



*Please hand this to
Richard Strong when you have
finished with it.
Estelle Strong*

DACOWITS 1972 FALL MEETING
NOVEMBER 12-16, 1972
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO

THE EFFECT OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT
ON
WOMEN IN THE MILITARY

Speech by: Mrs. Carole L. Frings, Office of the General
Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense

I. Introduction

Mrs. Stacy, General Benade, Members of DACOWITS, and women of the military. As a starting point for my topic today, I'd like to read to you from a court decision once written by Justice Brandeis, one of the most eminent and respected Justices ever to sit on the United States Supreme Court. Here is what he had to say on the role of women in society.

"That woman's physical structure and the performance of material functions place her at a disadvantage in the struggle for subsistence is obvious. This is especially true when the burdens of motherhood are upon her. Even when they are not, by abundant testimony of the medical fraternity, continuance for a long time on her feet at work, repeating this from day to day, tends to injurious effects upon the body, and as healthy mothers are essential to vigorous offspring, the physical well-being of woman becomes an object of public interest and care in order to preserve the strength and vigor of the race.

"Still again, history discloses the fact that woman has always been dependent upon man. He established his control at the outset by superior physical strength, and this control in various forms, with diminishing intensity, has continued to the present. As minors, though not to the same extent, she has been looked upon in the courts as needing especial care that her rights may be preserved. Education was long denied her, and while now the doors of the school room are opened and her opportunities for acquiring knowledge are great, yet even with that and the consequent increase of capacity for business affairs it is still true that in the struggle for subsistence she is not an equal competitor with her brother."

What I have just read to you may sound shocking in this day and age, with all its male supremacist assumptions that woman's primary role is to produce vigorous offspring for the preservation of the race, and with its assumptions that woman is obviously inferior to and weaker than man. In fact, if any man today made such a statement, he would immediately be

branded by certain women's libbers as a "male chauvinist pig" of the worst order.

That statement is part of a court opinion written by Justice Brandeis in 1908. The case was Muller v. Oregon, in which the Supreme Court upheld an Oregon law forbidding women to work in a factory or laundry any longer than 10 hours a day, while no such restriction was placed on men. The part I read to you was part of Justice Brandeis's rationale for why such a law protecting women was necessary and constitutional.

I quoted that opinion in order to give you an idea of just how radically the legal thinking on women's rights has changed in the past 60 years or so, and also to give you a historical perspective from which to study the impact of the new Equal Rights Amendment.

I'd like to start out by giving you the historical background on related Constitutional Amendments and on the court cases dealing with sex discrimination, so that you can see why Congress felt that a special Constitutional Amendment to give women equal rights was necessary.

II. Historical Background of the Equal Rights Amendment

A. History of Related Constitutional Amendments

The attempt to obtain equal rights for women dates far back into our history, and yet it is only in recent times that women have begun to achieve their objectives of equality in the areas of civic rights, employment opportunities, and legal rights in general.

For example, although this country is nearly 200 years old, women have had the right to vote for only 52 years.

It wasn't until 1848 that women first actually organized to try to achieve equality under the law. This was known as the Seneca Falls Convention.

In the 1860's and 1870's, when the 14th and 15th Amendments were being proposed to the Constitution, to give blacks the right to vote and equal protection under the laws, thousands of women sent petitions to Congress asking to be included. They were told, "No. This is the Negro's hour, you must wait. . . .", and it was a long wait indeed. It was 50 years before the 19th Amendment was finally passed and ratified in 1920, giving women the right to vote.

However, that Amendment only gave the right to vote and did not grant women any other type of equality under the law. The courts have continuously refused to extend the privileges or guarantees of the 14th Amendment to cover discrimination by sex. The 14th Amendment is the one that forbids the States to deny equal protection of the laws to any person. The 14th Amendment was ratified shortly after the Civil War and was designed to protect the emancipated slave. Its framers did not intend to include women within its protections. The standard under the 14th Amendment has always been that a State may classify persons into groups which are treated differently, as long as those classifications are not unreasonable.

Classifications based solely on race have consistently been held to be unreasonable and therefore in violation of the 14th Amendment.

