
Subject: Hillary's plan!
Posted by [excelav](#) on Sun, 03 Feb 2008 19:12:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Here a glimpse of what to expect from Hillary if she gets in. Check out Hillary's plan.

<http://apnews.excite.com/article/20080203/D8UIUU901.html>

You guys wanted to change the subject, right?

Subject: Re: Hillary's plan!
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Sun, 03 Feb 2008 19:31:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:47a603f0\$1@linux...

>
> Here a glimpse of what to expect from Hillary if she gets in. Check out
> Hillary's
> plan.
>
> <http://apnews.excite.com/article/20080203/D8UIUU901.html>
>
> You guys wanted to change the subject, right?

Coming soon to a commune near you!!!

;o)

Subject: Re: Hillary's plan!
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Sun, 03 Feb 2008 20:43:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

They already do compulsory health insurance in Mass. Enacted with Mitt Romney as gov.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Massachusetts_2006_Health_Reform_Statute

Personally, I do think everyone ought to be insured, but I don't think it should be through employers.

Why should insurance be tied to a job? People change jobs all the time and why should they have to change insurance. What a hassle.

Currently everyone is sort of covered already, but it's in a very inefficient way as emergency room treatment where costs are high, rather than as preventative care where costs are lower. We should be able to improve on this.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

Deej wrote:

> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:47a603f0\$1@linux...
>> Here a glimpse of what to expect from Hillary if she gets in. Check out
>> Hillary's
>> plan.
>>
>> <http://apnews.excite.com/article/20080203/D8UIUU901.html>
>>
>> You guys wanted to change the subject, right?
>
> Coming soon to a commune near you!!!
>
> ;o)
>
>
>
>
>

Subject: Re: Hillary's plan!
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Sun, 03 Feb 2008 20:55:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

O'bamaussey's healthcare plan is less o'bominable than Hilary's, at least on the face of it.

;o)

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a62ac6\$1@linux...
>
> They already do compulsory health insurance in Mass. Enacted with Mitt
> Romney as gov.
>
> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Massachusetts_2006_Health_Reform_Statute
>
> Personally, I do think everyone ought to be insured, but I don't think it
> should be through employers.

>
> Why should insurance be tied to a job? People change jobs all the time and
> why should they have to change insurance. What a hassle.
>
> Currently everyone is sort of covered already, but it's in a very
> inefficient way as emergency room treatment where costs are high, rather
> than as preventative care where costs are lower. We should be able to
> improve on this.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
> Deej wrote:
>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>> news:47a603f0\$1@linux...
>>> Here a glimpse of what to expect from Hillary if she gets in. Check out
>>> Hillary's
>>> plan.
>>>
>>> <http://apnews.excite.com/article/20080203/D8UIUU901.html>
>>>
>>> You guys wanted to change the subject, right?
>>
>> Coming soon to a commune near you!!!
>>
>> ;o)
>>
>>
>>

Subject: Re: Hillary's plan!

Posted by [Bill L](#) on Sun, 03 Feb 2008 21:27:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The very idea that the government would garnish wages to pay for enforced health insurance is anathema to me. Does my health and my body now also belong to the government? It's just another way for the government to tax us. Duh.

I wonder what the money trail is back to Ms Clinton's pocketbook?

James McCloskey wrote:

> Here a glimpse of what to expect from Hillary if she gets in. Check out Hillary's
> plan.
>

> <http://apnews.excite.com/article/20080203/D8UIUU901.html>

>

> You guys wanted to change the subject, right?

Subject: Re: Hillary's plan!

Posted by [Gary Flanigan](#) on Mon, 04 Feb 2008 19:06:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm not sure what the big deal is here. We already pay Medicare and SS taxes out of our paychecks, so what's different about this?

Frankly, we are already paying for these folks when they need health care and end up in the emergency room.

As for the libertarians among us, I'd be happy to have you not participate as long as you sign a release allowing medical care to be denied you when you need it and can't afford it.

Sarcasm aside, this is a big problem. There are millions of folks without coverage, and high costs in part because they don't get treated early in the stage of their afflictions. It is going to take some big changes to make this happen, but a lot of other countries do it and I'm sure we can find a way as well.

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>The very idea that the government would garnish wages to pay for
>enforced health insurance is anathema to me. Does my health and my body

>now also belong to the government? It's just another way for the
>government to tax us. Duh.

