

GILLIBRAND GOES OFF THE RAILS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on recent remarks by presidential hopeful New York Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand:

It was not a gaffe—it's who she is. Every time Kirsten Gillibrand mentions religion, especially Catholicism, she goes off the rails. Her latest embarrassment came this week in an interview with the *Des Moines Register*: She compared pro-life Americans (all religious in her mind) to racists. As always, her words were poorly constructed, but we got her point.

Gillibrand said that to appoint pro-life judges is the same as appointing racists to the bench. "There is no moral equivalency when you come to racism," she said, "and I do not believe there is a moral equivalency when it comes to changing laws that deny women reproductive freedom." In her usual rambling way, she blamed people of faith for the latter.

Racism involves two principal actors: the racist and his victim. Abortion involves three actors: the abortionist, the woman, and the victim (her baby). There are laws that punish racists for victimizing others, but there are no laws that punish abortionists ([the woman in American jurisprudence has never been targeted](#)) for victimizing others.

If justice were to prevail, we would extend more protections to the victims of abortion than we do to the victims of racism: unlike discrimination, abortion kills.

If Gillibrand, who says she is Catholic but does not go to a Catholic church and does not believe in several core teachings of Catholicism, knew more about her "claimed" religion she would know that the Church holds that abortion and racism are *both* "intrinsically evil."

Gillibrand sees evil in racism but not abortion, which is why

she is consistently out of step with the religion she was raised in. It remains a mystery why she hasn't officially jumped ship and joined the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), Unitarian Universalist, or the United Church of Christ (Conservative Judaism and Reform Judaism are also options). All are in the pro-abortion camp.

Why stay where you don't belong? We're not going to change. Bet on it.

CALIFORNIA CONFESSIONAL BILL HEATING UP

Catholic League president Bill Donohue asks for help in defeating the California bill aimed at breaking the seal of confession:

Within a month, California assembly members are expected to vote on a bill that would compel a priest to disclose to the authorities information he has learned in the confessional if it involves the sexual abuse of a minor committed by another priest or co-worker. In short, the government would be allowed to punish a priest for not breaking the seal of confession.

When we previously asked Catholic League supporters to contact the California Catholic Conference on this issue they did so by the thousands, and with great effect: the original senate version of the bill made no exceptions for any penitent. While we recognize the improvement, it is still unacceptable for the government to police any sacrament in the Catholic Church.

To support the California Catholic Conference in its opposition to the bill, click [here](#) and complete the form.

Also, please email Assembly member Reginald Byron Jones-Sawyer, Sr. He is the chairman of the Assembly Public Safety Committee that is in charge of this bill.

Contact: assemblymember.jones-sawyer@assembly.ca.gov

FLAWED TRUMP NOMINEE CALLS IT QUIT

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a Trump nominee for the federal bench:

Michigan attorney Michael Bogren has withdrawn his nomination for the federal bench. He was being considered for a seat on the U.S. District Court for Western Michigan. The Catholic League fought his nomination from the get-go, and we are very pleased with the outcome.

On May 22, during a hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Bogren said there is no difference between Catholic farm owners refusing to rent their property for the purpose of a gay wedding and the Klan's right to discriminate against blacks. When asked to clarify what he meant, he stuck to his guns: the teachings of Christianity on marriage are morally equivalent to the Klan's racist ideology.

[On May 23](#), we contacted every member of the Senate Judiciary Committee expressing our concerns about the propriety of having someone like Bogren become a federal district judge. We asked that Bogren retract his vile analogy.

[On June 5](#), we issued a news release asking the Senate Judiciary Committee to reject Bogren. We did so in support of

Sen. Ted Cruz and Sen. Josh Hawley, both of whom pledged to reject his nomination. I also wrote to Sen. Lindsey Graham, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, urging him to join Cruz and Hawley in voting against Bogren. We asked our supporters to contact Graham (listing an email contact).

I told my staff last week that I expected Bogren would withdraw. He made a wise choice.

As I pointed out in my news release of June 5, Bogren's logic was deeply flawed. Worse, he had a chance to clear his name by insisting that he was only making a legal analogy and in no way was making a moral comparison between the teachings of Catholicism on marriage and the Klan's racist ideology. His decision not to do so was not a wise choice.

