

ERA RATIFICATION — WHAT IT'S REALLY ALL ABOUT

Abortion advocates will not quit! They have plenty of tricks up their sleeves. Don't be fooled! ERA may sound like it's all about protecting women's rights. Women's rights are already protected under the 14th Amendment. ERA is better described as being [everything related to abortion](#). There was a time when advocates denied this. But not now...

Pro-abortion advocates are reeling. Roe v Wade is on the cusp of being overturned. The push is on to ratify the ERA because, if and when Roe v. Wade is overturned, ERA becomes the legal weapon to invalidate all state and federal limits on abortion and to require taxpayer funding of all elective abortions at state and federal levels. If ERA is written into the US Constitution, Roe v. Wade is no longer needed.

But there's a problem... efforts to ratify the ERA expired years ago! Ratification is what amends the constitution.

ERA — WE DON'T NEED IT IN THE US CONSTITUTION!

"Equal Rights" sounds so fair and equitable, doesn't it? [Don't be fooled](#). ERA is a [wolf in sheep's clothing](#).

ERA Ratification isn't necessary and goes too far. Women are already protected under [The Equal Pay Act of 1963](#), the [Civil Rights Act of 1964](#) prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, the [Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972](#), [The 14th Amendment to the US Constitution](#), [Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972](#), are laws already in place to protect women.

ERA ratification hurts women — it jeopardizes their unique needs and physical biological differences resulting in the stripping of gender roles. This will impact alimony, child custody, sexual assault protection, and lead to single sex bathrooms, increased taxpayer funded abortions, and the forced military draft of women.

It is a two-step process. First, it must pass Congress, then three-fourths of the states (38) must vote to ratify.

In 1972, Congress proposed an amendment to the US Constitution, known as the "Equal Rights Amendment" to nullify any law or government policy that discriminates "on account of sex". The submitted resolution contained a seven-

year deadline for the required ratification by 38 states, which did not occur.

Twenty-two state legislatures ratified the ERA quickly, with little debate by the end of 1972. This was before the Supreme Court handed down the Roe v. Wade decision. Twelve more states ratified before government funding of abortion became a national issue. By 1977 only 35 state legislatures voted for ratification. [Maine](#) was one of them — voted on January 18, 1974.

In 1978, Congress voted to extend the original March 1979 deadline to June 30, 1982. However, no additional states voted yes before that date, and the ERA was still three states short. Meanwhile, five states voted to rescind their support of ERA, within the timeframe, as follows:

Nebraska: March 15, 1973

Tennessee: April 23, 1974

Idaho: February 8, 1977

Kentucky: March 20, 1978

South Dakota: March 5, 1979

In 1982, the US Supreme Court recognized that the ERA had failed to achieve ratification. Nevertheless, ignoring constitutional requirements, activist groups insist that congress has the power to retroactively erase the deadline, after which the 1972 ERA will become part of the Constitution if they got the three additional states needed to ratify it.

Today, ERA advocates have less support in Congress than in 1972. Rather than seeking compromise on amendment language, they attack the integrity of the constitutional amendment process, arguing the deadline is unconstitutional, and can be removed retroactively by any Congress, now or in the future. Efforts to seek three more states was achieved: Nevada -2017, Illinois — 2018, and finally, Virginia — 2020.

Archivists chose not to record the three states as valid. Attorney generals of Virginia, Nevada, and Illinois sued the federal court in Washington.



[Judge Rudolph Contreras](#), dismissed the case saying: “Plaintiffs’ ratifications came after both the original and extended deadlines that Congress attached to the ERA, so the Archivist is not bound to record them as valid.” During the 2020 presidential campaign, the Biden-Harris campaign made a campaign promise that “Biden will proudly advocate for Congress to recognize the ¾ of states have ratified the amendment and take action so our Constitution includes ERA.” The US House of Representatives along with Democratic majority leadership also announced plans to advance a resolution to retroactively remove the deadline. They were delivered a serious blow three days before the vote on the House floor, when longtime ERA champion, Justice Ruth Bader

ERA – WE DON'T NEED IT IN MAINE'S CONSTITUTION!!

Among the arguments Pro-ERA advocates use to shame people into supporting ERA ratification is the argument of pay and job opportunity inequity.

Of all the states in the country, [Maine](#) has one of the smallest wage gaps. Maine law requires pay equity, and if an employee in Maine questions a pay equity situation to the Maine Department of Labor, by law, the Department of Labor will do an investigation. Also – in 2019 a law was passed banning employers from asking about wages in job interviews.

