WHAT TO WATCH FOR DURING CLINTON’S ECONOMIC SPEECH ON THURSDAY

*When Hillary Clinton Unveils Her Economic Package Today, There Are Some Important Facts To Keep In Mind*

**SEVEN KEY POINTS TO REMEMBER...**

- The Non-Partisan Tax Foundation Says Clinton’s Plan Will Cost Jobs And Shrink The GDP
- Remember That Detroit Has Suffered Under The Obama-Clinton Economy
- Clinton Has Supported Job-Killing Trade Deals Like NAFTA And TPP
- Clinton Broke Her Promise About Creating Jobs In Upstate New York
- Clinton Praised President Obama On The Job He Has Done On The Economy While Middle-Class Americans Are Still Struggling To Recover
- Remember When Clinton Promised To Put Coal Miners Out Of Work
- Clinton Supports Radical Environmental Regulations That Will Cost Jobs

**The Non-Partisan Tax Foundation Says Clinton’s Plan Will Cost Jobs And Shrink The GDP**

According To Analysis By The Tax Foundation, Clinton’s Tax Proposals Would “Reduce The Economy’s Size By 1 Percent.” “According to the Tax Foundation’s Taxes and Growth Model, Hillary Clinton’s tax plan would reduce the economy’s size by 1 percent in the long run.” (Kyle Pomerleau and Michael Schuyler, “Details And Analysis Of Hillary Clinton’s Tax Proposals,” Tax Foundation, 1/26/16)

According To Analysis By The Tax Foundation, Clinton’s Tax Proposals Would Result In “311,000 Fewer Full-Time Equivalent Jobs.” “The plan would lead to 0.8 percent lower wages, a 2.8 percent smaller capital stock, and 311,000 fewer full-time equivalent jobs. The smaller economy results from somewhat higher marginal tax rates on capital and labor income.” (Kyle Pomerleau and Michael Schuyler, “Details And Analysis Of Hillary Clinton’s Tax Proposals,” Tax Foundation, 1/26/16)

According To Analysis By The Tax Foundation, Clinton’s Tax Proposals Would “Lead To 0.8 Percent Lower Wages.” “The plan would lead to 0.8 percent lower wages, a 2.8 percent smaller capital stock, and 311,000 fewer full-time equivalent jobs. The smaller economy results from somewhat higher marginal tax rates on capital and labor income.” (Kyle Pomerleau and Michael Schuyler, “Details And Analysis Of Hillary Clinton’s Tax Proposals,” Tax Foundation, 1/26/16)

When Accounting For The Economic Impact Of Clinton’s Plan, Clinton’s Tax Proposals Would Reduce American’s After-Tax Incomes By An Average Of 1.3 Percent. “On a dynamic
basis, the plan would reduce after-tax incomes by an average of 1.3 percent. All deciles would see a reduction in after-tax income of at least 0.9 percent over the long-term. Taxpayers that fall in the bottom nine deciles would see their after-tax incomes decline by between 0.9 and 1 percent.” (Kyle Pomerleau and Michael Schuyler, “Details And Analysis Of Hillary Clinton’s Tax Proposals,” Tax Foundation, 1/26/16)

**American’s That Are In The Bottom 90% Of Taxpayers Would See A Reduction In After-Tax Income Of At Least 0.9 Percent Over The Long-Term.** “On a dynamic basis, the plan would reduce after-tax incomes by an average of 1.3 percent. All deciles would see a reduction in after-tax income of at least 0.9 percent over the long-term. Taxpayers that fall in the bottom nine deciles would see their after-tax incomes decline by between 0.9 and 1 percent.” ( Kyle Pomerleau and Michael Schuyler, “Details And Analysis Of Hillary Clinton’s Tax Proposals,” Tax Foundation, 1/26/16)

**Remember That Detroit Has Suffered Under The Obama-Clinton Economy**

**Detroit's Economic Downturn During Obama's Presidency Has Been Catastrophic:**


- “People Are Trapped” In Detroit As “Those With Access And Means Are Moving Out, Leaving Behind Those Who Can’t Leave.” “‘We’re seeing on the ground in Detroit, people are trapped,’ said the Rev. David Alexander Bullock, a Detroit pastor with Greater St. Matthew Baptist Church who leads the advocacy group Change Agent Consortium. ‘It makes it harder for people to leave. Those with access and means are moving out, leaving behind those who can't leave.’” (Niraj Warikoo, “Detroit Has Highest Concentrated Poverty Rate Among Top 25 Metro Areas,” *Detroit Free Press*, 4/26/16)

According To A Study By The Brookings Institution, The Detroit-Warren-Dearborn Metro Area Had The 5th Highest Concentrated Poverty Rate In The United States. (Elizabeth Kneebone And Natalie Holmes, “U.S. Concentrated Poverty In The Wake Of The Great Recession,” Brookings, 3/31/16)


In Detroit, “The Number Of High-Poverty Census Tracts More Than Tripled.” “In Detroit, for example, the number of high-poverty census tracts more than tripled, from 51 to 184.” (Paul Jargowsky, “Architecture Of Segregation,” The Century Foundation, 8/7/15)

• High-Poverty And Borderline Tracts In Detroit Have Spread From Within City Limits Into Adjacent Inner-Ring Suburbs. “Further, in contrast to 2000, when high-poverty and borderline tracts were found within the confines of the Detroit city limits, in 2009–13, they spill out from the central city into adjacent inner-ring suburbs.” (Paul Jargowsky, “Architecture Of Segregation,” The Century Foundation, 8/7/15)

• “In Other Words, The Footprint Of Concentrated Poverty Has Grown, And The Suburbs, Or At Least The Inner-Ring Of Older Suburbs, Are No Longer Immune To Its Effects.” (Paul Jargowsky, “Architecture Of Segregation,” The Century Foundation, 8/7/15)

Detroit’s Economic Decline Under Obama – A Double-Whammy Of Higher Unemployment And Poverty Coupled With Lower Incomes:

Since Obama Has Been In Office, 149,527 Fewer Detroit Residents Are In The Labor Force. (Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

• In 2014, 539,755 Detroit Residents Were In The Labor Force. (Census, Accessed 8/4/16)
• In 2009, 689,282 Detroit Residents Were In The Labor Force. (Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

Since Obama Has Been In Office, 22.6 Percent More Detroit Residents Are Unemployed. (Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

• In 2014, 27.1 Percent Of Detroit Residents Were Unemployed. (Census, Accessed 8/4/16)
• In 2009, 22.1 Percent Of Detroit Residents Were Unemployed. (Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

Since Obama Has Been In Office, 5,547 More Detroit Residents Have Fallen Into Poverty. (Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

• In 2012, 141,774 Detroit Residents Were In Poverty. (Census, Accessed 8/4/16)
• In 2014, 147,321 Detroit Residents Were In Poverty. (Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

Since Obama Has Been In Office, The Median Household Income In Detroit Has Decreased By $2,262. (Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

• In 2014, Median Household Income In Detroit Was $26,095.
• In 2010, Median Household Income In Detroit Was $28,357.

