

## Cut all the manure

President's hit list too thin to matter

As Congress gears up to run another budget deficit in the hundreds of billions of dollars, President Bush has been watchdogging the prickly pear people. Prickly pear research — \$100,000 worth — is one of a hit list of projects Bush recently released as a group of rescissions he would like to see in the budget for fiscal year 1992. Altogether, Bush proposed \$3.6 billion of wide-ranging cuts.

To understand the nature of this list, it should be divided into two categories. Of the 68 programs identified, 66 together make up less than 10 percent of the total the rescissions would save. The other two make up 90 percent of the savings.

Far and away the largest savings would come from the previously announced axing of two Seawolf nuclear submarines costing \$2.8 billion. Another \$547.7 million chunk comes from funds allocated for new public housing construction.

The remainder of the cuts includes a variety of smaller programs from around the country, some of which appear to have been chosen because they might sound foolish to voters, and others that don't appear to have been chosen for any particular reason.

The Washington Post reported that, according to Republican congressional aides, many of the projects were recommended for the chopping block because they were not originally authorized "under normally applicable requirements."

Apparently, the other billions upon billions of deficit dollars were authorized according to the "requirements."

The list does contain a smattering of decidedly silly programs. Lowbrush blueberry research, vidalia onion storage, manure disposal and similar projects were each budgeted hundreds of thousands of dollars.

However, why other programs were included on the hit list is unknown. James Merchant, an associate professor with the UNL Conservation and Survey Division, said the projects, such as a water study he is involved with, had little in common with each other.

There is one thread that ties the list together: Except for the defense and housing cuts, none of these projects amounts to anything in the big scheme of things. One B-2 bomber costs more than 90 percent of these projects put together.

Some voters may get a kick out of this "crusade," but the pork the president picked is but a tiny collection of minuscule hams in a giant barrel. Election-year politicking won't help the budget deficit.

Office of Management and Budget Director Richard Darman said a longer list of more rescissions will follow the first. If it's just more of the same, the list will barely be worth the government funds the Administration will use to publicize it.

Bush should be spending his time coming up with a logical, comprehensive plan — not sticking his nose in prickly pears and manure.

## Homosexuals face prejudices

I would like to thank Matt McDonald for the informative editorial he wrote on Wednesday ("Liberal ignorance resurfaces," DN, April 1).

I had heard that sodomy was illegal, but I did not realize that law had been so recently tested and constitutionally verified by a Supreme Court decision (*Bowers v. Harwick*, 1986). I am glad that this fact was published because most people are unaware of the extent of the prejudice that homosexuals face. A lot of people think that homosexuals only have to deal with hostile, ignorant individuals who call them names and beat them up unprovoked. However, you have illustrated that the prejudice against homosexuals even infiltrates our laws.

As you pointed out, under the law, male homosexuals who have known each other for years and who love each other deeply enough to daily face prejudice and persecution as a result of that love, these men still do not have the right to copulate. However, under the law, two willing heterosexuals who just met at a party do have the right to have a one-night stand if they wish. They are not even required to have any tests done first to check for AIDS or STDs.

The legal system, as it now stands,

reminds me of a past time when, under the law, even the most abusive, prejudiced white men had the right to vote, but women and blacks did not.

I am also impressed with the fact that you uphold such high morals and do not smoke, drink or speed. You remind me of some very religious pharisees who, in the time of Jesus, used to accuse Jesus of sinning by committing loving acts of healing on the Sabbath, which was, of course, against their religious law.

Finally, I want to commend you for gearing your future to fix the problems that you see in society. However, you weren't very specific in how you will do that. Do you do it in the way that Jesus used to? He used to hang out with "sinners and tax-gatherers," eating and drinking with them, and showing them love and compassion. Do you also socialize with those you view as immoral? Do you visit gay bars or volunteer to minister to AIDS victims?

One final question, what sort of social problems arise when an undiseased man who is in love with another undiseased man, places his penis into the other's anus in the privacy of their own home?

Jery Sanom  
Lincoln

## EDITORIAL POLICY

Staff editorials represent the official policy of the Spring 1992 Daily Nebraskan. Policy is set by the Daily Nebraskan Editorial Board. Its members are: Jana Pedersen, editor; Alan Phelps, opinion page editor; Kara Wells, managing editor; Roger Price, wire editor; Wendy Navratil, copy

desk chief; Brian Shellito, cartoonist; Jeremy Fitzpatrick, senior reporter.

According to policy set by the regents, responsibility for the editorial content of the newspaper lies solely in the hands of its students.



## PAUL SOUDERS Politicians should end nastiness

Political nastiness is reaching an all-time high in Washington (D.C., that is, not the state, which is far too flaky to breed mutant armies of nasty politicians).