But since the 14th Amendment was passed in 1868, the Supreme Court in a long line of cases, has refused to extend the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment to women as a class. For example, in the 1908 case of Muller v. Oregon, 208 U.S. 412 (1908), which I have already alluded to, the U.S. Supreme Court held that a State law regulating the number of hours a female may labor, while not so restricting males, did not violate the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. Although this decision was intended for the benefit of women, it did allow the States to treat women differently under the law as a separate class, and thereby did not grant equal protection of the laws to women as a group.

In a more recent example, a 1961 case, the U.S. Supreme Court in Hoyt v. Florida, 368 U.S. 57 (1961), held that a State jury selection law differentiating between men and women solely on the basis of sex was based on a classification which was "reasonable" under the equal protection requirement of the 14th Amendment. The statute gave women an absolute exemption from jury duty based solely on their sex, whereas there was no such exemption for men. The court held that such a statute was constitutional.

The basic holding of this line of cases before the U.S. Supreme Court is that sex alone is a valid basis in most situations for classification of women into a separate class to be treated differently, and the result is

that the Supreme Court has not extended to women as a class the equal protection due "to any person" under the 14th Amendment.

There are only a few exceptions to this line of Supreme Court cases. One is the case of Reed v. Reed, 40 U.S.L.W. 4013 (1971), in which the U.S. Supreme Court, relying on the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment, did strike down an Idaho law arbitrarily requiring that men be preferred over equally qualified women in the appointment of estate administrators. But the Court did not overrule such cases as Muller and Hoyt, and the Court did not hold that sex discrimination per se is unreasonable under the 14th Amendment. Instead, the Court left the burden on every woman plaintiff to prove that governmental action perpetuating sex discrimination in her particular case is "unreasonable."

The point of all this case history is to explain why the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution is considered necessary. Since the Supreme Court has generally refused to apply the 14th Amendment to women, and since that is the only existing Amendment to the Constitution which would ban discrimination of the laws solely on the basis of sex, Congress deemed it necessary to pass a special Amendment to the Constitution solely to prevent discrimination in the laws on the basis of sex.

B. History of the Equal Rights Amendment

Now that you've seen why a special Equal Rights Amendment was considered necessary, I'd like to give you a brief history of that Amendment.

In 1923 the first Equal Rights Amendment was introduced in Congress by Senator Charles Curtis and Representative Daniel Anthony, both from Kansas. Similar resolutions have been introduced in every single Congress since then. During the years 1924 and 1938, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee favorably reported the proposal to the full committee three different times.

In May, 1943, the Amendment was reported to the Senate with amendments.

In 1946, the Senate considered the Amendment and defeated it by a vote of 35 to 23. The Senate has approved the Equal Rights Amendment on two occasions, in 1950, by a vote of 63 to 19, and in 1953, by a vote of 73 to 11.

In the House, in 1945, after public hearings, the House Judiciary Committee favorably reported the Amendment to the House for the first time, but no other action was taken. The Judiciary Committee again held public hearings in 1948, but no further action followed.

Then finally, this year, the Equal Rights Amendment was passed by Congress on March 22, 1972, almost 50 years after it was first introduced.

III. The Equal Rights Amendment Itself

The Amendment must now be ratified by 3/4th of the States within seven years. So far, 21 States have ratified it. A total of 38 States must ratify it before it becomes law.

Once it is ratified by the States, there is a two year waiting period before the Amendment takes effect.

There has been much confusion over what this Amendment actually says, so I'd like to read it to you:

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

So you see, this Amendment grants equal rights to men as well as women, and its purpose is to prevent discrimination solely on the basis of sex.

IV. Possible Effects of the Equal Rights Amendment on Women in the Armed Forces

A. Speculative Nature of this Topic

I would like to emphasize at the outset that any conclusions made at this point about the effects of the Equal Rights Amendment on women in the military are extremely tenuous and speculative in nature. The reasons for this are twofold: (1) there is tremendous controversy among legal experts as to what the effects of the Amendment will be; and (2) a great many of the issues created by the Amendment will have to be resolved by the courts, and it is impossible to predict how the courts will handle this entirely new area of the law.

So while I am discussing with you the possible impact of the Equal Rights Amendment on women in the military, please keep in mind that everything I say is in fact only speculation, and that either Congress or the

courts may take an entirely different view of the matter on any particular issue. However, I will try to focus on what the most likely results will be, based on what prominent authorities in this field have said.

