H.R. 3751 will go a long way in helping the Federal Government to craft a better dental, vision and hearing benefit for Federal employees.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3751, a bill to require the Office of Personnel Management to study and recommend options for enhancing the dental, vision and hearing benefits available to Federal employees. As the Federal Government strives to recruit top talent around the Nation, this issue plays a significant strategic role in attracting and retaining the very best to serve our country.

Currently, the dental, vision and hearing offerings available to those covered by the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program (FEHBP) can be described as inadequate at best. The Government's employees are often without proper dental care as part of their health insurance coverage. In fact, most plans in the FEHBP either do not offer dental and vision care, or cover only very minimal, basic procedures. While some plans do offer a supplemental dental package, they come at the cost of a very high premium.

By contract, dental and vision benefits offered to many employees in the private sector are more generous. A 2002 study by the Society for Human Resource Management determined that 96 percent of private sector firms offered dental coverage benefits. Furthermore, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that these private plans usually cover 100 percent of routine procedures and 50–80 percent of more expensive procedures.

According to the Office of Personal Management, Federal employees and retirees cite improved dental coverage as their most desired benefit enhancement. With these benefits so widely available in the private sector, the Federal Government cannot afford to ignore this issue, or it will lose the war for talent more often than it will win. The Government depends greatly on its competitive benefits packages to attract well-qualified candidates, and should explore the possibility of enhancing such benefits.

Putting more money into the system is not necessarily the answer, and this bill does not call for that. It simply requires the Federal Government's personnel experts, OPM, to study how to resolve this problem.

Whatever it reveals, the goal of the report is to recommend options for improving the availability of dental, vision and hearing benefits to employees in a way that fits within the current budgetary constraints. I urge all members to support H.R. 3751.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion

offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3751, as amended.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

“A bill to require that the Office of Personnel Management study current practices under which dental, vision, and hearing benefits are made available to Federal employees, annuitants, and other classes of individuals, and to require that the Office also present options and recommendations relating to how additional dental, vision, and hearing benefits could be made so available.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

2004 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OMNIBUS AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3797) to authorize improvements in the operations of the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3797

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “2004 District of Columbia Omnibus Authorization Act”.

SEC. 2. REQUIRING SUBMISSION OF PLAN BY SCHOOL BOARD FOR ALLOCATION OF FUNDS UNDER MAYOR'S PROPOSED BUDGET.

Section 452 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (sec. 1–204.52, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “With respect to” and inserting “(a) ROLE OF MAYOR AND COUNCIL.—With respect to”;

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “This section” and inserting “This subsection”;

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

“(b) PLAN FOR ALLOCATION OF FUNDS UNDER PROPOSED BUDGET.—

“(1) SUBMISSION OF PLAN TO COUNCIL.—Not later than March 1 of each year or the date on which the Mayor makes the proposed annual budget for a year available under section 442 (whichever occurs later), the Board of Education shall submit to the Council a plan for the allocation of the Mayor's proposed budget among various object classes and responsibility centers (as defined under regulations of the Board).

“(2) CONTENTS.—The plan submitted under this subsection shall include a detailed presentation of how much money will be allocated to each school, including—

“(A) a specific description of the amount of funds available to the school for which spending decisions are under the control of the school; and

“(B) a specific description of other responsibility center funds which will be spent in a manner directly benefiting the school, including funds which will be spent for personnel, equipment and supplies, property maintenance, and student services.”.

SEC. 3. MULTIYEAR CONTRACTING AUTHORITY AND LEASING AGREEMENTS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Subchapter III of chapter 17 of title 11, District of Columbia Code, is amended by inserting after section 11–1742 the following new section:

“§ 11–1742a. Multiyear contracting authority and leasing agreements

“(a) SEVERABLE SERVICES CONTRACTS FOR PERIODS CROSSING FISCAL YEARS.—The Executive Officer may enter into a contract for procurement of severable services in the same manner and to the same extent as the head of an executive agency may enter into such a contract under section 303L of title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253l).

“(b) MULTIYEAR LEASING AGREEMENTS.—

“(1) AUTHORITY.—The Executive Officer may enter into a lease agreement for the accommodation of the District of Columbia courts in a building which is in existence or being erected by the lessor to accommodate the District of Columbia courts.

