

A Statement by U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius, Jan. 20, 2012, www.hhs.gov/news/press/2012pres/01/20120120a.html (last visited Feb. 8, 2012) (emphasis added). While there is an exception for a very narrow range of church-related non-profit organizations, individuals like *Amici* who object will still be funding contraceptive abortions with their tax dollars.³

³ As this brief was being prepared for printing, President Obama has announced a “compromise” which does not eliminate *Amici*’s religious liberty objection. Insurance companies would be **forced** to provide a separate policy to all women employees that did cover abortion contraception. http://www.cnn.com/2012/02/10/politics/contraception-controversy/index.html?hpt=hp_tl (last visited Feb. 10 2012). So who will pay for the coverage? Obviously the employer will see his premiums rise because of the forced coverage. Insurance companies must pass on costs to survive. Another way to look at it is this: If, in order to get the type of life insurance that best fit a family’s needs, it was required to contribute to a “death fund,” through which other members of the insurance group might be murdered by being torn apart limb-by-limb, that would be profoundly objectionable. Segregating the “death fund” would not reduce its objectionable nature one iota. Hiding the forced transfer of costs from the employee who may want an abortion drug to her employer who objects on religious liberty grounds may be politically expedient, but it does not solve the constitutional impediment. See, also, Horace Cooper, *The Birth Control Mandate is Unconstitutional*, <http://nationalcenter.org/NPA632.html> (last visited Feb 10, 2012).