

## Peace Group Files Five Candidates

Winding up its petition campaign to place candidates in the Democratic party primary election of June 11, the 13th Congressional District Politics for Peace organization filed 2,000

signatures with Paul Powell, secretary of state, Monday.

The group's candidates are Professor Daniel H. Garrison for representative; Donald S. Frey and Gilbert Gordon for

delegates to the Democratic Party national convention; Maya Friedler and Isabel Condit for alternate delegates.

Garrison will campaign against the Johnson administra-

tion's Viet Nam policy. The delegates are pledged to support Sen. Eugene McCarthy or any other peace candidate at the national convention.

## FEPC Must Decide What Is Sex Bias In Employment

Illinois women made a major gain when Governor Ogilvie signed the bill to extend the protection of the Fair Employment Act to cover sex discrimination cases. Now it is up to the Fair Employment Practices Commission (FEPC) to decide how to implement it.

Tentative guidelines have already been

drafted and hearings were held last month at which various testimony was heard by the Commission. Members of the FEPC are now studying the transcripts from the hearings and will discuss in detail as to how to handle the new piece of legislation.

"Permanent guidelines will probably not be available until December or January," said Walter Ducey, executive director of the FEPC.

SINCE THE FAIR Employment Practices Commission was created in 1961, it has handled only cases involving discrimination based on race, color, creed, nationality and origin. This new law provides state level protection for women. The guidelines consist of eight different categories of discrimination which would be considered violations on the part of an employer.

Other state action regarding the status of women includes plans for the North Side Region of the Illinois Women's Political Caucus to hold its first meeting Tuesday, Nov. 2.

The North Side Region (north of the loop and northern suburbs) is one of the seven regions set up by the Illinois Women's Political Caucus at its organizational meeting in Springfield, Sept. 12. The state organization is the Illinois branch of the National Women's Political Caucus which was established this summer in Washington, D.C. Its aim is to provide women with a base of political power from which to fight sexism, racism, institutional violence and poverty.

THE REGIONAL meeting Nov. 2 will be held at noon at the downtown YWCA, 37 S. Wabash.

The Illinois Caucus has set as its first priority the election of more women delegates to the national political conventions.

The acting leadership urges interested women to attend the luncheon. Temporary regional convenors for the North Side Region are Maya Friedler of Evanston and Sonia Slavensky of Rogers Park. Reservations may be made through them, UN 4-0538 or 743-3198.

Women are also urged to set up neighborhood information meetings to prepare themselves to participate actively in the larger Caucus meeting. Arrangements for local meetings can be made through the regional convenors.



is available according to Mrs. Fred J. John Henecker who are busy pre-benefit. Reservations may be made by

## ***ERA backers to cook brunch for legislators***

Illinois housewives will be cooking brunch for members of the Illinois legislature Wednesday at the First Presbyterian Church in Springfield.

The women, members of "Housewives for ERA" are demonstrating their support for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment in the state.

"The great majority of women, young and old, married and single, believe that the Equal Rights Amendment must be passed in Illinois this year," according to Mrs. Maya Friedler, president of the group.

The Eggs Benedict Brunch will be served from 9 a.m. to noon at the church. Mrs. JoAnn Budde, chairperson for the breakfast, says that more than half of the legislators are expected to attend and that almost all will be hosted by housewives from their districts.



Day of reckoning nears for E.R.A.

# Will equality rise up from the legislative floor?

Illinois was the first state to pass an equal rights provision in its state constitution in 1970. Why, then, the delay in the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution? Is guaranteeing women equal rights such a devastating issue in 1974? This week, the bill comes up for vote again in the state Senate and for a hearing in a House committee and the go-around starts again. Here's the story behind the battle.



State Rep. Susan Catania addresses an Equal Rights Amendment rally. She stresses that passage of the E.R.A. will benefit the housewife and mother more than any other women.

By Carol Kleiman

IN THESE CLOSING days of the legislative session, proponents of the Equal Rights Amendment are making a final push this week for passage in 1974.

Today, Sen. Esther Saperstein is scheduled to bring the controversial bill up for another vote on the Senate floor.

The bill has passed previously by a majority of 22 yes votes. But it fell four votes short of the three-fifths majority vote required for passage of an amendment to the United States Constitution in the Illinois legislature.

At the same time, proponents of the E.R.A. in the House of Representatives—headed by Reps. Giddy Dyer, Eugenia Chapman, and Susan Catania—managed to get the bill assigned to a "friendly" committee, the Committee on Human Resources. A strong endorsement is expected from the committee today, and then the bill will be read on the floor of the House tomorrow. After two more readings, the House can vote on the E.R.A. amendment again.

[The House also passed the bill by a ma-

jority of 95 votes, but not by the three-fifths vote [107] required for a constitutional amendment.]

BOTH HOUSES have ruled that a three-fifths vote is needed, but E.R.A. supporters have been pushing for a simple majority. They've taken the issue to court and a three-judge panel in the U.S. District Court says it will rule after the Senate vote today.

Hundreds of women—and a strong contingent of men—are converging today on Springfield, many by chartered buses, to lobby for the bill that will give women equal protection under the law.

