

WHY CATHOLICS SHOULD

VOTE NO TO THE ERA

On November 5th, New Yorkers will vote on the “**Equal Rights Amendment**,” or “**Proposition One**,” a vaguely worded, unnecessary, and dangerous state constitutional amendment that would result in serious negative consequences by expanding “equal protection under the law” to include, among other things: age, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, and reproductive healthcare.

What does the ERA say?

Proposed changes to the constitution in **BOLD**

“No person shall be denied the equal protection of the laws of this state or any subdivision thereof.

No person shall, because of race, color, ETHNICITY, NATIONAL ORIGIN, **AGE**,

DISABILITY, creed [or], religion, **OR**

SEX, INCLUDING SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY, GENDER EXPRESSION,

PREGNANCY, PREGNANCY OUTCOMES, AND REPRODUCTIVE HEALTHCARE AND AUTONOMY,

be subjected to any discrimination...”



What would the ERA do?

1. Enshrine abortion up until birth in the New York State Constitution.

Abortion limitations to protect women and children would become impossible to pass. Conscience protections of health care professionals and individuals would also be threatened.

2. Allow children to make life-altering medical decisions without parental consent.

Children experiencing gender confusion would be able to seek gender reassignment therapies and surgeries without parental consent or knowledge.

3. Loosen age-appropriate restrictions.

Common sense age-restrictions on “sexual freedom” and the potential “right to die” would be endangered.



What can you do?

- **Vote NO** to the ERA in November!
- **Share** this information with other voters
- **Learn more:** tinyurl.com/oppose-ERA



ARCHDIOCESE
OF NEW YORK

TELL ME MORE ABOUT

WHY CATHOLICS SHOULD

VOTE NO TO THE ERA

1 NEW YORK ALREADY HAS TOO MUCH ABORTION.

New York currently has one of the most extreme abortion laws in the world, permitting abortions up to birth, allowing non-physicians to perform abortions, and excluding parents from the decision-making process. By making “reproductive healthcare” a constitutional right, it would be impossible to pass even the most limited restrictions to protect women and children, and would further threaten the conscience rights of health professionals and institutions that refuse to take unborn life by abortion.

2 CHILDREN SHOULDN'T MAKE LIFE-ALTERING MEDICAL DECISIONS WITHOUT PARENTAL CONSENT.

Confusion about gender has become an epidemic among young people. But gender reassignment therapies and surgeries have serious life-long consequences, and their safety and benefit are increasingly questioned, even by secular researchers. “Gender-affirming care” is based in ideologies that do not recognize the true nature of human sexuality and often these ‘treatments’ fail to adequately address underlying mental health struggles. This amendment would permit troubled children to seek these dangerous procedures without parental consent or even knowledge, excluding from the conversation those who know them best and desire their true good.

3 AGE RESTRICTIONS MAKE A LOT OF SENSE.

Laws “discriminate” based on age all the time. For the protection of vulnerable youth, we set minimum ages to drive, smoke, drink, or consent to sexual activity. To prevent elder abuse, we provide special privileges and protections to those over 65. This so-called new constitutional “protection” would make it much easier for activists to overturn these common-sense safeguards. Age restrictions that relate to “sexual freedom” or “the right to die” are those that would be most likely to be challenged. Some countries already permit children as young as 12 to consent to assisted suicide or euthanasia, which could soon be legalized in New York. We want to ensure that appropriate protections remain in place for vulnerable age groups.

