

Bush should rework 1991 budget plan

With his popularity soaring to record levels, and his recent victory over Congress on his China policy, it will be interesting to see if George Bush can push through his 1991 budget.

The \$1.23 trillion proposal, unveiled Monday, came under fire even before it was released. Opponents say Bush has based his budget on economic growth that probably will not pan out.

Bush has predicted the economy will increase next year by 2.6 percent, based on 1989 fourth quarter numbers. Most economists argue the growth rate will be much lower than that, and that for every 1 percentage point Bush is off, the U.S. will lose \$18 billion in revenue.

One of Bush's campaign promises was a balanced federal budget. The 1991 proposal is his first step in a process to balance the budget by 1993. Bush plans to reduce the federal deficit to "only" \$63.1 billion. This year, the federal government is \$123.8 billion in the red, far higher than the oft-ignored Gramm-Rudman level of \$100 billion.

In 1980, before he became his running mate, Bush accused Ronald Reagan of practicing "voodoo economics." Now, after serving almost a decade under Reaganomics, Bush seems to have fallen into the same sort of number-juggling and budget-bending tactics of his predecessor.

Last year saw great change in the Soviet bloc countries, and it was partially reflected in the Bush budget. He plans to increase aid to Eastern Europe in hopes of keeping the fledgling democracies operating.

Announcements of huge weapon and troop reductions by the Soviets fueled speculation that Bush might propose large cuts in the defense budget. He did. His \$303.3 billion defense budget, when inflation is figured in, amounts to a 2 percent decline from last year's figures.

In light of the rumors that the Soviets may propose a total removal of troops in Europe, Bush's minuscule defense cuts must seem like a slap in the face to Gorbachev and other European leaders.

Opponents of the budget have already declared they will fight it in Congress. Bush's plan to keep defense costs high, while gutting social programs such as Medicare and farm subsidies, does not sit well with the Democrat-controlled House.

The present budget will surely be different from the one that will emerge after the legislative trench warfare has ended. Before the proposal gets bogged down in political rhetoric, Bush should concede to his opponents the need for reduced defense spending and increased budgets for social programs.



The Rainy Season

Senators take the wrong stand on Pelosi

Despite vocal pleas from their constituents, Oregon's two senators, Mark Hatfield and Bob Packwood, voted last week to uphold President George Bush's veto of legislation granting immigration relief to Chinese students in the United States. Now, 43,000 Chinese students in this country feel betrayed by a country they want to emulate. Shame on these senators for not taking the proper moral stand on this issue.

Hatfield and Packwood bought into the lie that Bush's executive order protected Chinese students in the same way the Pelosi bill would have, and that the bill was therefore superfluous. To us however, it seems if Bush truly supported the protection extended by this bill, he would have jumped at the chance to sign it.

Bush's problem, of course, is that legislation is binding, while executive orders can be retracted at any time. That must be appealing to an administration willing to say one thing about China and do the other. Witness the secret diplomatic missions to Beijing shortly after the Tiananmen massacre while Bush's official policy was one of no

dialogue.

Bush — and Hatfield and Packwood by agreement — also argued that an enacted Pelosi bill would have angered Chinese leaders enough to endanger future student exchanges. That point is worth briefly pondering, for indeed, we do no favors for Chinese students keeping them in their country. Of course, we also do them little good allowing them here but keeping them mute, as China wants them.

First, it's doubtful the Chinese leadership, highly desirous of advancing the nation, would prohibit China's best minds from seeking the best education. Secondly, if Pelosi angers Beijing, why doesn't Bush's enforced presidential decree?

But the Chinese government is smart, and it sees the more likely scenario: the protection offered by Bush's executive order and the protection offered in Pelosi are not the same. Beijing, which has so far done as it pleases fearing little objection from Washington, recognizes that Bush appears tolerant of whatever atrocities the Chinese government is willing to commit.

