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( Senate Finance Chairman Max Baucus unveiled his long-awaited health care reform bill. Dana Bash reports. )

DANA BASH, CNN CONGRESSIONAL CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): After months of intense negotiations with Republicans in search of a bipartisan health care agreement, the Democratic finance chairman made his big announcement alone. But still declared...  
  
SEN. MAX BAUCUS (D), MONTANA: This is a good bill. This is a balanced bill. It can pass the Senate.  
  
BASH: What Senator Max Baucus means by that is his much anticipated health care proposal is more moderate than other Democratic bills. The starkest example -- it does not include a government-run insurance option that many Democrats called critical to increasing competition and lowering costs. Instead, it proposes nonprofit insurance cooperatives.  
  
The Congressional Budget Office says Baucus' plan cost $774 billion, considerably less than the $1 trillion Democratic House plan. Baucus insists it will be paid for with hundreds of billions of dollars in cuts to government health programs, mostly Medicare, as well as new taxes and fees. Senator Baucus insists it will be paid for with more than $500 billion in cuts and savings, to government health care programs, mostly Medicare and nearly $350 billion in new taxes and fees.  
  
That includes a 35 percent tax on insurance companies for high- end so-called Cadillac plans that cost over $21,000. Baucus' proposal would ban discrimination based on preexisting conditions. And it would require all Americans to have health coverage. Those who don't would be penalized with a fine up to $3,800 for a family of four making $66,000 a year, but low-income Americans would get help from the government to pay for their coverage either through expanded Medicaid or tax credits. To lower the cost of the plan, though, Baucus offers fewer subsidies than the House Democrats bill.  
  
BAUCUS: There are some who think I've not gone far enough. There are some on both sides of the aisle think I've gone too far.  
  
BASH: Some of the harshest criticism is coming from Baucus' fellow Democrats.  
  
REP. NANCY PELOSI (D-CA), HOUSE SPEAKER: How can we give all these new consumers to the health insurance industry with no accountability, no competition, and no real challenge for them to honor the reforms that we have in the bill?  
  
(END VIDEOTAPE)  
  
BASH: Now, the three Republicans in the Senate who Baucus spent hundreds of hours negotiating with, they're not supporting this right now because they say it still spends too much. On the other side, there are some Democrats on his finance committee who say they're not supporting it right now because they say it doesn't spend enough, especially on making insurance more affordable. So what we are going to see for sure, Lou, next week when the Senate Finance Committee starts voting is vigorous attempts on both sides of the aisle to change this proposal.

<https://transcripts.cnn.com/show/ldt/date/2009-09-16/segment/01>
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( The Senate Finance Committee passed an $829 billion health care bill by a 14-9 vote. CNN's Brianna Keilar reports.

• Key Senate committee passes health care plan )

Brianna Keilar:

It wasn't a completely foregone conclusion. I think the general expectation was this was going to pass, but there was some question about whether that Republican Senator Olympia Snowe would sign on and she did. And certainly this went exactly as the Democratic chairman of this committee committee Max Baucus hoped that it would go. But you know, this was a really key vote. This wasn't just any committee vote. The reason you heard that clapping? I don't think you hear that after every committee that votes legislation out of committee, you heard it because this was the 5th of five, so the final committee that needed to vote that legislation out and so that's what they did today. And this really moves health care reform to a whole new phase. Now. Also another significant point to make about this vote. This bill that passes committee today is very different from the four other bills before Congress. It's a more conservative bill. It's seen, at least in the Senate, as having the best chance of passing the Senate. Why? Because it does not include that public option that government run insurance plan instead. Here's what it includes, health care cooperatives, non-profit health care co-ops instead of that public option. Also, it includes an individual mandate requiring Americans to get health care insurance or pay a penalty, but it doesn't include a similar mandate for employers to pay for coverage for employees. And also it has a price tag of $829 billion, far less than any other bill, making it the only bill that falls. Under that $900 billion benchmark that President Obama has laid out, and I think it's also really important. Reggie to note a couple of things. This bill does have in common with the others that I think matter a lot to consumers. This bill would tell insurers you cannot deny coverage to potential to potential patients or potential customers on the basis of having a pre-existing condition, and you cannot cap the amount of benefits they get either for a year.

Or over the course of their lifetime, big concerns for people who have had just big headaches with health insurance.

Reggie Aqui

There are a lot of questions about what happens to the public option, which as you say it was not included in this version of the bill, but it may still be included in a version that could ultimately be passed by the Senate floor. I already heard, I think Senator that came out from this vote. Who's on the committee say that he's very much in favor of the public option.

