

Leo Gerard
Transcript from 5/7/07
A North American Labor Assembly on Climate Crisis
UFT, New York City

I want to first of all thank Harry Katz for the great work they did for putting this together. And, rather than just acknowledge the Steelworkers in this room, so that you know we take this very seriously, I'd like all the Steelworkers in this room to stand so that I can see what the hell you're doing. (Applause.) I've been trying to figure out where half our office was!

Let me just say, for a lot people that don't know our union or think they know our union from a distance, they probably never thought that the Steelworkers union was in fact, and has been for many years, an environmental union. I thought that I'd just review a few highlights over the last 50 years.

In 1948, the Steelworkers donated \$10,000 when \$10,000 was a lot of money to a public health study on a temperature inversion in Donora, PA that killed 20 people and injured 6000. In 1969, when we used to call it "Pollution Conferences," we held our first conference on pollution and that was before the first Earth Day. In 1970, we overcame a lot of opposition among our members to help fight and win the Clean Air Act. In 1973, we held conferences on Smelter pollution and how to clean up smelters. In 1974, we fought for legislation on benzene exposure and lead exposure, then led by one of our staff, later to become president, George Becker. In the 1980s, we passed resolutions trying to convince people that global warming was a pending crisis.

In 1990, and at the literature table you'll find this, we passed our first environmental statement called Our Children's World. And In Our Children's World, we actually said and elaborated in substantial detail, that global warming, we said in 1990, was the most important environmental crisis facing the world today. We said that in 1990!

In 1992, we fought for new coal company emissions, again fighting with our own members. Folks that are here from the steel plants will remember that the companies hired buses and gave our members the day off to travel to Washington on the buses. Somehow for reasons that I don't

quite understand, the bus drivers never made it to the bus. The company paid for buses that never left town.

In 2005, to make a quick overview, we issued a new paper that was an update of our 1990 paper called *Securing Our Children's World*. Again we rang the bell as loud as we could about a number of environmental issues but predominately global warming.

We're not Johnny-come-latelys to the whole issue of protecting our environment and, in particular, the issue of global warming. In recent years, we helped form the Apollo Alliance that I'll talk about later. We formed with the Sierra Club, the Blue-Green Alliance. Part of the reason we wanted to form the Blue-Green Alliance and be part of the Apollo Alliance is we think it's tremendously important that we find a method and process to continuously lay to rest the false dichotomy, the false choice that you can't have good jobs and a clean environment.

Those of us in the labor movement, all of you in this room, will know every time we want to do something, the employer will say "You can't have good health care and good wages. You can't have descent pensions and high wages. You can't have all the seniority protection and good wages." It's no different when it comes to the environment when they tell us, "You can't have a clean environment and good wages."

Our belief in the Steelworker is that not only can you, but you *must* have both a clean environment and good jobs. You'll either have both or you'll have neither, simple as that to our union. (Applause.) And that helps to create our Blue-Green Alliance.

In listening to Bernie Sanders a little earlier, Senator Sanders, it feels so good to say that, I think he hit the nail right on the head. The challenge going forward is to combine the issue of industrial manufacturing, trade and sound environmental policy. Those of us that labor everyday in the fight for fair trade understand that it's next to impossible to think that we can have an economy in America or in Canada that wants high environmental standards, and then we're going to be told that we've got to compete with an economy from somewhere else that has no environmental standards.

We need to combine the trade fight and the environmental fight. That's what we did in the Blue-Green Alliance. We recognized that if we wanted to have a clean environment that we had to have uniform standards on our trade deals. There's no reason on earth why we should have a trade pact with any country that doesn't meet the minimum standards that we do in North America. And if they can't afford it, then part of that trade pact should be us helping them to afford it. Because guess what? We breathe the same air. (Applause.) If we want to try to impose that system on them, but not be there to help them, then we shouldn't be surprised by their resistance. At the same time, if we don't help them, then we'll have two different standards, and what will happen here is we'll lose the jobs that have decent environmental standards, and they'll be made in places where they don't have decent environmental standards.

For us in the Steelworkers, it's a logical fit that the environmental community and our union should work together on those issues. We have been working on individual issues with the Sierra Club. And as my friend Carl Pope says, "We had been dating and mostly just being seen together at night, and we decided to come out in broad daylight." (Laughter.) But we had been working together for some 30 years on different projects.

The Apollo Alliance that we helped create, to us, was really fundamental. Again, taking on the false choice of good jobs and a clean environment. What we did was, we went around the country talking about renewable energy, and talking about the trade-offs, and talking about what could be done. We did it just around the time that the debate was trailing for the 13th, 14th or 15th time around ANWR [Arctic National Wildlife Refuge].

The reality was that the research we had gotten done could demonstrate that we could save more jobs, create more jobs and save more energy by simply retrofitting buildings to current science than we could have got in the drilling at ANWR. (Applause.) In fact, the drilling at ANWR, to be blunt in our view, had nothing to do with drilling at ANWR because they know how little was really there. It was actually to win the fight, to prove to the rest of the world that they do whatever they want, whenever they wanted. For us to be able to be in a strong position, we had to stop that.

