

FACT SHEET: RAHALL “PLAY STRAIGHT”

AUDIO: “When did Congressman Nick Rahall decide the facts don’t count?”

Says he never voted for a budget that had a carbon tax. But, he did. You can check for yourself.”

FACT: On March 20, 2013, Rep. Rahall voted for the “Grijalva of Arizona Substitute Amendment No. 3”. (<http://clerk.house.gov/evs/2013/roll085.xml>) This was a vote on the Congressional Progressive Caucus’ “Back to Work Budget” (<http://cpc.grijalva.house.gov/back-to-work-budget/>).

FACT: According to the Progressive Caucus, “The Back to Work Budget would impose on polluters a \$25 per ton price on carbon dioxide (increasing at 5.6% a year), rebating 25% of all revenues as refundable credits to protect low income families.” (<http://cpc.grijalva.house.gov/uploads/Back%20to%20Work%20Budget%20-%20Executive%20Summary.pdf>)

FACT: When Rep. Garrett rose in opposition to the Amendment, he stated “So, today, we have a Progressive substitute on the floor. This budget will do what? It will raise taxes by almost \$6 trillion over the next 10 years, including a new tax on carbon. \$5.7 trillion in new taxes necessarily means greater tax burdens on who? The American family. These tax cuts put job creators in the penalty box again, and that means more Americans will be where? Without jobs.” (<http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/C?r113:./temp/~r1138GWvx3>)

FACT: The Center for American Progress explained that the Congressional Progressive Caucus’ budget “includes a carbon tax to increase funding for alternative energy methods and a public option to lower the cost of health care.” (<http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2013/03/14/1717621/progressive-caucus-budget/>)

FACT: The Washington Post’s Ezra Klein explained that the Back to Work Budget has massive tax increases including a carbon tax. He writes, “Investment on this scale will add trillions to the deficit. But the House Progressives have an answer for that: Higher taxes. About \$4.2 trillion in higher taxes over the next decade, to be exact. The revenues come from raising marginal tax rates on high-income individuals and corporations, but also from closing a raft of deductions as well as adding a financial transactions tax and a carbon tax.” (<http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/03/14/house-progressives-have-the-best-answer-to-paul-ryan/>)

FACT: The Charleston Daily Mail reports that Rahall “said he voted for the budget amendment but said it did not include any carbon tax”. (<http://www.charlestondaily.com/News/statehouse/201307310147?page=1&build=cache>)

FACT: Rep. Rahall told E&E News that “I read the amendment, and nowhere is a carbon tax stated.” (<http://www.eenews.net/eedaily/stories/1059982459/>) As E&E further explains:

“In a certain light, that’s true [that a carbon tax is not stated]. The amendment to the GOP’s annual spending and tax blueprint specified no policy items at all, just funding levels for various federal functions. The same can be said for any budget resolution, including the one sponsored by House Budget Chairman Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) that cleared the House.

But the supporting documents on the budget provided by the House Progressive Caucus make it clear that some of the revenue the budget counts on would come from a tax on carbon dioxide.

“The Budget for All would impose a \$20 per ton price on CO2 (increasing at 5.6% a year) on polluters, and rebate 25% of all revenues as refundable credits holding low and middle income families harmless,” it states.

AUDIO: “That budget would cost the average family more than \$2000 a year and kill coal jobs here in West Virginia.”

FACT: According to the Heritage Foundation, which examined an analysis from the Energy Information Administration, the impact of a \$25 a ton carbon tax that rises at 5 percent a year is that it would reduce the income of a family of four by \$1,900 a year as well as raise the family-of-four energy bill by more than \$500 per year (not counting the cost of gasoline) and cause gasoline prices to increase by up to \$0.50 gallon.

(<http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/01/carbon-tax-would-raise-unemployment-not-revenue>) These aggregate costs are well in excess of a \$2,000 a year for the average family of four.

FACT: The National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) released a study by NERA Economic Consulting on the impacts of a \$20 a ton carbon tax which increases at 4 percent a year. This is lower than the carbon tax Rep. Rahall voted for.

(<http://www.nam.org/Issues/Energy-and-Climate/Carbon-Tax.aspx>)

FACT: The NAM carbon tax study found that even with a lower carbon tax than the one Rep. Rahall voted for “The hardest hit economic sectors in West Virginia would be agriculture, which would lose between 2.6 and 3.4 percent in economic output, **coal, which would lose between 50.5 and 59.3 percent**, and energy-intensive manufacturing, which would lose 2.1 percent. (<http://www.nam.org/~media/1F708D21E64E4D4A80B9868E16B6906D.ashx>) [emphasis added]

FACT: The NAM carbon tax study also found “This tax would deal a blow to employment in West Virginia, with a loss of worker income equivalent to 35,000 to 40,000 jobs in 2013 and 18,000 to 24,000 by 2023.”

AUDIO: “Call Congressman Rahall at 202-225-3452. Tell him: Carbon taxes hurt West Virginia families.

Paid for by American Energy Alliance. americanenergyalliance.org”

