

Re: OT – This just in...

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.transcription/2004-09/2799.html>

From: Josh Rosenbluth (rosenbluth_at_nono_comcast.net)

Date: 09/11/04

Date: Sat, 11 Sep 2004 10:10:52 -0400

"Phyllis" <phyllisnilsson@buckeye-express.com> wrote in message news:4142F930.4040906@buckeye-express.com...

- > *An increase of 2–5% of the population on Social Security is a very big*
- > *number and will certainly affect the benefits received by everyone (if*
- > *they are willing to rewrite and we aren't sure at this point they will).*

Social Security benefit payouts are projected to increase by between 150 and 200% (in real terms) between now and 2030. That's because of the baby-boomer retirement. An additional 2–5% on top of that is tiny and has nothing to do with Social Security's problem. Moreover, the increase wouldn't be 2–5%. Same-sex marriage does not increase direct Social Security benefits. It only increases spousal survivor benefits which only make up 15% of the beneficiaries. So, we are talking a 2–5% increase of 15% or, 0.3–0.8%.

- > *The other things you mention are also going to cost a very large amount*
- > *of money in benefits. Those who are not gay and do not have the*
- > *privilege of marrying someone from the same sex for convenience and/or*
- > *monetary reasons, may have their own benefits reduced or eliminated.*

Marriages of convenience are available today. Legalizing same-sex marriage will do nothing to increase that number. Why would anyone who wants a marriage of convenience wait for legalized same-sex marriage when they can marry a person of the opposite sex already?

- > *The others that you mention that are a "bother" for gays have to be*
- > *entered into by anyone not a spouse, but are members of the person's*
- > *family (siblings, aunts, uncles, etc). If it isn't too much of a*
- > *"bother" for them, then why should it be for anyone else?*

Family and medical leave isn't a "bother". A gay couple cannot get it no matter what they do. Sponsoring your alien partner for a green card isn't a "bother". A gay person cannot do that for their partner no matter what they do. Getting health insurance from your partner isn't a "bother". A gay person cannot get that from their partner no matter what they do. 5th Amendment spousal protection isn't a "bother". A gay person doesn't get it no matter what they do. Equal tax and other benefit treatment isn't a

"bother". A gay couple cannot get equal treatment no matter what they do.

The only things that are bothers are estate planning and power of attorney. You ask why shouldn't a gay couple be treated the same as siblings, aunts and uncles? Using that logic, why shouldn't a straight couple be treated the same as siblings, aunts and uncles? The salient question is why shouldn't a gay couple be treated the same as a straight couple?

Josh Rosenbluth