

# silvy's ap gov't blog

THIS IS A FORUM FOR DISCUSSION AMONG AP GOVERNMENT & POLITICS STUDENTS IN MR. SILVERMAN'S CLASSES AT CORONADO HIGH SCHOOL. TOPICS/ARTICLES WILL BE POSTED TWICE DURING EACH 6-WEEK GRADING PERIOD, AND STUDENTS WILL BE REQUIRED TO RESPOND TO EACH TOPIC WITH AT LEAST TWO (2) COMMENTS. STUDENT COMMENTS CAN EITHER BE A RESPONSE DIRECTLY TO THE TOPIC/ARTICLE OR TO ANOTHER COMMENT POSTED BY A CLASSMATE.

Thursday, February 17, 2011

## Federalism & Health Care

Welcome to our 1st blog assignment of this new semester! Since we're just finishing up our work on Federalism, what the Federal Government has the power to do vs. State Governments, etc., I thought a perfect (although perhaps not terribly easy to understand) topic for this first assignment would be the controversial new **Health Care Reform** law that President Obama and the Congress enacted last year. As with many of the issues we mentioned in the past week (gun control, civil rights, gay marriage, even illegal immigration), for our purposes the debate isn't simply "**do we think what the law does is GOOD or BAD?**" (there are strong opinions on both sides of that when it comes to Health Care), but rather "**do we think it should be the FEDERAL Government who takes care of this or should it be up to the STATES?**"

For this assignment you will be looking at some information on a website as well as watching two different short video clips. Click on the title of the post above (**'Federalism & Health Care'**) to go to a website which presents some basic information about the issues involved in the Health Care debate, as well as some arguments for and against the law. Read through those 'pros and cons,' and I encourage you to watch some of the video clips or click on some of the PDF links, as well, for statistical data and other additional information. After looking at the pros and cons, consider the following questions:

- **Of all the arguments given on either side, with which one do you AGREE the most strongly? Why?**
- **Of all the arguments given on either side, with which one do you DISAGREE the most strongly? Why?**
- **I realize the Health Care bill is a very complex and confusing thing and you may not feel like you know a lot about it (I freely admit to not completely understanding it myself), but based on what you've read and what you've heard, what are your general thoughts about this law, or in a larger sense, about the role of the federal government in providing access to health care for its citizens?**

You're also going to watch a couple of **video clips** by clicking on the links below. The first is a Fox News interview with **Ken Cuccinelli, the Attorney General of Virginia** who, on behalf of his state, is suing the federal government over the health care law, claiming it is unconstitutional. The second clip is an MSNBC interview with **Thurbert Baker, the Attorney General of Georgia**, who completely disagrees with Mr. Cuccinelli and therefore is not taking part in the lawsuit being brought by several states against the federal government.

<http://video.foxbusiness.com/v/4300526/virginia-ag-on-health-care-lawsuit-ruling>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=inJq8kSumsA>

The main issue is the so-called "**individual mandate**," which requires that all Americans buy health insurance, just like how you're supposed to have auto insurance if you drive a car. There are other controversial parts of the law, but this is the provision that's getting the most attention; the question is: does Congress' power to "regulate commerce" include a power to regulate a "lack of commerce?" In other words, **can the government force a person to engage in commerce (buying insurance) if the person hasn't already done so?**

I realize that these and other legal points made in the interviews may be confusing, but I think several of the issues or concepts that were brought up should have sounded familiar, so let's keep the questions relatively simple

<http://silvysapgovernment.blogspot.com/2011/02/federalism-health-care.html>

## followers

## blog archive

- ▼ 2011 (4)
  - ▼ February (4)
    - [blog assignment #1](#)
    - [I agree with the fourth con, which states that it ...](#)
    - [After reviewing the 'pros and cons' list with resp...](#)
    - [Federalism & Health Care](#)
- ▶ 2010 (21)
- ▶ 2009 (12)

## contributors

[Melissa Lewis](#)  
[Griffin](#)  
[Corona](#)  
[hanky](#)  
[Gabby](#)  
[Sammy Hemp](#)  
[Michelle Pigott](#)  
[Will Burroughs](#)  
[Christina Stewart](#)  
[Austin](#)  
[Polo\\$tar'11](#)  
[Alex Bookout](#)  
[Helen Hejl](#)  
[krazykatie1993](#)  
[maddieblaire](#)  
[Meg Sweeney](#)  
[Dylan Peterson](#)  
[sally](#)  
[Rowena](#)  
[white.rabbit](#)  
[Cassandra.Fisher18](#)  
[Danielle](#)  
[Jaime G.](#)  
[Alex](#)  
[Dluc](#)  
[kittenmittens](#)  
[Dr. Ian Malcolm \(Sébastien\)](#)  
[Brandon \(Yves\) Shariffi](#)  
[Paulette](#)  
[Lauren](#)  
[Delaney Luna](#)  
[Liliane/Heather](#)  
[AngeloCueto](#)  
[Heather Rowan](#)  
[Taylor](#)  
[jenilee](#)  
[Tamara](#)  
[atoomey](#)  
[Lizz](#)

and straightforward:

- **What terms or concepts did you hear in either video clip that sounded familiar based on what we've been discussing in class for the past week or so?**
- **Who do you think made the better argument, Mr. Cuccinelli ("the law is unconstitutional") or Mr. Baker ("the law is constitutional")? Why do you say this?**

Your **TWO (2) comments** on this topic must be posted by **11:59 PM Pacific Time on Tuesday, February 22**. Your 1st post should simply be your responses to the questions I've posed after looking at the 'pros and cons' website and watching the videos. The 2nd post should be a response/agreement/disagreement to one of your classmates' comments. Please be sure that all your comments are appropriate and respectful; you can criticize someone else's ideas or arguments, but any sort of personal attacks will not be tolerated. **Good luck and have fun--I look forward to reading your comments! --Silvy :)**

Posted by sensorsilvy76 at 11:54 AM

### 135 comments:

 [maddieblaire](#) said...

I most strongly agreed with a argument in favor of the right to health care. The fifth argument on the list given in the article states that by providing health care to all U.S. citizens, Americans will be encouraged to get regular check ups and exams. The overall cost of these check ups would be less than if the patient waited until a serious injury or became chronically ill. Thus, health care costs would decrease. I felt this argument was quite logical. I most strongly disagreed with the argument against the right to health care that simply stated that many Americans do not take proper measures to manage their health. Although I agree that, to an extent, it is an individual's responsibility to manage their health, this does not serve as a basis for why all Americans should not be guaranteed the right to health care. It is almost like punishing a whole classroom due to one student's misbehavior. Many Americans do suffer from diseases or injuries that cannot be prevented. Therefore we should not assume that everyone should have personal responsibility for their state of health. I felt that both sides of the debate made logical arguments. However, I think that the federal government should either take full responsibility for nation wide health care, or it should be left completely up to our free market economy, with little government interference. After watching the clips of the Attorney Generals of Virginia and Georgia, I felt that Ken Cuccinelli made a stronger argument than Thurbert Baker. Whereas Thurbert Baker simply stated that after some research of the bill and the Constitution, he couldn't really find anything wrong with the individual mandate, Cuccinelli made stronger, more concrete arguments and even included points concerning "liberty." Thus he appealed more to the emotions of the audience. Within both clips I heard the Attorney Generals mention the commerce clause, the Arizona Immigration Law SB 1070 and Judge Bolton, and the supremacy clause.

[February 18, 2011 9:36 AM](#)

 [Cassandra.Fisher18](#) said...

Of all the arguments given on either side, I agree most with the fourth con which talked about how it is the individual's , not the government's, job to ensure personal health. You choose the way you live and what you eat. Your health comes from those decisions, but I do understand certain exceptions to this because some people have illness that is hereditary, and some that come unannounced. But for the most part, we choose the way we live and it isn't the government's job to take care of us if we brought unhealthiness upon us.

Of all the arguments given on either side, I disagree with the sixth pro which talked about if everyone had health care, then they will live longer and be able to contribute more economically. This specific pro reminds me of the Lopez vs Us court case dealing with the commerce clause. I feel like this is sort of just another forced excuse. It makes sense, but even with them living longer, this bill will make them pay

[brooke.bernardy](#)  
[ZEVILICIOUS](#)  
[dane](#)  
[sara strabala](#)  
[annamarie](#)  
[Russell James Case II](#)  
[sensorsilvy76](#)  
[Elizabeth](#)  
[Braydon](#)  
[Renée Élise](#)  
[Betsay](#)  
[Caleb](#)  
[Danielle Swanson](#)  
[Maia Feliu](#)  
[Lindsay](#)  
[nwilson](#)  
[Nicole](#)  
[Ali](#)  
[Andera](#)  
[brianne](#)  
[sdunseath](#)  
[Brett Layman](#)  
[dchelalama](#)  
[SR](#)  
[Bailey Goodwin](#)  
[Jason F](#)  
[Alec Oval](#)  
[UFO Today \(bryon\)](#)  
[Dorian Snyder](#)  
[yvonne wood](#)  
[Emily Stansell](#)  
[Madman of Zaun](#)  
[Ruben A. Perez-Berton](#)

for other's insurance, when they have been working their entire lives for it.

