

INDEPENDENT THINKING

Universal health care: the wrong prescription

By BRIAN SCHWARTZ

What good is having medical insurance if you cannot get medical care? Peddlers of “universal health care” – from Hillary, Obama, to 2nd Congressional democratic candidate Jared Polis – don’t get this.

“Universal health care” is false advertising for politically-controlled medicine, with government as the “single-payer” monopolistic insurer. But having coverage does not guarantee getting medical care.

Since patients prepay through taxes, medical care appears “free.” Hence, they have strong incentive to over-consume and providers need not compete on price. To contain costs, governments restrict your access to life-saving treatment. In countries with such “universal coverage,” patients die waiting for treatment.

The Canadian Medical Association Journal reports that in one year, 71 Ontario patients died while waiting for coronary bypass surgery and over one hundred more became “medically unfit for surgery.” The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation reports that “109 people had a heart attack or suffered heart failure while on the waiting list. Fifty of those patients died.”

“Physicians across Canada are in an advanced stage of burnout due to work conditions” which “causes them to retire early...or simply leave,” a former Canadian Medical Association president told the New York Times. He “attributed much of the problem to technological shortages and the powerlessness doctors feel when patients complain about long waits for treatment.”

“Access to a waiting list is not access to healthcare,” wrote Canadian Chief Justice McLachlin when striking down legislation banning private insurance in 2005. Last year a New York Times read: “As Canada’s Slow-Motion Public Health System Falters, Private Medical Care Is Surging.”

And England? The BBC reports that “up to 500 heart patients die each year while they wait for potentially life-saving surgery.” The Times claims that a British woman “will be denied free National Health Service treatment for breast cancer if she seeks to improve her chances by paying privately for an additional drug.” A Daily Telegraph headline reads: “Sufferers pull out teeth due to lack of dentists.” Another article says that “doctors are calling for NHS treatment to be withheld from patients who are too old or who lead unhealthy lives.”

Consider politically-controlled health care in America: Medicaid and Medicare. Doctors are five times more likely to refuse seeing new Medicaid patients than privately-insured patients.

Increasing reimbursement rates won’t help much; more than two-thirds of doctors reported being overwhelmed by Medicaid’s billing requirements, paperwork, and delays in payment. ABC News says that “Medicare rules bar cancer drugs for patients,” including the privately-insured.

“Single payer” advocates cite international comparisons of life expectancy to support their cause. But life expectancy depends on factors unrelated to healthcare, such as unintentional injury and homicide. Health economist Robert Ohsfeldt found that when accounting for these two factors, life expectancy in America is comparable to that of Canada and England.

What really matters is your chance of surviving a serious illness. The American Cancer Society claims that “U.S. patients have better survival rates than European patients for most types of cancer.”

So if politically-controlled medicine isn’t the solution, what is?

Not a Massachusetts-style “individual mandate,” which forces everyone to buy insurance. This is essentially single-payer in disguise. Insurance regulations severely limit competition, so insurance companies are effectively government contractors for politically-defined insurance.

The Boston Globe reports that to contain costs, Massachusetts authorities will “probably cut payments to doctors and hospitals” and “reduce choices for patients.” Sound familiar? Instead, we must recognize how government policies have crippled free markets.

Because the tax code deeply discounts employer-provided insurance, you’re essentially stuck with your employer’s non-portable plans. Hence, insurance companies can afford to be stingy and deny you care; they know that losing you as a customer requires that you change jobs. With government as “single-payer” it’s even worse: to change insurance providers you must move to a different state or country.

Our current system also encourages thoughtless over-consumption and skyrocketing costs. The tax code punishes paying for medical care out-of-pocket and rewards buying insurance. So “insurance” has become prepaid medicine, and patients over-consume like business travelers dining on their company’s expense account.

[See THINKING, Page 12]

VOICES



THEY SAID IT:

“I believe that if it were left to artists to choose their own labels, most would choose none.”

— Ben Shahn



DOONESBURY



BY GARRY TRUDEAU

LEARNING THE LAW

Give us nominees, please

By GRANT SULLIVAN

On April 4, 2008, Colorado will face an unprecedented emergency. No, it will not be from tainted mine shaft water, or a sink hole on the interstate. Rather, it will be from empty courtrooms.

On that date, three of Colorado’s seven federal district court judgeships will be vacant. Judges Babcock and Miller are transitioning to “senior status,” a quasi-retirement stage where they take on a significantly reduced caseload, while Judge Phillip Figa’s post opened up last month when he sadly passed away after a lengthy battle with cancer.

These three vacancies will result in an even heavier burden being placed on the already overloaded district court docket (Colorado, mind you, is a state that, according to the Judicial Conference, is worthy of eight, not seven, district court judgeships).

