



By SEN. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

Hazel Palmer visits Sen. Butler's office on Capitol Hill to chat about the prospects for passage of the Equal Rights Amendment.

THE CASE FOR EQUAL LEGAL RIGHTS

I AM very happy to have this opportunity to discuss Senate Joint Resolution 80, commonly known as the "Equal Rights Amendment." This amendment, which I introduced early in April, is not new but was first suggested in 1923. Since that time, it has been introduced in every single Congress. It was passed by the Senate in the summer of 1953, but was not considered by the House. The support of Equal Rights for Women has been written into the Republican Party platform since 1940 and the Democratic Party platform since 1944.

In this session, I sincerely hope that we will be able to live up to those campaign promises and to fulfill the hopes and expectations of so many American women. I am proud to be chief sponsor of this measure in conjunction with a large number of other honorable members. Now at last the prospects for the success

of the Resolution seem bright.

The evils which this amendment seeks to cure are many. There are states in this Union where women are denied the fundamental right to serve on juries, where women cannot own property except with their husbands' approval, where women are denied the rights of natural guardianship, where women do not even have full control of their own personal earnings. These evils have an historical basis in the inferior position of women in medieval days and under the old English common law, but they have no sound and reasonable basis in twentieth century America.

American women today do not deserve the stigma of inferiority and incompetence that those laws carry. Many of the laws which stem from a more enlightened desire to protect women against industrial abuses are out of date today. For the hours and conditions that were once estab-

lished as a special favor for women workers are now widely recognized as the minimum prerequisites for any good and efficient worker, male or female. And the other benefits, like maternity or sick leave privileges, which would be applicable only to women, would be no less valid than the legislation which has been passed, for instance, to assist veterans. For special needs there will always have to be special provisions.

Socially, politically and economically, American women have demonstrated their abilities and their potentialities. It only remains for us to acknowledge constitutionally the position that they deserve actually. By approving this resolution, we will be starting it well upon the road to ratification. We will be showing to American women and to the women of the whole world that America recognizes ability and accomplishment wherever they may be found.

The social and political implica-

Sen. John Marshall Butler, who introduced the Equal Rights Amendment in the Senate on April fourth, discusses its economic implications.

tions of this measure are important and far-reaching. But I should like above all to deal with the economic consequences that we might reasonably expect from the Equal Rights Amendment. For the position of women in the economy of this country is extremely significant, but all too often neglected.

THERE are at the moment approximately 21 million women in paid employment in the United States. That represents 35 per cent of all women 14 years old and over and 32 per cent of the total labor force of the country. By 1975, the population of the United States is expected to increase from its present figure of 167 million to a new high of 227 million. This rapid increase is caused by the fact that each year there are approximately three million more births than there are deaths. One of the most important shifts that will result from this population growth will be the greater number of persons below the age of 20 and above the age of 65. As a result, the working-age group of 20 to 65, which today represents 58 per cent of the total population, will in 1975 represent only 52 per cent of a greatly increased total population.

The meaning of that figure is clear. In order to maintain in 1975 the same standards of living and productivity that we are enjoying today, we shall in all probability need to draw even more heavily upon the women of America. We shall have an economy that requires skilled and able workers, but unless we can utilize the untapped resources of hitherto unemployed women, we shall not have the skilled and able workers necessary to keep it running.

These figures are very significant. Today there may be a few people still who are old-fashioned enough to think that a woman's place is only in the home. Tomorrow there

will be no room for such thinking at all.

The need for more trained workers to support a larger population upon the higher level that we hope to achieve can be met, as has been pointed out, only by drawing ever more heavily upon the women who are not in the labor force today and who are perhaps not even thinking of joining it.

HOW can we persuade those women to undertake jobs outside of their homes? For, incidentally, whereas only 35 per cent of America's women over 14 are employed out of their homes, there are 55 per cent who devote their full time to homemaking and 7 per cent who are still attending school, leaving only 3 per cent not actually working somewhere. How then can the 55 per cent still at home be persuaded to contribute their talents on a wider basis?

The answer, I believe, can only be found in the passage of a simple yet comprehensive measure like the Equal Rights Amendment. Only by removing the various differentials that militate against the employment of women can we persuade these women, many of them extremely able and ambitious, to seek outside jobs.

The discrimination that exists in industry and many of the professions takes many forms. There is the direct and obvious fixing of wage differentials. Thus women may perform the very same work as men but receive appreciably smaller wages. This type of discrimination would be completely outlawed by the amendment. Or there are the various subtle policies that retard the promotion of able women, that limit their access to special facilities or that make tacit assumption of their inabilities. These methods are harder to attack. But there can be

no doubt that the Equal Rights Amendment, should it go through, would contribute immeasurably to an atmosphere in which outdated prejudices would be discarded and women would be judged solely on their own merits.

