

« Kerry pushes the Sky Is Falling bill

Why Byrd was upset with the Daily Mail

In at least his last 5 runs for re-election — a span covering nearly 30 years — the Charleston Daily Mail editorial board has endorsed his re-election.

We quoted him accurately.

Obviously we do not always agree with him.

How did he repay us?

By saying we are barking from the nether reaches of Glennbeckistan.

The Daily Mail had published a respectful editorial urging him to vote against imposing Obamacare by a simple majority under reconciliation.

The editorial used his own words.

Obviously, Byrd could not argue against the editorial using reason or facts. So he wrote that we are barking from Glennbeckistan.

The editorial of March 2:

Using reconciliation would hurt Democrats
Choking off debate is no way to muscle through health legislation
Advertiser

DEMOCRATS face widespread public opposition to their health legislation – 2,500 pages long, and costing \$2.5 trillion over 10 years. And the loss of the late Sen. Ted Kennedy's Senate seat cost the party the 60-seat supermajority that enables parties to cut off debate in the U.S. Senate.

Democratic leaders in the House and Senate nevertheless vow to pass a health care bill by corrupting their own procedures if need be. Using the process of "reconciliation," which limits debate to 20 hours, Democrats could impose their health care scheme on the nation with only 51 votes in the Senate.

Members of the House would be asked to pass the Senate bill, which differs greatly from their own. Then the Senate, using reconciliation, would pass a package of changes to appease House Democrats.

Sen. Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., is author of the Byrd rule, which since 1985 has limited the use of reconciliation. As senior fellow Michael D. Tanner of the Cato Institute recently reminded, Byrd once explained: "Reconciliation was intended to adjust revenue and spending levels in order to reduce deficits... It was not designed to... restructure the entire health care system."

Byrd warned that using reconciliation to enact a huge health care package would "violate the intent and spirit of the budget process, and do serious injury to the constitutional role of the Senate."

Reconciliation has been used by both parties since 1974 to, in Tanner's words, "make it easier for Congress to adjust taxes and spending in order to 'reconcile' actual revenues and expenditures with a previously approved budget resolution."

But clearly, liberal Democrats' health care bill is not a budget adjustment. It's a gigantic piece of social legislation that would impose government control on a fifth of the U.S. economy.

The New York Times reports that some Democrats who once opposed the use of reconciliation with such far-reaching legislation may not be opposed now. Sen. Jay Rockefeller IV, D-W.Va., was counted in that number.

And where does West Virginia's senior senator stand now?

"Mr. Byrd," wrote the Times, is not opposed "if it's done right," a spokesman said.

Sad.

Using a power play is not the right way to pass a huge, expensive and far-reaching health care bill. It's a corruption not only of Senate procedures, but also an act of disrespect to the American people, who have a right to the protection debate provides.

His response was published in the next edition after it was received:

It has been said that a little knowledge can be a dangerous thing. In the Daily Mail's March 2 editorial regarding health care reform legislation, "Using reconciliation would hurt Democrats: Choking off debate is no way to muscle through health legislation," the newspaper's misunderstanding of congressional procedures misinforms readers who, in

rapidly increasing numbers, find themselves unable to obtain or afford medical insurance.

The editorial correctly quoted me as saying in the spring of 2009 that using reconciliation to enact a huge health care package would "violate the intent and spirit of the budget process..."

I believed then, as now, that the Senate should debate the health reform bill under regular rules, which it did. The result of that debate was the passing of a comprehensive health care reform bill in the Senate by a 60-vote supermajority.

I continue to support the budget reconciliation process for deficit reduction. The entire Senate- or House- passed health care bill could not and would not pass muster under the current reconciliation rules, which were established under my watch.

Yet a bill structured to reduce deficits by, for example, finding savings in Medicare or lowering health care costs, may be consistent with the Budget Act, and appropriately considered under reconciliation.

With all due respect, the Daily Mail's hyperbole about "imposing government control," acts of "disrespect to the American people" and "corruption" of Senate procedures resembles more the barkings from the nether regions of Glennbeckistan than the "sober and second thought" of one of West Virginia's oldest and most respected daily newspapers.

My commitment to protecting the best interests of all West Virginians and the American people remains as firm and consistent as my devotion to observing the necessary and essential Senate rules and procedures intended to guarantee debate and the airing of diverse views.

Robert C. Byrd
Washington, D.C.

I am tempted to say more, but my readers are smart enough to judge for themselves.



This entry was posted on Monday, March 8, 2010 at 11:00 AM and is filed under All. You can follow any responses to this entry through the RSS 2.0 feed. You can leave a response, or trackback from your own site.

7 RESPONSES TO "WHY BYRD WAS UPSET WITH THE DAILY MAIL"

1. *Barry Soetoro (D-King Of The World!) says:*

March 8, 2010 at 11:13 AM

Speaking of Byrd;

Dear Diary,,,

Here at the White House, that sweet, wistful feeling of spring is in the air. It's that time of year when many a young mans thoughts turn to love. But alas, mine have been forced to ponder gardening. As luck would have it, Michelle has once again contracted the gardening fever, only this time axelrod has suggested that I get involved, you know, to show case my earthy, down to nature side. My first assignment was a photo-op at the local Home Depot purchasing some gardening tools. I really loved the garden weasel but axelrod said no, because my name and weasel together in print wouldn't look good, especially now with the way things are going. I had fertilizer on my list too, but again, axelrod said no because there would be jokes about me and fertilizer on Saturday Night Live. At one point I had picked up a hoe, she was a pretty hoe, a top dollar hoe I was told, the best hoe in town I was sure, but again, axelrod shot that down too. So after a couple shots of me in front of some pansy's in the potted plant section, I settled on buying a rugged, manly rake... I chose the brand 'Union Tools'. Axelrod smiled knowingly and nodded. So off we went, back to the White House and out to the garden for some of those manly photos, you know the kind, where I'm wearing boots and jeans and have my sleeves rolled up. That's when it all went down hill, see,, I had only dragged the rake across the freshly tilled soil but twice when it came apart. Jimmy-Joe, the kindly old lawns keeper from some allah forsaken place called Poca, quickly put it back together for me. But again, after a couple of minutes it came apart. Jimmy-Joe appeared again, while pointing at the rake he looked me square in the eye and said, "Mr. President, rat-thars where ya' went wrong", I asked what do you mean? Jimmy-Joe answered, "Well sir, you got one of them 'Union Tool' rakes- and ever-body knows they jus' cost too much and don't work" (Sigh),,, I gave up and went back inside.....

Til next time dear diary,,

Barry

OsamaHusseiniIslamObama 2012'
(the terrorist-Uighur-ACORN-media choice)
-It's never too early to campaign-



2. *Libtard says:*

March 8, 2010 at 11:14 AM

Don, you don't play fair. It's a cheap shot to hit a lib with the facts, especially when it