

# Ballot Measures: Health

## PROPOSITION 86: Tobacco tax for children's health care

This measure would raise \$2.1 billion for affordable health insurance for all children (\$371 million); emergency room services (\$828 million); prevention and treatment of cancer, lung disease, and asthma (\$416 million); smoking prevention and cessation programs (\$213 million); nurse education (\$100 million); and community clinics and First 5 programs (\$64 million). It would increase cigarette taxes by \$2.60 a pack.

### SUPPORTERS SAY

The measure would “win health coverage for all kids, prevent kids from smoking and help smokers quit, and strengthen health care in our communities,” says PICO California. Prop. 86 would



SOUTHEAST MISSOURI HOSPITAL

- **Insure all kids:** Children would be eligible if they are under 19, don't qualify for public programs, and live in families with incomes under 300% of the poverty level (\$60,000 for a family of four).
- **Save billions in long-term health costs:** More children would have access to primary care (rather than relying on expensive emergency room visits) and fewer people would get cancer or asthma because of smoking.
- **Prevent deaths related to smoking:** The high price of cigarettes would keep kids from smoking and encourage smokers to quit.

**Supporters:** 100% Campaign (510-763-2444, x 122, [www.100percentcampaign.org](http://www.100percentcampaign.org)), Children's Defense Fund-California, PICO California, American Lung Association of California, California Department of Health Services, California State PTA

### OPPONENTS SAY

“This tax (could) drive the cigarette market underground” and encourage tobacco smuggling, says Jon Coupal of the Howard Jarvis Tax Association. Prop 86 would also

- **Add more taxes** in a state that is overtaxed.
- **Not be fair to smokers**, particularly low-income smokers who pay a higher percentage of their income for cigarettes.
- **Provide services for illegal immigrants.**
- **Bring in less money over time** because people will quit smoking.

**Opponents:** Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association (916-444-9950), California Chamber of Commerce, National Tax-Limitation Committee

—Aimee Strain

## PROPOSITION 84: Water quality and park improvements



This measure would borrow \$5.4 billion by issuing bonds to provide funds to public agencies (which may contract with qualified service providers) for safe-drinking-water projects, flood control, protection of natural resources, improvements to state and local parks, and improvements to air and water quality.

### SUPPORTERS SAY

“Our state and local park systems are not keeping pace with a rapidly-growing population,” says the Yes on 84 campaign. Prop. 84 would

- **Provide clean drinking water** for every community.
- **Restore and expand state parks** so children can “see and feel history,” says the campaign.
- **Create regional and local parks in underserved neighborhoods** and expand overused parks.
- **Reduce the risk of flooding** that could leave Californians without safe drinking water after a natural disaster.

**Supporters:** Yes on Prop. 84 (916-558-1516, [www.yeson84.com](http://www.yeson84.com)), California League of Conservation Voters, National Wildlife Federation, Black American Political Association of California, League of Women Voters of California

### OPPONENTS SAY

“This is one of the most egregiously self-interested initiatives that we have seen,” says Lew Uhler of the National Tax Limitation Committee. Prop. 84 would

- **“Line the pockets” of environmental groups:** Many organizations that gave money to put measure on the ballot would get millions for their projects, says Uhler.
- **Be very expensive:** Over 30 years, the bonds will cost \$10 to 11 billion to pay back, says Uhler.
- **Not meet water and energy needs:** There are no funds for dams or reservoirs.

**Opponents:** National Tax Limitation Committee (916-786-9400), California State Board of Equalization, Americans for Tax Reform

—Jessine Foss