

EDITORIALS • COMMENTS • OPINIONS

An Independent View from Capitol Hill

BY HON. GUS SAVAGE
First Black journalist
ever elected to Congress



Tax Bill - Wrong Medicine For The Wrong Patient

I voted against raising taxes for TWO reasons. FIRST of all, the bi-partisan, Reagan-supported "tax bill" which Congress adopted Thursday 226-207, includes more than tax increases. It includes further cuts in domestic needs.

It cuts medicare \$13.3 billion by raising the premiums for Part 2 beneficiaries and reducing reimbursements to hospitals and physicians.

It cuts medicaid \$1.1 billion by permitting states to place liens on the property of nursing home patients and authorizing co-payments by beneficiaries.

It cuts Aid to Families with Dependent Children \$405 million by reducing benefits to recipients.

It cuts Supplemental Security Income for the blind and disabled by \$386 million by reducing benefits paid to recipients.

I voted against this mess because I have promised not to vote for any more cuts in needed domestic services, as long as the savings are for the purpose of buying more bombs and bombers and feeding the greedy at the expense of the needy. The only fair way of balancing the federal budget is to reduce the budget for war and restore graduated taxation on overpowering wealth.

The SECOND reason I voted against this unfair bill is because it places more taxes on the wrong people, those least able to pay: the unemployed and underpaid working people of our nation.

True enough, increases in business taxes account for 43 percent of the total revenue this bill proposes to raise over a 3-year period. However, 17 percent is derived from more excise taxes, more individual income tax, and stricter tax compliance measures.

In some instances, under this bill, the unemployed and the underpaid have to pay excise taxes in the same amounts as the multi-millionaires.

Under this bill, the federal excise tax on cigarettes is doubled, from eight cents a pack to 16 cents a pack. The tax on telephone bills is tripled, from one percent to three percent.

In addition, the bill estimates entirely the income tax reduction for health insurance premiums. Until now, taxpayers could deduct one-half of the premiums they pay for health insurance, up to a maximum deduction of \$150.

Also, the bill limits income tax deductions for non-business casualty losses, such as from theft and fires, to only that amount which exceeds 10 percent of the taxpayers' adjusted gross income.

Furthermore, the bill adds a 1.3 percent medicare tax

on wages of all federal employees.

Finally, while the bill does not touch the "3-martini lunch" tax deduction for business executives, it tightens-up the reporting of taxes by service employees. It requires restaurants to take eight percent of its gross income, assumed to be the amount of tip income received by all of its tipped employees, and report that amount to the Internal Revenue Service.

In other words, the Republican Administration, with the support of the majority of Congress, dug a hole of a deficit last year by 1) Granting a \$750 million (3-year) tax decrease for the biggest corporations and richest individuals, and 2) Raising the war budget to a historic \$1 trillion (5-year). Although this hole represented about half of all the land of federal revenue, we who were evicted as a result of this tremendous excavation are now told to find the landfill to cover the hole but not to take it from the mountain of dirt which came from the hole.

They drastically reduced services to the needy, but still not enough to satisfy the greedy. This was such a huge mistake, that the very foundations of our nation, economic and social, threatened to cave into the hole.

In this week's tax bill, its supporters did wrap a tiny bait around the tip of this huge hook. They added six to 10 weeks of temporary employment compensation payments for those who have exhausted current unemployment benefits. Even this program would last only six and one-half months.

Incidentally, in the old industrial states such as mine (Illinois), where high unemployment has existed so long that many have exhausted their 13 weeks "extended benefits," this program will result in a bottom-line net loss of the total number of weeks an unemployed person may receive benefits.

When the formula which triggers the current 13-week federal/state "extended benefits" program is increased (Sept. 15) from five to six percent of covered unemployment, some of the states with the highest unemployment will no longer be eligible to pay 13 weeks "extended benefits" to the unemployed.

That is, the unemployed in states such as Illinois, Michigan, Ohio and Pennsylvania will only receive compensation for the regular 26-weeks program plus the additional 10 weeks provided under this bill. This represents a total of only 36 weeks.

