

Reagan era of sexual discrimination ending

In this era of Reagan-appointed judges and understaffed anti-discrimination agencies, last week's settlement of two major sex bias cases comes as a refreshing surprise.

In Washington D.C., U.S. District Judge Gerhard Gesell awarded Ann Hopkins a partnership in the prestigious Price Waterhouse accounting firm, after Hopkins sued the firm in 1983 for denying her partnership on the grounds that she behaved too much like a man.

Price Waterhouse executives admitted that Hopkins had brought in more business to the firm than any of the other 87 candidates for the partnership. But Price Waterhouse does not exactly have a glowing record of bringing women into the higher echelons of management. Only 27 of the 900 firm partners are women.

Judge Gesell must have taken this into consideration in his decision to make Hopkins a partner rather than just award her the more than \$400,000 in back pay she was granted.

Gesell's ruling was a first ever in the history of sexual discrimination litigation, but Gesell wrote in his decision that "Partnership is the logical remedy," because Hopkins "was likely to have been made a partner if not for unlawful discrimination."

In Portland, women also claimed a big victory over sexism in the workplace when Precision Castparts agreed to pay \$3.5 million to about 1,000 female employees for delegating certain production jobs to women.

The women who filed the complaint in 1980 said the company was keeping women in the bottom 20 percent of the pay scale at the same time men were hired and promoted in other areas of production.

The firm agreed to settle rather than face further litigation. In addition to one of the largest financial awards ever settled through the U.S. Department of Labor, Precision Castparts agreed to offer career counseling to the women who have been employed in the delegated "traditional women's jobs" and to set hiring and promotion goals for women.

The magnitude of the financial settlement in Portland and the precedent-setting decision in the Price Waterhouse case are hopefully indications that the Reagan administration's dismal record on sexual discrimination will not be repeated under Bush.

Although it may be too optimistic to predict behavior of the Bush administration on the merits of two cases, last week's events send a clear message to employers that discrimination — of any sort — will not be tolerated in the American workplace.



Proofreading

In response to Catherine Hawley's story "Logging opponents intensify efforts" (*ODE*, May 15), we would like to commend the *Emerald* for doing such a thorough proofreading and editing job. We would like to commend the *Emerald* for doing such a thorough proofreading and editing job. We are unduly impressed.

Lisa Uszler
Krisi Mattson
Journalism

Light of day

In response to Dean Walton's letter "Incubators" (*ODE*, May 14):

It is amazing to me that you equate a "perfect baby" as a baby that tests negative for drugs.

Granted, even with all of the best prenatal care available, no one can guarantee a perfect baby. But why intensify the situation with needless abuse to the child? Are you willing to attempt convincing yourself and others that a conscious action that needlessly abuses children is within a woman's right to undertake if she so chooses? Is there something inherently wrong with protecting the interests of such an extremely unvocal minority such as children, whatever their age?

In this society, the unborn are not legal persons with protectable rights under the current U.S. Constitution. Once born, however, they have all the fundamental rights that any other member of society has.

In your letter, I sense a rather passive attitude toward the interests of children, newborns in particular. Conversely, you actively voice your opinion in the mother's interest. These individuals are both legal persons now; why not have equal interest in the rights of the child?

With the ability today to legally destroy the unborn, does society also have to condone the irresponsible abuse of those

fortunate enough to see the light of day?

James Kordich
Political Science

Environment

To anyone who voted for George Bush and believes the current administration is truly dedicated to environmental issues, this letter is for you.

Secretary of the Interior Manuel Lujan, who the "environmental president" appointed, complained recently the Endangered Species Act is too restrictive and is impeding development. He also flaunted his unbelievable ignorance and insensitivity to wildlife issues by stating, "Do we have to save every subspecies? ... Nobody's told me the difference between a red squirrel, a black one or a brown one." (*New York Times*, May 12) I wonder how he feels about various owl species.

Bush's choice for this position, a position which is meant to be the primary protector of wildlife in this country, is an undeniable indication of the level of his commitment to environmental issues. I saw no condemnation or signs of embarrassment from Bush following those outrageous remarks. He obviously agrees with Lujan.

Bush also allowed Chief of Staff John Sununu to downplay the possibility of the "greenhouse effect." And let's not forget his lackadaisical handling of the Exxon Valdez accident.