Replace them, you say? With good reason, replacing a federal judge is no simple matter. Once nominated by the President, the life-time appointments are granted only after confirmation by the Senate and an extensive federal background check. But before even getting to that point, there is an unwritten rule that the Senators from the state containing the vacancy must agree on a list of possible nominees to send to the President. Therein lies the problem.

Colorado’s Senators Allard and Salazar, being from opposite sides of the aisle, have failed to agree on a list of possible nominees, despite being given a year’s notice that Judges Babcock and Miller will be moving to senior status this April.

To help illustrate this lunacy, imagine if, after being informed by Hank Brown last February of his intentions to step down as CU President, the Regents did nothing—didn’t form a presidential search committee, didn’t interview candidates, didn’t do a darn thing. And now that Hank Brown’s time is up, CU’s top office sits empty. Not for a few days, or even a few weeks, but for months, perhaps years. As Colorado’s chief district court judge, Edward Nottingham, recently noted, he is not optimistic that the vacant judgeships will be filled before 2009 or 2010 due

HOW TO CONTACT US

Contact Oakland L. Childers, Managing Editor. Letters are published in the order they are received; no more than one letter per contributor per week will be accepted. Letters more than 400 words in length may be printed less promptly due to space limitations. The Colorado Daily reserves the right to edit letters for length and content. Published or unpublished letters become the property of the newspaper and will not be returned. All letters must include name, address and a verifiable phone number, and should not exceed 600 words. **THE COLORADO DAILY NO LONGER ACCEPTS HAND-WRITTEN OR TYPED LETTERS.** E-MAIL LETTERS TO: letters@coloradodaily.com.

to the current political climate.

Compounding this crisis is the confirmation process itself. Confirmation procedures are already unnecessarily prolonged, sometimes depriving the judicial district of a qualified judge for years. For example, Senator Arlen Specter recently wrote in an op-ed for the Wall Street Journal that a Fourth Circuit appellate judgeship has been vacant for an astonishing 13 years. Although a judicial emergency has been declared for that Circuit, and despite a qualified district court judge being nominated last July, no confirmation vote is yet on the horizon.

Democratic Senator Ken Salazar can’t be faulted for thinking strategically. By forming a commission to recommend candidates to him, rather than just sitting down with his Republican counterpart and agreeing on a list, Salazar has delayed the nomination process indefinitely. By doing so, he increases the likelihood that the next President, possibly a Democrat, will get to ink the com-

missions of the new judges.


While I am sure Senator Salazar thinks the quality of judges selected may be improved by going this route, he risks pushing Colorado’s district court to the brink of irreparable harm. With exploding dockets and jammed court calendars, the time that litigants and victims will be forced to wait for justice will increase dramatically.

With seven full-time judges in the courthouse, civil litigants in Colorado already wait an average 6.9 months from the time of filing to get their case resolved, and that’s just the cases that don’t go to trial. Those that do go to trial wait an average of 29 months before even seeing the light of a courtroom.

With just four full-time district court judges in Colorado (half of what is needed), these waiting times are bound to skyrocket, delaying justice and hemorrhaging our court system.

If there’s anything that this campaign season has taught us, it’s that the people are hungry for change, or, at the very least, for an end to partisan bickering. Our Senators should stop quibbling about the niceties of each qualified candidate’s background, and work together to fill these vacancies as soon as possible. The health and functionality of our courts depend on it.

Grant Sullivan is a third-year law student from Irving, TX, attending CU Law School. He writes about matters of law and scholarship. The views expressed here are his own, and not necessarily those of the Colorado Daily management or staff.



LETTERS

Is Benson the ethical choice?

I know that you have been getting lots of feedback on Mr. Benson's nomination from the student body (in addition to the faculty, local community, and our state government), but I would like to let you know how I feel about it.

I do not know much about his personal history or connections with the GOP. I believe I am correct, however, in understanding that he has been a sizable contributor to our University. This creates an inescapable and unignorable ethical dilemma! Especially considering he is the only nominated candidate (as of now), you must be very uncomfortable that your noble intentions could very easily be made to appear otherwise. Surely, not one of you would want to open the door for an attack on your personal ethics!! Those in your position are responsible for many tough decisions, and are entrusted to act with only the highest ethics and intents.

I believe Mr. Benson is an aggres-

sive man with a good history in fundraising. It is illogical to assume he is the only person that a wonderful and well-respected institution like CU can find with this attribute. And, this is certainly not a good enough reason to hire someone for such a position as University President!

I am a dance major, working on my BEA, and so I am certainly not in a position to criticize another's academic achievements (especially from a generation when times were certainly different).

