

# Betting on the future

High-stakes debate over climate legislation such as the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009 (ACES), passed by the U.S. House and now in the Senate, raises many issues. Here are frequently heard pros and cons.



**PRO**

## Energy transformation:

Carbon limits would increase demand for “clean” energy from wind turbines, nuclear and other sources and for energy-efficient products.



**PRO**

## Cleaner environment:

Potentially, emission reductions could total up to 33 percent below 2005 levels by 2020 and up to 81 percent below 2005 levels by 2050.



**PRO**

## Economically beneficial:

Millions of jobs would be created and shift the U.S. toward a clean-energy economy at a per-family daily cost of less than a postage stamp.



**CON**

## Weakened economy:

Increased energy costs are an energy tax that would stall economic output, erode purchasing power and reduce job creation, putting the U.S. at a competitive disadvantage.



**CON**

## Negligible impact:

If the legislation worked as planned, it would lower global temperatures by only a few tenths of a degree by 2050.



**CON**

## Unilateral folly:

Curbing greenhouse gas emissions must be a global effort. China must participate. The United States alone cannot improve world climate conditions.