

Ethan Allen Institute

Newsletter - May 2016 (Printer Edition)

Top Story: Jefferson Day Dinner Success!

“Vermont’s Jeffersonian Vision for Local Self Government” was the topic of the Institute’s 23rd annual Jefferson Day observance, a dinner at the Windjammer in South Burlington on Jefferson’s 277th Birthday, April 13, 2016.

Institute advisory board member Frank Bryan, a former Jefferson dinner speaker, introduced his longtime friend and coauthor, John McClaughry, noting that John had just completed his fiftieth year as moderator of Kirby town meeting.

John counterattacked the long-running attack on local self government that arose with the Progressive Era, dated to around 1909. The Progressive attitude to citizen decision making was, basically, “What do those yokels know? Public decisions should be turned over to the wise, educated, and public spirited, whose far-seeing leadership would make government at all levels more efficient in carrying out ever more activities determined by the best and the brightest to be for the good of the people! The duty of the people is to appreciate the wise and selfless efforts of their leaders, gratefully return them to office, and cheerfully cover the costs of their programs created to advance the public interest.”

John went on to describe the forms that local self government has taken in the ancient Western world tradition – the mark, deme, phratia, canton, hundred, and especially the tun (town) which originated in King Alfred’s day (9th century).

Jefferson made the case for town government – conspicuously lacking in 18th Century Virginia -in an often-quoted letter to his Congressman Joseph Cabell in 1816: “Where every man is a sharer in the direction of his ward-republic [town], or of some of the higher ones, and feels that he is a participant in the government of affairs, not merely at election one day in the year, but every day; when there shall not be a man in the state who will not be a member of some one of its councils, great or small, he will let his heart be torn out of his body sooner than his power be wrested from him by a Caesar or a Bonaparte.”

John’s conclusion was that local self-government is not faring well in Vermont today, as the State takes away more and more of the functions once the province of the people. He quoted from his Kirby town report message of 1991: “One great task worthy of accomplishing at the dawn of our new century is to restore to the people of Kirby and of Vermont the right to govern themselves in all matters that have only local consequences. A local government cannot be allowed to become a tyranny which deprives local people of their rights; but at the same time a state government cannot be allowed to become a huge, intrusive, meddlesome, tax-eating monstrosity that constantly commands every public act of people who were, and of right ought to be, free and independent citizens.”

Among the dinner attendees was Col. Larry Cabell (USA Ret.) of Craftsbury, a descendant of Congressman Joseph Cabell.

Remarks of John McClaughry, vice president of the Ethan Allen Institute, at a meeting of the Government Restructuring and Operations Review Commission, State House April 26, 2016

The legislative mandate for GRORC focuses on “efficiency and productivity” in State government. That is politically safe, but wholly inadequate. A thorough going performance review would have to begin with the inherited structure of governments, the existing consensus about what “core functions” state government should be undertaking, how well they are being performed and by whom, the effects of state government activity on private sector wealth and revenue generation, and what functions should be Privatized, Eliminated, Retained or Modified. (in Michigan terminology, PERM). Even for a small state like Vermont, this is a MAJOR undertaking, far beyond the capacity of GRORC. It requires a committed Governor, a commission of recognized leaders, a supportive legislature, a competent and creative staff, a recognition of the successes and failures of similar efforts in Vermont and elsewhere, and above all, backbone.

Commentary: Sorell’s Partisan War Against “Climate Fraud”

by John McClaughry

On March 29 Vermont’s outgoing attorney general William Sorrell and two of his lawyers travelled to Manhattan to serve as useful props in a news conference orchestrated by New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman and global climate warrior Al Gore.

There Schneiderman announced a coordinated campaign by 20 AGs to find some legally believable way to prosecute the world’s biggest oil company, ExxonMobil. Two quite different, but both credible, headlines resulted. The news arm of the liberal Center for American Progress blared “State AGs Vow to Tackle Climate Change and Fossil Fuel Industry Fraud.” The conservative Washington Times offered “Democratic Attorneys General to Police Climate Change Dissent.”

The spur to this publicity extravaganza was the findings of an investigation into ExxonMobil’s policies over 30 years by a team of researchers at Columbia Graduate School of Journalism. The researchers were funded in part, it turned out, by two Rockefeller foundations, vigorous supporters of climate change politics.