The transparent veil of pseudo-environmentalism Bush attempts to wrap around himself has now completely dissolved and the true hypocrite has been revealed.

Mother Earth is the loser in this fiasco. But the people who support this man are just as re-

sponsible for the outcome as he.

I beg of you, don't continue to believe his claims. And, for Earth's sake, don't vote for him in 1992.

Tim Webber
TCF

Not news

We are writing in response to the article concerning Terrell Brandon's detainment by the Oregon police (*ODE*, May 15).

We believe that there were several irrelevant aspects of the incident that were brought to our attention, such as the fact that "drugs and alcohol were not involved in the arrest."

Why should such accusatory statements be mentioned at all? The statement was unrelated to the topic and seemed to imply there may have been some substances involved.

One of the citations clearly stated that a reason for his behavior was to specifically avoid unnecessary negative publicity, and you insisted upon bringing this to our attention despite his desire for privacy.

The use of the word "reportedly" throughout the article indicated that there was a sense of disbelief regarding the circumstances surrounding the incident.

Just as Brandon feels the incident is not a reflection on himself, we feel the related article is an example of shabby reporting and is a direct violation by the *Emerald*. We may be disillusioned in our expectations of the *Emerald's* ability to produce competent articles for a college publication and not a supermarket tabloid — this is the *Oregon Daily Emerald*, not the *Oregon Daily Enquirer*.

Cary Windsor
Rose Marie Beatty
Students

Letters Policy

Letters to the editor must be limited to no more than 250 words, legible, signed and the identification of the writer must be verified when the letter is submitted.

Oregon Daily Emerald

P.O. Box 3159, Eugene, Oregon 97403

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published Monday through Friday except during exam week and vacations by the Oregon Daily Emerald Publishing Co., at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The Emerald is operated independently of the University with offices on the third floor of the Erb Memorial Union and is a member of the Associated Press.

The Emerald is private property. The unlawful removal or use of papers is prosecutable by law.

Editor Thomas Prowell		
Managing Editor	Alice Wheeler	News Editor
Editorial Editor	Don Peters	Sports Editor
Graphics Editor	Mark Ylen	Supplements Editor
Encore Editor	Kevin Wee	Night Editor
		Christopher Blair
		Tracy Sumner
		Darla Jackson
		Alice Wheeler

Associate Editors
Community: Hon Walker Student Government/Activities: Catherine Hawley
Higher Education/Administration: Chris Bouneff Features: Denise Clifton

Reporters: Jolie Andrade, Peter Cogswell, Ashley Conklin, Dan Eisler, Stephanie Holland, Joe Kidd, Layne Laketish, Pat Malach, Stephanie Mencimer, Cam Sivesind, Alice Thornton

Photographers: Steve Card, Martin Thiel

Advertising: Maureen Bernadelli, Mark Brundage, Shellie Hagen, Scott McAvoy, Amy Mittelstaedt, Melissa Nelson, Kathy Smith, Kristi Strother, Edward Wenick

Apprentice: Kathy Endicott, Becky Horn, Jennifer Kosta, Ken McBride, Nicole Leahy, Susan Miguel-Acosta, Stephen Mosley, Maria Newman, Lisa Richman

Production: Jennifer Archer, Kathryn Barton, Mia Bertelsen, Teri Boring, Jed Clark, Alice Cannon, Lotus Child, Jim Finch, Corine Frier, Yvette Gill, Susan Head, Jennifer Huey, Julie Keeton, Linda Klaastad, Elisa Lichtman, Sheila Lorenzo, Scott Maben, Jim Mason, Wendy Morris, Angela Muniz, Anna Rembecki, Janet Schober, Jean Senechal, Jennifer Smith, Anne Stephenson, Martin Thiel, Jennifer Thomas, Ingrid White, Kelly Williams, Todd Williams

General Staff
Advertising Director: Susan Thelen Assistant to the Publisher: Jean Ownbey
Production Manager: Michele Ross Advertising Coordinator: Sandra Daller
Classified Manager: Tom Bosworth

Accounts Receivable, Circulation, Newsroom	346-5511
Classified Advertising	346-4343
Display Advertising	346-3712
Production, Graphic Services	346-4381