“(2) TERMS.—A lease agreement under this subsection shall be on terms the Executive Officer considers to be in the interest of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia and necessary for the accommodation of the District of Columbia courts. However, the lease agreement may not bind the District of Columbia courts for more than 10 years and the obligation of amounts for a lease under this subsection is limited to the current fiscal year for which payments are due without regard to section 1341(a)(1)(B) of title 31, United States Code.

“(c) MULTIYEAR CONTRACTS.—

“(1) AUTHORITY.—The Executive Officer may enter into a multiyear contract for the acquisition of property or services in the same manner and to the same extent as an executive agency may enter into such a contract under section 304B of title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254c). In applying such authority—

“(A) in section 304B(a)(2)(B)—

“(i) ‘the best interests of the District of Columbia and the Federal Government’ shall be substituted for ‘the best interests of the United States’; and

“(ii) ‘the courts’ programs’ shall be substituted for ‘the agency’s programs’;

“(B) the second sentence of section 304B(b), and subsection (e), shall not apply; and

“(C) in section 304B(c), ‘\$5,000,000’ shall be substituted for ‘\$10,000,000’.

“(2) CANCELLATION OR TERMINATION FOR INSUFFICIENT FUNDING AFTER FIRST YEAR.—In the event that funds are not made available for the continuation of a multiyear contract for services into a subsequent fiscal year, the contract shall be canceled or terminated, and the costs of cancellation or termination may be paid from—

“(A) appropriations originally available for the performance of the contract concerned;

“(B) appropriations currently available for procurement of the type of services concerned, and not otherwise obligated; or

“(C) funds appropriated for those payments.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter III of chapter 17 of title 11, District of Columbia Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 11–1742 the following new item:

“11–1742a. Multiyear contracting authority and leasing agreements.”.

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF ACADEMIC YEAR AS FISCAL YEAR FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS.

Section 441 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (sec. 1–204.41, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “The fiscal year” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the fiscal year”;

(2) by striking the third sentence; and

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

“(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(1) ARMORY BOARD.—The fiscal year for the Armory Board shall begin on the first day of January and shall end on the thirty-first day of December of each calendar year.

“(2) SCHOOLS.—Effective with respect to fiscal year 2007 and each succeeding fiscal year, the fiscal year for the District of Columbia Public Schools (including public charter schools) and the University of the District of Columbia shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June of each calendar year.”.

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF DEADLINE FOR COUNCIL TO ADOPT BUDGET TO ACCOUNT FOR DAYS OF RECESS.

Section 446(a) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (sec. 1-204.46(a), D.C. Official Code), as amended by section 101(a), is amended by striking “50 calendar days” and inserting “56 calendar days”.

SEC. 6. EXEMPTION OF DISTRICT GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES ON COMPRESSED SCHEDULE FROM FEDERAL OVERTIME REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act (29 U.S.C. 207) shall not apply to the hours of an employee of the District of Columbia government which constitute a compressed schedule.

(b) COMPRESSED SCHEDULE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “compressed schedule” means—

(1) in the case of a full-time employee, an 80-hour biweekly basic work requirement which is scheduled for less than 10 workdays, and

(2) in the case of a part-time employee, a biweekly basic work requirement of less than 80 hours which is scheduled for less than 10 workdays.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to hours occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. AVAILABILITY OF ENFORCED ANNUAL LEAVE OR ENFORCED LEAVE WITHOUT PAY AS DISCIPLINARY ACTION FOR CORPORATION COUNSEL ATTORNEYS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 856(a) of the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 (sec. 1-608.56(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “or reduction in grade,” and inserting “reduction in grade, or the placing of such attorney on enforced annual leave or enforced leave without pay.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. REGULATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BANKS BY FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION.

(a) FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT.—(1) Section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking “, State bank, and District bank” and inserting “and State bank”;

(B) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (4);

(C) in subsection (q)(1), by striking “, any District bank,”;

(D) in subsection (q)(2)(A), by striking “(except a District bank)”;

(E) in subsection (q)(3), by striking “(except a District bank),”.

(2) Section 7(a)(1) of such Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(a)(1)) is amended by striking “(except a District bank)”.

(3) Section 10(b)(2)(A) of such Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(b)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “(except a District bank)”.

(4) Section 11 of such Act (12 U.S.C. 1821) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(2)(A)(i), by striking “or District bank”;

(B) in subsection (c)(2)(A)(ii)—

(i) by striking “or District bank”; and

(ii) by striking “or the code of law for the District of Columbia”; and

(C) in subsection (c)(3)(A), by striking “(other than a District depository institution)”.

