

## Letter to the Editor:

A few weeks ago we read a sign in the Reed Building which, as we recall, stated, "What did Jesus say about homosexuality and homosexuals? Absolutely nothing!" We are not sure of the motive of the creators of the sign. With the invitation to "Come Out" on the sign, it seems the intent was to remove any Scriptural restraint someone might have to openly endorsing homosexuality. Whether or not Jesus said anything about homosexuality is uncertain because the Gospels were never intended to be a complete account of all Jesus said or did (John 21:25). What is certain is that the biblical model for the home is the traditional family (e.g. Genesis 2:24; Matthew 19:4-6; Ephesians 5:22-6:4). The Bible requires that the sexual relationship remain between a man and a woman who have made a lifetime commitment to faithfully love each other within marriage. Therefore, it seems inconceivable that Jesus Christ, the central figure of Scripture, would condone any lifestyle which deviates from the biblical model.

In our country every person has the right to promote any conviction or lifestyle; we respect that right. However, no person has the right to distort the teachings of a historical person to advance their viewpoint. For the situation in question, Christ's view of the issue was probably the opposite of what the sign implied. This is particularly disheartening to us as Christians since Christ is the center of our faith and worship.

*InterVarsity Christian Fellowship leadership team and advisors*



# Budget reform

In the midst of the Federal Budget crisis, the Republicans in congress are actually doing what they promised to the voters in 1994. That is making the necessary sacrifices toward securing the first balance budget since 1969.

The Liberals and the Clinton administration launched a campaign of fear and antagonism in order to discredit the GOP drive for a balanced budget. The Democrats up to date have not provided a concise plan for obtaining a balanced budget. In fact the CBO (Congressional Budget Office) has predicted that Clinton budget figures will result in a \$209 billion deficit in 2004, nearly 40 billion dollars higher than it is today. The president promised to present a 5-year plan on balancing the budget to Congress on Larry King Live in June 1992. Mr. Clinton's plan was so bad that the Senate voted 98-0 against his budget, and not one Democrat agreed to sponsor it. The president clearly has no vision to obtain the balanced budget that Governor Clinton called for during the campaign, but when Congress proposed a blueprint to do just that he starts crying foul.

Does President Clinton get it? America no longer can afford to spend and spend because the costs in the future are just too great.

He campaigned as an agent of change, but he defends the status quo at every turn. Maybe Clinton thinks that we can balance the budget without pain. Former CBO director Robert Reischauer (a Democrat) told the Los Angeles Times on September 4, 1995, "If Clinton vetoes the continuing resolutions, he will be responsible for shutting down the government. If he signs, he will have lost a key fight. I don't think that he has many cards in this game." Clinton vetoed the continuing resolutions, not out of principle or facts, but because he wants to keep Air Force One.

Former Democratic Congressman Tim Penny said it best in a September 28, 1995 Washington Post interview, "My party is making a big mistake. With Medicare facing a financial crisis, Democrats are playing politics instead of coming up with constructive solutions."

Constant cries comes from the Left that Republicans want to cut Medicare and deprive our nation's elderly of decent health care. The Democrats ignore the facts. If we allow Medicare to continue its growth rate under current law, it will be bankrupt in less than seven years according to the April 1995 Medicare Trustees report. In testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee on September 22, 1995, Guy King, former chairman of the Health Care Finance Committee stated that \$160 billion in part A Medicare savings was necessary over the next 7 years in order to keep the Medicare trust fund solvent. Medicare faces a looming crisis, mostly due to the vast number of Baby Boomers who will retire over the next fifteen years. Mr. King estimates that \$160 billion in savings is necessary in part A Medicare coverage and that \$110 billion is necessary in part B savings. Currently the Democrats have only offered \$89 billion in savings. The CBO estimates that the Democratic plan will only result in delaying bankruptcy by two years rather than solving the problem of a looming bankruptcy.

Under the GOP plan no senior will be forced to give up their current medicare coverage. Over the next seven years personal Medicare coverage will increase from the current \$4800 to over \$6700 in the year 2002. The GOP also includes provisions that will give seniors the right to choose several private health care

plans. The rate that determines the growth of part B premiums will not change. In the past seven years monthly Medicare premiums have risen from \$24.80 in 1988 to \$46.10 in 1995. Under Clinton's FY 1996 budget he has proposed increasing Medicare premiums to \$83 in 2002 just four dollars below the GOP proposal. The net result will be \$270 billion in savings over seven years. More affluent seniors will be forced to pay higher premiums. The House has proposed an increase on those seniors with yearly incomes over \$75,000 and couples making over \$125,000 reducing the amount of taxpayer subsidies of their premiums. The wealthiest seniors will pay 100% of their premiums. The Republicans are NOT cutting Medicare over the next seven years, in fact Medicare spending will grow at 4.7% over the next seven years. The Democrats call increasing spending less than 10% on budgeting items a cut.

