

VIEWPOINTS

Editor: Eric Spangler, espangler@communitypress.com, 576-8251

INDIAN HILL
JOURNAL

EDITORIALS | LETTERS | COLUMNS | CH@TROOM

CommunityPress.com

Repeal the Affordable Care Act

In his recent guest column, Bruce Healey claims Susan Wisner didn't make her point clearly in a previous column about the Affordable Care Act. As they say in the sports world, let's review the tape.

In her column on May 30, Mrs. Wisner pointed out that the Affordable Care Act gives the federal government unprecedented power over our lives and vests much of that power in the IRS. She believes the act threatens our liberty and that the enhanced IRS powers are particularly dangerous given the IRS's admitted recent abuses of power.

Mr. Healey's reaction: He's not sure what Mrs. Wisner opposes. "Is it Obamacare? Is it the IRS?" He says, "I wish people on all sides of any debate would be clear about their point."

My conclusion - There's nothing unclear about what Mrs. Wisner is saying: the



Jack Painter
COMMUNITY PRESS
GUEST COLUMNIST

Affordable Care Act should be repealed.

In saying this, Mrs. Wisner is heeding the advice of James Madison, who said, "The essence of government

is power; and power, lodged as it must be in human hands, will ever be liable to abuse." He also said, "We are right to take alarm at the first experiment upon our liberties."

Mr. Healey is apparently unfamiliar with these concerns. In fact, his main point is that Republicans oppose the Affordable Care Act only because "it's a Democrat-sourced idea." In other words, he believes there is no principled argument against the law, so there is nothing to debate!

That, of course, should settle it, but to be safe he offers a litany of other points that are irrelevant.

For example, he points out that many people cannot afford health care, which is an argument for health care reform, not for the Affordable Care Act. In fact, there are alternate approaches that provide universal access to affordable health care while avoiding the problems cited by Mrs. Wisner. See Paul Ryan's plan at <http://1.usa.gov/Sciypz>.

Mr. Healey also disputes the unpopularity of the Affordable Care Act, noting that the Democrat-controlled Senate has blocked 37 attempts to repeal the law. But repeal requires 60 votes out of 100 in the Senate. Sixty percent is a high standard to be considered unpopular. In any event, an NBC/*Wall Street Journal* poll last week shows that only 37 percent of Americans support the

law.

Mr. Healey also cites the Britain's National Healthcare System as evidence that socialized medicine works. Really?

But my favorite: Susan Wisner is likely one of the lucky Americans who can afford health insurance. Is Mr. Healey saying only people who are uninsured are qualified to offer thoughtful opinions on health care policy?

My reaction to Mr. Healey's litany of points is "So What?" What do they have to do with Mrs. Wisner's concerns?

More importantly, what do they have to do with choosing among the sensible alternative plans that are on the table?

I respect Mr. Healey's willingness to offer his views and engage in debate in a public forum. But I don't understand his point.

Jack Painter is a resident of Indian Hill

We are all Republicans - let's talk

After the gerrymander of Indian Hill into District 1 we may as well all be Republicans.

Our views differ. Are we going forward, dealing with our fiscal problems; or, are we going back into time when only white landholders were allowed to vote, and women were less valuable than slaves because they could not be sold.

Our government was a Plutocracy then; and, it is a Plutocracy now. It is not a representative Republic, and certainly not a democracy.

Why? Because most legislators and votes are hired and purchased by big money interests.

We could suggest the Republican idea of cutting the tax deductions for all political contributions. This would reduce the amount given and shift the direction of Congress more toward democracy. It would also reduce the debt.

If the debt is the main

CH@TROOM

Last week's question

Ohio legislators are considering a bill which would require only rear license plates on vehicles. Is this a good idea? Why or why not?

NEXT QUESTION

What is your reaction to the Supreme Court ruling that says police can take your DNA when

What's taken Ohio so long?

"But I would hope the legislators have better things to spend their time on (e.g., right to work legislation, etc) than this."

T.B.

the finances, and people weren't required to buy two plates. Car registration was managed by mail and worked just fine. It was also less expensive for the driver