Taxpayer-funded services such as health care, food assistance, housing supports, and more are supposed to be provided to those in need without discrimination. In November, the U.S. Supreme Court will hear arguments in the case *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*. If the Court rules that religiously affiliated organizations that contract with federal, state, and local governments don’t have to abide by contract terms, it would upend millions of people’s access to lifesaving and necessary services, particularly during times of crisis.

While the case is specifically about same-sex couples and a city-contracted agency’s refusal to license same-sex couples, the case has the potential to permit discrimination against almost people who do not meet the agency’s religious litmus test. This could include anyone who comes from a different religious background, same-sex couples, unmarried couples, single parents, LGBTQ people, and others. For example, an Evangelical Christian agency in South Carolina with a state contract refused to work with both a Jewish woman and a Catholic couple—simply because they did not share the agency’s beliefs.

When a government contracts with a private agency to provide public services, those private agencies should be required to meet contract terms that apply to all other agencies, include prohibitions on discrimination based on the basis of race or ethnicity, religion, sex, age, disability, and/or sexual orientation and gender identity.