

Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act

The Supreme Court decision means that bosses' personal views can interfere with preventive care for their employees, but the bosses' views in this case are far outside the mainstream. More than two in three female voters say that corporations should not be able to exempt themselves from the ACA's birth control coverage.

Birth control is a core preventive service for women -- guaranteed by the Affordable Care Act (ACA). Yet, on June 30th the Supreme Court held in *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby* and *Conestoga Wood v. Burwell*, that some employers who personally believe birth control is wrong have the power to deny legally mandated health care coverage of it for their employees.

Discrimination Against Women

- By allowing bosses to take away their employees' legal right to birth control coverage, the ruling essentially gives bosses the right to discriminate against women- as 99% of women use birth control.
- The families who own Hobby Lobby and Wood Specialties falsely believe that emergency contraceptives and intrauterine devices are "abortifacients." This claim has no basis in science, and underscores why decisions about birth control should be between a woman and her doctor, without intrusion from her boss. Siding with the bosses, Justice Samuel Alito wrote in the majority decision that the ACA's birth control coverage mandate would force the companies to violate "their sincerely held religious beliefs."
- Maddeningly, the ruling states that it does not protect employers who try to "cloak illegal discrimination as a religious practice." Oh no, it's not protecting discrimination at all. It's just denying a specific type of health care to the only type of people who need it: women.

Opens the door for more discrimination- Slippery Slope

- The Court's ruling is just for "closely held," for-profit corporations, which includes large companies that have a handful of people who own half the stock. The ruling's logic can extend to companies of any size, public or private, and invites many more companies to claim religious exemptions from the government's health care regulations, nearly 90% of companies are closely-held.
- The decision is so startlingly broad that it can override the health care needs of employees and their dependents across the country. In her dissent, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg called out the precedent being set, saying that it can deny "legions of women who do not hold their employers' beliefs access to contraceptive coverage that the ACA would otherwise secure."
- The ruling creates a slippery slope where employers could end up denying health coverage for any medical service that they say conflicts with their own religious beliefs. And that could lead to employers discriminating against women, minorities, and any other groups that need particular types of medications or procedures.

Millions of Women still benefit from the ACA

- Affordable birth control is an economic issue for women- especially those working hourly jobs trying to make ends meet.
- Thanks to the ACA's birth control benefit, women in the U.S. saved \$483 million on birth control and 30 million women are now eligible for birth control without copay, we need to protect their access to birth control.

The five justices who ruled against women's health this week are out of step with most Americans. Fix this and support the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act.

Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act: Employers should not be able to interfere in their employee's decisions about health services through discrimination by:

-Stopping employers from using their Supreme Court issued free license to single out women and discriminate.

-Stopping employers from being allowed to impose their religious beliefs on employees.

-Protecting employees from employer attempts to refuse coverage of other vital services like immunizations, blood transfusions, and HIV treatment all in the name of religion.

-Includes the exemption from the contraceptive coverage requirement for houses of worship and the accommodation for religious non-profits.