have to fund political contributions and candidates they do not support. The administration, by Executive order, refuses to enforce the Beck decision.

So when we hear the term ''campaign reform,'' it means making the Beck decision law; it means removing this injustice that Thomas Jefferson called sinful and tyrannical, it means freeing up the workers of this country.

CONSIDER CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM THIS YEAR

(Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on June 11, 1995, the President and Speaker of the House, in a very famous photo of shaking hands, committed themselves to campaign finance reform. It has been over 2 years later. We have had 85 bills filed. There have been no hearings on campaign finance reform. There have been no bills passed.

The President will support campaign finance reform, Mr. Speaker. This House and the House leadership needs to step forward and let this body consider campaign finance reform this year. My own preference is the freshmen bipartisan bill, the Hutchinson-Allen bill. There are other good bills out there, but they will get nowhere without hearings and without being brought to the floor of this House. We need to do our job this year on campaign finance reform.

FOLLOW MINNESOTA'S LEAD IN EDUCATION

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my Governor, Arne Carlson, of Minnesota. Back in Minnesota we are very proud of our schools and we are very proud of our students. Many people listen to Garrison Keiler when he talks about Lake Wobegone, and sometimes we talk about the Lake Wobegone syndrome.

In fact, we do believe our women are strong, our men are good looking, and our children are above average. And there is reason to believe that. If we look at the numbers, Minnesota students rank second in graduation rate. On the ACT test, we once again ranked in second place in all of the United States in 1996. But that is the good news.

The bad news is, in some of the tests that we have been giving our students in the last several years on basic skills, Minnesota students are not doing as well as they should. In reading, for example, we asked students to read a few newspaper articles, then answer some questions, and only 59 percent of the students passed that test.

That is why Governor Carlson, together with the legislature, began a process this year of real reform of our schools, and that was built around choices and giving parents more empowerment. It is tax credits. It is empowering parents with more deductibility for educational expenses.

We in Washington ought to do the same. In fact, they say back in Minnesota, either lead, follow, or get out of the way. In terms of education reform, we ought to follow the lead of Governor Carlson and other brave Governors who are empowering parents to get better education for their kids.

NATIONAL STUDENT TESTING IS NOT THE ANSWER

(Mr. COOK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, the latest great idea from the administration to improve education is national testing. After all, who could be against a proposal that will make it easier to see how your school is doing and make it easier to compare your children against the performance of students nationwide?

I guess my first reaction is that we do not need a national test to discover that a school with fourth graders who do not read has a big problem. We do not need a national test to figure out that something is terribly wrong when kids graduate from high school feeling just wonderful about themselves but are unable to write a coherent paragraph.

The bottom line is, we do not need a national test to determine that our schools are failing us and failing the communities which support them. It is as if the other side actually believes that the same schools that do not enforce standards now will suddenly do so if Washington comes up with a new test.

If academic rigor is absent in our schools now, call it a hunch, but I am guessing that rigor will be absent in our schools after the latest national test is created.

□ 1215

SCHOOL CHOICE

(Mr. WELDON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my question is, Would a plan to make it easier for parents to save for their children's college education be a good thing or a bad thing? What if their children took that money and used it to go to a private university like Harvard? Would that be a threat to public universities like the University of Michigan or the University of Virginia? Or would that make schools like the University of Michigan and the University of Virginia try even harder to compete for students that might otherwise go to Harvard?

If allowing parents to send their kids to Harvard is not a threat to public universities, why would making it a little easier for parents to send their kids to private schools be a threat to public schools at the elementary and secondary level? Could it be that many parents would vote with their feet and take their kids out of bad public schools and put them in private schools? That would force bad schools to clean up their act or shut down, which is exactly the point.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, another week has gone by in Washington, and still the Republican leadership has not scheduled a vote on campaign finance reform. Delay has always been the strategy of those who are opposed to curbing the influence of special interest money. We cannot accept delay any longer.

My colleagues and I are demanding that Speaker GINGRICH schedule a vote to ban soft money, the huge unregulated contributions to both political parties that have corrupted our political process in Congress. But the Speaker's response is there is not time, or the Speaker's response is what we need is more money in our election system. That is wrong.

Tomorrow afternoon the Republicans hope to leave work early in the day to travel to New York City to hold a massive fund raiser. Apparently there is enough time in the congressional schedule to leave early and fly to New York on private jets to raise money, but there is not enough time to schedule a vote on campaign finance reform and to ban soft money. This is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker, to me, to my colleagues, and to the majority of the American people.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE IN CURRENT LAW

(Mrs. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, most children have tried the tactic we are now seeing from the other side regarding the White House scandals and campaign finance reform. If you catch a child with his hands in the cookie jar, sometimes he tries to change the subject on that which they are doing, and if they cannot successfully change the subject, then they get angry.