Overall, I am against the bill. I have grown up in a military family and have discussed this bill much with family and friends. I don't think it is fair to those who have to work their butts off for what ever amount of years, to gain great medical care through working, to have to pay for others that decided not to get a job, or not carry insurance. People get jobs to provide for their families and make sure they are cared for, but what makes it right for the federal government to promote this bill and make people who have worked hard, pay for those who haven't.

Another reason I don't like this bill is because I have also grown up with a mother who is a real estate broker, and her hard work and devotion to selling houses, is going to get cut off more pay because 3.2%, or something around there, is being cut to pay for this bill. I just don't like those who have worked hard get the short end of the stick with this bill.

The terms and concepts that sounded familiar during the video were the commerce clause, the taxing power of the Supreme Court, and how the ruling was that the federal government should't have the power to do this, but it should be the courts who decides the fate. Also, the New Deal was brought up, as well as federalism in general.

I think that Mr. Cuccinelli made a better argument compared to Mr. Baker because he brought up more valid points with how the system works, who has the power , and the clauses that will have to be looked at to see if this bill is unconstitutional or not. Mr. Baker, although he barely got a word in with the reporter, was relating back to the interstate commerce clause that gave more expansive powers, which he is using to defend himself. He is repeating the idea of this to show that Congress has the right to do what they are doing. Mr. Cuccinelli was proving how it needs to be looked over through various clauses and people to get the right decision.

[February 20, 2011 11:10 AM](#)

 [Braydon](#) said...

The argument I most strongly agree with is number four on the cons side: It is the individual's responsibility, not that of the government's, to ensure personal health. Diseases and health problems, such as obesity, cancer, stroke, and diabetes can often be prevented by individuals choosing to live healthier lifestyles. I agree with this because even with the governments duty to protect the citizens from a foreign threat, it is also, if not more importantly, the citizen's responsibility to protect themselves whenever possible. We know the risks involved with what we put into our bodies by the time that we truly need Health Care. I disagree most strongly with number seven on the pros side: Lacking health care can lead people to suffer from anxiety, depression, sickness, and stress, and other symptoms that affect not only individuals, but families and communities of that individual as well, because I cannot see a correlation between Health Care preventing any of these "symptoms" besides sickness. Almost every American suffers from stress, anxiety, or depression.

Some familiar terms from the clips were the commerce clause, the supremacy clause, and federalism in general. I think that Mr. Cuccinelli made the better argument because he had reviewed the bill, and made the arguments that it was simply wrong for the states to pass.

[February 20, 2011 1:29 PM](#)

 [brianne](#) said...

I agree most with the fourth and fifth con because I think that to some extent, being healthy is related to personal choices. Of course there are some instants of illness you can't prevent, however, there are also many that you can prevent. For example, you can chose to smoke which may lead you to suffer from lung cancer. So now, why should other people have to pay more taxes for someone's lung treatment when that person knew the risk they were taking when they smoked? Also, the government should not be able to force the people to be a consumer. This would take away from the idea of being a free market economy. I believe it would be better if rather than forcing people by law to buy health insurance, if instead to make it an incentive to buy it by lowering the costs. One way to make the insurance cheaper is to open more medical schools and therefore have more people studying to be doctors. This would make jobs of being a

doctor more competitive so their service costs would go down. Another way to lower costs would be to have insurance companies be national rather than individual state companies. This would allow someone to have one insurance company their whole life, even if they move, instead of having to switch policies costing them more money. The only way to allow this kind of policy though would be if buying health insurance was done personally rather than being regulated by an employer's policy. If the government could make health insurance cheaper, then more people would buy it because they chose to, not because the law forces them to. I disagree most (or think it is a weak argument) with the seventh pro because the way I'm interpreting it, is that people get stressed out and depressed if they don't have health insurance. Honestly, if it's that big of a deal that you don't have coverage, then that's a personal budgeting issue that you would need to manage yourself by handling your money in a way you feel more comfortable with. I think Mr. Baker's argument was weaker than Mr. Cuccinelli's because for the majority of his response he would only restate that he didn't see anything unconstitutional with the law. I think his argument would have been better if he had stated the argument of why the law may be seen as unconstitutional and then give his opinion as to prove why the law was constitutional. I think Mr. Cuccinelli's was stronger because he was able to answer questions that involved what was happening now and what possible outcomes could be. Terms and ideas I recognized were the issue of the federal government's power and the commerce clause.

[February 20, 2011 2:43 PM](#)



[white.rabbit](#) said...

CLOE MOCTEZUMA

Out of all the arguments listed on both sides, I, surprisingly, agree most with a point made on the 'Cons' side. The point that I agreed with most was the point that by making health care a part of the national budget, it will only be further spending, which will increase the federal deficit. Now, all other components of the deficit aside, I believe that the government should be doing everything within their power to reduce our national debt without worsening the conditions of the public by taking away programs that ensure safety. And yes, having a health care program would increase public safety, but I don't think our government should be spending money that they don't have. If we can't, they shouldn't. To me, that's the bottom line.

The argument that I most disagreed with was also on the 'Cons' list. I disagreed with the claim that an individual is wholly responsible for their health condition. I do not disagree because I think this is entirely false. In fact, I believe that a person is mostly responsible for their medical condition. However, there are illnesses that are simply genetic or that occur because of an unknown exposure to dangerous materials. Also, airborne and contact illnesses are almost unavoidable in everyday life. The factor of genetics and good old change are way too crucial in the final outcome of an individual's health for the anti-health care bill to be making this claim. Yes, people are responsible for treating their bodies kindly, but one's environment can cause an individual harm, sometimes without their knowledge.

I am very conflicted by my thoughts regarding health care reform. On one hand, I believe that the pharmaceutical companies are like well-oiled vending machines that steal your money. I think that they have too much power to price treatment drugs at any price they wish. They are the quintessential example of good intention poisoned by the sign of the dollar. It would be a lovely reality in which people could buy the drugs to care for themselves at reasonable prices. The idea that an individual wouldn't even have to worry about having the money to care for them-self makes me extremely happy. It feels just. However, on the other hand, I don't think that we can move forward until all parts of the system move forward. Increasing taxes and increasing the deficit by implementing this program before the country is fiscally prepared wouldn't be doing the American people justice. I don't think that we can get out of the hole only by digging deeper. I don't know if I would consider the health care bill constitutional or unconstitutional. To be honest, I feel that the interpretation could be either, but I'm no expert. I think that the founding fathers of this country intended for the words in the constitution to prevent the government from taking the lives of its citizens without an entirely justified cause. But of course, like everything else, interpretation shifts with the age. I don't believe that it was the Framers' intention for the government to

provide health for its citizens. But it's entirely possible that if they lived in these times, they would see fit for the health care bill to be passed. Anyway, I don't have a fully formed opinion on the bill, but I would definitely be in support of more pharmaceutical company regulations.

~ Sorry about the name. I created this account a long time ago and there wasn't an option for me to write my name. =[

[February 20, 2011 9:07 PM](#)



[white.rabbit](#) said...

[Sorry, I didn't realize that the two different sections of questions were supposed to be in the same comment!]

In the video clips, I recognized the terms "commerce/interstate commerce clause," "taxing power of the Supreme Court," "the New Deal," "federalism," "power of the federal government," "Constitution/constitutional," and "impeachable," "Congress," "the supremacy clause," and "Medicaid."

Although I respect the way that Mr. Baker handled his opinion, I almost was bored listening to him speak. He didn't really say what specifically in his research made him decide that the law wasn't unconstitutional. He just kept repeating himself and saying that it was within Congress' jurisdiction to deal with the health care bill because it was apropos to interstate commerce. Although I would tend to agree with his point of view, he didn't make a convincing argument. So overall, I'd have to say that I thought Mr. Cuccinelli better supported his opinion with hard evidence. He explained his opinion and provided scenarios to back them up.

[February 20, 2011 9:39 PM](#)



[Alex Bookout](#) said...

Out of all the pro's and con's, the idea that I agree with most is the idea that all Americans should have the right to health care as stated in all of the pro's. Most other developed countries are blessed with universal health care, and for all of America's stand out features, health care is not one of them. America co-owns the title of highest infant mortality rate with Hungary and Slovakia, and is 31st when it comes to life expectancy. Also, Americans are blessed with the concept of having "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" as stated in the Declaration of Independence. And with this health care bill, American's own the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness", because the right to health is beneficial to all three aspects of said phrase. Another pro for health care that I agree with is the idea that it promotes entrepreneurship. It does so by giving people who want to start their own business, health care, without the fear of not being able to afford it.

The argument on either side that I disagree with most is that "If health care is considered a right, then government bureaucrats will be making health, life, and death decisions that should be up to the patient and doctor to decide." This seems outlandish to me as does the argument that the quality of care provided will decrease. Doctors take their jobs knowing that they must supply aid to the best of their abilities. To suggest that their care would decrease because everyone would be available to it is a little ridiculous.

My general thought on this law is that it should be a right of all citizens to obtain health care. I believe that it would make the United States a healthier nation, and it would help cover people who couldn't afford it before. I believe that because the United States isn't a healthier nation based on the people's own care, that the Federal government should have a role in providing health care. Also, the idea that no one should be entitled to Health Care and that it is a material good, seems crazy to me. That goes against the idea of man's sovereign rights as a citizen of this country.

