

# Still a chance for abortion funding

The Oregon Legislature's Emergency Board voted Friday to follow the lead of the federal government in not paying for welfare abortions unless the pregnancy occurred because of rape or incest, or unless the mother's life is endangered.

The federal government is denying the use of welfare money for abortions, leaving the issue in the hands of the states. This state has responded by rejecting a proposal to fund the abortions with emergency fund money.

In addition, the Emergency Board rejected a compromise proposal to allow the funding of abortions for women who are on welfare at the time of conception. It seems that the Emergency Board is tagging along with the fed in refusing to recognize the injustice of allowing abortions for all but the poor.

There is a chance that the Department of Human Resources, the agency requesting the abortion funding, will bring the issue back to the Emergency Board at its Feb. 23 meeting for reconsideration. At that time, the Emergency Board may be able to change its stand and allow abortions for the poor.

The case for welfare abortions has been made. The poor, saddled with expenses that eat up a large percentage of their income — if they have an income at all — may have to resort to the coat-hanger abortions so common before welfare abortions became available. An abortion in Eugene now costs about \$250 — far out of reach of the poor.

It is a woman's right to control her life. An unwanted birth may affect the course of a woman's life irreparably. Birth control devices are not always completely effective, nor are they completely safe. Rich women can call back the mistake under safe conditions. Without welfare money, the poor will be relegated to unsafe practices — the public health ramifications of which the federal and the state governments have so far ignored.

If both rich and poor must eat to live, but the poor can't afford it, the government steps in to pick up the tab for the poor to ensure that no one suffers. And so it should be. But with other legal actions, such as legal abortions, the government has created a double standard so obvious and vile that it brings the justice of our economic and political system under question.

The Supreme Court has ruled that abortion is legal during the first three months of pregnancy. A woman can have an abortion if she wants one, but only if she can pay the price. The federal decision to disallow welfare abortions creates yet another division between rich and poor in America. The rights allowed to the rich are denied the poor because the government refuses to create equality between the classes.

The "let them eat cake" attitude adopted by the federal government and the state's Emergency board cannot continue. The Emergency Board should recognize human rights by reversing its stand. Oregon should recognize the rights of its women and its poor: the abortion funding must be given.

# Letters

## Dear protester...

It is presumptuous for you to assume that I don't hold ideas, because I don't hold your ideas. It is vile. I do not march for divestment, or for liberation in South Africa. I do not march for "Stop the stalling, dump the stocks now." I do not march for the apartheid form of government in South Africa. I do march for myself; whenever and wherever my own interests are at issue. I am proud of that.

You cannot successfully demur a Mack truck that runs a red light when you have the walk sign, by stepping in its path. You cannot successfully protest a differing value by vehemently maintaining yours. (Spitting in your opponents face does not help either.) I wait

on the curb for the truck to pass. I end the discussion. I will not presume you do the same.

Instead, I will offer a solution to your ultimatum with which you can test not only the validity of your opposition to U.S. investments in South Africa, but also the validity of your moral convictions. I will not presume you have those.

There would be no University without students. If instead of marching you leave the University, protesting by refusing to attend and pay tuition, then your problem would be resolved.

In effect, you would no longer be supporting the "vicious" apartheid system in South Africa. Listen. You would no longer be supporting the apartheid form of gov-

ernment in South Africa. And if, indeed, your desires are reasonable, then obviously, all students would follow. The University could not function as such without your tuition. The result? There would be no University investment in U.S. corporations operating in South Africa. There would be no University.

There is only one form of rational protest: Individual voice; individual choice. Choose. If yours is the wrong choice then beware of Mack trucks running red lights. And please, chant a little quieter when I'm studying, and you're parading in the EMU.

David Greene  
Sophomore, Economics

## analysis

# Sadat has three-fold purpose

By NICOLAS B. TATRO  
Associated Press Writer

CAIRO, Egypt — President Anwar Sadat's upcoming trip to the United States appears to have a three-fold purpose: to ask U.S. leaders to put political pressure on Israel, lobby Congress for arms aid and sell his negotiating position to the American public.

Sadat is scheduled to huddle with President Carter in the secluded surroundings of Camp David, Md., Saturday and Sunday for discussions on the current status of Middle East peace negotiations. He also plans meetings with key members of Congress and the media.

Egyptian diplomats, legislators and newspapers are calling for a change in what they see as America's "blind support" of Israel militarily and its unwillingness to alienate a long-time political ally.

"The trip would be a real success should we succeed in changing the U.S. position," said a Sunday editorial in Al Gomhouria, one of Cairo's three leading daily newspapers.

"We do not ask the Americans to take sides with us but we

want a frank answer to this question: is the U.S. ready to defend Israel within its borders or is it ready to defend its expansions as well?"

In a joint statement Saturday, the Egyptian parliament's national security and foreign relations committees called for "more decisive and effective" U.S. pressure on the Israelis. One senior Egyptian diplomat has accused the Carter administration of being "very weak" and even "gutless" when it came to using its muscle on Israel.

The two committees also criticized U.S. arms sales to Israel on grounds they provoke Israeli intransigence at the negotiating table.

Sadat made it clear in a speech to the Egyptian parliament on Jan. 21 he is seeking arms parity with Israel. Unable to purchase Soviet weapons because of a diplomatic squabble in 1972 and limited to buying nonlethal armaments from the United States, Sadat said he has asked Carter "to arm Egypt with all the weapons Israel has."

The Egyptian president argues he needs modern arms not to attack Israel but to thwart Soviet ambitions throughout Africa, particularly because of Russian sup-

port for Ethiopia in its conflict with Moslem Somali.

Sadat hopes to put pressure on Israel through a public relations campaign during his U.S. visit. Using television interviews and news conferences, Egyptian sources said, Sadat hopes to convince the American public that Israel is to blame for the stalled peace talks.

Egypt also will seek support from several European nations when Sadat meets with heads of state from Britain, West Germany, Austria, Romania and France during stops on his way home from Washington.

But Sadat continues to lack support from most of his Arab brethren.

As for more concrete developments arising from Sadat's trip, Foreign Minister Mohamed Ibrahim Kamel has said not to expect Carter and Sadat to finalize any delcaration of Mideast peace principles because of the "big gap" now separating Israeli and Egyptian positions.

Kamel's statement was aimed at reducing expectations raised by reports from Washington and Israel that an agreement was close at hand.

I AM OPPOSED TO AFFIRMATIVE ACTION ON MORAL GROUNDS.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION SETS UP QUOTAS.

IT FAVORS SOME GROUPS -

AND RESTRICTS OTHER GROUPS.



MY GROUP HAS PROSPERED WITHOUT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION.

SO TO HELL WITH YOUR GROUP.

BUT WHAT ARE YOUR MORAL GROUNDS?

ME FIRST!



ONE FIELD NEWSPAPER SYNDICATE, 1977

© 1977 THE NEW YORK TIMES

1-29