

From: Lachlan321@aol.com
To: [E-OHPSCA2713.EBSA](#)
Subject: Comment: RIN 1210-AB44
Date: Friday, September 09, 2011 1:23:27 PM

To Whom It May Concern:

Please consider not calling homosexual legislation "progressive." It is highly regressive legislation, and the acceptance of homosexuality by ignorant people is thousands of years old.

I also ask you to reconsider your definition of religious employer and offer an authentic conscience protection for any organization and business that has moral or religious objection to providing such insurance to their employees. This legal mandate clearly violates the spirit of conscience laws which prohibit government discrimination against those who object to various health services on moral or religious grounds. The definition of "religious employer" in the regulation is so narrow as to only include churches, but will still mean that a host of businesses and organizations that have conscience objections will be required to choose between either violating their conscience or not being able to offer employees health insurance.

Please protect the conscience rights of insurers, providers and people like me who object to being forced by the federal government to offer or subsidize contraceptives and sterilization services, especially when some of these drugs can take the life of early unborn children. No Americans should be forced by the federal government to essentially subsidize services they object to. I again urge you in the strongest way possible to reverse course and remove contraceptives and sterilizations from the list of mandatory preventive services.

Sincerely,
Sally MacLachlan
, 12259