

# WHAT OTHERS ARE SAYING ABOUT THE WAXMAN-MARKEY CLIMATE BILL

"The bill's sponsors are still trying to resolve questions over whether and how to impose sanctions on countries that do not limit emissions. That's crucial. Those foreign countries would enjoy a cost advantage in manufacturing if their industries were free to pollute, while American industries picked up the tab for controlling emissions. ... The Democrats need to delay the vote. Otherwise, House members should vote no."

Editorial, Chicago Tribune, June 25, 2009

#### **Retailers: National Association of Convenience Stores (NACS)**

From a June 23, 2009 letter to House Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman Henry Waxman and Ranking Member Joe Barton (emphasis added):

- "NACS is concerned that certain provisions in pending legislation (such as the allocation of allowances) may result in dramatically higher costs for motor fuels, which will significantly distress our customers. We are further concerned that if these costs materialize, Congress will once again seek to intervene to protect consumers from retail motor fuel costs which are beyond the industry's control."
- "The future of America's energy economy can be dynamic, but **policies that punish one sector and** negatively affect consumers will only undermine the advancements necessary to protect the environment."
- "The leading proposals in the House and Senate will have a massive impact on virtually every aspect of the American economy. To ensure that consumers and small business owners do not bear an unreasonable economic burden, it is essential that Congress reconsider the direction in which it is currently heading."

## Airlines: Air Transport Association of America, Inc.

From testimony given June 9, 2009 by Air Transport Association President and CEO James C. May to the House Subcommittee on Energy and the Environment (emphasis added):

"[T]he American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009, as currently crafted, would do significant harm to this industry and its initiatives. The cap-and-trade system would apply to our purchase of jet fuel, essentially operating as an additional, exorbitant tax on this fuel. While high fuel prices and volatility already threaten this industry and the nation's economy, <u>application of this legislation ... would serve</u> as an 'anti-stimulus,' wiping out the steps that the government has taken to try to help this nation recover."

- "For an airline, higher fuel prices would <u>negatively impact ticket prices</u>, <u>reduce service</u> to both small and large communities and <u>severely hamper the economic development associated with</u> <u>commercial aviation</u> (i.e., travel and leisure businesses, aircraft manufacturing, airport-related jobs, etc.)."
- "Moreover, higher fuel prices associated with a cap-and-trade system would <u>siphon away the very</u> capital we need to continue the investments in technology, operations and infrastructure that have made us so fuel- and GHG-efficient today, essentially <u>subsidizing industries that have done far less to</u> improve their fuel efficiency."

#### Truckers: American Trucking Associations, Inc.

From testimony given June 9, 2009 on behalf of the American Trucking Associations to the House Subcommittee on Energy and the Environment (emphasis added):

- "Provisions under H.R. 2454 granting oil refiners <u>2 percent of the carbon allowances</u> between 2014 and 2016 to help mitigate refinery GHG emissions are <u>inadequate and will result in significant price</u> <u>increases for refined products</u>. ... This allocation shortfall will have a <u>dramatic impact upon the</u> <u>price of petroleum-derived fuel</u> and will <u>negatively impact the trucking industry and the U.S.</u> <u>economy</u>."
- "The 2 percent allotment to refineries over a 2-year period covers the refineries' facility emissions, but totally ignores carbon emissions from the combustion of petroleum products and <u>leaves downstream</u> <u>users, such as trucking companies, exposed to dramatic and sudden fuel price spikes</u>. <u>A</u> <u>misconception exists that any increase in energy costs can simply be passed through</u> to the next downstream entity."
- "Any substantial cost increases imposed directly or indirectly on trucks by H.R. 2454 will <u>curtail the</u> <u>delivery of vital consumer goods across the nation such as food, medicine, and clothing</u>. Constraining the country's freight delivery system would change our way of life for the worse by <u>significantly increasing the cost of everything we buy</u>."

## Transportation Community: American Highway Users Alliance

From a June 24, 2009 Legislative Alert issued by the American Highway Users Alliance (emphasis added):

- "The Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade bill will <u>dramatically raise the price of highway fuel through a</u> <u>hidden tax on the carbon present in the fuel</u>. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that this bill will <u>raise the price of gasoline by 77 cents</u> over the next decade. And unlike a traditional fuel tax increase, none of the revenue raised will be spent on highways."
- "The final bill reserves as much as 1% of cap-and-trade taxes for transportation but <u>none of this money</u> <u>can be used for highways - even if the highway project would reduce emissions by relieving</u> <u>congestion</u>."
- "The inclusion of highway fuel under the 'cap' is unprecedented, even in European countries with many years of experience regulating greenhouse gases. <u>The Waxman Markey bill will represent the largest tax increase for American drivers in American history</u>."