

# HILLARY MARCHES IN ST. PATRICK'S DAY PARADE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue took notice of Senator Hillary Clinton's decision to march in this year's St. Patrick's Day Parade in New York City:

"In 2000, when Hillary Clinton was running for the U.S. Senate in New York, she marched in the St. Patrick's Day Parade. But that didn't sit too well with gay activists who blasted her for marching in a parade that excludes gays from marching under their own banner. Indeed, Christine Quinn, now the City Council Speaker and then a councilwoman, told the *Daily News* in 2001 that she was 'very disappointed and critical of Mrs. Clinton's decision to march last year.' And the *Journal News* reported that Clinton 'was roundly criticized by her gay supporters for marching in last year's parade.' So what happened in 2001? Hillary said she had a scheduling conflict that prevented her from marching, an excuse that was denounced by former New York City Mayor Ed Koch as 'ridiculous.'

"Having been beaten up for not marching in 2001, Hillary decided to march in 2002, and once again she was criticized by gay activists for doing so. This explains why she sat out the parades of 2003, 2004 and 2005. So why is Hillary marching in 2006? Because it's an election year. No doubt she'll march again for the next couple of years because she wants to be elected president in 2008.

"Hillary Clinton's chameleonic response to the St. Patrick's Day Parade is grounded in politics and deceit. She will pander to gays one year, to Irish Catholics the next. She's fooling no one save her loyalists, a shrinking band of bi-coastal, switch-hitting fat cats."

---

# GAY ADOPTION ISSUE SPURS BIGOTED FUROR

A *Boston Globe* editorial yesterday criticized Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney for endorsing a bill that would allow Catholic Charities to continue providing adoption services without servicing gay couples. In a related development, San Francisco mayor Gavin Newsom said he will not attend the installation ceremony of former San Francisco Archbishop William Levada as a cardinal because of the Vatican's opposition to gay adoptions.

Catholic League president Bill Donohue responded as follows:

"In perhaps the most anti-Catholic editorial we've seen in years by any major American newspaper, the *Boston Globe* erupted in a Catholic-bashing furor yesterday that will surely mar its reputation. It wasn't sufficient for the newspaper to simply criticize Governor Romney for seeking to exempt Catholic Charities from a state law on adoption services, it had to lecture him that he is 'governor, not a Catholic bishop.' Worse, after citing John F. Kennedy's remarks on separation of church and state, the editorial accused Romney, a Mormon, of 'accepting instructions on public policy from the pope.' Their lame attempt to spin the issue will fool no one save those Boston Catholics whose anger over the sex abuse scandal has driven them off the deep end. They are so full of rage they can't even see straight anymore.

"Another city that is cracking up with Catholic-bashing furor is San Francisco. It's not the Catholics who have cracked up there—it's those public officials who are so wedded to the radical gay agenda that they no longer know what the common

good means. When Pope John Paul II died, Mayor Newsom and the entire Board of Supervisors refused to attend a Mass presided over by Archbishop Levada, and now Newsom has decided not to travel to Rome for Levada's installation because he thinks the Vatican's opposition to gay adoption is 'corrosive and divisive.' He also blasted the Vatican for its 'stale and questionable documents,' as if his trendy and morally bankrupt positions should instruct the Vatican.

"It's open season on the Catholic Church. The bullies need to be beaten back and branded as the bigots that they are."

---

## **HYPOCRITES AT "SOUTH PARK" AND SHOWTIME**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue commented today on the news that Isaac Hayes has quit "South Park" because of an episode that attacked his religion, the Church of Scientology:

"It is nothing short of amazing to read that 'South Park' co-creator Matt Stone is now charging Isaac Hayes with 'intolerance and bigotry' for not complaining earlier about all the shows 'South Park' did 'making fun of Christians.' Forget about Hayes—the real issue here is the two-faced, super-bratty response from Stone. For him to lecture Hayes on intolerance and bigotry is on the order of John Gotti lecturing Curtis Sliwa on ethics. After all, it was on 'South Park' last year that they depicted the Virgin Mary spraying blood from her vagina. How would Stone know anything about tolerance?"

