

Midterm madness and markets

A special report by the Portfolio Advisory Group

Click [here](#) for author's contact information.

All values in U.S. dollars and priced as of October 31, 2018, market close, unless otherwise noted.

Produced: Nov 1, 2018 15:14ET; Disseminated: Nov 1, 2018 15:30ET;

For required disclosures, see [page 7](#).

NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION TO THE U.S.



Wealth Management
Dominion Securities

Midterm madness and markets



Tasneem Azim-Khan, CFA
tasneem.azimkhan@rbc.com

The U.S. midterm elections are in less than a week, and we believe there has been considerable anxiety amongst voters and investors alike regarding potential outcomes. Such anxiety is somewhat understandable given markets inherently dislike uncertainty, and we believe the feeling of ambiguity is amplified in the context of a cycle that many worry has become unsustainably long in the tooth (though we take issue with the word “unsustainably”). We would also go as far as to opine that this anxiety fed into the approximate 7% market correction we saw in October.

Investors’ focus should remain on the health of the U.S. economy, alongside the outlook for EPS growth, in our opinion. On the former, we do not expect changes to Congress to shift the course U.S. economic growth, which is expected to be about 3% in 2018 and 2.5% in 2019 (modestly above the average pace of growth over the last decade), according to RBC Capital Markets. EPS growth forecasts of 19% and 9% in 2018 and 2019, respectively, by RBC Capital Markets are above the average EPS growth since 2011. Furthermore, based on what we have seen of market performance in previous midterm election years, we would use periods of market volatility leading to the election to opportunistically add to high-quality stocks that have hitherto been out of reach due to elevated valuations.

Likely outcomes: Congress is having control issues

Next week Tuesday (November 6), U.S. voters will be arbiters of the fate for 35 of 100 Senate seats, 36 of 50 governorships, and all 435 seats in the House of Representatives (House).

Republicans hold 237 House seats, Democrats 193, and there are five vacancies. Thus, the Democrats would need a net gain of 23 seats to recapture control of that chamber. In this regard, the consensus seems to be that the House has a high likelihood of switching to Democratic control. Indeed, prediction markets such as FiveThirtyEight, the Iowa Electronic Markets, and PredictIt see about an 85%, 78%, and 70% chance, respectively, that the Democrats will gain control of the House.

Prediction markets expectations

Forecaster	Likelihood Democrats win...	
	House	Senate
FiveThirtyEight	85%	15%
Iowa Electronic Markets (IEM)	78%	27%
PredictIt	70%	13%

Source - PredictIt, FiveThirtyEight, Iowa Electronic Markets


The situation in the Senate is different. Republicans hold a slim 51-49 majority, yet it is likely that the GOP will defend its control because, of the 100 Senate seats, 35 are up for election, 26 of which are held by Democrats. So, the Democrats are under more pressure to maintain those 26, but also flip the nine Republican-held seats that are up for grabs. This is no small feat, especially given that 10 of the 26 Democrat-held seats at stake are in states that President Donald Trump carried in the 2016 presidential election.

Another useful predictor that has been used in the past has been the “party of the president”.

Another useful predictor that has been used in the past has been the “party of the president”. Since WWII, the sitting president’s party has lost an average of 25 seats in midterm elections. In this regard, investors should take some comfort in the fact that such a change across Congress is not unusual. Furthermore, the popularity of a sitting president is also relevant. Based on research from JP Morgan, when the presidential approval rating is below 50%, the number of seats lost is 37; above 50%, it is 14. President Trump’s approval numbers have recently floated around 40%, giving hope to Democrats.

Of the three possible election outcomes—the GOP maintains control over both legislative chambers, Democrats gain control over both chambers, or the consensus/base case that the Democrats take the House while the GOP wins the Senate—the second outcome typically gives investors the greatest concern. We opine that this may be because Democrats tend to be perceived as less business friendly (though not necessarily) than Republicans, and would look to pursue a more partisan, progressive agenda.

What are the implications for each of the following?



Source - PredictIt, FiveThirtyEight, Iowa Electronic Markets

Setting aside what we think is the low likelihood Congress becomes majority Democrat, and irrespective of whether the Democrats control one or both chambers, we still believe either outcome is unlikely to have any meaningful economic impact. This is because any new legislation would have to be passed by both the House and Senate, and not be vetoed by the president, a Republican. Similarly, in the more likely event that the GOP and Dems control the Senate and House, respectively, the former would face an uphill battle with respect to passing new legislation given the latter holds veto power.