Illinois was the first state to pass an equal rights provision in its new state constitution passed in 1970. Which is why most persons wonder why 1) the E.R.A. didn't sail thru the Illinois legislature the first time and, 2) why it still faces a stormy sea. If the bill passes this month, Illinois will be the 34th state to have done so. Thirty-eight are needed.

Of further irony is that the new state constitution changed the vote for passage of a



State Sen. Esther Saperstein, who introduced the Senate E.R.A. bill originally and brings it up again today, weeps after the last time the bill failed to pass the Senate. She cried, she says, in response to ovation from supporters in the gallery.



Organized women's groups come out strongly for E.R.A. passage. Here a board meeting of YWCA gives its approval.

federal amendment to a three-fifths majority.

[The previous state constitution was silent on the issue.] Now, Illinois requires a higher vote to pass the amendment than any other state legislature. This is a sore point among backers, who claim the bill should already be

Continued on following page

## Dispelling the myths haunting E.R. A. success

IF THE Equal Rights Amendment passes in Illinois, and subsequently in the nation, will the role of women change overnight?

"The E. R. A. does not eliminate existing discriminatory practices and laws in itself," says Maya Friedler, E. R. A. activist. "We will still have, the day after it's passed, discrimination in Social Security, credit cards, mortgages, loans, apartment rentals, insurance premiums, medical care, and pension programs."

"But the inclusion of specific mention of women in our Constitution is essential in order to deal with sex-discriminating laws and policies," she continues. "The E. R. A. has a unifying aspect under which women can protest sex discrimination."

This is the basis of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment, but in reality, what kind of protection will it give women—or take away?

IN A BOOKLET published by E. R. A. Central, 33 W. Jackson Blvd., facts and myths of the proposed Constitutional amendment are delineated.

Myth: E. R. A. will make every wife in the United States legally responsible to provide 50 per cent of the financial support of her family.

Fact: At present in Illinois, both parents are equally responsible for the support of each other and their children. If E. R. A. passes, and is used to eliminate sex discrimination in salaries, women

will be able to earn more money for themselves and their families.

Myth: E. R. A. will subject women to the draft.

Fact: There is no draft now, only a volunteer Army. And Congress now has the power to draft women if and when it is reactivated.

Myth: E. R. A. will wipe out many protective labor laws beneficial to women.

Fact: The so-called "protective" laws have already been eliminated in Illinois. In fact, they "protected" women right out of good jobs and overtime pay.

Myth: E. R. A. will nullify thousands of present laws which protect women and will transform every provision of law concerning women into a Constitutional issue that will ultimately have to be resolved by the Supreme Court.

Fact: There are thousands of laws on the books of our 50 states that discriminate against women. Opponents of E. R. A. tell equal rights proponents to repeal them one by one.

"WHAT E. R. A. will do," says Friedler, "is provide a psychological tool for women, a Constitutional basis for challenging discrimination. Women will then know they have a right to be equal, and the E. R. A. will be the law under which to bring suit."

"First we must get the E. R. A. passed. And then we'll have to go on to the next battle—filling all those lawsuits."

## Day of reckoning nears for E. R. A.

Cont. from 1st Tempo page  
approved because of a majority of state legislators favor it.

WHAT ARE the pros, the cons, the problems, and the behind-the-scenes maneuvering to get the Equal Rights Amendment passed?

Proponents of the bill speak of passage in 1975 with certainty; today, with hope. Sen. Saperstein is for the E.R.A. "because we don't want special laws or privileges. We want equality."

Other proponents are organized groups of feminists, such as the Illinois Women's Political Caucus,

Housewives for E.R.A. the YWCA of Metropolitan Chicago, political liberals, and, according to a poll by E.R.A. Central [a coordinating group for pro-E.R.A. organizations], 60 per cent of the voting public of Illinois.

E.R.A. opponents include some conservative organizations, the John Birch society, and some organized church groups. Their fear, they say, is that traditional sex roles of men and women will be broken down, the home and family as we now know them will be destroyed, that women will be eligible for draft, that husbands will not have to support wives, and that women

will lose the existing protective laws.

IN THE FACE of these charges, and in the male-dominated House and Senate, getting the bill passed is not a simple matter.

"If the bill does not pass this time," says Sonia McCallum, executive director of E.R.A. Central, "we are going to gang up on the men—and they are men—who have voted against the amendment. They're going to have to run on their record and be accountable for not representing the women of this state."

"The more the battle drags on, the smarter women get. Most of us were nov-

ices when the campaign to pass the bill began. But not anymore. We've learned a lot in two years."

MAYA FRIEDLER of the Illinois Women's Political Caucus and Housewives for E.R.A., says time works for the bill's passage and for the women involved.

"We are becoming more closely knit and more politically effective. Tho we get more votes each time, each setback brings us closer together in real feelings of sisterhood."

Altho Gov. Walker, Mayor Daley, Atty. Gen. Scott, Secretary of State Howlett are on record as for E.R.A., one recurring factor may again

spell defeat. "What can we do against such male chauvinists?" a leading organizer for the bill says.

"The men are so afraid we may get some of their power away from them, that society will be changed overnight. We are getting very angry, more militant."

"We can't even get them to listen to us long enough to say it's a matter of basic human rights that everyone, regardless of sex, should be guaranteed equality, that not everything will be changed. It's more a statement of rights than anything else. How can they be against that?"