According to NPR (12/15/15), the investigators “found that ExxonMobil had been planning for the consequences of a warming climate on oil exploration in the Arctic, even as it cast public doubt on the reliability of climate change science and lobbied against some proposals designed to address those concerns.”

What exactly is the crime here? Schneiderman stated “If there are companies... committing fraud in an effort to maximize their short term profits at the expense of the people we represent, we want to find out about it... expose it, and pursue them to the fullest extent of the law.”

From reading the two Columbia reports, featured in the Los Angeles Times last October 9 and 15, the case against ExxonMobil comes down to this: Soon after 1977, which was the last of 37 years of global cooling, global temperatures started back up. ExxonMobil naturally wondered how warming in the Arctic, believed to be caused by carbon dioxide emissions, would affect the company's plans to extract oil and gas from the Beaufort Sea.

So the company told its scientists to investigate. They found that yes, there might be something to it, but the primitive climate models of that day weren't good enough to make firm predictions.

But after 1988, when Senator and then Vice President Al Gore made himself the global voice of onrushing climate disaster, political pressure grew for drastic governmental action to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuel combustion.

ExxonMobil argued against drastic action based on unreliable models, and according to the left wing press, "funded the deniers of climate change". One left wing group claims the company did so to the tune of \$16 million, another claims \$30 million. Meanwhile, the Clinton-Gore administration spent untold billions of tax dollars not to define the natural drivers of the planet's climate, but to produce reports designed to make people believe that governments must save the planet from certain Heat Death.

Since the El Nino temperature spike of 1998, carbon dioxide emissions have steadily increased, but global temperatures have remained essentially flat. Hmmm, there must be something wrong with Gore's theory. (With the 2015 reappearance of El Nino, northern hemisphere temperature increases have resumed.)

With their vaunted 1990s climate projections now looking ridiculous, the climate change advocates have headed off into this demonization of ExxonMobil, without a shred of evidence that the company committed "fraud", namely, "a deceitful practice or willful device, resorted to with intent to deprive another of his right, or in some manner to do him injury."

But what is the practice? The device? The right? The injury? It's easy for politically ambitious AGs to shout "fraud", but it's a lot harder to make a credible legal case for it.

Even fair minded people who believe in the approaching terrors of climate change ought to view the Schneiderman-Gore-Sorrell assault on Exxon Mobil for declining to endorse Gore's views of "climate change" as a contemptible political stunt.

Defending against political lawsuits in twenty states would be very costly for ExxonMobil, even if no case ever went to court. Gore drew the parallel with the tobacco litigation of 1998, where ringleader AG William Sorrell coordinated a 46-state campaign that successfully extorted \$206 billion from the tobacco industry, after the AGs disgracefully persuaded their legislatures to strip that industry of its legal defenses.

Watch for the threat of similar suits against the fossil fuel industry "for fraudulently opposing Al Gore's version of science", followed by a multibillion dollar AG-led settlement negotiation. Sorrell surely wants to make Vermont a plaintiff before leaving office at the end of this year.

The obvious solution to Sorrell's expansive concept of the AG's office is for the voters to elect AGs who competently perform the state's legal duties, and refuse to sign on to political lawsuits contrived to advance partisan causes. Above all, the legislature should make the AG a governor's appointee with consent of the Senate, instead of an ambitious, independently-elected crusader eager to make the office into his or her own public interest law firm.

- John McClaughry is the founder and vice president of the Ethan Allen Institute

Commentary: Legislature Shouldn't Blow a Chance to Help Vermont's Economy

by Rob Roper

Vermont Business Magazine (VBM) wrote about some good news for a Vermont economy that has otherwise been pretty moribund for several years. The bright spot is our tech industry. As the VBM article points out, “Vermont’s tech sector makes up a quarter of the state’s workers and 40 percent of its wages, and generates higher pay and faster job growth compared to the state’s overall economy.”

That’s great, but it’s still a growing slice of a shrinking economic pie. In other news, this week saw the publication of the 9th Edition of Rich States, Poor States, which ranked Vermont’s economic outlook as 49th in the nation based on our tax and regulatory environment. Yes, this is just one ranking, but whether Rich States, Poor States, Forbes, the Tax Foundation or one of the other ranking organizations, Vermont consistently performs badly in these things. On the other hand, we do extremely well in rankings that score quality of life.