MICHAEL NEWDOW IS A LOSER

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest loss by atheist Michael Newdow:

National League pitchers have a better batting record than Michael Newdow. The devout atheist lost again yesterday when the U.S. Supreme Court refused to hear his case, thus ending his quest to get "In God We Trust" off the coins. He previously lost twice in the lower courts.

In 2003, I noted how he tried to censor Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia: Newdow argued that the Catholic judge should be disqualified from hearing his case trying to erase "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance. Why? Because Scalia was too public about his support for religious liberty. Newdow lost.

In 2004, the Catholic League filed an amicus brief with the Thomas More Law Center supporting the right of public school students to say the Pledge of Allegiance. Newdow lost when the high court said he lacked standing.

In 2005, I wrote about Newdow's attempt to ban the Inaugural prayer. Judge Brett Kavanaugh, then a D.C. Circuit Court judge, defended the religious significance of this well-established prayer, saying it did not run afoul of the First Amendment provision regarding separation of church and state. Newdow lost again.

Newdow is a lawyer and an ER physician. His success as a lawyer is abysmal, and God only knows how he has performed as an emergency room doctor.

Perhaps most interesting, Newdow is also an atheist minister. This is an oxymoron to most, but recall that Barry Lynn, the long-time head of Americans United for Separation of Church and State, was an ordained minister in the United Church of Christ, and he worked tirelessly against religious liberty.

Newdow is a minister in the Universal Life Church. What's that? I had to look it up. It's basically a fraud. The guy who invented this "church" started out in his garage in Modesto, California preaching how important it is to do the "right thing." But the IRS said he didn't do the right thing when he refused to pay his fair share, and that is why he was forced to fork up \$1.5 million in back taxes.

What is really great about the Universal Life Church is its commitment to inclusion. Anyone can join, and it takes only seconds to do so. Think I'm kidding? This is what it says on its website: "Get Ordained Online. Officiate A Wedding." It also says, "Ordination is Fast, Free & Easy." How long does it take? It says you "can become a minister within seconds."

This is all news to me. All along I thought Al Sharpton had the ordination record. He was "ordained" at the age of nine.

But at least Al has some victories under his belt, however scurrilous some of them are. Newdow has yet to win. He is a real loser.

VATICAN SLAMS GENDER IDEOLOGY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a new Vatican document on gender ideology:

The Congregation for Catholic Education has published the most brilliant and authoritative document on the sexes that is currently available. It literally tears to pieces the fatuous claims of gender ideology. Fortunately, it does not water down its account by trying to appease its critics.

“Male and Female: He Created Them” is not only the title of this work, it accurately conveys reality. God did not create mere human beings. No, he created two very different, yet complementary, sexes.

The document takes aim at gender theory, which, it says, “denies the difference and reciprocity in nature of a man and a woman and envisages a society without sexual differences, thereby eliminating the anthropological basis of the family.” Such a vision postulates the absurd notion that “human identity becomes the choice of the individual, one which can also change over time.”

The document notes how gender ideology developed in the 20th century. It celebrates the “freedom of the individual,” emphasizing that “the only thing that matters in personal relationships is the affection between the individuals involved, irrespective of sexual difference or procreation which would be seen as irrelevant in the formation of

families.” To put it mildly, this position is sociologically illiterate.

This kind of subjectivism allows the gender ideology promoters to separate sex from gender. “This separation is at the root of the distinctions proposed between various ‘sexual orientations’ which are no longer defined by the sexual differences between male and female, and can then assume other forms, determined solely by the individual, who is seen as radically autonomous.” This kind of madness is now being taught in the schools.

The Vatican document rightly notes how gender ideology seeks to separate the body from human will, as if one can will his sex. This nonsense finds expression in the “fictitious construct known as ‘gender neutral’ or ‘third gender,’ which has the effect of obscuring the fact that a person’s sex is a structural determinant of male or female identity.” These theories, which include such wild notions as “intersex” or “transgender,” are, at bottom, attempts to “annihilate the concept of ‘nature.’”

There is so much more to this splendid document. It is written for Catholic educators, but it should be read by everyone. The loss of common sense, as evidenced by many in the humanities and social sciences, is directly challenged in this real-life reading of some eternal truths. [See my new book, *Common Sense Catholicism: How to Resolve Our Cultural Crisis*, especially the chapter titled, “Sex Equality,” for more on this subject.]

