



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Monday, July 24, 2017

Contact: Dale Butland, 614-783-5833

press@DeceptiveRxIssue.org

THE COLUMBUS DISPATCH: ISSUE 2 IS BAD PUBLIC POLICY THAT WON'T WORK
Newspaper calls prescription drug ballot proposal "dangerous"

Columbus, OH – *The Columbus Dispatch* has become the first major daily in the state to editorialize on Issue 2, urging voters to oppose the prescription drug state purchasing proposal to appear on the November 7 Ohio statewide ballot.

In an in-depth, full-page [editorial](#) in its Sunday, July 23 edition, *The Dispatch* slammed Issue 2 as “bad public policy” that is based on “wishful thinking and misinformation” and “loaded with unknown costs, consequences and potential harms for some of Ohio’s most vulnerable residents.”

“Proponents argue this issue is simple. They claim it (Issue 2) would reduce drug prices for 4 million Ohioans and pledge that it would save Ohio at least \$400 million per year. But a state budget expert says their math is faulty, and the group doesn’t seem to be able to support its claims with much more than flat assertions and emotion,” the newspaper wrote.

The editorial also expressed concern about a provision in the ballot issue that gives its four named sponsors the right to intervene in any related court challenges and requires Ohio taxpayers to pay their legal fees. Said the newspaper, “If backers of this proposal objected to a state Medicaid director’s workaround for this unworkable plan, the state could be sued by this gang of four—and Ohio taxpayers would be compelled to pay legal bills on both sides of a possibly protracted lawsuit.”

The Dispatch noted that a virtually identical proposal was defeated in California last year—and that the “no” coalition in Ohio has attracted support from more than 60 statewide organizations while “not a single statewide group has backed Issue 2.”

The newspaper concluded that the “Ohio Drug Price Relief Act would not do what its name suggests,” and that it is “strewn with health and financial landmines.” “Opponents brand this proposal as ‘deceptive.’ It’s worse: It’s dangerous.”

-30-