Part of our work on the Apollo Alliance was to be able to prove that if you're serious about energy, there were a dozen ways that you could do energy conservation that would be more efficient and better for the environment than that. One of the issues that we've taken on recently, and surprisingly to me, we've been getting much less traction in Washington than I've anticipated, and that is the issue of illegal logging in places like Indonesia and China.

The North American paper industry and the North American forest industry have, relative to most of the rest of the world, pretty high environmental standards. We can have fights, and there are fights about whether we should log this track of land or that track of land. Usually we're talking about a couple a hundred or a couple a thousand acres, and we're having that fight about that.

But in other parts of the world, like Indonesia and Peru to name two, there basically is no regulation and no enforcement. In fact the most recent figures that I saw is that deforestation from illegal logging in those places in the Amazon, Indonesia, causes a 20 percent increase in carbon dioxide because the forest isn't there to consume the carbon dioxide. There are 20 percent higher carbon dioxide emissions in the atmosphere because of that.

In the industry that we represent in forest and paper products, forest companies and paper product companies are getting killed by illegal logging and illegal forestry practices that are driving down the cost of fibers, driving down the cost of wood because it goes from Indonesia to China and back here. What's happening here is that companies are trying way to circumvent regulations and are trying to find ways to put pressure on our members to put pressure on us to get off this kick. Well, the reality again exists that if we want to have descent standards in North America or in any where else in the world, we have to insist that in the global trading system that we get to a uniform set of standards and to recognize that in the developing world that to get to those standards, they are going to have to get help from us.

I would much rather find a way to tax the big oil companies for the minimal tax that they are entitled to pay us, and then take that money and help the developing world to reach our environmental standards, rather than give that money to Shell, BP and Exxon. (Applause.)

The point I'm trying to make is this. Bernie Sanders and I had a few words at the table. I for once may be more optimistic than Bernie. I actually believe that we can make great progress with some additional science and we ought to do that. But if we gather up all the science that we know now, and we know everything that could work now, and we had a number one priority to utilize all of the science that we know now to get to renewable energy standards, to get to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, to get to reducing carbon emissions, to put that science to work, we don't have to look at 2050. I believe we can do it in a generation if you look at what's there and say that it's a priority. We've got 100 years of coal. If we had coal carbon sequestration and we put the kind of money into that. If that was one tenth of what we're putting into Iraq, we would have carbon sequestration. We could mine clean coal and we could put coalworkers to work. (Applause)

It's about perverted priorities, to be blunt. Look at my comment about retrofitting buildings. I was on this to the point where Carl Pope and Dave Foster were fed up from hearing me every time **we'd** go to have a meeting I'd jump on retrofitting buildings. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out that if you took all of the buildings that are publicly-owned buildings, schools, state buildings, federal buildings, all of the buildings that were built pre-1960 and made those the first priority to retrofit them to current standards, how many jobs you'd create. And, if you did a little tweaking the way you use taxes, and said we're going to retrofit those to current standards, and we're going to retrofit them with products that are union made in America, you'd end up creating millions of jobs. You'd get WTO complaints and the hell with it. Let's fight the WTO complaint for 10 years while we build the stuff. And you'd create good descent jobs.

In other countries, whether it's France or Britain or Brazil, they ought to do the same thing, use their taxpayers' dollars to retrofit their building to current technology. Then once you've done the 1960 buildings up to 2005 technology or 2010 technology, take the buildings from 1960 to 1980 and 1980 to 2000. And, over a period of 15 to 20 to 25 years, you'd retrofit your buildings, you'd reduce all kinds of wasted energy, and you'd create millions of jobs. Our kids and our public buildings, our kids would breathe better air in schools, and our public buildings would be better to be in. It's about priority to me.

I see Roger [Toussaint] sitting here. Every g-d damn town I go in has got a cut, every town I go in. I shouldn't say "town;" cities, big cities, small cities, everywhere cuts in public transit, cuts in mass transit. It's the most energy efficient way to move people.

If we really care about the environment we ought to *all* be yelling, not just the transit workers or not just the poor people who ride the transit, except for maybe in New York. In most places rich folks don't ride the transit, do they? Make public transit a key issue.

Talk about the Steelworkers not being Johnny-come-latelys. Our Secretary-Treasurer is here, Jim English, 20 years ago Jim, Maglev, 20 years ago the Steelworkers initiated a project called Maglev. We put, I don't know, over the years, I don't know, how many hundreds of thousands of dollars we put into it. Maglev is Magnetically Levitated Train Systems, high-speed trains about the fastest you could go. There were trials in Europe. We've been pushing MagLev in the US Congress for 20 years. This year we've got some funding. I think a half a million dollars for a demonstration project where they're going to do some fabricating. China's built two Maglevs and I think in Europe, in France, they just had the world's fastest train. Image what we could do in the Eastern seaboard with the Maglev or rapid transit system for the environment. It's about priorities.