No wonder the gender ideology promoters are furious. This is a cogent take-down of their plainly stupid, indeed pernicious, ideas about man and society. Its timeliness could not be more fortuitous—it is a heady antidote to the many fictions entertained during “Pride” month events.

It cannot be said too emphatically that any Catholic who is at odds with this document is at odds with more than just the

Catholic Church. He is at odds with nature, and nature's God.

CLERGY SEXUAL ABUSE IS NEGLECTIBLE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest data on clergy sexual abuse:

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops latest findings on clergy sexual abuse continue to show how this problem has largely been checked.

The 2018 Annual Report, "Findings and Recommendations on the Implementation of the Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People," covers the period from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018.

During this period, there were 26 new allegations involving current minors. But only three were substantiated (all three men were removed from ministry). Seven were unsubstantiated; three were unable to be proven; two were referred to a religious order; two were reported as unknown; and three were boundary violations, not instances of sexual abuse.

If we consider the three cases that were substantiated, this means that only .006 percent of the 50,648 members of the clergy had a substantiated accusation made against him in that one-year period. Everyone will agree that ideally the figure should be .000, but fair-minded people will conclude that .006 percent is a negligible amount.

I would go further: Show me a demographic group, or an institution, secular or religious, where adults intermingle

with minors on a regular basis, which has a better record than this. As I have said many times before, Catholics are being played by those—many of whom are Catholic—who do not want the scandal to go away. That way they can push for their reforms. This includes those on the right as well as the left.

Just as previous annual reports found, most of the abuse took place between 1960 and 1990, hitting a peak during the most destructive decade of the 20th century, namely the 1970s. That's when the Church let down its guard to a shameless degree.

As usual, most of the alleged victims were male (82 percent). Only about a fifth were prepubescent, meaning that once again it is obvious we are dealing with homosexual predators, though, as always, the annual report refuses to so say.

This report broke new ground in one way: it sought to measure the diagnosis of some alleged offenders. I say "some" because the questionnaire only applied to religious institutes. Moreover, the survey did not seek a diagnosis of the most common abuser—the homosexual clergyman. It only applied to pedophiles. This decision is never explained in the report.

The findings revealed that 57 percent of the pedophiles were deemed "situational offenders," meaning they did not have a preference for prepubescent children; 43 percent were diagnosed as "preferential offenders," meaning they sought out prepubescent children.

The latter category is easy to understand: they are true pedophiles. What about the former? What kind of man abuses a child simply because it is convenient for him to do so? It suggests that such a man would have hit on an adolescent if the situation were ripe, and since most of the victims are male, the problem circles back to homosexuality.

The good news is that the problem of clergy sexual abuse is being checked. The bad news is that those who do these reports

refuse to ask some of the really hard questions.

BIDEN'S BIGGEST BLUNDER

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Joe Biden's new position on the Hyde Amendment:

Joe Biden can get away with his penchant for gaffes, but he will never get away with his newly decided opposition to the Hyde Amendment. For decades, his pro-abortion stance drew a line in the sand when it came to forcing the taxpayers to pay for abortions. That line is now gone. This is Joe Biden's biggest blunder.

To begin with, Biden blundered morally: mandating that the public pay for the killing of unborn babies (at any time of gestation and for any reason) is obscene.

He also blundered by being dishonest. He was right to say that "circumstances have changed," but he was dishonest when he blamed Republicans for his historic flip flop. As everyone knows, Biden gave in to pressure from the pro-abortion industry and activists in his Party.

It is the Democrats that have changed. There was a time, not long ago, when Democrats who were abortion-rights advocates balked when it came to partial-birth abortion and taxpayer-funded abortions.

New York Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, and New York City Mayor Ed Koch, both Democrats, refused to go that far. Yet they never paid a political price for doing so. But "circumstances have changed," and now the abortion zealots have taken full control of the Democratic Party; they will punish anyone who

disagrees with them.

Biden has also blundered politically. While his decision to fold may win the plaudits of the activists in his Party, his embrace of the extremist positions on abortion runs against the grain of the country. When it comes to the general election, Biden will lose on this issue. Just ask Hillary Clinton. Her defense of partial-birth abortion cost her big time.