"And now we learn that Stone and his buddy Trey Parker were moved to take a shot at Scientology because they were ticked

off that their equally foul-mouthed friend, Penn Jillette, was banned from ripping Scientology on his crude Showtime series, 'Bulls – – t.' Forget about Stone and Parker—the real issue here is the cowardly, hypocritical response from Jillette. Last year, Jillette went on a rampage against Mother Teresa calling her 'Mother F- – king Teresa.' Yet this same big oaf hasn't got the guts to slam Scientologists for fear of upsetting his bigoted boss, Sumner Redstone (he is chairman of Viacom, which owns Showtime). As for Redstone, he wrote to me last August defending Jillette's assault on Mother Teresa saying 'we as an organization are committed to artistic freedom.' Not when it comes to Scientologists—their penchant for filing lawsuits scares the daylights out of him.

"What does it take to get the New York-Hollywood gang to stop with their Catholic bashing? Threats of beheadings? Threats of lawsuits? Seems that way. What ever happened to common decency?"

---

## **SONY, RON HOWARD, NOT AVERSE TO DISCLAIMERS**

Bill Donohue, president of the Catholic League, spoke out today about his request for a disclaimer in the upcoming film, "The Da Vinci Code":

"Last Monday, the Catholic League ran an 'Open Letter to Ron Howard' on the op-ed page of the *New York Times* requesting a disclaimer in the beginning of the movie noting its fictional nature. That request has since been denounced as an 'arrogant' demand, suggesting it is an infringement on the artistic rights of Sony, the company that is releasing the

film, and Ron Howard, the director. But a little research reveals that neither Sony nor Howard are averse to disclaimers in their movies.

“When Sony released ‘The Merchant of Venice,’ the movie opened with a disclaimer noting that ‘Intolerance of the Jews was a fact of 16<sup>th</sup> Century life even in Venice, the most powerful and liberal city state in Europe.’ And in ‘A Beautiful Mind,’ a Ron Howard film, the movie ended with a disclaimer noting that it differs from the book (of the same name) that inspired the film: Howard, and screen writer Akiva Goldman, admitted that they ‘fictionalized a number of the incidents.’

“So much for the argument that the Catholic League is out of line by asking for a disclaimer in ‘The Da Vinci Code.’ The Dan Brown book upon which the film is based is a pack of anti-Catholic lies, and it is the author’s duplicity that is driving our campaign: he has tried to pitch his book as if it were an authentic historical account. Thus, to the extent that the movie fails to note that it is a fable, some viewers will be misled. And, as we warned in the ad, Howard’s reputation will be damaged. There’s a lot at stake and there’s an easy way out. The ball is in their court.”

---

## **CONNECTICUT                      LT.                      GOV. OVERREACHES**

On Monday, Connecticut’s state victim advocate, James Papillo, told the state legislature’s Public Health Committee that a bill that would force all hospitals, including Catholic ones, to give rape victims emergency contraception was ill-advised and smacked of bias against Catholicism. Yesterday, Lt. Gov.

Kevin Sullivan called for Papillo to resign: he accused Papillo, a Catholic deacon, of abusing his office. Papillo says he will not do so.

Weighing in on this issue is Catholic League president Bill Donohue:

“Lt. Gov. Sullivan is overreaching. If he doesn’t like James Papillo’s position, so be it. But who is he to tell an appointed official to resign simply because of a partisan squabble? Sullivan’s outburst shows contempt for freedom of speech and the democratic process. Does he really think that appointed officials need to clear their remarks with him before they speak? Sullivan could benefit from a course in Civics 101.

“Papillo is correct to say that ‘What’s being proposed here is a solution in search of a problem.’ As he instructs, the four Catholic hospitals in Connecticut routinely refer rape victims to other hospitals if they think the woman is pregnant and wants emergency contraception. ‘Victims are not being denied services,’ Papillo rightly observes.

