

Battle Born PAC's Blog

On the front lines in the campaign against socialism.

- [home](#)
- [tags](#)
- [search](#)
- [feed](#)

[Obama's Energy Tax To Cost You \\$1,000/Year](#)

Posted by: [Staff](#) in [Tax Reform](#) , [Fiscal Responsibility](#) on Mar 22, 2009

The cost of [Barack Obama's energy tax](#) keeps spiraling higher:

President Obama's energy tax plan -- a version of the failed European "cap and trade" global warming fiasco -- may cost families \$1,800 yearly in higher utility bills, far exceeding his promised \$800 a year tax cut for 95% of Americans.

While campaigning, Obama admitted that his energy plan would cause electric bills to "skyrocket." Few took note, perhaps because Sen. John McCain also backed some form of a "cap-and-trade" energy tax.

Obama's official budget claims that his proposed energy tax would add \$646 billion to energy costs over 8 years. But that's low-balling it.

As the *Washington Times* reported:

President Obama's climate plan could cost industry close to \$2 trillion, nearly three times the White House's initial estimate of the so-called "cap-and-trade" legislation, according to Senate

staffers who were briefed by the White House. . . . At the meeting, Jason Furman, a top Obama staffer, estimated that the president's cap-and-trade program could cost up to three times as much as the administration's early estimate of \$646 billion over eight years.

What does that mean for the average family:

So Obama's \$250-billion a year energy tax could approach a 50% increase in what you, as a consumer, pay for energy, since all costs are passed along to consumers. Yet the Obama budget audaciously claims that it will "reduce utility bills"

According to the White Fence Index, the average home utility bill is \$297 per month, which is about \$3,600 per year. So a 50% increase would be \$1,800 per year under the Obama proposal. This far exceeds a Heritage Foundation projection of \$467 a year in higher utility bills under an earlier U.S. Senate energy tax plan. That less-aggressive plan, though, could have cost 500,000 to 1 million jobs, according to Heritage. Who knows how many jobs would be lost under Obama's more burdensome plan? The lost jobs would become "gangrene jobs," a counter to Obama's claim to create new "green jobs."

The White House and Mr. Furman try to justify drastically higher energy costs by offsetting it with their plan to give 95% of American families a permanent \$800 per year "Making Work Pay" tax credit. (42% of that "tax cut" would actually go to people who don't pay any income tax.) **But even with the \$800 subsidy, the net loss is \$1,000 per family per year.**

That's right \$1,000 per year.

[\[Back \]](#)
