



Congress & Politics

July 25, 2009
111th Congress

"They (the government), essentially, are creating an America where regulation is the profession to be in. - If you have a kid and you are thinking 'should my kid be a lawyer, should he be an accountant, should he be a feed store clerk' . . . don't bother trying to encourage him to start his own business or doing anything on his own. Tell him to be a government regulator. That's going to be where the big business will be in the years ahead."

Mark Steyn

"There is another class of coloured people who make a business of keeping the troubles, the wrongs, and the hardships of the Negro race before the public. Having learned that they are able to make a living out of their troubles, they have grown into the settled habit of advertising their wrongs — partly because they want sympathy and partly because it pays. Some of these people do not want the Negro to lose his grievances, because they do not want to lose their jobs"

Booker T. Washington

Important Issues

United States National Health Care Act

History has warned governments that when citizens find how they could vote themselves riches out of the nation's treasury, especially with the help of those who manage the treasury, the nation was doomed. This new "reform" is actually a revolutionary act involving our nation's treasury. It hands over large duties and large finances to the federal government, whose management skills are, at in the most kind description, debatable.

We are again addressing the subject because many substantial fixes, including legal reform, have not been passed by Congress. Instead our government has complicated the system with more bureaus, such as HMO's and PPO's; now they are claiming they can fix it again after even they do not like the problems that they have created.

This new system is not just for citizens, but residents, and in some cases, guests in the United States as well. The care includes almost everything imaginable, except cosmetic surgery.

There are several plans before Congress and they may continue to change. But the present core is that there will be no deductibles, no copayments, no coinsurance or other cost-sharing. The patients will have free choice in their selection of physicians, hospitals or clinics.

Then there is this ominous section in one bill:
It is unlawful for a private health insurer to sell health insurance coverage that duplicates the benefits provided under this Act.

Are they outlawing any competition with the new government care system? Will any private insurers be left after this law passes? Just wondering...

There is more on this subject in the next two pages.

Climate Security Act

a.k.a. Cap and Trade

There is a great division between scientists when the arguments of global warming or climate change are brought forward. But the liberals in congress are

moving ahead as if the warming and its causes are real and proven. Of course, they offer government as the solution!

The Democrats believe that heavily taxing and regulating pollution will result in less pollution. Why don't they understand that heavily taxing and regulating business will result in fewer businesses as well?

These congress-critters seek to address every use of energy that creates carbon dioxide, and then find ways to tax and control that use. The gigantic proposals now before Congress will create equally gigantic government bureaus and their necessary regulations. But these powers do not end their powers at businesses; they will find ways into private lives and homes.



H.R. 2629 Coercion is Not Health Care Act

To protect the American people's ability to make their own health care decisions by ensuring the Federal Government shall not force any American to purchase health insurance.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the 'Coercion is Not Health Care Act'.

SEC. 2. NO FEDERAL REQUIREMENT FOR HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.

Participation in, or access to, any program of the Federal Government or eligibility to receive any benefit under Federal law shall not be conditioned on the purchase or maintenance of health insurance coverage.

SEC. 3. LIMITATION ON FEDERAL AUTHORITY.

No individual or agency of the Federal Government shall ever require any individual to purchase health insurance coverage.

This bill sits in committee with no cosponsors

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government. . ."

Mr. Ron Paul (TX) Madam Speaker, today I am introducing the Coercion is Not Health Care Act. This legislation forbids the Federal Government from forcing any American to purchase health insurance, and from conditioning participation in any Federal program, or receipt of any Federal benefit, on the purchase of health insurance.

While often marketed as a "moderate" compromise between nationalized health care and a free market solution, forcing every American to purchase a government-approved health insurance plan is a back door approach to creating a government-controlled health care system.

If Congress requires individuals to purchase insurance, Congress must define what insurance policies satisfy the government mandate. Thus, Congress will decide what is and is not covered in the mandatory insurance policy. Does anyone seriously doubt that what conditions and treatments are covered will be determined by who has the most effective lobby. Or that Congress will be incapable of writing a mandatory insurance policy that will fit the unique needs of every individual in the United States?

The experience of States that allow their legislatures to mandate what benefits health insurance plans must cover has shown that politicizing health insurance inevitably makes health insurance more expensive. As the cost of government-mandated health insurance rises, Congress will likely create yet another fiscally unsustainable entitlement program to help cover the cost of insurance.