The Obama Economy Has Hit African Americans Extremely Hard In Detroit:

Since Obama Has Been In Office, 92,877 Fewer African American Detroit Residents Are In The Labor Force. (Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

• In 2014, There Were 437,836 African Americans In The Labor Force In Detroit, Michigan. (Census, Accessed 8/4/16)
• In 2009, There Were 530,713 African Americans In The Labor Force In Detroit, Michigan. (Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

Since Obama Has Been In Office, 11 Percent Fewer African Americans In Detroit Are Employed. (Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

• In 2014, 37.9 Percent Of African Americans In Detroit Were Employed. (Census, Accessed 8/4/16)
In 2009, 42.1 Percent Of African Americans In Detroit Were Employed.  
(Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

Since Obama Has Been In Office, 20.7 Percent More African Americans In Detroit Are Unemployed.  
(Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

In 2014, 28.7 Percent Of African Americans In Detroit Were Unemployed.  
(Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

In 2009, 23.8 Percent Of African Americans In Detroit Were Unemployed.  
(Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

Since Obama Has Been In Office, 20.4 Percent More African American Residents In Detroit Have Fallen Into Poverty.  
(Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

In 2014, 34.8 Percent Of African Americans In Detroit Were In Poverty.  
(Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

In 2009, 28.9 Percent Of African Americans In Detroit Were In Poverty.  
(Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

Since Obama Has Been In Office, 28 Percent More African American Married-Couple Families In Detroit Have Fallen Into Poverty.  
(Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

In 2014, 14.2 Percent Of African American Married-Couple Families In Detroit Were In Poverty.  
(Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

In 2009, 11.1 Percent Of African American Married-Couple Families In Detroit Were In Poverty.  
(Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

Since Obama Has Been In Office, 12.6 Percent More African American Families With A Female Head Of Household In Detroit Have Fallen Into Poverty.  
(Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

In 2014, 45.6 Percent Of African American Families With A Female Head Of Household In Detroit Were In Poverty.  
(Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

In 2009, 40.5 Percent Of African American Families With A Female Head Of Household In Detroit Were In Poverty.  
(Census, Accessed 8/4/16)

Clinton Has Supported Job-Killing Trade Deals Like NAFTA And TPP

CLINTON SUPPORTED AND HELPED DRAFT THE JOB-KILLING TPP

Clinton Took A Lead Role In Drafting TPP And Said It “Sets The Gold Standard In Trade Agreements”:

As Secretary Of State, Clinton Took “A Leading Part In Drafting The Trans-Pacific Partnership.” “She’s pressed the case for U.S. business in Cambodia, Singapore, Vietnam, Indonesia, and other countries in China’s shadow. She’s also taken a leading part in drafting the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a free trade pact that would give U.S. companies a leg up on their Chinese competitors.” (Elizabeth Dwoskin and Indira Laksmanan, “How Hillary Clinton Created A U.S. Business-Promotion Machine,” Bloomberg, 1/10/13)

Clinton Had Said The Trans-Pacific Partnership “Sets The Gold Standard In Trade Agreements.” CLINTON: “[We] need to keep upping our game both bilaterally and with partners across the region through agreements like the Trans-Pacific Partnership or TPP. Australia is a
critical partner. This TPP sets the gold standard in trade agreements to open free, transparent, fair trade, the kind of environment that has the rule of law and a level playing field. And when negotiated, this agreement will cover 40 percent of the world’s total trade and build in strong protections for workers and the environment.” (Hillary Clinton, Remarks at Techport Australia, 11/15/12)

**Last Week Virginia Gov. Terry McAuliffe Said Clinton Would Support TPP As President:**

In An Interview On Tuesday, Gov. Terry McAuliffe, “Longtime Best Friend To The Clintons,” Said He “Believes Hillary Clinton Will Support The TPP Trade Deal If Elected President.”

“Virginia Gov. Terry McAuliffe, longtime best friend to the Clintons, said Tuesday that he believes Hillary Clinton will support the TPP trade deal if elected president, with some tweaks.” (Annie Karni, “Clinton Friend McAuliffe Says Clinton Will Flip On TPP, Then Walks It Back,” Politico, 7/26/16)

McAuliffe: “Once The Election’s Over, And We Sit Down On Trade” I Expect Clinton Will Support TPP. “I worry that if we don’t do TPP, at some point China’s going to break the rules -- but Hillary understands this,” he said in an interview after his speech on the main stage at the Democratic National Convention. ‘Once the election’s over, and we sit down on trade, people understand a couple things we want to fix on it but going forward we got to build a global economy.’ Pressed on whether Clinton would turn around and support the trade deal she opposed during the heat of the primary fight against Bernie Sanders, McAuliffe said: ‘Yes. Listen, she was in support of it. There were specific things in it she wants fixed.’” (Annie Karni, “Clinton Friend McAuliffe Says Clinton Will Flip On TPP, Then Walks It Back,” Politico, 7/26/16)