The public has no appetite for pro-abortion extremism. In October 2016, a survey published by the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health found that only 36% of likely voters favored Medicaid funding of abortion; 58% were opposed.

The year before, a survey commissioned by the Catholic League found that 61% of Catholics were pro-life. Perhaps even more important, of those who were in the abortion-rights camp, only 5% said that abortion should be allowed for any reason and at any time.

There is another reason, having nothing to do with abortion, why Biden blundered politically. It makes him look weak. One of the reasons why President Trump continues to draw support from Independents is his leadership credentials—he is fearless.

Now look what happened to Beto O'Rourke. He started out just fine, then crashed (his support stands at 3% today). Why? After he broke hard from the gate, all he did was apologize for at least a week. That's not leadership.

Biden's blunder on abortion shows no leadership. He had a chance to distinguish himself from his competitors—on an issue where the public would have had his back—but he blew it. Now he is just another pro-abortion Democrat, of a militant stripe.

CHURCH IS RIGHT TO HIRE LOBBYISTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a report that criticizes the Catholic Church for hiring lobbyists:

The Catholic Church has come under fire by wealthy lawyers who are attacking the Church for paying lobbyists to defend its interests. Their goal is to rile the faithful, hoping they will insist that their money be spent on other matters.

We hope the bishops spend more money on lobbyists. It is only moral to do so.

Given all the spin by those who work at the law firms of Seeger Weiss, Williams Cedar, Abraham Watkins and Simpson Tuegel—it is their report that the media have picked up on—it is imperative that the Church not be intimidated by these bullies.

The report notes that between 2011 and 2018, the Church spent \$10.6 million on lobbyists to defend itself against proposed laws on sexual abuse. NBC News ran a headline that said the lobbyists were paid to “stymie priest sex abuse suits.” Another headline from the same media outlet read, “Sunday Collections Went to Pay for Lobbyists.” CBS also did a story on this issue.

Is the Catholic Church the only institution that is not supposed to defend itself from rapacious lawyers? That is what the report and the media are saying. It is totally misleading to say that the Church was trying to “stymie priest sex abuse suits.” No, it was trying to establish a level playing field and stop the cherry picking. And yes, the cause of justice

demands that the faithful pay the bill.

What the report does not mention, and the news stories gloss over, is the fact that the laws the lobbyists were opposing were rooted in bigotry: the proposed revisions to the statute of limitations that allowed for a "look-back provision" (allowing old cases to be prosecuted), singled out the Catholic Church. The bills did not apply to the public sector.

The only exception was in New York where, after years of berating politicians for not blanketing the public schools, the bills were amended to be inclusive. We are happy to note the role we played in this campaign. It should be noted that once the public schools were covered in the final bill, the New York Catholic Conference dropped its opposition.

One of the report's lawyers, Gerald Williams, said, "The church has yet to implement meaningful reforms, and by working to prevent laws from passing, the church is clearly demonstrating that it does not stand with survivors."

Williams is either ignorant or a liar. Is he aware of the latest data on clergy sexual abuse? There were 26 new allegations made against over 50,000 members of the clergy between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018. Of the 26, *three* were substantiated; the three were removed from ministry.

There is not a single institution in the nation, religious or secular, which has less of a problem with the sexual abuse of minors today than the Roman Catholic Church.

Moreover, many dioceses have implemented programs to compensate those who have been abused. What other institution has done likewise? Not one. Yet the sexual abuse of minors is rampant in places like Hollywood, to say nothing about what is going on in the public schools.

If we include sexual misconduct in the workplace, NBC and CBS are among the worst (NBC refused to hire an outside law firm

to investigate Matt Lauer and Tom Brokaw—it was all done in house). They are not alone. Two years ago it was reported that U.S. companies paid out nearly \$300 million in public penalties over sexual harassment claims.

Pennsylvania Attorney General Josh Shapiro, who released a grand jury report last year on clergy abuse—none of the accused had an opportunity to contest anything—said that by paying for lobbyists, the Church proves it “cannot be trusted to police itself.” It would be more accurate to say that he cannot be trusted to tell the truth: of the 301 priests named in his report, he succeeded in prosecuting two of them. What a colossal waste of the taxpayers’ money.