>

>I wonder what the money trail is back to Ms Clinton's pocketbook?

>

>James McCloskey wrote:

>> Here a glimpse of what to expect from Hillary if she gets in. Check out
Hillary's

>> plan.

>>

>> <http://apnews.excite.com/article/20080203/D8UIUU901.html>

>>

>> You guys wanted to change the subject, right?

Subject: Re: Hillary's plan!

Posted by [Bill L](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 00:19:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Some folks in America have a notion that we can afford anything, but those days are over. The dollar is dying because financial markets don't have confidence in a currency that tries to print its way out of trouble. Now our so-called leaders want to borrow more money to give everybody a bribe, oops, I mean "tax rebate" to "stimulate the economy". How about ending the idiotic "war on terror" and using the trillion dollars we are blowing in the middle east to pay off some bills and salvage what is left of our down-sliding economy?

Here's a national health plan I could agree to:

1. The less you get sick, the less you pay. If you have a life long record of wellness your insurance costs very little. This can be computed actuarially so that it is a correct prediction of what you will probably cost the system
2. If you exercise, stay within a healthy weight, eat organic food, you pay less
3. The less you drink or smoke, the less you pay
4. If you actively participate in preventive health programs you pay less
5. If your lifestyle statistically suggests you will require less insurance, you pay less

In other words reward better performers with a much lower rate - a truly proportionally lower rate. I rarely get sick and I have never had a serious disease.

I'm not hard-hearted and I know illness sucks - but we need a system that makes people responsible for themselves otherwise they typically just get weaker. I don't drink or smoke or take any drugs. I exercise regularly and I stay at a healthy weight. Why should I pay premiums to support people who don't give a shit about themselves or their health until they get sick?

Gary Flanigan wrote:

- > I'm not sure what the big deal is here. We already pay Medicare and SS taxes
- > out of our paychecks, so what's different about this?

So you're saying since we're already getting screwed what's a few dollars more?

- >
- > Frankly, we are already paying for these folks when they need health care
- > and end up in the emergency room.
- >
- > As for the libertarians among us, I'd be happy to have you not participate
- > as long as you sign a release allowing medical care to be denied you when
- > you need it and can't afford it.

Not a problem. Can I opt out of all the other bullshit I don't want to pay for too? Doubt it. Our lowest common denominator system doesn't work without a police and military to make sure everybody pays.

>

> Sarcasm aside, this is a big problem. There are millions of folks without coverage, and high costs in part because they don't get treated early in the stage of their afflictions. It is going to take some big changes to make this happen, but a lot of other countries do it and I'm sure we can find a way as well.

>

>

>

>

>

> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>> The very idea that the government would garnish wages to pay for enforced health insurance is anathema to me. Does my health and my body

>

>> now also belong to the government? It's just another way for the government to tax us. Duh.

>>

>> I wonder what the money trail is back to Ms Clinton's pocketbook?

>>

>> James McCloskey wrote:

>>> Here a glimpse of what to expect from Hillary if she gets in. Check out

> Hillary's

>>> plan.

>>>

>>> <http://apnews.excite.com/article/20080203/D8UIUU901.html>

>>>

>>> You guys wanted to change the subject, right?

>

Subject: Re: Hillary's plan!

Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 01:55:56 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Bill, you have now made yourself God. Don;t you know any minute (God-Forbidden) you can come down with a debilitating disease?

Yes, you done all the so-called right things to stay healthy. But, there are millions of folks who were Health-Nuts who contracted cancer, MS, and other deadly deseases my friend.

You are one of the blessed ones to not have contracted many deseases.

No Man(Woman) knows the day or hour when our time is up on this earth. We

don't even know if we'll see the next day.
Just a thought..

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>Some folks in America have a notion that we can afford anything, but
>those days are over. The dollar is dying because financial markets don't

>have confidence in a currency that tries to print its way out of
>trouble. Now our so-called leaders want to borrow more money to give
>everybody a bribe, oops, I mean "tax rebate" to "stimulate the economy".

>How about ending the idiotic "war on terror" and using the trillion
>dollars we are blowing in the middle east to pay off some bills and
>salvage what is left of our down-sliding economy?