However, I would like to point out two situations I have run across which showed me how important CU feels post-grad degrees are. Firstly, my academic advisor is Kyle Neidt, and she has a PhD. She doesn't even teach one class in my department: her job function is primarily to help students plan for their degree. Second situation: we have a wonderful yoga instructor with decades of experience as a Master

Yogi, and she comes in every Friday to teach a class for all dance majors (BEA and MFA students). This wonderfully qualified and gifted teacher is unable to join the faculty, because she only holds a Bachelor's degree. After asking around, it seems ALL teachers here have earned at least a Master's degree. This is a wonderful example of why we, as young people, should pursue the highest education attainable, yes? I simply cannot believe that you would give us this message and then contradict it by endorsing a President without the same education as our faculty and advisors!! Surely you do not want this!!

I am sure you see why I am having trouble reconciling this nomination!

I am also sure you are as concerned as the rest of us about Mr. Benson's involvement with a committee in Denver that is being sued by faculty over tenure issues. I would hate CU

to lose its status in the education community because of correlations like this. It is integral that (y)our faculty feel secure here. It is also integral that a lifeline into the future remain so that new leaders in respective fields are attracted to our wonderful institution.

Mr. Benson has been involved in the game of politics for decades, but earlier this week he told a number of students that he has 'turned away from all that' recently. How could anyone be expected to believe that after such a lengthy track record, a person's motives and relations would end so quickly?! I am certain you are losing a certain amount of sleep over the strong possibility that the President you are so close to voting in will not be able to form working relationships with the Legislature - no, in fact, he seems to have already burnt important bridges.

Mr. Benson is a completely unacceptable candidate for the CU Presidency. He is not the man to fix the

problems you would have him fix, and I put it to you that he would mar the CU reputation. If named President, Mr. Benson will be a complete disaster to us all and harm what is home to so many of us.

I beseech you to PLEASE find other options.

I would like to thank those of you who are holding out for a better option than George Benson. We are counting on you, our Regents, to make the best decision for us all - in the most obviously ethical way. We look to you not just for ourselves, but also the future of our great university.

I appreciate your consideration of the points I have brought to your attention, and I thank you for your valuable time. My contact information is below.

CLIFF PATTERSON
CU Theatre and Dance

THINKING: Politically-controlled medication not the answer

[THINKING, from page 11]

Further, legislation mandating minimum benefits makes insurance unaffordable for many. Consider: Colorado law compels widowed wives


to pay higher premiums for prostate screening, maternity, and marital therapy. Some Colorado legislators recognize this injustice. Just as businesses incorporated in other states can operate in Colorado, Coloradans should

be able to buy affordable policies from insurance companies that meet less damaging regulations of another state.

While "universal health care" may provide health insurance; it doesn't guarantee health care. The uninsured

are not the problem rather they are the symptom of the real problem - government meddling in personal choices of how we care for ourselves and our families.

"Independent Ideas" runs on the second and fourth Monday of each month in the Colorado Daily. It represents the views of the Independence Institute and its selected authors, and not necessarily those of the Colorado Daily management or staff.



Rocky Mountain Urgent Care

No Appointment Necessary
Monday-Friday 8am - 8pm
Saturday & Sunday 8am - 4pm
Open on Holidays

Rocky Mountain Urgent Care Physicians
Lisa A. Brone, MD
Stanley K. Jack, DO
Mary M. Reynolds, MD

Cuts • Burns • Breaks • Colds • Flu
Allergies • Skin Rashes • Bites
Stomachaches • IV Hydration
Workers' Comp • Sports Physicals
X-Ray and Lab On-Site


Most Insurance Accepted
No Insurance?
We have a discount plan
\$18/month for an entire family!

4800 Baseline Road
Boulder, CO 80303
(In the Meadows Shopping Center at
Baseline & Foothills)
(303) 499-4800
www.RockyMountainUrgentCare.com



penny weights





Sterling Peace Sign Pendant \$6.75
Sterling Swarovski Crystal Earrings \$10.75
Sterling Silver Feather Earrings \$9.85

Sterling Bead Chain \$8.85

Boulder's Best Selection of Sterling Silver Earrings, Bracelets, Necklaces, Accessories and More!

1441 Pearl Street • 303.441.1436 • www.pennyweights.com

HOLLERING GOOD SINCE 1973 • 11TH AND WALNUT • DOWNTOWN BOULDER

MONDAY

WHEN IS IT BEER:30? ALWAYS.

\$2.00 SELECT CALLS
\$2.25 23OZ BUD & DRAFTS
BUD LIGHT

GuitarHero Tuesdays
from 8-9:30pm Weekly

HAPPY HOUR MON - SAT 4P - 8P
\$1.50 MICRO BREW MUGS
\$1.75 WELLS \$2.25 BUD, BUD LIGHT,
\$2.00 23 OZ PBR MILLER LITE, COORS LIGHT
WITH FREE POOL

the Walrus SALOON
SINCE 1976