The terms and concepts that I recognized from both videos were the Commerce clause/interstate commerce clause, the Supremacy clause, the New Deal, the Civil Rights Act and Accommodation clause, and Mr. Cuccinelli briefly mentioned Judge Bolton's decision in Immigration law regards.

I agree more with Mr. Baker then I do Mr. Cuccinelli. Although Mr. Cuccinelli made some good points for why it is unconstitutional, I

believe that Mr. Baker's ground for being constitutional was more secure. I believe this because his arguments for the constitutionality of Health Care seemed to come from a more level grounded approach rather than Mr. Cuccinelli, who seemed to exercise his political beliefs more than anything.

[February 21, 2011 10:08 AM](#)

 [Meg Sweeney](#) said...

I think that this topic is a very important one in our country because, as stated in the article, the United States is one of the few out of all the developed countries that does not guarantee health coverage for its citizens. I agree most strongly with the 5th pro argument which basically states that we should have health care so that people can receive regular and preventive medical care and not wait until they are chronically sick to seek treatment when medical costs are higher. This makes a lot of sense because the costs of treating chronically ill patients are extremely high, and can somewhat be avoided if the person was able to receive treatment on a regular basis. When people have some access to health care, they live longer lives. Therefore, they can also contribute to society for a longer time. However, the health care provided on a regular basis should cover necessary appointments and procedures only.

The argument that I most strongly disagree with is the 7th con argument, which argues that providing a right to health care is bad for economic productivity because it is a form of charity, and distributing charity to society makes people lazy, decreases the incentive for people to strive for excellence, and inhibits productivity. I find this argument completely false. I think that people would work more and become less lazy if they know they are protected and have health care if something bad were to happen. The United States is often at the top when compared to other developed countries in economic categories. However, Americans have relatively poor health compared to people of these other nations. Americans who are healthy can contribute more to the economy and strive for excellence knowing that they will live longer with sufficient health care.

My thought is that health care should be a right of all American citizens. The videos mention that the interstate commerce clause can be broadly interpreted to make people buy health care. However, I feel that America is a country that should provide health care not only because it is mentioned in the Constitution, but also because it will reduce costs and contribute to a better economy as a whole. In the videos, they made use of the Supremacy Clause, the New Deal, and the SB1070 Arizona Immigration Law. I also think that we should take action on this issue soon because ignoring the problem does not aid the health care woes. Mr. Cuccinelli had a stronger argument by basing it on previous laws and incorporating looks for the future, saying it needs to be reviewed quite thoroughly in order to come to a conclusion.

[February 21, 2011 12:21 PM](#)

 [SR](#) said...

For me, it is very important that all Americans have access to health care. An issue that wasn't specifically mentioned, but is my main argument, is that it may help to prevent emergency room visits. My brother, Charlie, has a compromised immune system, and my family and I have spent quite a lot of time in the local Children's ER. Charlie has homecare nursing, so if we're forced to go to the hospital, he normally is extremely ill. Often, the kids preventing my brother from immediate medical attention are there because they lacked preventative care—for example, they had an infection and never got an antibiotic, so it now has escalated to critical condition, or a child with asthma needs to go to the ER because they cannot afford medication otherwise. In order to make the ER more efficient, it would be helpful to give people access to affordable preventative care via health insurance.

However, I don't necessarily believe it should be mandated. There are economic reasons where it is cheaper for some people to go without health care, especially if they are not at risk. I think that, like car insurance, it is a useful precaution to take, it is also not the governments place to enforce it.

Article I Section XIII of the Constitution, however, does state that, "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties,

Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States..." In essence, the government may provide for the "welfare" or health of its citizens. This duty of Congress makes it even more ethical that the government provide a source of healthcare to its citizens. Per above, the debate does entail "federalism," as mentioned in both clips. Does providing health care interfere with the states? I think that it is a parallel with the government's provision of education. The states have some control, but it is government mandated. If I were to construct my own bill, I believe that having the health care issue become a "concurrent" power would be the most Constitutional way of providing a service that would be unethical to forgo.

[February 21, 2011 3:05 PM](#)

 [brianne](#) said...

I agree with CJ in that the people who are working hard to provide for their families and therefore can afford insurance now have to pay towards others, too. Not to say that people who don't have coverage aren't working hard or anything, but maybe they just didn't plan well enough or manage their money in a way that they could provide insurance; it's hard to say though because every family's situation is unique.

Overall, I think that the government had the right idea at mind in trying to take care of the less fortunate; however, I don't think this law is the right way to do it because it also takes away from wealthier families, too. I also think the government shouldn't be able to force anyone into consumerism and that insurance should be an option. It would be better if the government could regulate health insurance companies more and reform them in a way so that they would be more available for the families that can't afford it. Looking at and changing the health insurance companies may lead to a solution that more people would see as fair. I am glad we are considering this issue and are trying to solve it, but I don't think this law is the best we can do. I think the government needs to look at more options before settling on this law.

[February 21, 2011 3:19 PM](#)

 [Dluc](#) said...

First of all I must say right off the bat that I am in favor of health care for every citizen of the country. I believe that when thirty some odd million people in a country do not have health care that it gets to a point where it really doesn't become the people's fault that they don't have it and it develops into a federal issue. The reasons why those people don't have health care could be vastly different going from person to person, however I am sure you would find the most likely reason is because the people simply can't afford it. Now, why is the health care so expensive to the point where these people can't afford it? And it is pretty easy to see that it was because of the privatization of the medical field. Now, I am not saying it should be forever free however, it is obvious we need the most basic of services more readily available to everyone.

So, the first reason why I am in favor of the bill, and the reason that is the strongest, is because we have so many people without health care. Whatever the reason may be the people need it to survive, and the government is supposed to provide for the needs of its people.

People say that people will begin to take riskier actions because they are given health care by the government. But why would they do this? People don't go out and want to hurt themselves they are still going to do what they normally do to stay safe. It will just be nice for them to have more options available in case they do get sick.

In the first video, from the attorney general of VA, we were told that it wasn't found unconstitutional but instead it was temporarily put on hold because of how huge it was. The A.G of Virginia wants to allow the states to decide on what they get to do, and they are hoping for even just one clause to be thrown out. This is because the fact that in this bill all the clauses are together, and are not considered separate like most bills. So, if they get one clause thrown out they are all gone.

I agree more with the Attorney State General of Georgia. He brought up the fact that the Interstate Commerce Clause is a huge clause that covers many different aspects and I think that is really what it will boil down to. Whether or not it is covered under that.

[February 21, 2011 4:07 PM](#)

 [Ali](#) said...

I agree with the con that health insurance is the responsibility of individuals. It shouldn't be the governments job to insure everyone has it. People make life decisions everyday and this is another one they have to make. If its important to them to get health insurance they should get it. I do however think it should be more affordable for families with lower incomes. All people also have different medical issues and everyone has different needs so determining how you deal with your health care depends on who you are. I also agree with the fact that the quality of health care could go down with more people receiving it.

I disagree with Pro #10 talking about how it will give equal opportunity to disadvantage people economically in our society. We need to look at why they are disadvantages because it could of been their lifestyle that made them unhealthy and the government should not be responsible because they decided not to take care of their body properly.

Health care will also put higher taxes on people and that's unfair to people already having health insurance and will our economy how it is right now I don't think that is the answer.

[February 21, 2011 5:34 PM](#)

 [Anastasia](#) said...

I didn't specifically look for which pro and con I liked I just wrote down the gist of it. One of the pros that I agreed with was that by opening health care up to all of the citizens of the U.S. it would combat the spread of diseases like the swine flu. If the shots to prevent the flu were open to everyone then the flu wouldn't be able to travel along because everyone would be vaccinated from it. Another point that I agreed with, on the con side though, was that it might spread doctors to thin. If people were coming in all the time for treatment doctors would have to be working a lot harder and they also wouldn't be as readily available. Patients with more severe injuries might have to wait longer as well because people with less intense injuries would already be with the doctor. I think that is a valid fear. Something that I did not agree with was a con saying that changing your lifestyle would be enough to help your health and prevent cancer and diabetes. In some cases that is true but in cases where the diseases are hereditary that is not true at all. Changing your lifestyle to one that is healthier will not make you immune to all diseases.

I really like this health care bill because I do believe that everyone should have an equal oppurtunity to health. I heard it mentioned that some of the citizens are complaining that they will have to pay for it but I think the costs will even out. I think that if the federal gov't doesn't open up the free health care to everyone in all the states it will hinder the states who do have open healthcare. Because then citizens from different states would be going to the free states and hurting the economy of the doctors in the states where you have to pay for healthcare. And if that happened then the federal gov't could claim the commerce clause and they would have to deal with it federally anyway.

Some of the terms that I heard mentioned in the videos that sounded familiar were interstate commerce, commerce clause, supremacy clause, appealate court, impeach, and taxing power.

I think that Mr. Baker made a better argument because it seemed like he had done more research and called into the conversation many examples and terms that supported his argument. He brought up examples and cited different areas that supported his argument. I think overall he did better.

[February 21, 2011 6:07 PM](#)

 [Cassandra.Fisher18](#) said...

Although I am against the bill, Alex Bookout made a very good statement of how our nation is very low in some aspects such as health care. I do agree with him with how America can work on this, I just think that this bill isn't the right way to do it. Everyone should have healthcare, I don't disagree with that, but I think that the government could find an alternative way to help others set up a medical system that doesn't effect people who have managed their lives accordingly.