Why won't the Democrats quit their demagoguery over a \$4 difference between what they want for Medicare premiums and what the GOP wants and agree to a plan to save Medicare?

Another cry of Liberal ideologues is that the Republicans want to cut programs to "pay for a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans." On the contrary the bulk of tax cuts are on the Middle Class Americans who account for most of the tax revenue. Under the Senate plan \$245 billion in taxes would be cut, 70% of all tax cuts will come from single income families making under \$75,000 per year. These families also you receive a \$500 per child tax credit. Tax cuts allow Americans to keep more of their hard earned incomes, and to invest them in the economy. It is ironic that John F. Kennedy called for a tax cut in 1962-63, which resulted in an increase of new jobs and wealth. If we remove the barriers to prosperity more Americans will be able to reap the benefits of economic process. The Democrats cheer about a prosperous economy. How can it be so prosperous when the best and brightest skilled workers are losing their job? Lower interest rates are always a sign of a slowing economy. Just ask Alan Greenspan. To each according to their ability, and to each according to his ambition.

Democratic policies clearly cannot offer Americans the security that they desire because it is the same old politics as usual. Where are all the innovative Democratic proposals to balance the budget, and save Medicare? We can see that the Democrats clearly lack the vision that Bill Clinton in 1992 said was so vital for the next century. Instead of proposing realistic alternatives to Republican proposals, they attack when they provide no alternatives. If you like \$200 billion deficits as far as the eye can see support Clinton. If the Democrats truly care about Americans they will work with the Republicans to balance the budget, and deliver concrete solutions to concrete problems. Instead of trying to cover a hemorrhaging wound with a band-aid, Americans need to start thinking more about their country, and thinking less about themselves. As long as people cry about this program or that program instead of saying, "We are in this together, and we need to make a sacrifice." We can enjoy the pleasures of \$200 billion deficits as far as the eye can see. How can we call for deficit reduction, and say leave my program alone? Why should we accept these cuts? So that we can look forward to a leaner and more financially sound federal government.

--By John Rossomondo

## The Behrend College Collegian

Published weekly by the students of  
The Pennsylvania State University  
at Erie, The Behrend College

**Editor in Chief**  
Jennifer V. Colvin

**Business Manager**  
Jennifer Heilman

**News Editor**  
Danielle Murphy

**Sports Editor**  
Nick Zulovich  
**Assistant Sports Editor**  
Julie Stocker

**Entertainment Editor**  
Joe Mottilo

**Photography Editors**  
Sheila Bickel  
Joe Stiller

**Opinion Editor**  
R. Carl Campbell III

**Advertising Manager**  
Jeremiah Bull

**Copy Editor**  
Michelle Gruendl

**Advisor**  
Mrs. Cathy Mester

**Artwork**  
Brad Martin

**Collegian Staff:** Ryan Bogart, Chad Clouse, Mike Coursey, Eddie Edwards, Doreen Foutz, Brian Gregory, Ericha Hagenbuch, Bryan Harkins, Adria Kovaly, Steve Landon, Adam Levenstein, Matt Plizga, Colette Rethage, John Rossomondo, Joe Ryan, Sean Slekkinen, Angie Yu.

**Photographers:** Dave Boulos, Coleen Gritzen, Bob Misulich, Chris Nelson, Dan Nowicki.

**Postal Information:** *The Collegian* is published weekly by the students of The Pennsylvania State University at Erie, The Behrend College; First Floor, The J. Elmer Reed Union Building, Station Road, Erie, PA 16563. 814-898-6488 or 814-898-6019 fax. ISSN 1071-9288

**Letter Policy:** *The Collegian* encourages letters on news coverage, editorial content and University affairs. Letters should be typewritten, double-spaced and signed by no more than two persons. Letters should be no longer than 400 words. Letters should include the semester standing and major of the writer. All letters should provide the address and phone number of the writer for verification of the letter. *The Collegian* reserves the right to edit letters for length and to reject letters. Letters submitted to *The Collegian* become the property of the newspaper. *The Collegian* is published every Thursday during the academic year on recycled paper.