Keilar:

No, there were Liberal Democrats who even voted this bill out of the committee to move it to the next step.

Who said, no, I still want a public option and I'm voting this bill out to move it forward in the hopes that I can get that public option added through the amendment process on the floor. But it is so much in question whether there is support among Senate Democrats, they have 60 votes. Reggie, but there are certainly not. They're not 60 Democrats altogether. Who say, you know what I will support a public option. So at this point.
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( Florida's Attorney General plans to take the health care reform debate to the courts.

• McCollum to file suit after health-care bill signed

http://floridacapitalnews.com/article/20100322/CAPITOLNEWS/100322008 )

BILL MCCOLLUM (R), FLORIDA ATTORNEY GENERAL:

A few minutes before 12:00 o'clock the president of United States today, signed into the bill or into law a healthcare bill that, in our judgment and the judgment of 12 other States Attorney generals, is unconstitutional and invades the sovereignty of the States and each of us who are involved in a lawsuit that we filed at 12:02 PM today in the Northern District of Florida, believe that the freedoms of Americans, and particularly in my state of Florida, were impaired by this bill, and it forces people to do something.

In the sense of buying a health care policy or pay a penalty, attacks or fine, that's simply the Constitution does not allow Congress to do,

but it's about constitutionality. It's about forcing people to buy health insurance when there is no provision that constitution that allows for anybody to be forced to do something where there's no commerce, no action. You're just sitting there. It's just a living tax, and it's about the question of forcing the state of Florida and the other states against the sovereignty that's guaranteed under our Constitution to our states.

To do things that are practically impossible to do as a practical matter and forcing us to do it without giving any resources or money to do it with.

This is not a partisan issue in terms of the constitutionality of this law. It's a question for most of us in the states of the cost. It is to our people and to the rights and the freedoms of the individual citizens, and upholding our constitutional duties as as attorney general,

the truth of the matter is the American public and the people that we represent I represent in this state deserve to have a determination.

On the constitutionality of this, this is not lawful. It may have passed Congress, but there are three branches of government and my part of it in the executive branch. As the Attorney General of the state is to take up the cudgel for the people I represent, the people of Florida to protect their interests and allow the Court to determine which I think they will, that a law passed by Congress is wrong, unconstitutional, and one that will ruin this state in financially as well as interfere with the lives of individual citizens who should not be required.

To be penalized for doing nothing but sitting in a chair and saying we're not going to buy a health insurance policy.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*
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15-14d 20100323 am.acosta.hc.reform.fight.cnn\_576x324\_dl.flv

( Some states are gearing up to challenge federal health care reform. CNN's Jim Acosta reports. )

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)  
JIM ACOSTA, CNN CORRESPONDENT:   
ACOSTA (voice-over): President Obama, meet Ken Cuccinelli, Virginia's Republican attorney general who is vowing to take health care reform to court.  
  
KEN CUCCINELLI (R), VIRGINIA ATTORNEY GENERAL: We believe clearly that the federal government does not have the constitutional authority to order every American to buy health insurance.  
  
ACOSTA: That individual mandate to most Americans to buy insurance will not only be tested in Virginia, attorneys general in roughly a dozen states, all Republicans, are also filing lawsuits.  
  
BILL MCCOLLUM (R), FLORIDA ATTORNEY GENERAL: There are no politics involved in this whatsoever. This is something I would do whether I were attorney general or not. This bill is wrong.  
  
ACOSTA: And that's not all. Thirty-six states, in fact, are considering new laws to block an array of health care reform measures. Many of those states point to the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, which says powers not delegated to the federal government are reserved for the states. But there's a problem, clause in the Constitution that declares laws passed by Congress as the supreme law of the land. That Supremacy Clause has stood the test of time.  
  
PROF. CAL JILLSON, SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY: We've got a very conservative Supreme Court, but they are not about to overturn 200 years of constitutional history and interpretation, and declare that the Supremacy Clause is no longer in effect.  
  
ACOSTA (on camera): Do you believe in the Supremacy Clause?  
  
CUCCINELLI: I believe in God. I read the Supremacy Clause and it is effective law in America.  
  
ACOSTA (voice-over): The White House argues bucking the law at the state level would be a waste of time?  
  
ROBERT GIBBS, WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY: My advice from counsel is that we'll win these -- we'll win these lawsuits.  
  