However, if the cockeyed formula were adjusted properly, the unemployed in those states would be receiving the regular 26 weeks compensation plus the 13 weeks of "extended benefits." This would represent a total of 39 weeks.

Therefore, I voted against the tax bill because it is a wrongside-up inside-out fraud on the working and unemployed people of America, Black and white, by that Robin Hood-in-reverse who occupies the White House and strangely dominates both the Republican and Democratic leadership of the Congress.

Our nation's elected public officials should be too proud of their trust to accept the choice of eating poisoned-crow or not eating at all. I would rather starve for right than feast on wrong.

P.S. I am proud to say, the 17 Black voting Members voted 12-5 against bill. Those voting for the bill are: Cardiss Collins (Ill.), John Conyers (Mich.), Harold Ford (Tenn.), Mickey Leland (Tex.) and Charles Rangel (N.Y.) The total vote found 123 Democrats joining with 163 Republicans voting for passage.

sovereign states, those requests have been ignored. Instead, there have been a series of efforts to interfere in the internal affairs of Grenada by attempting to cut off international support for developmental projects underway in the country such as the international airport. Additionally, there has been an increase in military maneuvers in the Caribbean, which totally disregards the international call declaring the Caribbean area a zone of peace.

The NCBL notes with a sense of irony efforts by the U.S. to justify its position regarding Grenada, on the ground that Grenada is undemocratic because of its failure to hold elections, while at the same time no firm stand has been taken against efforts in this country to disenfranchise Black and other minority communities through a dilution of the Voting Rights Act.

We of the National Conference of Black Lawyers are of the view that it is incumbent upon the present Administration to begin to have discussions with Grenada and work towards the establishment of normal relations which respect Grenada's right to national sovereignty and self-determination.

The continuing selective focus by the Reagan Administration on the fact that Grenada does not hold regular elections, and is therefore undemocratic, is a pretext. Reagan is not concerned with democratic ideals as they apply to Grenada. Reagan sees a western neo-colony of former African slaves rising up to be free. A people afraid to tell the world that henceforth only Grenadians will have the power to determine their fate.

In April of this year at a meeting of Eastern Caribbean leaders in Barbados, Reagan declared that "El Salvador isn't the only country being threatened by Marxism. All of us are concerned with the overthrow of Westminster-parliamentary democracy in Grenada." We ask, "What Democracy?" Eric Gairy, the former Prime Minister, convened York House, the former Grenadian parliament, at his whim. The people in Grenada had no say in the government of Grenada. The policies of Eric Gairy were those of a dictator, who only conveniently used the facade of parliamentary procedure to cover his heinous acts against the people of Grenada. Yet, Ronald Wilson Reagan continues to declare present day Grenada an undemocratic state, as he continues relations with Chile, South Korea, South Africa, and Israel, all known for their model democratic governments. Free, sane and progressive people understand that the record proves otherwise.

The Reagan policy of non-recognition of Grenada



Coping

By Dr. Charles W. Faulkner

The Truth About Counseling

I have counseled and helped thousands of unhappy people during the past few years and have discovered a striking similarity in a significant number of the cases. Most of my clients are honest, kind, loving people in search of a reliable mate who can make them happy. When they find a potential mate they bestow enormous affection. When they do not receive the same thing in return, they become unhappy and seek counseling in order to find out what went wrong. Their mate usually takes them for granted, finds the challenge disappearing in the relationship and becomes bored with the mate's loving predictability.

Invariably, counselors tell these unhappy people to be honest, kind, loving and affectionate, and they will receive the same thing in return. They are told to continue the very behavior that caused the unhappiness in the first place. Wouldn't it be nice if this were true? It is such a nice concept. But, is it true? Answer yes or no to the following questions: Are you always treated kindly by your mate when you are kind, loving and affectionate? Most of the time, Some of the time, Never. Are you taken for granted and treated rudely by your mate when you are kind, loving and affectionate?

