As the financial sector continues its tailspin despite efforts to bail out Wall Street, among the few gainers in recent stock trading have been those companies looking for a new “shot in the arm” with government funding from the next administration.

With its strident rhetoric toward reestablishing the so called “pro-choice” agenda, the incoming administration has threatened a whole host of policies that would not only reduce restrictions on abortion, but would actually force people who wish to avoid participating in the procedure to support it.

As a physician who has delivered over 4,000 babies I am very disturbed by the continued efforts of those on the left to establish absolute rights to abortion. However, even more distressing is the notion that taxpayers should be forced to subsidize life-ending procedures such as abortion and embryonic stem cell research.

In addition to the news that those who will benefit from federally-funded stem cell research have seen an uptick in their financial position as a result of the election, comes news from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops that many health care facilities under the auspices of the Roman Catholic Church may be shut down as a result of the so-called “Freedom of Choice Act” for refusal to perform abortions.

Not only does this Act seem to have growing support in Congress, the President-elect and his Administration have indicated support for this legislation. Since many people cast their votes in a way that they believed would help to improve and increase availability of health care, this is an

ironic twist.

Of course, the government takeover of health care began a long time ago, but we should be wary of how far that takeover will go if more private providers are forced out of the marketplace. If enacted, The Freedom of Choice Act and the potential for increased federal funding of embryonic stem cell research will go to show that the incoming Congress and Administration are far more dedicated to a government takeover than they are to affordable and available health care. Moreover, these approaches show no real concern at all for the free choices of taxpayers and health care providers who wish to be free from giving assistance to immoral activities.

These facts should also serve to remind social conservatives that they are better to leave the legislative remedies for important social issues at the level where they constitutionally belong, namely at the discretion of state and local officials. The centralization of power that seemed so attractive to many conservatives just a few years ago no longer seems pleasant at all in light of a more liberal-minded majority in both Houses of Congress and the White House.

This should be a good lesson for future conservative majorities, namely that the centralization of power never results in anything more than the most temporary of “gains” for those who are committed to traditional moral principles, and the power one administration consolidates for itself must inevitably be handed over to the next administration, which will use that increased power for its own agenda.

Feel free to leave a comment. Comments are moderated and may take several hours to appear.