>

>Here's a national health plan I could agree to:

>1. The less you get sick, the less you pay. If you have a life long
>record of wellness your insurance costs very little. This can be
>computed actuarially so that it is a correct prediction of what you will

>probably cost the system

>2. If you exercise, stay within a healthy weight, eat organic food, you

>pay less

>3. The less you drink or smoke, the less you pay

>4. If you actively participate in preventive health programs you pay less

>5. If your lifestyle statistically suggests you will require less

>insurance, you pay less

>

>In other words reward better performers with a much lower rate - a truly

>proportionally lower rate. I rarely get sick and I have never had a
>serious disease.

>

>I'm not hard-hearted and I know illness sucks - but we need a system
>that makes people responsible for themselves otherwise they typically
>just get weaker. I don't drink or smoke or take any drugs. I exercise
>regularly and I stay at a healthy weight. Why should I pay premiums to
>support people who don't give a shit about themselves or their health
>until they get sick?

>

>Gary Flanigan wrote:

>> I'm not sure what the big deal is here. We already pay Medicare and SS
taxes

>> out of our paychecks, so what's different about this?

>

>So you're saying since we're already getting screwed what's a few
>dollars more?

>>
>> Frankly, we are already paying for these folks when they need health care
>> and end up in the emergency room.
>>
>> As for the libertarians among us, I'd be happy to have you not participate
>> as long as you sign a release allowing medical care to be denied you when
>> you need it and can't afford it.
>Not a problem. Can I opt out of all the other bullshit I don't want to
>pay for too? Doubt it. Our lowest common denominator system doesn't work

>without a police and military to make sure everybody pays.
>>
>> Sarcasm aside, this is a big problem. There are millions of folks without
>> coverage, and high costs in part because they don't get treated early
in
>> the stage of their afflictions. It is going to take some big changes
to
>> make this happen, but a lot of other countries do it and I'm sure we can
>> find a way as well.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>> The very idea that the government would garnish wages to pay for
>>> enforced health insurance is anathema to me. Does my health and my body
>>
>>> now also belong to the government? It's just another way for the
>>> government to tax us. Duh.
>>>
>>> I wonder what the money trail is back to Ms Clinton's pocketbook?
>>>
>>> James McCloskey wrote:
>>>> Here a glimpse of what to expect from Hillary if she gets in. Check
out
>> Hillary's
>>>> plan.
>>>>
>>>> <http://apnews.excite.com/article/20080203/D8UIUU901.html>
>>>>
>>>> You guys wanted to change the subject, right?
>>

Subject: Re: Hillary's plan!
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 13:45:07 GMT

Fine, except that a lot of people are sick through no fault of their own, including a lot of children at the mercy of their parents' health knowledge and habits. Not to mention, I see people in their 80s in pretty good shape who just quit smoking and/or drinking a few years ago, and exercise and health food fanatics in their 50s with horrible diseases.

The "responsible for one's own condition" theory has some limits.

S

"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:47a7af01\$1@linux...
> Some folks in America have a notion that we can afford anything, but those
> days are over. The dollar is dying because financial markets don't have
> confidence in a currency that tries to print its way out of trouble. Now
> our so-called leaders want to borrow more money to give everybody a bribe,
> oops, I mean "tax rebate" to "stimulate the economy". How about ending the
> idiotic "war on terror" and using the trillion dollars we are blowing in
> the middle east to pay off some bills and salvage what is left of our
> down-sliding economy?
>
> Here's a national health plan I could agree to:
> 1. The less you get sick, the less you pay. If you have a life long record
> of wellness your insurance costs very little. This can be computed
> actuarially so that it is a correct prediction of what you will probably
> cost the system
> 2. If you exercise, stay within a healthy weight, eat organic food, you
> pay less
> 3. The less you drink or smoke, the less you pay
> 4. If you actively participate in preventive health programs you pay less
> 5. If your lifestyle statistically suggests you will require less
> insurance, you pay less
>
> In other words reward better performers with a much lower rate - a truly
> proportionally lower rate. I rarely get sick and I have never had a
> serious disease.
>
> I'm not hard-hearted and I know illness sucks - but we need a system that
> makes people responsible for themselves otherwise they typically just get
> weaker. I don't drink or smoke or take any drugs. I exercise regularly and
> I stay at a healthy weight. Why should I pay premiums to support people
> who don't give a shit about themselves or their health until they get
> sick?
>
> Gary Flanigan wrote:
>> I'm not sure what the big deal is here. We already pay Medicare and SS
>> taxes