Unfortunately, many people who turn the other cheek find that cheek getting slapped, also. The honest, kind person often gets abused and made to feel unhappy. The hard-nosed manipulative person takes advantage of the kind person, reaps great personal and material rewards and achieves a level of happiness. Everyone manipulates practically everyone else, to some degree, in order to get what they want: A smile will get you a pleasant hello; a compliment will get you a new friend; a "pleasant" personality will get you a pay raise.

Manipulation has found an important place in society. Manipulation, which is used by each of us, is ethically acceptable as long as the behavior is not intended to harm the other party. Following is an example:

Mary loved John and treated him with continued kindness and affection. John became bored with Mary's loving predictability and wanted a new challenge, so he stopped calling her and began to date other women. John knew that Mary would always be there when he needed her and that she constantly sat by the phone waiting for his telephone call. John felt that Mary was not desired by any other men because she was always at home waiting for his call.

In essence, he felt that no one else wanted Mary and, thus, John did not want a woman whom no one else wanted. He did not want a loser. Mary decided that she would play a mild "trick" on John by making him think

that she had other suitors. So, when John finally did call, Mary told him that she was preparing to go out on a date with someone else and could talk only briefly with him. John was skeptical and felt that this was merely a once in a lifetime affair and, after the date, Mary would return to her former habit of waiting for his call. However, when he called again, she told him that she had company.

John immediately became jealous. Suddenly, he had a tremendous need for Mary. Suddenly, Mary was no longer a "loser." He felt that if other men were dating Mary, she was worth having . . . and he now wanted her desperately.

The truth is that Mary had no other suitors but had "conned" or manipulated John into thinking otherwise. Thus, Mary manipulated John into wanting her. John was not harmed by this behavior.

The result of this behavior was happiness and personal fulfillment for both Mary and John.

Your suggestions are welcomed. Suggestions for future articles will be appreciated. Cassette tapes of this and other articles are available for individual use, discussion groups and classroom use. All letters and inquiries should be sent to Dr. Charles W. Faulkner, Post Office Box 50016, Washington, D.C. 20004.

VIEWPOINT



JULIAN BOND

Reagan must love the poor

By Julian Bond

Abraham Lincoln once said that the Lord must love poor people because he made so many of them.

Well, the Lord can move over in that department. Now he has an earthly competitor who is rapidly increasing the ranks of the impoverished.

His name is Ronald Reagan. More than 4 million Americans will become poor during the second year of the Reagan administration. That's quite an accomplishment for any earthly being.

Last year Reagan only managed to push 2.2 million unfortunate below the poverty line.

In fairness, it must be noted that this trend began even before Reagan took office. This will be the third year in a row that has seen a rise in the percentage of Americans below the poverty line.

In 1979, 11.7 percent of all Americans were considered poor. The poverty-level population rose to 13.2 percent of the total in 1980 and to 14 percent in 1981. The percentage had fallen in the two previous years.

"But, hey," you may be saying. "How can you blame President Reagan for a trend that began while President Carter was still in office?"

"Easy," I reply. I can blame Reagan for something he didn't start because he has done all he can to make it worse.

Poor Americans made up 14 percent of the U.S. population in 1966, the first year of President Johnson's War on Poverty. The percentage was back at 14 last year and will be even higher by the end of 1982.

Part of the blame must go to the economy, whose weak condition is not entirely the present president's fault. But neither are inflation, recession and high interest rates solely responsible for overpopulating the poverty precincts.

It's also the scissoring of the safety net that is driving millions of souls into the surplus-cheese lines.

And that's where Ronald Reagan jumps to the head of the class.

He moves ahead of Lyndon Johnson, who sabotaged his own War on Poverty with a foreign war that fueled the inflation rate. He slips past Richard Nixon and Jimmy Carter, who trimmed the War on Poverty to the dimensions of a backyard skirmish.

But Reagan was the only one of the bunch who made severe slashes in the federal assistance programs that helped half of all poor households in 1980.

That puts this president first in poverty production. He surely cannot want that title — no matter how much he loves the poor.

It is commonly seen with teenagers a reluctance to share feelings or thoughts with their parents. This is a normal phase in the adolescent's development, however it can and does create tension between parents and teenagers who lack a clear understanding of what is appropriate behavior.

