THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

for

Equal Rights Under Law

The Equal Rights Amendment, passed by Congress and submitted to the States for ratification, would write into the U.S. Constitution the principle of individual liberty and freedom of action upon which this nation was declared to be founded.

The Equal Rights Amendment:

Sec. 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article.

Sec. 3. This Amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification.

Prepared by Marguerite Rawalt
Past President, National Association of Women Lawyers;
ERA Chair, WEAL Board of Directors

WOMEN'S EQUITY ACTION LEAGUE
weal

NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20045

May 1976
Per copy 50¢;
10 or more 35¢ each

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

was approved in the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress on October 12, 1971, by a vote of 354 to 23. The Senate approved by a vote of 84 to 8 on March 22, 1972, after decisively rejecting, one by one, nine different proposals to alter and defeat it. It will become part of the Constitution when 38 state legislatures have ratified it. Thirty-four have already done so (as of May, 1976).

The Amendment would mandate that the U.S. Constitution, which is the supreme law of the land, (Art. VI therof), be applied without favor to every individual, man or woman, no matter what the color skin, the ethnic origin, the race, or the sex of that person.

Equal rights for everyone threatens no one. No one will lose a single right now enjoyed. Male persons, black or white, who now enjoy all legal rights will merely extend that privilege to women, the only class of persons not presently included.

The Amendment applies only to actions by government, not to private actions.

WHY IS IT NECESSARY TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION TO INSURE EQUAL LEGAL RIGHTS?

First, because the original constitution of 1787, which was founded upon English common law, did not include women or slaves; both were "property" under the common law, owned by husbands or by masters, without independent individual rights under the law. Secondly, because the courts have failed to interpret the 14th Amendment to include all women.

For blacks, the 15th Amendment conferred citizenship and the right to vote upon the emancipated slaves and the 14th Amendment (1870) granted to them as "ALL PERSONS. . .the equal protection of law". Yet, 100 years later, the 14th Amendment has not included women within its guarantees. Women have but one constitutional right, the right to vote, for which a specific constitutional amendment was necessary.

As said in the U.S. Senate in 1972:

"What we are trying to do is something that should have been done 200 years ago and that is to provide that everybody in this nation was created legally equal under the Constitution". (Senator Marlow Cook, Cong. Rec. 1972, S-4407).

"In the movement toward social liberation, we have taken on the task of improving the status of blacks, Indians, Spanish-speaking Americans, and other minority groups, but in the process we have overlooked another important group that has suffered from many forms of discrimination—women—which is all the more amazing because they are a majority rather than a minority group". (Senator Gurney, 3-21-72, Cong. Rec. S-4393).

The Constitution means what the U.S. Supreme Court says it means. In an 1873 landmark decision, the U.S. Supreme Court refused to apply the 14th Amendment in an opinion denying a woman a right to practice law. The opinion declared *"that the paramount destiny and mission of woman are to fulfill the noble and benign offices of wife and mother. This is the law of the Creator". Bradwell v Illinois (1873) 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 130, 141.* During 103 years since that time scores of decisions have enlarged the 14th Amendment's equal protection guarantee to uphold the rights of corporations, of alien Japanese fishermen, of alien Chinese Laundrymen, of criminals, of illegitimate children, of juveniles, and of black persons in numerous cases of discrimination on account of race. But it failed to extend unrestricted coverage to women who are 53% of the population—either to black women, to white women, or to women of any ethnic or religious persuasion.

House debate at the time of passage produced these statements as part of voluminous consideration:

1. *"All the ERA seeks to do is to say to the Supreme Court of the United States—'Wake Up!' This is the 20th Century. Before it is over, judge women as individual human beings". (Congresswoman Martha Griffiths, principal sponsor of the Amendment) (Congressional Record October 6, 1971, H-9264)*

2. *Ellen Grasso (Connecitcut, Congresswoman, now Governor). "History shows that women cannot rely on the courts to achieve their rights. . .Unfortunately, the 5th and 14th Amendments have not accorded equal rights to women—the equal rights they must have". (Congressional Record, October 12, 1971, H-9376)*

3. *Congressman John B. Anderson of Illionis. "We are called upon once and for all to make women equal under the law of the land—to remove the last vestiges of their second class citizenship from the books. . .We are tilting at windmills instead of smiting the pervasive discrimination which has held American women in legal bondage for nearly two centuries".*

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY—HOW WILL ERA BE APPLIED?