>> out of our paychecks, so what's different about this?
>
> So you're saying since we're already getting screwed what's a few dollars
> more?
>>
>> Frankly, we are already paying for these folks when they need health care
>> and end up in the emergency room.
>>
>> As for the libertarians among us, I'd be happy to have you not
>> participate
>> as long as you sign a release allowing medical care to be denied you when
>> you need it and can't afford it.
> Not a problem. Can I opt out of all the other bullshit I don't want to pay
> for too? Doubt it. Our lowest common denominator system doesn't work
> without a police and military to make sure everybody pays.
>>
>> Sarcasm aside, this is a big problem. There are millions of folks
>> without
>> coverage, and high costs in part because they don't get treated early in
>> the stage of their afflictions. It is going to take some big changes to
>> make this happen, but a lot of other countries do it and I'm sure we can
>> find a way as well.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>> The very idea that the government would garnish wages to pay for
>>> enforced health insurance is anathema to me. Does my health and my body
>>
>>> now also belong to the government? It's just another way for the
>>> government to tax us. Duh.
>>>
>>> I wonder what the money trail is back to Ms Clinton's pocketbook?
>>>
>>> James McCloskey wrote:
>>>> Here a glimpse of what to expect from Hillary if she gets in. Check
>>>> out
>> Hillary's
>>>> plan.
>>>>
>>>> <http://apnews.excite.com/article/20080203/D8UIUU901.html>
>>>>
>>>> You guys wanted to change the subject, right?
>>

Subject: Re: Hillary's plan!

Posted by [TCB](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 16:24:17 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The fact that Hilary happens to be the _biggest_ whore for the drug companies only means she's a bit more savvy extracting money from that part of the (traditionally Democratic) fund raising base than her opponents. Believe me, if Obama wins the nomination he'll be taking their checks soon enough.

I'm suspicious of the idea of a nationalized health care system. While I've experienced two very good ones, one in Japan and one in Germany, both countries are legendary for being 'cultures of order.' Needless to say, we are not. I _do_ think there is a need for more people to get access to insurance and, crucially, preventative care. Both save lots of money in the long run and if a sensible plan can be put together that will cost me some tax money I can't say it's such a bad idea, despite my occasional libertarian leanings.

BTW - that was what really scared the bejeesus out of people about Ron Paul. No prominent politician of either party has any serious problem with mildly crypto-racist baiting about lazy welfare mothers and everyone using the emergency room as an insurance plan. What RP was threatening to do was keeping the noses of Monsanto, Eli-Lilly, and Lockheed-Martin out of the public trough. That'll get you a couple of grams of lead behind your political ear every time.

TCB

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>The very idea that the government would garnish wages to pay for
>enforced health insurance is anathema to me. Does my health and my body

>now also belong to the government? It's just another way for the
>government to tax us. Duh.

>
>I wonder what the money trail is back to Ms Clinton's pocketbook?

>
>James McCloskey wrote:

>> Here a glimpse of what to expect from Hillary if she gets in. Check out
Hillary's
>> plan.

>>
>> <http://apnews.excite.com/article/20080203/D8UIUU901.html>

>>
>> You guys wanted to change the subject, right?

Subject: Re: Hillary's plan!

Posted by [Bill L](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 21:14:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have no problem with the best free health care and really good food (and education) for children. And I know that people can do all the right things and still get sick, but there are ways to statistically predict illness and one can look at the past record of a person to see if they are likely to get sick again, and from these data it can be determined whether they should pay a high or low premium. What I absolutely wouldn't want is "From each according to his/her ability and to each according to his/her need." That communist maxim sounds wonderful, but gets you a tiny handful of struggling individuals holding it all together and a huge number of apathetic drudges letting it fall apart. Current human beings need a little danger, stress and necessity to rise up to doing something about it, and any workable system must have that as a component or it fails.

At least that is what I think right now. If there is something I'm missing, let me in on it.

