

Dakota Voice

June 1, 2012 Friday 11:46 AM EST

Lies We re Told About ObamaCare Health Care Exchanges

Health Insurance Exchanges Requirement

ObamaCare is an assault on the U.S. Constitution and the American way of life on many levels.

It assumes authority not granted to the federal government under Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution which enumerates what the federal government can do and nothing more.

Further, the Tenth Amendment clarifies what is already clear from Article 1 Section 8 and the writings and statements of the founders, including the Federalist Papers.

It also violates a freedom so fundamental the freedom to buy what you want or not buy what you don t want that the founders never in their wildest imaginations dreamed of the need to enumerate and protect this freedom.

We have also learned beyond any remaining shadow of a doubt that ObamaCare includes abortion coverage for \$1. Many if not most Americans find abortion to be the morally repugnant practice that it truly is.

And we have also learned that it is an outright attack on religious freedom and freedom of conscience freedoms that have been most fundamental and most cherished since the earliest days of America.

And we shouldn t even need to go into the fact that it is astronomically expensive even more so than the lies we were originally told at a time when we can least afford such unconstitutional and unfeasible boondoggles.

So you would expect the states at least those controlled by Republicans to resist this offensive wad of bureaucratic tyranny with everything they have, right? At the very least, until the U.S. Supreme Court might ostensibly join in this tyranny and laughably pronounce it constitutional, right?

Well, not really. Some states are resisting and holding off on building any part of this tyrannical edifice, but others are moving ahead with compliance.

From the Politico:

Two years into the law s implementation, conservative emissaries have contributed to impressive stats. Almost all red states are holding off on exchange legislation at least until the Supreme Court decides on the Affordable Care Act, and in most of those states, exchange-building legislation has crawled to a stop.

But not here in South Dakota. Oh, no. Our Republican governor and his Republican cohorts in the Republican-supermajority legislature pushed this pro-ObamaCare legislation in under the radar last year, and have fought efforts to resist ObamaCare three years running.

As the video below says, states are not obligated under law to create these ObamaCare health care exchanges. We are being told that the federal government will come in and make one and run it themselves if we don't do it to ourselves first.

Guess what? The federal government plans to tell the states what to do anyway. This pro-ObamaCare argument is a completely bogus excuse for complicity.

Importantly, as Michael Cannon at the **Cato Institute** points out, playing along with ObamaCare has hurt our chances of seeing ObamaCare overturned either by congress or the Supreme Court. Ostensibly, SCOTUS shouldn't play political games but should instead adjudicate according to the U.S. Constitution. However, we know that this judicial standard largely went out the window when FDR brow-beat the court into approving his unconstitutional socialist agenda. If the states not only refused to play ball at all with ObamaCare, but also sent a loud-and-clear legislative message that the federal government could take ObamaCare and stick it, this would have provided a resounding statement to all levels of the federal government.

Instead, our Republican governor and his Republican cronies have sent a humble, Yes, Master to the federal government.

Why have South Dakota Republicans been so eager to please their federal master? Is it because they agree that government should be doing things that the American people have always done for themselves, and that government should be telling once-free citizens what they should do and how they should spend their own money?

Perhaps. Some would argue that the pro-government health care contingent within the Republican party has been around for several years in South Dakota.

Maybe it simply comes down to dollars and cents. President Obama and the federal government are bribing the states with some pretty big wads of cash. South Dakota has already taken a \$1 million taxpayer-funded gift from the feds to study implementing government health care, and we recently learned of another \$5.9 taxpayer-funded gift to the ObamaCare nobles in Pierre.

But that's not all the money that's flowing into Pierre.

When you look at the campaign donations that are going to a lot of Republicans, you can see some pretty startling correlations on who's voting to facilitate ObamaCare and who's getting cash from health care industry lobbyists who stand to gain from ObamaCare. One South Dakotan recently researched campaign finance information pertaining to this issue and found that among state House members who received campaign contributions from the pro-ObamaCare South Dakota Association of Healthcare Organizations (SDAHO), 67% voted in favor of SB 38 in 2011. That correlation rose to more than 90% for SB 43.

Meanwhile, your freedom and mine seems to be the LAST thing on the minds of these Republicans who ostensibly represent us in government.

I'm sorry, but you cannot be a collaborator with tyranny and credibly call yourself a friend of freedom.

From the Cato video description:

Here are just a few reasons why states should refuse to create ObamaCare Exchanges.

Jobs. Refusing to create an exchange will block Obamacare from imposing a tax on employers whose health benefits do not meet the federal government's definition of essential coverage. That tax can run as high as \$3,000 per employee. A state that refuses to create an exchange will spare its employers from that tax, and will therefore enable them to create more jobs.

Religious freedom. In blocking that employer tax, state officials would likewise block Obamacare's effort to force religious employers to provide coverage for services they find immoral like contraception, pharmaceutical abortions, and sterilization.

The federal debt. Refusing to create exchanges would also reduce the federal debt, because it would prevent the Obama administration from doling out billions of dollars in subsidies to private insurance companies.

The U.S. Constitution. The Obama administration has indicated that it might try to tax employers and hand out those subsidies anyway even in states that don't create an exchange, and even though neither Obamacare nor any other federal law gives it the power to do so. If that happens, the fact that a state has refused to create an exchange would give every large employer in the state including the state government itself the ability to go to court to block the administration's attempt to usurp Congress's legislative powers.

A lower state tax burden. States that opt to create an exchange can expect to pay anywhere from \$10 million to \$100 million per year to run it. But if states refuse, Obamacare says the federal government must pay to create one. Why should states pay for something that the federal government is giving away?

Bye-bye, Obamacare. That is, if the feds can create an exchange at all. The Obama administration has admitted it doesn't have the money and good luck getting any such funding through the GOP-controlled House. Moreover, without state-run exchanges, the feds can't subsidize private insurance companies. That by itself could cause Obamacare to collapse.

Michael F. Cannon is the director of Health Policy Studies at the **Cato Institute**.
Video Produced by Caleb O. Brown and Austin Bragg.