The Courts have established as a cardinal principle that they will be guided by the intent of the Congress or the state legislature in applying a statute or constitutional amendment. The intent of Congress in passing the ERA is found in the House and Senate Judiciary Committee Reports and in the official debates. This is called the "legislative history". Congressional debate in both Houses of Congress was voluminous but intent was clear as shown by final votes overwhelmingly in favor.

Legislative history in the 92nd Congress which passed the Amendment is as follows:

92nd Congress, 1st Session (1971), in which the House passed the Amendment 354-23:

July 14, 1971, Report No. 92-359, House Judiciary Committee.
October 6, 1971, House floor debate, Congressional Record, pp. H-9229 to 9264.
October 12, 1971, House floor debate, Congressional Record, pp. H-9359 to 9392.

92nd Congress, 2nd Session (1972), in which the Senate passed the Amendment 84-8.
February 12, 1972, Report No. 92-689, Senate Judiciary Sub-Committee report abridged in Congressional Record, S-4582 to 4586, of March 22, 1972.
March 17, Senate floor debate, Congressional Record, pp. S-4135 to 4151; March 20, pp. S-4247 to 4273.
March 21, 1972, Congressional Record, S-4372 to 4431.
March 22, 1972, Congressional Record, pp. S-4531 to 4613. Passed.

Hearings May 5-7, 1970, 91st Congress, 2nd Session, before Senate Judiciary Sub-Committee on Constitution Amendments, on S.J. Res 61 (793 pp.).
Hearings September 9-15, 1970, 91st Congress, 2nd Session, Senate Judiciary Committee, on S.J. Res. 231 (433 pp.).
Hearings March 24 to April 5, 1971, 92nd Congress, 1st Session before House Judiciary Committee on H.J. Res. 208 (724 pp.).

(Available from Superintendent of Documents, Washington, DC 20402)

DOES THE ENFORCEMENT CLAUSE, SECTION 2, TAKE AWAY STATES' RIGHTS?

No. Section 2 of the Amendment provides that "Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this Article".

This is nothing new. Precisely these words were deemed necessary and included in the 13th, 14th, 15th, 19th, 23rd and 24th Amendments. For the Congress has only such powers as are delegated to it by the States, through the Constitution. This is set out in the 10th Amendment which provides that "powers not delegated to the United States by this Constitution. . .are reserved to the States or to the people".

Section 2 grants to Congress the power to act within its own Federal sphere; the States retain all their powers to act within their retained, non-delegated powers.

"States are not foreclosed from passing anti-discrimination measures to eliminate sex-based discrimination, just as they are not foreclosed from enacting civil rights legislation even though parallel legislation by Congress may exist. . .There is abundant experience in our history of Federal and State legislation directed toward common purpose: The Federal Equal Pay Act alongside State Equal Pay Acts; Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and Fair Employment legislation in nearly 4/5ths of the States".
(Professor Pauli Murray, testimony before Senate Judiciary Committee, September 1970, p. 432.)

HOW WOULD ERA AFFECT THE CUSTODY AND SUPPORT OF CHILDREN IN CASE OF DIVORCE?

The welfare of the child is the legally established principle for determining custody and support of children. State courts would not be deprived of their functions in deciding cases, nor State legislatures be deprived of enacting governing laws. the ERA would not deprive mothers of child support payments, nor of custody. It would make fathers eligible for custody rights, and at the same time eliminate arbitrary preference given to fathers for custody of a son, as is the present law in some States. Both parents would be liable for support of children. The amount of liability would be based upon their earnings and economic circumstances, **not** upon **the sex** of the parent. In balancing financial responsibilities a value would be placed upon the services contributed by the mother in the home, as provided in the Uniform Marriage and Divorce Act.

WILL ERA REQUIRE THAT PUBLIC REST ROOMS, PRISON SLEEPING QUARTERS, SCHOOL DORMITORIES, BE SHARED BY MEN AND WOMEN?

No. The ERA will not do away with social mores. So long as State or Federal lawmakers decide their constituents want them, there will be separate public rest rooms and separate sleeping quarters in public institutions.