ACOSTA: President Obama once opposed mandates during the campaign.  
  
BARACK OBAMA, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: What really they are saying is, they mandate -- they will -- they will punish you in some way if you don't buy health care.  
  
ACOSTA: Now, the mandate is what opponents of reform want to use to tear the whole thing down.  
  
(on camera): You do hope that what you're doing will bring down the entire statute?  
  
CUCCINELLI: The goal is to -- is to bring down the individual mandate. That's the goal. Stepping into a legal analysis role, I rather expect that that means the whole statute will fall.  
  
(END VIDEOTAPE)

<https://transcripts.cnn.com/show/ltm/date/2010-03-23/segment/03>
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( Kate Bolduan looks at the questions the U.S. Supreme Court has to address in its ruling on the Affordable Care Act. )

ZORAIDA SAMBOLIN, CNN HOST:

Congressional correspondent Kate Bolduan is live in Washington and she is breaking it all down for us.  
  
Kate, can we start with an overview of what are the key issues we should be expecting today?

KATE BOLDUAN, CNN CONGRESSIONAL CORRESPONDENT: Hey there, Zoraida. Good morning.  
  
The nine justices need to answer a question. They are facing four issues today, and we will finally get an answer as we've been talking about this for months now.  
First off, the justices need to answer the question, should they take a kind of legal time-out here, not deciding this case, not taking up this challenge until maybe after 2014 when all of the main provisions kick in. That has to do with pretty archaic, not well known law called the Anti-Injunction Act from the 19th century. That's unlikely to happen for them, to kind of kick it off in a few years from now.  
  
But then the big question is the centerpiece -- the individual mandate requiring most -- nearly all-Americans to have health insurance or face a penalty. Will that stand or will that go?  
  
And then the next question right after that is, we kind of call it the domino effect. If the individual mandate is ruled unconstitutional, if it's ruled to step beyond the bounds of the authority that Congress has, does the rest of the law or part of the law stand or does all of it go if the centerpiece of the law is ruled unconstitutional.  
  
And finally, on a separate issue, a challenge to the expanded Medicaid program within the health care law combines together to argue that this is stepping on state's rights, that it is an overreach of the federal government and that this expanded Medicare program unfairly coerces states to take part in the expanded program. All four very important issues, very legally dense and finally, Zoraida, we should hopefully have an answer sometime after 10:00 this morning.  
  
SAMBOLIN: We're sternly looking forward to it. What if there's a split decision a 5-4 either way?  
  
BOLDUAN: Yes. There's of course a lot of talk about this. And, of course, the high court would love to have a unanimous vote on all rulings. They would love to speak with one voice on any decision that they make.  
  
But on hot issues like health care has become, we have come to expect a divide here, an ideological split, because there is an ideological difference between many of these justices.  
  
I'll tell you, it's interesting. Ruth Bader Ginsburg -- Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, she actually said recently that, you know, it may surprise you that we have voted unanimously and decided unanimously in some 40 percent of the cases they've taken up this year. These are less high profile cases, less big headline cases, but they do speak with one voice occasionally.  
I'm not going to read the tea leaves today. We will see. I wouldn't be surprised if it is a split decision, though.  
  
SAMBOLIN: Well, historically I was reading typically it is like that like Supreme Court Justice Ginsburg said.  
  
I know you have a long day in store for you. So, we'll be talking to you again.

<https://transcripts.cnn.com/show/es/date/2012-06-28/segment/01>
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( CNN reports on U.S. Supreme Court decision to uphold the health care law. )

WOLF BLITZER, CNN ANCHOR:

BLITZER: Yes. As we say, there's some confusion out there, conflicting reports coming from inside the Supreme Court. Let's hold off on drawing any final conclusions on what exactly these -- the nine justices of the U.S. Supreme Court have decided.  
  
Initial suggestion that perhaps the mandate, the individual mandate not valid exercise of the commerce clause of the constitution, but now there are now there are other reports saying perhaps the tax would be imposed on those who refuse to purchase health insurance, but could get -- we're now getting more information.  
  
I just want to update our viewers. The Chief Justice John Roberts, saying potentially, potentially the individual mandate could be upheld as a tax, but we're getting some conflicting information on what leads up to that.  
  
So let's take a deep breath and let's see what the justices actually decide. It could be a little bit more complicated than initially thought.  
  
All of this unfolding, if you're watching Twitter, you can get some of the confusion as well because we're getting widely different assessments of what the United States Supreme Court has decided.  
  