B. Policies of the Services Which May Be Affected by the Equal Rights Amendment

1. The Draft

One of the most controversial issues created by the Amendment is the question of whether women will be required to be drafted along with men. At present the Military Selective Service Act specifically applies only to male persons. The general consensus of most authorities and of the Congress on this issue is that women will be subject to the draft.

The Senate Report on the Amendment stated that:

"It seems likely . . . that the ERA will require Congress to treat men and women equally with respect to the draft. This means that, if there is a draft at all, both men and women who meet the physical and other requirements, and who are not exempt or deferred by law, will be subject to conscription. . . .

"Of course, the ERA will not require that all women serve in the military any more than all men are now required to serve. Those women who are physically or mentally unqualified, or who are conscientious objectors, or who are exempt because of their responsibilities (e.g., certain public officials; or those with dependents) will not have to serve, just as men who are unqualified or exempt do not serve today. 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."

During the House Judiciary Committee hearings on the Amendment in April of 1971, Mr. William H. Rehnquist, who was then the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, and who is now a United States Supreme Court Justice, was asked to provide the Committee with a legal opinion on the probable effects of the Amendment on various matters, including the military draft. Mr. Rehnquist did prepare such an opinion for the Committee and in it he states as the legal opinion of the Department of Justice the following:

"The question here is whether Congress would be required either to draft both men and women or to draft no one. A closely related question is whether Congress must permit women to volunteer on an equal basis for all sorts of military service, including combat duty. We believe that the likely result of passage of the equal rights amendment is to require both of those results. As has been pointed out by many of the amendment's supporters, that would not require or permit women any more than men to undertake duties for which they are physically unqualified under some generally applied standard. . . ."

In any event, this entire question may soon be moot since President Nixon has stated his intention not to ask for an extension of his induction authority after June 30, 1973. This would mean that no one, neither men nor women, would be subject to the draft. But since it is possible during some future emergency that the draft may be reinstated, this issue may arise again at that time.

2. Entrance Requirements

At present there are different entrance requirements for women than for men in all of the Services.

In title 10 of the United States Code, section 505, there are listed general qualifications requirements for original enlistments in the Regular Branches of all of the Services. This statute establishes a different age requirement for women than for men. It provides that a female must be at least 18 in order to enlist, and must get her parents' permission if she is under 21; whereas a male need only be 17 in order to enlist, and must have his parents' consent only if he is under 18.

It seems very probable that this age requirement will have to be made the same for both men and women in order to comply with the Amendment.

Secondly, all of the Services have indicated to me that in general the minimum standards on test results and educational level required in order for a person to enlist or be an officer are generally higher for women than for men. In addition, at least some of the tests given are different for women than for men. This is done by policy and regulation in each Service rather than by statute. The reason for this difference is simple--the Services generally have more women applicants than they can use, and they also require much fewer numbers of women than men. As a result, the Services can set higher standards for women, picking and

choosing among only the best qualified, and still fill their needs. In the case of men, on the other hand, much greater numbers of them are needed, and it's often difficult to get enough applicants to fill all of the manpower alots for men. As a result, the Services must set lower standards for men in order to get enough men to fill their needs.

There are at least two views on how the Equal Rights Amendment will affect this difference in standards between men and women. One view is that the Amendment will require the standards to be absolutely the same across the board for both men and women. This view would require either that the women's standards be lowered to those of the men, or that the men's standards be raised to those of the women. This argument can certainly be supported by the language of the Amendment, which calls for "equality of rights" for men and women.

However, another view is that employers, both military and civilian, have always been free to select the most qualified applicants for a position, as long as in doing so they did not arbitrarily rule out certain persons solely on the grounds that they belonged to a certain race, religion or sex. Using this rationale, the argument has been made that the military departments will be allowed to choose the most qualified applicants, both men and women, who apply, keeping in mind that the Services will go only as far as they have to for either men or women in lowering their test standards and educational qualifications in order to get enough men or

enough women for their particular needs. This view would not require that the standards be identical for both men and women, but would allow the military departments to pick the "cream of the crop" among both men and women applicants.