Many parents fall victim to some poor communication habits, non-attentive listening (i.e. watching T.V. while your child is trying to talk with you, lengthy lectures, and/or body language which shows a lack of interest in what your child has to say).

For parents who are experiencing problems in this area here are some helpful hints:

- (1) Have good eye contact when your child is talking with you.
- (2) Encourage expression of feelings and thoughts.
- (3) Give supportive feedback.
- (4) Be a role model for communicating; that means show or express your feelings and thoughts to your child.
- (5) Learn the art of listening instead of the tendency to lecture; allow your child to talk to you.

These are some techniques that can assist parents and children improve their relationship and communication patterns.

Next week: Are You Ready for School?

THE MEDIUM NEWSPAPER is published weekly on Wednesday for \$16 per year by Tiloben Publishing Co., Inc., 2600 South Jackson Street, Seattle, Washington 98144. Second-class postage paid at Seattle, Washington and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: Publication No. 564370. Send address changes to THE MEDIUM NEWSPAPER, P.O. Box 22047, Seattle Washington 98122.

Any reproduction of material in whole or in part without written permission from the publisher is prohibited. Copyright, 1982, TILOBEN PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC.

Christopher H. Bennett
Publisher

Connie Bennett Cameron
Managing Editor

NCBL JOURNAL

Why The U.S. Should Normalize Relations With Grenada

Grenada is a small island nation in the Eastern Caribbean. It is the only free Black, english-speaking country in the Caribbean. On March 31, 1979, Grenada broke the chains of neo-colonialism and installed the Peoples Revolutionary Government.

In the past three years of administration of the state apparatus by the PRG, Grenada has made significant progress. Grenada has reduced unemployment to 25%, down from 55%; created a climate which trade unions have full bargaining and recruiting rights; established equal pay for equal work among women and men; and created Worker's and Parish Councils for the purpose of allowing direct worker input into government policy. Yet, despite these positive steps designed to create a better life for the 110,000 Grenadians, the U.S. has rebuffed the repeated attempts of Grenada to establish normal relations between two sovereign states.

In response to this impasse caused by the intransigent posture of the U.S., the NCBL made the following statement on June 15, 1982, to the U.S. House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, in the course of its hearing on U.S. relations with the government of Grenada:

Over the last two years, the NCBL has sent several delegations to Grenada that have had an opportunity to observe first-hand the process of social transformation underway. Even though Grenada is a poor country and underdeveloped from a technological standpoint, nevertheless, our members state that significant strides have been made in the areas of health, education and political participation. Discussions with various sectors of the Grenadian population revealed genuine support and a sense of pride in the achievements being made by the present government under the leadership of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop.

Although numerous requests have been made first to the Carter Administration and now the Reagan Administration for normal relations between two

will continue as long as the Grenadian people aspire to be more than a neo-colony in the backyard of the United States. Grenada is on the road to peace, freedom and cooperation. Virtues by which save people of all cultures chart and direct their lives.

(The National Conference of Black Lawyers (NCBL) is an activist organization designed to use the talents and skills of its members in the battle against racism. If you are interested in the group or have questions regarding this column, please write to NCBL, P.O. Box 675, Seattle, WA 98111.)



The Black Family

By Ray Willis
Family Life Education,
Catholic Community Services

You Must Have Something To Say

While attending a recent Parents' Support Group meeting, several members raised the question, "Why do parents and children, particularly teenagers, have trouble talking with one another?" As various members attempted to problem-solve this question, it appeared that the group's level of frustration increased, perhaps due to barriers existing in relationships with their children.

In sharing ideas with this group I discussed how a child's personality, learning behavior, and interactions with parents may influence the way he/she chooses to communicate. In many families young people will share feelings and thoughts with a particular parent or relative who is seen as being caring and understanding.

Parent/child communication is influenced by many factors, however important measures for beginning open communication are the established parent/child relationship, level of trust or respect, family stability, and a parents' awareness of their child's developmental stage. These measures serve as a foundation for building open communication styles between parents and children.