So let's wait and see. We have our producer, Bill Mears, inside. Kate Bolduan is getting that information directly from Bill Mears. So, we'll see what is happening, but this is a momentous occasion.  
  
John King is watching all of this unfold as well. John, what else are you picking up?

JOHN KING, CNN CHIEF NATIONAL CORRESPONDENT:   
KING: Wolf, just waiting for more of the decision.  
  
BLITZER: Hold on, John. Kate Bolduan is getting some more information. Kate, what are you learning?

KATE BOLDUAN, CNN CONGRESSIONAL CORRESPONDENT:   
BOLDUAN: Well, I've got to tell you. This is a very confusing, very large opinion. But I want to make sure we are very clear on the second read. I'll read you the exact line.  
  
Chief Justice John Roberts delivered the opinion of the court with respect to part 3, that is the individual mandate, concluding that the individual mandate may be upheld as within Congress' power under the taxing clause.  
  
What we are reading here is that the individual mandate may be upheld under a narrow reading of the constitution, not under the commerce clause. We're talking about the taxing clause, Wolf, very important distinction here.  
  
As you can see this is very thick and we're reading through it. It's very legally dense. I'm going right back to it to find out about the rest of it.  
  
BLITZER: Yes, because there were conflicting assessments from the Obama administration whether in fact this is a tax or not a tax. The penalty that would be imposed on those who have the ability to buy health insurance would be required to buy health insurance, but still decided not to do so, whether or not that would be a tax or not a tax.  
  
So you just heard Kate say that the Chief Justice John Roberts, saying that yes, under the tax provisions, under the tax writing provisions of Congress, and the president would sign it into law, that this would be allowed.  
  
That was not necessarily the argument that was made by the Obama administration. They didn't necessarily say it was a tax, they thought it was a commerce clause provision, which is different.  
  
John King is joining us right now. Excuse me, Kate Bolduan is getting some more details. What else are you learning, Kate?  
  
BOLDUAN: As we're reading through this again. We are reading now that the entire law has been upheld, Wolf. We are reading through this to see how the count -- how the vote count went within the justices.  
  
Because it looks like there are a lot of different concurring and maybe even pluralities here. But from what we are reading here, it looks like the entire health care law including the individual mandate has been upheld.  
  
BLITZER: And that explains why the chief justice initially, in one of the lines that we reported, said that the individual mandate might not be appropriate with the commerce clause of the constitution.  
  
But he does say it is appropriate, it is being upheld as part of the tax writing ability of the Congress to go forward and impose taxes. If in fact that is the justification, then it's a huge, huge victory for President Obama.  
  
And for the Democrats who worked very, very hard to enact the health care reform law. What the critics have often called Obama care. But if the chief justice says, and he is the decider obviously, if Chief Justice John Roberts says the Affordable Care Act is in fact constitutional.  
  
That the individual mandate is constitutional provided in accordance with the tax writing ability of the U.S. Congress, then obviously a big, big victory for the Obama administration, and President Obama himself.  
  
Some of the confusion, I want to bring in John King, who's outside the Supreme Court as well, the initial confusion, John, I think was the result of John Roberts saying that the individual mandate was not consistent with the commerce clause, which is what the Obama administration had argued before the Supreme Court.  
  
So initially, the sense was that maybe the whole thing was going to be thrown out. But now we see that he has come forward and says it is consistent with the tax writing clauses of the constitution.  
As a result Obamacare is now likely to be upheld in full, according to this latest information we're getting from inside the Supreme Court. Is that your reading of what we're getting, John?  
  
KING: Wolf, I have the decision in my hand and I'm reading through it as we speak, and that is exactly right. There are parts where the chief justice writes the majority decision. This will be a landmark day for the Roberts court as we call it.  
  
In this decision, there are parts in which you mentioned the commerce clause, where the chief justice writes it is the opinion of the court, the divided opinion of the court that congress has no authority under that provision, the commerce provision to tell states they must do this.  
  
But he goes on to say that Congress has broad powers to enact taxes and fees and essentially powers to tell the states what they must do are quite broad. So in that context, it is upheld.  
  
You read through this decision and you have the sense from the justices more conservative, Justice Thomas, Justice Alito, for example, and Justice Scalia, all dissenting in this decision.  
  
And Justice Ginsberg writing parts of it, it's a several different decisions within one if you will, but in the end what they are saying, with John Roberts, the chief justice, appointed by George W. Bush, of course, saying that this law now stands.  
  
