

April 8, 2014

Time to have a look at the healthcare act. Peggy Noonan calls it "A Catastrophe Like No Other."

... Support it or not, you cannot look at ObamaCare and call it anything but a huge, historic mess. It is also utterly unique in the annals of American lawmaking and government administration.

Its biggest proponent in Congress, the Democratic speaker of the House, literally said—blithely, mindlessly, but in a way forthcomingly—that we have to pass the bill to find out what's in it. It is a cliché to note this. But really, Nancy Pelosi's statement was a historic admission that she was fighting hard for something she herself didn't understand, but she had every confidence regulators and bureaucratic interpreters would tell her in time what she'd done. This is how we make laws now. ...

... There's a brute test of a policy: If you knew then what you know now, would you do it? I will never forget a conversation in 2006 or thereabouts with a passionate and eloquent supporter of the decision to go into Iraq. We had been having this conversation for years, he a stalwart who would highlight every optimistic sign, every good glimmering. He argued always for the rightness of the administration's decision. I would share my disquiet, my doubts, finally my skepticism. One night over dinner I asked him, in passing, "If we had it to do over again, should we have gone in? would you support it?"

And he said, "Of course not!"

Which told me everything.

There are very, very few Democrats who would do ObamaCare over again. Some would do something different, but they wouldn't do this. The cost of the blunder has been too high in terms of policy and politics.

They, and the president, are trying to put a good face on it.

Republicans of all people should not go for the happy face. They cannot run only on ObamaCare this year and later, because it's not the only problem in America. But it's a problem, a big one, and needs to be hard and shrewdly fought.

Peter Ferrara documents how statistics are used to lie about the healthcare act. He goes on to propose alternatives.

The population of the U.S. is 314 million. On the day Obamacare was passed, the estimate of the uninsured was 60 million. So in this context, the supposed 7 million Americans signed up for insurance on the Obamacare Exchanges, even if that is a valid number, and all of those have actually started paying premiums, both of which are highly dubious, does not mean any significant success for Obamacare.

That is especially so since at least 6 million Americans have lost their health insurance due to Obamacare, so far, with more to come once the illegally and arbitrarily delayed employer mandate becomes effective, if it is ever allowed to do so. The estimate based on a new Rand Corporation study is that only 858,000 Americans signed up on the Obamacare Exchanges were previously

uninsured. That is barely a dent of just over 1% in the original number of uninsured, from the historic Obamacare program that was supposed to provide “universal” coverage.

Yes, there are other sources of coverage under Obamacare. President Obama told us in his celebratory, hocus pocus, Obamacare address on April Fools’ Day that “more than 3 million young adults have gained insurance under this law by staying on their family’s plan.”

But that number is a publicly documented fabrication. It comes from a 2010 survey by the highly politicized Department of Health and Human Services estimating coverage for 19 to 25 year olds from all sources, including taxpayer financed Medicaid, and private insurance, which includes employer provided insurance and individually purchased plans, not just coverage from their parents’ health insurance, as David Hogberg explained at Spectator.org on April 2.

Moreover, that data is now outdated, as later HHS surveys show that health coverage for 18 to 25 year olds has since declined from 2010, Hogberg adds. That is why HHS has not released any new data on the point for almost two years now. ...

... Obama doesn’t get it. He said further on April Fools’ Day, Obamacare is “helping people from coast to coast, all of which makes the lengths to which some critics have gone to scare people or undermine the law, or try to repeal the law without offering any plausible alternative so hard to understand. I’ve got to admit, I don’t get it. Why are folks working so hard for people not to have health insurance?”

Many readers are not going to understand this. But my job here is to tell the truth, not to play politically correct footsie with you. What our President is telling us here, actually, is that he has so carefully avoided hearing any of the debate on this issue, that he actually does not understand the issue, on which he imagines himself as the historic founding father of American health care.

The plan I support to replace Obamacare, root and branch, is the reform proposal developed by John Goodman, President of the National Center for Policy Analysis. That proposal, unlike Obamacare, actually would ensure universal health care. But it would do so at far less cost. It would do so, again unlike Obamacare, while actually reducing health costs. That proposal is actually far more plausible than Obamacare, which has already proven itself implausible in the real world. That is why Obama has already acted to change the enacted Obamacare law without the approval of Congress, in violation of the Constitution and his own oath of office.