When addressing the wage gap, it is important to consider the [professions women choose](#), the number of hours they work, and the jobs that families choose to ensure that they have the right balance in their lives to care for children and earn for the household. Women often choose less demanding jobs. It is a choice that families make and it has nothing to do with employers or laws.

[Women are thriving in Maine!](#) In terms of total job opportunity in Maine, the share of jobs is split evenly between male and female. The rate of women who choose to be in the workforce is growing. When it comes to managerial and professional occupations, 43% of these jobs are held by women. 30.1% of Maine businesses are owned by women. There isn't inequity in opportunity and pay for women in Maine.

ERA diminishes and devalues the role of motherhood. Maine, of all states, should be encouraging motherhood!

Ginsburg addressed the validity of the deadline and the power of the states wishing to rescind, Bader Ginsburg said, “I would like to see a new beginning. I'd like it to start over. There's too much controversy about latecomers – Virginia, long after the deadline passed. Plus a number of states have withdrawn their ratification. So, if you count a latecomer on the

plus side, how can you disregard states that said, ‘We've changed our minds?’”

On January 27, 2022, [President Biden](#), in an attempt to appease political activist, issued a statement: “I am calling on Congress to act immediately to pass a resolution recognizing ratification of the ERA.”

At some point soon, the US Senate will conduct a Cloture Vote on the “Deadline Removal” measure, that purports to retroactively remove the ratification deadline. [Senator Susan Collins](#) is one of only two Republicans who support the measure. Not a single other Republican has expressed support for the “deadline removal” measure.

Clearly, ERA advocates will not stop! “The ERA – cannot-die movement has run up an unbroken 40-year losing streak in the courts, before federal judges of every political stripe,” explains Douglas Johnson, National Right To Life Committee's Federal Legislative Director, who has put together a comprehensive [in-depth special report](#) on the Equal Rights Amendment – it is worth a read! “So far, 26 federal judges and justices have had opportunities to act on some substantive or jurisdictional issue advanced by ERA-revival litigators – and those litigators have yet to get a single judge on any component of their theories, although the judges were nearly evenly divided in party affiliation.”

Whether it's judges, Supreme Court Justices, state legislatures, or the general public – people are waking up to what the ERA really is, and why advocates push so hard for it. There once was a time, when Pro-Life advocates exposed ERA as being everything related to abortion were accused as lying, misleading, and imposing scare tactics. However, this is no longer the case.

Whether its judges, Supreme Court Justices, state legislatures, or the general public – people are waking up to what the ERA really is, and why advocates push so hard for it. There once was a time, when Pro-Life advocates exposed ERA as being [everything related to abortion](#) were accused as lying, misleading, and imposing scare tactics. However, this is no longer the case.

Now Pro-ERA and abortion activists, attorneys, allied office holders have become emboldened and openly proclaim that ERA will protect federal “abortion rights.” Georgetown Law Professor, Victoria Nourse said: “Without a text of the ERA [in the Constitution] it may well be that the [Supreme] Court reverses Roe v Wade.” With more Pro-ERA advocacy groups chiming in:

National Organization for Women: “an ERA – properly interpreted – could negate the hundreds of laws that have been passed restricting access to abortion card...”

NARAL Pro-Choice America: “The ERA would reinforce the constitutional right to abortion...[it] would require judges to strike down anti-abortion laws...”

Associated Press – January 1, 2020, quoted Emily Martin, from National Women’s Law Center: “Adding the amendment to the Constitution would enable courts to rule that restrictions on abortion ‘perpetuate gender inequity.’” Later that same month, AP reporter David Crary

wrote, “Abortion rights supporters are eager to nullify the [ERA ratification] deadline and get the amendment ratified so it could be used to overturn state laws restricting abortion.”

So important that get abortion written into the US constitution, ERA advocates will chip around all the edges of state legislatures to make their inroads. [Maine](#) law maker, [Lois Reckett \(D\)](#) – South Portland is determined to cover all bases. This year she introduced LD433: A “RESOLUTION, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of Maine To Explicitly Prohibit Discrimination Based on the Sex of an Individual” was brought before the legislature. If it had received a two-thirds vote in both the Maine House and Maine Senate, ERA would be a referendum question on this November 2022’s ballot. LD433 failed to get the needed 2/3 vote. But, rest assured, ERA will be back.

The biased mainstream media aids and abets every step of the way misleading the public that ERA is about equal rights for women, giving Pro-ERA advocates cover to, no longer, not so secretly, get ERA written into the state of Maine and the US Constitution. There is a reason that abortion isn’t written into the Constitution. The framers of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence were fighting for the right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness – not for some, but for all. Abortion doesn’t accomplish this!