The traditional power of the State to regulate cohabitation and sexual activity by unmarried persons permits the State to require segregation of the sexes in such facilities.

"The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled clearly that the impact of the 1st, 3rd, 4th and 9th Amendments require an acceptance of a constitutional right of privacy, establishing an independent right of privacy". (Professor Emerson, 1971 Hearings, p. 403)

"Privacy would not be lost. It is sometimes claimed that an Amendment would require all public rest rooms to be integrated, along with sleeping quarters of prisons and other public institutions. This, of course, is NONSENSE". "We find no serious problem in the "rest room-bathroom spectres raised by opponents of ERA". (Professor Norman Dorsen, New York University School of Law, member Board, A.C.L.U., 1971 Hearings, p. 174)

And, from a principal opponent of ERA, in agreement: "I have no fear courts would apply the Amendment to require opening up rest rooms and the court jail cells regardless of sex, on the analogy of race". (Professor Paul A. Freund, Harvard School of Law, letter dated January 30, 1974)

WOULD THE ERA BREAK DOWN SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN?

The ERA applies to rights "UNDER THE LAW" not to social mores and customs. The question of who pays the dinner check, opens the door, or pulls out a chair, has nothing to do with equal legal rights. As said in Congressional debate: *"The passage of the Equal Rights Amendment will neither make a man a gentleman nor will it require him to stop being one". (91st Congress, Senator Cook)*

WILL WOMEN BE DRAFTED? WILL WOMEN SERVE IN COMBAT?

The cry that ERA would make women subject to the draft is not an acceptable alibi for opposing ratification. Congress has full authority and responsibility, without ERA, "to raise and support armies. . .to provide and maintain a navy. . .to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia". (Art. I, Sec. 8, U.S. Constitution), Moreover. . .

Just before the end of World War II, Congress was in the process of enacting a law to draft women. A bill was pending to draft "unmarried, unemployed women into the services as more logical than drafting men away from their families". (H.R. 4906, see Congressional Record 1944, p. 5151, *New York Times,* June 2, 1944) The Nurses Selective Service Act of 1945 (H.R. 2277) had passed the House and been reported out favorably by the Senate Military Affairs Committee when the end of the war rendered it moot. Thus, with or without the ERA, Congress will draft women when needed. The State of Texas presently requires military duty from all able-bodied men and women. (Vernon's Civil Stats., Title 94, Art. 5765-6)

Over 350,000 women served in the Armed Forces during World War II by volunteering, even though only women with at least a high school education were eligible.

Today, the draft has been replaced by an "all volunteer force" policy under which more women want to volunteer than the military services will take.

The draft of men aged 18 to 26 under the Selective Service Act provided for many exemptions and deferments. Exemptions were allowed for public officials, such as members of Congress, governors, and others. Classifications under the law allowed "deferment from training or service of any category of students" and for those in optometry, pre-medical, pre-veterinary, pre-dental training; for full-time high school students, those employed by the U.S. or a State in health safety activities, or by non-profit organizations.

Fathers, sons, brothers, 18-26, with a child or one whose absence would cause "hardship to dependents" were deferred to Class III-A. The cry that mothers would be torn from their children to serve in combat is groundless. Female students and employees in excepted categories would be subject to the same delayed classifications. In short only females ages 18 to 26, not married, not supporting dependents, not employed in preferred occupations, not conscientious objectors, not entitled to student deferments, were subject to the draft on the same basis as young men.

In the 1971 draft call, only those classified as I-A were ever called to serve. And only 5% of the eligible males were inducted into the Army. Less than 1% of eligibles were assigned to combat duty. The education requirement for women who volunteered foreclosed less educated women from the benefits which accrued to male draftees. As further pointed out in the Senate Committee report:

> *". . .women are often arbitrarily barred from military service and from the benefits which flow from it: for example, educational benefits of the G.I. bill; medical care in the service and through Veterans Hospitals; job preferences in government and out; and the training, maturity and leadership provided by the service in the military itself.*
>
> *"Thus the fear that mothers will be conscripted from their children into military service if the Equal Rights Amendment is ratified is totally and completely unfounded. Congress will retain ample power to create legitimate sex-neutral exemptions from compulsory service. For example, Congress might well decide to exempt all parents of children under 18 from the draft." (Sen. Rep. 92-689)*

Combat Service

In the event of threatened extinction in a future nuclear war, the home front will be the combat zone, and women at home will be combatants as well as those manning guns.

