

Searching for something?

I see you searched for **bob inglis** on Google. Would you like to try again using our deep site search?

Home Opinion

Tax swap: Making sense

STORY UPDATED AT 12:56 AM ON TUESDAY, APR. 21, 2009

EMAIL PRINT BLOG THIS COMMENT

🖸 SHARE 📲 🎡 🧤 🔍 🔍 Tr

CARBON TAX SWAP

Key elements of the Carbon Act of 2008: **Carbon tax:** Raise the tax gradually till 2040. This provides business with enough certainty to plan. The tax would apply at the mine mouth, the oil refinery and gas pipeline to simplify collection.

Payroll reductions: Lower payroll tax an equal amount for employers and employees. Also, increase Social Security benefits for seniors to pay higher energy bills.

Imports and exports: Imported products would be subject to the carbon tax. It would be removed from goods for export.

Keeping it neutral: A supermajority of two-thirds in both the House and Senate would be needed to use the carbon tax revenue for purposes other than payroll tax reduction.



This page recently supported what seemed a common-sense proposal: tax carbon used for fuel and reduce payroll taxes by an equal amount.

That would tax what we don't want - pollution and carbon dioxide - and provide incentives for something we do want - work.

It's classic American pragmatism.

It wasn't our idea, it has been floated elsewhere.

In fact, as the staff of Rep. Bob Inglis, a Republican from South Carolina, informed us, that's the crux of his bill in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Inglis wrote an opinion column in The New York Times to make that case with co-writer Arthur Laffer, a key economic adviser to President Ronald Reagan.

You don't have to be a conservative to oppose major new taxes during a recession. American families are already being hit with higher utility prices. But offer a tax swap and conservatives might join.

The loser in such a proposal is to siphon some of the revenue into unrelated programs. No matter how well-meaning, that would be a convenient way to avoid making hard decisions.

Inglis notes in his New York Times piece that, even if more oil drilling is allowed in the United States, OPEC still will control 70 percent of the world's oil reserves.

And it's not a certainty that domestic oil would lower prices much. Remember: Oil companies are multi-national. Oil

prices are based on the world market, which the United States doesn't control.

The other pragmatic element in the tax swap proposal is that it doesn't require total belief in global warming.

U.S. News

"All we need to assume is that burning less fossil fuels would be a good thing," Inglis writes, for national security reasons at least.

So let's not complicate this with political shenanigans.

Raise taxes on carbon fuels.

Lower taxes on payroll.

Win twice with one bill.

Login or register to post comments EMAIL PRINT BLOG THIS 55 reads

Other recent articles

Government: Here's a no-brainer Government cutbacks: Let's see if it's catching Tax swap: Making sense Four cheers: Tops for child care Brazilian neighbor: Building a global family Criminal probe of dead horses opened in Florida Somali pirate arrives in NYC, awaits court hearing Heir to The New York Herald Tribune dies at 95 Lawyer: FBI officer innocent of spying on girls

User Comments



C02 is not polution! Submitted by Humbug on Tue. 4/21/2009 at 5:44 am

The FairTax places the same level of taxation on everything sold at retail. It is visible and fair... the working poor actually get a break instead of higher utility bills.

This "C02 is bad" argument is a lie. We would have to increase C02 millions of times over before it became a "polution". Too much oxygen could be a problem just as bad. C02 circulates through life and is as necessary as water.

The lie is a distraction used for leverage to suppress development.

20

...but those who torment us for our own good will torment us without end for they do so with the approval of their own conscience, "C. S. Lewis

Login Or Register To Post Comments Flag As Offensive



Climate Change Fraud Submitted by John Galt on Tue. 4/21/2009 at 5:51 am Sounds OK, except that the whole thing is based on the most egregious fraud ever perpetrated on mankind: Manmade Global Climate Change.

"Shrug"

www.fairtax.org

http://www.numbersusa.com/content/resources/video/recommended/immigratio...

"The government cannot give to anyone anything that it does not first take from someone else."

"Si vis pacem, para bellum."

Login Or Register To Post Comments Flag As Offensive



Submitted by lidaoc on Tue. 4/21/2009 at 6:09 am No group of politicians are going to make any substantial cuts to payroll taxes. If you actually think they would lower their revenues from this cash cow, you are sorely mistaken.

Login Or Register To Post Comments Flag As Offensive



All 3 of you are correct. BTW Humbug, while it's true Submitted by Morgan Orlins on Tue. 4/21/2009 at 6:39 am

that CO2 isn't a pollutant, they intend to tax it and control it's emissions because then these leftist control freaks control YOU! That's why they've labeled it a "pollutant." Tyrants pay no heed to the truth

The appetite of the statist and the busybody is voracious as they devour our freedom. Witness the trespasses of the new administration

Morgan, 2009

Login Or Register To Post Comments Flag As Offensive

Tax Swap



Submitted by Snakepilot on Tue, 4/21/2009 at 12:28 pm

Making Sense? Really? The Social Security payroll tax (SSI) is an admitted Ponzi Scheme and you propose doing the same with a carbon tax? Proposed energy programs and other type programs will still be run by the same type of bureaucrats that are appointed by politicians and currently run other current government programs, but this time things will be different? O.K. Sounds as if someone is delusional. If CO2 is really bad and is the manmade agent that is causing the Earth to unusually warm, then first we need to verify that with disinterested third parties and make darn sure we are not going off on a tangent reminescent of Y2K. The complete ICCP Report while thought provoking is not definitive and is politically influenced. The U.N.is a disaccredited institutution and to make its climate report that lacks consensus the definitive text for a national tax is a foolhardy proposition. A new Congressional investigation into it and national debate on it are, at the least, required. If CO2 polluting air is truly a climate change culprit, then maybe taking the Bjorn Lomborg approach might be in order. That is, using existing technology in which we're competent(ex: flood control)rather than expend resources on underperforming technology with a limited track record - i.e. wind turbines. Thinking that either government energy programs or government sponsored tax incentives will lead us into new fields of energy use is really stretching the idea of hope. The past is to full of failures in this regard not to lead one to suspect otherwise. There's no incentive or responsibility in government. Oil, coal and international trade in them is not evil. Emissions, with the right incentives, can be cleaned-up. To buy a commodity from one area of the World for use in another is good. To me, being against international trade and oil is the same as promoting " buy local" and building windmills, both long since proven false hopes. What to do? One might promote a free market in energy - yes, oil & coal included - out of our mixed economy and with the correct environmental laws in place be surprised at the positive outcome. No more government sitting on and controlling oil leases, no more use of pollution laws to control competition, no more political extortion, etc.,. A free open market without social scientists and editorials dictating policy. Government doing nothing but getting out of the wav.





1 Riverside Ave. Jacksonville, FL 32202 © Copyright The Florida Times-Union. All Rights Reserved. Privacy Policy | Contact Us | Advertising