workers have been free to transfer to formerly all-white units, but the price of a transfer was a cut in pay and a loss of seniority; the black workers had to start at the bottom of the wage and seniority ladders in the new units. Secretary Hodgson's order, based on Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, changed all of that. Black workers who now seek to transfer out of predominantly black units can qualify to fill vacancies in formerly all-white units on the basis of their seniority at the plant, not in any particular unit. And when they do transfer, they will retain their present wage rates and all other accrued seniority rights.

Two days later, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company agreed to settle a lawsuit alleging similar job discrimination. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Labor Department, acting under authority of the Equal Pay Act of 1963 as well as Title VII, had brought the suit, charging that ATT's past discriminatory practices in job placement, promotions and pay scales had discouraged women and minority group males from applying for higher-paying jobs. Technically, ATT's willingness to settle was not an admission of this discrimination. Still, the terms of the agreement exacted by the two government agencies require the firm to place a specified percentage of women and minority group males in more desirable jobs and to compensate the alleged victims of past discrimination, roughly 51,000 of them, with $38 million in back pay and raises.

Neither of these remedies could have been effected without an intense commitment on the part of the Administration. Both were unprecedented. ATT should find it easier to live with its settlement than Bethlehem with Secretary Hodgson's order. While $38 million is a lot of money, the firm's 1972 profits totaled $2.5 billion; the settlement will reduce its earnings by less than two cents a share. The crunch will come at Sparrows Point, when black workers move into jobs that white employees had confidently expected to inherit. Racial tension and widespread resentment among white workers seem inevitable. They are, unfortunately, part of the high but necessary price the nation must pay for past denial of equal opportunity.

Supreme Court on Abortion

The recent Supreme Court decisions on the abortion issue leave us dismayed, respectful and determined. We are dismayed because, as a matter of constitutional law, unborn children now enjoy no legal protection against their mothers for the greater part of their lives in the womb. Only when the unborn reach the stage of independent viability are the states free to protect their lives against arbitrary decisions by their mothers.

"The unborn," the court tells us, "have never been recognized in the law as persons in the whole sense." The court adduces a great deal of medico-legal history to support this proposition. Inevitably, we think of the *Dred Scott* decision and the historical reasoning by which the Supreme Court, in 1857, decided that blacks were not "people." It took a constitutional amendment, the Fourteenth, to reverse the *Dred Scott* decision, and now that amendment itself has been used to classify still other human beings as not "persons."

The Supreme Court's opinion in the abortion cases is long on history but short on science. Nevertheless, we respect the court's decision, first, because the decision had to be made, second, because the court had to make it, and finally, because the court faced its task honestly.

Dismayed but respectful, we remain determined to do everything we can to protect the life of the unborn. We will support all efforts to persuade mothers to choose life, not death. We will also continue our efforts to call attention to solutions for personal, social and economic problems that motivate many abortions.

As a result of the Supreme Court's decisions, certain matters must receive immediate attention by hospitals, clinics, doctors, nurses and other medical personnel. Chief among these, from our point of view, is statutory protection for the right of all organizations and individuals not to participate in abortions against their own consciences and traditional values, and not to suffer any legal or professional detriment because they choose not to participate. Such "conscience clauses" are a necessary part of the revision of the anti-abortion statutes that is now required by the recent Supreme Court decisions. The constitutional right of women to choose to have an abortion must not be extended to the right to compel others to participate against their will.

New Round on School Aid

On the same day the Supreme Court handed down the abortion decisions, it gave foes and friends alike of aid to education in parochial schools another chance for full-scale review by the Supreme Court. By accepting cases from Pennsylvania and New York, the court has now agreed to rule on the constitutionality of four different kinds of programs. Three of the programs involve cash payments by the government: one to help low-income families pay tuition, one to help