It is impossible to say which view will be taken by either Congress or the courts. However, it seems likely that under either view, the Services would probably have to at least give the same tests to both men and women.

The third aspect of entrance requirements is the matter of physical standards. Since there are basic physiological differences between men and women, there will probably have to be some differences in the physical examinations given to women and in the physical standards applied to them. Since there are certain physical conditions that only women can have, such as pregnancy, and which might make it difficult physically for a woman to perform satisfactorily in the military, it would be impossible to apply those same physical standards to men, or vice versa.

However, when you get into the area of what physical standards are required in order for a woman to enter a certain type of occupational specialty, those types of standards may have to be the same for both men and women. I will discuss this a little later in my talk.

3. Training

Basic training has always been separate for men and women and still is.

Training that occurs after basic training has in the past been separate for men and women in some of the Services for at least some types of training.

Will the Equal Rights Amendment require all training to be coeducational in the future, including basic training?

It has been long established that different types of physical exercises, for example, are desirable for women as opposed to men in order to maximize their physical development. This is due to the differing physiological structure of men and women. One could argue that no one's equal rights would be denied by prescribing different types of physical exercise and training for women than for men, if this is what would best maximize the physical fitness and potentialities of women as well as of men. Therefore, there is an argument for separate basic training under the Equal Rights Amendment.

However, the opposing view is that equality means equality, and that the women must train along with the men throughout basic training.

Either argument is defensible under the Amendment, and we may have to wait for Congress or the courts to decide this one.

But when it comes to training in the individual's occupational specialty, many people argue that there is no room under the Amendment to justify separate training for men and women. This view contends that if that specialty is one that is open to both men and women, then there is no

rationale for arguing that women be trained separately for performing skills identical to those to be performed by the men.

It is my understanding that all of the Services either already are, or soon will be, training at least some women personnel in with the men for both officer and enlisted specialty training. Complete integration of training may take some time, as some training facilities currently used only for men will have to be expanded to accommodate additional numbers of people.

Another phase of training is ROTC scholarships. This year, for the first time I believe, that program has been opened to women in all of the Services. In some of the Services it is only in a partial limited stage for this academic year because it is such a new program. However, the Equal Rights Amendment would probably require that the ROTC program, along with all other types of educational programs and benefits, be open equally to men and women, within the limits of how many women officers so trained were needed by each of the military departments.

4. Assignments

The question here is: Does the Equal Rights Amendment require that women be allowed to volunteer on an equal basis with men for all sorts of military service, including combat duty? Needless to say, there has been much controversy over this issue.

Within the last year or so, the services have opened up practically all specialities to women except those that are combat-oriented

or are considered physically too arduous or dangerous for women.

In the Army 434 MOS's (Military Occupational Specialties) are now open to enlisted women, and only 48 are closed to them. For officers, 177 specialties are open to women, and 188 are closed. Of these 188 closed fields, 81 are medical, and of the remaining 107, 35 are male command positions; 49 involve railroad, marine, or aviation operations; and 23 others involve strenuous physical labor or assignments to combat or hazardous duty areas.

In the Marine Corps, for both officers and enlisted women, 23 general fields are now open to women, and only 13 fields are closed to them.

In the Navy, by authority of a famous "Z-gram" put out last spring by Admiral Zumwalt, Chief of Naval Operations, all enlisted ratings are now open to women, and all staff corps are now open to women officers.

And in the Air Force, most specialties are open to women except those which are combat-oriented, physically too arduous, or which put women in special jeopardy.

The Air Force is presently prohibited by law, in section 8549 of title 10, United States Code, from assigning women to duty in aircraft engaged in combat missions. This does not mean women can't fly in aircraft, it only means they can't be assigned to one having a combat mission.

The Navy is presently prohibited by law, in section 6015 of title 10, United States Code, from assigning women to duty in aircraft that are engaged in combat missions, or on vessels of the Navy, other than hospital ships and transports.

There is no law prohibiting the Army from assigning women to combat duty or any other type of duty. However, the Army has closed to women by regulation those specialties which are combat-oriented, physically too arduous, or too dangerous for women. The Air Force has a similar standard.