The challenge for our legislature is (or rather should be) to marry that high quality of life with economic policies that foster growth and prosperity. In other words, instead of settling for a Vermont that’s a great place to live if you can afford to live here, we should be striving to be a great place to live that is also a great place to earn a living.

One opportunity to move in this direction would be to pass the Independent Contractor bill (H.867), which passed out of the House Committee on Commerce and Economic Development on a unanimous tri-partisan vote of 11-0. This legislation, in a nutshell, makes it easier for individuals to work as independent contractors rather than as direct employees, and it clarifies the laws surrounding independent contractors so that employers and employees can easily comply with the law without worrying about penalties and fines.

This bill would help bring the state into line with the new realities of the 21st Century economy in which many people are creating their own jobs in rapidly evolving marketplaces. We have all witnessed the rise of the sharing economy with companies like Uber, AirBnB, eBay, Freelancer, etc. These platforms are generating billions of dollars worth of economic growth.

Allowing individuals to operate more easily and independently as entrepreneurs is not just a positive economic policy, but also one that caters to lifestyle. Workers, particularly young people, are no longer looking for a forty-year career with a single company. They change jobs regularly, and are more interested in finding jobs that allow them to pursue rewarding lifestyles outside of work. Vermont is (or rather could be given some imagination and leadership) perfectly situated to take advantage of these trends. Which brings us back to that good news about Vermont’s tech sector. An industry that is dynamic, constantly changing and exploring new directions is perfect for attracting and growing independent contractors who do coding, graphic design, marketing, accounting

and finance for small, start-up companies that are not ready to bring on large numbers of full time employees.

These are good paying jobs in growth businesses. So, why did the Speaker of the House recently declare the Independent Contractor bill essentially dead? The same sclerotic, old-economy special interests that have earned for Vermont that 49th in the nation for economic outlook ranking circled the wagons and killed the bill in the House. But hope still exists for progress in the Senate before this session ends and our incumbent politicians head off to the campaign trail asking for our votes for what? More of the same economic stagnation?

Here I will confess a guilty pleasure for the Discovery Chanel's show Naked and Afraid, in which two people are dropped in some wilderness landscape with nothing but a single survival tool each and the challenge to stay alive for three weeks. Every show features at least one scene in which these folks struggle to build a fire. They work mightily to generate one small ember, nurturing it with all the care imaginable in hopes of turning the small spark into a sustainable flame. Here we have that spark with our Tech industry, and the legislature, rather than lovingly blowing on it and feeding it dry grass and twigs, is playing the role of monsoon clouds on the horizon.

The House blew it. Let's hope the Senate has more sense.

- Rob Roper is president of the Ethan Allen Institute. He lives in Stowe.

Commentary:

A Potentially HUGE Bill for Property Taxpayers on the Horizon

By Rob Roper

Vermont property taxpayers are in the pot like the boiling frog from that old analogy. For over a decade we have been following the goal of the VTNEA and their allies in Montpelier to expand the public school system by two years to include three and four-year-olds. The next steps in this long-term play are underway right now.

First, a brief history of how we got to where we are today. In 2006, the legislature passed Act 62, which make "Universal Pre-K" for three and four-year-olds eligible for funding by property taxpayers. This was sold as a voluntary program for school districts, and public schools mostly partnered with "qualified" private childcare businesses to provide 10 hours of "quality" childcare per week.

In 2013, the voluntary aspect went away when the legislature mandated that all school district must provide access to those 10 hours of pre-k whether they want to or not (Act 166). And, by this time, more public schools started to forget about those private partnerships and put programs into their own buildings.

Then, in 2014 Vermont got a \$33 million federal grant (Hooray, free money!) to support full day pre-k programs for four-year-olds. A Vermont Digger article notes that one such program "includes meals, transportation and access to art, music, gym and library." Sounds like whole other grade of school, doesn't it? The grant pays for everything except the 10 hours per week Vermonters are mandated to cover under our own law.

But here's the catch (and we bet you saw this coming)... The federal money goes

away after four years. So, Vermont property taxpayers, get out your wallets! The lobbying campaign already begun. As Digger explains:

The Joint Fiscal Office has not yet researched the impact of a change to the weighting system for pre-K students [from .46 to 1.0] on the education fund. Mark Perrault, a fiscal analyst for JFO, said the change would likely lower the per pupil spending rates for towns that offer full-time pre-K. Towns that don't offer full time pre-K would have higher per pupil spending rates, and under the education yield formula, would end up absorbing the cost in higher local property taxes for towns that do provide full-time pre-K, he said.

