

## Bush's quick court nomination curious

President Bush didn't waste any time selecting a nominee to replace retired Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan. But the Senate should take a long, hard look at David Souter, Bush's choice to replace Brennan.

Brennan will be sorely missed. Appointed by Pres. Dwight Eisenhower 34 years ago, he was a staunch supporter of civil rights. His departure means the court is losing the most vocal member of the liberal wing of the Court. He is largely responsible for putting together the coalition for the recent 5-4 decision upholding free speech in regards to flag burning.

Brennan resigned from the highest court in the land last week citing ill health. But his resignation sets the stage for the biggest political battle of George Bush's presidency.

Bush's candidate for the open position, David Souter, was appointed by the president earlier this year to the 1st U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Until then, he was a member of the New Hampshire State Supreme Court, appointed by then-governor John Sununu, currently Bush's chief of staff.

The president's expedient nomination of a candidate is baffling. He said that the process for screening candidates for a potential vacancy has been going on for some time, but not with Brennan in mind. Why Bush was concerned about a non-problem is not known. But if he has been worrying about a possible vacancy on the high court, it helps explain his neglect of important national problems such as the S & L debacle, homelessness, and the budget.

While Bush claims he felt it inappropriate to ask Souter his personal views on specific issues, all the president had to do was ask Sununu. And while Bush correctly feels it is a Justice's duty to interpret the Constitution and not legislate laws, the confrontation in the Senate will be between conservatives who believe that interpretation of the Constitution should be done in the spirit of the original writers, or liberals who believe it should be applied to today's society.

The Supreme Court has shifted to the right since Ronald Reagan's presidency. Many civil rights decisions of the 1960s and 70s are under close scrutiny, most notably the 1973 Roe vs. Wade decision allowing abortions. The criteria for selecting a new Supreme Court Justice should begin with a willingness to accept past decisions of the high court.

Although Bush would like a swift confirmation, the Senate, remembering the failed Reagan nominations of Bork and Ginsburg, should take its time and make sure it does not appoint a Bush ideologue. Let civil rights, free speech and the Roe vs. Wade decisions stand. The new Justice should be concerned with shaping future decisions, not changing past ones.



## Housing decision precedent-setting

After almost a year of deliberation, Myles Brand's decision on family housing is a good one.

Now students with children, whether single, married, gay, lesbian or straight, will have access to family housing. These people will also be allowed to have a partner, roommate, friend, or whoever share the housing with them.

The ruling seems to have the right group of people in mind: students with children.

As we enter the '90s, the number of college students with children continues to grow. For these students, college is an expensive prospect. Tuition, fees, books, rent, food, clothing, transportation, child care, medical expenses and utilities are only the beginning. There are endless hidden costs involved in raising children.

Unfortunately, the current mandates of University Housing do not give any preference to students with children. Graduate students are given first priority and then all others on a first come, first served basis. This policy is not set to change.

Perhaps as University Housing expands this fall, it should consider adopting another new policy, one that gives priority to students with children.

While it may be difficult for married stu-

dents to find inexpensive housing, their cost of living is not as high as student parents. This is not to say that married students should be blocked from University Housing, just that student parents should have first priority.

While some are disappointed that Brand did not choose to allow unmarried or gay and lesbian couples without children to live in family housing, his decision is not surprising.

Brand's focus was to provide housing for students with dependent children. To open family housing to unmarried couples without children would just limit the number of housing units available to student parents.

It is exciting to see that the University is publicly accepting gay and lesbian couples living together raising children.

Brand, a strong supporter of affirmative action, has put his money where his mouth is and put together a policy that does not discriminate and will increase access to education for students with children.

This decision is precedent-setting and hopefully will cause other schools to reconsider their family housing policies. As the student population shifts, it is good to see the University and Brand at the forefront of policy change.

## Missed facts

In her letter (ODE, April 27) Jackie Corday missed important facts concerning Sen. Peg Jolin. To be fair, it's not all Ms. Corday's fault; the media's admitted preference for a snappy quote is partly to blame.

Sen. Jolin used a phrase about owls and frying pans to illustrate an attitude held by some upset loggers, an attitude that is just as unhelpful as some lawsuits bent on halting timber harvests. The context of the remark was omitted in reports of the press conference where the statement was made.

On another point, however, Ms. Corday should have checked before making assumptions about the senator's legislative work.

Peg Jolin has worked hard on legislation to offer displaced forest industry workers job re-

training, to ban export of raw logs, to encourage more development and marketing of finished wood products, and to institute better silviculture practices. She has been fighting for precisely those efforts Ms. Corday wants legislators' energies concentrated on.

During this interim between sessions, Sen. Jolin is serving on the Joint Forest Products Policy Committee (which I co-chair) where we are pursuing all these avenues and others. Timber is, and will be for many years to come, a mainstay of our economy. We need to protect its jobs as we strengthen protection of the environment. To pretend any side in this complex discussion has all the answers merely polarizes; it does not help us reach the balance we must achieve.

Bill Bradbury  
Senate Majority Leader

## No manners

Bill Rogers' "gaffes" are getting worse. Could he be suffering from Alzheimers disease or is he just an uncouth bigot who has no public manners in a public job? He wanted this position as chairman of the Lane County Commissioners but appears incapable of performing it. I can hardly wait for January 1991 when we can get a "real chairman" to do the job. I wish he could be stripped of his position now. Lane County deserves better than this man.

Hilde Cherry  
Eugene

## Non-students

A few days ago, in the middle of the afternoon, I observed

Officer Cline of the Eugene Police Department approach a small group of seated people near 13th and Kincaid and ask them to leave campus. He claimed to be enforcing a University policy barring unaccompanied non-students from campus.

Surprised that this would be University policy, I contacted Dan Williams, vice-president for administration. He confirmed that he had authorized the police to, at their discretion, arrest non-students merely for being on-campus at this "troubled" corner. He wasn't sure that trespassing charges would hold up in court (can a public university restrict access more than a private airport?) but didn't think that it would be tested. Of course this is because the people being selectively ejected can't afford to fight for their rights.

## Letters

Mr. Williams was not willing to suggest to the police that they approach people only for behavioral reasons, and not just for being on campus and looking "different".

Should a university mimic a chic New York night club, with hired bouncers to decide who is "ugly" and should be excluded? Aren't we here to exchange ideas with and learn about other people, including the homeless?

Of course people who disturb classes with noise, accost students and, I suppose, consciously damage the lawn should be asked to move on. But do we really want to, or have the right to, exclude people from the University just because they don't look like candidates for the business school?

Robert Schofield  
Physics