

MAJORITY MEMBERS:

VIRGINIA FOXX, NORTH CAROLINA, *Chairwoman*

JOE WILSON, SOUTH CAROLINA
 DUNCAN HUNTER, CALIFORNIA
 DAVID P. ROE, TENNESSEE
 GLENN "GT" THOMPSON, PENNSYLVANIA
 TIM WALBERG, MICHIGAN
 BRETT GUTHRIE, KENTUCKY
 TODD ROKITA, INDIANA
 LOU BARLETTA, PENNSYLVANIA
 LUKE MESSER, INDIANA
 BRADLEY BYRNE, ALABAMA
 DAVID BRAT, VIRGINIA
 GLENN GROTHMAN, WISCONSIN
 ELISE STEFANIK, NEW YORK
 RICK W. ALLEN, GEORGIA
 JASON LEWIS, MINNESOTA
 FRANCIS ROONEY, FLORIDA
 TOM GARRETT, JR., VIRGINIA
 LLOYD K. SMUCKER, PENNSYLVANIA
 A. DREW FERGUSON, IV, GEORGIA
 RON ESTES, KANSAS
 KAREN HANDEL, GEORGIA
 JIM BANKS, INDIANA



COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
 AND THE WORKFORCE
 U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 2176 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
 WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6100

MINORITY MEMBERS:

ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT, VIRGINIA,
Ranking Member

SUSAN A. DAVIS, CALIFORNIA
 RAÚL M. GRIJALVA, ARIZONA
 JOE COURTNEY, CONNECTICUT
 MARCIA L. FUDGE, OHIO
 JARED POLIS, COLORADO
 GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLÁN,
 NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS
 FEDERICA S. WILSON, FLORIDA
 SUZANNE BONAMICI, OREGON
 MARK TAKANO, CALIFORNIA
 ALMA S. ADAMS, NORTH CAROLINA
 MARK DeSAULNIER, CALIFORNIA
 DONALD NORCROSS, NEW JERSEY
 LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER, DELAWARE
 RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, ILLINOIS
 CAROL SHEA-PORTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE
 ADRIANO ESPALLAT, NEW YORK

November 1, 2018

The Honorable Alex M. Azar II
 Secretary
 Department of Health and Human Services
 200 Independence Avenue, SW
 Washington, DC 20201

Dear Secretary Azar:

I write to raise serious concerns about reports that the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) is considering using the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA) to allow a taxpayer-funded child welfare provider to violate laws and policies that bar discrimination. The exemption under consideration is not justified under applicable legal standards and threatens to tear a hole in our nation's social safety net, while undermining both civil rights and religious liberty.

When Congress passed RFRA in 1993 in response to a Supreme Court case,¹ the discussion centered on how the law would help religious minorities exercise their faith. It was not intended to be a tool to violate constitutional and statutory protections against discrimination. Moreover, RFRA explicitly requires that any exemption abide by the limits of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment which prohibits granting religious exemptions that would detrimentally affect any third party.² When considering such an exemption, the government "must take adequate account of the burdens" that it "may impose on nonbeneficiaries" and must ensure that any exemption is "measured so that it does not override other significant interests."³

Faith-based child welfare agencies have and will play a vital role in serving children in the foster care system, often in partnership with the government. However, religious freedom does not give these agencies a right to use taxpayer dollars to fund discriminatory practices. A child should not be denied a loving, stable home because prospective parents are Humanist, Jewish, Mormon, or Catholic. Qualified LGBTQ families, families who do not attend worship services every week, and families who use contraception should not be told they are not good enough in

¹ *Employment Division v. Smith*, 485 U.S. 660 (1988).

² *E.g., Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 134 S. Ct. 2751, 2781 n.37 (2014) (citing *Cutter v. Wilkinson*, 544 U.S. 709, 720 (2005)); *Holt v. Hobbs*, 135 S. Ct. 853, 867 (2015) (Ginsburg, J., concurring); *Cutter*, 544 U.S. at 726 (may not "impose unjustified burdens on other[s]"); *Texas Monthly, Inc. v. Bullock*, 489 U.S. 1, 18 n.8 (1989) (may not "impose substantial burdens on nonbeneficiaries").

³ *Cutter*, 544 U.S. at 720, 722; see also *Estate of Thornton v. Caldor, Inc.*, 472 U.S. 703, 709-10 (1985).

The Honorable Alex M. Azar II

November 1, 2018

Page 2

the eyes of a taxpayer-funded provider to serve children in need. Finally, employees paid for with federal money should be selected based on qualifications, not religious beliefs.

Child welfare policies should be guided solely by what is in the best interest of the child. An exemption under RFRA would undermine this principle by using tax dollars to fund discriminatory practices, which place the religious beliefs of social service providers above the best interest of children.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

Ranking Member