But Obama continued, “Many of the tall tales that have been told about this law have been debunked. There are still no death panels.” Mr. Obama, the death panel in the law is called the Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB). You have carefully avoided appointing members to this board and making it operative, until after the mid-term elections.

He knows what he is doing here, but not what he is talking about. ...

... the tragedy of Obamacare extends beyond health care.

Obamacare has been a major drag on the economy, preventing full recovery from the recession. Employers trying to avoid the costs of the employer mandate have reduced many full time jobs to part time jobs. Or they have frozen hiring, and the associated costs due to Obamacare. This is contributing to income stagnation and decline for the middle class, the working class, and the poor. And it is actually increasing inequality.

The new taxes of Obamacare are also deterring job creating investment, or capital investment that would increase worker productivity, and consequently wages and incomes. The costly regulatory burdens of Obamacare are increasing rather than reducing health insurance costs, which is a further drag on the economy.

The alternative, John Goodman, NCPA plan would achieve universal health care, with no employer mandate, no individual mandate, reduced taxes and spending, and sharply reduced regulatory burdens and costs as compared to Obamacare. All of that would be sharply pro-growth, and promote more jobs, and higher wages.

*But Obama says that would not be a plausible alternative. **The real problem is that he is not plausible as President. Only once he leaves the White House can the American economy be liberated to grow, and American health care be liberated to once again serve the sick, especially the most sick and in need of health care.***

During his April Fool's Day remarks on healthcare, the president offered his ideas on what is news. **Carl Cannon** schools the bystanding president.

... As a student, Barack Obama attended Columbia University, which has a world-class journalism program. Unfortunately, he didn't study journalism. After graduation, he attended another famed Ivy League institution, Harvard Law School, where he honed his skills as an advocate. So he is well-trained to engage in adversarial discourse, and he excels at it. As an appraiser of journalism, however, he has neither training nor the temperament. So let's help him:

When a president campaigns for his sweeping new law while claiming repeatedly that it won't impact those who already have health insurance—and this turns out to be utterly false—that is news.

When the same president repeatedly assures voters who already have insurance that they can keep their doctors—and wins re-election while stressing this fallacious claim—that is news.

When it turns out that the federal government, despite a three-year rollout, isn't competent enough to provide the service it is making people purchase – yes, that is news. If it keeps happening in the future, sorry, Mr. President, that is news.

When the president states that 7.1 million Americans signed up via the government-run health care exchanges because of his own selfless efforts and those of his allies—but his administration claims it has no idea how many of those people enrolled because their private sector plans were canceled—that is news.

When respected third party organizations estimate that between two-thirds and three-fourths of those who bought the government plan did so because their previous plan was canceled due to the Affordable Care Act—that is also news. ...

WSJ

[A Catastrophe Like No Other](#)

The president tries to put a good face on ObamaCare.

by Peggy Noonan

Put aside the numbers for a moment, and the daily argument.

"Seven point one million people have signed up!"

"But six million people lost their coverage and were forced onto the exchanges! That's no triumph, it's a manipulation. And how many of the 7.1 million have paid?"

"We can't say, but 7.1 million is a big number and redeems the program."

"Is it a real number?"

"Your lack of trust betrays a dark and conspiratorial right-wing mindset."

As I say, put aside the argument, step back and view the thing at a distance. Support it or not, you cannot look at [ObamaCare](#) and call it anything but a huge, historic mess. It is also utterly unique in the annals of American lawmaking and government administration.

Its biggest proponent in Congress, the Democratic speaker of the House, literally said—blithely, mindlessly, but in a way forthcomingly—that we have to pass the bill to find out what's in it. It is a cliché to note this. But really, [Nancy Pelosi](#)'s statement was a historic admission that she was fighting hard for something she herself didn't understand, but she had every confidence regulators and bureaucratic interpreters would tell her in time what she'd done. This is how we make laws now.

Her comments alarmed congressional Republicans but inspired Democrats, who for the next three years would carry on like blithering idiots making believe they'd read the bill and understood its implications. They were later taken aback by complaints from their constituents. The White House, on the other hand, seems to have understood what the bill would do, and lied in a way so specific it showed they knew exactly what to spin and how. "If you like your health-care plan, you can keep your health-care plan, period." "If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor, period." That of course was the president, misrepresenting the facts of his signature legislative effort. That was historic, too. If you liked your doctor, your plan, your network, your coverage, your deductible you

could not keep it. Your existing policy had to pass muster with the administration, which would fight to the death to ensure that 60-year-old women have pediatric dental coverage.