Hot on the heels of the congressional check-bouncing, post office and stealing-candy-from-babies scandals comes a House of Representatives' inquiry into White House travel expenses.

Apparently, the best-traveled president since we've started having presidents is unable to account for the source of all his travel money. If it takes \$50,000 an hour to operate the presidential jet Air Force One, why is George Bush's total AFI flight budget a mere \$29,000? For pocket change like \$29,000 a year, I'd expect the president to be flying back in the sardine seats with me.

Actually, sending the commander in chief out in coach class isn't such a bad idea. It would be great for George's apparent lack of identification with "the little guy" (i.e. non-millionaires). After all, the born-wealthy Bush probably never has flown anything but first class, even in his pre-political infancy.

What a photo opportunity! If Mr. Bush can't run down to the local mall to fetch a pair of socks without setting up a major media event, think what great publicity riding nine hours shoulder-to-shoulder with a 300-pound skunk farmer and his sniffly, non-potty-trained two-year-old would bring.

Of course, the head exec of the world's richest nation can look forward to his complimentary snack of a teeny handful of unsalted peanuts and his dinner choice of either baked tuna soufflé or meatloaf almondine.

And all of this free national press would come with massive savings for the average taxpayer, who will no longer need to shell out annual executive travel bills in the neighborhood of tens of millions of dollars. That's a pretty nice neighborhood — the kind of neighborhood where presidential aides get chauffeured limousine rides to work every day.

Speaker of the House Tom Foley claims the inquiry is aimed only at finding where the money actually does come from (probably military and



**Actually, sending the commander in chief out in coach class isn't such a bad idea. It would be great for George's apparent lack of identification with "the little guy" (i.e. non-millionaires).**

secret service budgets) and why White House accounts don't reflect the expense.

Foley says he's not interested in why the money is spent the way it is and that the inquiry has been in the works for months. But it couldn't have come at a more politically expedient time, what with the scandal-of-the-week (something about the post office, I think) rocking Capitol Hill.

But this is also the White House's response, to blame Congressional Democrats for one impropriety or another, to vehemently deny everything and to pass the whole mess off onto Democratic political game-playing. Not coincidentally, it is also the White House line on every executive failure (the annual budget wrestling match comes to mind here) to get a little frothy-mouthed and rant about the Demos on the Hill.

George Bush just can't stand it when he can't get his way, and it's all the Democrats' fault.

My big question is, if the money's all legit, but just spread out all over, what's the big deal? Why all the stink?

It seems to me to be just another incident in a long line of political maneuvers aimed mostly at making someone else look bad.

I'd like to see George Bush come out and say something like, "Sure, Tom, come on over and check the books. We'll work this out." Instead, the American public is treated to another intragovernment trench war along the party battle lines.

And in election years, that war spills over to intraparty battles. In the latest Brown/Clinton debate, Jerry Brown became vindictive and more than a little rude (even interrupting the moderator) trying to respond to Clinton's assertion that the Brown "flat tax rate" plan would fail to fill out the budget.

At least I think that's why Jerry got so mad; I even watched the debate, nearly in its entirety, and would have trouble saying what set him off.

Clinton's numbers just breezed by, a blur of statistics muttered in anger in the space of about 10 seconds, but it was enough to make Gov. Moonbeam hot under the collar.

Clinton, too, had his little eruption last week, blowing up at his naysayers in an impromptu explosion. He'd had enough, by gum, and he wasn't going to take anymore.

To all these politicians, regardless of party affiliation, who can't take the irritation of scrutiny and public inquiry, I can only offer the advice: If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.

The entire Brown/Clinton vendetta seems to be especially nasty for a primary election. Usually we don't see this kind of poison until the general election, probably because candidates in the same party are supposed to be on the same side.

I'd even venture to say that politicians in the same government — regardless of party affiliation — should be more or less on the same side. The side of the "general good," of prosperity and freedom, etc.

But of course that's more than a little optimistic. Given the sad state of national politics these days, I'm amazed the revolution hasn't started yet.

Souder is a junior English major and a Daily Nebraskan columnist.

## LETTER POLICY

The Daily Nebraskan welcomes brief letters to the editor from all readers and interested others.

Letters will be selected for publication on the basis of clarity, originality, timeliness and space avail-

able. The Daily Nebraskan retains the right to edit or reject all material submitted.

Anonymous submissions will not be considered for publication. Letters should include the author's

name, year in school, major and group affiliation, if any. Requests to withhold names will not be granted.

Submit material to the Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, 1400 R St., Lincoln, Neb. 68588-0448.