# **Patient Power**

Because your health care is too important to be left to politicians.

- Home
- *Real* reform: free markets
- About
- authors
- Stay Informed

## "Opting out" of the "public option"

October 28th, 2009 | by Brian Schwartz |

The Wall Street Journal reported last week:

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, stepping deeper into the health-care debate, put his weight Thursday behind a proposal that would create a new government-run insurance plan while giving states the option not to participate.

Roger Pilon of Cato <u>asks</u> the pertinent question:

Will residents in states that opt-out be able to opt-out of the taxes needed to support the public option? (Please don't say the public option will be self-supporting: we're grown-ups.)

#### Michael Cannon comments:

Taxpayers in every state will have to subsidize Fannie Med, either implicitly or explicitly. What state official will say, "I don't care if my constituents are subsidizing Fannie Med, I'm not going to let my constituents get their money back"? State officials are obsessed with maximizing their share of federal dollars. Voters will crucify officials who opt out. Fannie Med supporters know that. They're counting on it.

A state opt-out provision does not make Fannie Med any more moderate. It is not a concession. It is merely the latest entreaty <u>from the Spider to the Fly</u>.

#### **ShareThis**

tags: Harry Reid, Obama Care, public option

- Who decides on medical care? Insurers & government, not you
- Maine's "public option" has failed
- Government health co-op: public plan in disguise?
- Obama lies (or misleads) on health care
- Michael Bennet's health care confusion

### Post a Comment