

Grandiose, unrealistic plans

November 27, 2014

After reading the editorial “Taxing carbon” just after reading the news about the Obamacare scandal, I thought that the similarities were uncanny.

Both have grandiose (some say unrealistic) objectives. Obamacare objectives were to provide better, more extensive health care to all Americans, allowing everyone to retain their doctor and plan, while reducing premiums.

The objectives of a carbon tax are to create a livable planet, add more than 1,000 Vermont jobs and add \$40 million annually to the gross state product all by merely controlling the weather.

Both programs have ultimate objectives of redistribution of wealth. Obamacare is doing this by giving money to those with lower income to purchase health care. This redistribution scheme was validated by the recent disclosures of MIT professor Jonathan Gruber. Carbon taxes would provide tax credits to low-income Vermonters.

Both programs raise this money by taxing. Obamacare taxes insurance companies, medical devices, brand named drugs, Cadillac plans, etc. The carbon tax plan would tax industries which are deemed polluters. Ask yourself who ultimately will pay. The answer is we, the American consumer, pay or as professor Gruber calls us — the stupid voters.

Both programs are supported by models. The Professor Gruber’s model on which Obamacare is based must be validated due to the recent controversy. The study on which the Vermont carbon tax is based is derived from Regional Economic Models Inc. (REMI). The Cato Institute published a report on REMI which concluded, “REMI models are frequently misused by state governments in ways that patently exaggerate the benefits of proposed state government projects.”

We now are aware of Obamacare deception because the mainstream media was compelled to report it. What you are probably unaware of, because of lack of media attention, is the deception in the climate change issue (the alleged basis for carbon tax).

Since the editorial encouraged “a full, thoughtful dialogue on climate change,” I suggest you begin your own researching knowing that one of the founders of Greenpeace has stated, “Global warming is a natural phenomenon and there is no proof of man-made warming and that alarmism is leading to bad environmental policies.”

By the way, “research” does not mean reading Mother Jones, listening to NPR and watching Jon Stewart.

KERRY O’HARA

Shrewsbury