

"No doctor has ever told me what I could do and couldn't do. I knew what I could handle. I didn't do it to prove a point. I did what was right for me. The children have enriched my life."

Dennis Olsen dropped dead from a heart attack while shoveling snow four years ago. Sheila Olsen says he left her well provided for, and she and her younger children have remained in the family's six-bedroom home. There were six children living at home when her husband died, and now there are four. She has a mother and daughter team who come in and clean the house once a week, but the rest of the time she and the children manage alone. Her disease has progressed significantly since her husband's death.

She no longer can walk, and uses a tricat to get around. She recently bought a van that had been owned by and equipped for a paraplegic, so she can continue to drive. She has used her organizational skills to compensate for what she cannot do physically.

Her children, she says, have days when they are in charge of cooking and cleaning up in the kitchen. The house is divided into sections and each child is responsible for that section for three months at a time. "When that section includes the utility room, they are responsible for the laundry," she said. Thus, Jon's chore list for Jan. 23, 1989, printed on her computer, was headlined: "No TV until these chores are done!" The first paragraph read: "This page is valuable! When all the blanks are properly filled in, it is redeemable for a full allowance . . ." Among the items on Jon's list: "Gather dirty clothes from all over house, sort, wash, dry, fold. Straighten up utility room. Vacuum utility room when everything is off the floor. Wipe off appliances in utility room so they look nice. Clean your bedroom thoroughly. Vacuum. Feed and water Charlie."

Jon was 10.

"We've done what we had to do to live around the MS and above it, and at the same time acknowledging it. It's like AA: Accept the things you can't change and change the things you can. That's the balance."

"I think that every person in life has their own set of challenges that they face. I honestly believe some of the things you see are easier to bear than the unseen heartaches. I get all kinds of help and understanding. What about the person who is having real heartaches with a child or a spouse? They don't have the support system I have," through her church, political allies, and friends. "So I have never felt sorry or bitter. "That is not to say it isn't a challenge. I've walked and it is better to walk."

Last Friday, Sheila Olsen, 50, went to the White House to receive a plaque from Bush honoring her as the MS Mother of the Year. Her 10 children were with her. She is enormously proud of them. "The thing you practice in a family in unconditional love," she said, "and you keep the circle of love regardless."

"I am the support and mother to those children. I determined when Dennis died that we would go on as a vital, happy family and that has been my goal," she said.

"And I think we've achieved it."

FLAG BURNING

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the Supreme Court announced a decision that has engendered the type of public outcry not seen since the Dred Scott decision of the 1800's. I am referring to the flag-burning case. During the 1984 Repub-

lican National Convention, Gregory Lee Johnson burned the American flag while participating in a demonstration against the Reagan administration. In a 5-to-4 decision, the Supreme Court stated that Johnson's conviction for violating a Texas statute prohibiting the desecration of a venerated object was itself a violation of Johnson's first amendment right of freedom of expression.

I do not support the Supreme Court's decision. I am a champion of first amendment rights, but the flag is unique. The American flag is the banner of freedom for which thousands have laid down their lives, and it is hope for oppressed people around the world. The flag is more than a representation of America, it is dear in its own right.

On July 21, 1989, will mark the 1-month anniversary of the Texas versus Johnson decision. The people of Coeur D'Alene, ID, are taking notice of the significance of the day. On the 21st they will fly American flags to show their pride in Old Glory and to protest the Texas versus Johnson decision. They are now working to encourage people in Idaho and around the country to join them in honoring the American flag. I commend the people of Coeur D'Alene for their efforts and encourage others who may be listening to join in this effort to mark the 1-month anniversary of that Supreme Court decision by flying the American flag proudly that day. Together let us fly our flags to remind America of what Old Glory stands for—the ideals of America, and the many who died in battle to uphold those ideals.

REMARKS OF JAMES S. BRADY, VICE CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION ON DISABILITY

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, few persons have given as much in the public service to their country as Jim Brady. Jim retired from the Federal Government earlier this year—but he has not retired from public life. He has taken an unpaid full-time job as the vice chairman of the National Organization on Disability. The National Organization on Disability is a private, Washington-based group which was formed in 1982 to expand the participation of the Nation's 37 million disabled persons in the mainstream of their communities and to enhance public understanding of disabled persons. Jim's role in his new job is to bring the message of the National Organization on Disability to the public's attention. I know from personal experience that no one could have a better person to fulfill this responsibility. I thought my colleagues might be interested in Jim's remarks before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. I ask that Jim's speech, "Calling on America" be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF JAMES S. BRADY

CALLING ON AMERICA

I never thought I'd be in the disability community. As you know, I joined it in one instant. There are 37 million of us—men, women, and children, with physical or mental disabilities, plus at least as many family members living with us on a daily basis.

