



WHAT CONSUMERS ARE SAYING ABOUT THE WAXMAN-MARKEY CAP-AND-TRADE BILL

“Based on this sampling of letters to editors from across the country, H.R. 2454 clearly does not enjoy overwhelming support from informed American consumers who know best what this legislation’s negative impacts will be on their jobs and daily lives.”

Charles T. Drevna
President, National Petrochemical & Refiners Association (NPRA)
July 6, 2009

From a Reader in Paradis, La.

“If this bill becomes law, every American will see a substantial increase in his or her cost of living. That should rate front page news!” (Letter to the Editor, “Climate bill will cost us big,” [The Times-Picayune](#) [New Orleans], July 6, 2009)

From a Reader in Coshocton, Ohio

“Under the guise of lowering carbon emissions our government has **further harmed our chances of economic recovery.** The bill is **largely a shell game** that raises taxes by \$646 billion dollars on coal, oil and natural gas. **This tax increase on American businesses will cause massive job cuts and will undoubtedly be passed on to consumers** by raising home energy bills substantially.” (Letter to the Editor, “Space let us down with yes vote,” [Coshocton Tribune](#), July 2, 2009 [emphasis added])

From a Reader in Cumberland, Md.

“The House of Representatives narrowly passed the Cap and Trade bill — ‘Cap and Tax’ seems more appropriate — on June 26. All day people were bombarding phone lines so much that the switchboards overloaded. **If this bill passes the Senate and gets signed into law it will mean higher cost on every household.**” (Letter to the Editor, “What House passed should be called ‘Cap and Tax’ bill instead,” [Cumberland Times-News](#), July 2, 2009 [emphasis added])

From a Reader in Roanoke, Va.

“Those of you who wanted change will have it in a big way if the Senate passes the House version of the cap and trade legislation. **While we sit on some of the world’s largest oil, natural gas, coal and oil shale reserve, the cost of our energy for everything from gas, electricity and heating oil to bus and airline travel, etc., will go up. All of the extra cost associated with this tax will be passed on to consumers.** ... I encourage everyone to find out about this legislation, then **call your senators and tell them how you feel.**” (Letter to the Editor, “Cap and trade will cost consumers dearly,” [The Roanoke Times](#), July 1, 2009 [emphasis added])

From a Reader in Drayton, N.D.

“The CBO — realizing the bill will raise prices — claims that **the increase in consumer prices** actually will be good for people because the federal income tax largely is indexed to the consumer price index. For that reason, poorer people actually will pay less in income tax, to the tune of \$8.7 billion, according to the CBO. However, **this will increase the federal deficit**, as the CBO acknowledges. So, government borrowing will raise interest rates and move \$8.7 billion from private capital markets to the government. The result, [economist Robert] Murphy said, will be that **Americans will lose to the deficit and slower economic growth whatever they allegedly ‘gain’ from lower taxes.** (Letter to the Editor, “Estimates lowball cap and trade’s costs,” [Grand Forks Herald](#), July 2, 2009 [emphasis added])

From a Reader in Roxbury Township, N.J.

“However, though appearing incredibly noble, **Cap & Trade has the potential to harm families and our economy.** This proposal would create a system for reducing emissions through a government mandated pollution cap, auction off permits to companies or homes which create pollutants, and allow permits to be traded or sold as needed. **That will only raise the cost of energy** as permits are traded and companies are forced to implement expensive ‘green’ technologies. **Undeniably, those costs will be passed along to consumers. This will indirectly hike the price of everything from food to automobiles to electricity** — something even President Obama admitted openly before last year’s election.” (Letter to the Editor, “The dangers of ‘cap and trade,’” [Daily Record](#) [Parsippany, N.J.], June 29, 2009 [emphasis added])

From a Reader in Bellevue, Wash.

“This Waxman-Markey bill claims to go after big energy consumers and polluters, **but it will ultimately place the burden on consumers resulting in higher prices across the board.** Low-income and middle-class working Americans will be adversely affected by this legislation as they see **steep price increases in filling their gas tanks, heating their homes and buying groceries.**” (Letter to the Editor, “Waxman-Markey bill would bring rising costs to homeowners,” [The Seattle Times](#), July 1, 2009 [emphasis added])

From a Reader in Lorain, Ohio

“If such legislation passes the Senate, higher energy costs will become effective in 2012. For a household of four, energy costs go up \$436 that year, eventually reach \$1,241 in 2035 and average \$829 annually over that span. Electricity would go up 90 percent by 2035, gasoline 58 percent and natural gas 55 percent. The cumulative costs for a family of four would be nearly \$20,000. Aside from direct energy costs, **everything else would be more costly because higher energy costs raise production costs.** The total cost of Waxman-Markey (H.R. 2454) works out to an average of \$2,979 annually from 2012-35 for a household of four. By 2035 the cost is over \$4,600. Plus, job losses are estimated at 1,145,000. **The nation will be \$9.4 trillion poorer with Waxman-Markey than without it. And what would Americans ‘get for all this pain?’ A ‘reduction in global temperature in 2050 by a mere 0.05 degree Celsius.’**” (Letter to the Editor, “Cap and trade economic disaster,” [The Morning Journal](#), July 2, 2009 [emphasis added])

From a Reader in Riva, Md.