(5) Section 18 of such Act (12 U.S.C. 1828) is amended—

(A) in section (c)(2)(A), by striking “or a District bank”;

(B) in subsection (c)(2)(B), by striking “(except a District bank)”;

(C) in subsection (c)(2)(C), by striking “a District Bank or”;

(D) in subsection (d)(1), by striking “(except a District bank)” each place such term appears;

(E) in subsection (f), by striking “or a District bank”;

(F) in subsection (i)(1), by striking “(except a District bank)”;

(G) in subsection (i)(2), by striking subparagraph (A) and by redesignating subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively;

(H) in subsection (i)(2)(A) (as so redesignated by subparagraph (G)), by striking “(except a District bank)”;

(I) in subsection (i)(2)(B) (as so redesignated by subparagraph (G)), by striking “(except a District bank)”.

(b) NATIONAL HOUSING ACT.—Section 203(s)(5) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1709(s)(5)) is amended by striking “or District bank”.

(c) BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT.—The Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 is amended—

(1) in section 2(c) (12 U.S.C. 1841(c)), by striking paragraph (3); and

(2) in section 3(b)(1) (12 U.S.C. 1842(b)(1)), by striking “or a District bank”.

(d) BANK PROTECTION ACT OF 1968.—Section 2(1) of the Bank Protection Act of 1968 (12 U.S.C. 1881(1)) is amended by striking “and district banks”.

(e) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION MANAGEMENT INTERLOCKS ACT.—The Depository Institution Management Interlocks Act (12 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 207(1), by striking “and banks located in the District of Columbia”; and

(2) in section 209(1), by striking “and banks located in the District of Columbia”.

(f) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended—

(1) in section 3(a)(34) (15 U.S.C. 78c(34)), by striking “or a bank operating under the Code of Law for the District of Columbia” each place such term appears in clause (i) of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), and (F);

(2) in section 3(a)(34)(G)(i) (15 U.S.C. 78c(34)(G)(i)), by striking “, a bank in the District of Columbia examined by the Comptroller of the Currency,”;

(3) in section 3(a)(34)(H)(i) (15 U.S.C. 78c(34)(H)(i)), by striking “or a bank in the District of Columbia examined by the Comptroller of the Currency”;

(4) in section 12(i)(1) (15 U.S.C. 78i(1)), by striking “and banks operating under the Code of Law for the District of Columbia”;

(5) in section 17(f)(4)(A) (15 U.S.C. 78q(f)(4)(A)), by striking “and banks operating under the Code of Law for the District of Columbia”;

(6) in section 17(f)(4)(B) (15 U.S.C. 78q(f)(4)(B)), by striking “or a bank operating under the Code of Law for the District of Columbia”.

(g) NATIONAL BANK RECEIVERSHIP ACT.—The National Bank Receivership Act is amended by striking section 6.

(h) FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.—The last sentence of the 3rd undesignated paragraph of section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 321) is amended by striking “(except within the District of Columbia)”.

(i) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 9. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2005 and each succeeding fiscal year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan, Mrs. MILLER.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3797, and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3797, a bill introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), authorizes the operations of the District of Columbia government. The bill, the first of its kind, actually, provides a vehicle to address necessary changes in Federal law pertaining to the District of Columbia. This legislation will give the mayor and the city's leadership necessary autonomy by allowing them to only have to deal with the House Committee of Jurisdiction, the Committee on Government Reform, on changes to Federal laws that affect the District.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for ushering H.R. 3797 through the Committee on Government Reform and on to the floor today, and I support its passage.

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

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

Let me begin by thanking my friend and colleague on the Committee on Government Reform, its chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), for working closely with me in moving H.R. 3797. This legislation institutes a new process that will significantly facilitate D.C. government operations, promote greater efficiency in Congress by conforming the handling of District of Columbia matters to House rules, and improve the efficiency of both the House and the District of Columbia on these matters.

This is the first time that the Committee on Government Reform, the authorizing committee for District of Columbia matters that must come to the Congress, has introduced a bill to enact legislative changes that have been

passed by the D.C. council, and are here only because they require affirmative action by Congress to become law because they amend the D.C. Home Rule Act, which can only be amended by the Congress.