When the cost of government-mandated insurance proves to be an unsustainable burden on individuals and small employers, and the government, Congress will likely impose price controls on medical treatments, and even go so far as to limit what procedures and treatments will be reimbursed by the mandatory insurance. The result will be an increasing number of providers turning to "cash only" practices, thus making it difficult for those relying on the government-mandated insurance to find health care. Anyone who doubts that result should consider the increasing number of physicians who are withdrawing from the Medicare program because of the low reimbursement and constant bureaucratic harassment from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

Madam Speaker, the key to effective health care reform lies not in increasing government control, but in increasing the American people's ability to make their own health care decisions. Thus, instead of forcing Americans to purchase government-approved health insurance, Congress should put the American people back in charge of health care by expanding health care tax credits and deductions, as well as increasing access to Health Savings Accounts. Therefore, I have introduced legislation, the Comprehensive Health Care Reform Act (H.R. 1495), which provides a series of health care tax credits and deductions designed to empower patients. I urge my colleagues to reject the big government-knows-best approach to health care by cosponsoring my Coercion is Not Health Care Act and Comprehensive Health Care Reform Act.

THURSDAY, MAY 21, 2009



More on Government Health Care

Five Questions

Senator Jim DeMint of South Carolina has put forward these questions concerning the health care bill now being pushed by the President. No answer yet.....

1. If the major provisions of the health care bills will not kick in until 2014, four years from now, why the rush to pass a thousand-page bill before the August recess, a bill you admit that you haven't fully read yourself?

2. You have said your health care bill will cut costs and not increase the deficit. But, independent analysis by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office contradicts both claims, saying it will raise costs and increase the deficit by \$240 billion in the first ten years. What independent analysis will you provide that supports your claims and refutes CBO's?

3. You have repeatedly said that your health care bill allows any American who likes their current employer-based plan to keep it. But the most comprehensive independent analysis available, by the Lewin Group, contradicts your claim and found your bill will force over 80 million Americans to lose their current coverage. Will you provide independent analysis to refute this study?

4. Your own record in the Senate reveals you spend years voting against nearly every reform to make health care more affordable accessible, but this week you said that opponents of your plan are "content to perpetuate the status quo, [and] are, in fact, fighting reform on behalf of powerful special interests."

Which specific elected officials will you cite that have proposed to keep the status quo, and is that how you characterize the opposition of the 52 Blue Dog Democrats in the House and the moderate Democrats in the Senate?

5. Yes or no question: Will you guarantee pro-life Americans that, under your plan, they will not be forced to subsidize elective abortions?

This newsletter is written by Steven Maikoski. My hope is that people judge government from a Constitutional perspective with limited federal involvement, which was the intent of our founding fathers. None of the information provided is to be construed as legal help or information. Please realize that Congress can change the content of any bill without notice.

I wish to recognize some wonderful Internet sites and publications for information that may lead to items in this newsletter, including the Wall Street Journal, Investors Business Daily, Congressional Quarterly, Townhall.com, About.humor.com and the Patriot Post.

Constructive, polite, comments and criticism is welcome. You can reach me by email at steven@influencecongress.com. website: influencecongress.com

Both of these proposals would give tremendous powers to the federal government at the expense of the free-enterprise system. The Health Care bill would hand over 15% of the economy to direct manipulation and control of the federal authorities; the Cap and Trade bill will increase the federal powers to tax and regulate every industry, small business and home in the nation.

Both of these bills are subject to high pressure sales tactics from their sponsors, and both are large bills. Pressing the public to accept rapid action on complicated bills is the opposite of what President Obama promised during his presidential campaign. Yet, he is the one who is asking for these bills by October on C & T, and November on health care. Why the pressure?

Regardless of the possible benefits from these proposals, time should be taken to consider the realities of federal management of any large system; not one of the federal programs is properly managed and all are in heavy debt. In other words, the costs have exceeded the benefits. Now, the parties who have increased this nation's debt beyond measure want to control a substantially larger part of its finances and economy. Should we wait until the economy improves? Shall we trust them after what they have done?

**United States National Health Care Act
(HR 676)**

The more government has gotten involved in health care the more expensive it has become. Some people are now so focused on their perceived benefits that they have lost the will, or the ability to use reason; they want FREE CARE, no matter what it costs, no matter what it could do to our economy.

Over the years Congress has refused to pass legal and market reforms that would have dramatically lowered the costs of health care. They have made the system more expensive and more complicated, yet now say that they can provide a solution to the problems they caused.

One version of this new proposal provides eligibility to residents and citizens. Here is information directly from the proposal, do you think our government can afford to do all this?

(a) In General- All individuals residing in the United States (including any territory of the United States) are covered under the USNHC Program entitling them to a universal, best quality standard of care. Each such individual shall receive a card with a unique number in the mail. An individual's social security number shall not be used for purposes of registration under this section.