[February 21, 2011 7:34 PM](#)

 [AngeloCueto](#) said...

I agree with the pro of the bill. It will definitely give equal chances of survival to people in poverty. A lot of people cannot afford the high priced health insurance which is needed in this country to get medical treatment. Accidents happen all the time and it's unfortunate when it happens to people who cannot afford to be treated medically. That shouldn't be the case, the government should pay for our medical treatments but should keep the medical field a private business. Our tax pays for it, but the medical field is still private. We should really not give our medical papers to the government. The people shouldn't have the responsibility to make sure that if struck by lightning they'll wish they hadn't been saved because if they were they wouldn't be able to afford it. Health Care is something everyone has a right to, no one should have to deal with having to make sure they can afford it. But doesn't really matter what we say there is a plan, on where it is heading and no vote will stop with what the Agenda has intended for us.

[February 21, 2011 7:58 PM](#)

 [Christina Stewart](#) said...

Universal Health care reform has been debated and rebutted throughout Congress since FDR proposed it in 1938 and now in 2011, President Obama is tackling this issue. The arguments for and against these are strong and as with most reforms presented to citizens of the United States there is going to be heavy debate and nice YouTube videos for students taking government to think about and agree or disagree with. Of all the arguments given on either side, I agreed most strongly with the opponents of the Universal Health care being a right because it presented the most non-speculative arguments for the reform. In the article Right to Health Care ProCon, I want to support my argument with the con side's #4 and #10, which state that it is the individuals responsibility and history has shown that health care as a right would lead to greater government deficits. I understand that #4 is a bold statement to make for this health care argument, but as we've seen around us and on TV there are heavier people and even shows like "The Biggest Loser" and "Heavy". I do believe that people can prevent most mainstream health problems by exercising, eating right, and not smoking and drinking to excessively.

Now, with the arguments that I disagreed with the most on the Con side was specifically #5 and #7. Ensuring that all Americans have the right to Health Care would not necessarily decrease health care costs because more people could go into the hospital for problems that they wouldn't necessarily go into if they had to pay for it themselves. The private institution of health care creates a sense of priority for medical cases. Plus The US already has the highest prostate and survival rates in a Concord study of the world. We do want a person to live the longest, which is the ideal goal. However, I do not believe that it should necessarily be a right, as stated in #1 of the Pro Right to Health Care. There is too much ambiguity for this goal.

Universal Health Care sounds good to everyone, but when you look at the big picture this goal is going to have too many different parts that will be hard to classify for the long-term. This somewhat parallels with the creation of the constitution when the framers were trying to create a constitution to cover everything. There is always going to be "loose" constructionists and "strict" constructionists. The pro rights to health care arguments are more of a loose constructionists and the con right to health care arguments are more of a strict constructionists. In this day and age, I believe that the federal government should learn from the history of this universal health care in different countries and take a more strict approach. The federal government should work on the other problems the country has such as the \$14,140,479,138,989.70 deficit, and then try to create a more reasonable approach to health

care.

The terms and concepts that sounded familiar in both of the video clips were commerce clause, impeach, the conflict between the federal government and the state governments, the Civil Rights Act, the supremacy clause, and federalism. I think that Mr. Baker ("the law is constitutional") made the better argument in the interview because he made good points such as the Congress having the power to pass important laws like this, as they have done in the past. He was confident in spite of the governor trying to impeach him. He did a good job overall and the debate was efficient and interesting on both sides.

[February 21, 2011 7:59 PM](#)

 [Christina Stewart](#) said...

I have to agree with Casandra Fisher with her comment about people working hard and getting quality health care insurance, while others who might work decently get the same quality of health care for free, under this bill. It sounds very barbaric and almost dog eat dog like but I believe there should be a level of competition and one's individual responsibility to keep healthy and stay active in both the work force and their own life. I also discussed this bill with some members of the armed forces and one pointed out that for a dental treatment (crowns) it would take a waiting time for three months. I understand this isn't necessarily an urgent medical treatment, but if this was the case for people who need procedures done in America there would probably be a long waiting period too as mentioned in Con #6. It has been proven in the past and the future in countries such as Canada and the UK. Universal Health Care is not the solution to our problems.

[February 21, 2011 8:15 PM](#)

 [Liliane/Heather](#) said...

FIRST SET OF QUESTIONS:

\* Of the arguments, I most strongly agree with #11 on the pro side ("Health care services are crucial to the functioning of a community, just like trash and water services, and should therefore be guaranteed like these services are to all Americans")--it is a genuinely convincing and interesting argument. Why is it that the government will regulate the cleanliness and beautification of our cities and states but not provide for the health of its people?

\* The argument I most disagree with, however, is #1 also on the pro side ("All Americans should have a right to health care because the Declaration of Independence states that all men have the unalienable right to 'Life,' which entails having the health care needed to preserve life")--since when do we count the statements put forth in the Declaration of Independence as law? Unless the same argument can be made in relation to the Constitution, this argument doesn't hold much weight legally.

\* Personally, I find it surprising/amusing that so many Americans seem to have such a deep-rooted fear and distaste for socialism. What's so terrible about socialism, truly? Many highly successful nations with very satisfied citizens are socialist or socialist-leaning nations (Sweden, anyone?). Aside from this, however, it seems to me that the ideas behind the bill seem to be sound, though I have not attempted to weed through the nitty-gritty, of course. The idea that a government should help to ensure the health and prosperity of its citizens seems highly logical to me and I find it surprising that the existing system, which is clearly flawed as the statistics support, should be so highly lauded despite its shortcomings. If the current system (not federally controlled) has not been successful, why not try a system with more federal involvement?

SECOND SET OF QUESTIONS:

\* Attorney General Cuccinelli's mention of Johnathan Turley's quote about federalism obviously sticks out ("If the states lose this case, it's the end of federalism as we've known it for 220 years"), as does the mention of the Interstate Commerce clause and the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution in the second video

\* It is my opinion that Attorney General Baker made the more compelling argument--his reasoning was clear and he seemed logical and relatively unemotional. Attorney General Cuccinelli's description of the bill as an attempt by the federal government to regulate inactivity seems a little misleading and his discussion was more based on the structure of the bill (lack of severability clause) than its unconstitutionality.

[February 21, 2011 8:29 PM](#)

 [Liliane/Heather](#) said...

In response to Braydon's opinion of the pros and cons, I feel the need to disagree with his disagreement with Pro #7. Though I do think that this point was worded a little strangely and/or vaguely, Braydon's assertion that anxiety, depression, and stress cannot stem from a lack of health care is a little shaky.

I would imagine that waking up every day worried that you or your family might become sick but won't be able to afford to visit a hospital because you and your spouse both work minimum wage (think of the movie "30 Days: Minimum Wage" from Econ) would be extremely stressful! I'm getting a little anxious just thinking about it. =) Even though health care can only "cure" sickness, the lack of it can definitely cause anxiety, depression, or stress.

[February 21, 2011 8:42 PM](#)

 [Meg Sweeney](#) said...

I agree with Christina in that the government should learn from other countries and take a more strict approach when it comes to dealing with the health care issue. I also agree with Ali on that fact that everyone has different health issues, so health care should be made affordable depending on the circumstances. The people who can afford health care shouldn't have to pay large sums of money in taxes to help others who could not adequately take care of themselves. Therefore, Universal Health Care is not the answer but there should be some amends made so that it is more affordable and the US deficit does not increase.

[February 21, 2011 8:49 PM](#)

 [Russell James Case II](#) said...

Before I answer any of the set questions, there is something I need to discuss that I can't believe hasn't been discussed already and I'm surprised there isn't a question concerning it. You see, I consider myself a member of the hard left. I flip between msnbc and cnn almost the whole time I'm watching television. I cannot believe I missed such a disturbing event on msnbc. No, I'm not talking about the way Mr. Baker's eyes and pseudo charming smile seemed to peer directly into one's own soul. It is something that I could not ignore during the video and based on my experience since (I watched that one first, of course), will not leave my mind's eye for years to come. I am talking, of course, about two simple words. Words, that, by themselves, are harmless and innocent, but together, will wreck havoc on one's soul. I refer to, of course....

Georgia  
(Im)peach

Msnbc, you should be ashamed of yourself. After seventy five years of reliable left-wing journalism, you flush it down the toilet with this filth. What was it? Were ratings down? Did you think you could win hot, new viewers with this garbage? I don't want to know. Msnbc, you have lost yourself a long time viewer and fan, and it will take a lot to win me back. From now on, I am a loyal cnn viewer, and I don't even know if I can trust them, either. They've only been around for about seventy two years! This has made me rethink my life, my priorities and my beliefs. I don't know what to do with myself anymore, and I don't know who I can trust to shovel me over the face with what I'm supposed to think.

As to the original question: Yes.

[February 21, 2011 9:25 PM](#)

 [Russell James Case II](#) said...

After once again reading the comments and, god help me, watching the videos again, I have to say something. Angelo, if you can't do the time, don't do the crime. That is all.

[February 21, 2011 9:27 PM](#)

 [Maia Feliu](#) said...

