

Exhibit L

Joey Songy

From: Jameson Taylor <taylor@mspolicy.org>
Sent: Monday, April 04, 2016 4:00 PM
To: Drew Snyder; Joey Songy; Knox Graham
Subject: Who supports HB 1523_April
Attachments: Who supports HB 1523_April.docx

Attached are the below talking points and list of supporters. We have copies of all the letters, if you need them.

When you are asked who wants the bill, here is your answer.

HB 1523:

The Protecting Freedom of Conscience from Government Discrimination Act

States told by Obama administration to “strike different balances”

In June 2015, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a decision that imposes a redefinition of marriage on Mississippi. In the words of Chief Justice Roberts the decision: “creates serious questions about religious liberty. Many good and decent people oppose same-sex marriage as a tenet of faith,” and their freedom to live consistent with their beliefs is now jeopardized.

During oral arguments for *Obergefell*, the U.S. Solicitor General acknowledged that the nonprofit status of organizations that support one man/one woman marriage “is going to be an issue.” At the same time, he said that the balance between making same-sex marriage the law of the land and respecting the rights of conscience of those who disagree “is going to depend on how States work [it out] ... and how they decide what kinds of accommodations they are going to allow under state law. And different states could strike different balances.”

A narrowly crafted bill based on the First Amendment Defense Act

The balance we are going to strike is to protect freedom of conscience in narrow situations. Accordingly, HB 1523 is very narrowly and carefully crafted in response to one thing: the Supreme Court same-sex marriage decision. It was written in accordance with the direction of the arguments and the decision itself. In this respect, it is NOT like the NC law or the GA law or the Utah law or any other state law you may have heard about. Rather, it is most like the First Amendment Defense Act, which virtually the entire MS delegation supports (turn over, for list of supporters).

Similar to Post-Roe v. Wade Conscience Protections for Healthcare Professionals

HB 1523 is best compared to the narrow protection of conscience laws many states passed after *Roe v. Wade*. Mississippi is one of these states. These laws do not discriminate against anyone or in any way undermine the court’s finding of a “constitutional” right to an abortion. Likewise, HB 1523 does not question or undermine the Court’s finding of a constitutional right to same-sex marriage. In fact, the bill specifically ensures that same-sex couples will be able to obtain marriage licenses without delay (line 125).

Live and Let Live Means Not Forcing Your Views on Others

HB 1523 does not authorize discrimination in any way. Rather, it says that the force of government may not be used against someone who sincerely believes marriage is a union of one man/one woman.

An analogy may help put this bill into perspective. We would never think of forcing a Jewish baker to make a swastika-adorned cake for a neo-Nazi wedding. (Such weddings are legal, after all.) Why would we think it's OK to force a religious business owner to assist in a wedding ceremony that violates his or her deeply-held beliefs, simply because it is now legal to hold such a wedding ceremony?

Who supports HB 1523?

Nearly **two-thirds of MS voters** support this bill: a majority from every age group, both parties, races, sexes in a recent Mason-Dixon poll.

More than 270 pastors have signed a letter of support on the bill. Other pastors/churches submitted separate letters.

Franklin Graham has endorsed the bill

The Southern Baptist Convention has endorsed the bill

Rep. Steven Palazzo has endorsed the bill directly and is a sponsor, along with **Rep. Harper, Rep. Kelly, Senator Cochran and Senator Wicker**, of the federal version. (Note: The federal version applies only to federal practices and not to Mississippi. Hence, the need for HB 1523.)

Bethany Christian Services submitted a letter on the bill's behalf

New Beginnings Adoptions submitted a letter on the bill's behalf

The two Catholic dioceses/bishops of Mississippi submitted a letter on the bill's behalf. They also represent Mississippi's Catholic schools and Catholic Charities

Home of Grace Addiction Recovery submitted a letter on the bill's behalf

American Family Association submitted a letter on the bill's behalf

The National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference submitted a letter on the bill's behalf

The United Pentecostal Church, Mississippi District submitted a letter on the bill's behalf

The American Association of Christian Schools submitted a letter on the bill's behalf

The Miss. Center for Public Policy has provided favorable analysis, supporting the bill

Redemption Outreach Ministries International wrote an op-ed supporting the bill

Alliance Defending Freedom has endorsed the bill from a legal perspective and affirmed its constitutionality

The Family Research Council has endorsed the bill

The Heritage Foundation has written favorably about the bill

Knox Graham

From: Jameson Taylor <taylor@mspolicy.org>
Sent: Monday, April 04, 2016 4:00 PM
To: Drew Snyder; Joey Songy; Knox Graham
Subject: Who supports HB 1523_April
Attachments: Who supports HB 1523_April.docx

Attached are the below talking points and list of supporters. We have copies of all the letters, if you need them.

