

Re: MSNBC (Oberg) – Deadly space lessons go unheeded

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2005–01/3127.html>

From: JazzMan (No_Spam_at_airmail.net)

Date: 01/29/05

Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2005 22:15:49 -0600

Rand Simberg wrote:

>
> On Fri, 28 Jan 2005 10:59:14 -0600, in a place far, far away,
> "Christopher M. Jones" <christopher.m.jones@gmail.com> made the
> phosphor on my monitor glow in such a way as to indicate that:
>
> >JazzMan wrote:
> >> I have what's considered fairly decent insurance through my
> >> employer, coverage that I could in no way afford on my own
> >> since it runs upwards of \$6,000/year, and even with that my
> >> annual out of pocket costs are over \$3,000. That's a \$1,200
> >> deductible, and the rest is 20% copay up to a maximum copay
> >> of \$1,800 in any given year.
> >
> >Here's a quiz for you. Your employer pays "their" share of
> >your medical insurance, why? Obviously it is because they
> >consider the value you provide to the company to be worth
> >that compensation. Will they continue to pay that
> >contribution if you no longer work there? Obviously not.
> >The only possible conclusion from these two incredibly
> >obvious facts is that the "employer contribution" to your
> >health insurance premiums is, in fact, nothing other than
> >compensation for employment, just as any wage would be.
> >The only difference is that it is kept on a different
> >balance sheet so that you do not perceive it to be such.
>
> The fact that it's not taxed if your employer pays it, but is taxed if
> you do, is one of the fundamental problems with the system.

Not only that, but for someone making 5\$.15 an hour it doesn't matter simply because even if they spent 100% of their net income on medical insurance to the exclusion of food, shelter, child costs, etc, they still wouldn't be able to get good medical care.

I chal