The Following Day, McAuliffe Doubled Down On His Comments That Hillary Clinton Plans To Support TPP Once Elected President. STEPHANIE RUHLE: “Hillary Clinton’s decision to join Sanders in opposing the deal has been a key to winning over a lot of his supporters. But on Tuesday one of her oldest friends, Virginia governor Terry McAuliffe said she may flip her position and actually support the deal when and if she wins the White House. NBC’s Andrea Mitchell, spoke exclusively with Governor McAuliffe less than one hour ago. She joins me now on the phone. Andrea what did you learn?” ANDREA MITCHELL: “Well, he is not backing down. He is saying, though, that Hillary Clinton would make changes to it before going along with it. but since that is the priority of the president, they’re going to proceed and try to get TPP on a lame duck session. Right now I am in the Virginia delegation where the vice presidential running mate is about to be coming out. So let me play you a little bit of McAuliffe sound. And if I am distracted, you’ll know it’s because we are at a live event right here with Tim Kaine. This is what Terry McAuliffe had to say.” GOV. TERRY MCAULIFFE (CLIP): “Let me be very clear she will only go forward if the changes she wants are implemented, that everyone is in agreement, the labor folks are in agreement. She’s not going forward as it is today. So unless the changes are made she’s not for it. President Obama does want this, as you know.” RUHLE: “So for you, it doesn’t seem like there’s a lot of wiggle room. Terry almost sounds like he’s doubling down.” MITCHELL: “It is definitely doubling down and indicating that is the policy.” (MSNBC, 7/27/16)

**The Economic Policy Institute Estimates The U.S. Lost More Than 2 Million Jobs To TPP Nations In 2015 Alone:**

The Economic Policy Institute Estimates That The U.S. Trade Deficit With The 11 TPP Nations Led To The Elimination Of More Than 2 Million U.S. Jobs In 2015. “The U.S. trade deficit with the 11 other TPP countries eliminated 2 million jobs, as shown in Table 2, which reports the number of direct, indirect, and respending jobs lost (aggregated over all industries). The trade deficit between the United States and the 11 other TPP member countries in 2015 directly eliminated 418,900 jobs. In addition to the direct jobs lost, the U.S. trade deficit with the
TPP country group eliminated an additional 847,200 indirect jobs in supplier industries, including jobs in manufacturing, commodity, and service industries. Finally, wages lost because of direct and indirect job cuts from the trade deficits with the TPP member countries would have supported an additional 759,700 respending jobs. The direct, indirect, and respending jobs displaced by the U.S. trade deficit with TPP member countries totals 2,025,800 jobs lost.” (Robert E. Scott and Elizabeth Glass, “Trans-Pacific Partnership, Currency Manipulation, Trade, And Jobs,” Economic Policy Institute, 3/3/16)

The U.S. Already Has “A Large And Growing Trade Deficit” With The 11 Members Of The Proposed Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) Trade Deal. “The United States already has a large and growing trade deficit with the 11 other countries in the proposed TPP, which reached $265.1 billion in 2014. In contrast, the United States had a small trade surplus with Mexico in 1993, before NAFTA took effect. In other words, outsourcing to the TPP countries is a potentially much greater threat than it was under NAFTA with Mexico.” (Robert E. Scott, “Fast Track To Lost Jobs And Lower Wages,” Economic Policy Institute’s Working Economics Blog, 4/13/15)

CLINTON IS A LONG-TIME SUPPORTER OF NAFTA, EVEN TOUTING ITS BENEFITS AS SECRETARY OF STATE

As First Lady, Clinton Strongly Promoted NAFTA, And Viewed It As An Example Of The Economy That Is “Reaping The Benefits, Not The Burdens Of Globalization”:

In Her Book “Living History,” Clinton Praised NAFTA, Calling It An Example Of The Economy “Reaping The Benefits, Not The Burdens Of Globalization.” “Creating a free trade zone in North America- the largest free trade zone in the world- would expand U.S. exports, create jobs and ensure that our economy was reaping the benefits, not the burdens of globalization.” (Hillary Rodham Clinton, Living History, 2003, p. 182)

In 1998, Clinton Praised The Passage Of NAFTA, Pledging To Continue Free Trade Advocacy: “It Is Certainly Clear That We Have Not By Any Means Finished The Job That Has Begun.” “At the 1998 World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, she praised corporations for mounting ‘a very effective business effort in the U.S. on behalf of NAFTA.’ She added: ‘It is certainly clear that we have not by any means finished the job that has begun.’” (Kristin Jensen and Mark Drajem, “Clinton Breaks With Husband’s Legacy On Nafta Pact, China Trade,” Bloomberg, 3/30/07)

- Clinton Said The Business Community Was Very Effective On Behalf Of NAFTA.
  SCHWAB: “In the same context, the fast-track trade legislation is very much at the top of the priorities of your husbands administration. What can you say also to the business community here to give the active and effective support for this legislative measure?” CLINTON: “Well, I would probably just echo what I already said, at the risk of being repetitive. There was a very effective business effort in the United States on behalf of NAFTA.” (Hillary Clinton, Interview With Klaus Schwab At The Annual Meeting Of The World Economic Forum, Davos, Switzerland, 2/2/98)

During A 1996 Campaign Stop In Texas, Hillary Clinton Touted NAFTA “Saying It Would Reap Widespread Benefits In The Region.” “Meanwhile, first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton stumped in the heavily Democratic lower Rio Grande valley. In Brownsville, she touted the president’s support for the North American Free Trade Agreement, saying it would reap widespread benefits in the region.” (“Clinton Campaigns In Texas,” United Press International, 11/1/96)

At A Union Event In 1996, Then First-Lady Clinton Told Workers That “I Think That NAFTA Is Proving Its Worth.” CLINTON: “Oh I think that, everybody is in favor of free and fair trade, and I think that NAFTA is proving its worth.” (First Lady Hillary Clinton, Remarks At An Event For The Union Of Needle Trades, Industrial, And Textile Employees (UNITE), New York, NY, 3/6/96)
As Secretary Of State, Clinton Touted The Benefits Of NAFTA:

Clinton Said “The North American Market, Of Which Mexico Is Such A Central Part Under NAFTA, Is Going To Remain Strong,” Adding “We’re Going To Continue To Import And Export To And From Mexico.” CLINTON: “But I want to start from the point that here we are in the midst of a global economic crisis, and we need all the growth we can get because that will eventually help every country be able to overcome this recession, since we are so interdependent. I think it’s also important to say that I think that the North American market, of which Mexico is such a central part under NAFTA, is going to remain strong. The fact that goods can be manufactured and assembled in Mexico, cutting down on transportation costs, cutting down on the carbon footprint, which will become an even more important consideration in the years ahead, means that we’re going to continue to import and export to and from Mexico.”

