

From: [Tom Pittman](#)
To: [E-OHPSCA2713.EBSA](#)
Cc: [IttyBittyComputers](#)
Subject: Comment to "RIN 1210-AB44"
Date: Tuesday, August 23, 2011 9:59:34 AM

Comment to "RIN 1210-AB44"

Why is this regulation in patent violation of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the USA, in which "Congress [and by extension, Federal agencies authorized by Congress] shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" whereas in this "interim final regulations" [Page 46623],

"certain religio[n]s" (literally "certain religious employers and their employees in certain religious positions") are respected (the actual word is "respecting") as established (the actual word used is "establish"), by defining them to consist solely and exclusively:

"for purposes of this policy, a religious employer is one that:

- (1) Has the inculcation of religious values as its purpose;
- (2) primarily employs persons who share its religious tenets;
- (3) primarily serves persons who share its religious tenets; and
- (4) is a non-profit organization under section 6033(a)(1) and section 6033(a)(3)(A)(i) or (iii) of the Code. Section 6033(a)(3)(A)(i) and (iii) refer to churches, their integrated auxiliaries, and conventions or associations of churches, as well as to the exclusively religious activities of any religious order."

The clear intent of this "definition of religious employer" is to respect the establishment of "certain religio[n]s" while denying the free exercise of others, who might reasonably be carrying out the religious activities of their religion, such as for example defined in the Bible [James 1:27] "Religion that God our Father accepts as pure and faultless is this: to look after orphans and widows in their distress and to keep oneself from being polluted by the world. My brothers, as believers in our glorious Lord Jesus Christ, don't show favoritism." Thus a "religious employer" by God's definition fails to meet one or more of those four defining and establishing restrictions in this "interim final regulations" and is thereby denied the free exercise of their religion.

While this "interim final regulations" pretends to be instructed by and "consistent with the policies of States that require contraceptive services coverage," it is also clear that it intends to trample upon and override the Rights of those States which have laid no such burden on their religious citizens nor established some of them for protection while denying (as does this "interim final regulations") the free exercise of others.

This is both morally Wrong and UnConstitutional.