Of all the arguments presented on both sides of the issue, the idea that I most agree with is that health care should be considered a right for every American citizen. Having grown up in Spain where a universal healthcare system is present, I have always felt that no citizen should be denied the medical treatments that they need. Although there are individuals who have indeed contributed to the demise of their own medical conditions, I do not believe that other citizens who are victims of chance should be denied the best possible treatment that can be made available to them. Also, I think that one of the most important provisions of the health care bill is that coverage will be extended to everyone. Right now, health care costs are unaffordable, especially for individuals who are faced with terminal or potentially terminal illnesses. I feel that these Americans should not have to face the decision of whether to go bankrupt to pay for their treatment, or to live in constant pain.

The argument that I disagreed with the most was that guaranteeing health care to all Americans would lead to a "moral hazard". In my opinion, this statement seems to be grasping at straws. People will always partake in risky behavior, and people are always going to get hurt. However, I think that this type of behavior has more to do with the attitude of an individual, and not whether they have health care coverage. I do not believe that knowing that an individual has health care coverage is going to dramatically alter their lifestyle and urge them to suddenly start seeking out life-threatening situations. In my mind, that argument simply does not make sense.

My general thought on this issue is that health care should be provided, or at least made to be more affordable, for every American citizen. Although I am not well acquainted with the intricacies of the health care bill, I truly believe in the concept of preventative medicine. Because many Americans are not covered by any form of health care, they often delay going to the hospital when something is bothering them, simply because they do not have the financial resources to pay for a visit to the hospital. It is rare that a medical ailment will go away if left alone. More likely, these individuals will find themselves in the emergency room later, because their minor ache or bother has escalated into a full-blown medical condition. If they had seen a doctor sooner, the problem might have been detected, and the \$300-\$400 price tag on a trip to the ER could have been avoided. In my opinion, it is more economically efficient to provide Americans with preventative measures by making personal consultations with doctors more accessible and affordable. To do this, at least some type of health care reform is essential, whether it be what is proposed in the Obama health care bill or not.

The terms and concepts that I recognized in both videos were the Supremacy clause, the Civil Rights Act, the Commerce/ Interstate Commerce clause, the New Deal, the concept of impeachment, and a reference to Judge Bolton and the Arizona Immigration law.

In my opinion, Mr. Baker made the more compelling argument. Although Mr. Cuccinelli made various valid points about why he disagrees with the law, he seemed to be largely appealing to the emotional side of the audience. In stating how this law would "change the entire concept of federalism" and how it is "a threat to liberty", he relied on dramatic statements that overshadowed his real argument. Mr. Baker's composure and level-headedness seemed to be more effective to me. He calmly and rationally explained why he believes the law is constitutional under the Interstate Commerce clause.

[February 21, 2011 9:49 PM](#)

 [SR](#) said...

Multiple comments above address the idea that some people don't deserve equal health care because they put themselves into a risky situation. I believe that sometimes this can't be avoided

(hereditary/child of parent with poor habits/impoverished), although it clearly can be an issue in some cases. Perhaps the bill should be structured on a sliding scale: For non-essential medical expenses (plastic surgery, teeth whitening, etc) you must purchase your own health insurance. For surgery and ER visits you can buy into a cheap nation-wide plan. For basic check ups/cold meds everyone is covered. Then simple health problems can be cured before they cost the system more money, but people are still encouraged to work/pay for the larger expenses and the wait time won't be as long.

[February 21, 2011 10:18 PM](#)

 [jenilee](#) said...

I find myself agreeing most with number 4 on the cons list that states "it is the individual's responsibility, not that of the government's, to ensure personal health". The government could do all that they can to provide the opportunity for the best healthcare, but they can only do so much. I do think residents of the US should be open to working with the government by engaging in a healthy lifestyle when a benefit like this is provided. I don't see how the government would directly end up making health decisions, as stated in number 11 on the cons list. Perhaps I need to be given a specific situation or am biased by my support, but I think that universal health care would ultimately give people the freedom of choosing the best medical treatment with little to no financial hassle in return. Overall, I am in favor of a health care reform because of the economic benefits. I realize that it would effect much more of our lives than our wallet as well, and I am weary of this too. But I am optimistic.

I recognized the mentions of the commerce clause, federal level of control, ruling parts of a bill as unconstitutional, federalism, a parallel with the Civil Rights Act, and the supremacy clause in the video clips. Mr. Baker's arguments seemed more solid to me than Mr. Cuccinelli's. Although Mr. Cuccinelli provided some factual support of his views, Mr. Baker brought up points that I saw as less debatable and more open to agreement from anyone on either side.

[February 21, 2011 10:27 PM](#)

 [Lindsay](#) said...

I agree completely with maddyblaire. If we based all of our decisions based on the minority few who don't fit the standard then we would be harming the majority who deserve healthcare. In Economics we watched 30 Days on Minimum Wage and during that time the main characters had to go to the hospital. They put it off and when they finally went their bill was way more then they could afford. The price of their hospital bills would have pushed them far into debt if they hadn't only been working on minimum wage for 30 days. If we had had open health care to everyone like Canada has then those who have to try to survive on minimum wage, or a middle class income, will have a better chance of doing so. They won't be afraid of going to the hospital when they are hurt and will therefore be able to work better. I agree with the health care bill because I think it will help those on low incomes with their bills.

[February 21, 2011 10:51 PM](#)

 [Helen Hejl](#) said...

The argument I would mostly agree with would be number 8 of the pro column. Health care in the US is very expensive and can be a huge blow to families finances. If this health care plan has the ability to lessen the cost of doctors visits, or hospital and surgery bills, then I'm for it. The argument I would mostly disagree with would be number 13 of the con column. It should be considered that this health care plan would either add to the nation's debt or increase taxes. And that the federal government has to decide between increasing debt for the American people and access to health care for all its citizens. But I don't see how putting money as a priority over the health of American citizens is beneficial to America. It just seems to me that people pay their taxes, they live here, but when they are in need, its a struggle to get proper health care from insurance companies. And that the government is very happy to receive revenue from it's people but now with the resistance to this health care plan, it seems that they are

very hesitant to give back to its citizens.

I recognized the interstate commerce clause mentioned in the interview with Mr. Baker.

I think Mr. Baker made the better argument that the law is constitutional, because he had done plenty of research on the Constitution and was acting in the best interests of the people to not waste tax dollars investigating and debating and trying to declare the law unconstitutional.

[February 21, 2011 11:14 PM](#)

 [Braydon](#) said...

In response to Lindsay's comment: "I agree with the health care bill because I think it will help those on low incomes with their bills." I agree. My only issue with that statement is if the United States is capable of supporting those people who need the support with our current debt. If we shove more money towards spending, we will continue to dig a deeper and deeper hole, so to speak. And what happens when Health Care for everyone can absolutely no longer be afforded? If it could be done with fewer repercussions to our financial stability, then I would support it, until then, I can't

[February 21, 2011 11:28 PM](#)

 [Alec Oval](#) said...

The argument that I most agree with is the pro's argument that people should not have to choose between financial ruin and medical treatments. Medical services can be extremely expensive and can take a toll on those who do not earn much money. In the "30 Days on Minimum Wage" video we watched in Econ, the couple's medical expenses were very high, and they were already pinching pennies before then. Had they continued living on minimum wage, they would have had to make even more sacrifices to pay off their medical bills. No one should have to choose between health and economic security.

The argument that I most disagree with is the con's argument that providing health care will cause people to become lazy and will inhibit productivity. I understand how this argument could relate to other issues such as food stamps, but, regarding health care, I do not think it is applicable. People will not become lazy or unproductive simply because they have been given health care. If anything, providing health care will increase productivity by creating a healthier workforce.

Overall, I support the law. I believe that everyone should have an equal opportunity to health. I also think that providing health care for everyone will help create a healthier and more productive nation. Regarding the federal government's role in this issue, I believe the federal government should provide health care to all Americans because everyone has the right to health care.

Some terms or concepts that I recognized in the videos include the commerce clause, the SB1070 Arizona Immigration Law, FDR's New Deal, the Civil Rights Bill, appellate courts, and the supremacy clause.

I believe that Mr. Baker made a better argument than Mr. Cuccinelli. Mr. Baker supported his idea that the health care law is constitutional with many examples of federal government powers, such as the commerce clause and the supremacy clause. Mr. Cuccinelli appeared to be relying on invoking an emotional response, as opposed to providing logical evidence.

[February 21, 2011 11:28 PM](#)



[UFO Today](#) said...

We are...what we eat. Now of course I am being metaphorical, for I am not saying that if one were to consume a Domino's™ Pizza he would become a Domino's™ Pizza, that's just ridiculous. It is no laughing matter though, for more and more people each year "pig out" on heart stopping, artery clogging, gut bursting amounts of what we in America like to call.....food. This "food" leaves not thousands, not hundreds of thousands, but MILLIONS of people in such bad condition that they need mucho mucho medical attention to survive! And catch

this, they feel like it is not their fault when the health insurance companies say not yes, but NO to insuring them! It is now that I finally understand the saying "You can't have your cake.....and eat it too". So now you may understand why I am CON to the right to Health Care. I CONcur that I may have CONveyed myself as CONceded, but I have CONceived the CONcepts that CONCern the CONCise CONDitions that CONDemn those to the CONDors who CONFide in CONsciously CONgesting themselves without CONsidering the CONsequences. i.e (If we give them free health care, they won't ever think twice about it). So I hope you see where I am coming from, I hope I didn't CONFuse you at all, but it's all for the greater good really. See ya later!