(b) Registration- Individuals and families shall receive a United States National Health Insurance Card in the mail, after filling out a United States National Health Insurance application form at a health care provider. Such application form shall be no more than 2 pages long.

(c) Presumption- Individuals who present themselves for covered services from a participating provider shall be presumed to be eligible for benefits under this Act, but shall complete an application for benefits in order to receive a United States National Health Insurance Card and have payment made for such benefits.

(d) Residency Criteria- The Secretary shall promulgate a rule that provides criteria for determining residency for eligibility purposes under the USNHC Program.

(e) Coverage for Visitors- The Secretary shall promulgate a rule regarding visitors from other countries who seek premeditated non-emergency surgical procedures. Such a rule should facilitate the establishment of country-to-country reimbursement arrangements or self pay arrangements between the visitor and the provider of care.

The care includes "at least the following: (1) Primary care and prevention. (2) Inpatient care. (3) Outpatient care. (4) Emergency care. (5) Prescription drugs. (6) Durable medical equipment. (7) Long-term care. (8) Palliative care. (9) Mental health services. (10) The full scope of dental services (other than cosmetic dentistry). (11) Substance abuse treatment services. (12) Chiropractic services. (13) Basic vision care and vision correction (other than laser vision correction for cosmetic purposes). (14) Hearing services, including coverage of hearing aids. (15) Podiatric care."

**The American Clean Energy and Security Act (HR 2454)
America's Climate Security Act (S. 2191)
(Cap and Trade)**

There are two versions of this proposal. The House version did not exist in written form during its vote. It was over 1200 pages, including a last minute 300 page amendment that was issued on the day it was voted on. Since the two bills have not merged the details are not solid. Therefore, only the general concept is addressed at this point

The Heritage Foundation best explains the cap and trade concept: *"These measures would set a limit, or cap, on carbon dioxide emission from fossil fuel use. The effect of such a cap would be to impose rationing of coal, oil, and natural gas on the American economy. Each covered utility, oil company, and manufacturing facility would be given allowances based on past emissions or some other formula. Those companies that emit less carbon dioxide than permitted by their allowances could sell the excess to those that do not; this is the trade part of cap and trade. Over time, the cap would be ratcheted down, requiring greater cuts in emissions."*

Now, here is the EPA's definition: *Cap and trade is an environmental policy tool that delivers results with a mandatory cap on emissions while providing sources flexibility in how they comply. Successful cap and trade programs reward innovation, efficiency, and early action and provide strict environmental accountability without inhibiting economic growth.*

Did you notice the double talk? A mandatory cap, yet flexibility on the compliance? It says it works without inhibiting economic growth, yet how does increased taxes and regulation NOT inhibit economic growth? This definition is classic liberal doublespeak at best, an outright lie at worst. Keep in mind that this bill will give the EPA incredible powers; they want to appear reasonable and gentle to sell you on the idea.

The flexibility within mandatory requirements can become a source of corruption. What will make a bureaucrat flexible? What can make a party flexible? \$\$\$\$

Other than the great powers this bill will give government, it will foster a series of agencies and bureaus to make use of their new powers.

First, is this necessary? There is a great split among scientists about global warming. Some claim it is not happening at all. Some claim that what we have is caused or accelerated by man's activities, while others say that solar cycles and other natural phenomena are responsible. After all, we have been warming since the last ice age, so nature is already playing a heavy hand in any warming.

Some environmentalists are criticizing the proposals for being too weak, but know that once its systems are in place they can be strengthened, both in scope and costs. They know that once a federal program is in place, it never ends; it only grows.

Tremors

Bottoming Out: Comedian Al Franken has finally won the Senate seat in Minnesota, giving the Democrats their magic 60th seat; now they can pass anything they want without worrying about a cloture vote. It must be noted that the vote totals in his election were manipulated by lawsuits and strange recounts; it took almost eight months of legalities for the final decision. A re-vote would have served the best interests of a just result, but the Franken legal team would not allow that.

Franken's new partner in the Senate, Amy Klobuchar, had to tell the people that Al would take his job seriously, which relieved no one. Why should such a thing be said? By the way, Franken's first act was to sign-on to the Union card-check legislation.

Quotable: "There is no sane person in the world who would implement policies like this if their objective was economic growth and prosperity." Rush Limbaugh [] "The reforms we seek would bring greater competition, choice, savings and inefficiencies to our health care system." Barack Obama

President Obama was issued 17 parking tickets during his time in law school, most unpaid until he started his run for president. The troubles are twofold: Why so many? Why didn't he pay them? After he recently blasted the same police department as stupid, it may be due to Obama's old grudge with the agency.

