

LOONAN: SCHULTHEIS OFFERS CONJECTURE, NO PROOF

No integrity is necessary to accuse PP of "making a mint" providing safe abortions

Those in leadership, like Rep. Dave Schultheis, R-Colorado Springs, should present evidence instead of conjecture when debating critical

public policy issues.

In a Jan. 22 AP story Gov. Bill Owens' spokesman said the state Health

Department had filled the void left by Planned Parenthood (PP), but that's not true. Montezuma County decided on Jan. 14 to reject an offer of \$20,000 from the state to provide low-cost family-planning services, saying the county wasn't equipped to offer those services. Rep. Mark Larson, R-Cortez, who expressed his disappointment to Owens about his decision, is still looking to replace PP which had served 1,000 low-income women in his district.

PP warned about this consequence. It results from a shortage of health care providers in rural Colorado; something Owens himself acknowledges is problematic in an AP story on Jan. 13 and a reluctance by providers to accept the per-patient reimbursement amount. Schultheis calls our concern hysteria, says we're over-reacting. I don't believe Rep. Larson and the low-income women in his district would agree with that.

Moreover, Schultheis would have

been quick to share the names of providers taking PP's place in Security (in Schultheis's own county), where

1,300 low-income women need services, if that were a reality. My attempts to secure full-disclosure from the state Health Department about providers who've filled the void, has so far been met with silence. Our concerns are far from being exaggerations, sensationalism and scare mongering. It has basis in fact.

I didn't attack the accounting firm of Anderson and Whitney. I quoted them and provided reasoning that demonstrated how their complicity in providing Owens with political cover took shape. Life and Liberty for Women (LLW) isn't surprised Schultheis couldn't provide refutation.

All three major Colorado newspapers Schultheis says agrees with him got it wrong. The *Cortez Journal* wasn't fooled saying, about Owens' light bulb theory, Dec. 27, 2001 "... the argument that any funding provided for other aspects of the agency's mission frees up money for abortion is oversimplified and misguided." I don't believe Schultheis is naïve about the application of Owens' "light bulb rationale" to the section of the Constitution under discussion. First, I explained it in detail. Second, he acknowledges in his second commentary, after issuing a denial in his first, that Owens, "required" PP

to split their operation into two corporations (despite compliance with the law) using this rationale.

Schultheis's pretended naiveté has everything to do with his inability to refute the facts.

The *Denver Post* said, "The auditors concluded PP was renting facilities to abortion providers at below market rates, clearly violating the ban on indirect subsidies." But voters didn't ban indirect subsidies resulting from the use of private funds PP raises. In this case, rent payments at below market value. It's important to note that a 1999 poll said 84% of Colorado voters, 72% of self-identified 'pro-life' voters, supported PP's receiving tax dollars for family planning services.

Second, keeping our eye on the ball here shall we, LLW pointed out that taxpayer dollars indirectly paying for the performance of an abortion occurs only if taxpayer dollars allocated for family planning are funneled into the abortion corporation. Schultheis doesn't refute that the independence of the affiliates that voters demanded is about the funneling of taxpayer dollars, nor does he take issue with Anderson and Whitney's findings that such funneling of taxpayer money isn't occurring. So in truth, the standard accounting practice Schultheis claims proves PP isn't in compliance, in fact demonstrates a

lawful indirect subsidy/benefit flowing from private PP funds, thereby establishing PP's compliance with the voters mandate, also fact Schultheis can't refute.

No courage or integrity is necessary to throw around an accusation that PP "makes a mint" providing safe abortions. It has become a mantra of anti-abortion extremists filled with pathological hatred for PP. Again Schultheis offers conjecture, no proof. Schultheis also provides no reasoning for PP to offer family-planning services for any other reason than to reduce the number of abortions and for its positive effect upon the health of women; allowing women to control their fertility and space their children.

Most revealing, most disturbing is that Schultheis's comments didn't express any concern whatsoever for the need of 13,000 low-income women in his state for birth control and life saving cancer screening, nor concern about reducing overall, the number of unintended pregnancies, a proven way to reduce the need for abortion. His only concern? Attacking me and smacking PP, neither of which prevents even one abortion or one woman's death from cancer. Schultheis and Owens call this and their ethically challenged politically motivated shenanigans being on "the side of life?" I'll pass.

Peggy Loonan is the executive director of Life and Liberty for Women.

