



Insight

Prosecuting Trade

JUNE 28, 2016

Secretary Hillary Clinton & Sen. Elizabeth Warren hit the trail yesterday, displaying an uncharacteristically populist tone for the Clinton campaign. Notable among the many promises was a pledge to appoint a trade prosecutor in order to stop abuses of American markets & workers.

[Sec. Clinton](#) supported the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and less than three years ago called it “[The Gold Standard](#)” of trade deals, [as she helped negotiate it as Secretary of State](#).

Clinton once supported smart trade agreements when they could benefit our workers and our country, and she voted for and promoted them as Secretary of State, as Senator and as First Lady.

In the case of TPP, the Peterson Institute for Internal Economics estimates that if the agreement’s ratification were delayed just one year it would mean \$94 billion in lost revenue for the American economy. While other studies predict more modest impacts, many do [not consider](#) the economic gains that would result from increased intellectual property protections, U.S. specialization, and productivity growth.

The agreement would also provide an opportunity for the U.S. to write the rules of global trade, enabling American values to be established as the new norm in the Asia-Pacific. As someone who negotiated the compact, Secretary Clinton knows this is most likely a good deal for American workers.

Now Secretary Clinton’s gone one step further with a proposal to install a “trade prosecutor.” What would a trade prosecutor do that the U.S. Trade Representative doesn’t already do? Presumably little. In effect it would likely be just one more “czar” with a duplicative role.