

MEMO

To: Interested Parties

Fr: American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity

Re: Obama/Clinton Cap and Trade II

Date: September 8, 2015

Background

On August 3, 2015, President Barack Obama's Environmental Protection Agency unveiled "[the most far-reaching energy regulation in the nation's history](#)" known as the Clean Power Plan. The [fundamentally flawed plan](#) seeks to regulate carbon emissions from power plants as a means to [solidify the president's political legacy](#) as a fighter of climate change despite the burdensome regulation having virtually no impact on its stated purpose.

This illegal regulation is a [dressed-up version of the unpopular "cap and trade" legislation from five years ago](#) with a new name meant to deceive the public. This regulation would have the same devastating economic consequences as the first iteration of "cap and trade," which is why the first time around the idea ultimately died in the face of strong bipartisan opposition.

Presidential candidate and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton endorsed the regulation and [vowed](#) to build on it if elected president. Just like President Obama, Secretary Clinton has been a [steadfast supporter](#) of "cap and trade." The "Obama / Clinton Cap and Trade II" has all the signs of being the next political albatross for candidates and incumbents who support it.

"Cap and Trade I" Fails

Five years ago, the Democratic-controlled House of Representative lead by then-Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi barely passed the American Clean Energy and Security Act, or "cap and trade," despite vocal bipartisan opposition. The result was an [uprising of constituents at town hall meetings across the country](#) voicing their opposition to the legislation and dubbing it "cap and tax," on account of how it threatened to increase utility costs for consumers.

Concerned about the political consequences they would face at the ballot box in 2010, Senate Democrats called on the White House to [drop](#) their efforts and let the bill languish in the House. Attempts to drive this toxic piece of legislation through the Senate [failed](#) because it did not receive enough support. It's important to note, Senate Democrats

at the time controlled a super majority, enough to move legislation without procedural interference.

Obama’s Cap and Trade Allies “Slaughtered” at the Ballot Box

Members of Congress who voted for this legislation were “[slaughtered](#)” at the ballot box by voters in the 2010 mid-term election. Overall, “two dozen lawmakers who favored efforts to clamp down on heat-trapping emissions were swept away on Tuesday's anti-incumbent wave.”

According to [Pew Research](#), by a 2-1 margin, voters opposed legislation like cap and trade that seeks to implement limits on carbon emissions at the time of the 2010 mid-term election. Ignoring the concerns of voters on issues that impact their pocketbook is a recipe for getting booted from office.

Overwhelming Opposition to “Cap and Trade II”

Overreach by EPA on the carbon emissions rule has led to the formation of a bi-partisan coalition of public officials opposing the regulation. [Legislatures, governors, attorneys general and environmental officials from 32 states](#) have expressed concerns over the lawfulness of the final rule.

For instance, a [bipartisan group of state attorneys general](#) are seeking to stop EPA’s illegal regulation through the courts. Democratic lawmakers like Senators [Joe Donnelly](#) and [Joe Manchin](#) have weighed in to oppose the regulation. Besides the extreme environmental special interests that colluded behind closed doors with EPA, virtually no support exists for the regulation.

Recent polling by [Rasmussen Reports](#) finds 56 percent of likely U.S. voters believe the “Obama/Clinton Cap and Trade II,” will increase energy costs in the United States. Research by our organization shows consumers are [unlikely to support](#) the president’s own ruling if it squeezes the middle class, leads to job losses or increases household energy costs – facts President Obama and his cohorts, like Hillary Clinton, choose to ignore.

Minorities and low-income Americans will feel the greatest impact. A [recent study](#) revealed the carbon emissions ruling would “increase black poverty by 23 percent, Hispanic poverty by 26 percent, result in cumulative job losses of 7 million for blacks, nearly 12 million for Hispanics in 2035, and decrease black and Hispanic median household income by \$455 to \$550, respectively, in 2035.

Conclusion

It’s clear the “Obama/Clinton Cap and Trade II” regulation is a political loser for any public official. Current office holders and those seeking public office should take a clear stand

against and vow to work with the bipartisan coalition of elected officials working nonstop to stop President Obama's regulation by fiat through EPA.

###