(Secretary Hillary Clinton, Remarks At The First Diplomacy Briefing Series Meeting, Washington, DC, 12/11/09)
Clinton Added That She Was “Committed” To “Working With Our Mexican Partners, To Increase The Capacity Of The Mexican Economy So That They Can Export Even A Greater Range Of Goods.” CLINTON: “I think we also can do more, working with our Mexican partners, to increase the capacity of the Mexican economy so that they can export even a greater range of goods, because the best answer for Mexico and the best rebuke of the drug traffickers is to increase the economic prosperity of the people of Mexico. And I am committed to doing that and I think that other countries like China can grow. But Mexico will remain a critical partner to us in trade and economic well-being for many, many years to come.” (Secretary Hillary Clinton, Remarks At The First Diplomacy Briefing Series Meeting, Washington, DC, 12/11/09)

In March 2010, Clinton Said “We’ve Worked To Promote Growth And Create Jobs Through… Multilateral Pacts Like NAFTA And CAFTA-DR.” CLINTON: “In our region, prosperity has widened in recent decades. We’ve worked to promote growth and create jobs through sound fiscal policy, bilateral trade agreements, multilateral pacts like NAFTA and CAFTA-DR, and institutions like the Inter-American Development Bank.” (Secretary Hillary Clinton, Remarks At Pathways to Prosperity Ministerial, San Jose, Costa Rica, 3/4/10)

NAFTA Has Led To The Loss Of 850,000 U.S. Jobs:

The U.S. Trade Deficit With Canada And Mexico Increased Ten-Fold Between 1993 And 2013, Resulting In The Loss Of 850,000 Jobs. “Between 1993 (before NAFTA took effect) and 2013, the U.S. trade deficit with Mexico and Canada increased from $17.0 billion to $177.2 billion, displacing more than 850,000 U.S. jobs. Growing trade deficits and job displacement, especially between the United States and Mexico, were the result of a surge in outsourcing of production by U.S. and other foreign investors. The rise in outsourcing was fueled, in turn, by a surge in foreign direct investment (FDI) into Mexico, which increased by more than 150 percent in the post-NAFTA period.” (Robert E. Scott, “Fast Track To Lost Jobs And Lower Wages,” Economic Policy Institute’s Working Economics Blog, 4/13/15)


**THE U.S. HAS SEEN JOB LOSSES AND DEPRESSED WAGES DUE TO FREE TRADE**

**The U.S. Has Lost 5 Million Manufacturing Jobs Since 1997, Most Due To Bad Trade Deals And Rising Trade Deficits:**

“More Than 5 Million U.S. Manufacturing Jobs Were Lost Between 1997 And 2014,” Primarily Due To “Growing Trade Deficits With Countries That Have Negotiated Trade And Investment Deals With The United States.” “More than 5 million U.S. manufacturing jobs were lost between 1997 and 2014, and most of those job losses were due to growing trade deficits with countries that have negotiated trade and investment deals with the United States.” ([Robert E. Scott](http://www.epi.org/working-economist/blog-post/fast-track-to-lost-jobs-and-lower-wages), “Fast Track To Lost Jobs And Lower Wages,” Economic Policy Institute's Working Economics Blog, 4/13/15)


**Trade With Low-Wage Countries Reduced U.S. Workers’ Wages By $180 Billion In 2011:**

**Trade Competition With China And Other Low-Wage Countries Results In Reduced Wages For All 100 Million U.S. Workers Without A College Degree.** “Worse yet, growing competition with workers in China and other low-wage countries reduced the wages of all 100 million U.S. workers without a college degree, leading to cumulative losses of approximately $180 billion per year.” ([Will Kimball and Robert E. Scott](http://www.epi.org/blog/china-trade-outsourcing-and-jobs), “China Trade, Outsourcing And Jobs,” Economic Policy Institute, 12/11/14)

**Trade With Low-Wage Countries Lowered Annual Wages By 5.5 Percent – Roughly $1,800 For Full-Time Workers Without A College Degree.** “To put these estimates in macroeconomic terms, in 2011, trade with low-wage countries lowered annual wages by 5.5 percent—roughly $1,800 for all full-time, full-year workers without a college degree. To provide comparable economy-wide impact estimates, assume that 100 million workers without a college degree suffered total losses of $1,800 per year, which yields a total national loss of $180 billion.” ([Will Kimball and Robert E. Scott](http://www.epi.org/blog/china-trade-outsourcing-and-jobs), “China Trade, Outsourcing And Jobs,” Economic Policy Institute, 12/11/14)
Assuming 100 Million U.S. Workers Without A College Degree Results In A Lost Of $180 Billion In Wages In 2011. “To provide comparable economy-wide impact estimates, assume that 100 million workers without a college degree suffered total losses of $1,800 per year, which yields a total national loss of $180 billion.” (Will Kimball and Robert E. Scott, “China Trade, Outsourcing And Jobs,” Economic Policy Institute, 12/11/14)

Clinton Broke Her Promise About Creating Jobs In Upstate New York

Clinton Promised To Create 200,000 Jobs In Upstate New York When Running For Senate In 2000:

Clinton Promised To Create 200,000 Jobs In Upstate New York When She Campaigned For Senator In 2000. “She's reminded of it all the time around here, so Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton couldn’t have been surprised when her failed 2000 campaign promise to bring 200,000 jobs to economically desperate upstate New York became part of the latest presidential debate.” (Carolyn Thompson, “Fact Check: Clinton And Jobs Promised,” USA Today, 2/28/08)

Clinton Ran TV Ads “Just Before The Election” Touting Her 200,000 New Upstate Jobs Goal. “A day after announcing her 2000 candidacy, then-first lady Clinton vowed to infuse more than a half billion dollars into the upstate economy. A television ad ran just before the election, citing the 200,000 new jobs goal.” (Jerry Markon, “As senator, Clinton Promised 200,000 Jobs In Upstate New York. Her Efforts Fell Flat,” The Washington Post, 8/7/16)

The Washington Post Headline: “As Senator, Clinton Promised 200,000 Jobs In Upstate New York. Her Efforts Fell Flat.” (The Washington Post, 8/7/16)

Clinton Massively Underperformed This Goal, With Job Growth In Upstate New York Remaining Stagnant And Manufacturing Cratering:

The Public Policy Institute In Albany, Which Uses U.S. BLS Data, Reported That Upstate New York “Lost More Than 31,000 Payroll Jobs Between October 2001 And December 2006.” “The most authoritative jobs numbers are widely considered to be those from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). Multiple analyses of its New York data show that upstate actually lost jobs during Clinton’s first term. For example, the non-partisan Public Policy Institute in Albany — which uses BLS data for a monthly snapshot of Upstate New York — reported that the region lost more than 31,000 payroll jobs between October 2001 and December 2006.” (Jerry Markon, “As senator, Clinton Promised 200,000 Jobs In Upstate New York. Her Efforts Fell Flat,” The Washington Post, 8/7/16)