The leaders of our government have not felt, throughout the process, that they had any responsibility to be honest and forthcoming about the major aspects of the program, from its exact nature to its exact cost. We are not being told the cost of anything—all those ads, all the consultants and computer work, even the cost of the essential program itself.

What the bill declared it would do—insure tens of millions of uninsured Americans—it has not done. There are still tens of millions uninsured Americans. On the other hand, it has terrorized millions who did have insurance and lost it, or who still have insurance and may lose it.

The program is unique in that it touches on an intimate and very human part of life, the health of one's body, and yet normal people have been almost wholly excluded from the debate. This surely was not a bug but a feature. Given a program whose complexity is so utter and defeating that it defies any normal human attempt at comprehension, two things will happen. Those inclined to like the spirit of the thing will support it on the assumption the government knows what its doing. And the opposition will find it difficult to effectively oppose—or repeal the thing—because of the program's bureaucratic density and complexity. It's like wrestling a manic, many-armed squid in ink-darkened water.

Social Security was simple. You'd pay into the system quite honestly and up front, and you'd receive from the system once you were of retirement age. If you supported or opposed the program you knew exactly what you were supporting or opposing. The hidden, secretive nature of [ObamaCare](#) is a major reason for the opposition it has engendered.

The program is unique in that the bill that was signed four years ago, on March 23, 2010, is not the law, or rather program, that now exists. Parts of it have been changed or delayed 30 times. It is telling that the president rebuffed Congress when it asked to work with him on alterations, but had no qualms about doing them by executive fiat. The program today, which affects a sixth of the U.S. economy, is not what was passed by the U.S. Congress. On Wednesday Robert Gibbs, who helped elect the president in 2008 and served as his first press secretary, predicted more changes to come. He told a business group in Colorado that the employer mandate would likely be scrapped entirely. He added that the program needed an "additional layer" or "cheaper" coverage and admitted he wasn't sure the individual mandate had been the right way to go.

Finally, the program's supporters have gone on quite a rhetorical journey, from "This is an excellent bill, and opponents hate the needy" to "People will love it once they have it" to "We may need some changes" to "I've co-sponsored a bill to make needed alternations" to "This will be seen by posterity as an advance in human freedom."

That was the president's approach on Tuesday, when he announced the purported 7.1 million enrollees. "The debate over repealing this law is over. The [Affordable Care Act](#) is here to stay. . . . In the end, history is not kind to those who would deny Americans their basic economic security. Nobody remembers well those who stand in the way of America's progress or our people. And that's what the Affordable Care Act represents. As messy as it's been sometimes, as contentious as it's been sometimes, it is progress."

Someone said it lacked everything but a "Mission Accomplished" banner. It was political showbiz of a particular sort, asking whether the picture given of a thing will counter the *experience* of the thing.

There's a brute test of a policy: If you knew then what you know now, would you do it? I will never forget a conversation in 2006 or thereabouts with a passionate and eloquent supporter of the decision to go into Iraq. We had been having this conversation for years, he a stalwart who would highlight every optimistic sign, every good glimmering. He argued always for the rightness of the administration's decision. I would share my disquiet, my doubts, finally my skepticism. One night over dinner I asked him, in passing, "If we had it to do over again, should we have gone in? would you support it?"

And he said, "Of course not!"

Which told me everything.

There are very, very few Democrats who would do ObamaCare over again. Some would do something different, but they wouldn't do this. The cost of the blunder has been too high in terms of policy and politics.

They, and the president, are trying to put a good face on it.

Republicans of all people should not go for the happy face. They cannot run only on ObamaCare this year and later, because it's not the only problem in America. But it's a problem, a big one, and needs to be hard and shrewdly fought.

Forbes

[Obamacare Shows America Suffers From A President Dangerously Disconnected From Reality](#)

by Peter Ferrara

The population of the U.S. is 314 million. On the day Obamacare was passed, the estimate of the uninsured was 60 million. So in this context, the supposed 7 million Americans signed up for insurance on the Obamacare Exchanges, even if that is a valid number, and all of those have actually started paying premiums, both of which are highly dubious, does not mean any significant success for Obamacare.

