

Re: Health insurance

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2006-02/msg00026.html>

- *From:* "Sgt.Sausage" <someone@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 2 Feb 2006 12:20:10 -0500
-

"Michael Scheltgen" <mjs818@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:xGcEf.305230\\$t1.156905@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](news:xGcEf.305230$t1.156905@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Sgt.Sausage wrote:

"nospam" <nospam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

It does when you *force* it upon the docs
through some
government run sham called "universal
healthcare".

No it doesn't. Socialism is when there is no private owned
business,
but all the production means are owned by community.

And what, exactly, are the "productions means" for a doc?

You are contolling the doc's means of production by telling
him what he can & can't charge. You *own* his means of
production.

He or she can charge whatever he or she wants but the third party payer
will pay what they have stipulated they will pay.

If, and only if, the doc has a contract w/ that third party.

That's Socialism. Even by your above quoted definition.

Re: Health insurance

That's precisely what private insurance companies do to doctors — dictate what they will pay.

And the doc *voluntarily* signs a contract when the doc *himself* decides he's going to join the provider network for a specific carrier.

See the difference? It's voluntary. If the doc thinks the prices are too low, or there's too much paperwork, or just doesn't like a particular carrier — he does not have to join that provider's network.

Free market. Voluntary transactions between the doc and the insurance carrier.

The premiums of private health insurance skyrocket so that almost 50 Mil. can not afford it.

If I can't afford a new car, I don't buy one.

If you can't afford healthcare, you don't get none. Period. Anything else means you have to *forcibly* take my dollars to pay for your problems.

How is this not theft?

If someone doesn't drive — why should they have to pay taxes to build roads?

IMO, they shouldn't. Roads should be a pay-per-use, toll-based system.

Why should a pacifist have to pay taxes that are directed to defense spending?

Because if they don't, you and your socialist brothers will take over. <grin>

Re: Health insurance

Cutting taxes to pump more money into the pockets of this looters, Medicare is in problem too not being able to pay in time.

English, please. I can't parse that one in any way that makes sense.

This hurt more doctors.
But who cares? There will always be in our society a gang of rightards kissing asses of rich shareholders in insurance companies. They lick shit for a living and oppose an universal health care system.

I'm kissing no ones ass. I'm simply a small business owner who doesn't want you, or anyone else sucking off my profits. Mine. I *earned* them. When you have your profits, go ahead and give 'em up if you want. Forcing me to give up mine is, still, nothing more than common theivery.

What if the money you'd save on out of pocket medical expenses is greater than the money in extra taxes, if any, you'd pay under a national health insurance scheme?

You're dreaming buddy. You can't add 50 million NON-PAYERS to the system and have it end up cheaper. If you think it can be done, you're a moron.

You're assuming NHI would cost you more than you're paying now. It wouldn't.

Who pays for the 50 million folks?

Or are you philosophically opposed to national health insurance but not military or education spending?

Re: Health insurance

Re: Health insurance

National Health Insurance: Against.

Military: For, but not to the extent that we're doing now. Less, in this case, is better.

Education: Against. If you can't afford it, you lose. End of story.

Are you against poor children receiving an education if they can't afford it?

Ummm ... yes. I've no kids, yet I send about \$2500 a year to the local school district in the form of my property tax. If you've got kids, pay for there education --- they're your responsibility, not mine.

Re: Health insurance