“During Her Overall Senate Tenure, According To The Institute, Upstate Jobs Rose 0.2 Percent Overall.” “During her overall Senate tenure, according to the institute, upstate jobs rose 0.2 percent overall, but manufacturing jobs fell 24.1 percent.” (Jerry Markon, “As senator, Clinton Promised 200,000 Jobs In Upstate New York. Her Efforts Fell Flat,” The Washington Post, 8/7/16)

Manufacturing Jobs In Upstate New York Fell By “Nearly 25 Percent During Clinton’s Time In The Senate.” “But nearly eight years after Clinton’s Senate exit, there is little evidence that her economic development programs had a substantial impact on upstate employment. Despite Clinton’s efforts, upstate job growth stagnated overall during her tenure, with manufacturing jobs plunging nearly 25 percent, according to jobs data.” (Jerry Markon, “As senator, Clinton Promised 200,000 Jobs In Upstate New York. Her Efforts Fell Flat,” The Washington Post, 8/7/16)

While Failing To Uphold Her Promise To Her Constituents, Clinton Was In India Claiming The Outsourcing Of American Jobs Was "An Inevitability":

The Washington Post Headline: “As Senator, Clinton Promised 200,000 Jobs In Upstate New York. Her Efforts Fell Flat.” (The Washington Post, 8/7/16)
In Remarks From A 2005 Closed Door Presentation In India, Clinton Declared That Outsourcing Is "An Inevitability There Is No Way To Legislate Against Reality... Outsourcing Will Continue." CLINTON: "Perhaps some economic incentives to at least think very hard before those decisions are made, but you know it is an inevitability there is no way to legislate against reality, so I think that uh, the outsourcing will continue." (Hillary Clinton, Remarks At India Today Conclave, New Delhi, India, 2/25/05)

Click To Watch

Clinton Blamed 9-11 And President Bush For Not Reaching Her 200,000 Jobs Goal For Upstate New York:

In April Clinton Was Grilled For Promising 200,000 New Jobs For Upstate New York During Her Time As A New York Senator, Blaming 9-11 And President Bush For Not Reaching Jobs Goal. REPORTER: "Again, you see particularly 'upstaters' recalling your time in the U.S. Senate and also recalling your pledge for the 200,000 jobs, right? And I know I've seen your comments since then, that you were overzealous or exuberant perhaps and your hope was that there would be a Democratic White House, which was not achieved. You're not making such pledges now, but do you think that you could boost job growth in upstate New York if you were in fact in the White House?" CLINTON: "I sure do. You know, three things happened; we had 9/11, which was devastating for the entire state, we did have The Great Recession and Republican policies, and we had a very difficult situation with the Bush administration not enforcing trade agreements." (Hillary Clinton, Interview With Capitol Tonight, 4/4/16)
Clinton Praised President Obama On The Job He Has Done On The Economy While Middle-Class Americans Are Still Struggling To Recover

Clinton Has Praised Obama's So-Called “Recovery” And Gave His Administration An “A” Grade For Its Performance:

In October 2015, Clinton Gave The Obama Administration An "A" For Its Overall Performance, Including The Clinton-Obama Economy. HILLARY CLINTON: "I'd give him an 'A.' I don't think he gets the credit he deserves for saving our economy from falling into a great depression, for saving the auto industry which represents millions of jobs up and down the supply chain, for beginning the crackdown on Wall Street abuses with Dodd-Frank, for getting the Affordable Care Act passed, for really being as responsive as he could possibly be given the obstructionism that he faced with the Republicans in Congress." (Hillary Clinton Interview With The Boston Globe, 10/17/15)
Clinton Continues To Maintain That President Obama’s Performance Is Evidence That The “Economy Does Better” With A “Democrat In The White House.” CLINTON: “But it is true, our economy does better when we have a democrat in the White House, and that is true in Alabama, just like its true anywhere. We are going to make that case, do the very best we can to kind of get people to recognize that we are all in this together.” (Hillary Clinton, Remarks At Townhall, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, 12/29/15)

Clinton Has Proudly Stated That Obama Doesn’t “Get The Credit He Deserves” For The State Of The U.S. Economy. CLINTON: “And, getting the economy to work better, getting our government to be more effective and productive in producing results, building on the progress that President Obama made it -- remember, he inherited the worst financial crisis since the Great Recession, and then he had to make sure it didn't fall into a depression. I don't think he gets the credit he deserves for making sure that did not happen. We are going to make that case. We are going to make that case throughout the country. I hope, effectively. I’m counting on that.” (Hillary Clinton, Remarks At Townhall, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, 12/29/15)
Under Clinton’s “A” Economy, Americans Have Watched Their Incomes Fall And Poverty Rise:

Middle-Income American Families “Make Substantially Less Money” In Inflation Adjusted Terms Than Years Ago And “There Is No Evidence That Is Reversing.” “A middle-income American family, in other words, makes substantially less money in inflation-adjusted terms than it did 15 years ago. And there is no evidence that is reversing.” (Neil Irwin, “Why Americans Still Think The Economy Is Terrible,” The New York Times, 9/16/15)

During The Obama Administration, Median Household Income Has Fallen $1,656, From $55,313 In 2008 To $53,657 In 2014. (Census, Accessed 9/16/15)

- The Median Household Income In The U.S. Fell $805, Or 1.5 Percent, From $54,462 In 2013 To $53,657 In 2014. (Census, Accessed 9/16/15)

American Household Incomes “Lost Ground” In 2014, In A Sign The U.S. Economic Expansion “Has Not Led To Gains For Many Americans” Since The End Of The 2007-2009 Recession. “American household incomes lost ground last year and the poverty rate ticked up, the U.S. Census Bureau said on Wednesday, in a sign the U.S. economic expansion has not led to gains for many Americans five years after the 2007-2009 recession.” (Susan Heavey, “U.S. Household Incomes Slip, Poverty Rate Up Slightly In 2014,” Reuters, 9/16/15)


