



Unravelling the New World Order

*An Exposé of How Government, Religious, and Financial Insiders
Are Deciding Your Future*

Year End 2009/January 2010

The Elephant in the Room: *The Healthcare Bills are Unconstitutional*

By UNWO Editors

At this writing, it appears healthcare reform legislation may be stalled, thanks to the stunning victory of Scott Brown in Massachusetts. Losing their filibuster-proof majority virtually overnight seemed to sober up some of the Democrats in Congress. However, given the cold-blooded, near-fanatical zeal of the Obama/Pelosi/Reid trinity for passing healthcare “reform,” we can be sure of one thing: *they will be back*.

In any event, we believe it is a good idea at this point to look back at what has been happening under the guise of “healthcare reform.” For the better part of the past year, the Obama/Reid/Pelosi Soviet-style central planning committee has been determined to ram through their healthcare “reform” monstrosity. Never mind that a majority of us know this was never about healthcare reform. It has been—every step of the way—about vastly increased power for the Federal government and consolidating power in perpetuity for the party of Obama.

Republicans were completely shut out of the legislative process for healthcare reform. Hence, the rancorous divisions over various provisions in both bills—the “public option,” government-paid abortions, coverage for illegals, proposed taxes on “Cadillac” healthcare plans, potentially huge cuts in Medicare, and a wide array of other issues—have been within the Democrat party. It was ludicrous to see Democrat leaders lambasting Republicans on camera for their non-support, then retiring behind closed doors to continue wrangling over the final, one-party outcome.

Daily, the liberal media and the White House disgorged their quota of propaganda, vaunting the fiscal prudence of Obamacare, along with their wildly overblown pronouncements on the “healthcare crisis” in America.

All the while, the “elephant in the room”—the brazenly unconstitutional aspects of the bills—were ignored by those whose political interests coincided with passing Obamacare.

Now, the law firm of Hatch, Blackwell and Klukowski (in which Senator Orrin Hatch is a partner) has published an article in the *Wall Street Journal*: “Why the Health-Care Bills Are Unconstitutional” (January 2, 2010). These attorneys point out several aspects (paraphrased here) of the bills that are clearly unconstitutional.

#1. The Constitution does not give Congress the power to require that Americans purchase health insurance. For any legislation Congress passes, it must be able to point to at least one of its enumerated powers in the Constitution as the basis. None of those powers provide legal justification for an individual insurance mandate.

#2. The bill passed by the Senate involves deals that Harry Reid cut to “buy” votes of individual senators and the backing of pharmaceutical companies, unions, and other powerful entities. Some of those deals waive certain states’ obligations to contribute to the Medicaid program. This “selective spending”—bribery, in other words—runs afoul of the general welfare clause.

The latest outrage is that 87% of Americans who don’t belong to a union will have to foot the bill (if this passes) for a \$60 billion giveaway to union members. The Senate bill was financed in part by a 40% excise tax on high cost (“Cadillac”) insurance plans. The White House pushed this tax as one of their “cost-control” measures. Not surprisingly, Big Labor threw a fit, resulting in another of Harry Reid’s infamous closed-door sessions. This latest deal provides a special exemption from the Cadillac tax to any health plan that is part of a collective-bargaining agreement—i.e., *special exemptions for all workers who are unionized*. All others with high-end insurance plans will start paying the 40% tax in 2013, but union members will get a free pass until 2018 (or—we would bet—as long as the Democrats have the power to

extend it). The bottom line is, two workers, identical in all respects—wages, job, health plan—will be treated differently by the tax system, *based solely on union membership*.

This deal with union leaders follows a similar one in which Harry Reid exempted the 17 states in which health costs are highest, as well as longshoremen, construction workers, some farmers and an assortment of other special interest groups.

California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger commented mid-January that buying votes—as Reid, Pelosi and Obama have been doing—*is illegal in Sacramento*. Isn't it illegal everywhere in this country? Doesn't this fall into the category of bribing public officials?

#3. A third defect in this legislation is its mandate that states establish such things as benefit exchanges, which would require state legislation and regulations. If the states do not establish these exchanges, the Secretary of Health and Human Services threatens to do it for them, rendering states little more than subdivisions of the federal government.

In *New York v. United States* (1992) and *Printz v. United States* (1997), the Supreme Court struck down two laws on the grounds that the Constitution forbids the federal government from commandeering any branch of state government to administer a federal program.

America's founders invested the federal government with limited powers so that the states have an independent, sovereign place in our system of government. The Federal government can lawfully exercise only those powers granted to it—or those powers that are denied to the states. The states may do everything else. States may have authority to require individuals to purchase health insurance, but the federal government does not. States may require that individuals purchase car insurance before choosing to drive a car, but the federal government may not require all individuals to purchase health insurance.

Senator Hatch commented, “The Obama/Reid/Pelosi legislation to take control of the American health-care system is the most sweeping and intrusive federal program ever devised.”

Analysts, scholars and litigators are only beginning to examine the vast array of the issues that have been raised and will continue to be raised.

One thing we know: If the federal government can do *this* to us, then it can do *anything* to us.