That is especially so since at least 6 million Americans have lost their health insurance due to Obamacare, so far, with more to come once the illegally and arbitrarily delayed employer mandate becomes effective, if it is ever allowed to do so. The estimate based on a new Rand Corporation study is that only 858,000 Americans signed up on the Obamacare Exchanges were previously uninsured. That is barely a dent of just over 1% in the original number of uninsured, from the historic Obamacare program that was supposed to provide "universal" coverage.

Yes, there are other sources of coverage under Obamacare. President Obama told us in his celebratory, hocus pocus, Obamacare address on April Fools' Day that "more than 3 million young adults have gained insurance under this law by staying on their family's plan."

But that number is a publicly documented fabrication. It comes from a 2010 survey by the highly politicized Department of Health and Human Services estimating coverage for 19 to 25 year olds from all sources, including taxpayer financed Medicaid, and private insurance, which includes employer provided insurance and individually purchased plans, not just coverage from their parents' health insurance, as David Hogberg explained at Spectator.org on April 2.

Moreover, that data is now outdated, as later HHS surveys show that health coverage for 18 to 25 year olds has since declined from 2010, Hogberg adds. That is why HHS has not released any new data on the point for almost two years now.

In addition, Hogberg further demonstrates based on 2012 data from the far less politicized Census Bureau, which breaks out data for Medicaid and employer provided health insurance, that the number of young adults gaining coverage on their parents' health insurance under Obamacare totals at most 258,000.

In any event, the virtue of this young adult dependency on their parents' health insurance is greatly exaggerated. That coverage is not free. The parents are paying more for it. Moreover, these young adults are not helpless, with no alternatives for health insurance. They can get their own jobs with employer provided health insurance. Or at least they could if Obama was not President. Or they could buy their own health insurance in the market, with help from their parents, if that is needed and desired. Young adults under 26 are the least in need of health insurance, and have the least trouble getting it. The healthiest population in America, they are targeted under Obamacare as lambs to be fleeced for funds to finance health care for others.

President Obama in his April Fools' Day speech also cited "millions more who have gained access through Medicaid expansion...." But they cannot be included among the "millions of Americans [who] finally had the same chance to buy quality, affordable health care—and the peace of mind that comes with it—as everybody else." That is because Medicaid is a taxpayer financed, welfare program, so those covered by it are not buying anything. Moreover, Medicaid does not provide "quality" health care, because it pays so little to the doctors and hospitals providing the actual health care for the poor, that many, especially the best, won't take patients on Medicaid. Simply expanding Medicaid to cover ultimately 100 million Americans at taxpayer expense does not qualify as any sort of achievement.

But there were other howlers in Obama's April Fools' Day address. He told the American people that "Because of [Obamacare], 100 million Americans have gained free preventive care, like mammograms and contraceptive care, under their existing plans." Here we have a President of the United States who does not understand that when the government requires health insurers to provide additional benefits, the cost of their health insurance has to go up, just to ensure the insurer has enough money to pay all the covered benefits. So there is nothing "free" about Obamacare's required preventive care.

There are high school students who understand such basic economic reasoning better than the President. Of course, there are many adults who voted for him who cannot. Those are the people

the President is counting on, and who are actually the ones who are most responsible for the long term, rapid decline America is now suffering.

Another more than dubious statement by the President on April Fools' Day was that "a whole lot of families won't be driven into bankruptcy by a serious illness, because [Obamacare] prevents your insurer from placing dollar limits on the coverage they provide." A whole lot of families? Where is the documentation of that? I dispute that "a whole lot of families" were being driven into bankruptcy by the dollar limits on their health coverage before Obamacare.

Of course, again the President doesn't understand that removing dollar limits on the coverage means the cost of that coverage must be higher. And that is the more so the more families were reaching those dollar limits before. The actual effect of the Obamacare dollar limit ban is that consumers are denied the freedom of making the choice themselves of whether they want to pay more for coverage without any dollar limit. That is because Obama and his "Progressives" are so certain that they know better than everyone else what that choice should be.

But the biggest howler in Obama's April Fools' Day speech was that, "Under [Obamacare], the share of Americans with health insurance is up and the growth of health costs is down...." Whether the ultimate effect of Obamacare will be to reduce or increase the uninsured is highly uncertain at this time. The employer mandate has been delayed until after the elections because the President knows the effect in terminating current coverage is going to be ugly. What is certain now is that Obamacare won't get America anywhere near universal coverage, as Obama led the Left to believe was the whole point of the exercise.