About 46.7 Million Americans Were Living In Poverty Last Year. “Around 14.8% of Americans, or 46.7 million individuals, were living in poverty last year, unchanged from 2013.” (Nick Timiraos, “U.S. Income Edged Lower In 2014,” The Wall Street Journal, 9/16/15)

The Poverty Rate Has Increased By 1.6 Percentage Points Under Obama, From 13.2 Percent In 2008 To 14.8 Percent In 2014. (Census, Accessed 9/16/15)
The Impact Of Clinton’s “A” Economy Is A Disappearing Middle-Class:

A December 2015 Pew Study Found That For The First Time In Four Decades, The Middle Class Is No Longer The Majority. "After more than four decades of serving as the nation’s economic majority, the American middle class is now matched in number by those in the economic tiers above and below it. In early 2015, 120.8 million adults were in middle-income households, compared with 121.3 million in lower- and upper-income households combined, a demographic shift that could signal a tipping point, according to a new Pew Research Center analysis of government data." ("The American Middle Class Is Losing Ground," Pew Research Center, 12/9/15)

- Middle-Class Jobs, That “Provided A Stable Living For Those With Less Education,” Have “Been Replaced With Low-Wage Work.” “But middle-skilled jobs, which once provided a stable living for those with less education, have been replaced with low-wage work. Occupations at the growing bottom earn less than $32,000 on average. Only one-third have health insurance and only one-quarter have retirement benefits.” (Josh Zumbrun, “Post Recession Job Growth Coming In High-Wage Positions,” The Wall Street Journal, 8/17/15)

The U.S. Middle-Class “Has Shrunk To The Point Where It No Longer Constitutes The Majority Of The Adult Population.” “The nation’s middle class, long a pillar of the U.S. economy and foundation of the American dream, has shrunk to the point where it no longer constitutes the majority of the adult population, according to a new major study.” (Don Lee, “Middle-Class Families, Pillar Of The American Dream, Are No Longer In The Majority, Study Finds,” Los Angeles Times, 12/9/15)

A Gallup Survey Found That Only 51 Percent Of U.S. Adults Identify As Middle-Class, Down From 63 Percent Of Those Polled In 2008. “A Gallup survey this spring showed that just 51% of U.S. adults considered themselves middle or upper middle class, with 48% saying they are part of the lower or working class. As recently as 2008, 63% of those polled by Gallup said they were middle class.” (Don Lee, “Middle-Class Families, Pillar Of The American Dream, Are No Longer In The Majority, Study Finds,” Los Angeles Times, 12/9/15)

Remember When Clinton Promised To Put Coal Miners Out Of Work

Clinton’s Vowed To “Put A Lot Of Coal Miners And Coal Companies Out Of Business” In March, Drawing The Ire Of Coal State Democrats:

Clinton’s Town Hall Remarks “Caught The Attention Of Coal Country.” “Democratic presidential candidate Hillary Clinton caught the attention of coal country for her statement during a CNN town hall last Sunday when she said, ‘We’re going to put a lot of coal miners and coal companies out of business.’” (Hoppy Kercheval, “Clinton’s Kinsley Gaffe,” West Virginia MetroNews, 3/17/16)

The Roanoke [Virginia] Times Editorial: “Clinton May Be The First Candidate To Brag She’s Going To Put An Entire Industry Out Of Work.” “Clinton may be the first candidate to brag she’s going to put an entire industry out of work.” (Editorial, “Our View: Clinton’s Coal Gaffe?,” The Roanoke [Virginia] Times, 3/17/16)

West Virginia Political Commentator Hoppy Kercheval: Clinton’s Comments “Reaffirm What Coal Industry Supporters Fear About Clinton, That She Will Continue Obama’s Policies That “Make It Impossible To Mine And Burn Coal.” “The comment reaffirmed what coal industry supporters fear about Clinton, that she will continue down the path set forth by the Obama administration of using executive authority to make it impossible to mine and burn coal.” (Hoppy Kercheval, “Clinton’s Kinsley Gaffe,” West Virginia MetroNews, 3/17/16)
The President Of The National Mining Association, Hal Quinn, Said It Was “Deeply Troubling” To Hear Clinton “Boast” That She Wants “To Destroy The Livelihoods Of Tens Of Thousands Of Hard-Working Americans.” “The National Mining Association joined in. Hal Quinn, the group’s president, said it is ‘surpassing strange and deeply troubling to hear prominent presidential candidates boast of their determination in office to destroy the livelihoods of tens of thousands of hard-working Americans.’” (Timothy Cama, “GOP, Industry Backlash After Clinton’s Coal Comments,” The Hill, 3/14/16)

West Virginia Democrat Senator Joe Manchin Was “Livid” After Hearing Of Clinton’s “Horrific” Comments, And “Was So Appalled He Was Prepared To Cut Political Ties” With Clinton. “Joe Manchin was livid. The Democratic senator from West Virginia had seen Hillary Clinton tell a televised town hall audience that if she became president, ‘we’re going to put a lot of coal miners and coal companies out of business,’ in a broader answer about creating jobs in areas hurt by the decline of the coal industry. Coal miners have been struggling in his home state and Mr. Manchin was so appalled he was prepared to cut political ties with the Democratic presidential front-runner. ‘It was horrific,’ he said in an interview Thursday.” (Peter Nicholas, “West Virginia’s Joe Manchin Shaken By Hillary Clinton’s ‘Horrific’ Coal Comment,” The Wall Street Journal’s Washington Wire, 3/25/16)

Alison Lundergan Grimes, Clinton Friend And Kentucky’s Democrat Secretary Of State, Said She Was “Very Disappointed” In Clinton’s Anti-Coal Comments. “‘I was very disappointed to hear the comments that came out of the debate,’ said Alison Lundergan Grimes, Kentucky’s secretary of state and a close friend of the Clinton family who received their endorsement during her unsuccessful challenge to [Senator Mitch] McConnell in 2014. ‘My hope is she’ll have a chance to clarify those comments, comments that as I said were completely out of line with personal conversations that I have had with her.’” (Adam Beam and Jonathan Mattise, “Facing Backlash, Clinton Says Coal Still Has A Future,” The Associated Press, 3/14/16)

