

Opinion articles do not necessarily represent the views of the Portland Observer. We welcome reader essays, photos and story ideas. Submit to news@portlandobserver.com.

OPINION

What Trumponomics Means for Women

Republican policies that don't work

BY MARTHA BURK

On the campaign trail, Donald Trump promised again and again to “fix the economy.”

And now that he's won, he's busy padding his cabinet with Wall Street rogues and off-the-chart conservatives from the fringes.

If you read their resumes, it's not hard to figure out they're planning an umpteenth refrain of well worn Republican policies that don't work: cutting taxes across the board, especially for corporations and the wealthy; privatizing health care, education, Medicare, and Social Security; and getting rid of any government regulations that survive the onslaught.

It's trickle down economics redux. The working-class populism of the campaign is long gone.



Trump's so called fixes will hurt the nation's majority — women — the most. While scores of men have fallen off the middle-class ladder since 1980, many more women never made it past the lowest rung in the first place.

Adult women remain the majority of minimum wage workers. And single moms struggle the most, trying to make ends meet while balancing the need to work with child care costs (which can run up to 37 percent of a single parent's income).

Our incoming leader is smugly proud of his child care plan, which you might think benefits women if you aren't listening too closely. He proposes to “allow parents to fully deduct the average cost of child care” from income taxes.

But changing child care to a deductible instead of a credit, as it is now, hits middle income workers hardest. The present Child and Dependent Care Credit comes off your tax bill whether you itemize or not. Changing it to a deduction

means if you don't itemize, you don't get the deduction.

And besides, what does the “average cost of child care” actually mean? Child care costs vary considerably from state to state, arrangement to arrangement, and income to income.

So presumably a mother such as Ivanka Trump — her father says she'll be put in charge of

it's maternity leave only — there's no benefit for new dads, and nothing for taking care of sick family members — it's sexist on its face.

But the deeper problem is how employers will view female workers if they're of child bearing age and there's no comparable benefit for men: Better not promote her, some may think, since she might get pregnant. For that matter, bet-

But what of their lower paid sisters? No meat on that bone.

These women already make so little they qualify for the Earned Income Tax Credit — and often have to rely on Medicaid and Food Stamps to get by. So they don't pay income tax, making the cuts meaningless. Trump's plan ignores this inconvenient truth for women, who are still getting 78

Trump's newly minted maternity leave plan also has a hidden economic barb for women. Since it's maternity leave only — there's no benefit for new dads, and nothing for taking care of sick family members — it's sexist on its face.

child care reform — could deduct the cost of a high priced live in nanny. But those with a child in family day care, or one cared for by grandparents, could deduct a comparative pittance — or nothing at all.

Trump's newly minted maternity leave plan also has a hidden economic barb for women. Since

ter hire the guy in the first place.

Trump does have one proposal that'll help a tiny slice of the female population. His plan to slash the top income tax rate from 39.6 percent to 33 percent would definitely benefit the fraction of a percent of upper income female workers who earn more than \$413,350 per year.

cents on the dollar for full time work when compared to men.

No doubt about it — Trump's economic “fixes” will put women in a fix for sure.

Martha Burk is the director of the Corporate Accountability Project for the National Council of Women's Organizations. Distributed by OtherWords.org.

The Threat to Liberty and Justice for All

Stage set for rollback on civil rights

“This committee has a duty to our citizens to carefully examine the qualifications of nominees for the Federal bench and to give our approval only to those who have demonstrated a personal commitment to the principle of equality for all Americans and a sensitivity to the long history of inequality which we are still struggling to overcome...Mr. Sessions is a throwback to a shameful era which I know both black and white Americans thought was in our past. It is inconceivable to me that a person of this attitude is qualified to be a U.S. attorney, let alone a U.S. Federal judge. He is, I believe, a disgrace to the Justice Department and he should withdraw his nomination and resign his position.” — Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, Senate Judiciary Committee Opening Statement, March 13, 1986

BY MARC H. MORIAL

During a presidential campaign rally in Dimondale, Mich., Re-



publican nominee Donald Trump made an impassioned, six-word overture to African Americans, who had shown little enthusiasm for his campaign: “What do you have to lose?” Well, if the President-elect's cabinet nominations are any indication, for African Americans — and anyone concerned over imminent threats to justice for all Americans — the answer is simple: everything.

With Trump's nomination of Republican Alabama Sen. Jeff Sessions as attorney general, the stage appears set to rollback the clock on racial justice, immigration policy, LGBTQ movement advances and gender equality, among other hard fought for gains in the American struggle towards equality for all its citizens.

Sen. Sessions first emerged on the national stage in 1986, when President Ronald Reagan nominated the then United States attorney for the Southern District of Alabama for a federal judgeship.

His bid for the lifetime appointment was promptly derailed by the Republican-controlled Senate Judiciary Committee as a result of sworn testimony that pointed to a disturbing pattern of racist actions

and comments.

Among the diverse allegations brought by witnesses, Sen. Sessions was accused of calling an African-American prosecutor “boy” on more than one occasion. He was also accused of calling a white attorney a “disgrace to his race” for representing black clients in a voting rights case.

Sessions labeled the NAACP and the American Civil Liberties Union “un-American” and “communist-inspired” organizations, arguing that the groups “forced civil rights down the throats of people.” He also publicly described the Voting Rights Act of 1965 as “an intrusive piece of legislation.”

For his alarming and distressing comments, Sen. Sessions became the second man in half a century to be rejected by the Judiciary Committee. By a bipartisan vote of 10-8—with two Republicans joining the Democrats—Sen. Sessions' nomination was rightfully opposed. But he wasn't finished. Sen. Sessions went on to become the attorney general of Alabama, then he moved on to become state's junior senator.

And now, a man once rejected as too racist to hold a federal judgeship, and has demonstrated a

career-long, deep hostility to civil rights, is now being considered to serve as the nation's chief enforcer of civil rights law. A man who once described the Voting Rights act as “intrusive,” he is now being considered as the nation's top law enforcer, tasked with enforcing our nation's voting rights laws.

It seems the Trump administration is poised to set the fox to guard the henhouse.

As it did three decades ago when Sen. Sessions testified before it, we expect and demand that the Senate Judiciary Committee conduct a thorough and complete examination to determine if Sen. Sessions is fit to serve in this crucial federal justice enforcement capacity. But this examination cannot, and must not, be limited to past transgressions. Sen. Sessions, who has worked as a public servant for decades, has amassed a record that can speak for itself — and it speaks volumes.

In 2006, Sen. Sessions supported a ban on same-sex marriage. In 2009, Sen. Sessions voted against a bill that would expand federal hate crime legislation, and against Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay. Sen. Sessions has opposed legislation that would restore the pre-clearance provision of the Voting Rights

Act — supported by civil rights groups. And, during a debate on immigration reform, Sen. Sessions insulted Dominican immigrants, claiming that, “Fundamentally, almost no one coming from the Dominican Republic to the United States is coming here because they have a provable skill that would benefit us and that would indicate their likely success in our society.”

As it did three decades ago, the Judiciary Committee must vigorously question Sen. Sessions and seriously contemplate whether his 30-year record of action and statements befits a candidate whose job requires enforcing the constitutional and civil rights of all Americans.

The National Urban League, along with a broader civil rights coalition are conducting its own review of Sen. Sessions' record. If our examination does not determine that he is fit to serve as chief enforcer of civil rights laws, it will be our responsibility to oppose his nomination. We encourage all senators who are champions of civil rights to refrain from committing their support to this nomination until our examination is complete.

Marc H. Morial is president and chief executive officer of the National Urban League.