And that's what will go forward. Wolf, you're seeing the reaction outside of the court. It's a very complicated decision. But the bottom line is by a 5-4 decision, the Supreme Court says it stands.

<https://transcripts.cnn.com/show/se/date/2012-06-28/segment/02>
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( The U.S. Supreme Court ruled Obamacare constitutional today, but can we even afford it? )

ERIN BURNETT, CNN ANCHOR:

Well, good evening, everyone. I'm Erin Burnett. And OUTFRONT tonight, party time. Both sides spinning the health care verdict. The president celebrating his individual mandate ruling at the Supreme Court.  
  
(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)  
  
BARACK OBAMA, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: Today, I'm as confident as ever that when we look back five years from now or 10 years from now, or 20 years from now, we'll be better off because we have the courage to pass this law and keep moving forward.  
  
(END VIDEO CLIP)  
  
BURNETT: And Republicans seeing a way to rally the base. Because after all, this is now a fight for the underdog. They see it as hey, the Supreme Court failed to repeal what Republicans see as a hated health care act, a big overreach of big government. But if you elect Mitt Romney, he is going to slay the health care dragon.  
  
(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)  
  
MITT ROMNEY (R), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: What the court did not do on its last day in session, I will do on my first day if elected president of the United States.  
  
(END VIDEO CLIP)  
  
BURNETT: Well, that was pretty loud and clear. Both sides were celebrating. Partying it up. Like guys at a bachelor party. But the problem is no one was a winner today. And soon they're going to wake up feeling pretty hung over. In fact, just like how the party ended in, well, "The Hangover."  
  
(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)  
  
BRADLEY COOPER, ACTOR: You OK, buddy?  
  
ED HELMS, ACTOR: No, I am in so much pain right now.  
  
COOPER: Look at this place.  
  
HELMS: I know. Phil, they have my credit card downstairs. I am so screwed.  
  
ZACH GALIFIANAKIS, ACTOR: How does a tiger get in the bathroom? He almost killed me.  
  
(END VIDEO CLIP)  
  
BURNETT: Yes, we just woke up with a tiger in America's bathroom. In all seriousness, the point is this, we're all losers. Why? Because even if you love what this health care bill does, things like covering pre-existing conditions, you have to hate what it does not do. Because it does not deal with surging health care costs in America.  
  
As we've been saying, in our country where we spend the most on health care per person than any developed person on earth, we rank number 27 in life expectancy. So more people are covered, thanks to the Supreme Court ruling, which may be a great thing. But under the so-called Affordable Health Care Act.  
  
Health care analyst Dan Ripp of research firm Bradley Wood says premiums will rise 7.5 percent a year. Four times more than the inflation rate. And the spending is getting worse. According to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, health spending in 2010 grew about 3.9 percent from the year before.  
  
But in 2014, when the president's health care law takes full effect, spending will jump 7.4 percent. That is a massive fail.

<https://transcripts.cnn.com/show/ebo/date/2012-06-28/segment/01>
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Panel discussion on the impact that today's SCOTUS ruling will have on our countries medical future.

ERIN BURNETT, CNN ANCHOR: OUTFRONT

BURNETT: So you think this will motivate the Republican base more than a victory which would have sort of, you know, eliminated the big, hey, if I get in office, I'm going to repeal it argument?

ERICK ERICKSON, CNN POLITICAL ANALYST:   
ERICKSON: Yes. Absolutely.  
  
BURNETT: Yes.  
  
ERICKSON: It has taken the Supreme Court off the table for the left. It's made it an issue for the right. Mitt Romney has raised $2 million before sunset today just on this issue.  
  
BURNETT: Yes, that's right. And Roland, I think the latest number is $2.5 million from the Mitt Romney campaign. I just got an e-mail here. The Obama administration is saying -- say you're with me on affordable care. They're trying to raise money.  
  
Who do you think will benefit more when it comes to fundraising off this? The winner, Barack Obama, or the seeming loser Mitt Romney?  
  
ROLAND MARTIN, CNN POLITICAL ANALYST: Look, I know we love to go right to the heart of the political issue. But, again, I will say the very people out there, the millions of people who are now covered, the folks with pre-existing conditions, the folks who are sitting there -- if you're a young person on your parents' health care.  
  
Let me tell you something, Erin. Look, I know how this feels, OK? Two thousand covering the Democratic National Convention. My appendix ruptured. Five days in a hospital in L.A. $100,000. No health insurance. Had to file for bankruptcy. House almost foreclosed on. So I know what it feels like not to have health insurance. And so when we can get caught up in the political arena. But the reality is, we now have to deal with people who now can be protected.  
  
