## Lancaster Sunday News - April 1, 2012



## What she really said

If the letter writers who condemn Sandra Fluke had actually read her testimony, they might be surprised to discover that not once does she refer to her sex life or using contraception. Rather, she talks about women whose prescriptions were denied insurance coverage, even those who were prescribed birth control pills for reasons other than contraception.

These women expected neither Georgetown University nor the government to pay for contraception. They wanted the insurance policy they purchased through Georgetown to offer coverage. That's hardly expecting taxpayers to pay for their "behavior."

I find it interesting that there is no consideration that married women use contraception or that married women are concerned about unintended pregnancy. I also find it interesting that while many evince concern for the pre-born, concern for the postborn is met with silence and indifference.

Donna Scanlon, Marietta

## Co-op program?

Oh, Gil, I have some ideas on how to settle this abortion/contraception debacle.

If women want to have free sex, why should I have to pay for it? Have them and their partners pay for it. We could set up a co-op program for them to pay into and draw from. This would also include drug costs for sexually transmitted diseases. They would have a co-op card that they could show at any pharmacy to get the free drugs.

While in the Illinois Legislature, State Sen. Obama voted in favor of partial-birth abortion, when an aborted baby that is born alive is left to die. Have the baby stay with its mother till it dies.

In actuality, I do believe in abortion. I read in your newspapers everyday of child molesters, child killers, rapists, and others whom society would be better off without, had they been aborted.

In a recent column you wrote about the costs associated with poor children, if there are any in America, and taxpayers having to bear the cost of those children. Provide free abortion, but only with free mandatory sterilization.

Steve Soldner, Mountville

## Non-existent problem

During a conversation about Pennsylvania's new voter photo ID law, Sen. Mike Brubaker admitted to me that there is no documentation of the problem the law is intended to fix -- that of one person impersonating another at the polls. He also acknowledged that taxpayers will pay an estimated \$13 million to enact the legislation. He assured me that elections in Lancaster County are well run, then added, "But what about Philadelphia?" He never did tell me "what about Philadelphia."

If politicians in Pennsylvania and at least 15 other Republican-controlled states are willing to spend this kind of money on a nonexistent problem while slashing funds for teachers, police, firefighters and needed social programs, I conclude one of the following:

- a) Republican politicians are lying about being fiscal conservatives.
- b) Republican politicians have an ulterior motive in enacting voter ID laws.
- c) Republican politicians are more interested in winning than in governing.
- d) All of the above.

**Shelby Chunko**, Mount Joy