Less than 1% of all eligible males in the country were ever assigned to combat duty in the field in 1971 (less than 15% of the 5% who were inducted). (Congressional Record S-4390, March 21, 1972)

"If we ever get involved in a nuclear exchange, find me a non-combat zone" if you can. "Combat duty in a future war may be a lady sitting at a computer in North Dakota". (Congressional debate)

The concern of those who would maintain second rate legal status to all women in preference to calling them to serve in defense of their country has been answered by the action of the 200,000 member Intercollegiate Association of Women Students, in testifying before Congress that they stood "for the involvement of women equally with men in the responsibilities, requirements, and rights inherent in the draft system". George Washington University women students testified:

> *"As draft age women. . .(that) The draft is being used to intimidate women in their efforts to gain recognition of rights that are inherent in the principles of a democratic society. (Opposing) Senators pose the threat of conscription to obscure the issue of equality. We must question the credibility of a government that talks of an end to the draft and at the same time uses that hammer to nail women to the wall. . .".*

HOW WOULD ERA AFFECT THE PROPERTY RIGHTS OF MARRIED WOMEN, ESPECIALLY OF THE "HOMEMAKER" WHOSE CAREER IS WITHOUT PAY?

The "homemaker" wife and mother needs the Equal Rights Amendment more than any other class of women. The laws of 42 States are grounded in the common law principle that the one who earns is the one who owns the property acquired with his or her earnings. The homemaker, having no earnings of her own, has no ownership in the property acquired during the marriage. If her husband dies without a will, she may be penniless, or, at most, have a claim of a dower right, being one-third of the income from the property for her life. For example, where husband and wife own farm land, even in joint tenancy, estate tax laws penalize a surviving widow. Since the law makes the husband sole owner, at his death, estate taxes will be measured by the whole value and the widow receives only what is left after payment of taxes. She may have to sell part of the property to pay the tax. At her later death, still a

second tax will be imposed. On the other hand, if the widow dies first, since no value is placed upon her services and her ownership is zero, the husband comes into the whole, undiminished by taxes. Further, in 14 states, in case of divorce, state judges have no authority to divide any property where title is held in only one spouse's name, almost always in the name of the husband.

In the eight community property states, husband and wife each owns an out-right one-half of the property acquired during marriage, even though the wife has no outside earnings. But four of the eight jurisdictions still give the husband, and not the wife, the management rights, enabling him to create debts and dissipate the property without the knowledge or consent of his wife. Texas and Washington have notably revised their community property laws to share management rights.

The prestigious American Bar Association has moved toward correcting these injustices by launching a model **Uniform Marriage and Divorce Act**, already adopted by several States. It provides that courts must consider as one of the factors in ownership and division of property, "the contribution of the spouse as homemaker", thus giving her a legal ownership.

WOULD ERA ELIMINATE THE HUSBAND'S DUTY OF SUPPORT? WOULD ALIMONY BE ELIMINATED? WOULD WIVES BE FORCED TO WORK OUTSIDE THE HOME TO SUPPORT HUSBANDS?

No to all three questions. There could be no grosser misrepresentations than these. To begin with, so long as she lives under his roof, a wife cannot complain or seek relief in court about the amount of support which her husband provides. The duty of support requires the husband to provide what the law calls "necessaries" of food and shelter and furthermore makes him the sole judge of what is necessary. He can cut off any credit to the wife at his will. Only if the wife sues to break up her marriage can she get court relief. The Senate Report stated:

> *"Where one spouse is the primary wage earner and the other runs the home, the wage earner would have a duty to support the spouse who stays at home in compensation for the performance of her or his duties". (Senate Report 92-689)*

> *"Upon dissolution of marriage both husbands and wives would be entitled to fairer treatment on the bases of individual circumstances rather than sex. . ."*

Further, floor debate pointed out that with the ERA. . .

