

# CAP-AND-TRADE FOR BABIES?

*Investor's Business Daily*

*pitter patter...pitter patter*



SPPI COMMENTARY & ESSAY SERIES ♦ October 21, 2009

# CAP-AND-TRADE FOR BABIES?

Investor's Business Daily | October 19, 2009

**Earth:** *An environmental writer mainstreams an idea floating around the green fringe — save the earth by population control and give carbon credits to one-child families. Are we threatened by the patter of little carbon footprints?*

It's long been a mantra on the left that people are a plague on the earth, ravaging its surface for food and resources, polluting its atmosphere and endangering its species. Now we are endangering its very climate to the point of extinction. Even the result of our breathing — carbon dioxide — has been declared by the EPA to be a dangerous pollutant.

Treaties like Kyoto and the upcoming economic suicide pact to be forged in Copenhagen have focused on the instruments and byproducts of our civilization. Now the focus is shifting increasingly to the people who built it.

New York Times environmental writer Andrew Revkin participated in an Oct. 14 panel discussion on climate change with other media pundits titled "Covering Climate: What's Population Got To Do With It?" People who need people they are not.

Participating via Web cam, Revkin volunteered that in allocating carbon credits as part of any cap-and-trade scheme, "if you can measurably somehow divert fertility rate, say toward accelerating decline in a place with a high fertility rate, shouldn't there be a carbon value to that?"

He went on to say that "probably the single most concrete and substantive thing an American, young American, could do to lower our carbon footprint is not turning off the light or driving a Prius, it's having fewer kids, having fewer children."

"More children equal more carbon dioxide emissions," Rivkin has blogged, wondering "whether this means we'll soon see a market in baby-avoidance carbon credits similar to efforts to sell CO<sub>2</sub> credits for avoiding deforestation." Save the trees, not the children.

Rivkin's views are unfortunately shared by people with power and influence. Jonathon Porritt, chairman of Britain's Sustainable Development Commission, believes that "having

more than two children is irresponsible" and that people should "connect up their own responsibility for their total environmental footprint."

Earlier this year, Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi defended federal contraceptive initiatives as an effort to "reduce costs to the states and to the federal government." For Pelosi, mother of five, the fewer the merrier.

Would this proposed carbon-credit carrot turn someday into a large stick? Would child exemptions disappear after the first child or worse?

After all, we have a White House communications director, Anita Dunn, who considers mass murderer Mao Zedong her favorite philosopher. China has its one-child policy, which it vigorously enforces.

**Source:** <http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=509554>.