Clinton Supports Radical Environmental Regulations That Will Cost Jobs

Clinton Has Vowed To “Defend And Build On” The Obama Administration’s Anti-Coal Regulations, Which Has Earned Her Support From Environmentalists But Led To Concerns From Labor Unions. “Clinton was quick last week to praise President Obama’s stricter rules on coal-fired power plants, vowing to both defend and build on them. Her stance won plaudits from environmentalists within her party, but unions, a key constituency, are concerned she has yet to say how tougher climate rules will affect coal industry jobs.” (Valerie Volcovici and Amanda Becker, “Clinton Strays From Her Roots As Coal Miner’s Great Granddaughter,” Reuters, 8/10/15)

Clinton’s 2016 Campaign Chair, John Podesta, Was The “Architect” Of The Obama Administration’s Carbon Regulations. “Mrs. Clinton’s campaign chairman, John Podesta, was the architect of Mr. Obama’s signature climate change policy, a set of E.P.A. regulations to cut carbon emissions from power plants. Mrs. Clinton’s new plan appears explicitly designed to build on that plan.” (Trip Gabriel and Coral Davenport, “Hillary Clinton Lays Out Climate Change Plan,” The New York Times, 7/27/15)

In August 2015, Obama Finalized New EPA Regulations That Mandate “Tougher Greenhouse Gas Cuts On American Power Plants.” “Aiming to jolt the rest of the world to action, President Barack Obama moved ahead Sunday with even tougher greenhouse gas cuts on American power plants, setting up a certain confrontation in the courts with energy producers and Republican-led states.” (Josh Lederman, “Climate Change: Obama Orders Steeper Cuts From Power Plants,” The Associated Press, 8/2/15)

• Obama’s EPA Initially Proposed The Regulations In 2014, Which Take Aim At The Country’s Coal-Fired Power Plants By Drastically Cutting Carbon Emissions. “The
Obama administration on Monday announced one of the strongest actions ever taken by the United States government to fight climate change, a proposed Environmental Protection Agency regulation to cut carbon pollution from the nation’s power plants 30 percent from 2005 levels by 2030. The regulation takes aim at the largest source of carbon pollution in the United States, the nation’s more than 600 coal-fired power plants.” (Coral Davenport, “Unveiling New Carbon Plan, E.P.A. Focuses On Flexibility,” The New York Times, 6/2/14)

The Final EPA “Clean Power Plan” Rule “Requires A 32 Percent Cut In Power-Plant Carbon-Dioxide Emissions By 2030 From 2005 Levels.” “The limits on carbon emissions are a central component of the U.S.’s pledge to its international partners to cut greenhouse gases by a range of 26% to 28% by 2025, from 2005 levels. The final Environmental Protection Agency rule requires a 32% cut in power-plant carbon-dioxide emissions by 2030 from 2005 levels, which is a more ambitious target than the draft rules proposed last year.” (Colleen McCain Nelson And Amy Harder, “Obama Announces Rule To Cut Carbon Emissions From Power Plants,” The Wall Street Journal, 8/3/15)

The Final EPA Rule, Running More Than 1500 Pages, Explicitly Says That States Can Use Tax Increases “As A Tool For Meeting Their Emissions-Cutting Requirements.” “In a change from the draft plan, the final EPA rule now explicitly says states can use ‘fees’ (i.e., taxes) as a tool for meeting their emissions-cutting requirements. That’s on page 899 of the massive 1,560-page rule. Plans that states craft to comply with the mandate, the rule states, ‘could accommodate imposition by a state of a fee for CO2 emissions from affected [electric generating units], an approach suggested by a number of commenters.’ That language is a rather brief blessing but enough to excite the ad-hoc, Left-Right mix of environmentalists, economists, and a few conservative carbon-tax advocates who have long been swimming upstream at the national and state level.” (Ben Geman, “Obama Climate Plan Revives Talk Of A Carbon Tax,” National Journal, 8/3/15)

Obama’s Plan To Crack Down On Emissions Is “Unprecedented” And “Controversial.” “In finalizing the unprecedented pollution controls, Obama was installing the core of his ambitious and controversial plan to drastically reduce overall U.S. emissions, as he works to secure a legacy on fighting global warming. Yet it will be up to Obama’s successor to implement his plan, which reverberated across the 2016 presidential campaign trail.” (Josh Lederman, “Obama Orders Steeper Greenhouse Gas Cuts From U.S. Power Plants,” The Associated Press, 8/2/15)

- Obama’s Regulations Are Intended To “Wean” The Country Off Coal Produced Energy.
  “Another key change to the initial proposal marks a major shift for Obama on natural gas, which the president has championed as a ‘bridge fuel’ whose growing use can help the U.S. wean itself off dirtier coal power while ramping up renewable energy capacity. The final version aims to keep the share of natural gas in the nation’s power mix at current levels.” (Josh Lederman, “Obama Orders Steeper Greenhouse Gas Cuts From U.S. Power Plants,” The Associated Press, 8/2/15)

In June 2014, Clinton Praised The Obama Administration’s EPA Rules On Coal-Fired Power Plants And Described The New Rules As “A Very Creative American Solution.” CLINTON: “So part of what President Obama is doing, and I fully support it, is making it clear that the United States is going to act. We’ve done work on mileage, now with the EPA rules on coal-fired plants, and a very creative American solution, having different states figure out what they can do to try to lower their coal-fired emissions. But then the Supreme Court just agreed that the government has the authority to regulate carbon.” (Hillary Clinton, Remarks At The Aspen Ideas Festival, Aspen, CO, 6/30/14)

Clinton Commended Obama For His Actions On Climate Change, Including New EPA Regulations To Limit Carbon Emissions From Coal-Fired Power Plants. “On climate change, Clinton commended President Obama for some recent actions, including new federal regulations
limiting carbon emissions from coal-fired power plants. ‘We’re moving,’ Clinton said, ‘but we need to do so much more.’” (Philip Rucker, “Hillary Clinton Tries To Strike The Right Tone On Wealth And Income Inequality,” The Washington Post, 6/30/14)

- But Clinton Also Said She Believed America Needed To Go Further Than Obama’s Actions: “So We Are Moving But We Need To Do So Much More.” CLINTON: “So we are moving but we need to do so much more. But the United States cannot go to an international forum unless we’ve done more. And I think what President Obama is now doing is laying down here is what the United States of America is going to do, what are you going to do and being able to bring people around the table by 2015 so maybe we can stem off what will be a terrible, terrible outcome for our world.” (Hillary Clinton, Remarks At The Aspen Ideas Festival, Aspen, CO, 6/30/14)

