

Kids as Carbon Footprints? A recent Washington Post article reports on D.C. families taking “green” to the extreme that is revealing about the makeup of the radical environmental community.

"I'm 40, so my clock is going boom! Boom! Boom! Sometimes, I just roll my eyes and go, 'Come on, honey, think about who our child could be!'" said Mimi Iklé-Khalsa. But her husband says a second child could have too high an environmental cost. *"We've had the discussion of, 'If we have another biological child, it means we never fly,' "* and do other things to offset the child's carbon footprint, she said. - Washington Post, 4/19/2009

“Green Jobs”: A recent study on the effects of Spanish renewable energy policies highlights problematic findings as the U.S. considers similar policies. The study concludes that 2.2 jobs are destroyed for each renewable job financed by the government and each “green job” was created at a cost of \$753,778 (\$1.3 million per wind job). The Spanish government’s renewable energy policies eliminated 113,000 jobs elsewhere in the economy, according to the study by researchers at the Universidad of Rey Juan Carlos. According to the study, if President Obama is successful in creating 3 to 5 million “green jobs”, then 6.6 to 11 million other American jobs will be lost. And according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, Spain’s annual emissions of carbon dioxide have increased by nearly 50% since it began its aggressive push to subsidize and support “green jobs.”

Upcoming Energy Summits:

- On May 5th, we will host our D.C. Energy Summit in the CVC which will focus on the devastating effects of cap-and-tax. We have several prominent witnesses confirmed to attend, including John Engler, the President of NAM and former Governor of Michigan.
- Over the Memorial Day recess, we will take our energy message to the American people by holding Energy Summits around the country. Details are being finalized now.

The Cost of Cap-and-Tax: Republicans continue to cite up to **\$3,128 per household** as the annual cost per family of a cap-and-tax bill. To get that number, Leadership took MIT’s estimate of S. 309 from the 110th Congress because the emissions targets track the emissions targets outlined in President Obama’s budget. MIT’s own number for the cost in the year 2015—\$366 billion—was divided by the number of U.S. households (117 million households, assuming 300 million people and an average household size of 2.56 people). Using this formula, you get \$3,128. The MIT professor questions the \$3,100 figure because he claims “government rebates to consumers” must be factored in. However, Democrats have no intention of using a cap-and-tax system to deliver rebates to consumers; they want the tax revenue to fund more government spending.

History Repeats Itself: Both Presidents Clinton and Obama called for a sweeping national energy tax in their inaugural budget submissions. In 1993, Clinton called for an across-the-board tax on fuels, based on their heat content, the so-called “BTU tax.” Now, President Obama and Democrat allies propose a cap-and-tax system to raise revenue and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Both energy taxes ultimately target energy consumers—families and businesses—and cost millions of jobs. Over a comparable five year period, cap-and-tax is roughly *16 times* larger than the Clinton BTU tax. After the Clinton BTU tax passed by a narrow vote of 219-213 in the House, the plan was dropped in the Senate in favor of a watered-down transportation fuel tax on gasoline, diesel, and other motor fuels. However, the legislative episode led to the coining of the phrase “being BTUed” to describe instances where the House passes unpopular legislative initiatives only to be stopped by the Senate. Might history repeat itself?