What it Costs When It's Free

This will be the Comment of the Day, left on a friend's page:

> *Well look, they're always looking for ways to improve the statistics. And the statistics just look better when you don't treat sick people. You can call it an unintended consequence or a creative solution... I call it the logical consequence of indulging the single-payer fantasy.*

Anyone already aware of the NHS's condition already knows that it's been cutting back long before Charlie Gard. For years it's been denying dialysis treatments (because of chronic shortages of staff and equipment) to 50-something people, whose care would have been commonplace in the United States, and determining that certain people are too old for life-prolonging treatments. None of this should shock a person who understands what "socialized medicine" really is. Ultimately, as more people scramble to get their piece of a limited pie, and they can't be made to pay more, then the pieces must get smaller and/or some will be denied. The Land of Orwell is fulfilling "1984" bit by bit, and it'll be only a matter of time before people are forced into fitness. Then when everyone is in what would be considered good physical health, the bar for treatment will be set higher and higher. Of course, Inner Party members will never need to worry.

To be sure, when one receives the king's coin, one implicitly must accept all conditions. However, these are people who pay taxes for "free" health insurance, which prices them out of private alternatives. In a free market, those people could still get insurance policies, albeit with hefty surcharges, of course, if they could afford them, but they'd still have a shot at getting policies, or they could pay doctors and hospitals outright if they have the means.

P.J. O'Rourke said years ago, "If you think health care is expensive now, wait until you see what it costs when it's free." We can now say, "If you think your health care isn't very good now, wait until it's free and you won't get what your taxes pay for."