His actions are discomfoting. He should have never answered the obviously staged question. But it was so important to him that he wanted his opinion on record. It was not presidential. But there is another possibility in this event.

When Gates was questioned by the police he became belligerent, shouting "Do you know who I am?" Perhaps he meant that he was a professor of some note; but did he mean that he was a friend of the President, so he should not be arrested? Did Obama's claim that "they acted stupidly" meant that you don't arrest his friends?

Just in: If a burglar now starts to sack Gates' house, what are the odds that the police department will NOT respond to a call? We would all share a good laugh if that happened.

In case you're wondering, the Obama Administration is up to over thirty czars. Senator John McCain said that Obama has more Czars than the Romanovs, who ruled Russia for three centuries.

Many States have overestimated their tax revenues, and not just by a bit. The Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government reported that in the **month of April alone**, 37 early reporting states collected about \$18.2 billion less in personal income tax revenues compared to the same month of 2008. As the economy slowed and people lost their jobs, the governments experienced a shift in money, they lost their income and their expenses increased. This is CHANGE!

Government needs business to be successful if the bureaucrats are to be paid; they should welcome business, not punish it.

Interesting: "An extensive study conducted by professors at Smith College and George Washington University confirmed that most liberals exhibit a "narcissistic pathology" marked by "grandiosity, envy, a lack of empathy, illusion of personal perfection, and a sense of entitlement." Liberals are twice as likely to value being popular as conservatives, whereas conservatives are more likely to value "making my parents proud." Ann Coulter—in her book "Guilty"

That may be why they use opinion polls so much.

General Motors has announced that it will spend \$1 billion to start development on two new cars (one small and one medium sized). This will take place in its most promising new marketplace: Brazil. The South American nation is welcoming the new jobs it will bring, and GM likes the friendly business atmosphere. Does OUR Congress understand what is happening?

Meanwhile, in the US, there is a new Cadillac cologne for men.



The **F-22 Raptor** is the best jet in the skies, but its projected numbers continue to shrink in as the Congress wonders if our nation should be able to defend itself.

Current and future threats must be considered, yet some are still stuck in cold war (old) thinking, not realizing that newer fighters and missiles continue to be produced by powers who may be willing to use them, especially if

our fighters are so spread out that we are unable to defend ourselves from attacks on our bases.

The government has a constitutional obligation to protect the nation; it does not have an obligation to provide health care, bailouts, social security, etc.. Although the Raptor is an expensive aircraft (\$339 million) it has stealth, the ability to cruise at supersonic speeds and vectored thrust that give it incredible handling abilities which make one of its craft able to fight several of its enemies; but we must have enough fighters to protect our bases and nation.

The Raptor is vital to our air superiority. Congress is still working on the numbers as the conference approaches.

By the way, the "other guys" are building expensive fighters as well. The Russian Sukhoi family is impressive, and being sold to China and Indonesia. China has even produced its own clone of the SU-27. Because of these threats both South Korea and Japan are interested in the F-22 Raptors. Congress needs to consider these interests. If you believe in a strong national defense let your congressmen know of your concerns. Call it a military stimulus.

Last week **National Public Radio** aired a segment concerning some people's desires for a new California constitutional convention. Two reasons became readily apparent: the incredible debt with their limited ability to tax, and same sex marriage becoming legal. The voters have defeated same sex marriage twice and are insulated against heavy tax increases, so the liberals want to start their own government and then tax away, as if California does not have enough problems keeping businesses in the State.

Prudence advises us to watch out for this. CHANGE, in the wrong hands can be a terrible thing, especially when it releases politicians from their accountability and allows more spending.

The Tenth Amendment: "*The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.*"

Some States are working on resolutions that tell the Federal Government to cease and desist from issuing laws and regulations that are beyond the scope of its constitutionally delegated powers; these are called State Sovereignty Resolutions. Over half our States are working on resolutions or have already passed one.

Two States, Montana and Tennessee, have passed resolutions that limit the Feds on firearms issues. The Montana law would exempt from federal regulation all guns, ammunition, and accessories that are made, sold, and kept within the state as long as they are permanently affixed with the words "Made in Montana."

Yes, the ATF does not like this. They have informed the citizens that their State laws do not trump Federal law. But, does Federal law trump the Constitution? This will be interesting.

Jupiter was hit by an asteroid the size of Earth Tuesday, leaving a huge crater. Al Gore is trying to figure out how a planet can be damaged without having Republicans on it. (*Argus Hamilton*)