“Perhaps Sullivan is unaware of the fact that an innocent unborn child who is at risk—at risk of having his or her life intentionally terminated—is precisely the kind of person that a state’s victim advocate should defend. Looks like he needs a course in Bio 101 as well.”

---

## **GANGING UP ON THE CATHOLIC**

# CHURCH

Catholic League president Bill Donohue accused two mid-Western newspapers today of ganging up on the Catholic Church:

“On Sunday, March 5, the *Telegraph Herald*, a Dubuque, Iowa newspaper, started an eight-day series exposing sexual abuse in the Archdiocese of Dubuque. The series looks at sexual abuse by priests over decades, complete with accounts from alleged victims and portraits of their alleged victimizers. The titles assigned to each story are revealing: ‘A Culture of Catholicity’; ‘Victims Tell Their Stories’; ‘Unholy Fathers’; ‘Raising the Bar’; ‘Are the Children Protected?’; ‘The Effect on the Good and Holy’; ‘The Support Groups’; and ‘Apology and Forgiveness.’

“On Sunday, March 5, the *Chicago Sun-Times* ran a long article by a local columnist for some other newspaper, Tim Placher, entitled, ‘Bless Me Father, for You Have Sinned: A Suburban Newspaper Columnist Tells the Story of How He Fell Prey to a Predatory Priest.’ It is a detailed account of what allegedly happened to him in 1979.

“There is only one reason why these articles are being printed now—it’s in vogue to bash the Catholic Church. If bigotry isn’t in play, then it needs to be explained why the *Telegraph Herald* decided to run an eight-part series on the dirty laundry of the Dubuque archdiocese extending back decades but not on the dirty laundry of local school districts. It is beyond dispute that the public school industry houses more sexual abusers than any other comparative group, so why hasn’t the Dubuque community been treated to a litany of sordid stories on how school superintendents ‘pass the trash’ (this is code for passing molesting teachers from one school district to another, a practice so common it has its own argot)? And are there no columnists or reporters at the *Chicago Sun-Times* who have been sexually abused by a

public school employee? Even if it occurred in the 1970s, isn't it worthy of being told now?

"To be sure, we expect more from priests than teachers. But the disproportionate coverage given to priests cannot be fairly justified."

---

## DA VINCI CODE TRIAL RESOLVES NOTHING

Catholic League president William Donohue commented today on the London court's ruling in the dispute between Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh, authors of *Holy Blood, Holy Grail*, and Dan Brown, author of *The Da Vinci Code*:

"The court's finding today, that Dan Brown is not guilty, is totally inconsequential to the interests of the Catholic League. We regard all parties to the dispute—Dan Brown, Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh—as anti-Catholic frauds. Baigent and Leigh lied in 1982 when they marketed their book, *Holy Blood, Holy Grail*, as non-fiction: we know this because in order to sue Brown they decided to rename their work 'historical conjecture,' thus enabling them to charge him with copyright infringement. Brown is also a fraud: *The Da Vinci Code* opens with three 'facts,' all of which are lies.

"The Catholic League is keeping an open mind with regards to Ron Howard, the director of the movie adaptation of Brown's volume. We have asked him to put a disclaimer at the start of the film indicating that it is a purely fictional account. The ball's in his court."

---

# LOS ANGELES TIMES AND NEW YORK TIMES CHEER RELIGIOUS SPEECH

In today's editions of the *Los Angeles Times* and the *New York Times*, there are editorials praising Los Angeles Archbishop Roger Cardinal Mahony for opposing restrictive immigration bills. If a bill with punitive measures gets passed, Cardinal Mahony wants priests and the laity to defy the law. Here's what Catholic League president Bill Donohue had to say about this development:

"The *Los Angeles Times* not only commends Cardinal Mahony for his latest statement on public policy, it congratulates him for 'reinforcing the right of religious leaders to speak out on the moral ramifications of political issues.' This is a dramatic breakthrough given that this same newspaper once ran an editorial condemning Cardinal Mahony for his 'unwelcome clerical intrusion into the political process.' Confused? We're not. Today's loving editorial concerns the issue of illegal immigration; the damning one concerned abortion. Got it?