> *"most fathers in the country are still going to have the primary responsibility of supporting the raising of their children, NOT because they are men, NOT because they are fathers but because most fathers are the primary wagearners. . .the ones who, if the family is dissolved, are still going to have the earning power in the marketplace." (Cong. Rec. March 22, 1972, p. S-4540.)*

The husband's duty upon divorce is quickly found to be more ephemeral than real. The records show that 79% of divorced husbands are paying no support obligations 10 years after court orders. And if the wife goes to court to enforce payment, criminal liability would simply place the husband in jail, making it impossible for him to pay. The records show that in the 11 States which have already adopted State equal rights amendments, not one has interpreted the law as imposing a legal duty upon the wife to support her husband. There is no law compelling any person to work. If there were, there would be little necessity for welfare payments. The ERA contains no language to affect this situation.

Alimony may presently be imposed upon either spouse in over 1/3rd of the States. In those where alimony applies only against a husband the ERA would simply bar a greater liability upon him solely because of his sex. The courts would, as they now do, base such payments upon ability to pay. Thus equality of rights would be observed.

The **amount** of alimony or maintenance is a matter wholly within the discretion of the divorce court, with all the variations among the hundreds of State courts, since there are no uniform guidelines. Most court decrees simply adopt an agreement worked out between the attorneys for the two parties. Alimony payments are deductible by the paying husband and taxable to the wife, which is an element entering into the battle of opposing counsel in arriving at the terms of the agreement. Court settlements upon divorced wives all too often fall tragically short. An example:

Sally got:	**Edgar got:**
Custody of 4 children, with daily parental responsibility for their guidance and care	
$500.00 per month alimony (as long as Edgar pays) upon which she must pay income tax	
$300.00 per month for maintenance of children (A TOTAL of $9,600.00 per year)	**The $100,000.00 per year income-producing business**
A $20,000.00 mortgage debt on the home	**HIS FREEDOM**

The Uniform Marriage and Divorce Act further provides that if a spouse is unable to support herself, maintenance payments shall be made by the other for reasonable needs. A court officer is chargeable with monitoring the payments and enforcing compliance. This Act embraces the reasoning of the ERA to eliminate discrimination against the wife, and particularly the wife whose work is inside the home.

MAY A STATE LEGISLATURE RESCIND AN ORIGINAL VOTE OF RATIFICATION?

No. This is a question for the Congress, and not one for the Courts, as was ruled by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1939 in *Coleman v Miller,* 307 U.S. 433. The power to ratify was NOT one of the powers belonging initially to the State and reserved by the State in the delegation of powers to the Federal Government.

It is a special power, conferred upon the States by the U.S. Constitution, Art. V. Article V provides that Congress proposes, and that State legislatures may rafity an Amendment.

Based upon opinions of the Court, of legal scholars, and of precedents by the Congress, the Senate Judiciary Committee has stated the opinion that once a State legislature has exercised its constitutional power to ratify, it has exhausted its power. (Opinion of Counsel for the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, February 20, 1973) This is the rationale which supports the past actions of Congress, for example, when it declared the 14th Amendment ratified by including Ohio and New Jersey which had ratified and later voted to rescind; also by including three States, North and South Carolina and Georgia, which has originally rejected the Amendment, later voted to ratify.

WOULD ERA LEGALIZE HOMOSEXUAL MARRIAGES?

The ERA would simply say that if a State permits single sex marriage between two males it must likewise permit such marriage between two females. Congressional legislative history made this clear.

> *"The Equal Rights Amendment would not prohibit a State from saying that the institution of marriage would be prohibited to men partners. It would not prohibit a State from saying the institution of marriage is prohibited from two women partners. All it says is that if a State legislature makes a judgement that it is wrong for a man to marry a man, then it must say it is wrong for a woman to marry a woman—or if a State says it is wrong for a woman to marry a woman, then it must say that it is wrong for a man to marry a man". (Congressional debate, Congressional Record, Vol. 118, S-4389)*

Recent court decisions have supported this interpretation.

The Supreme Court of Washington has ruled that a State law forbidding single sex marriage did not violate the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment, and further ruled that its decision was supported by both the State and proposed Federal Equal Rights Amendment. The U.S. Supreme Court refused to overrule a Virginia court decision upholding the State statute forbidding homosexual marriage.

