

The original documents are located in Box 39, folder “Reagan - Women” of the Ron Nessen Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

President Ford Committee

150 NORTH MAIN STREET, CONCORD, N. H. 03301 (603) 228-0159

No. 135

EMBARGOED FOR RELEASE

Contact Jon Breen

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 28, 10:00

REP. HAGER RAPS REAGAN ON ERA

Concord ... Rep. Elizabeth Hager of Concord charged today that "Ronald Reagan is political chameleon who will take whatever side he thinks is expedient on any given issue at any given time."

Rep. Hager, vice chairman of the Committee on Education in the N.H. House of Representatives addressed herself today to the issue of Reagan's "flip-flop" on the Equal Rights Amendment.

"I can respect a person who takes a stand on issue even if I don't particularly agree with the position," said Rep. Hager. "I have absolutely no respect for someone who says one thing on an issue only to do a 180 degree reversal when he or she finds it politically expedient to do so. This is exactly what Mr. Reagan has done, and I'm confident that the people of New Hampshire are quickly seeing through his shallow facade."

"The Ronald Reagan of 1972," said Rep. Hager, "was all for the Equal Rights Amendment. In April of that year he said, 'In my opinion, the simple declaration that "Equality of rights under the law shall not be abridged by the United States of any State on account of sex" is morally unassailable. Whether or not its adoption might lead to abuses, real or imagined, is beside the point. All the broad principles and guarantees of the original

(MORE)



Constitution carried the same potential abuse."

"So much for Mr. Reagan in 1972," said Rep. Hager.

"In November of 1975," continued Ms. Hager, "we found another Ronald Reagan; this one doing a complete flip-flop from his clearly stated position of 1972. In 1975 Mr. Reagan said, "I do not believe that a simple amendment, the Equal Rights Amendment, is the answer to the problem. I think that it opens a Pandora's Box, and could in fact militate against the very things that women are asking for. I believe the answer is by statute, that the Constitutional amendment, once in the Constitution, can be by strict interpretation, used to deny women the advantages they now have. I would prefer to resolve things by statute."

"So which way does Mr. Reagan want it?," asked Rep. Hager. "Based on his own statements, nobody really knows."

"Maybe no one has told Mr. Reagan that New Hampshire was the second state to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment," concluded Rep. Hager. "Once he finds out that New Hampshire, by of a vote of better than two to one, adopted its own Equal Rights Amendment, we'll find him changing his tune again."



"There are those who have sincere and unselfish reservations about the possible repercussions and unacceptable results which might flow from ratification of the simple, one-sentence Equal Rights Amendment. In my opinion, the simple declaration that "Equality of rights under the law shall not be abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex" is morally unassailable. Whether or not its adoption might lead to abuses, real or imagined, is beside the point. All of the broad principles and basic guarantees of the original Constitution carried the same potential for abuse. However, the implementation process, interpreted by the courts over the years and certain informally accepted limitations have kept us on an even course. I am confident this same time-proven process will be effective in this instance also."

Press Conference, April 14, 1972

Q. Governor Reagan, what are you going to do for Women?

A. Well I'm going to continue to support Nancy to the best of my ability -- I believe I think I understand the point of your question. You know Will Rogers once said, and I have to do this, I have to quote him, Will Rogers once said that women were going to try to become more and more equal to men until pretty soon, they weren't going to know any more than the men do. And I believe that if there are any injustices, if there are still any inequities with regard to difference in treatment of men and women, they should be corrected by statute. I think that they have a place in government, I think they can make a great contribution to government.

Q. Governor, what is your stand on the Equal Rights Amendment?

A. On the Equal Rights Amendment. I should have quit with the first answer over there. I originally started out, it sounded like a very simple thing, and why not? I have to say that as we progressed, and as I found myself with a position where I have to know more about it than that, like many others, I do not believe that a simple amendment, the Equal Rights Amendment, is the answer to the problem. I think that it opens a Pandora's Box, and could in fact militate against the very things that women are asking for. I believe the answer is by statute, that the Constitutional amendment, once in the Constitution, can be by strict interpretation, used to deny women many of the advantages they now have. I would prefer to resolve things by statute.