But more obviously false is the notion that Obamacare has driven the growth of health costs down. As I explained in a previous column, the decline in the growth of health costs started in 2003, when Health Savings Accounts were enacted, and Obama was still an Illinois state senator. As the number of people with HSA plans rose to 30 million over the years, the decline in health cost growth became sharper. Obamacare just went into effect, and here is our President taking credit for a health cost trend that started over a decade ago.

Unlike Obamacare, HSAs provide proven market incentives to reduce health costs. The only effect of Obamacare on health costs so far has been to increase them, due to costly overregulation. And contra Obama, that is not good for the middle class, or our fiscal future. Unless Obamacare actually reduces overall health coverage by increasing the uninsured, and the deductibles most covered people face, that cost increasing effect will become more obvious over time. But Obama will be gone by then, virulently opposing any change in his brilliant law from the private sector.

But Obama doesn't get it. He said further on April Fools' Day, Obamacare is "helping people from coast to coast, all of which makes the lengths to which some critics have gone to scare people or undermine the law, or try to repeal the law without offering any plausible alternative so hard to understand. I've got to admit, I don't get it. Why are folks working so hard for people not to have health insurance?"

Many readers are not going to understand this. But my job here is to tell the truth, not to play politically correct footsie with you. What our President is telling us here, actually, is that he has so carefully avoided hearing any of the debate on this issue, that he actually does not understand the issue, on which he imagines himself as the historic founding father of American health care.

The plan I support to replace Obamacare, root and branch, is the reform proposal developed by John Goodman, President of the National Center for Policy Analysis. That proposal, unlike Obamacare, actually would ensure universal health care. But it would do so at far less cost. It would do so, again unlike Obamacare, while actually reducing health costs. That proposal is actually far more plausible than Obamacare, which has already proven itself implausible in the real world. That is why Obama has already acted to change the enacted Obamacare law without the approval of Congress, in violation of the Constitution and his own oath of office.

But Obama continued, “Many of the tall tales that have been told about this law have been debunked. There are still no death panels.” Mr. Obama, the death panel in the law is called the Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB). You have carefully avoided appointing members to this board and making it operative, until after the mid-term elections.

He knows what he is doing here, but not what he is talking about.

Obama added further,

“And those who have based their entire political agenda on repealing it should have to explain why Jeane should go back to being uninsured. They should explain why Sean and his family should go back to paying thousands and thousands of dollars more. They’ve got to explain why Marla doesn’t deserve to feel like she has value. They have to explain why we should go...back to the days when Americans with preexisting conditions were out of luck—they could be routinely denied the economic security of health insurance—because that is exactly what would happen if we repeal this law. Millions of people who now have health insurance would not have it.”

But none of that would happen under the Goodman/NCPA reform plan I support. I explained that reform plan in a previous column. Look that up, or go to ncpa.org to find it. Again, what this demonstrates is that Obama, so carefully cloistered his whole life in his own ideological cell, is so disconnected from reality that he does not actually understand health policy issues.

But the harsh reality of how Obamacare works, or actually doesn’t work, is demonstrated by the story of Frank Alfisi, who died on January 14, 2014, at age 73, a victim of Obamacare, as explained by Jeffrey Lord at Spectator.org on April 1. Frank lived in a seniors’ apartment complex in Wantagh, Long Island, near the family of his daughter Amy.

While he was successfully treated with chemotherapy for 8 years for multiple myeloma, the chemo caused kidney failure. But Frank was fine as long as he could receive kidney dialysis three times a week. The problem began when he missed a dialysis appointment one day because he was ill with a stomach virus.

The next day, he was feeling very ill because of the toxin buildup in his body missing just one day without the scheduled dialysis. He called an ambulance, which took him to the nearby hospital to get his treatment. But under a new Medicare regulation, required by Obamacare, Frank could not receive the dialysis unless he was admitted as an inpatient for at least two days. Dialysis, however, does not require even one overnight stay. After the treatment, which takes a few hours, the patient can go home.

