

# Point of View

## Editorial

By the time this goes to press the results of the voting by members of the striking Teamsters Local 995 and Operating Engineers Local 501 will be known.

The union members voted on a contract proposal presented to them by the Nevada Resort Association on Tuesday, May 31, 1983.

We realize that several real issues were at stake in this strike. However, we hope that the two sides can come close enough together at this time to enable the many casino workers to return to full time gainful employment.

None has actually won in this strike. The workers have not won, because it will be several months or maybe years before they will recoup their income losses suffered during the strike. The casinos have not won because, with the possible exception of the Memorial Day weekend, many workers from out-of-town either stayed home or refused to cross picket lines.

We look forward to the day when the grocery workers' union or unions will bring some contract proposal to a vote and move forward toward the return of grocery workers to their jobs. This is not to say that the temporary help hired to work during the strike is not doing a good job, but the regular workers do not deserve to lose their jobs as a result of trying to attain better pay, working conditions, etc. After all, this is America where one should have the right to petition for grievances without fear of economic reprisals.



## Stopping The Biggest Rip-Off

By Frank J. Fahrenkopf, Jr.  
Chairman, Republican National Committee

It's the biggest rip-off in American history. It soaks 230 million Americans every year, and the "take" is tens of billions of dollars.

I'm talking about tax bracket creep: the way Big Government uses inflation to line its own pockets. The rip-off works like this: what cost you \$100 in 1967 now costs nearly three times as much. "But so what?" you might ask yourself. While everything costs three times as much, you're earning three times as much, so everything averages out, right?

Wrong! Fifteen years ago, if you earned \$25,000 a year you'd have been pretty well-off, and the government taxed you at a high rate because you were pretty well-off. Today, you may be earning \$25,000, living like someone who made \$8,500 in 1967, but paying rich man's taxes. Prices rise, and salaries rise along with them, but every time they go up a notch, you go into a higher and higher tax bracket with no increase in standard of living to show for it. Welcome to bracket creep!

If inflation were as bad as in some countries, you could be living on porks and beans and paying caviar-style taxes!

While bracket creep is a nightmare for working Americans, it's tons of fun for

and inflate, sock you with bracket creep, and laugh all the way to the bank.

Fortunately, there's a way to stop the rip-off, and it's called indexing. Indexing means that tax brackets "float" with wages and prices. No matter what happens to inflation, if you earn a moderate salary, you pay moderate taxes, and the only way government can raise your taxes is by passing a law that all can see.

Back in 1981, President Reagan passed indexing laws along with his historic tax cuts. According to the laws, indexing is supposed to start in 1985, but the big spenders are out to stop it. For them, indexing means the end of the gravy train. They argue that inflation is no longer a problem, so we have nothing to fear from bracket creep. They want us to trust them.

But with indexing, we don't have to trust them. If in one year, five years, or fifteen years, the big spenders fall back into their old tricks of inflationary binges, we'll still have indexing laws to protect us from bracket creep.

If President Reagan has his way, and indexing laws become effective in 1985, we're free from bracket creep. But if the big spenders have their way, it will be just as if President Reagan's indexing victory never happened. We'll

## To Be Equal

By John E. Jacob

Welfare is the ultimate safety net program, the last resort of people who are in deepest need. It is also the leakiest of all our social insurance safety nets. It is inadequate to meet the most basic needs of the poorest, while providing no help for millions of poor people who can't meet tightened eligibility standards.

The Administration's budget-slashing in welfare expenditures forced the working poor off the rolls, causing tremendous human suffering. But the Administration is trumpeting what it calls the success of its welfare

to, California. That's right, a poorhouse, just like in the nineteenth century.

Instead of welfare payments, the county provides room and board in a poorhouse. In exchange for a bunk bed and food, recipients have to work for the county. It is restricted for those not eligible for state and federal welfare payments. So balancing the county's budget takes precedence over simple humanitarian policies.

Doubtless, there are many who would love to reinstate the poorhouse and do away with welfare altogether, but

they do work.