Not to be outdone, New York State Senator Brad Hoylman chided the Church for spending money on lobbyists, saying that in his district, “a Catholic school that is closing might perhaps have stayed open if that money had been used for better causes.” The man is insincere. If he really cared about Catholic schools, he would promote school choice, not work against it.

The report issued by the law firms never mentions the amount of money

spent in New York by lobbyists for the public school establishment—it got worried once the law applied to them. Nor does it cite the money spent in other states by lobbyists for Orthodox Jews, the insurance industry, and others. Most important, it does not report on all the money that lawyers like them have made chasing one institution—the Catholic Church.

These are not mere attorneys—they are activist lawyers with an agenda. And they are dishonest.

Contact Gerald Williams (who said the Church has done nothing about this issue): gwilliams@williamscedar.com

SEN. JUDICIARY SHOULD REJECT TRUMP NOMINEE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a nominee for the federal bench:

On May 23, we contacted the Senate Judiciary Committee expressing our concerns about a Trump nominee for the federal bench, attorney Michael Bogren. He is being considered for a seat on the U.S. District Court for Western Michigan. At that time, we called on Bogren to apologize for making an invidious anti-Catholic remark. He has refused to do so.

Two Republicans on the Senate Judiciary Committee, Sen. Ted Cruz and Sen. Josh Hawley, have pledged to vote against Bogren. We are now contacting committee members again, asking them to support Cruz and Hawley.

The issue in question concerns an analogy that Bogren made in a 2017 legal brief contrasting the Catholic Church's teachings on marriage to that of the Ku Klux Klan's. Bogren was defending a decision by the city of East Lansing to bar a family of Catholic farm owners from the city's farm market because they would not rent their property to those seeking a gay wedding.

Bogren said "there can be no constitutionally sound argument that sincerely held religious beliefs would permit a secular business to avoid the prohibitions against racial discrimination or gender discrimination found in federal, state and local laws." That's when he offered his analogy between the Catholic farm owners and the Klan, saying that a Klan operated facility could not invoke the First Amendment religious-liberty provision to avoid an anti-discrimination

lawsuit.

Subsequently, when asked by Sen. Hawley to clarify his position, Bogren stuck to his guns. Hawley asked, "So you think these things are equivalent? You think that the Catholic family's pointing to the teachings of their church is equivalent to a KKK member invoking Christianity?"

Bogren replied, "From a legal perspective, there's no distinction."

Bogren is right to conclude that a Klan owned business could not seek protection under the religious-exercise provision of the First Amendment when discriminating against black customers, but he is wrong to equate the Catholic family's decision to that of the Klan's.

To begin with, the Ku Klux Klan is not a religious organization seeking to exercise its religious rights: It is a para-military terrorist organization that is expressly *anti*-religious. The Klan, Bogren should know, was founded on bigotry against blacks, Jews, and *Catholics*. Ergo, it is not entitled to a religious liberty defense on any matter.

Second, the Catholic family did not say it would not sell its produce to homosexuals. It objects to renting its facilities for the purpose of celebrating a gay marriage. There is a profound difference between decisions reached on individuals and decisions reached on social institutions.

Third, Bogren fails to distinguish between an interracial marriage and a same-sex marriage. The former has nothing to do with altering the meaning of the institution of marriage. The same is not true of a gay marriage: such a union may be an expression of love, but it is not ordered to marriage's ultimate social purpose—reproduction. Homosexual acts are incapable of creating a family; the same is not true of interracial heterosexual unions.

Fourth, there is no biblical injunction against interracial marriages. The same is not true of a marriage between two men. Indeed, homosexual acts are considered sinful, quite unlike marital sex between people of a different race and a different sex.

Fifth, beyond the jurisprudence, anthropology, and theology that embroils Bogren's flawed analogy, there is the matter of common decency. He could have maintained fidelity to his legal argument while unequivocally stating his abhorrence for the legacy of the Klan and his appreciation for the legacy of Catholicism (to cite one example, law in Western civilization owes much to Catholic teachings). But he chose not to do so, thus inviting people to think there is no fundamental difference between Catholic moral theology and the Klan's racist ideology.

Michael Bogren is not fit to serve on the federal bench.