The doctors knew Frank could not go home without his dialysis. So they kept running tests on him to find some reason to admit him, under Medicare regulations. Around 8:30 that night, Frank’s

blood pressure was so high because of the lack of dialysis that he had a seizure, still in the hospital emergency room, still not admitted, so he still could not receive the dialysis. Later that night he had a second seizure, and was unconscious for two days in the ER, still without any dialysis. His doctor told his daughter Amy, "You can thank Mr. Obama for this." The death by Obamacare has already begun.

After that second seizure, Frank was transferred for rehab in the hope he would recover well enough to get his dialysis, first to Gurwin Jewish medical center, and then to Parker Jewish. But Frank could never get his dialysis, and died while in that rehab. He was "covered," by Medicare, but because of Obamacare, and its cuts to Medicare to finance Obamacare, Frank was denied the actual straightforward health care that would save his life. In my interpretation, Frank Alfisi was murdered by Obamacare. This was what Sarah Palin was talking about when she used the term "death panels."

There are other examples of cancer patients losing their health insurance that was financing the doctors keeping them alive, because the insurance did not satisfy Obamacare requirements. Edie Littlefield Sundby had health insurance that spent \$1.2 million on health care for her stage 4 gall bladder cancer, as she explained in the Wall Street Journal. That plan included first rate doctors from her hometown of San Diego, to Stanford University's Cancer Institute, and the M.D. Anderson Cancer Center in Houston, that kept her alive for 7 years. But that plan was cancelled under Obamacare, forcing her insurer United Healthcare out of California altogether. So much for President Obama's promise, "If you like your health insurance, you can keep it."

Sundby and her health insurance consultants could not find another plan in the highly touted California Obamacare Exchange that includes those same doctors, at any price. So down went another Obamacare promise, "If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor?" But Harry Reid tells us that all such examples of Obamacare failure are lies. Tell that to Frank's daughter Amy. I dare you.

Further, similar examples have now been published as well. But the tragedy of Obamacare extends beyond health care.

Obamacare has been a major drag on the economy, preventing full recovery from the recession. Employers trying to avoid the costs of the employer mandate have reduced many full time jobs to part time jobs. Or they have frozen hiring, and the associated costs due to Obamacare. This is contributing to income stagnation and decline for the middle class, the working class, and the poor. And it is actually increasing inequality.

The new taxes of Obamacare are also deterring job creating investment, or capital investment that would increase worker productivity, and consequently wages and incomes. The costly regulatory burdens of Obamacare are increasing rather than reducing health insurance costs, which is a further drag on the economy.

The alternative, John Goodman, NCPA plan would achieve universal health care, with no employer mandate, no individual mandate, reduced taxes and spending, and sharply reduced regulatory burdens and costs as compared to Obamacare. All of that would be sharply pro-growth, and promote more jobs, and higher wages.

But Obama says that would not be a plausible alternative. The real problem is that he is not plausible as President. Only once he leaves the White House can the American economy be liberated to grow, and American health care be liberated to once again serve the sick, especially the most sick and in need of health care.

Real Clear Politics

Mr. President, I Have News for You

by Carl M. Cannon

President Obama was moonlighting again last week as a self-appointed media critic-in-chief, this time during a Rose Garden appearance to boast about the progress of the Affordable Care Act. It was a curious performance on many levels, not the least of which was the way he used the vice president, his own cabinet, and the White House press corps as silent props while he unveiled his message of the month.

If the ladies and gentlemen of the press weren't given a speaking role, they weren't forgotten. At one point, he addressed them specifically, immodestly offering his own unsolicited definition of what constitutes "news."

The president prefaced this digression by asserting that 7.1 million people had signed up for Obamacare, triggering historically low insurance premiums in the process, and proving his critics to be not only mistaken but malevolent. Resistance to the law is futile, he added, and Republicans seeking to repeal it and journalists who dare question it are to be shunned and shamed—condemned, as it were, to history's trash heap.

"The debate over repealing this law is over," he said. "The Affordable Care Act is here to stay."

The president then read testimonials from everyday Americans who've written to the White House thanking him for the law. "That's what the Affordable Care Act, or Obamacare, is all about," he said. "This law is doing what it's supposed to do. It's working."

Switching seamlessly from governing to campaign mode, the president then took aim at Obamacare's critics. "I don't get it," he said. "Why are folks working so hard for people not to have health insurance? Why are they so mad about the idea of folks having health insurance?"