The question is, will all such types of duty have to be open to women, once the Equal Rights Amendment becomes law? If you will remember from my previous quotation of Mr. Rehnquist's legal opinion, he, as Assistant Attorney General, felt that the likely result of passage of the Amendment would be to require Congress ". . . to permit women to volunteer on an equal basis [with men] for all sorts of military service, including combat duty. . . ." Mr. Rehnquist went on to point out, however, that the Amendment ". . . would not require or permit women any more than men to undertake duties for which they are physically unqualified under some generally applied standard. . . ."

Here is what the Senate Report on the Amendment had to say about this issue:

"It seems clear that the Equal Rights Amendment will require that women be allowed to volunteer for military service on the same basis as men; that is, women who are physically and otherwise qualified under neutral standards could not be prohibited from joining the service solely on the basis of their sex. This result is highly desirable for today 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 service in the military itself."

And the report went on to quote Congressman Edwards, who had chaired the House Subcommittee Hearings on the Equal Rights Amendment, who stated:

"Women in the military could be assigned to serve wherever their skills or talents were applicable and needed, in the discretion of the command, as men are at present."

This viewpoint argues that the Amendment will require that women be allowed to enter any type of duty for which they are physically and mentally qualified, including combat duty. The Services would have to establish neutral standards, and based on those, any man or woman who was strong enough and otherwise qualified to perform the tasks required of that type of duty, would be allowed to do so. Under this system, for example, if any particular woman were strong enough to carry a rifle and a pack many miles across country, she could become a combat infantryman, assuming she met the neutral minimum physical and other standards set up for that type of duty. I would like to stress that the physical standards would have to be neutral as to sex, that is, they must be based on the actual physical and other qualifications functionally necessary to perform that

task. For example, the standard could not require that all applicants weigh at least 165 lbs. and be at least 5'10", unless those attributes were actually necessary to perform such a duty. Obviously, such a standard would automatically bar most women from qualifying.

5. Promotion

In the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, women officers at present are by law considered for promotion separately from the men, but the enlisted women in those services compete on an equal basis with the men for promotion purposes.

In the Air Force, both women officers and the enlisted women are completely integrated with the men for promotion; there is no separate promotion for women in the Air Force.

Will the Equal Rights Amendment require that a separate promotion system for women officers be abolished?

Most legal authorities seem to agree that a promotion system kept separate solely on the basis of sex would violate the Amendment's mandate that equality of the laws must not be denied on account of sex. There is no apparent rationale that would justify the continuance of a separate women's promotion system under the new Equal Rights Amendment. So that system will probably have to go, in which case, the present laws which provide for separate promotion will have to be changed.

6. Separate Women's Corps

Now we come to the problem of whether it will be permissible under the Equal Rights Amendment to maintain separate women's corps. The only Service which still has a separate women's corps per se is the Army. This is largely due to the unique organization of the Army, which is divided into corps along functional lines, and in which each member is permanently assigned to a particular corps. A woman who is in the Army must belong to either the Women's Army Corps or to one of the various branches of the medical department; she is not allowed to belong to any other corps. However, she can be given all kinds of assignments which require her to be detailed to a different corps. When that happens, she is merely detailed or assigned to the other corps for the duration of her assignment. But at all times she remains a member of either the Women's Army Corps or a medical corps; she never joins another corps.

A similar system applies to the men in the Army--a man joins a particular corps, such as the Army Engineer Corps, and usually remains in it throughout his career, even though he may frequently be detailed to other corps at various times. However, a man is allowed to transfer to another corps, if he has the qualifications, and if there is an opening, whereas a woman may not transfer from the Women's Army Corps to anything but one of the medical corps.

The other Services, while not having a separate women's corps per se, do handle women separately for at least some administrative purposes. For example, the Marine Corps at most bases has, for administrative purposes, a separate women's company within a given battallion. For their job assignments these women are assigned among all the various men's branches and are counted against the overall strength of whatever unit they serve in. But for purposes of housing and administration they are treated separately.

Just how far the Equal Rights Amendment will require that the women's branches be integrated with the men's units is impossible to say.