Clinton’s “Support Of Obama’s Climate Agenda” Will Be A Liability For Her 2016 Campaign. “If Clinton runs in 2016, her support of Obama’s climate agenda, and push for more policies, would likely put her in the crosshairs of Republicans who call the president’s emissions standards a ‘war on coal’ and energy jobs.” (Laura Barron-Lopez, “Clinton: US Must Do More On Climate,” The Hill, 7/1/14)

Clinton Was “Really Proud” Of Obama For The 2014 EPA Regulations:

In June 2014, Clinton Said She Was “Really Proud Of President Obama For These New EPA Regulations.” CLINTON: “I am really proud of President Obama for these new EPA regulations and for the strong stance he has taken on climate change at home.” (Hillary Clinton, Remarks At Chicago Ideas Week, Chicago, IL, 6/11/14)

In June 2014, Clinton Said President Obama’s Use Of Executive Authority To Heavily Regulate Coal-Fired Power Plants Was “A Good Start” In Dealing With One Source Of Greenhouse Gas Emissions. CLINTON: “So here I think that we have to do what the President – President Obama is doing now. Within his executive authority, he has to take steps, as he recently did on the regulations for coal-fired plants. Recognizing that states are at different stages of development so that if you’re starting at a low base where you haven’t done very much to clean up the air, to deal with old plants, to come in with an alternative suite of energy products, then you’ve got to do more – but you’re given more time to do than if you’re a state like California or Massachusetts that have been real leaders – then your burden is different. So I think that if you look at the plan, it is a good start in dealing with one continuing source of greenhouse gas emissions.” (Hillary Clinton, Remarks At The BIO International Conference, 6/25/14)

Obama’s “Clean Power Plan” Regulations, Finalized In 2015, Will Raise Energy Costs And Kill Jobs:

Based On EPA Data, The American Action Forum Estimated The Obama Administration’s Finalized Regulations On Carbon Emissions Would Close 66 Power Plants, Eliminate 125,800 Coal Jobs, And Cut The Coal Industry In Half. “The final rule for the Clean Power Plan (CPP) was released by the Obama Administration this past August and is a direct attack on the coal industry. According to American Action Forum (AAF) research, the final plan, supported by Sec. Clinton, will shutter 66 power plants and eliminate 125,800 jobs in the coal industry. All of these figures are based on EPA data. The same study shows that using the 2012 baseline for coal generation and projections for 2030 output, the industry could shrink by 48 percent.” (Kimberly VanWhye, “Revitalizing Coal Communities: A $30 Billion Consolation Prize”, American Action Forum, 11/13/15)

An Analysis By NERA Economic Consulting Projected That Obama’s Carbon Regulations Will Cost As Much As $292 Billion. “NERA Economic Consulting has produced an analysis of the Clean Power Plan (CPP) recently finalized by the Obama Administration, aimed at reducing
carbon dioxide emissions from new and existing power plants by 32 percent nationwide. NERA's calculates the CPP could add $29 billion to $39 billion in costs to utilities or as much as $292 billion in added costs between 2022 and 2033, exclusive of added transmission, distribution and natural gas infrastructure costs.” (H. Sterling Burnett, “Economic Analysis of Clean Power Plan Shows High Cost, Minimal Benefits,” The Heartland Institute, 12/2/15)

The U.S. Chamber Of Commerce Estimates That The New Carbon Regulations Will Cause Annual Real Disposable Income To Decline More Than $200 Per Year, Totaling A Loss Of $3,400 By 2030. “Slower economic growth, job losses, and higher energy costs mean that annual real disposable household income will decline on an average of more than $200, with a peak loss of $367 in 2025. In fact, the typical household could lose a total of $3,400 in real disposable income during the modeled 2014-30 timeframe.” (“Assessing The Impact Of Potential New Carbon Regulations In The United States,” Institute For 21st Century Energy, 5/28/14)

As A Result Of These Regulations, The U.S. Chamber Of Commerce Estimates That From 2014 To 2030, On Average, The U.S. Economy Will Have 224,000 Fewer Jobs With A Peak Decline In Employment Of 442,000 Jobs. “On average, from 2014 to 2030, the U.S. economy will have 224,000 fewer jobs (Table ES-3), with a peak decline in employment of 442,000 jobs in 2022 (Figure ES-1). These job losses represent lost opportunities and income for hundreds of thousands of people that can never be recovered.” (“Assessing The Impact Of Potential New Carbon Regulations In The United States,” Institute For 21st Century Energy, 5/28/14)


• Industry Experts Say That The Regulations “Will Require Billions Of Dollars In New Investments.” “Industry experts say cutting carbon emissions 32% by 2030 will require billions of dollars in investments for new transmission lines that accommodate more solar and wind power and new pipelines to feed natural-gas-fired power plants, as coal becomes less important as a fuel.” (Amy Harder, Colleen McCain Nelson and Rebecca Smith, “Obama’s New Climate-Change Regulations To Alter, Challenge Industry,” The Wall Street Journal, 8/2/15)

The Obama Administration Claims The Plan Will Lower Energy Costs, But It Does So By Assuming People Will Simply Use Less Energy, An Assumption Challenged By Energy Providers. “Although the administration predicts the plan will actually lower the average U.S. energy bill by almost $85 in 2030, companies that produce and distribute electricity aren’t buying it. The savings come largely from increased use of wind, power and hydro plants, which operate at a cost of close to zero after they’re installed but cost a lot to get up and running. The administration is also counting on people’s power bills going because they’ll simply use less power as a result of efficiency measures. The National Association of Manufacturers, the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity, the National Mining Association, the American Energy Alliance and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association all predicted the rule would drive electricity bills up.” (“Winners And Losers Under Obama’s Stricter Power Plant Limits,” The Associated Press, 8/3/15)

Energy Executives Worry That The New Rules Will “Result In Shutting Power Plants” Leading To Higher Costs For Consumers. “Executives worry about the EPA plan’s cost, in part because it could result in shutting power plants that aren’t yet paid off, Mr. Akins said, meaning consumers will have to pay for assets that aren’t providing benefits. Other executives said consumers may be able to trim their electricity use and keep their bills flat—or even reduce them.” (Amy Harder, Colleen McCain, and Rebecca Smith, “Obama’s New Climate-Change Regulations To Alter, Challenge Industry,” The Wall Street Journal, 8/2/15)