I've always felt fortunate to survive that instant and to be alive. Now, the bear is back—not from hibernation, but from 7 years of rehabilitation and PT. (That's short for "pain and torture".) Thanks to the "physical terrorists," my wonderful wife and family, and many, many friends like you, I'm ready for action. I'm ready, as vice chairman of the National Organization on Disability, to call on America.

Disabled people are the Nation's largest minority and a great untapped resource. We don't want sympathy; we do want opportunity. We do want acceptance. We want to participate and to be included. Everyone has a part to play in this last great inclusion in American life—the inclusion of people with disabilities. This is good for us who are disabled; it is good for America. And that is why I am calling on all Americans to join with me and the National Organization on Disability to increase the dignity and participation in everyday life of all people with disabilities. Many of you have asked me what I'll be doing. In my public appearances, in meetings and in correspondence, here is what I will be doing as vice chairman of the National Organization on Disability.

I will be calling on the President, Members of Congress and other national leaders to ensure disability remains high on the national agenda. I'll urge them to speak out regularly and to follow words with deeds.

I will call on our Governors and State legislators to bring their disability statutes up to date, to remove discrimination and to open opportunity.

I will call on mayors and community leaders across America to break down attitudinal and physical barriers in their localities, to provide jobs and include disabled people in worship, education, voting, and other activities. I urge every community in the United States to become a community partner of the National Organization on Disability.

I'll be calling on educators to expand educational opportunities and make our schools and colleges more accessible to disabled students.

I'll call on business leaders, in companies large and small, to hire qualified disabled people and to make work places accessible. I'll ask them and philanthropic foundations to support the important work of disability organizations.

I will call on leaders of association to enlarge the concern and activity of their local chapters across America, focussing on bringing disabled people into the mainstream.

I will call on disabled people themselves to speak out forcefully about our rights as citizens and our desire to contribute to our Nation.

And tonight, my friends, I call on you—who are the gate-keepers and opinion-moulders in our country—to help our minority make up for lost time by telling our story and telling it often. We need your help to improve attitudes. When you get home, as a starter, I urge you to cover the new Americans With Disabilities Act, which is going to be introduced in Congress in a few days.

Together, you in the media and we at the National Organization on Disability can bring to reality the words of President Bush just 2 months ago in his first address to a joint session of Congress: "To those 37 million Americans with some form of disability: You belong in the economic mainstream. We need your talents in America's work force. Disabled Americans must become full partners in America's opportunity society."

Please join with me and the National Organization on Disability to help make America a better place for all of us.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR WILLIAM COHEN, BOWDOIN COLLEGE, BRUNSWICK, ME

Mr. RUDMAN. Mr. President, on June 3, 1989, Senator WILLIAM COHEN gave the commencement address at Bowdoin College in Brunswick, ME. I would like to commend this powerful speech to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIAM S. COHEN, BOWDOIN COLLEGE, BRUNSWICK, ME, JUNE 3, 1989

President Bush made a powerful speech in West Germany this week, restating for the NATO alliance what have always been the goals of the United States—peace, freedom and prosperity. And he pointed out a truth recognized by our Founding Fathers—that the passion for freedom cannot be denied forever.

The Declaration of Independence was not a uniquely American ideal, as some believed, but a revolutionary proclamation that was universal in application.

Just a few days before his death, Thomas Jefferson wrote: May it be to the world what I believe it will be: To some parts sooner, to others later, but finally to all, the signal of arousing men to burst their chains . . . The mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs for a favored few, booted and spurred ready to ride them by the grace of God."

Years later, Lincoln reinforced Jefferson's words when he said that the principle that held the Union together was not simply our separation from England. It was "something in the Declaration . . . Something giving liberty not alone to people of this country, but hope to the world. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men."

While men and women the world over yearn for freedom, the vast majority of them are still shackled to the ball and chain of political and personal oppression. But the fires of freedom, if not burning, are at least flickering in China, the Soviet Union, South Africa, eastern Europe, Panama and Central America.

Hundreds of thousands, lifted by the dream of democracy, are performing in deed what Patrick Henry said in words: "Give me liberty; or give me death."

They look to the United States for leadership, as the shining example of a revolution that forged an enduring democracy. And we should be proud and inspired by the Chinese students who erected a styrofoam replica of Lady Liberty in Tiananmen Square. And I would add parenthetically, quite a bit embarrassed too, that our young nation has slipped so quickly into middle age cynicism, apathy or indifference, whereby half of our

citizens can no longer be bothered to walk across the street to a polling booth on Election Day. Perhaps the courage of others to face bayonets and bullets so they might taste for the first time what we have enjoyed for more than 200 years will shake us from our slumber.

History has taught us that it requires courage to seek freedom, to establish a democracy, but vigilance to keep it.