“The purpose of cap-and-trade is to hike the cost of electricity and gas so Americans will use less. **However, these costs to businesses will be passed on to consumers resulting in higher prices for every manufactured good. Consumers will cut back on spending, resulting in cuts in production, which means fewer jobs and higher unemployment.** Some companies will move their operation overseas.” (Letter to the Editor, “I voted Republican,” [The Capital](#) [Annapolis, Md.], June 29, 2009 [emphasis added])

From a Reader in Dallas, Texas

“Common sense would reveal it would be nice to have alternative sources of energy already in place before the big switch from oil and coal. But seems that [sic] America has **run out of common sense** and is going to allow Congress and the president to **punish it indirectly with more taxes and more government control.**” (Letter to the Editor, “Climate bill punishes us,” [The Dallas Morning News](#), June 29, 2009 [emphasis added])

From a Reader in Ogden, Utah

“I would like to point out what **a miserable embarrassment the passing of the bill was in so many ways, besides the fact that it was a job-killer and burden for families** all in the name of reversing ‘global warming’ or ‘climate change’.” (Letter to the Editor, “Cap and trade bill an embarrassment,” [The Standard-Examiner](#) [Ogden, Utah], June 29, 2009 [emphasis added])

From a Reader in Gladstone, N.D.

“This disastrous and dangerous bill is truly a wolf in sheep’s clothing. ... Cap and Trade is all about power and control and excessive taxation only!” (Letter to the Editor, “Cap and Trade Bill nothing but a hoax,” [The Dickinson Press](#), July 2, 2009)

From a Reader in Meredith, N.H.

“You will love this bill if you have the following problems: You don’t pay enough for gasoline, heating fuel or electricity. Your cost of living is too low. Your total taxes are not high enough. You want a bigger, more expensive government. ... Claims that this bill will help the environment are false. **Similar cap-and-trade schemes in Europe have not been beneficial. Moving American jobs overseas will increase CO2 production and total pollution because U.S. industry is clean compared to many others.**” (Letter to the Editor, “Cap-and-trade plan is far too costly,” [Concord Monitor](#), July 2, 2009 [emphasis added])

From a Reader in Grand Junction, Colo.

“The bill, which supposedly seeks to reduce carbon emissions by 80 percent in 2050, **is in reality a tax upon the working class families Obama promised would get tax breaks.** The worst part about the bill is the Congressional Budget Office did some fancy footwork to make the bill appear less damaging. The budget office said the bill would cost households \$175 in increases by 2020, or about a postage stamp a day. **But what sounds too good to be true usually is.** ... Now that the bill has unfortunately passed the house, we need to make sure Sens. Mark Udall and Michael Bennet protect Colorado from this unacceptable legislation.” (Letter to the Editor, “Salazar was right to oppose energy act,” [Glenwood Springs Post Independent](#), June 29, 2009 [emphasis added])

From a Reader in Austintown, Ohio

“**This bill will significantly hurt the working class people greatest** as they are the ones who suffer most from higher energy bills. With the added taxes it certainly isn’t the energy companies who will struggle as they will pass this sinful tax onto the consumers. The CBO estimates this climate bill will cost the average household \$175 a year because of this tax. **Not only are people going to suffer higher bills from passing the tax onto the consumer, it’s going to be a lot harder to find a job because of cap and trade, which is a part of the bill.** Companies are going to find it a lot harder to stay in business producing things in America when the government wants to tax any productive entity. So, as Americans, we now have to deal with this out of control huge government, **a recession that will be signed into law through this climate bill, and, without a doubt, higher energy bills.**” (Letter to the Editor, “A congressional monster,” [The Vindicator](#) [Youngstown, Ohio], June 30, 2009 [emphasis added])

From a Reader in Pitman, N.J.

“This bill was not designed for the advantage of the American people in general. And woe betide to those who would seek profit on the troubles it will cause American taxpayers.” (Letter to the Editor, “Will LoBiondo explain climate vote?”, [Gloucester County Times](#), July 2, 2009)

From a Reader in Seattle, Wash.

“The U.S. House has passed another troublesome bill that not only threatens the growth of the economy but job security for low-income and middle-class workers across the nation. With HB 2454, Congress hopes to again go after the wallet of Americans in the name of climate change; **effectively taxing both families and companies for their energy use without regard for the effects on families around the country.** Last summer, companies sent workers home because they could not afford the costs of labor due to soaring energy costs. **If our senators want to truly stand up for those who need it most, if they want to show empathy to those who have the chips stacked against them, I urge them to vote against this bill. It will only help give us the feared 10 percent unemployment rate.** Washington voters asked for change. By change, we did not mean from employed to unemployed.” (Letter to the Editor, “Rising energy costs will bring more unemployment,” [The Seattle Times](#), July 1, 2009 [emphasis added])

From a Reader in North Hills, Calif.

“The feds have effectively shut down California agriculture. Now with the infamous cap and trade plan, they will shut down the rest of the country. Who wrote this multipage bill that no one in Congress had the time to read before rubber-stamping it?” (Letter to the Editor, “Climate bill will kill business,” [Daily News](#) [Los Angeles], July 1, 2009)