

Dear Committee Members,

I am writing to oppose HB 17. What this bill does is require insurance companies to cover the cost of particular medications to address an elective activity. This is not a life saving medication like metformin or levothyroxine, but a medication that is aimed to address the impact of an optional activity- unprotected sex.

First the bill forces companies to cover the cost of "emergency contraception," or the morning after pill.

This is medication taken after the act of sex and before a pregnancy test. It is intended to abort a pregnancy shortly after the moment of conception. This is essentially requiring a business to pay for an abortion.

The cost of this requirement on the insurance company would be imposed on individuals who object to this medication as a matter of faith or conscience.

The state should never impose a requirement for others to pay for abortions when they object to the procedure.

Second, the bill requires insurance companies to cover a 12 month supply of contraceptive medication. This is not the practice followed by medications such as metformin or levothyroxine. Best practices would be to issue a 90 day supply with a follow up after 60 days with a telemed appointment to adjust medication.

Third, the state should not be in the business of mandating the sort of services a business should cover. There are faith based companies out there who would be forced to offer services that are of little interest to their customers or are against their customers morals.

Please vote against HB 17.

JOSEPHINE MARIE STACK- Fairbanks

Dear Legislators,

Please KILL HB 17. It is contrary to our state and national interest to promote the killing of unborn children or to prevent the conception and birth of children. We certainly should never force or require any insurance company, or health care provider to provide or promote abortifacient or contraceptive drugs or medical care. These drugs have adverse physical and mental health consequences for many women. Women need good health care and these drugs do not cure any illness. Women need support to care for their children not fear mongering about the difficulties or pressure to kill their children.

We are already below replacement fertility in our country and most of the rest of the world. This will continue to bring labor shortages and stagnant economies. It is insane to continue to pretend that this is not a problem already apparent in our society. It is foolhardy to compound the problem rather than finding ways to support women and families.

Mary Beth Juday

Fairbanks, AK 99709

Dear Committee members,

I am writing to oppose HB 17. What this bill does is require insurance companies to cover the cost of particular medications to address an elective activity. This is not a life saving medication like metformin or levothyroxine, but a medication that is aimed to address the impact of an optional activity.

First the bill forces companies to cover the cost of "emergency contraception," or the morning after pill. The whole discussion of tissues and abortifacients obfuscates the issue at hand. This is medication taken after the act of sex and before a pregnancy test. It is intended to abort a pregnancy shortly after the moment of conception. The cost of this requirement on the insurance company would be imposed on individuals who object to this medication as a matter of faith or conscience. The state should never impose a requirement for others to pay for abortions when they object to the procedure.

Second, the bill requires insurance companies to cover a 12 month supply of contraceptive medication. This is not the practice followed by medications such as metformin or levothyroxine. Best practices would be to issue a 90 day supply with a follow up after 60 days with a telemed appointment to adjust medication.

Third, the state should not be in the business of mandating the sort of services a business should cover. There are faith based companies out there who would be forced to offer services that are of little interest to their customers or are against their customers morals.

Please vote against HB 17.

Sincerely,

Kelly Nash

We urge you to vote no on HB 17. Government has no business dictating their opinions to the public, insurance companies, or the medical system.

Life is created by God not the government.

Patrick and Sharon Dalton

Delta Junction

The state government should not be in the business of mandating companies to pay for abortion medications. The state needs to get out of the baby-killing business altogether.

The state needs to honor and respect those of us who know that this baby-killing industry violates the US Constitution's guarantee of protecting "Life..." This bill contradicts the Governor's goal to be the most pro-life state in the Union.

Respectfully,

Jon and Ruth Ewig

[REDACTED]

Fairbanks, AK 99701

[REDACTED]

Dear House Health & Social Services Committee Members:

I am writing to testify against passage of HB 17, "An Act relating to insurance coverage for contraceptives and related services; relating to medical assistance coverage for contraceptives and related services; and providing for an effective date."

If you have continued reading beyond my first sentence, I salute you. While you may be a committee, each individual on the committee is a duly elected *representative* of their constituents. I would like to remind each of you that you are an *agent* of the people; you *supply the place of others*, being *invested with your constituents' authority*.

I understand that few Alaskans, let alone US Citizens, truly understand the dynamics of what it means to be a self-governing state and nation. The purpose of civil *self-government* is quite simple: praise that which is good, punish those who do evil, and protect the people's property. HB 17 does none of these things, therefore it is not within your place (or the People's authority) to pass such a piece of legislation.