Yes, health insurance premiums are rising, he conceded, but "those premiums have risen more slowly since the Affordable Care Act passed than at any time in the past 50 years."

He thanked the pro-ACA groups, volunteers, and advertising execs who ran campaigns encouraging Americans to sign up for insurance (some of it subsidized), adding, "That's why 7.1 million folks have health insurance—because people got the word out."

To be sure, these are dubious claims – some would say absurd – but before the White House press corps could begin to fact-check the president, he launched a preemptive strike:

"I want to make sure everybody understands," he said, looking at press row. "In the months, years ahead ... there will be additional challenges to implementing this law. There will be days when the

website stumbles, I guarantee it. So, press, I want you to anticipate: There will be some moment when the website is down, and I know it will be on all of your front pages. It's going to happen. It won't be news."

Take a moment to digest that comment, and to consider its context. He's saying that if www.healthcare.gov continues to have problems providing a service Americans are required by law to obtain, that's not news. This might qualify as the most specious remark Obama has ever made as president.

As a student, Barack Obama attended Columbia University, which has a world-class journalism program. Unfortunately, he didn't study journalism. After graduation, he attended another famed Ivy League institution, Harvard Law School, where he honed his skills as an advocate. So he is well-trained to engage in adversarial discourse, and he excels at it. As an appraiser of journalism, however, he has neither training nor the temperament. So let's help him:

When a president campaigns for his sweeping new law while claiming repeatedly that it won't impact those who already have health insurance—and this turns out to be utterly false—that is news.

When the same president repeatedly assures voters who already have insurance that they can keep their doctors—and wins re-election while stressing this fallacious claim—that is news.

When it turns out that the federal government, despite a three-year rollout, isn't competent enough to provide the service it is making people purchase – yes, that is news. If it keeps happening in the future, sorry, Mr. President, that is news.

When the president states that 7.1 million Americans signed up via the government-run health care exchanges because of his own selfless efforts and those of his allies—but his administration claims it has no idea how many of those people enrolled because their private sector plans were canceled—that is news.

When respected third party organizations estimate that between two-thirds and three-fourths of those who bought the government plan did so because their previous plan was canceled due to the Affordable Care Act—that is also news.

Anecdotal evidence is cited by advocates on both sides of Obamacare, and when those anecdotes are true, they are certainly relevant to the conversation. So when the president relates the accounts of Americans who consider this law a godsend, that shouldn't be taken lightly. But those testimonials flow both ways. Obama took no questions from the press in the Rose Garden, despite modern journalism being a two-way conversation. And one veteran White House correspondent, RealClearPolitics' Alexis Simendinger, received a terse tweet in response to her story about the president's event.

"Yet I'm one of those signups and I think the law is terrible," it read. "Cancelled. Premium up. Deductible up. Lost access to doctor."

And, yes, that is news, too.



APRIL FOOLS

It is not a PHONY SCANDAL. IF YOU LIKE YOUR HEALTH PLAN, YOU CAN KEEP YOUR PLAN, PERIOD. The "Sequester" is not something I proposed. TRUST ME, 7.1 MILLION AMERICANS HAVE PAID FOR HEALTH INSURANCE THROUGH OBAMACARE. BENGHAZI OBAMACARE WILL NOT ADD ONE DIME TO THE DEFICIT. I never met the Uncle I lived with while I went to college. We will OPEN period for shovel-read projects. ObamaCare will cover 44 million AMERICANS. Obamacare will create 4 million jobs. OVER 3 MILLION YOUNG ADULTS HAVE RECEIVED COVERAGE UNDER THEIR PARENTS' HEALTH PLANS.

UNDER MY PLAN, NO FAMILY MAKING LESS THAN \$250,000 A YEAR WILL SEE ANY FORM OF TAX INCREASE. If you like your Doctor, you can keep your Doctor. This is the MOST TRANSPARENT administration in HISTORY. IRS We will OPEN period for shovel-read projects. WE ARE GOING TO LOWER YOUR PREMIUMS BY \$2500 PER YEAR. A

comics.com EMAIL: hpayne@detroitnews.com

HPayne@comics



"RECALL THIS BEAUTY? AND DENY 7 MILLION AMERICANS AN AFFORDABLE PRODUCT?"

©2011 THE AUTHOR. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. BY THE AUTHOR.
 FINE LINE