[February 21, 2011 11:35 PM](#)



[UFO Today \(bryon\)](#) said...

This is a response to Alex Bookout. You had some okay points, but maybe you should break a "book out" and do some more research, because it's "all ex"plained in the text.

[February 21, 2011 11:44 PM](#)

 [Alec Oval](#) said...

I agree with Cloe's idea regarding the argument that individuals are responsible for their own health. There are circumstances in which an individual caused their own health problems, but there are also circumstances in which the individual had no control over their health problems. The con argument states that the government should not be responsible for people's medical conditions because many of them could have been avoided by "individuals choosing to live healthier lifestyles." However, there are many diseases or ailments that cannot be avoided this way. Therefore, it should not be solely the individual's responsibility.

[February 21, 2011 11:57 PM](#)

 [krazykatie1993](#) said...

Of all the arguments given from both sides, I agree mainly with the idea of providing free health care to every citizen in the United States. I completely disagree with the statement that people should find a way on their own for health insurance, because some people arent as lucky or have as many opportunities as others, and cannot just pull money out from the money tree in their backyard.

Yes, "everyone" in America has equal opportunity, but really, open your eyes and look around at all the homeless, sick, and dying people of this nation, and tell me you have no sympathy or desire to help stop this selfishness. I understand the point that it is not in the Constitution or the Bill of Rights to grant anyone health insurance, so that is a legit point. So then this would be considered a State decision, considering they run the decisions on peoples morals and everyday lives.

The States should then all allow free health care, or the Federal government should use a categorical grant, or a condition of aid. With this they could possibly get the states to provide health care for all their citizens. I consider it extremely ignorant and cold hearted to say "whatever, it's their own fault they dont get insurance, or dont have it". When really you should be asking yourself what if it was you, or someone you cared about without health insurance who was dying or extremely ill. Then would you want there to be free health care? People need to take their heads out of their own selfish egos, and think of the people in their country who need help.

[February 22, 2011 10:53 AM](#)

 [krazykatie1993](#) said...

I would disagree with Jenilee's comment, because i think the simple fact is to then have the State governments provide health care for their citizens. As you can see, we are one of the only countries to not provide health care for out citizens; what is that saying to us? We are too concerned with our own benefits and our own welfare, to even recognize the pain and suffering that goes on in this country, because an uninsured person cant go to the hospital to treat a simple cough

without being charged thousands of dollars.

We cannot sit back and watch people of this country slowly die off, because of our own greed. A question to ask yourself would be "what if it was you sick, or someone you loved sick? What would you want then?"

[February 22, 2011 10:58 AM](#)

 [Will Burroughs](#) said...

I don't really think that the argument is even remotely about the question of do I believe everyone should have medical care. Hopefully no one is against a health care system that can supply everyone with good and safe medical care. The real issue lies in whether the health care system can be carried out affectively, for even the consideration of an obstacle like this to be true you need to take the business out of the health care system. No big business is going to want to stop making money from health care. Yes either side can argue that they have the right interpretation of the constitution in the end it will be decided by a court case. The main issue is the republicans don't want to see their precious money go into something that might possibly end in failure and can easily be profitable in the private sector. Profitable by the exploitation of many for the financial gain of the few. While the democrats are trying to push through with a program that realistically is going to be so hard to put in place and could be vastly easier to structure on a small scale for individual states or counties. If a realistically priced system were to be put in place where the people were not overtaxed and the system did not get sent into a spiral of debt it would be a monumental step in American history. The points on both sides are easily understood from the varying points of view. The democrats believe everybody should be entitled to healthcare as a citizen of the United States. While the republicans are just like bruh I am just really not trying to pay for all these people to get free health care.

But yes you might say on what level can we judge someone's worthiness of health care, for example should someone who has spent the last 10 years of their life eating themselves into a nonmobile position should they be entitled to health care. Would self endangerment be a crime since in theory when putting yourself in danger in a situation where you would need to go to a hospital due to a health issue that was your own fault, is that just the same as stealing money from the govt. If the person isn't contributing to taxes then is he cheating his way through the system? It's an argument that each side can become very confident in their point of view so each side believes they are truly correct. The only way I see this system coming into place is on a small scale where money is given to states then broken down to lower levels where hospitals can provide for a smaller group of people on a large scale.

[February 22, 2011 11:10 AM](#)

 [Will Burroughs](#) said...

*This post has been removed by the author.*

[February 22, 2011 11:19 AM](#)

 [Will Burroughs](#) said...

I think that Cristina is saying some really real stuff when it comes down to the exploitation of a system of this type would encounter. Pretty difficult to try and stop millions of people from abusing a system.

[February 22, 2011 11:22 AM](#)



[Sammy Hemp](#) said...

So much money goes into the medical system that a lot of people don't realize. Growing up with a surgeon as a father, I've learned a lot about how a hospital works and about what is needed to do certain things, such as harvesting and artery.

I do believe, however, that everyone should have some sort of health care. It should not come down to whether or not one can afford to go to the doctor to get a valve replaced, because that is something that will need to happen just for that person to live. You shouldn't have to pay astronomical amounts of money to save yourself. You should be

getting as much help as possible. On the flipside, though, surgery is expensive. And if you aren't paying for it, then who is? Every time surgery is performed, they need new instruments, gloves, masks, anesthesia, and other various things that aren't cheap. Taxes would be a lot higher to pay for everything that everyone is having done to them.

Although I believe that one should not be denied healthcare, I do not think that people should be forced to get it either. I feel it's a personal right as to whether or not you want healthcare. And I don't think that people should have to fight to get the best healthcare possible.

[February 22, 2011 11:45 AM](#)



[Sammy Hemp](#) said...

In response to CJ Fisher:

"I don't think it is fair to those who have to work their butts off for what ever amount of years, to gain great medical care through working, to have to pay for others that decided not to get a job, or not carry insurance. People get jobs to provide for their families and make sure they are cared for, but what makes it right for the federal government to promote this bill and make people who have worked hard, pay for those who haven't."

I mostly agree with this statement above. Plus, if someone was choosing NOT to have healthcare, why would we want to pay even more money for someone who doesn't want it? Healthcare in general is expensive enough as it is.

[February 22, 2011 11:48 AM](#)



[Emily Stansell](#) said...

Of the arguments given for both sides, I think I would choose to not make health care a right for everyone. I believe that the strongest argument against health care is that it is an individual's responsibility to maintain their own health. It's not up to the government to control and observe every single person in the United States; as the article stated, ensured health care would lower the quality and availability and I think that would be unfair to the people who work hard enough to have higher health care. I disagree with the pro that states that people without health care will suffer from stress, sickness, anxiety, etc. because each person has the choice to make better lifestyles, and if they made a bad decision it shouldn't be up to the government to pull them out. I think passing this law is meant to do good because every country wants to provide the very best for their citizens, but I don't think it should be a forced law, especially when the economy is suffering already (like ours).

[February 22, 2011 3:01 PM](#)



[Emily Stansell](#) said...

In response to CJ Fisher and Sammy Hemp, they bring up good points that if there are people out there who don't even want health care, we shouldn't be spending OUR hard-earned money in the economy to go to waste. It goes back to decision making as well; I don't think someone should complain about their lack of health care if they made poor life choices in the first place.

[February 22, 2011 3:04 PM](#)



[Bailey Goodwin](#) said...

I agree the most with the pro point 8. "Health care costs are unaffordable and bankrupting Americans. In 2007, 62.1% of all US bankruptcies were related to medical expenses and 78% of these bankruptcies were filed by people who had medical insurance". This should not be the case. People should not be bankrupt because of medical bills. People should be able to have access to affordable health care. No one should have to give up anything because they are ill or hurt. I disagree the most with the con points 1. "Health care should not be a right because it is inconsistent with the Declaration of Independence, which guarantees the right to "pursue" happiness, not the right to happiness or free medical services." The Declaration of

Independence is not the law of the land and the bill is not about free health care, it is about everyone having access to affordable health services. I agree with the health care bill. I do not understand why people are so resistant to the federal government running our health care. It gives everyone an equal opportunity for treatment, and it relieves stress to those who could not afford health care. "Since 2000, health insurance premiums have risen three times faster than wages." We are one of the few developed countries that does not have nationwide health care. I think our government should be in a major factor in providing for our health care. In the videos the concept that sounded the most familiar was the commerce clause and how much power the federal government should and does have. I think Mr. Baker made the better argument. As he said since 1937 the U.S. has been clear that congress has a very expansive power with the commerce clause, therefore making the bill constitutional. Yes there are debates on other issues related with this bill political and economical, but it is constitutional.

[February 22, 2011 4:15 PM](#)

 [Bailey Goodwin](#) said...

I disagree with Braydons argument to con number 4. "It is the individual's responsibility, not that of the government's, to ensure personal health. Diseases and health problems, such as obesity, cancer, stroke, and diabetes can often be prevented by individuals choosing to live healthier lifestyles." Yes some people could live healthier lives but not all of these things are preventable and someone should not be denied treatment because they cannot afford it. Also if someone is ill because of their choices, does that mean they should not get treatment at all? That's what the health care bill is about. Providing health care accessible to everyone and having everyone contribute. Also with the health care bill people can go in for more regular check ups and try and prevent these things from happening.

