

T O L E D O FREE★PRESS

GUEST COLUMN

What Liberals fail to discuss concerning health care reform

Written by Thomas Berry | | opinion@toledofreep.com

In columns a week apart in late August, [Don Burnard](#) and [Reverend Eric McGlade](#) expressed their support for President Obama's intended reform — make that demolition — of our health care system. A refutation, albeit belated, is in order.

On Aug. 30, Reverend McGlade stated his faith that “government can resolve problems.” Indeed, it can. But what it can do and what it does do are often at great odds.

Government was going to resolve problems in the American auto industry with “Cash for Clunkers.” Dealers' sales volume was briefly improved, and a lot of people bought new cars. But most of the business went to Japanese makes, the price of used cars was inflated as supply diminished, perfectly good cars were scrapped rather than parted out, dealers faced bewildering paperwork and interminable delays in getting paid, and at least one state treated the rebates as taxable income. Some problems solved, temporarily; but a host of others were exacerbated or created anew. Yet the same liberals who blasted the Bush Administration's response to the problems of Hurricane Katrina think government will solve the problems in health care?

McGlade and, in his column of Aug. 23, Burnard claim that the health care system is broken. Of course there are problems. But both cite the World Health Organization's ridiculous assertion that our health care system is inferior to such medical powerhouses as Costa Rica and Slovenia. If this were so, then these men must be joining their fellow liberals in making pilgrimage to Slovenia's world-renowned clinics, research centers and hospitals for care rather than daring to rely on America's grossly inferior providers. C'mon, guys — if you really believe this, then pack your bags.

The Cato Institute comprehensively refutes the WHO rankings at <http://www.cato.org/pubs/bp/bp101.pdf>, and citing the WHO as reliable is as laughable as Mr. Burnard calling whitehouse.gov a reputable source of information. One wonders if he regarded the White House website to be as undeniably trustworthy in the Bush years. And one quick comparison of the list of medical breakthroughs originating in America to those from Oman, Colombia and the thirty-six other alleged world leaders closes the argument of whose system is best.

Both decry insurance company control over physicians' choices. But neither acknowledges that the government will assume that control. If they're concerned about a broken health care system, they should ardently oppose handing it over to the bureaucracy that gave us the income tax code.

Burnard in particular mocks at length the assertion that government "death squads" will decide who does and doesn't get care. But although that particular name isn't there, the National Coordinator of Health Information Technology would have specific power to choose who lives or dies; and extremists in the Obama administration like Drs. Ezekiel Emanuel (brother of White House chief of staff Rahm Emanuel) and David Blumenthal have made it clear that they would not hesitate to deny care and shackle medical innovation on economic grounds. Under health care demolition, America would truly be far back in the pack.

Burnard damns profit rather than moral imperative for being the motivation to provide health care. Okay, whose morals will be the imperative? Those of the left, who otherwise demand that morality not be legislated when their agenda violates someone else's morality? How about the morality of abortion, which will be funded by health care demolition? And if profit is unacceptable as a motive for providing health care, then how can he be silent about the government denying health care and medical innovation for economic purposes?

Both men avoid three critical aspects of the debate. Neither addresses the frightening implications to our liberty if the government is allowed to control our health care. Give government that power, and everything else is forfeit, because a government with power over our health care will exercise power over anything else that it wants to claim affects our health. Look no further for proof than the proposed massive fines and year's imprisonment for not buying only the health insurance that Big Brother chooses for you.

Neither cites the complete lack of tort reform in the legislation. And neither can cite any Constitutional authority for the government to nationalize anything, let alone health care. Yet, in a subsequent column, Mr. Burnard claims his opponents are, among other ad hominem attacks, ignorant of both the issues and the Constitution. But who's ignorant here? Opponents, for rightly pointing out the lack of Constitutional authority? Or Burnard, for implying that authority exists where it does not?

Burnard and his fellow liberals can say they're sick of opposition all they want. They can use the clichéd litany of insults all they want. But all the smears and complaining in the world cannot dilute the force of fact being directed against their propaganda.

This entry was posted on Friday, October 2nd, 2009 at 12:00 am and is filed under [Guest Column](#).

You can follow any responses to this entry through the [RSS 2.0](#) feed.

You can skip to the end and leave a response. Pinging is currently not allowed.