So, the districts that don't offer this program get to pay for those that do, until this perverse incentive (accompanied undoubtedly with cries for "equity") drives everybody to implement the program, at which time everybody has to pay. If there are any holdouts, no doubt Montpelier will repeat history and make the program mandatory.

Keep in mind that the \$33 million grant (average \$8.25 million per year) only covers pilot programs in eight supervisory unions and a half a dozen or so individual school districts. That's about \$1 million per supervisory union per year. There are currently over 60 supervisory unions in Vermont. Do the math! And then, of course, you can double that price when they inevitably move onto the next phase of adding three-year-olds into the mix.

The propaganda campaign pushing for this is in full swing. Two articles in Vermont Digger, Early Education Survey Highlights Public Private Differences, and Education Board Asked to Offer Fix for Concerns About Pre-K Law speak to the point. The first article basically trashes privately run childcare facilities, citing statistics from a poorly participated in survey such as,

Nearly 80 percent of Vermont's public school survey respondents hold higher degrees, with 23 percent having a bachelor's degree in early childhood or a related field and 45 percent holding a master's in the subject. In contrast, the majority of family providers have a high school degree or a GED, while 23 percent of respondents said they have some college.

Who wants to send their kids to a childcare center run by poorly educated, poorly paid unsophisticates? Forget the fact that before Vermont kids had widespread access to these "high quality," public-school-run pre-k programs and small, home based childcare was pretty much it, Vermont kids actually scored better on benchmark tests when they reached the fourth grade than they do now.

The second article is perhaps even more alarming. The Speaker of the House, Shap Smith (D-Morristown), has asked the State Board of Education to investigate and recommend fixes to the Vermont' universal pre-k law. According to the article:

The main concerns are that some working and impoverished families can't take advantage of the vouchers the state provides for 10 hours a week of pre-kindergarten for every child, because they can't pay for the rest of the week.

Families may also lack transportation to get their children to a center or pick them up after the voucher hours and move them to day care for the rest of the

workday.

Yup. Ten hours a week of property taxpayer funded pre-k is not enough. We need forty hours a week of property taxpayer funded pre-k to make it “fair.” It doesn’t take a preschooler to figure out exactly where this is going. Or where the money’s going to come from. You!

- Rob Roper is president of the Ethan Allen Institute

Events

May 2. Climate Hustle is a new documentary movie that explains how the “climate change” industry is trying to scare us into making that industry’s investments profitable, and as usual, transferring billions of dollars to Third World countries to get them to join the global struggle against “climate change”. This move will be shown in Vermont at Merrill Palace 9 Cinema, 10 Fayette Dr., South Burlington. Call 660-9300 for show times.

May 7. Rob Roper will present “A Carbon Tax Is a Bad Idea for Vermont” to the Green Mountain Patriots, 9-11 am at the Essex Junction Police Department. If you would like to schedule this presentation for your organization, contact Rob at rob@ethanallen.org.

Roll Call Reports

House Says No to Striking \$1.6 Million Telephone Tax Increase, 48-97

House Votes to Raise Smoking Age/Tobacco Taxes, 84-61

House Approves \$11 Million Motor Vehicle Fee Increases, 104-40

House Votes to Raise Property Taxes by \$7.9 Million, 98-45

House Approves \$37 Million in New Miscellaneous Taxes, 86-59

House Passes 92% Tax on E-Cigarettes, 83-54

Senate Votes to Give Towns Some Say Over Renewable Energy Siting, But State Maintains Ultimate Control, 22-3

News & Views

Vermont Ranks 49th for Economic Outlook. [The 9th edition of “Rich States, Poor States](#): ALEC-Laffer State Economic Competitiveness Index is out with some happy revelations about “a pro-growth trend across the nation for 2016.” Well... not all the way across the nation. Vermont ranked 49th for Economic Outlook, and 39th in State Economic Performance from 2004-2014. Vermont has been consistent in this analysis, as we have ranked 49th every year since 2009, except 2013 when we were dead last at 50. If there is a silver lining here it’s that the record shows we have not preformed quite as badly as this particular formula predicted we would.