When you are asked who wants the bill, here is your answer.

HB 1523:

The Protecting Freedom of Conscience from Government Discrimination Act

States told by Obama administration to “strike different balances”

In June 2015, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a decision that imposes a redefinition of marriage on Mississippi. In the words of Chief Justice Roberts the decision: “creates serious questions about religious liberty. Many good and decent people oppose same-sex marriage as a tenet of faith,” and their freedom to live consistent with their beliefs is now jeopardized.

During oral arguments for *Obergefell*, the U.S. Solicitor General acknowledged that the nonprofit status of organizations that support one man/one woman marriage “is going to be an issue.” At the same time, he said that the balance between making same-sex marriage the law of the land and respecting the rights of conscience of those who disagree “is going to depend on how States work [it out] ... and how they decide what kinds of accommodations they are going to allow under state law. And different states could strike different balances.”

A narrowly crafted bill based on the First Amendment Defense Act

The balance we are going to strike is to protect freedom of conscience in narrow situations. Accordingly, HB 1523 is very narrowly and carefully crafted in response to one thing: the Supreme Court same-sex marriage decision. It was written in accordance with the direction of the arguments and the decision itself. In this respect, it is NOT like the NC law or the GA law or the Utah law or any other state law you may have heard about. Rather, it is most like the First Amendment Defense Act, which virtually the entire MS delegation supports (turn over, for list of supporters).

Similar to Post-Roe v. Wade Conscience Protections for Healthcare Professionals

HB 1523 is best compared to the narrow protection of conscience laws many states passed after *Roe v. Wade*. Mississippi is one of these states. These laws do not discriminate against anyone or in any way undermine the court’s finding of a “constitutional” right to an abortion. Likewise, HB 1523 does not question or undermine the Court’s finding of a constitutional right to same-sex marriage. In fact, the bill specifically ensures that same-sex couples will be able to obtain marriage licenses without delay (line 125).

Live and Let Live Means Not Forcing Your Views on Others

HB 1523 does not authorize discrimination in any way. Rather, it says that the force of government may not be used against someone who sincerely believes marriage is a union of one man/one woman.

An analogy may help put this bill into perspective. We would never think of forcing a Jewish baker to make a swastika-adorned cake for a neo-Nazi wedding. (Such weddings are legal, after all.) Why would we think it's OK to force a religious business owner to assist in a wedding ceremony that violates his or her deeply-held beliefs, simply because it is now legal to hold such a wedding ceremony?

Who supports HB 1523?

Nearly **two-thirds of MS voters** support this bill: a majority from every age group, both parties, races, sexes in a recent Mason-Dixon poll.

More than 270 pastors have signed a letter of support on the bill. Other pastors/churches submitted separate letters.

Franklin Graham has endorsed the bill

The Southern Baptist Convention has endorsed the bill

Rep. Steven Palazzo has endorsed the bill directly and is a sponsor, along with **Rep. Harper, Rep. Kelly, Senator Cochran and Senator Wicker**, of the federal version. (Note: The federal version applies only to federal practices and not to Mississippi. Hence, the need for HB 1523.)

Bethany Christian Services submitted a letter on the bill's behalf

New Beginnings Adoptions submitted a letter on the bill's behalf

The two Catholic dioceses/bishops of Mississippi submitted a letter on the bill's behalf. They also represent Mississippi's Catholic schools and Catholic Charities

Home of Grace Addiction Recovery submitted a letter on the bill's behalf

American Family Association submitted a letter on the bill's behalf

The National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference submitted a letter on the bill's behalf

The United Pentecostal Church, Mississippi District submitted a letter on the bill's behalf

The American Association of Christian Schools submitted a letter on the bill's behalf

The Miss. Center for Public Policy has provided favorable analysis, supporting the bill

Redemption Outreach Ministries International wrote an op-ed supporting the bill

Alliance Defending Freedom has endorsed the bill from a legal perspective and affirmed its constitutionality

The Family Research Council has endorsed the bill

The Heritage Foundation has written favorably about the bill