[February 22, 2011 4:20 PM](#)

 [sally](#) said...

I most strongly agree that the right to health care should be measured as a civil right. The Preamble of the U.S. Constitution states the purpose to "promote the general welfare" of people, so citizens should have the right to health care, just like all Americans have a right to an education. Not only that, but I also agree that people should not be discriminated against for being ill. No one should have to go through the heartache of deciding between financial ruins or staying alive.

I disagree with this statement: "no one should be entitled to health care because it is a service and a material good that a person must pay for to obtain." To me, this makes health sound like a luxury. I do not believe that people who can afford health care should be the only people who can obtain health care. I don't think that it is fair to the people who cannot afford it.

In general, I believe that everyone should have the right and opportunity to get the health care that they want and wish to receive. Health is incredibly important and crucial in everyone's lives. I believe that all Americans should have the right to health care. The United States is one of very few nations in the world that does not guarantee health coverage.

Some terms and concepts that sounded familiar were the commerce clause, the New Deal, federalism, and the interstate commerce clause.

In my opinion, I think that Mr. Baker had a more convincing argument because he stated the Constitution, the commerce clause, and the supremacy clause.

[February 22, 2011 4:22 PM](#)

 [Maia Feliu](#) said...

I definitely agree with Bailey. Health care costs should not be bankrupting families who are in desperate need of quality medical care. It seems almost immoral to charge such ludicrous amounts when

individuals are genuinely sick. I do not think health care should be considered a "luxury good". Whether or not I agree with every aspect of the health care reform bill, I definitely think that every American citizen should have access to affordable health care.

[February 22, 2011 4:26 PM](#)

 [Polo\\$tar'11](#) said...

most strongly agreed with the argument for healthcare which stated that it is the job of the US government to promote the general welfare of its people. What better way to promote the general welfare of an entire nation of people than to provide healthcare. Health is one of the most basic aspects of life and if the government has the power to assist in providing in ways that are more affordable than from the private sector, then it should become law. Too many people in this country cannot afford healthcare or don't see the benefits as outweighing the costs. I feel that the government should take steps not to completely control healthcare, but to simply make it accessible to more people which would in turn lower the costs since patients wouldn't wait until a serious condition arose to see a doctor. I most strongly disagreed with the anti-healthcare argument that illness and disease are brought upon oneself and therefore, you should pay for your own healthcare. While it may be true that certain diseases like diabetes are caused by eating and exercise habits, I think a huge majority are related to aging and the general way of life that modern society provides. I don't think it's fair to people such as elderly cancer patients to simply say that their predicament is a result of an unhealthy life, and that healthcare won't be provided. However, I do think regulations should be in place to prevent people like the obese diabetes patient from taking advantage of tax payer dollars to pay for a condition that really was brought on his own.

In terms of whether or not the federal government should be able to regulate the healthcare system, I believe they should be able to. I think Mr. Cuccinelli had a stronger argument than Mr. Baker who never offered a strong basis or any specifics about his research on the healthcare bill with which to say that the law was NOT UNconstitutional. He only stated that Healthcare could be related to interstate commerce and that it was therefore an issue that Congress had the power to regulate over.

My overall thoughts are that it should be a right of all people as included in the pursuit of life and general wealthfare. Congress and the federal government have constitutional backing to regulate and pass the laws. Not only is it legal, but costs would be reduced and money would not be flowing out of consumers pockets into the hands of pharmaceutical and insurance companies.

i think this shows the "control/corruption" of corporate controlled healthcare.....

Insight Journal:

Celebrex 100 mg

Consumer price (100 tablets): \$130.27

Cost of general active ingredients: \$0.60

Percent markup: 21,712%

Claritin 10 mg

Consumer Price (100 tablets): \$215.17

Cost of general active ingredients: \$0.71

Percent markup: 30,306%

Keflex 250 mg

Consumer Price (100 tablets): \$157.39

Cost of general active ingredients: \$1.88

Percent markup: 8,372%

[February 22, 2011 4:36 PM](#)

 [Polo\\$tar'11](#) said...

in response to Willberto's post, I think he made a good point that most countries aren't the size of the US and providing healthcare through a single, federally run entity for millions of people is a logistical nightmare. Most countries aren't even the size of a single US state, which makes the organization of a healthcare department much

more streamlined and easy to manage. He said that lending money to states, but ultimately leaving the federal government in control and with the power to regulate the system is the only way to do it. I agree that this will allow for more adaptive responses by local and state healthcare providers and allow them to give specific treatment for the conditions they see the most of. A problem that this might encounter would be how much power to regulate would the federal government have and how much would be state reserved.

[February 22, 2011 4:42 PM](#)

 [sally](#) said...

I agree with Bailey Goodwin that people should not become bankrupt because of medical bills. 62.1% of all United States bankruptcies should not have been related to medical expenses, and people who had medical insurance should not have filed 78% of these bankruptcies. I also agree with Helen Hejl: "I don't see how putting money as a priority over the health of American citizens is beneficial to America". The government should not have to decide between increasing debt for the people and accessing health care for everyone.

[February 22, 2011 5:06 PM](#)

 [Jason F](#) said...

To start off I am in favor of universal health care for all but not necessarily in favor of this bill. Now after reading each of the pros and cons I feel that of all the arguments on either side of the health care bill, the one I actually disagree with is the seventh pro that an individual can suffer from anxiety, sickness, or stress because the government can't prevent that in any individual and if they are suffering from it then the individual should be able to obtain their own health care. Now health care should be cheaper but you can't actually use that as an argument to justify this bill. Also, I didn't feel that the first con and the first pro about the declaration of independence were justifiable either because it just wasn't a valid way to prove a point since it is all about how you interpret the words that were written. Now the one that I agree with the most is the fourth con which states that American citizens should have to take care of themselves because obesity, cancer, and some other diseases like that can be prevented by living a healthier lifestyle. However, I feel the government should make it easier to get access to health but this health care bill isn't quite what they needed because it has too many flaws to it. I believe that Mr. Cuccinelli made a better argument than Mr. Baker did because he gave more thorough reasons as to make the viewer more convinced with his argument, however I feel Mr. Baker had valid opinions but he just wasn't able to convey as well as to why the law would be constitutional and didn't say enough about his research. Some familiar terms I heard were the Supremacy Clause, Commerce Clause, and the New Deal.

[February 22, 2011 5:29 PM](#)

 [Andera](#) said...

I think that the right to healthcare in the U.S is an argument that should have been discussed and settled on long ago, mainly due to the fact that our country behind as it is one of the very few wealthy, developed nations that doesn't guarantee health coverage. I can think of a lot of specific examples that argue both sides of the debate, but the health coverage bill is aimed toward the general public, not specific people with specific circumstances. So after reading the pros and cons, I decided that all Americans should be entitled to health care. Although both sides make effective arguments, I mostly disagree with number 7 on the Con side which states that "distributing charity to society makes people lazy, decreases the incentive for people to strive for excellence, and inhibits productivity." I can see how distributing money to upper-middle class families will in a sense make the rich get richer, but to the majority of lower-middle class families a healthcare plan will ease the burden of finding a job specifically for health insurance. I don't think that this bill would make people become lazy and not search for a job, and I don't think it would make anyone quit their job just because they will have free health. Also, this con claims that a right to health care will be bad for the economy, but pro number 6 argues this point, and I happen to agree with this point the

most. It says that a right to health care will be good for economic productivity, and that "the cost of bad health and shorter life spans of Americans suffering from uninsurance amounts to \$65-130 billion annually." If Americans live longer and healthier lives, they will be contributing the economy for a longer period of time. Our economy can't afford to lose this much money, and if everyone could get medical attention when needed than this deficit would hopefully be nonexistent.

In the video clips, I heard several things that sounded familiar based on what we have been learning. Mr. Cuccinelli referenced the commerce clause and his opinions on federalism. Mr. Baker mentioned the supremacy clause in which "federal law supersedes state law." From what I saw, Mr. Baker made the better argument because he used references to the Constitution that he clearly researched whereas Mr. Cuccinelli seemed to be repeating the fact that everything about the case is "unconstitutional". He also says that if the states lose, then it will be the "end of federalism", which I believe to be a little extreme.

[February 22, 2011 5:31 PM](#)

 [Alex Bookout](#) said...

I agree with Maia Feliu in her belief that universal health care would not lead to a "moral hazard." Just because people are given health care would not mean that they would go out and hurt themselves to exercise said health care.

[February 22, 2011 5:37 PM](#)



[Paulette](#) said...

I agree with the pro of the bill. It will definitely give equal chances of survival to people regardless of income. A lot of people cannot afford the high priced health insurance which is needed in this country to get medical treatment. I've been just got medical insurance last week after having none for five months. Ironically I got sick and injured a lot during that time period. However my mother still doesn't have insurance because the insurance company is questioning her thyroid problems. It hasn't been a joyous occasion at all. Insurance should be an option to all, regardless to issues or income. They should have a social security number, a home address, and a tax record; those would be my requirements for insurance.

I disagree with the statement on the pro side number nine: "Guaranteeing the right to health care will encourage entrepreneurship, which is good for job creation. Currently people are afraid to start their own business for fear of losing the health insurance provided at their existing job." People abuse the unemployment system; I personally deal with this through my mother and the constant questions she gets from the unemployment office. Sometimes you pay extra for the better insurance from a better job. Because the state will pay for insurance for a person on unemployment doesn't mean they'll think "Yay one less thing to think about now. I'll go look for a job." People say they're looking when they aren't.