Most parents see right through what their child is trying to do to escape punishment for disobeying their parents. Fortunately, thank goodness, most Americans are able to see through the hypocrisy of Democrats who claim to want to ban soft money, the very same people who have raised illegal fund raising from foreign sources to an art form.

Current law, I know that the other side is not very concerned about current law, especially last year, in last year's campaign, but current law does not require full disclosure. If it had during 1996, we would have known what the millions of dollars in soft money raised from foreign sources were that was actually returned because of their criminal behavior.

EDUCATION SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

(Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, making education affordable, whether at the college level or at the primary and secondary level, has to be one of the primary concerns of Congress. Our Republican tax bill adopted this year contained provisions that provided real tax relief for families that were paying tuition. But unfortunately, at the end of the conference with the administration, the administration demanded that key provisions be stripped out or that the bill would be vetoed.

Specifically the Clinton administration opposed tax relief for prepaid tuition plans like we have in Pennsylvania and tax relief in the form of a parent and student savings account plus, which would provide up to $2,000 a year for an education savings account with the buildup of interest to be tax free.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the legislation introduced by Speaker GINGRICH in the House and Senator COVERDELL in the Senate to create an education savings account to make education affordable and make the American dream more accessible.

Mr. President, please realize this issue is not going to go away. We will not go away until working families and students get the tax relief they deserve. We are going to push this issue this year.

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). This is the day for the call of the Private Calendar.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the call of the Private Calendar today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV. Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 2 p.m. today.

JOHN N. GRIESEMER POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1254) to designate the U.S. Post Office building located at Bennett and Kansas Avenue in Springfield, MO, as the ''John N. Griesemer Post Office Building,'' as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1254

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States Post Office building located at 1919 West Bennett Street in Springfield, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the ''John N. Griesemer Post Office Building''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States Post Office building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''John N. Griesemer Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CUMMINGS] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1254 was introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLUNT] on April 29. This legislation, as has been noted, designates the U.S. Post Office located at Bennett and Kansas Avenue in Springfield, MO, as the ''John N. Griesemer Post Office Building''. The amendment at the desk, Mr. Speaker, corrects the address of the building to 1919 West Bennett Street. The exact assignment of the street address was not known when the bill was originally drafted.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the policy of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the bill is cosponsored by the entire House delegation of the State of the sponsoring Member, the State of Missouri. The measure was before the Subcommittee on Postal Service on June 5 and was approved, as amended, by all the subcommittee members.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation obviously honors John N. Griesemer, who was born in Mount Vernon, MO, and, as I am sure we will hear later from the sponsor of the bill, amassed a long and very admirable record in civic and public duties. Most particularly of interest to the subcommittee and to myself, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was, in 1984, named by President Reagan to serve on the U.S. Postal Board of Governors. He was elected chairman of the Board in 1987 and 1988 and served for 3 years as the Board's vice chairman.

I think it is for this reason particularly, Mr. Speaker, that the naming of this post office in memory of a man who served with distinction through his entire public life, but particularly served with distinction as a member of the very body that governs the Postal Service, makes this bill so very appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLUNT], the Missouri delegation, and I wish to thank our full committee chairman and ranking members for their cooperation in bringing this, I think, very worthy piece of legislation to the floor. I would urge our colleagues to support this bill, as amended.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation, H.R. 1254, as amended, which would designate the U.S. Post Office Building located at 1919 West Bennett Street in Springfield, Missouri, as the John N. Griesemer Post Office Building.

Mr. Griesemer, a Springfield, MO businessman, was named to serve on the U.S. Postal Service Board of Governors in 1984. He was elected chairman of the Board in 1987 and 1988 and served for 3 years as the vice chairman.

A native of Billings, MO, John Griesemer worked for his family's business, the Griesemer Stone Co. He served as its president and director until his death in 1993.

H.R. 1254, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLUNT] enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire Missouri congressional delegation. I urge my colleagues to support this measure, which is a fitting testament to the great work of Mr. Griesemer.

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

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLUNT], the primary sponsor of this legislation.

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Service, for his assistance in moving this legislation through his subcommittee. I would also like to thank the members of the full committee and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the chairman, for discharging the bill so it could be considered today. And, of course, I would like to thank the other members of the Missouri delegation for joining me unanimously as cosponsors of this resolution.

The resolution we are debating, Mr. Speaker, will name the new postal facility in my district for the late John N. Griesemer. Mr. Griesemer invested