Sarah wrote:

> Fine, except that a lot of people are sick through no fault of their own,
> including a lot of children at the mercy of their parents' health knowledge
> and habits. Not to mention, I see people in their 80s in pretty good shape
> who just quit smoking and/or drinking a few years ago, and exercise and
> health food fanatics in their 50s with horrible diseases.
>
> The "responsible for one's own condition" theory has some limits.
>
> S
>
>
> "Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:47a7af01\$1@linux...
>> Some folks in America have a notion that we can afford anything, but those
>> days are over. The dollar is dying because financial markets don't have
>> confidence in a currency that tries to print its way out of trouble. Now
>> our so-called leaders want to borrow more money to give everybody a bribe,
>> oops, I mean "tax rebate" to "stimulate the economy". How about ending the
>> idiotic "war on terror" and using the trillion dollars we are blowing in
>> the middle east to pay off some bills and salvage what is left of our
>> down-sliding economy?
>>
>> Here's a national health plan I could agree to:
>> 1. The less you get sick, the less you pay. If you have a life long record
>> of wellness your insurance costs very little. This can be computed
>> actuarially so that it is a correct prediction of what you will probably
>> cost the system
>> 2. If you exercise, stay within a healthy weight, eat organic food, you

>> pay less
>> 3. The less you drink or smoke, the less you pay
>> 4. If you actively participate in preventive health programs you pay less
>> 5. If your lifestyle statistically suggests you will require less
>> insurance, you pay less
>>
>> In other words reward better performers with a much lower rate - a truly
>> proportionally lower rate. I rarely get sick and I have never had a
>> serious disease.
>>
>> I'm not hard-hearted and I know illness sucks - but we need a system that
>> makes people responsible for themselves otherwise they typically just get
>> weaker. I don't drink or smoke or take any drugs. I exercise regularly and
>> I stay at a healthy weight. Why should I pay premiums to support people
>> who don't give a shit about themselves or their health until they get
>> sick?
>>
>> Gary Flanigan wrote:
>>> I'm not sure what the big deal is here. We already pay Medicare and SS
>>> taxes
>>> out of our paychecks, so what's different about this?
>> So you're saying since we're already getting screwed what's a few dollars
>> more?
>>> Frankly, we are already paying for these folks when they need health care
>>> and end up in the emergency room.
>>>
>>> As for the libertarians among us, I'd be happy to have you not
>>> participate
>>> as long as you sign a release allowing medical care to be denied you when
>>> you need it and can't afford it.
>> Not a problem. Can I opt out of all the other bullshit I don't want to pay
>> for too? Doubt it. Our lowest common denominator system doesn't work
>> without a police and military to make sure everybody pays.
>>> Sarcasm aside, this is a big problem. There are millions of folks
>>> without
>>> coverage, and high costs in part because they don't get treated early in
>>> the stage of their afflictions. It is going to take some big changes to
>>> make this happen, but a lot of other countries do it and I'm sure we can
>>> find a way as well.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>> The very idea that the government would garnish wages to pay for
>>>> enforced health insurance is anathema to me. Does my health and my body
>>>> now also belong to the government? It's just another way for the

>>>> government to tax us. Duh.
>>>>
>>>> I wonder what the money trail is back to Ms Clinton's pocketbook?
>>>>
>>>> James McCloskey wrote:
>>>>> Here a glimpse of what to expect from Hillary if she gets in. Check
>>>>> out
>>> Hillary's
>>>>> plan.
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://apnews.excite.com/article/20080203/D8UIUU901.html>
>>>>>
>>>>> You guys wanted to change the subject, right?
>
>

Subject: Re: Hillary's plan!
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 22:39:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well.....and long as it makes vaccination mandatory.....

<http://www.dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dws/fea/healthylivin/g/health/stories/020208dnlivHPV.21f1149.html>

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:47a603f0\$1@linux...

>
> Here a glimpse of what to expect from Hillary if she gets in. Check out
> Hillary's
> plan.
>
> <http://apnews.excite.com/article/20080203/D8UIUU901.html>
>
> You guys wanted to change the subject, right?

Subject: Re: Hillary's plan!
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 09:18:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't think you're missing anything, it's just a point of view. I just happen to agree with countries who treat public health like fire or police protection. I found the views of health care in England, France, Cuba, and Canada presented in "Sicko" to be very interesting. Almost made me want to look for work in BC. :)

S

"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:47a8d4fb@linux...
>I have no problem with the best free health care and really good food (and
>education) for children. And I know that people can do all the right things
>and still get sick, but there are ways to statistically predict illness and
>one can look at the past record of a person to see if they are likely to
>get sick again, and from these data it can be determined whether they
>should pay a high or low premium. What I absolutely wouldn't want is "From
>each according to his/her ability and to each according to his/her need."
>That communist maxim sounds wonderful, but gets you a tiny handful of
>struggling individuals holding it all together and a huge number of
>apathetic drudges letting it fall apart. Current human beings need a little
>danger, stress and necessity to rise up to doing something about it, and
>any workable system must have that as a component or it fails.