HOW WILL THE SO-CALLED "PROTECTIVE LABOR STANDARDS LAWS" APPLYING TO WOMEN ONLY BE AFFECTED?

The ERA would wipe out the labor laws and practices restricting women, such as those keeping women out of jobs by limiting the hours they may work, imposing weight limitations, forbidding night work, and imposing separate seniority lists. At the same time it would extend beneficial laws to men as well, such as minimum wages, and Social Security benefits. In reality, laws of the past century enacted for "protection" have been transformed into shackles of discrimination.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Court decisions thereunder have already eliminated most of these laws, e.g., ten States have repealed maximum hours laws, while in 13 others, the law has been ruled unenforceable. This Act applies to employers of 15 or more persons. The ERA will broaden coverage and give clear constitutional authority to enforcement of the Act. Labor standards laws which confer a benefit will be extended to both sexes.

To decry elimination of these outmoded and restrictive labor laws is "whipping a dead horse" since the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Enforcement of Title VII has transformed the previous opposition by organized labor into support for ERA. The three major divisions of organized labor, the AFL-CIO, the United Automobile Workers and the Teamsters Unions, are all officially committed to support of the Amendment. There is no remaining opposition.

Furthermore, to the employee, the ERA would confer a major benefit by shifting the burden to the employer to prove he did not discriminate. Employees now carry the burden, with accompanying sizeable fees, of proving that the employer did discriminate.

WHO SUPPORTS RATIFICATION OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT?

Almost all women's organizations with a record of concern for the advancement of women (working women, homemakers, professional women, union women—women of all races and national origins)—and the unions of organized labor, the churches, and Civil Rights groups—now support ratification. They are listed below:

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America
Amalgamated Meat Cutter and Butcher Workmen of North America
American Association of University Professors
American Association of Law Libraries
AAUW, American Association of University Women
American Association of Women Ministers
American Baptist Women
American Bar Association
American Civil Liberties Union
American Federation of Government Employees
American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees
American Federation of Teachers
American Federation of Television and Radio Artists
ADA, Americans for Democratic Action
American Home Economics Association
American Jewish Committee
American Medical Women's Association
American Newspaper Guild
American Nurses Association

American Psychiatric Association
American Psychological Association
ASPA, American Society for Public Administration
American Society of Women Accountants
American Society of Women Certified Public Accountants
American Veterans Committee
American Women in Radio and Television
American Federation of Soroptimist Clubs
Association of Flight Attendants
Association of Women in Science
B'nai B'rith Women
Brotherhood of Railway, Air Line and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees
Catholics for ERA
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
Christian Feminists
Church of the Brethren
Citizens Advisory Council on the Status of Women
CLUW, Coalition of Labor Union Women
Common Cause
Communications Workers of America
Democratic National Committee
Ecumenical Task Force on Women and Religion (Catholic Caucus)
ERA Ratification Council, Washington, DC
Evangelicals for Social Action
FEW, Federally Employed Women
Federation of Organizations for Professional Women
Friends Committee on National Legislation
General Federation of Women's Clubs
Insurance Workers International Union AFL-CIO
Intercollegiate Association of Women Students
International Association of Human Rights Agencies
International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers
International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers
International Ladies' Garment Workers Union
International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers
Leadership Conference for Women Religious
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights
League of American Working Women
League of Women Voters
Lutheran Church in America
Movement of Economic Justice
NAACP, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
National Association of Colored Business and Professional Women's Clubs
National Association of Railway Business Women
National Association of Commissions for Women
National Association of Social Workers
National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors
National Association of Women Lawyers
National Board of the Leadership Conference of Women Religious (Catholic)
National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year-1975
National Coalition of American Nuns
National Council of Churches (of Christ)
National Council of Church Women
National Council of Jewish Women
National Council of Negro Women
National Education Association
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs
National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods
National Order of Women Legislators
National Organization for Women
National School Boards Association
National Secretaries Association
National Welfare Rights Organization
National Women's Education Association
National Women's Party
National Women's Political Caucus
NETWORK, Catholic Nuns
National Federation of Democratic Women's Clubs
Office and Professional Employees International Union
Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Union
Professional Women's Caucus
Republican National Committee
Retail Clerks International Association
Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union
St. Joan's International Alliance (Catholic)
Screen Actors Guild
Service Employees International Union (AFL-CIO)
Transport Workers Union of America
Textile Workers of America
Union of American Hebrew Congregations
Unitarian Universalist Church Women's Federation
United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Workers of America (UAW)
United Church of Christ, Council for Social Action
United Jewish Congress
United Methodist Church
United Methodist Women's Division
United Methodist Board of Church and Society
United Mine Workers of America
United Presbyterian Church, USA
United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America
United States Department of Labor
United States Commission on Civil Rights
United Steelworkers of America
Women in Communications
Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor
Women's Campaign Fund
Women's Equity Action League
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
Women's Joint Legislative Committee for Civil Rights
Women's National Democratic Club
YWCA, Young Women's Christian Association
Zonta International