Letters

Control

Once again, a "reminder," that abortion did not stop when they were made illegal, and the number of deaths of women rose drastically due to back-alley, coat hanger abortions.

Bob Weigel, in response to your "Used to be" letter (ODE, Jan. 26), do you really have any idea about what the issue of abortion is really about? It is much more than whether the legal abortion rate is up or down, it has to do with women controlling their own bodies and therefore, their own emotional well-being.

Rape happens. Incest happens, and birth control does fail. This is not the fault of the woman, and she cannot be "blamed" for the consequences," as you so conveniently suggest. Also, a baby should not just be a consequence. Just because a woman gets pregnant does not mean she has to "put her body out for use by anyone."

A woman's body is hers to do with what she will, just like yours, Weigel. Making abortion illegal puts women in a con-

stant state of fear and regret. And lastly, men who want to manipulate and control women's bodies are as they have always been: anti-choice. That's what this issue is about, choice and personal control. I am pro-life, pro-children, pro-women and most of all, pro-choice.

America means freedom.

Deborah Rae Watson
Psychology

Do-gooder

If Michael Schell (ODE, Jan. 24) wants to rip on Tim Hughes, fine. He may have a point, but to over-generalize and say that everyone who sees the world as a place that can use some improvement is a psychotic do-gooder is going too far.

It is Schell's sort of close-minded apathy that keeps passing the buck of responsibility on and on until the only thing an individual will take pride in is his or her little petty world.

Most letters try to do more than say "sodomize a Mercedes owner." They try to make the reader think about what is truly necessary. I hope Schell can

observe, generalize and accept the media as more than a medium to bring entertainment to make the morning happier.

Have a good life, and do something good for someone besides yourself.

Kirk Rinaldi
Student

Manipulation?

Bob Weigel, thanks for the "reminder" (ODE, Jan. 26). The law actually is a reminder of what is right, providing the right laws have been made. The question is, what is the right law? I guess you've decided that.

I argue also that the number of abortions per capita have increased since they have been legalized. I mean, obviously those back alley clinic used to keep very accurate records.

I also argue women may have feared the consequences (of getting pregnant). It was hard to find a job as a woman, much less being an "unmarried-pregnant" one. It was/is easier to keep a wife "in line" if she has kids.

The last bit of your letter is hard to understand. How is a

woman's body misused? By having intercourse once with a man? I feel sorry for your future (or present) state of mind.

Lastly, I'm pro-abortion, and I know I do not want to manipulate women. The reason I'm saying anything at all is so that I can protect those poor ignorant sluts from manipulative men, because I'm not one.

Michael Abell
Eugene

Go Everett

This letter is in response to Michael Simon's praising of Green Bay quarterback Don Majkowski (ODE, Jan. 26). First of all, anyone who doesn't think Joe Montana was the best in the league this past season is an absolute idiot. The man accomplished the highest computer rating ever. Being a Rams fan, this is a big compliment from me.

The real argument should be made for second best. Majkowski shouldn't even be on the Pro Bowl team. The most overlooked quarterback for the past two seasons has been the Rams' Jim Everett.

Everett led the league in

passing yardage, completion percentage and touchdowns in 1988, while he was second in passing yardage and first in touchdowns in 1989. He was rated third behind only Montana and Boomer Esiason. Majkowski was fifth in the NFC alone.

Secondly, the Rams were the best come-from-behind team. Everett led his team to more late fourth-quarter scores than even Majkowski, including a 13-12 win over San Francisco and a 19-13 playoff win over New York.

Finally, if you're going to say Majkowski's the best because the Packers beat the 49ers, then be prepared to pay the consequences. Everett and the Rams beat both the 49ers and the Packers during the regular season.

All the facts point to Montana and Everett as the two best quarterbacks in the NFL. All other arguments fall short.

One final question: While the Rams and 49ers were battling for the NFC championship, where were Majkowski and the Packers?

Eric Luebbers
Pre-business