Midterms and the U.S. economy

We do not believe the midterm election results will break the pace of economic growth in the U.S. Indeed, we have yet to see any GDP growth downgrades in light of the midterms. RBC Capital Markets adheres to its GDP growth estimates of about 3% in 2018 and 2.5% in 2019, representing a faster pace of economic growth versus Canada, the eurozone, U.K., and Japan.

Historically, federal government policy has had macroeconomic implications to the extent that the outcome affects the overall level of taxation in a meaningful way.

Historically, federal government policy has had macroeconomic implications to the extent that the outcome affects the overall level of taxation in a meaningful way. In this regard, we believe that concerns that a greater Democratic presence in Congress could lead to a reversal of the tax cuts instituted at the beginning of 2018, are overdone. President Trump and the Republican majority in Congress already achieved their key objective with respect to taxes at the beginning of the year with the passing of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (TCJA). To be clear, the TCJA has a number of provisions that will sunset in the future and at some point Congress will have to decide whether or not to extend some of these temporary aspects. But under current law, the bulk of these provisions do not expire until 2025, and as such we are not concerned that the TCJA will be clawed back meaningfully, even in the unlikely event Democrats occupy both chambers after the midterms. Again, any attempts to undo Republican policies will no doubt be met with a veto by the president, in our opinion.

That said, looking ahead, we believe there is a possibility the Trump administration would be more inclined to roll out additional fiscal stimulus à la TCJA part deux, particularly in the context of the 2020 federal election. Under such a scenario, a Democrat majority in Congress is not likely to let such legislation pass.

In contrast, should the Republicans control Congress, we believe additional fiscal stimulus in the form of more tax cuts is far more likely. Such an event would likely extend the outperformance of U.S. economic growth, versus its global peers, at least in the short-to-medium term. Yet another fiscal boost would have meaningful implications for the Fed's interest rate policy i.e., we would expect the interest rate differential between the U.S. and its developed peers to persist for longer as the Fed may consider an extended and/or more aggressive rate hike path in the context of a stronger-for-longer expansion. Following from this, one could surmise that the prospects for persistent strength in the U.S. dollar are higher under a Republican-controlled Congress versus one that is Democrat-controlled.

To the extent that we have a split-Congress scenario, the prospect of TCJA part deux is still somewhat uncertain given that 60 Senate votes are required under current rules for such legislation to pass.

Under any of these outcomes, we believe there is potential for a sizeable infrastructure bill to be passed given that such spending tends to have bipartisan support. Indeed, both Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump campaigned on greater infrastructure spending leading up to the 2016 presidential election. Earlier this year, President Trump outlined an infrastructure plan for US\$200B in government funds over a 10-year period. However, the plan had little detail around how such spending would be

financed, which could be a source of contention between Republicans and Democrats in the passing of a bill.

Trade policy: U.S.-China trade war

It is important to keep in mind, that Congress does not have much of an ability to control trade policy, as the Oval Office has power to act unilaterally. Still, in our view, the outcome that could increase the threat of protectionism would be the GOP taking both chambers of Congress. The Trump administration could take a harder stance towards trade with China through its “America First” policies via rising tariffs, and could adopt a similar approach with other key trading partners, e.g., Europe. Essentially, this scenario increases the risk of a global trade war, in our view, and subsequently amplifies the risk of a global recession. One mitigating factor, though likely more short-to-medium term in nature, could be a boost to fiscal stimulus by a GOP-controlled Congress (as discussed above).

It should be noted that U.S. concerns regarding trade relations with China pre-dated the Trump administration.


It should be noted, however, that U.S. concerns regarding trade relations with China pre-dated the Trump administration. In particular, the protection of U.S. intellectual property, the desire for greater access of foreign companies into China, and China’s manipulation of its own currency have long been contentious issues. In other words, the antipathy towards trade relations with China seems to be bipartisan. Furthermore, we believe Democrats will likely do themselves no favors by defending China or visibly promoting free trade as the aforementioned concerns have yet to be addressed, let alone resolved. Still, we believe that in the event the Democrats occupy one or both chambers, there is a possibility trade protectionism de-escalates in particular should the economic costs increase.