>
> At least that is what I think right now. If there is something I'm
> missing, let me in on it.

>
> Sarah wrote:

>> Fine, except that a lot of people are sick through no fault of their own,
>> including a lot of children at the mercy of their parents' health
>> knowledge and habits. Not to mention, I see people in their 80s in
>> pretty good shape who just quit smoking and/or drinking a few years ago,
>> and exercise and health food fanatics in their 50s with horrible
>> diseases.

>>
>> The "responsible for one's own condition" theory has some limits.

>>
>> S

>>
>>
>> "Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message
>> news:47a7af01\$1@linux...

>>> Some folks in America have a notion that we can afford anything, but
>>> those days are over. The dollar is dying because financial markets don't
>>> have confidence in a currency that tries to print its way out of
>>> trouble. Now our so-called leaders want to borrow more money to give
>>> everybody a bribe, oops, I mean "tax rebate" to "stimulate the economy".
>>> How about ending the idiotic "war on terror" and using the trillion
>>> dollars we are blowing in the middle east to pay off some bills and
>>> salvage what is left of our down-sliding economy?

>>>
>>> Here's a national health plan I could agree to:
>>> 1. The less you get sick, the less you pay. If you have a life long
>>> record of wellness your insurance costs very little. This can be
>>> computed actuarially so that it is a correct prediction of what you will

>>> probably cost the system
>>> 2. If you exercise, stay within a healthy weight, eat organic food, you
>>> pay less
>>> 3. The less you drink or smoke, the less you pay
>>> 4. If you actively participate in preventive health programs you pay
>>> less
>>> 5. If your lifestyle statistically suggests you will require less
>>> insurance, you pay less
>>>
>>> In other words reward better performers with a much lower rate - a truly
>>> proportionally lower rate. I rarely get sick and I have never had a
>>> serious disease.
>>>
>>> I'm not hard-hearted and I know illness sucks - but we need a system
>>> that makes people responsible for themselves otherwise they typically
>>> just get weaker. I don't drink or smoke or take any drugs. I exercise
>>> regularly and I stay at a healthy weight. Why should I pay premiums to
>>> support people who don't give a shit about themselves or their health
>>> until they get sick?
>>>
>>> Gary Flanigan wrote:
>>>> I'm not sure what the big deal is here. We already pay Medicare and SS
>>>> taxes
>>>> out of our paychecks, so what's different about this?
>>> So you're saying since we're already getting screwed what's a few
>>> dollars more?
>>>> Frankly, we are already paying for these folks when they need health
>>>> care
>>>> and end up in the emergency room.
>>>>
>>>> As for the libertarians among us, I'd be happy to have you not
>>>> participate
>>>> as long as you sign a release allowing medical care to be denied you
>>>> when
>>>> you need it and can't afford it.
>>> Not a problem. Can I opt out of all the other bullshit I don't want to
>>> pay for too? Doubt it. Our lowest common denominator system doesn't work
>>> without a police and military to make sure everybody pays.
>>>> Sarcasm aside, this is a big problem. There are millions of folks
>>>> without
>>>> coverage, and high costs in part because they don't get treated early
>>>> in
>>>> the stage of their afflictions. It is going to take some big changes
>>>> to
>>>> make this happen, but a lot of other countries do it and I'm sure we
>>>> can
>>>> find a way as well.
>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>>>>> The very idea that the government would garnish wages to pay for
>>>>> enforced health insurance is anathema to me. Does my health and my
>>>>> body

>>>>> now also belong to the government? It's just another way for the
>>>>> government to tax us. Duh.

>>>>>

>>>>> I wonder what the money trail is back to Ms Clinton's pocketbook?

>>>>>

>>>>> James McCloskey wrote:

>>>>>> Here a glimpse of what to expect from Hillary if she gets in. Check
>>>>>> out

>>>> Hillary's

>>>>>> plan.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> <http://apnews.excite.com/article/20080203/D8UIUU901.html>

>>>>>>

>>>>>> You guys wanted to change the subject, right?

>>