Sen. Lindsey Graham is chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Contact his Deputy Communications Director, Toby Tyler: toby_tyler@lgraham.senate.gov

THE COST OF WARRING ON RELIGION

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on what happens when politicians declare war on God:

The Left likes to describe the way status groupings such as class, race, and gender interconnect, constituting what they call intersectionality. In real life, no one uses such verbiage: it is confined to higher education and other left-

wing ghettos. But it may have some utility in explaining why so many Democrats are sponsoring bills that result in the killing of innocent persons.

Women and African Americans, two segments of the population championed by Democrats, are now at risk, thanks to policies that Democrats are supporting. On June 3, the Democrat-controlled Illinois Senate voted to sustain the vote in the Democrat-controlled House allowing for an abortion bill that threatens to put the life of women in jeopardy, especially black women. It will be signed by Gov. J.B. Pritzker, a Democrat.

This bill as originally written would have put women at risk in three ways: (a) it removes regulations for abortion clinics, allowing them to be self-policing b) it eliminates all reporting requirements and regulations governing an investigation of maternal deaths due to abortion, which further puts women at risk and (c) it would have allowed people not trained as doctors to perform abortions, thus jeopardizing the life of a woman who suffers from complications. Although this last provision was removed shortly before passage, the bill's original intent is clear.

If anyone thinks I am exaggerating the danger to women, consider what Dr. Matt Zban, an emergency room doctor from Charlotte, North Carolina told me via an email in April. He said that a doctor who performed an abortion at a nearby clinic was unable to help the woman's condition—she was experiencing low blood pressure, vaginal bleeding and had a perforated uterus. He contacted a colleague of Dr. Zban's, an Ob/Gyn specialist.

Fortunately, this abortion doctor referenced the woman to a physician who could help her, and the good news is that she was treated for her complications. But under the original Illinois statute, a midwife who performed an abortion and was presented with these kinds of issues would not have been

required to seek help from a doctor. If the woman died, there would have been no investigation and no penalties for anyone connected to the abortion.

Wealthy white women seeking an abortion in Illinois would not have had to worry about some non-doctor aborting their child and placing them at risk—they would have the best service that money can buy. But what about indigent black women? We all know that they would be the most likely to be placed at risk.

An assisted-suicide bill, pushed by Democrats in New York, mandates that a patient suffering from “an incurable and irreversible illness” must have two witnesses to his request to be put down. There is more to this bill that is really disturbing.

One of the bill’s provisions says that family members need not be told of their loved one’s decision. So who qualifies as a witness? The bill explicitly permits one of them to be “a person entitled to a portion of the patient’s estate, or a person associated with the health care facility where the patient is receiving treatment.” That’s right—those who stand to profit from the sudden death option can act as a witness.

What’s driving these Democrats to promote abortion-on-demand, absent protections for the women’s life, and euthanasia for despondent patients, supported by those who may benefit from it?

One does not have to be religious to wonder whether the absence of God from public life has something to do with such madness. It is not hard to connect the dots.

On February 28, three persons appeared before the House Judiciary Committee and were sworn in before they gave their testimony. Democrat Rep. Steve Cohen asked them, “Do you swear or affirm under penalty of perjury that the testimony you’re about to give is true and correct, to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?”

Cohen intentionally left out the phrase, "So help me God." When a Republican colleague took issue with this startling omission, he was quickly put in his place by the chairman of the committee, Rep. Jerry Nadler, a Democrat. Nadler said, "We do not have religious tests for office or for anything else, and we should let it go with that."

The matter in question, however, had absolutely nothing to do with violating the Constitutional provision barring a religious test—that stipulation applies only to those seeking public office.

The bias against religion, especially our Judeo-Christian heritage, is so commonplace among Democrats these days that the aforementioned Illinois abortion bill removes conscience protection for healthcare personnel who oppose abortion. It also requires all private health insurance plans to cover abortions.

These two provisions are obviously aimed at Catholics, though not exclusively so. The law would punish Catholic doctors and nurses for not performing, or assisting in, an abortion, and would force Catholic schools and other non-profits to pay for an employee's abortion.

This bill will be challenged in the courts, but the fact remains that these Democrats, having abandoned any fidelity to our religious heritage, are hell bent on promoting death to innocents. This is the most obscene illustration of what intersectionality means when applied to the liberal-left agenda.