

Freedom of Conscience Act

Protecting American Taxpayers, Individual Liberty, and Equal Treatment in Government Spending

Union of Saints — Proposed Federal Legislative Initiative
Draft proposal for public discussion and legislative review
United States of America | 2026

“Let’s Feed the State of Vermont

At \$94.4 million would buy approximately 472,084 carts of groceries, equivalent to about \$146.45 per person across Vermont’s estimated population of 644,663 residents.”

I. Statement of Purpose

The Freedom of Conscience Act is proposed to protect individual conscience, strengthen taxpayer accountability, increase transparency in government spending, and prevent the unlawful or unjustified allocation of public funds.

American taxpayers are required to contribute to government programs regardless of whether they agree with every expenditure. Although collective taxation is established under current law, citizens should have meaningful opportunities to question government spending, challenge unlawful allocations, request information, petition their representatives, and seek reforms when public money is used in ways they consider unjust, discriminatory, wasteful, or inconsistent with their moral convictions.

This proposal seeks to establish stronger public oversight of government grants and expenditures while protecting freedom of religion, freedom of conscience, equal treatment, and the constitutional rights of all Americans.

The objective is not to deny security or equal protection to any religious, ethnic, or secular community. It is to ensure that public spending is justified by legitimate public purposes, administered under consistent standards, and subject to transparent and accountable oversight.

II. The Problem: Taxpayer Conscience and Public Spending

Federal taxation funds a wide range of programs, including national defense, public safety, education, social services, and grants to private nonprofit organizations. Taxpayers generally cannot choose which individual programs receive their contributions or withhold taxes because they object to a particular expenditure.

This creates a legitimate public-policy question: What rights and remedies should taxpayers have when government spending conflicts with their moral, ethical, religious, or philosophical convictions?

Freedom of conscience is an important American principle. However, under current law, it does not generally provide an individual exemption from federal taxation simply because the taxpayer objects to a particular government program.

A workable reform should therefore establish meaningful opportunities for taxpayers to review spending, submit formal objections, demand transparency, and seek lawful remedies without assuming that individuals can unilaterally opt out of existing tax obligations.

III. Example: Federal Security Grants to Jewish Faith-Based Organizations

The federal Nonprofit Security Grant Program provides funding to eligible nonprofit organizations facing risks of terrorist or extremist attacks. Eligible institutions can include religious and secular nonprofits, depending on the program's requirements.

In June 2025, the Department of Homeland Security announced approximately \$94.4 million in security grants for 512 Jewish faith-based organizations.

Using the reported total of \$94,416,838, the arithmetic average is:

$$\$94,416,838 \div 512 = \$184,407.89$$

This equals approximately **\$184,408 per recipient organization**.

This is an average, not a confirmed payment to every organization. The 512 recipients were described as Jewish faith-based organizations, not necessarily 512 synagogues. Individual grant awards can vary.

These grants were intended for eligible security improvements. They were not direct personal payments to Jewish individuals.

Why this example matters: Taxpayers should be able to examine the amount of public money allocated, the eligibility criteria, the security risks identified, the distribution of awards, and the safeguards against fraud, waste, and preferential treatment.

The same standards of transparency and accountability should apply to grants benefiting churches, mosques, synagogues, secular nonprofit organizations, and other eligible institutions.

The question is not whether one community deserves protection less than another. The question is whether government can demonstrate that its use of taxpayer money is lawful, necessary, equitable, and accountable.

Primary source: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, June 27, 2025, announcement concerning security grants for 512 Jewish faith-based

These funds may be appropriated to other political organizations that go against the conscience of the American taxpayer and may become a form of forced political servitude, where Americans have to work and provide labor for free to organizations or movements they do not support.

Is this really “freedom”? We say no. We think Americans deserve more power over where their taxes go.

Libertarian Principle: Freedom of Conscience and Taxpayer Choice

We support individual liberty, freedom of conscience, and greater taxpayer accountability. Americans should have a greater voice in how their tax dollars are spent, particularly when public funds support organizations or political causes that conflict with their conscience. Government spending should respect individual liberty, operate transparently, and remain accountable to the people it serves.