

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>As of:</b> October 04, 2011
<b>Received:</b> September 30, 2011
<b>Status:</b> Pending_Post
<b>Tracking No.</b> 80f475ba
<b>Comments Due:</b> September 30, 2011
<b>Submission Type:</b> Web

**Docket:** EBSA-2010-0018

Interim Final Rules for Group Health Plans and Health Insurance Issuers Relating to Coverage of Preventive Services Under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act

**Comment On:** EBSA-2010-0018-0002

Group Health Plans and Health Insurance Issuers Relating to Coverage of Preventive Services under Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act: Amendment

**Document:** EBSA-2010-0018-DRAFT-0682

Comment on FR Doc # 2011-19684

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Ryan L.

**Address:**

814 Millstream Dr  
Reynoldsburg, OH, 43068

**Email:** blackace333@yahoo.com

---

## General Comment

I am writing to oppose this amendment. The submitting of the human body to drugs/surgery to render its ability to reproduce dysfunctional/inert is far from 'preventative' health care. In fact, in some studies, some procedures/drugs that would be included in this coverage have been linked to cervical/breast/liver cancer, along with other maladies.

Becoming pregnant is a life choice, not something that comes from being infected by bacteria or a virus or due to a genetic predisposition. Being fertile is not a disorder; in fact, being infertile is treated as a disorder. The right and ability to choose if and when one has children is not something an insurance agency/government is needed to ensure. Human beings have had that right and ability without medical procedures or laws for as long as they have existed on earth. Pregnancy is not a disease that needs to be prevented.

In requiring coverage for these services, especially without co-pay, we will increase the monetary output of the insurers, which will be passed directly to the population and companies (and thus, their consumers) in their premiums. Most people are already dealing with huge increases in insurance and general living costs and mandating them to carry this burden will not help.

Lastly, I must question how this mandate fits with our first amendment rights. As so far as I can understand, my insurer (and all others) would be forced to cover all of these services without question. At this point, if my religious convictions require me to oppose and not support this, my only way to do so would be to forfeit paying into health insurance. With the new act requiring coverage, would this be possible without penalization? I would be forced by government mandate to violate my religious convictions to maintain my physical and financial health. At the same time I would be unable to express my own views without doing so in hypocrisy.

Please think of the implications, direct and implied, of this amendment.