Perhaps the most noteworthy provision, in light of recent events, is the change in the fiscal year for D.C. public schools and the University of the District of Columbia's academic year to conform to the school system's new fiscal year. Imagine the difficulties if the fiscal year and the academic year are not in tandem, as they have not been. The proposed change was already in the bill, but its necessity is underlined by the fact that this is one of the changes requested by the top candidate for superintendent of the D.C. public schools, Carl Cohen.

Similarly, as requested by the mayor and city council, H.R. 3795 amends the Home Rule Charter to give the city council and additional 6 days with which to review the mayor's proposed budget, restoring the full 50-day period to the council to allow the D.C. government to use compressed schedules in order to exempt employees from Federal overtime requirements, to allow the D.C. government to offer enforced annual leave, or enforced leave without pay as a disciplinary action for corporation counsel attorneys while an investigation is underway for alleged misconduct, and to allow oversight of D.C. chartered banks to be changed from the U.S. Office of the Comptroller to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in order to bring D.C. banking law into conformity with what occurs in all 50 States, relieving the current regulatory burden that has discouraged the establishment of D.C. charter banks.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 3797, and I also want to thank the chairman of the Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), for his outstanding leadership on this bill. It is really of vital importance to our Nation's capital, and I know the chairman is always working very hard to address all the challenges and concerns of the people of the District.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, please include the attached exchange of letters between Chairman MICHAEL G. OXLEY of the Committee on Financial Services, Chairman JOHN A. BOEHNER of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and myself in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the end of the debate on H.R. 3797 under general leave.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2004.

Hon. TOM DAVIS,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,
Washington, DC.

DEAR TOM: On February 26, 2004, the Committee on Government Reform ordered reported H.R. 3797, the 2004 District of Columbia Omnibus Authorization Act. As you

know, the Committee on Financial Services was granted an additional referral upon the bill's introduction pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction under Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives over banks and banking. Section 8 of the bill addresses the regulation of banks chartered by the District of Columbia by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Because of your willingness to consult with my committee regarding this matter, I will waive consideration of the bill by the Financial Services Committee. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Financial Services Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 3797. In addition, the Committee on Financial Services reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within the Financial Services Committee's jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Financial Services for conferees on H.R. 3797 or related legislation.

I request that you include this letter and your response as part of your committee's report on the bill and the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2004.

Hon. MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your recent letter regarding the Financial Services Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 3797, the 2004 District of Columbia Authorization Act. As you have stated, Section 8 regarding the regulation of banks chartered by the District of Columbia by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is within the jurisdiction of your Committee.

I agree that the Financial Services Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 3797 by waiving further consideration of the bill. In addition, I will support your request for conferees from the Financial Services Committee should a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation be convened.

As you have requested, I will include a copy of your letter and this response as part of the Government Reform Committee's report and the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your assistance as I work towards the enactment of H.R. 3797.

Sincerely,

TOM DAVIS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
AND THE WORKFORCE,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2004.

Hon. TOM DAVIS,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to consideration of H.R. 3797, the "2004 District of Columbia Authorization Act," which the Committee on Government Reform reported on February 26, 2004. This bill was referred to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Financial Services. Section 6, Exemption of District of Columbia Employees on Compressed Schedule from Federal Overtime Requirements, amends the Fair Labor Stand-

ards Act and is within the sole jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Given the fact that I support the policy contained in Section 6, I do not intend to ask for continued referral of H.R. 3797, nor will I object to the scheduling of this bill for consideration in the House of Representatives. However, I do so only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the Committee on Education and the Workforce's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on these provisions or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future. Furthermore, should these or similar provisions be considered in a conference with the Senate, I would expect Members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce to be appointed to the conference committee on those provisions.

Finally, I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in your report to accompany this bill. If you have questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to call me. I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2004.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Chairman, Committee on Education and the
Workforce, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your recent letter regarding the Education and the Workforce Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 3797, the 2004 District of Columbia Authorization Act. As you have stated, Section 6 exempting certain District of Columbia employees from overtime regulation under the Fair Labor Standards Act is within the jurisdiction of your Committee.

I agree that the Education and Workforce Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 3797 by waiving further consideration of the bill. In addition, I will support your request for conferees from the Government Reform Committee should a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation be convened.

As you have requested, I will include a copy of your letter and this response as part of the Government Reform Committee's report and the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your assistance as I work towards the enactment of H.R. 3797.

Sincerely,

TOM DAVIS,
Chairman.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3797.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEWELL GEORGE POST OFFICE
BUILDING

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules