

## Hypocrisy in smokers, gay lifestyle debate

Considering the fact that the average life span of a smoker is a little longer than the average life span of a homosexual (I'll explain why below), one has to get a kick out of all the pro-homosexual liberals who favor "discriminating" against smokers while hypocritically promoting the "homosexual lifestyle." Liberal meccas like Chicago and Oak Park, both well-known as extremely "gay-friendly" cities, have voted to ban smoking in most public places. Now I read in the June 9 Reporter that Woodridge Trustee Robert Brandt, who criticizes me on his Web site [www.homestead.com/robertbrandt/action04.html](http://www.homestead.com/robertbrandt/action04.html)) for being against homosexual activity, "has been the most vocal proponent of an overall smoking ban" in Woodridge.

First, let me explain why the average life span of a homosexual is somewhat shorter than the average life span of a smoker. Then we'll examine liberal hypocrisy.

It is easy to document that male homosexuals have abnormally high anal cancer and AIDS rates and that lesbians have an abnormally high breast cancer rate. Those are the major reasons why the average life span of homosexuals is so relatively short. (It also doesn't help that smoking, alcohol use and illegal drug use are popular among homosexuals -- a fact even some homosexual writers lament.)

We also know that many innocent American hemophiliacs (some researchers put the number at 10,000) died of AIDS after being transfused with HIV-infected blood donated by HIV-positive homo/bisexuals back in the late 1970s/early 1980s when AIDS was almost exclusively a homo/bisexual disease. (Because of that disaster, active homo/bisexuals are currently and rightly barred from donating blood.) And this country spends around \$2 billion a year on health care for HIV-infected homo/bisexuals who voluntarily engaged in unsafe sex. (We could be spending that money on starving children around the world, for example, or for other worthy causes. One can buy a lot with \$2 billion.)

To any unbiased observer, homosexual activity is as much or more of a health issue as smoking. However, we know the "politically correct" libs have their biases. For them, to take one issue, flying the Confederate flag is a no-no because it offends some people, but protesters desecrating the Stars and Stripes is OK even though it offends many American patriots. For the average lib, the death penalty, even for guilty criminals, is a no-no, though it is OK for partially born innocent babies (via partial-birth abortion). Libs like to describe themselves as "pro-choice," but they are against research aimed at finding a way out of (a "cure" for) homosexuality for those who want out -- in other words, the libs are against providing homosexuals who want out of homosexuality a choice.

I could go on and on about liberal hypocrisy, but you probably get the point. Since truth has power, the libs will eventually get it too, though it could take some time to break through their liberal biases and prejudices. In the meantime, let us oppose their efforts to take us back thousands of years to Sodom. Been there, done that. Let's progress, not regress. (Incidentally, for the record, I am an ex-smoker who is opposed to smoking and favors restricting the "rights" of smokers. But I also believe in playing fair.)

**Wayne Lela**

Woodridge