Our Constitution and democratic institutions have endured and that is a testament to their strength and resiliency. But we also know that those institutions are fragile and not only capable of being overwhelmed by external enemies but undermined by those entrusted with political power who find the workings of democracy too slow, cumbersome or inconvenient.

Twice in a period of just thirteen years, we witnessed a small group of men in the White House grow frustrated with the division of constitutional powers, who equated dissent with disloyalty and treated the rule of law with disdain. The goal was thought to be greater than the method of achieving it and so rules were bent, laws broken, lies told. In each instance, rescue of the truth turned upon happenstance: a night watchman who discovered a peice of tape on a hotel doorlock; a cargo plane shot down in the jungles of Nicaragua and an allegation of wrongdoing printed in a Beirut newspaper.

The inevitable contest for power and the potential for abuse of power were clearly foreseen by our country's founders. They knew that there would be those who would demand action, question the motives of those who disagreed, and seek to stifle the voices of dissent. Speed of action was never the goal of America's architects. They realized that a king could move faster than a congressman on any occasion. But kings, while agile and swift could also enslave. The founders expressly preferred debate, deliberation and even delay to the allure of swift declarations by an autonomous executive. They knew that: power must be entrusted to someone, but no one could be trusted with power; that democracy can best be defended by a diffusion of political power; that while our laws must be ever changing and adaptive in a world of rapid change, what must remain unshakable is the sanctity of the rule of law itself. The need for an absolute reverence for the rule of law was captured in "A Man For All Seasons" when William Roper declared "I'd cut down every law in England to get at the devil." And Sir Thomas More said, "Oh? And when the last law was down, and the devil turned round on you, where would you hide, Roper . . . If you cut them down, do you really think you could stand upright in the winds that blow then? Yes, I'd give the devil benefit of law for my own safety's sake."

And it is for our safety's sake that each one of us has a responsibility to remain a watchman in the night.

The threats to freedom will come not only from those who claim a higher good, a greater patriotism or a grander vision. They will come in guises never contemplated.

As we enter the third century of the Constitution, the rate of technological innovations is accelerating exponentially. As has been the case throughout history, these innovations hold the promise of great benefit—improving health and the quality of life—and potentially great harm—to the environment, to human life, and even to our democratic ideals. As we rocket our way through the age of Future Shock, our survival as a free and open society will turn on how well we will be able to maintain the balance between the national interest and individual rights in the face of mounting social

problems, and how well we avoid infringing on constitutional rights with a technology that is silent but potentially more subversive than anything in our past experience.

One factor that has dramatically altered our society in the past half-century has been the computer. This modern day Prometheus gift of fire has forever altered the way we do business ourselves, with each other, and with our government. No longer is the computer the exclusive tool of IBM or academia, with one mammoth mainframe in the science building. Rather, it is an everyday tool of business and bureaucrats, students and shoppers, airline pilots and police officers. The computer, and the linkage of multiple data bases allows us to gather, store, retrieve, and process vast quantities of information in milliseconds.

We embrace the technology that carries us to the moon and allows us to obtain cash at bank machines in the pre-dawn hours. But it is the very efficiency, convenience, and comfort that disguise the dangers that information technology can bring to our liberties.

The clearest conflict that has emerged is that of the government's use of information and the citizen's right to privacy. Justice Louis Brandeis identified the "right to be left alone (as) the most comprehensive of rights, and the right most valued by civilized men." As information becomes more available to the government, however, this right to be left alone will become increasingly difficult to sustain.

An instructive example is computer matching, an investigative technique that is widely used by states and local governments. In a computer matching program, one agency compares its lists against the lists of another agency to find common names. The government matches a thousand or even a hundred thousand names against phone numbers, social security numbers, or other identifiers within seconds to find evidence of fraud, waste or abuse.

At times of high budget deficits, the lure of computer techniques to find fraud is not only appealing, but irresistible. Advocates of computer matching argue that there is really nothing new when the government uses computers to search through files—and that the same investigations have been done manually for years. The computer, they argue, is simply a tool—a neutral tool that is not menacing or vindictive. "It's not the computer that creates the problem, it's people," they claim. This is but a half-truth. The sheer speed and capacity of the computer enables and encourages searches of files that would never be undertaken manually. The computer search also takes on a more intrusive, insidious character. No longer is it the man in the raincoat and the dark hat following you around or searching through your bank files. Rather, it is the faceless, remote machine that can scan massive amounts of the most sensitive, personal data, with almost no human beings involved in the process of storing and tracking information.

The argument has been raised that only those who have something to hide will be affected by the government's use of computer investigative techniques. The honest have nothing to fear. But the case of a computer match involving bank records in Massachusetts several years ago illustrates that many more persons than only the fraudulent can have their due process and privacy rights threatened by such computer techniques. The State of Massachusetts matched its list of welfare recipients to records of banks to determine if persons receiving welfare had any hidden assets. The match turned up the names of over 1,000 welfare recipients who