

## The Insiders: A new tax won't change our weather

By Ed Rogers Updated: April 16 at 1:23 pm

The lead sentence of an April 14 New York Times “news article,” headlined [“Political Rifts Slow U.S. Effort on Climate Laws,”](#) deserves some study. The first sentence reads, “The United States needs to enact a major climate change law, such as a tax on carbon pollution, by the end of this decade to stave off the most catastrophic impacts of global warming, according to the authors of a report released this week by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.” What? According to this article, if the United States doesn't act unilaterally with a giant new tax, it will be impossible to “protect the globe from a future of serious food and water shortages, a drastic sea level rise, increased poverty and disease and other profound risks.” It is fair for voters to ask, “Do you like how your current tax dollars are spent? Will a new tax designed to shape the climate be spent any better?”

The article is typical in that it suggests that if Republicans would just get out of the way and allow yet another tax increase, the weather would become more to our liking. But it is dishonest to suggest that we are one tax increase away from arresting climate change, improving the weather or saving the planet. For the New York Times and the authors of the U.N. report to suggest otherwise is the reason why climate alarmists are losing credibility. And the more these alarmists are mocked and scorned for their radical views and condescending lectures, the louder and more threatening they become. The global warming crusaders who like to tout science would know that — scientifically — one tax increase can't change the weather. So what does enacting a carbon tax actually accomplish? Nothing except lower growth, less prosperity and fewer jobs.

Anyway, this Times article is useful because it highlights the avoidance and even deceit that [I have written about before](#). That is, Democrats and environmental activists won't answer three questions: One, who pays; two, how much; and three, for what result? And they don't come close to being honest about how their plans would raise just about everyone's power bills. The president and his allies avoid these questions — and, even more so, their answers — for fear that if they reveal what they really want to do and how little they know about what the consequences might be, there is no chance Americans would support them at the ballot box.

In the absence of any serious, realistic proposals, it's no wonder that, as even the author of this Times article admits, “addressing it [climate change] ranks at the bottom of voters' priorities.” The Democrats are wearing out their welcome because of all the hyperbole surrounding global warming, and they know it.

Follow Ed on Twitter: [@EdRogersDC](#)

© The Washington Post Company