The ERA has been endorsed by:

President Dwight D. Eisenhower
President John F. Kennedy
President Lyndon B. Johnson
President Richard M. Nixon
President Gerald R. Ford

The following organizations oppose the ratification of ERA:

The American Party
Communist Party, U.S.A.
Daughters of the American Revolution
The National Council of Catholic Women
John Birch Society
Ku Klux Klan

ERAmerica • Headquarters at 1525 M Street, NW, • Suite 605
Washington, DC 20036 • Tel: 202-833-4354

Supporting organizations of ERA have set up a national umbrella organization, **ERAmerica**, to pool their efforts and insure ratification. Liz Carpenter and Elly Peterson, as Co-Chairmen, constitute a nationally known and bi-partisan team drafted to spearhead this national effort. A professional staff has been assembled to keep current on the situation in the states, render any assistance feasible, and keep supporting organizations informed. Being national in scope, **ERAmerica** can attract support from individuals and other sources who would not be in position to respond with financial support to local state groups; attract national press coverage; rally political support from both parties; maintain a speakers roster; exchange information on the legislative situation; and act with facility and dispatch as the situation changes.

Additional copies of this are available upon request from Women's Equity Action League (WEAL) • 377 National Press Building • Washington, DC 20045 • 50¢ each; 10 or more, 35¢ each.

WHAT THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT WILL DO

WILL end the practice of imposing higher qualifications for women than for men in the military and thus extend the possibilities of G.I. benefits (learning skills, G.I. job preference, medical benefits, mortgage insurance, education) to a greater number of women.

WILL require tax supported public schools and State universities to admit men and women under the same standards, and to make all courses and extracurricular activities equally available.

WILL cause the Government to accept women and men on the same standards in the manpower training programs.

WILL support extension of laws banning employment discrimination on the basis of sex to all employers and employees.

WILL extend to men such employment benefits as are now applied only to women, such as minimum wages, rest periods, etc.

WILL extend to men the right to benefits from their wives' Social Security contributions and equalize special disability and death benefits to include widowers as well as widows.

WILL provide that men may receive welfare payments under the same circumstances as women—the father would no longer have to run away from home.

WILL support inheritance rights in land to widowers, comparable to present dower rights to widows.

WILL support laws placing a recognized value upon the services of the homemaker not employed outside the home to support and ownership in the property acquired during the marriage.

WILL give the "homemaker" an individual credit rating and give constitutional status to the Equal Credit Opportunity Act.

WHAT THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT WILL NOT DO

WILL NOT invalidate laws which punish rape.

WILL NOT invalidate State laws requiring separate public rest rooms for men and women in public institutions.

WILL NOT drag mothers from the cradle to serve on the combat line because of the drafting of women into military service. The same deferments and exemptions will apply to exempt women on grounds of motherhood (as for fatherhood) and because of hardship on dependents.

WILL NOT force women into the business world while their children are placed in Government controlled day care centers—one of the most heinous and irresponsible of charges thrown at susceptible uninformed women.

WILL NOT apply to laws directly concerned with physical differences found in only one sex, such as functioning as wet nurse or sperm donor where there can be no denial of equal rights to the other sex. For example, it WILL NOT apply to abortion; maternity leave; forcible rape as legally defined; homosexual relations; paternity legislation.

WOMEN'S EQUITY ACTION LEAGUE
weal
National Press Building
Washington, D.C. 20045