Midterms and the market – Historical precedent

The Portfolio Advisory Group has written prolifically about the imminent midterms in the *Global Insight Weeklys* dated [May 24, July 19](#), and [August 9, 2018](#). Based on the research of previous election cycles, we know that the U.S. market typically corrects in the 12 months leading up to the midterm election. Such volatility is par for the course as the market inherently dislikes uncertainty. Indeed, based on S&P 500 returns

Corrections are common in midterm years, and so are follow-on rallies

S&P 500 returns surrounding midterm elections (1934–2014)



Performance before and after 21 midterm election years, measured from the peak within 12 months before the midterm election year low, to that low. Source - RBC Wealth Management, Bloomberg

surrounding midterm elections between 1934 and 2014, the S&P 500 corrected by an average of 20.6% over the 21 instances.


In this regard, 2018 has been no exception. The approximate 10% correction from late January to early February remains rife in investors' minds. More recently, we saw an approximate 7% correction in early October. While it's not clear what the primary driver of that volatility was, we would think angst related to the midterms contributed to the negative sentiment.

While the equity market performance leading up to the midterms is less than ideal, we believe what happens after the midterms matters. In that regard, the U.S. market demonstrates better performance after the midterm election year low has been established. In fact, based on our research, the S&P 500 rallied 47.3% on average, as measured from the low point reached during the midterm election year to the high in the following year. In all of the 21 instances since 1934, the market traded higher.

In addition, RBC Capital Markets' analysis of election cycles (during the four-year period from the election year, to one year after the midterms) since 1928 suggests a similar pattern. While there are stock market gains

While there are stock market gains during midterm election years, they tend to be far below those seen in the other years.

Average and median S&P 500 performance during election cycles since 1928



Source - RBC U.S. Equity Strategy, Bloomberg

during midterm election years, they tend to be far below those seen in the other years. In fact, stock market performance tends to be superior during the year after the midterm year versus the three years prior.

Note that the directional changes in performance have not always occurred immediately after the midterms, so we could see more market volatility before we see a rebound later, often weeks or months later.

Still, all said, it would seem that based on historical precedent, one should look beyond the noise related to the midterms and opportunistically use such volatility to add to high-quality stocks that hitherto have been out of reach due to a run-up in valuations.

Disclosures and disclaimers

Author

Tasneem Azim-Khan, CFA, Portfolio Advisor
tasneem.azimkhan@rbc.com; RBC Dominion Securities Inc.

Analyst Certification

All of the views expressed in this report accurately reflect the personal views of the responsible analyst(s) about any and all of the subject securities or issuers. No part of the compensation of the responsible analyst(s) named herein is, or will be, directly or indirectly, related to the specific recommendations or views expressed by the responsible analyst(s) in this report.

This report is issued by the Portfolio Advisory Group (“PAG”) which is part of the retail division of RBC Dominion Securities Inc. (“RBC DS”). The PAG provides portfolio advisory services to RBC DS Investment Advisors. Reports published by the PAG may be made available to clients of RBC DS through its Investment Advisors. The PAG relies on a number of different sources when preparing its reports including, without limitation, research reports published by RBC Capital Markets (“RBC CM”). RBC CM is not independent of RBC DS or the PAG. RBC CM is a business name used by Royal Bank of Canada and certain of its affiliates, including RBC DS, in connection with its corporate and investment banking activities. As a result of the relationship between RBC DS, the PAG and RBC CM, there may be conflicts of interest relating to the RBC CM analyst that is responsible for publishing research on a company referred to in a report issued by the PAG.

Required Disclosures

RBC Capital Markets Distribution of Ratings

For purposes of ratings distributions, regulatory rules require member firms to assign ratings to one of three rating categories –Buy, Hold/Neutral, or Sell– regardless of a firm’s own rating categories. Although RBC Capital Markets’ ratings of Top Pick/Outperform, Sector Perform and Underperform most closely correspond to Buy, Hold/Neutral and Sell, respectively, the meanings are not the same because our ratings are determined on a relative basis.

