

Prop 72 in the News

Exposed "Scare Tactics" Reveals Deception by Opponents of Prop 72's Health Care Protections

You might have seen an ad against Proposition 72, the measure to ensure that workers in large and medium size companies get private health care coverage on the job. The ad features a woman talking about the impact of Proposition 72 on "her" restaurant.

There's one problem: it's wrong. She's an actress, not a restaurant owner. (See San Francisco Chronicle October 2004)

She's in a small restaurant that employs 12 people, and thus would be exempt from Prop 72 since it is under 50 employees. The restaurant would have to more than quadruple its size in order even to be subject to Prop 72. Over 93% of restaurants have less than 50 employees and would be exempt.

She's just wrong. She says she provides "good benefits" but would still have to pay money. If an employer provides good benefits (as most large and medium size businesses do), they would not have to pay any more under Prop 72.

She's dead wrong. She says she would be "forced" into a "government-run" system. If an employer provides good benefits, nothing in Proposition 72 would require her to change the coverage they provide workers in any way. She has the option of joining a statewide purchasing pool, but even that would provide a choice of private plans.

Author of Fast Food Nation Reveals Super-Size Deception

Why has McDonald's, of all companies, become the biggest opponent of a critical health care law supported by doctors, nurses, and consumer groups? McDonald's and its franchisees have given \$1.4 million to oppose Proposition 72, an important measure that would protect the coverage that millions of Californians get on-the-job, extend such coverage to one million more California workers and family members, and provide fairness for employers and taxpayers that often must bear the cost of paying for the health care of those employers that do not provide coverage. The author of the critically-acclaimed book "Fast Food Nation" provides a revealing look at the measure's opposition in this recent Los Angeles Times editorial.