*Former Congressman Bob Inglis represented Greenville-Spartanburg, South Carolina from 1992-1998 and 2004-2010. Inglis is the founder and executive director of Energy and Enterprise Initiative and republicEN.org, which promote climate change solutions through a conservative, free market lens. The following excerpt is from a talk Inglis gave in September 2017 at Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs.* ***The talk has been modified for the classroom.***

**How can we mitigate the effects of climate change while also staying true to conservative values?**

…The thing to do is to make it apparent in the marketplace what the costs of energy are, and eliminate all the subsidies, and have a level playing field and a strong competition. If you do that, we can fix climate change…For example, we at [republicEn.org](http://www.republicen.org/about_us/principles) would say, "No more electric car credits. No more production tax credit for wind. No more investment tax credits for solar. Certainly no more direct subsidies like [Solyndra](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Solyndra) was. No more"—and then this gets a little bit dicier when we are talking to fellow conservatives—"under-market [less than market value] leases on public land for the extraction of minerals."

…Then we get to the hardest one: No more of the biggest subsidy of them all…which is the ability for me at Inglis Industries Coal-Fired Electricity [hypothetical company] to just let my soot and my CO2 go into the atmosphere without any accountability. [Why is that a subsidy?] Because it lets me put that cost onto society and not keep it on my product and reflect it in my product's price…You see, if I am Inglis Coal-Fired Electricity, I'm selling you electricity that looks cheap when it comes to your power meter. But what is not reflected on there is the people who are coughing up their lungs at the hospital because of my soot that I'm getting away with socializing [spreading among the people] and the cost I am putting on future generations for the climate change…

**Independent Questions (answer and then share with your partner):**1. How would you summarize Inglis' plan to mitigate the effects of climate change? Who bears the costs in this scenario? Who benefits?

2. In August 2018, [new EPA coal rules](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/21/climate/epa-coal-pollution-deaths.html) are estimated by the Trump administration to result in 470 to 1,400 more premature deaths a year by 2030 due to respiratory ailments. How would Inglis’ proposed policy respond to this?

**Collective Questions (answer together in pairs):**3. Which plan do you like better? Explain.

[*Gernot Wagner*](https://www.carnegiecouncil.org/people/gernot-wagner)*, an economist for the Environmental Defense Fund, led a talk at Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs in 2011 entitled “*[*But Will the Planet Notice? How Smart Economics Can Save the World*](https://www.carnegiecouncil.org/studio/multimedia/20111025-but-will-the-planet-notice-how-smart-economics-can-save-the-world)*”* ***The following excerpt has been modified for the classroom.***

**How can environmental regulation help the economy?**

…[Acid rain] was this enormous problem in the 1970s and the 1980s. It was kids getting asthma, forests dying, stone sculptures literally melting in the rain. Now, the [1990 Clean Air Act Amendments](http://www.epa.gov/air/caa/) were passed and decreased sulfur dioxide pollution (which causes acid rain) by over 50 percent, all the while letting companies and businesses decide how to innovate themselves out of this problem. As a result, [benefits](https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2012/09/how-the-clean-air-act-has-saved-22-trillion-in-health-care-costs/262071/) of this particular legislation exceeded costs and exceeded investments, at a ratio of around 30:1…$1 invested, $30 of benefits as a result.

Now, most of these benefits, by the way, are human-health related. This isn't about birds feeling better about themselves—that's nice too, that's all good. But this is about human beings, about fewer people getting sick and dying as a result of this legislation. Of course, that translates into real economic benefits as well. The1970 Clean Air Act, enacted 40 years ago, had the impact of increasing GDP in 2010 by about 1.5 percent. It turns out not poisoning our children makes for more productive workers later on, and GDP goes up as a result. We might even use a moral equivalent of arguing against child labor by saying that keeping kids in school makes for more productive workers later on.

**Independent Questions (answer and then share with your partner):**1. How would you summarize Wagner’s plan to mitigate the effects of climate change? Who bears the costs in this scenario? Who benefits?

2. In August 2018, [new EPA coal rules](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/21/climate/epa-coal-pollution-deaths.html) are estimated by the Trump administration to result in 470 to 1,400 more premature deaths a year by 2030 due to respiratory ailments. What would Wagner suggest to counter this pollution?

**Collective Questions (answer together in pairs):**3. Which plan do you like better? Explain.