And so now, how do you fortify this? How do you make it better? How do you bring down costs? This is a start. This is not the end. This is the beginning of a real discussion and a real national health care plan.  
  
BURNETT: All right, Nick, the problem is, though, is this seems to fall in that category of it's great, more people are covered, and you want that outcome, but this was done without dealing with the costs.  
  
NICK GILLESPIE, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, REASON TV AND REASON.COM: Yes --  
  
BURNETT: We're looking at costs rising 4 percent in 2009, 7.4 percent under this law. Costs are going to rise more under this law than they were before.  
  
GILLESPIE: Right. And if past the -- if the past is prologue, the health care costs are going to be jacked up even more. The government, you know, whether it's state, local or federal, already spends almost 50 cents out of health -- every health care dollar and prices have been going up astronomically, far above the rate of inflation.  
  
You bring the government even more into the matter and the prices are only going to spiral up more than the government will say, well, we got to subsidize rates more. And then that will jack it up the next time.  
  
I think the question for Roland to ask -- and I say this, I'm not a Republican, I'm not a Democrat. My book, which is out in paperback, is the "Declaration of Independence." I am an independent. Why would it cost a hundred grand to fix your appendix? You know, it's partly because of the heavy subsidies and the government involvement already.  
  
To go back to the Republicans, Mitt Romney is the last person you want to be arguing in a world where Obamacare has just -- has just passed constitutional muster. He has no plan to counter what was just -- you know, what he did at the state level, at the federal level. It's a -- it's a real problem.  
  
(CROSSTALK)  
  
BURNETT: Yes, Roland, what --  
  
MARTIN: But let's -- but let's --  
  
BLITZER: Yes.  
  
MARTIN: Let's not sit here and we talk about costs going up as somehow it's only because of the Affordable Care Act. One of the reasons costs --  
  
GILLESPIE: That isn't what I said.  
  
MARTIN: No, no, no. I'm not saying you said it. What I'm saying is one of the reasons we're seeing rising health care as well is because our nation also is becoming more obese. We also don't want to confront when it comes to wellness. And so when you begin to deal with the issue of wellness, when you begin to have folks who have regular checkups. When you begin to have folks where you're able to catch something earlier as opposed to late in the game, then you're dealing with that. And so I say you have to deal with the cost. This is simply the beginning of a process.  
  
BURNETT: Well, then you're getting --  
  
(CROSSTALK)  
  
BURNETT: Then you're getting the issues of saying, OK, look, well, you know what, if we're going to deal with obesity, that means people who weigh more will have to pay more. And that is something that just doesn't seem to have muster in this country.

BEN SMITH, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, BUZZFEED:   
SMITH: Yes, and I think --  
  
MARTIN: It could be --  
  
(CROSSTALK)  
  
SMITH: One of the things to learn in the first round of this thing is that -- is that any attempts for the government to impose cost controls, I mean, death panels so-called, were the outstanding instance of that. And I think the Obama administration backed off very fast. People just don't like the idea of the government saying, you know, this treatment is cheaper, and so we're only going to pay for that, if we're right or wrong.  
<https://transcripts.cnn.com/show/ebo/date/2012-06-28/segment/01>
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( Christine Romans explains why the Obamacare ruling is just the first step on a long road to fixing the U.S. health care system. )

CHRISTINE ROMANS, CNN ANCHOR:  I wanted to share it with you. Some points that have become lost in the ugly politics of the Obamacare debate. A debate that has totally swamped some very important challenges we still have in healthcare. This is the beginning, not the end of an important national mission to fix a bloated and inconsistent bureaucracy,

here's what the ugly debate did not settle. This was always meant to increase coverage, access to health insurance. It doesn't mean lower costs or better health. Here is still what we have to do. There's no meaningful malpractice reform. Insurance companies are not forced to compete on state lines there. There was no meaningful discussion.

With end of life issues at a time when we have an aging population instead, we're at a moment in American politics where this complicated and emotional issue is reduced to a death panel bumper sticker.

75% of health care costs are associated with lifestyle choices. By some estimates, how do we incentivize people to take better care of themselves? Consumers still have no idea how to bring their own costs down. When you purchase a health service, how do you even understand what you're about to get an understanding? The cost is simply impossible. Healthcare is the largest single industry in America.

1/8 of our economy is healthcare. This is just the beginning, not the end.
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