

# Obamacare: Two-front fight

## [Comments 1](#)

February 05, 2011 9:04 AM

It's in the nation's interest that the Obamacare battle be decided quickly. Either the courts, Congress or the states must undo the health care overhaul's over-reaching excesses. The sooner accomplished, the sooner governments at all levels can reverse the trend of increasing state control and allow health care consumers, providers and insurers to voluntarily work out more equitable arrangements.

The Jan. 31 ruling by U.S. District Judge Roger Vinson that last year's landmark health care law, with its mandate that everyone must buy insurance or pay a fine, is unconstitutional accelerated an already contentious year of debate, legislation and, perhaps, even a veto, if a repeal bill reaches President Barack Obama.

Judge Vinson's ruling "should give the new Congress all the confidence it needs to rescind this provision and more," observed the libertarian Cato Institute's Roger Pilon.

Already, the Republican-controlled House has passed a repeal bill, but it failed in the Democratic-controlled Senate. The votes, however, at least put lawmakers on record for the 2012 election.

Vinson's ruling is the second court ruling against Obamacare, all but assures that the law will reach the U.S. Supreme Court, where the difficult-to-predict Justice Anthony Kennedy could cast the swing vote.

A new element was added this week as Judge Vinson not only declared unconstitutional the mandate to buy insurance, but threw out the entire law, accepting the administration's argument that, without the mandate, Obamacare's other regulations can't function properly. A previous ruling shot down only the mandate.

There's no shortage of conflict. Plaintiff attorney David Rivkin insists Judge Vinson's ruling means the 26 states joined in that lawsuit now aren't required to implement any portion of Obamacare. The administration, however, says the law will continue to be implemented, and the Supreme Court is the final arbiter.

Meanwhile, public outrage that arose with last year's hurried congressional approval continues to fester. A Rasmussen Reports survey found voters "remain concerned" the law will cause some employers to drop health insurance. The poll also found 60 percent of voters "think it is a bad idea for the administration to give waivers to companies" that otherwise would drop coverage. Those respondents said all companies should be granted waivers.

If voters are bothered by waivers for some, but not all, companies, how will the residents of 24 states react if the 26 states represented in Judge Vinson's case drop the law altogether?

At stake, whether arrived at legislatively, judicially or in the court of public opinion, is how America will regard its government. Should Washington intercede to guarantee every want and need? Or, as Vanderbilt Law School professor James Ely put it, "even laudable goals must be achieved within constitutional limits."