Michael Costello Obama fears Obamacare

Michael Costello/Lewiston Tribune

Could it possibly be a coincidence that Barack Obama has illegally postponed the imposition of Obamacare until after the next round of congressional elections? Even though the execrable Nancy Pelosi tried to make the case that we should celebrate Obamacare on the Fourth of July (Dependence Day?), congressional Democrats (other than Pelosi) understand full well that the implementation of Obamacare will cost many of them their jobs.

The damage that just the anticipation of Obamacare has already done to the economy is easily quantified. Many employers have elected to reduce the hours that their employees may work to below 30 hours per week to escape the mandatory coverage provisions for full-time employees. Other small businesses have laid off employees or refused to grow beyond 49 workers to escape the mandate.

While the mainstream news media cheerleaders did their best to smear lipstick on last month's job creation report, the fact remains that the few jobs that Obamanomics have created are disproportionately low-paid, part-time positions. Walmart remains the nation's largest employer, but Kelly Services, an agency that provides temporary employees, has grown to become America's second-largest employer.

This is reflected in the most recent economic statistics. While the unemployment rate remained unchanged last month at 7.6 percent, the U-6 unemployment rate, which includes those who are involuntarily underemployed, rose sharply from 13.8 percent to 14.3 percent. Stripped of its "seasonal adjustments," last month, 240,000 Americans lost full-time jobs, while the Obama economy added 360,000 part-time jobs.

And if not for the millions of Americans who have given up looking for work, the unemployment rate would not be 7.6 percent. It would be closer to 11 percent.

The proportion of working-age adults who are participating in the workforce is the lowest we have seen since the Jimmy Carter debacle during the latter half of the 1970s.

And if simply the prospect of Obamacare can do this much damage, just imagine what the reality will bring.

Already we have learned that, contrary to the promises made in 2008, 2009 and 2010, premiums will not be going down. In fact, the average family's health insurance bill will rise by at least $2,500. This is probably a low-ball estimate because the states have started off-loading their chronically ill onto federal mandated programs.

Last week, Obama announced that he would suspend the employer mandate section of the bill that was supposed to take effect on Jan. 1. Surely he understood that the law would cause the economy to shed full-time jobs between now and Election Day 2014. And congressional

Democrats certainly did not want to have to defend the law that destroyed those jobs. So, they hope that they're buying another two years.

But the truth is that Obama almost certainly lacks the authority to simply refuse to enforce a law that Congress passed and he signed. Presidents simply do not have that power under the U.S. Constitution. According to Article 3, Section 2, the president is legally obligated to "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed."

The Obamacare law specifically states that the employer mandate "shall apply to months beginning after Dec. 31, 2013." Obama has no legal authority to do what he did. For you Obamatons who believe that your lord and savior can do no wrong, place yourself in the scenario proposed by former 10th Circuit Court of Appeals judge and Stanford constitutional law professor Michael McConnell. Imagine that Mitt Romney had won the election and had simply announced that he would do America a big favor by refusing to enforce Obamacare. I am quite certain that you would join all the other Obamatons in demanding Romney's impeachment.

The Obamacare bill that the Democrat-controlled Congress passed in 2010 was written to provide protections against fraud. If someone applied for federal health insurance subsidies, the federal government was supposed to verify his or her eligibility. That, too, has been thrown out the window because Obama has simply chosen to ignore that part of the law as well.

Let's add this to Obama's decision to not enforce provisions that would have imposed severe penalties on smokers. There aren't as many smokers as there once were, but Democrats certainly didn't want to lose those votes either.

Obama's politically motivated decision to decline enforcement of his signature legislation tells us all we need to know. Even Obama wishes it would go away.

Costello is a research technician at Washington State University. His email address is kozmocostello@hotmail.com.