But I would like to tell you what the Judge Advocate General of the Army had to say when the Army was questioned by the House Appropriations Committee this year. The Committee asked: What effect will the Equal Rights Amendment have on the structure of Women's Army Corps? Here is part of his reply:

"The legislative history [of the Equal Rights Amendment] . . . indicates that a number of functions now served by maintenance of a separate Women's Army Corps will not be permitted if the equal rights amendment is ratified. For example, selection, assignment, and promotion of personnel, in my opinion, will have to be done on a best qualified basis, rather than by continuing separate assignment categories and promotion lists. . . .

"The primary function of maintaining a separate Women's Army Corps will probably be eliminated upon ratification of the equal rights amendment. Whether those distinctions based on sex that would remain permissible under the amendment will be continued through a separate label for female members is primarily a question of policy. However, the impact of the equal rights amendment, in my opinion, will so limit the permissible distinctions that it would be inaccurate to designate female members as belonging to a separate corps, as that term is used to designate separate branches within the Army. The ultimate impact on the Women's Army Corps will depend, in large part, on the nature of such implementing legislation as Congress may enact and, to some extent, on court decisions, if litigation results. It therefore is premature for me to state an opinion [on] whether the amendment will require the Army to discard entirely the concept of a Women's Army Corps."

I think what the Judge Advocate General of the Army had to say on this subject pretty well sums it up.

7. Entitlements for Women

There are still certain benefits and allowances automatically granted to men in the Services which are not available to women.

Male members are provided quarters on base, or else a basic quarters allowance for their dependents is provided if they live off base. A married woman member, while she could live on base by herself if she chose, would naturally want to live off base so that she could be with her civilian husband. And yet this woman is not entitled to any quarters allowance unless her husband is dependent on her for over one-half of his support. A male member, on the other hand, automatically gets a quarters

allowance for his wife and children whether or not they are in fact dependent on him. The same thing applies to a woman member who has children. She must prove that they are dependent on her for over one-half of their support for some benefits and, of course, if her husband is working she usually can't prove this.

The same system applies to medical benefits. A woman member's husband is not entitled to any free medical care at all unless he is dependent on her, whereas a male member's wife automatically gets free medical care. However, both male and female members get medical care for their minor children.

If a woman member is transferred, her husband must travel to the new location at his own expense and she gets no allowance for moving expenses, whereas a male member would get both of these things.

Under the Equal Rights Amendment, in my opinion, these policies will probably have to be changed, because the present system appears to be an abridgment of equality under the law on account of sex. Probably all members, both men and women, will either have to prove that their spouses and children are dependent on them, or else all members, both male and female, will automatically get certain allowances for their spouses and children without having to prove dependency. In other words, in my opinion, the standard will have to be the same for both male and female members with regard to qualifications for entitlements.

Bills have been proposed in Congress, both by individual Congressmen and by the Defense Department, to alleviate some of these problems, but so far none of them has passed. If the Equal Rights Amendment becomes law, such changes would, I believe, be required.

C. Summary

The above are the major subject areas that will probably be affected by the Equal Rights Amendment. The authorities on this subject seem to agree that at least some changes will be required in the areas of entrance requirements, training and assignments, separate promotions, separate women's corps, and entitlements for women.

V. What the Defense Department is Doing to Comply with the Equal Rights Amendment

Both the Army and the Navy have each recently appointed a Task Force to review all of their laws and regulations to determine which, if any, are discriminating against women and to pinpoint those which may therefore have to be changed if the Equal Rights Amendment becomes law. Each Task Force is composed of a broad range of persons, including Judge Advocate General lawyers and manpower and personnel administrators and policy-makers. The Air Force, through the office of General Holm, is taking a similar look at their laws and regulations.

These groups will be making a very thorough review of every law and regulation which treats women differently than men, including a review of

all the subject areas I have covered today, as well as others. Out of this should come some very concrete suggestions for legislative proposals and regulatory changes to end any remaining inequality of treatment that still exists today.

These changes, both the ones that are now being made and those that undoubtedly will be made by the Services, will make our military departments among the most progressive in the world in their treatment of women, and will be an example to other branches of the government as well as to private industry of the kinds of opportunities that can be made available to women.

In conclusion, although the Equal Rights Amendment may impose some additional military responsibilities on women, in my opinion, the benefits and the opportunities that this Amendment will bring to women in the armed forces will far outweigh the additional duties imposed.