



Planned Parenthood Gets the Boot

June 27, 2025

Medicaid is a huge handout and also a massive burden, straining resources and tax revenues, and (of course) adding to the debt. It is also known for its complexity, a federal program run by the states.

Some reformers, seeing the program as an *over*-complicated mess, yearn to “simplify” it by providing medical care as a “free” federal program. Others, concerned about the dangers of centralization and the obvious incompetence of bureaucracies far removed from taxpayers, advise collapsing Medicaid completely back to the states, to be organized and funded *locally*.

In this context, the Supreme Court’s ruling yesterday allowing

South Carolina to remove Planned Parenthood from its Medicaid program is instructive.

“The majority [opinion](#) in the 6–3 decision in *Medina v. Planned Parenthood South Atlantic* was written by Justice Neil Gorsuch,” [explains](#) Matthew Vadum in *The Epoch Times*. “The new ruling reverses a federal appeals court decision that blocked South Carolina from excluding Planned Parenthood from the program.”

The key issue in the litigation regards a supposed right to choose medical providers: South Carolina, by dropping Planned Parenthood, was alleged to be abridging the right of recipients to choose their medical providers.

Remember that choosing your doctor was falsely promised by President Barack Obama in his medical insurance scheme—so, obviously, the option is highly valued by Americans. But is it a “right”?

“New rights for some mean new duties for others,” Justice Gorsuch wrote, elucidating a basic principle of legal philosophy.

Applying the idea of rights to government handouts (in which taxpayers are on the hook) is a recipe for disaster.

Applying federalism, on the other hand, makes not only constitutional sense, but—because the states are closer to both taxpayers and those in need—Common Sense.

I’m Paul Jacob.