This is not an issue that will go away if and when the economy recovers. Even if unemployment fell to the lowest level of the 1970s some 15 million workers would be in families below the poverty level. And that is an optimistic



John E. Jacob

projection, the reality is likely to be far worse.

So welfare doesn't

discourage working nor does the fact that a person works at low wages suggest that he or she doesn't need welfare. In our economy, with its large pool of marginal, low income workers, welfare aid is essential to ensure that millions of working families are above the threshold of deprivation.

If anything, welfare assistance to the working poor is necessary to encourage independence, not dependency. It is needed to supplement indecently low wages in some sectors.

Meanness and the poorhouse aren't the answers; a humane system of income maintenance is.

## John E. Jacob is President Of The National Urban League

policies.

It seems that a study it commissioned indicates that most of the working poor forced off the rolls did not quit their jobs to qualify for welfare support, although they would have come out ahead financially if they had done so.

This is testimony to the strength of the work ethic among the poor, who don't seem to need the "incentives" and tax giveaways the Administration offers the affluent to encourage them to work harder and to produce more.

Whatever the merits of the study though, there's nothing to cheer about. The government may have saved a little money by dropping poor people from the rolls, but the victims of those cuts have experienced even lower living standards, lower nutrition and less medical care.

They've been robbed of the little help they needed to secure a better life. They are victims of the national hostility to welfare programs.

Perhaps the most glaring example of that hostility is the establishment of a poorhouse in Sacramen-

outside some pockets of ultimate meanness, that's not in the cards. Instead, the poor will be picked at piecemeal, with cuts in benefits and eligibility restrictions.

Despite the policy of tighter eligibility and cuts aimed at the working poor, those welfare rolls are climbing again, the result of widespread unemployment and increasing destitution.

If the experience of the past two years has taught us anything, it is that welfare constitutes a vital safety net that needs to be improved and that those on welfare are there not because of personal failings but because our economy doesn't provide job opportunities for all.

We also should have learned that aiding the working poor should be an integral part of the welfare system.

Almost a tenth of all workers live in poverty - they just don't earn enough to achieve a minimum decent standard of living. There is an enormous pool of workers who are prone to periods of unemployment and who earn very low wages when

the big spenders in Congress. Without ever having to put their necks on the line by voting for tax increases, they can spend and spend, inflate

be just like before, lined up and gawking while the big spenders take up the cleaners with the old inflationary shell game.

## A Decade Of Growth And Impact!

# NABSEE Sees Slow Advancement Among Las Vegas Educators

For the past ten years, the National Alliance of Black School Educators has been in existence having as its main goal: addressing the unique problems confronting Black educators and students in order to eliminate and to rectify the effects of racism in education.

While being a national organization, NABSE realizes that problems such as those previously mentioned must be addressed on a local basis and in smaller communities as well. And that's why communities such as Las Vegas have aligned themselves with this influential and well respected organization.

Official alignment of the Las Vegas Alliance took place under the leadership of Dr. Herschel L. Williams on May 20, 1982.

Dr. Williams, who has spent the last twenty years teaching and holding key administrative positions in the Clark County School District in Las

Vegas, recently discussed his organization's goals and objectives, along with their purpose for being in existence.

The Las Vegas NABSE president returned from a recent conference which had been held in Memphis, Tenn. The convention's keynote speakers were Dr. Benjamin Hooks, present president of the NAACP; NABSE's founder, Dr. Charles D. Moody Sr.; and former official of the Johnson Administration and Rockefeller Foundation, Dr. Charles H. Smith. Williams enthusiastically described the convention as being one of the most exciting and informative conferences that he'd ever been a part of.

Williams cited one of his goals as first president of the Las Vegas Alliance of NABSE. "I'd like to see a closer association between the area's Black teachers, the principal's council and board members,

The views expressed on these editorial pages are those of the artists or authors indicated. Only the one indicated as the Sentinel-Voice editorial represents this publication.