[February 22, 2011 5:44 PM](#)



[Paulette](#) said...

I agree with Sammy Hemp's comments on where the money goes. It's good to have a little further insight in what you're trying to understand

[February 22, 2011 5:45 PM](#)

 [Andera](#) said...

I agree with Cassandra Fisher that it would not be fair for hardworking people to pay for an unemployed person's health insurance. For example, a person working 8 hours a day to raise and support a family would not want their hard earned money to be taxed for coverage of an unemployed drug addict's treatment in a hospital. I think this bill would definitely need to be worked on to find a plan that would prevent unfair treatment of individuals, yet at the same time would give everyone an equal opportunity.

[February 22, 2011 5:46 PM](#)

 [Jason F](#) said...

I agree with Braydon on this bill because I too feel the same way about the health care bill and agree with his statement of the "if the bill had fewer repercussions to our financial stability, then I would support it." I feel this bill does have a threat to the financial security in the country which is already doing poorly economically. Now although we are no longer in a recession the economy is far from fixed and once we are able to fix our economy and really get it booming again, that's when we should start to focus on providing health care for all and taking care of everyone in the country.

[February 22, 2011 5:50 PM](#)

 [Danielle Swanson](#) said...

The argument that I agree with the most is that we the people should be responsible for our healthcare, not the government. A majority of American's health problems are self imposed; for example, those who smoke can develop lung cancer and those who eat tons of junk food such as McDonalds and Burger King, can become fat/obese and have heart problems or other health issues. Many of our health problems could easily vanish if we only had healthier lifestyles. I think that those who live unhealthy should not be "rewarded" with free healthcare. The argument that I disagree with the most is that by ensuring all Americans the right to health care will decrease healthcare costs. Although the logic behind this is reasonable- the more frequent and regular visits will prevent people from waiting until they are chronically ill to seek treatment, when by then it is extremely expensive. However, by making our government now cover ALL Americans, I am sure the costs will be going anywhere by down. I do think that it is/should be the government's job to be in charge of healthcare. I personally don't think that the government should have to provide health care for everyone, however I do think it should be their responsibility to set rules, regulations, guidelines, etc.

Some things in the videos that were brought up that relate back to what we have been learning about are the issues/struggles between the power of the national and the power of the state governments. They mentioned how the national government is trying to use the commerce clause to enforce people to buy health insurance. In class we have been learning about different cases where the national government uses this clause to give itself more power and create laws in their favor. The videos also brought up the term "constitutional" and "unconstitutional" when they were discussing whether the national government is allowed to make a law that requires Americans to buy health insurance. I think that Mr. Cuccinelli made a more persuading argument because it doesn't seem justifiably right to that the government can punish people for not buying something; he also mentioned that if the government wins this case, it's going to give them a whole lot more power, which isn't necessarily good

[February 22, 2011 5:56 PM](#)

 [Danielle Swanson](#) said...

I agree with Bailey about disagreeing that the con point #1 doesn't seem just. "Health care should not be a right because it is inconsistent with the Declaration of Independence, which guarantees the right to "pursue" happiness, not the right to happiness or free medical services." Just because it isn't explicitly stated in the Declaration of Independence that we should have healthcare, doesn't mean we shouldn't have it. Our government isn't completely spelled out in the Constitution; we have put our own spin on things and have interpreted things in different ways; therefore I think it is ok to give healthcare to Americans even though it doesn't say so in the Declaration of Independence.

[February 22, 2011 6:03 PM](#)

 [sdunseath](#) said...

Ideally, health care should be available to every American citizen, but at this point in time it is simply unrealistic to attempt to build a

federally funded multibillion dollar industry while the U.S. is, as of January 20, 2011, \$14 trillion in debt. That being said, I disagree with the con "no one should be entitled to health care because it is a service and a material good that a person must pay for to obtain" because not only is that cold-hearted and inhumane, but also it does not even comply with the regulations of the current system. Under the current system, hospitals are legally bound to administer the best health care possible to any person entering the ER regardless of whether or not they can pay their bill. Granted it would be much better if people could receive healthcare before their ailments progressed to such dangerous levels, but who is supposed to pay for this? Medical studies and equipment are expensive. The only way to fund such a program would be to drastically increase federal income taxes which are already approaching 40% in the top tax bracket (keep in mind that most people at this level are not millionaires--and that this figure excludes state taxes). That being said, I understand that health care has soared and is too expensive for most people. There should be some sort of health care reform to cut the unnecessary costs, but the federal government should not under any circumstances direct a national health care system. As listed under the cons, "If health care is considered a right, then government bureaucrats will be making health, life, and death decisions that should be up to the patient and doctor."

Not only is it unaffordable given our country's current economic state, but the creation of such a system would expand the federal government more so than any preceding bill. As Mr. Cuccinelli stated, such a bill would actually consider doing nothing an economic activity. It would also be a major blow to states' rights. I also agree with his statement that such a system is beyond the outer limits of the commerce clause and taxing power and therefore is unconstitutional. Do we really want such an expansive federal government? The more services the government provides, the more people grow dependent on the system as can be seen with the growing reliance on Social Security since its inception under FDR's New Deal in 1935.

Because my mother's side of the family lives in Switzerland and my father is a Doctor in the United States, I have seen and experienced two very different health care systems. Federally regulated health care works well in Switzerland, but not only do they have much higher per capita income and a much lower unemployment rate than in the U.S., but medical care in general is much cheaper (and just as good if not better quality-wise as indicated by their high life expectancy and infant mortality ratings) due to a less litigious population, cheaper drugs, fewer machines, and lower pay for doctors. Also, their population is around 7 million, a number requiring much less management than 300 million; therefore, their successful system of universal health care may not be implementable in the U.S. To solve this health care problem, we need to cut the costs where we can for the time being and implement universal health care at a later date when the U.S. is not so indebted and unemployment is not so high.

[February 22, 2011 6:16 PM](#)

 [sdunseath](#) said...

\* the universal health care system i mentioned last refers to one controlled by the states, not the federal government

[February 22, 2011 6:30 PM](#)



[Corona](#) said...

i personally dont agree with the proposition. it is not that i dont like the idea of everyone benefiting helth care or greed of tax money, but i feel like there would be an abuse of this benefit. the good side of this proposition is all the benefit everyone would get, being a equility right. people that are in need of medical care but cant aford helth ensurance woul be atended and the death rate could drop. however it would promote lazines out of people who dont take care of themselves and dont want to pay for themselves. people who work hard to keep up a healthy life would get reduction money out of their taxes from those that dont work hard and dont take care of them selvese. furthermore it would socialist to promote this proposition. moreover, this bill recalls to the topics spoken on class how it might be constituional or not, depending on how it is red.the constiution can be implied to both sides. it promotes the right of "life", however this is a right that the persuded, a person has the right to persude their

life by taking care of themselves, and its not up to the government to be keeping up with this, is up to one selve. it's up to the judge how to imply these constitutional right.i thinl that it is not something that would be considered unconstiutional, however i dont thin its something that it is obligated or suported by the constitution, it is just something it should be done or not up to the government. i, like i sed before, do not agree so much with the bill. i dont understand it very well, but from what i know im no so much about it.

[February 22, 2011 6:32 PM](#)

 [Delaney Luna](#) said...

The point I agree with the most is that all Americans have the right to be given health care, and that, as stated in the Constitution, the federal government is supposed to "promote the general welfare" of its people and protect their rights. I think it really says something that the United States is one of the only developed nations that does not guarantee health care to its people. I disagree with the argument that people should not be given health care by the government because it is a person's responsibility to care for their own health, and that a lot of health problems, like cancer and diabetes, are usually the person's own fault anyway. I feel like this is incredibly unfair, because most illnesses are completely out of the victim's control, and although a select few can be attributed to lifestyle, the majority are not. We should not discriminate against people just because they were unfortunate enough to be sick and not have enough money to pay outrageous health insurance premiums. I generally think that this law should be passed, and that it is mostly the federal government's responsibility to carry it out. Not because I think the federal government should have too much power, but because, as far as I can tell, it is the only institution in our country that has the ability to reach everyone fairly. If this power was given to the states, health care could potentially unfairly favor some citizens over others because the states would have different policies.

Some familiar terms and concepts I heard in the videos were the supremacy clause and the commerce clause. I think that Mr. Baker's argument, that they could not find any just means to call this law unconstitutional, was better, because he seems to have looked at the law more objectively and was respectful in his argument. However, I do agree with Mr. Cuccinelli in that there is a lot at stake in this ruling, and I believe that a decision must be approached cautiously and with a lot of deliberation. As much as I agree with the health care law, I don't really think that the federal government should be able to regulate inactivity, and force people to buy health care. If the federal government is allowed to do this, it could potentially open the doors for many other cases to arise and to reach a similar outcome, just like how the ruling the Heart of Atlanta Motel v. United States broadened the power and scope of the commerce clause.

[February 22, 2011 6:36 PM](#)



[Corona](#) said...

respond to Polo\$tar11:

you have a strong point that the bill is suported by the constitutional right of welfare and Life. however i dont think helthcare is something that should be force by the Constitution: it is certainly not something