Although the 1994 crime bill authorized funding for numerous prevention programs, since the Republicans gained the majority, none of that money has been appropriated. Therefore, it cannot be argued that prevention has failed. We haven't even begun to try prevention programs. Before we lose an entire generation to the criminal justice system, we have an obligation to make every effort to assist children in making the right choices and to offer them meaningful alternatives to crime.

As with guns, at Chairman MCCOLLUM's juvenile crime meetings around the country, local officials stressed the importance of prevention programs and Mr. MCCOLLUM professed to agree that prevention programs are a necessary part of the effort to stem crime. Yet the bill we consider here today offers little in the way of prevention.

The lock 'em up approach taken by H.R. 3 will do little if anything to stem the rising tide of juvenile crime with which the majority professes to be so concerned. Once again, we are trying to fool the American public into thinking we are doing something about crime when we are actually only politicizing crime. If this bill becomes law and the juvenile crime rate fails to decrease, we will have only ourselves to blame for the further public disillusionment and cynicism about politics as well as for the escalating juvenile crime problem.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GILCHREST] having assumed the chair, Mr. KINGSTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3) to combat violent youth crime and increase accountability for juvenile criminal offenses, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENDING ORDER OF THE HOUSE OF APRIL 23, 1997 THROUGH JUNE 12, 1997

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the House of April 23, 1997, be extended through Thursday, June 12, 1997.

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

There was no objection.

□ 2145

APPOINTMENT TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE RECORDS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, a democratic leader of the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER
Washington, DC, May 7, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 2702 of 44 U.S.C., as amended by Public Law 101–509, I hereby appoint the following individual to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress: Dr. Joseph Cooper of Baltimore, MD.

Yours very truly,

RICHARD GEPHARDT.

RICHARD GEPHARDT.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of Section 3(a) of Public Law 86–380, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations:

Mr. SHAYS of Connecticut and
Mr. SNOWBARGER of Kansas.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO THE CONGRESSIONAL AWARD BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of Section 4 of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 803), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Congressional Award Board:

Mrs. CUBIN of Wyoming.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULSHOF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HULSHOF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

IN COMMEMORATION OF TAX FREEDOM DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in commemoration of Tax Freedom Day, which this year falls on May 9. Tax Freedom Day is that day that Americans work to simply to pay their taxes and obligations to their State, Federal and local governments.

Tax Freedom Day is a symbol of the burden that we put on American families all across this country. Over 35 percent of our country's national product, what we produce every year is absorbed in taxes by our State, Federal and local governments. This is more than the average family pays in food, shelter, and clothing combined. Those essentials that they need for their daily existence, they pay more in taxes every year.

Mr. Speaker, this burden consumes more and more of our economy every year, and it makes it difficult for families to get by. Where they used to be able to exist and enjoy a good quality of life with a single wage earner, today the typical family is more often required to have two wage earners, and that is just not fair. It is the burden that our tax system places on that hard-working family.

Second, taxes represent not just a burden but a price, a price that we pay on everything in our economy. It is a price that we pay on productive work, it is a price that we pay on savings and investment, it is a price that we pay on job creation. And as most people would agree, when we raise the price on anything we get less of it, but if we lower the price on those things we get more. If we lowered the price with lower taxes, we get more productivity, more savings, and more job creation, and similarly with the high tax burden that we face today, as one would expect, we get lower productivity, lower rates of savings and lower rates of job creation.

Third, the high Federal tax burden that we put on our working families keeps control centralized here in Washington. Money, particularly in the form of taxes, is power, and if we put all the money and all the tax revenues here in Washington, control them from here in Washington, it becomes a place of power, as one would expect. But if we can take the money out of Washington and put it back in the pockets of working Americans, we make Washington less important, and we make the family, the individual in a city or town more important.

And I think fundamentally that is the direction we should be headed in. This is, after all, your money that we are talking about. When we speak about government revenues or tax revenues, we are talking about the hard-