Even a Preschooler Knows Free Money Isn’t Free. In 2014 Vermont got a \$33 million federal grant to support full day pre-k programs for four year olds. Montpelier bit hard on this worm, but here’s the hook (betcha saw this coming)... The federal money goes away after four years. Vermont property taxpayers, get out your wallets because you’re now going to be asked to cover this nut! Keep in mind that the \$33 million grant (average \$8.25 million per year) only supports full day pre-k programs in eight supervisory unions and a half a dozen or so individual school districts. So, imagine what the cost will be when full day pre-k is mandated for all four-year-olds statewide in the name of, you know, equity. And then, of course, there’s the three-year-olds....

How Big is the Hole? “The average state OPEB [Other Post Employment Benefits] is 28% of the unfunded pension liability using realistic discount rates to calculate the accurate pension liability. In Vermont [OPEB] is 60%.... It’s just a matter of time before it all blows up.” -actuarial expert David Coates (4/4/16).

Vermont in Top Three! “Federal investigators found significant cybersecurity weaknesses in the health insurance websites of California, Kentucky and Vermont that could enable hackers to get their hands on sensitive personal information about hundreds of thousands of people, The Associated Press has learned.” (4/7/16)

Wind Turbines Reduce Property Values. Professor Stephen Gibbons of the London School of Economics has published a study titled, “[Gone with the wind: Valuing the visual impacts of wind turbines through house prices](#).” The long and the short of it is that homes that find themselves near by commercial wind facilities can lose up to 12 percent of their value within a perimeter of 14 kilometers (8 miles). The closer you are to the turbines, the greater the negative impact. Vermonters have reason to pay attention is because our Comprehensive Energy Plan will require a massive expansion of renewable energy project to meet the goal of 90% renewables by 2050. David Blittersdorf has said he envisions 200 miles of ridgelines developed with wind turbines to meet this goal. Given that Vermont is only about 150 miles long at its widest point, that means a lot of Vermonter’s homes will be within 8 miles of one or more of these wind facilities.

No Doctors, No Healthcare. Vermont Watchdog ran a story, *Vermont health professionals opting out of state health care system*, about how difficult it is for doctors to thrive and give quality care under Vermont’s current healthcare system. One key stat from the article cites, “The challenge of running a successful private practice in Vermont is reflected in the fact that about 20 percent of Vermont doctors are independent, compared to more than 50 percent in the rest of the nation.” The key quote: “The cards

are stacked so hard against us,” [Dr. Mark] Healey said. “The community is losing out. Competition is good. When a monopoly develops, responsiveness decreases.”

Is This a Worse Scandal Than Jay Peake/Q Burke? “A citizen-led group is calling on Vermont Attorney General William Sorrell to investigate ethically questionable relationships between government officials and renewable-energy developers in the state. On March 22, Vermonters for a Clean Government delivered a 16-document packet to the attorney general’s office that provides ammunition for investigating “suspected misconduct” among top Vermont officials. One of the documents, and eight-page petition for a corruption investigation, cites potential ethics violations ranging from conflicts of interest and favoritism to influence peddling and collusion.” Vermont Watchdog, 4/11/16)

Kill the Nukes, Increase Carbon Dioxide Emissions. A new report from the Institute for Energy Research notes that when the Vermont Yankee nuclear plant was set to close, [Middlebury climate activist Bill] McKibben claimed Vermont “is completely capable of replacing (and far more) its power output with renewables.”

The reality is much different. “Wind and solar cannot replace nuclear power plants, which can operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week, independent of the wind blowing or the sun shining. Natural gas, not renewables, picked up Vermont Yankee’s slack. Natural gas-generated electricity in New England increased from 43.1 percent of generation in 2014 to 48.6 percent of generation in 2015, resulting in a 7 percent growth in New England’s carbon dioxide emissions in 2015.

Single Payer in the News Again. Canadian authorities managing single payer health care say they have taken action to reduce the notoriously long wait times for priority treatments. “But patients say the rosy picture made public Thursday in a report called ‘Wait Times for Priority Procedures in Canada 2016’ falls short because it fails to consider the weeks and months it can take for patients to get on the waiting list.” (Montreal Gazette, 4/1/16)

Memo to Bernie. “Socialism only works in two places – Heaven, where they don’t need it, and Hell, where they already have it.” – Ronald Reagan

Tax Increase not a Tax Increase. (Re: raising the 13 c/pack cigarette tax increase) “Reducing the number of young people who smoke will lower health care spending. This is a not a tax. This is a way to make Vermonters healthier.” – Rep. Carolyn Branagan, House Ways and means vice chair. (SevenDays 4/12/16)

Terrifying Weather Extremes. “Predictions of unprecedented rainfall extremes in the 20th century driven by global warming turned out wrong, a study said Wednesday, casting doubt on methods used to project future trends. A massive trawl of Northern Hemisphere rainfall data for the last 1,200 years revealed there had been more dramatic wet-dry weather extremes in earlier, cooler centuries before humans set off fossil fuel-driven global warming.