As written, it may very well punish those who do good and continue to promote collectivism and socialism, both of which are counter to our self-governing state and nation.

HB 17 is the state telling health insurance companies what they will and will not provide to Alaskan citizens, namely women. These health insurance companies are private entities, also known as private businesses. As you know, the point of business is to make money. In effect, the state is telling insurance companies that if they want to do business with an Alaskan woman, they must adhere to providing any kind out of every kind of contraceptive available for an entire year. When the state compels something, through statute and regulation, it no longer is affordable. Insurance premiums jumped when the federal government compelled them to cover everyone and not refuse anyone with a pre-existing condition. Now the state of Alaska is asking for those premiums to jump again, on top of both businesses and individuals having to deal with the rising costs due to inflation and supply chain issues. The state of Alaska, and the people of Alaska who hold the authority, do not have the authority to tell an insurance company what they will and will not provide in order to do business with an Alaskan citizen. What if the majority of the already few health insurance companies decide that they rather have profit instead of increasing premiums to appease the state of Alaska and no longer offer coverage in Alaska? This bill does not protect the citizens' property.

Section 21.42.427 (h), Section 21.42.427 (h)(1), and Section 21.42.427 (h)(2) are discriminating and violating religious liberty. A religious employer that opposes such coverage should not have to provide a list of what is opposed to each prospective enrollee *and* provide a list of what is opposed annually to all insureds enrolled. Would you require the Health Medical Sharing accounts, such as Christian Care Medi-Share, to provide that list to their members too? Or what of the non-religious employer who opposes it? No, that employer has zero say. Sounds very socialist to me. Would this verbiage even allow it to pass the Legal Analysis for submittal to the Governor?

Section 4; AS 39.30.090(a)(9) for each permanent part-time employee electing coverage under this section, the state shall contribute one-half the state contribution rate for permanent full-time state employees, . . . where does this money come from? Is not the state still crying that its expenses are far greater than its income? The fiscal notes on this bill should be pretty extensive. When one's expenses are greater than one's income, it is called debt. As it stands, our federal debt will never be paid as each citizen does not make \$200,000 extra to pay to the federal government. Alaska seems to be following the trend of indebtedness. Perhaps you think that you'll just take additional sums from the Permanent Fund Dividend Payments, the most regressive tax the legislature can oppress its people with. Eventually, the people will not receive their PFD payments and not because the state has stolen them, but their won't be any PFD payments to steal. Adding to the state budget does not quantify protecting the people's property. It is tightening the shackles and increasing the burden on the people.

Another interesting aspect of this bill is the provision for a 12 month supply of prescription contraceptives. Most prescriptions for contraceptives are already year-long, requiring refills of the

prescription. Considering our already strained supply chain, is it wise to deplete any surplus? For those who work remotely and cannot get to a pharmacy, allow a 90-day supply, not 365 days worth. Where are people going to store a year's worth of prescription contraceptives? Are we going to encourage theft of prescription medications by requiring a 12-month supply? Can you guarantee that a supply, even if just a month's worth of contraceptive pills, wouldn't be stolen and put into the hands of someone who doesn't have that prescription? How many women will be able to trade their unused supply for drugs or alcohol? Or worse, sold for the sex-traffickers to give to the girls and young women they've groomed through the public schools. If it sounds absurd, then you are obviously out of touch with your districts and ignoring those who you claim to be protecting.

If you've read this far, I commend you. The entire point of public testimony is to listen to constituents. Remember that you are invested with **our** authority, it is not your own. Does the legislature really want to help and support women? Then kill the bill. Let women govern themselves. I know Planned Parenthood has been to Juneau to lobby for their agenda. It is Planned Parenthood that has boasted of giving free contraceptives to women. Let them continue to do so. It is not the state's job to be a surrogate Planned Parenthood.

Respectfully,

Jacquelyn Makinen
Alaskan Citizen, Voter, Daughter, Wife, Mother, Grandmother

As a voting citizen of the state of Alaska I say to vote no on bill HB-17.

The Plan B pill creates a horror nightmare for the woman taking it as testified by the following video. The Plan B pill should not be available to anyone as it is abortion and the death of a person.

Listen to what Isabel Vaughan-Spruce says about her 2 friends who took this murderous pill. Isabel Vaughan-Spruce Was arrested for praying outside of an abortion clinic, but listen to why she was praying that no one else should have to go through the horror that her 2 friends have gone through after taking abortion pills.

https://youtu.be/l-8M4_1y8L0

Kent Widmayer

Fairbanks Alaska