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–Ca.), 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 healthcare 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'g 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

going to save them is in the juvenile justice system.

The thing we have to do is make sure there's no favoritism, because not every child is treated alike. Some have a good support system, some have no support system.

You walk a tightrope. I want what's in best interest of the children, but we have to protect our friends and neighbors in the community.

There's nothing wrong with that program as long as it's handled right.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES SHOULD BE EXEMPT FROM SANCTIONS

HON. GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, JR.

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation on behalf of more than thirty original cosponsors to exempt federally guaranteed agricultural commodities from the application of sanctions under the Arms Export Control Act. Recent nuclear tests in India and Pakistan forced the Administration to impose sweeping economic sanctions on both countries, with potentially devastating consequences for American agricultural exports to South Asia.

Under the terms of the Arms Export Control Act, the President has very little flexibility in the imposition of sanctions. When a non-nuclear weapon state detonates a nuclear device, the U.S. government is required to terminate sales of defense articles, end foreign military financing, oppose all loans from international financial institutions, and prohibit all commercial loans from U.S. banks, except for the purchase of agricultural commodities. The Act also requires the government to deny any credit guarantees or financial assistance by any department or agency.

This sanction could effectively cut off any federally guaranteed agricultural exports to either India or Pakistan. These new sanctions come at a difficult time for many American farmers, who are experiencing historically low grain prices, and who could now be locked out of a market of 1.1 billion consumers.

Some of these sanctions may have a place, and U.S. interests are certainly served by limiting the flow of technologies and financing that contribute to weapons proliferation. But having failed to deter nuclear testing, what continued purpose do the broader, unilateral sanctions serve? If international competitors quickly fill the market that the U.S. has unilaterally abandoned, the effects of most sanctions will be negligible. In a classic case of unintended consequences, the sanctions on both India and Pakistan may severely impact certain sectors of the American economy while having relatively little consequence on the target nations.

I am particularly concerned about sanctions which deny all U.S. credit guarantees to both nations, a prohibition which could unintentionally punish American agricultural producers. Export credit guarantee programs administered by the Department of Agriculture are a critical tool for foreign agricultural sales, but the Arms Export Control Act could effectively cut off any federally guaranteed exports to either India or Pakistan. Such sanctions come at a difficult time for many American farmers, who are experiencing historically low grain prices, and who could now be locked out of a market of 1.1 billion consumers.

The issue goes beyond the specific programs guaranteed through the Department of Agriculture by undermining American's reliability as a supplier. Sanctions introduce an uncertain element that makes our trading partners reluctant to do business with us when more consistent, reliable trade partners are available. International competitors have already indicated a willingness to fill orders for American agricultural commodities. Our farmers lose twice in this situation—we miss the first sale and will have difficulty convincing the governments of India and Pakistan to buy from us in the future.

This legislation provides a necessary clarification of applicable sanctions under the Arms Control Export Act. While I believe that the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to make this determination, the terms for an exemption remain unclear and require codification. This effort must be part of a larger process of reviewing the effectiveness and hidden costs associated with unilateral sanctions. Legislated, mandatory sanctions force diplomatic flexibility to the side in favor of a chainsaw approach to carving out foreign policy positions. The Arms Export Control Act has forced the President into a corner and marginalized the role of the United States in South Asia. Pulling India and Pakistan away from the precipice of armed confrontation will require an element of delicate maneuvering that should be accommodated in the U.S. Code.

TALENTED HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS REPRESENTING OREGON

HON. ELIZABETH FURSE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, on May 2–May 4, 1998, more than 1,200 students from 50 states and the District of Columbia competed in the national finals of the We the People . . . The Citizens and the Constitution program in Washington, D.C. I am proud to announce that the class from Lincoln High School from Portland representing Oregon and the First Congressional District won an honorable mention as one of the top ten finalists. These young scholars worked diligently to reach the national finals by winning local competitions in their home state.

The distinguished members of the team representing Oregon are:

Alyssa Anne Aaby, Rebecca Mae Allen, Milo Twohy Dochow, Ian James Dunlap, Joshua Josef Hansen, Andrea Marina Hart, Thomas Hugh Hendrickson, Misha Andrew David Isaak, Laura Elizabeth Kanter, Aaron Matthew Lande, Andrew Benjamin Lauck, Dugan Alan Lawrence, Marcus Page Lindbloom, Brenna Rose McMahon, Maren Christine Olson, Galway Peter O'Mahony, Nicholas Albert Peters, Emma Rachel Pollack-Pelzvner, Jennifer Lewis Rosenbaum, Jay Boss Rubin, Karen Deborah Rutzick, Margaret Suzanne Schouten, Kennon Harris Scott, Andrew Patterson Sheets, Meghan Marie Simmons, Kristin Kiele Sunamoto, Evan Miles Wiener.

I would also like to recognize their teacher, Mr. Hal Hart, who deserves much of the credit for the success of the team. The district coordinator, Mr. Daniel James, and the state coordinator, Ms. Marilyn Cover, also contributed a significant amount of time and effort to help the team reach the national finals.

The We the People . . . The Citizens and the Constitution program is the most extensive educational program in the country developed specifically to educate young people about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The three-day national competition simulates a congressional hearing in which students' oral presentations are judged on the basis of their knowledge of constitutional principles and their ability to apply them to historical and contemporary issues.

Administered by the Center for Civic Education, the We the People . . . program, now in its ninth academic year, has reached more than 75,000 teachers, and 24 million students nationwide at the upper elementary, middle and high school levels. Members of Congress and their staff enhance the program by discussing current constitutional issues with students and teachers.

The We the People . . . program provides an excellent opportunity for students to gain an informed perspective on the significance of the U.S. Constitution and its place in our history and our lives. I congratulate these students in the national finals and look forward to their continued success in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO HERBERT AND SALLY BOYKIN

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a couple celebrating their 50th wedding anniversary, Herbert and Sally Boykin of Rembert, South Carolina.

Mr. Boykin worked first as a janitor and then as a custodial supervisor in the Sumter County schools. He also served as a Deacon for more than forty years at Union Baptist Church and recently retired as a Chairman of the Deacon Board. Mr. Boykin is also a Mason.

Mrs. Boykin returned to school after having five children to continue her education at Morris College where she became a certified classroom teacher. She taught in Kershaw County and the City of Sumter for more than thirty years. Mrs. Boykin is still an active member of the Deaconess Board and the National Council of Negro Women.

Mr. & Mrs. Boykin were married on July 11, 1948. After ten years of marriage, the couple had five children. The Boykins worked hard to provide a college education for all five of their children. They remain active members of Union Baptist Church, where their children were baptized.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in honoring Herbert and Sally Boykin, as they celebrate their Golden Anniversary.