Q: What advantages?

A. Well, I think you open up the question then of special provisions in say factory work, industrial work, for employees that take cognizance of the fact that there are physical differences between men and women; I think you open up the whole role of individuals in time of emergency being able to challenge their own call to duty on the basis that now it was their Constitutional rights that were being denied because others were not being called, and I don't care how some women may feel about it, but I would hate to see a nation that's going to rely on women in the combat forces.

Press Conference, November 20, 1975

New Hampshire was the second state to ratify the ERA Amendment. In addition, November 5, 1974 by a vote of 135,989 to 65,421 New Hampshire passed a state version of the ERA.



REMARKS BY REP. ELIZABETH HAGER

January 28, 1976 10:00 a.m.

Concord, N. H.

The past several weeks has seen growing concern by many New Hampshire residents regarding the unclear positions taken by Presidential candidate Ronald Reagan -- and this concern is well taken.

What is becoming increasingly bothersome to a large segment of the New Hampshire electorate is Mr. Reagan's inability to take a position on an issue and stick to it. This inability points to a singular flaw in Mr. Reagan's credibility which raises serious questions about his ability to lead our nation during these critical times.

First we found Mr. Reagan unable to explain the details of his 90 billion dollar scheme to reduce the Federal budget. Despite numerous questions on the subject, Mr. Reagan waffled with generalities, only to say that maybe he had made a mistake. Less than twenty four hours later, the same Mr. Reagan declared that he had not really made a mistake after all. I think that the caption on a recent Nashua Telegraph editorial summed up Mr. Reagan's position on the 90 billion dollars perfectly -- . . . "Your mistake is in making the mistake of mistaking my mistake for a mistake."

The 90 billion dollar scheme is not the only area in which Mr. Reagan has shown inconsistency. In 1965 Mr. Reagan said that Social Security should be made voluntary. In 1975, in Houston, he pointed to a situation whereby the payroll tax could be eliminated and retirement bonds with an annuity effect could be realized. Yet one month later, in Conway, New Hampshire, this same Ronald Reagan said that the only Social Security plans he knew of being offered were those "based on plans in which the compulsory features of participation would remain."



My only reason for citing the 90 billion dollar scheme and Social Security as examples of Mr. Reagan's waffling, is to pave the way for another, heretofore unmentioned Reagan flip-flop.

As you are all aware, I have been very active in support of the Equal Rights Amendment. I am proud of the fact that New Hampshire was the second state to ratify the E-R-A currently before the states. I am equally proud of the fact that the people of New Hampshire, by a vote of 135,989 to 65,421 or better than two to one, approved a state version of the Equal Rights Amendment.

Now, I can respect a person who takes a stand on an issue, even if I don't particularly agree with that position. I have absolutely no respect, however, for someone who says one thing on an issue, only to do a 180 degree reversal when he or she finds it politically expedient to do so. This is exactly what Mr. Reagan has done in respect to the Equal Rights Amendment, and I am confident that the people of New Hampshire are quickly seeing through his shallow facade.

The Ronald Reagan of 1972 was all for the Equal Rights Amendment. In April of that year he said, "In my opinion, the simple declaration that 'Equality of rights under the law shall not be abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex' is morally unassailable. Whether or not its adoption might lead to abuses, real or imagined, is beside the point. All the broad principles and guarantees of the original Constitution carried the same potential for abuse."

So much for Mr. Reagan in 1972!

In November of 1975, we found another Ronald Reagan -- this one doing a complete flip-flop from his clearly stated position of 1972. In 1975 Mr. Reagan said, "I do not believe that a simple amendment, the Equal Rights Amendment, is the answer to the problem. I think that it opens a Pandora's Box, and could in fact militate against the very things that women



are asking for. I believe the answer is by statute, that the Constitutional amendment, once in the Constitution, can be by strict interpretation, used to deny women the advantages they now have. I would prefer to resolve things by statute."

So which way does Mr. Reagan want it? Based on his own statements, nobody really knows.

It is becoming more and more evident that Ronald Reagan is a political chameleon who will take whatever side he thinks is expedient on any given issue at any given time.

Mr. Reagan insults the intelligence of New Hampshire's voters.