Rating	Count	Percent	Investment Banking Services Provided During Past 12 Months	
			Count	Percent
Buy [Top Pick & Outperform]	859	54.33	251	29.22
Hold [Sector Perform]	646	40.86	125	19.35
Sell [Underperform]	76	4.81	5	6.58

References to a Recommended List in the recommendation history chart may include one or more recommended lists or model portfolios maintained by RBC Wealth Management or one of its affiliates. RBC Wealth Management recommended lists include the Guided Portfolio: Prime Income (RL 6), the Guided Portfolio: Dividend Growth (RL 8), the Guided Portfolio: ADR (RL 10), and the Guided Portfolio: All Cap Growth (RL 12), and former lists called the Guided Portfolio: Large Cap (RL 7), the Guided Portfolio: Midcap 111 (RL 9), and the Guided Portfolio: Global Equity (U.S.) (RL 11). RBC Capital Markets recommended lists include the Strategy Focus List and the Fundamental Equity Weightings (FEW) portfolios. The abbreviation ‘RL On’ means the date a security was placed on a Recommended List. The abbreviation ‘RL Off’ means the date a security was removed from a Recommended List.

Valuation and Risks to Rating and Price Target

When RBC Wealth Management assigns a value to a company in a research report, FINRA Rules and NYSE Rules (as incorporated into the FINRA Rulebook) require that the basis for the valuation and the impediments to obtaining that valuation be described. Where applicable, this information is included in the text of our research in the sections entitled “Valuation” and “Risks to Rating and Price Target”, respectively.

The analyst(s) responsible for preparing this research report received compensation that is based upon various factors, including total revenues of RBC Capital Markets, LLC, and its affiliates, a portion of which are or have been generated by investment banking activities of the member companies of RBC Capital Markets, LLC and its affiliates.

Explanation of RBC Capital Markets, LLC Equity Rating System

An analyst’s “sector” is the universe of companies for which the analyst provides research coverage. Accordingly, the rating assigned to a particular stock represents solely the analyst’s view of how that stock will perform over the next 12 months relative to the analyst’s sector average.

Ratings

Top Pick (TP): Represents analyst’s best idea in the sector; expected to provide significant absolute total return over 12 months with a favorable risk-reward ratio. **Outperform (O):** Expected to materially outperform sector average over 12 months. **Sector Perform (SP):** Returns expected to be in line with sector average over 12 months. **Underperform (U):** Returns expected to be materially below sector average over 12 months. **Restricted (R):** RBC policy precludes certain types of communications, including an investment recommendation, when RBC is acting as an advisor in certain

merger or other strategic transactions and in certain other circumstances. **Not Rated (NR):** The rating, price targets and estimates have been removed due to applicable legal, regulatory or policy constraints which may include when RBC Capital Markets is acting in an advisory capacity involving the company.

Risk Rating

The **Speculative** risk rating reflects a security's lower level of financial or operating predictability, illiquid share trading volumes, high balance sheet leverage, or limited operating history that result in a higher expectation of financial and/or stock price volatility.

RBC Capital Markets Conflicts Policy

RBC Capital Markets Policy for Managing Conflicts of Interest in Relation to Investment Research is available from us on request. To access our current policy, clients should refer to <https://www.rbccm.com/global/file-414164.pdf> or send a request to RBC Capital Markets Research Publishing, P.O. Box 50, 200 Bay Street, Royal Bank Plaza, 29th Floor, South Tower, Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W7. We reserve the right to amend or supplement this policy at any time.

Dissemination of Research & Short Term Ideas

RBC Capital Markets endeavours to make all reasonable efforts to provide research simultaneously to all eligible clients, having regard to local time zones in overseas jurisdictions. Subject to any applicable regulatory considerations, "eligible clients" may include RBC Capital Markets institutional clients globally, the retail divisions of RBC Dominion Securities Inc. and RBC Capital Markets LLC, and affiliates. RBC Capital Markets' equity research is posted to our proprietary websites to ensure eligible clients receive coverage initiations and changes in rating, targets and opinions in a timely manner. Additional distribution may be done by the sales personnel via email, fax or regular mail. Clients may also receive our research via third party vendors. Please contact your investment advisor or institutional salesperson for more information regarding RBC Capital Markets research. RBC Capital Markets also provides eligible clients with access to SPARC on its proprietary INSIGHT website. SPARC contains market color and commentary, and may also contain Short-Term Trade Ideas regarding the securities of subject companies discussed in this or other research reports. A Short-Term Trade Idea reflects the research analyst's directional view regarding the price of the security of a subject company in the coming days or weeks, based on market and trading events. A Short-Term Trade Idea may differ from the price targets and/or recommendations in our published research reports reflecting the research analyst's views of the longer-term (one year) prospects of the subject company, as a result of the differing time horizons, methodologies and/or other factors. Thus, it is possible that the security of a subject company that is considered a long-term 'Sector Perform' or even an 'Underperform' might be a short-term buying opportunity as a result of temporary