This is problematic, said a study in the [pro-“climate change”] Journal Nature, as the

same data models used to anticipate that global warming would cause record rainfall extremes in the 1900s, are the basis for projections of things to come. But the new work said sky-high temperatures in the 20th century did not directly translate into record extremes between wet and dry weather, as many had expected. This meant that "much of the change is not only driven by temperature, but some internal, more random variability," explained ...the study's lead author Fredrik Ljungqvist of Stockholm University. (Nature, April 2016).

Crime of the Century! "ExxonMobil is suspected to have engaged in, or be engaging in, conduct constituting a civil violation of the Criminally Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act ... by having engaged or engaging in conduct misrepresenting its knowledge of the likelihood that its products and activities have contributed and are continuing to contribute to Climate Change in order to defraud the Government of the United States Virgin Islands and consumers in the Virgin Islands," the [Virgin Island AG's] subpoena states. (VW 4/26/16)

Tubman on the \$20. Hey, if Barack Obama wants to replace the founder of the Democrat Party (Andrew Jackson), with a gun toting, freedom loving, Christian Republican (Harriet Tubman) on the \$20 bill, why stop him.

Madison's View. "Since the general civilization of mankind, I believe there are more instances of the abridgement of freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments by those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations."(1788)

Book of the Month

How We Got To Now

Six Innovations that Made the Modern World

By Steven Johnson

Riverhead Books, 2015 (pp. 320)

http://www.amazon.com/How-We-Got-Now-Innovations/dp/1594633932/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1461353448&sr=1-1&keywords=how+we+got+to+here

I'm a sucker for stories about successful entrepreneurs, "eureka" moments of creativity, and obscure historical facts. You can't ask for more in *How We Got To Now*, a fascinating look at how free markets, science, art and society have intertwined and played off of one another in an amazing organic process to, as the title tells, get us to where we are now.

Steven Johnston takes us through six areas of innovation that have come to shape the modern world we live in: glass, cold, sound, clean, time, and light. Each story takes us from a beginning point in human history, shows us the problems society is faced with solving throughout time that spark experimentation, how each element evolves as part of the solution to the problem, and, of course, to the characters who bring those solutions to fruition.

Glass for example. What began as a freak natural curiosity – desert sand melted by a comet strike – used as a decorative luxury item in jewelry making evolves into the one of the most necessary and diverse technological components in the world today. Glass is now used in everything from drinking vessels to boat hulls to fiber optic communications. Along the way, Johnston shows us how things like the introduction of the printing press created a more literate society, which, in turn, created a demand for reading glasses. Experiments with these new lens technologies, in turn, led to the telescope and microscope, which, in turn, led to the discovery of bacteria and a new problem to challenge society.

If you want to find out how the discovery of the microscope led to the bikini bathing suit, you'll have to read the book. Or how the invention of flash photography led to a dramatic cultural shift in how we understand and deal with poverty. Or how a New England entrepreneur took three almost valueless commodities, lake ice, saw dust, and empty cargo ships in need of ballast, and totally reshaped the world we live in.

But, what Steven Johnston has really given us here is a broad look at how free markets work. These amazing strides forward for human history are not the result of central planning by government bureaucrats, but rather the result of creative people working to solve problems that, in many cases, society didn't even know existed at the time.

How We Got to Now is a tremendously entertaining, informative, and quick read. Highly recommended.

- Review by Rob Roper, president of the Ethan Allen Institute

The Final Word

May Survey

Should the Vermont Legislature expand its taxpayer funded pre-k program from 10 hours per week per student to a full-day (40 hours per week) program for four-year-olds, essentially adding another year to the public education system?

April Survey Results

Should the Vermont legislature pass a Carbon Tax in 2017, after the November election?

You said...

Yes. 1.67% (2)

No. 97.50% (117)

Don't know. 0.83% (1)