"Similarly, the *New York Times* is delighted with 'Cardinal Mahony's defiance' because it 'adds a moral dimension' to the issue. Bursting with glee, the editorial credits the cardinal with 'a startling call to civil disobedience' that is 'as courageous as it is timely.' But during the last presidential campaign, this same newspaper ran an editorial blasting Catholic bishops for 'breaching the church-state line that is so necessary to protect religious freedom.' The difference? The issue was abortion.

“None of this has anything to do with a change of heart—it’s about a change of issues. Still, it’s nice to know what it takes for Catholics to win the approval of these newspapers: call on the faithful to break laws that liberals don’t like and you’ll be an instant hero. Not only that, you’ll be spared their tired lecture about the necessity of keeping church and state separate. Gotta love these guys, don’t you?”

---

## **ALBANY LAWMAKERS MUST CENSURE ADELE COHEN**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue wrote to every member of the New York State Assembly today asking them to censure one of their colleagues, Adele Cohen. The request was occasioned by Cohen’s treatment of Catholics when they met to discuss tuition tax credits. Donohue explains as follows:

“On February 14, when eighth-grade students from St. Patrick’s School in Bay Ridge met with Cohen, they were treated to a lecture on how women should not be stay-at-home moms. Her dismissive treatment of the students grew worse when she met the pastor and principal of St. Bernadette’s in Dyker Heights: Cohen literally shut the door in their faces. What occasioned her insolence was a comment made by the principal, Sister Joan DiRienzo, that Cohen’s refusal to even meet with the group from St. Bernadette’s would be remembered in November. According to Sister Joan, ‘In the very brief time we had with Ms. Cohen, asking to be heard, she made a derogatory comment to me personally. She was not only rude, but also sarcastic.’

“Sensing that she had offended Catholics, Cohen tried to spin the issue by writing a letter to Brooklyn Bishop Nicholas

DiMarzio claiming she was victimized by the Catholics who met with her. But even in this instance, she couldn't hide her contempt for Catholicism: 'It makes me wonder what kind of education the Church is providing in its schools.'

"Now if a group of Orthodox Jewish clergy, parents and children met with a Catholic lawmaker about the need for school vouchers and were subjected to an ideological harangue about the merits of stay-at-home moms, had a door slammed in their faces and were treated with insolence, what would happen? Add to this a scenario where the lawmaker writes a prominent rabbi complaining about the way he was treated and ends with a snide comment about the kind of education being afforded in neighborhood yeshivas. Wouldn't that person be labeled a bigot? And wouldn't that be considered grounds for censure?"

"The disgraceful behavior of Assemblywoman Adele Cohen makes her unfit for public office. A vote to censure her needs to be taken."

---

## **CATHOLIC HOSPITALS DESERVE RELIGIOUS EXEMPTION**

The Connecticut legislature's Public Health Committee is considering a bill that would require all hospitals in the state, including four Roman Catholic ones, to provide emergency contraception to rape victims. The Connecticut Catholic Conference is asking for a religious exemption for Catholic hospitals.

Catholic League president William Donohue wrote the following letter today to members of the Public Health Committee asking

them to accede to the Catholic Conference's request:

*Dear Connecticut Lawmaker:*

*Requiring Roman Catholic hospitals to abide by state strictures on the distribution of emergency contraception ineluctably violates both the religious liberty provision of the First Amendment and the establishment provision, and that is why I am urging you to reject such an appeal*

*A Catholic institution cannot be considered Catholic if it is mandated to yield its religious prerogatives to the state. It is only just that the time-honored exemption afforded religious institutions in matters like this be affirmed. Not to do so sets up a judicial battle that will drain the resources of both sides, the likely outcome of which will be to respect the First Amendment right of Catholic hospitals to maintain their autonomy.*

*Finally, there is no evidence that the current practice of having Catholic hospitals make referrals to other hospitals isn't working. In other words, on the basis of legal, religious, moral and practical grounds, the case to provide an exemption to Catholic hospitals is decisive.*