selling pressure in the market; conversely, the security of a subject company that is rated a long-term 'Outperform' could be considered susceptible to a short-term downward price correction. Short-Term Trade Ideas are not ratings, nor are they part of any ratings system, and RBC Capital Markets generally does not intend, nor undertakes any obligation, to maintain or update Short-Term Trade Ideas. Short-Term Trade Ideas discussed in SPARC may not be suitable for all investors and have not been tailored to individual investor circumstances and objectives, and investors should make their own independent decisions regarding any Short-Term Trade Ideas discussed therein.

Conflict Disclosures

In the event that this is a compendium report (covers six or more subject companies), RBC DS may choose to provide specific disclosures for the subject companies by reference. To access RBC CM's current disclosures of these companies, please go to <https://www.rbccm.com/GLDisclosure/PublicWeb/DisclosureLookup.aspx?entityId=1>. Such information is also available upon request to RBC Dominion Securities, Attention: Manager, Portfolio Advisory Group, 155 Wellington Street West, 17th Floor, Toronto, ON M5V 3K7.

The authors are employed by RBC Dominion Securities Inc., a securities broker-dealer with principal offices located in Toronto, Canada.

The Global Industry Classification Standard ("GICS") was developed by and is the exclusive property and a service mark of MSCI Inc. ("MSCI") and Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC ("S&P") and is licensed for use by RBC. Neither MSCI, S&P, nor any other party involved in making or compiling the GICS or any GICS classifications makes any express or implied warranties or representations with respect to such standard or classification (or the results to be obtained by the use thereof), and all such parties hereby expressly disclaim all warranties of originality, accuracy, completeness, merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose with respect to any of such standard or classification. Without limiting any of the foregoing, in no event shall MSCI, S&P, any of their affiliates or any third party involved in making or compiling the GICS or any GICS classifications have any liability for any direct, indirect, special, punitive, consequential or any other damages (including lost profits) even if notified of the possibility of such damages.

References herein to "LIBOR", "LIBO Rate", "L" or other LIBOR abbreviations means the London interbank offered rate as administered by ICE Benchmark Administration (or any other person that takes over the administration of such rate).

Disclaimer

The information contained in this report has been compiled by RBC Dominion Securities Inc. ("RBC DS") from sources believed by it to be reliable, but no representations or warranty, express or implied, are made by RBC DS or any other person as to its accuracy, completeness or correctness. All opinions and estimates contained in this report constitute RBC DS' judgment as of the date of this report, are subject to change without notice and are provided in good faith but without legal responsibility. This report is not an offer to sell or a solicitation of an offer to buy any securities. Additionally, this report is not, and under no circumstances should be construed as, a solicitation to act as securities broker or dealer in any jurisdiction by any person or company that is not legally permitted to carry on the business of a securities broker or dealer in that jurisdiction. This material is prepared for general circulation to Investment Advisors and does not

have regard to the particular circumstances or needs of any specific person who may read it. RBC DS and its affiliates may have an investment banking or other relationship with some or all of the issuers mentioned herein and may trade in any of the securities mentioned herein either for their own account or the accounts of their customers. RBC DS and its affiliates may also issue options on securities mentioned herein and may trade in options issued by others. Accordingly, RBC DS or its affiliates may at any time have a long or short position in any such security or option thereon. Neither RBC DS nor any of its affiliates, nor any other person, accepts any liability whatsoever for any direct or consequential loss arising from any use of this report or the information contained herein. This report may not be reproduced, distributed or published by any recipient hereof for any purpose.

In all jurisdictions where RBC Capital Markets conducts business, we do not offer investment advice on Royal Bank of Canada. Certain regulations prohibit member firms from soliciting orders and offering investment advice or opinions on their own stock. References to Royal Bank are for informational purposes only and not intended as a direct or implied recommendation for investing in Royal Bank and all related securities.

RBC Dominion Securities Inc.* and Royal Bank of Canada are separate corporate entities which are affiliated. *Member-Canadian Investor Protection Fund. RBC Dominion Securities Inc. is a member company of RBC Wealth Management, a business segment of Royal Bank of Canada. ©Registered trademarks of Royal Bank of Canada. Used under licence. ©2018 Royal Bank of Canada. All rights reserved.