AM I looking too far into the future? Am I describing conditions that may never come to pass? Can it be argued that when the labor shortage occurs, higher wages and greater benefits will always increase the supply of workers and that by 1975 women will be enjoying equal rights even without the benefit of this resolution?

I should like to point out to you an interesting situation in the present labor market which bodes ill for the future unless we do take an active role in eliminating wholly unfounded discriminations. The increasing shortage of scientifically trained personnel, especially the problem of the Government, for instance, in finding and holding chemists, physicists, engineers, is common knowledge. This is a shortage that cannot be filled merely by raising the salaries of scientists, for there simply do not exist enough trained people to bridge the gap. The problem here is to encourage young people to undertake the long and arduous education that these fields require. And I consider it very interesting and very significant that these are the last fields to become generally open to and respectable for women. Already today we are feeling the deficiency that was caused by a lack of foresight in the past, a deficiency that cannot be wholly made up now at any price whatever.

WHY have women not made a greater effort to find a place for themselves in scientific work? Why have women not been willing to study science, mathematics and engineering? Is the answer not to be found in the social conditioning of women beginning in childhood when some professional pursuits are arbitrarily tagged "masculine" and therefore unladylike?

This attitude, I believe, has helped to cause a dangerous situation in our economy. The cure for it is

(Continued on page 16)

LONG, LONG HISTORY

from page 15

Congress by Senators Morse and Pepper in 1945.

Since then, it has been introduced into every succeeding Congress in various forms with hearings actually being held on three of the measures.

Equal pay bills are pending, of course, before the present Congress and prospects of their passage are rated as bright by the Labor Department.

One such bill is H. R. 651, introduced by Rep. Edith Green of Oregon, which was approved by the Federation in 1955.

Rep. Edna Kelly of New York has sponsored H. R. 715; Congresswoman Griffiths of Michigan, H. R. 6584; Congresswoman Dwyer of New Jersey, H. R. 6318; Rep. Joe Holt has introduced H. R. 6089 while Congressman Rodino of New Jersey submitted H. R. 394 and Rep. Multer of New York, H. R. 840.

In the Senate, Sen. Smith of New Jersey has introduced S. 817 in conjunction with Sens. Ives and Purtell. Sens. Morse, Murray, McNamara and Kennedy are also jointly sponsoring S. 1807.

It seems certain that the movement begun in 1833 will be completed soon; the pity is that it has taken so long.

EQUAL LEGAL RIGHTS

from page 7

neither easy nor immediate, but the first step must be an effort to equalize opportunities for women in this crucial area. And the first step in equalizing opportunities, I sincerely believe, should be the passing of the Equal Rights Amendment. Only by removing all relics of discrimination can we insure the nation an adequate supply of trained scientists, men and women.

It is difficult to estimate in dollars and cents the price that we are paying for our discrimination against women. One authority (Elmo Roper) has estimated the cost of all types of discrimination to be as much as 30 billion dollars. A large part of that sum, I am sure, is wasted because women have not been encouraged to train and prepare for important and challenging jobs, because they have been given inferior positions at inferior wages.

WE owe it to the women at work today and to the women who will be the workers of tomorrow to pass the Equal Rights Amendment. I am not expecting the Amendment to effect miracles over night, to raise all women immediately to executive positions. But I am expecting that the passage of this Amendment will eliminate some of the factors that have kept women either at home or at a less demanding type of work than they are capable of. It will surely hasten the disappearance of an outdated, economically unjustified prejudice against women workers. By thus providing greater opportunities and greater security for women in the labor force, this measure would benefit the whole economy.

In a world divided against itself, we cannot afford to neglect or minimize the women of America. They have always done their share, and more besides, without complaint or hesitation. Let us acknowledge their achievements of the past. And let us open the way for them to make still greater achievements in the future by giving the stamp of approval to the proposed Equal Rights Amendment.

EQUAL PAY TIME TABLE

1833—Glasgow Spinners Union demands Equal Pay	1947—Pennsylvania and New Hampshire adopt Equal Pay law
1868—National Labor Union Convention demands Equal Pay law	1948—Congress holds hearings on Equal Pay bills
1878—Knights of Labor make Equal Pay primary aim	1949—California, Connecticut, Maine and Alaska adopt Equal Pay bills
1919—Montana and Michigan adopt Equal Pay law	1950—Congress holds hearings on Equal Pay bills
1923—Civil Service Act establishes Equal Pay in government	1951—International Labor Organization recommends Equal Pay adoption
1943—Illinois and Washington adopt Equal Pay law	1952—New Jersey adopts Equal Pay law
1944—New York adopts Equal Pay law	1955—Arkansas, Colorado, Oregon adopt Equal Pay law
1945—Massachusetts adopts Equal Pay law	1956—President Eisenhower asks Equal Pay law
1945—Congress holds first Equal Pay hearings	1957—Congress considers Equal Pay bills
1946—Rhode Island adopts Equal Pay law	