

Rights Action League—or, for that matter, the League of Women Voters—find out about this trick?)

Clearly, in Mr. Baron's eyes, the Christian Coalition voter guides "in context can have no reasonable meaning other than to urge the election or defeat of one or more clearly identified candidates," and are deficient in maintaining the proper "educational manner" that would be required by law under the McCain-Feingold bill.

But mind you, when Mr. Baron says that the Christian Coalition's voter guides "manipulate voters," he does not mean sophisticated voters such as himself. No, if a smart Washington insider like Mr. Baron received a Christian Coalition voter guide, he would decide whether or not the issues discussed were the issues he considered salient, compare the information presented there to the information available from other sources, and reach his own judgment. But there are so many other voters out there in the hinterlands who Mr. Baron knows lack his powers of discernment, and it is they who are in need of the speech nannies that McCain-Feingold would provide.

This is a very steep and slippery slope. Those who hold or seek office are human, which means they don't like to be criticized. If speech-regulating legislators can get the courts to back off and use legal restrictions to reduce the amount of unpleasant stimuli to which they are subjected—and be applauded for their unselfish "reform" efforts to boot—we can expect that the scope and duration such restrictions will rapidly expand in all directions.

For example, Congressman Sam Farr (D-Cal.), author of the "campaign reform" bill sponsored by the House Democratic leadership, wrote that "material that is written in such a way that the recipient is left with the clear impression that the material advocates support or defeat of a particular political candidate or party—even without naming that candidate or party—would constitute express advocacy and would fall under the scope of campaign expenditure laws." (emphasis added)

In the same vein, Senator Max Cleland (D-Ga.) recently complained to the Associated Press about what he call "independent expenditure" ads on TV that asked his constituents to urge him to vote for the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act, shortly before the Senate passed the bill on May 20. (He didn't.) These ads demonstrated the need for "campaign reform" legislation such as the McCain-Feingold bill, Sen. Cleland fumed. Sen. Cleland is not up for re-election for 5½ years.

On ABC This Week for September 28, George Will asked Democratic National Committee General Chairman Roy Romer if the National Right to Life Committee should be able to buy pre-election newspaper ads that decry partial-birth abortions, if the ads do not name a candidate. The Colorado governor replied, "I think you ought to separate that from the time of the election. You've got twelve months during a year." Only when challenged by an incredulous Will did Romer graciously allow that "if it doesn't mention the candidate's name, you could probably leave it unregulated."

Rather than go down this path, we should heed the words of the Supreme Court in *Buckley v. Valeo*: "In the free society ordained by our Constitution it is not the government, but the people—individually as citizens and candidates and collectively as associations and political committees—who must retain control over the quantity and range of debate on public issues in a political campaign."

In other words, let's respect our elected officials and the demanding offices that they

hold. But let's not be such dimwits that we allow them to start telling us when, how, or how much we can talk about their voting records.

TRIBUTE TO TREVOR OLSON

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell you about a child in my congressional district in Bakersfield, California who is battling chest and lung cancer at the young age of eleven. His name is Trevor Olson. Trevor's parents, John and Karen, and younger brother and sister, Taylor and Leanne, have been a special source of love and support during this ordeal. However, it is Trevor's courage and heroism that provide an example to all of the people that know him and learn his story, that even the youngest of us can respond to extraordinary circumstances with bravery. I believe this young American's story needs to be shared.

On June 13th the people of Bakersfield will respond to Trevor's battle by granting a wish Trevor has had for a long time. That wish is to ride in a race car. Hospice, a local health-care clinic for the critically ill, and Young-Woolridge, a local law firm, will sponsor the televised event. Gary Collins, an internationally known race car driver, will drive Trevor. I am pleased that Hospice, an organization known for their compassion and assistance to those who are critically ill, is the organizer of this event.

To Trevor, we all hope as your wish comes true, that it is everything you dreamt it would be.

God bless you.

IN APPRECIATION OF JUDGE AARON COHN

HON. MAC COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my most sincere congratulations to and appreciation for Muscogee County Juvenile Court Judge Aaron Cohn.

Columbus, Georgia, which falls within the boundaries of Muscogee County, shares many of the juvenile crime problems faced by cities around the nation. Drugs, gangs, and violent crime are serious challenges that parents, teachers, and law enforcement officers are forced to address every day. When the efforts of these individuals fall short, however, we rely on the juvenile justice system to assist troubled youth and to protect our communities.

Boot camps are one approach that has proved particularly effective in Muscogee County. While some federal bureaucrats have suggested that boot camps are too severe a punishment, Judge Cohn's use of the program has been a very effective "last resort" for some of the area's most difficult cases. I congratulate Judge Cohn for utilizing successful local approaches to juvenile crime such as the boot camp program.

Boot camps are not, however, Judge Cohn's only approach to the juvenile crime problem. Judge Cohn understands that every child represents a unique set of circumstances and is in need of a personalized approach. I am sure I speak for many Muscogee County residents in expressing my appreciation for Judge Cohn's sensitivity to the needs of both children and the communities in which they live. The "tough love" that he provides the children of Muscogee County is saving taxpayers millions of dollars in future adult correctional costs, providing a safer environment for all children in their schools and neighborhoods, and insuring that even the most difficult children are given a fighting chance to succeed in life. Thank you, Judge Cohn, for your love of children and for your dedication to the communities of Georgia.

A FEW WORDS WITH . . . AARON COHN
MUSCOGEE COUNTY JUVENILE COURT JUDGE

Monday's paper carried a story that said more than 16,000 juveniles have been sentenced to boot camps since the program began four years ago. As juvenile judge, what is your assessment of that program?

I think it is a wonderful program for some children. Juvenile justice has to be individualized justice: One kid may react better to probation than to incarceration; another kid may require incarceration. It's not an exact science. You just never know sometimes.

One thing we do know: I don't think you can mix 11-year-olds with 15- and 16-year-olds. If the kid is real young I try to steer away from boot camp.

But with the boot camps, we're dealing with children who would never know what the word "discipline" is. And most of the kids going there, the ones we're sending there, are kids we've adjusted, we've talked to them, we've done everything we could to avoid it.

I think the first year, we may have led the pack (in boot camp sentences) for all I know. But we used it only as a last resort, based on the type of offense the person has committed.

What have the results been, in your experience?

The program does work for lots of people. It's like a baseball game—some you win, some you lose, some get rained out. Not every program works with every child, but they'll get something from this program.

I read the article saying the feds think it's a bad program . . . I don't know about any child who's been mistreated. I do know one thing—you couldn't just get some drill instructor at Parris Island. He's got to have tough love, but not so he just scares kids to death.

It's a good plan, but sometimes you may have the wrong person in there. You can't get away from the human equation.

What kind of youthful offender most benefits from a military program of that kind?

I like a child to be around 15 years old or older. We as a general rule do not send the 11- and 12-year-olds because they haven't even reached the age of criminal responsibility.

The bad part is that in any of our work, we can take a kid from a home that has no discipline, that's so fragmented and dysfunctional the family can't handle him. So even after we send him (to boot camp), what does he come back to? The same home, because we don't have enough foster homes, group homes to take care of him.

If we save one kid, if we turn him around, we save taxpayers about \$250,000. You pay now or you pay later, and if we can get him early enough where he doesn't go into the adult system . . . it's the only place we're