GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA SESSION 2003

H HOUSE BILL 403

Short Title:	Religious Freedom Restoration Act. (Pu	blic)
Sponsors:	Representatives Capps; Barnhart, Culp, Ellis, Frye, Gulley, Hilton Johnson, LaRoque, Moore, Preston, Rayfield, Rhodes, and Stam.	n, L.
Referred to:	Ways and Means, if favorable, Judiciary II.	
March 11, 2003		
	A BILL TO BE ENTITLED	
	TO ENACT THE NORTH CAROLINA RELIGIOUS FREED RATION ACT.	OM
	Assembly of North Carolina enacts:	
	ECTION 1. The North Carolina General Statutes are amended by addi	ng a
new Chapter		
	"Chapter 143C.	
" <u>§ 143C-1. I</u>	"Religious Freedom Restoration Act.	
	owing definitions apply in this Chapter:	
(1		the
<u> </u>	evidence and of persuasion.	
<u>(2</u>	(Exercise of religion' means an act or refusal to act that is substant	<u>ially</u>
	motivated by religious belief, whether or not the religious exercise	se is
	compulsory or central to a larger system of religious belief.	
<u>(3</u>		
	and official (or other person acting under color of law) of the State	te of
#8 142C 2	North Carolina or a political subdivision of the State.	
	Findings and purposes. he General Assembly finds the following:	
(a) <u>11</u> (1		and
<u>(1</u>	inalienable right secured by Article I, Section 13 of the North Card	
	Constitution.	<u> </u>
(2		rfere
	with the exercise of religion, may burden the exercise of religion.	
(3	-	gion
	without compelling justification.	

- In Employment Division v. Smith, 494 U.S. 872 (1990), the Supreme Court virtually eliminated the requirement under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution that government justify burdens on the exercise of religion imposed by laws neutral toward religion.
 - (5) In City of Boerne v. P. F. Flores, 521 U.S. 507 (1997), the Supreme Court held that an act passed by Congress to address the matter of burdens placed on the exercise of religion infringed on the legislative powers reserved to the states under the United States Constitution.
 - (6) The compelling interest test, as set forth in Wisconsin v. Yoder, 406 U.S. 205 (1972), and Sherbert v. Verner, 374 U.S. 398 (1963), is a workable test for striking sensible balances between religious liberty and competing governmental interests.
 - (b) The purposes of this Chapter are as follows:
 - (1) To restore the compelling interest test as set forth in Wisconsin v. Yoder, 406 U.S. 205 (1972), and Sherbert v. Verner, 374 U.S. 398 (1963), and to guarantee that a test of compelling governmental interest will be imposed on all State and local laws, ordinances, policies, procedures, practices, and governmental actions in all cases in which the free exercise of religion is substantially burdened.
 - (2) To provide a claim or defense to persons whose exercise of religion is substantially burdened by government.

"§ 143C-3. Free exercise of religion protected.

Government may not substantially burden a person's exercise of religion, even if the burden results from a rule of general applicability, unless it demonstrates that application of the burden to the person (i) is in furtherance of a compelling governmental interest and (ii) is the least restrictive means of furthering that compelling governmental interest.

"§ 143C-4. Judicial belief.

If a person's exercise of religion has been burdened in violation of this Chapter, that person may assert that violation as a claim or defense in a judicial proceeding and may obtain appropriate relief against a government. A party who prevails in an action to enforce this Chapter against a government is entitled to recover attorneys' fees and costs incurred in maintaining the claim or defense.

"§ 143C-5. Application of Chapter.

- (a) This Chapter applies to all State and local laws, ordinances, policies, procedures, practices, and governmental actions and their implementation, whether statutory or otherwise and whether adopted before or after the effective date of this Chapter.
- (b) Nothing in this Chapter shall be construed to authorize a government to burden any religious belief.
- (c) Nothing in this Chapter shall be construed to affect, interpret, or in any way address any of the following: (i) that portion of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution prohibiting laws respecting the establishment of religion, or (ii) Article I, Section 13 of the North Carolina Constitution, or (iii) the second sentence of

7

8

9

10

1112

13 14

15

16 17

- Article I, Section 19 of the North Carolina Constitution. Granting government funding, benefits, or exemptions, to the extent permissible under the three constitutional provisions described in items (i), (ii), and (iii) does not constitute a violation of this Chapter. In this subsection, 'granting', used with respect to government funding, benefits, or exemptions, does not include the denial of government funding, benefits, or exemptions.
 - (d) The governing body of a municipality or other unit of local government may enact ordinances, standards, rules, or regulations that protect the free exercise of religion in a manner or to an extent equal to or greater than the protection provided in this Chapter. If an ordinance, standard, rule, or regulation enacted under the authority of this section or under the authority of the unit of local government prohibits, restricts, narrows, or burdens a person's exercise of religion or permits the prohibitions, restriction, narrowing, or burdening of a person's exercise of religion, that ordinance, standard, rule, or regulation is void and unenforceable as to that person if it (i) is not in furtherance of a compelling governmental interest and (ii) is not the least restrictive means of furthering that governmental interest."
 - **SECTION 2.** This act become effective July 1, 2003.