We heard people talking about windmills. Again, the Steelworkers working with Governor Rendell brought in some standards. We attracted a wind manufacturer to PA, Gamesa. Gamesa is building windmills now on the grounds of two former US steel mills, one in Johnstown, PA, one in Fairless Hills. We're going to have a thousand members making windmills in those two plants. Governor Rendell wanted our support for the legislation. We wanted the manufacturer to come to PA, and we wanted the manufacturer to be union. We convinced the Governor to talk to Gamesa to talk to us, and we created a triangle, and we ended up having a unionized windmill manufacturer in closed-down former US steel plants that will give us 1000 industrial jobs that will pay us decent wages. (Applause.)

Now little did I know that it wasn't that easy, because the blades, as the professor said this morning, some of them are 200 feet long. It's next to impossible to move those blades across

three states because each state has a different regulation for how you move products that big across state lines. If you think about that, it will end up at some point that either we're going to have to change the law, or we're going to end up with a bunch of regional windmill manufacturers. I'm not sure which is, I can see a lot of jobs (Gerard and audience laugh), but I also think that that's not the most efficient way to do it. It will make it harder for us to promote wind technology, and we'll have some moron in Washington, by the way, thinking about morons in Washington, (laughter) how many know that last Friday George Bush hit 26 percent in the poles? (Applause.)

Now let me tell you another piece I read this morning. 29 percent of the population still believes Elvis is alive. (Laughter) Put that in your, you know. Bush is lower in the poles than the percent that believes that Elvis is still walking around.

Marco says there may be some overlap there. You know you take these things and segment them out, and when I do that with our local union leadership or with our staff for different events that we have for the Steelworkers, it becomes fairly clear that this is really a matter of will. And I think we need to have a comprehensive strategy. I think this is a terrific conference. I think the next conference after this ought to be, How Does the Labor Movement Get Jobs Out of This? when you get into your round tables and do other stuff.

How do we drive the agenda? I don't view this any differently than I view labor standards. Unless we make an alliance with the environmental movement, when I make the case that "you can't have good jobs or a clean environment, you've got to have both or neither," it's the same deal with the environmental movement and the labor movement. If we don't come together, we'll both get beat up individually. If we come together, we'll win together. We have to take the Blue-Green Alliance that we've formed, form others, or expand that one and then get ourselves to one common voice and try to make this one of the top priorities.

We're not going to succeed, and I say with all due respect to everybody in the room, we're not going to succeed if they win the argument that "in order to have a clean environment you've got to do away with jobs." You're not going to win that argument anywhere. The Steelworkers

union has 170 to 175 thousand of our members, that in the product they make, there's a good possibility that it will end up in an automobile or a truck.

We're the dominant union in tire and rubber, plastics, glass, aluminum, steel. I think we're the second biggest union in auto parts. If you take all those segments, just a quick snapshot, I'm probably missing half a dozen, and you put those together, we have 170 to 175 thousand of our members that need a successful North American auto industry for us to have decent family-supporting jobs.

I think that if you want to talk about a priority, there needs to be a priority between all levels of government, the labor movement, and the auto industry. To say to the industry we're going to help you get from here to there, just like in Europe. They helped them build an airbus. If we don't have an auto industry in America, we're going to lose a hell of a lot more than the auto industry. If we're not making cars in the very near future that are getting 40, 50, 60, and 70 miles per gallon, someone else will be making them. And if they're making them in China, we're out of luck. They'll be making cars to get that mileage, but they'll be making them in factories that don't come to our environmental standards.

For the Steelworkers Union it's important to have a dialogue. It's important to have a dialogue about clean coal. It's important to have a dialogue about fuel-efficient vehicles. It's important to have a dialogue about mass transit. It's important to have a dialogue about retrofitting buildings. It's important to have a dialogue about renewable energy and how do we get there?

By the way, if you talk about not being Johnny-come-latelys, I'm from a company that was the world's biggest polluter. I was born and raised in the place where, if you were old enough to remember prior to the moonwalk, the astronauts came to my town to practice. Had we let that company do what it wanted, it would be "the moon" today. Except that today, because of the work that our union has done, we forced them to plant 10 million trees in what they call the Sudbury Basin.

There's six thousand acres of tailings from the mills. We forced them to plant wheat on those tailings. You can't eat the wheat because it's full of minerals, but it can be cut, it falls, it creates

earth. You plant new wheat. They built a super stack. The world's tallest freestanding structure was in my hometown, 1400 feet. It was a smoke stack. They built that in the 70s. One of the reasons they built that was that they disperse the pollution over a much wider area. And what it did, it helped us disperse the lawsuits over a much wider area. (Laughter.) And we sued the hell out of them. And then because of that, they built a new smelter, and because of that we now have the most efficient smelter in the world, in nickel smelting.

And this week, my brother got his nickel price bonus. His bonus was \$22.75 for every hour he worked. Price of nickel's gone through the roof. One of the reasons the price of nickel's gone through the roof is the aerospace industry's back. We're building biofuel places using lots of nickel, lots of stainless steel, but also he got it because he's the most efficient smelter in the world. That goes back 30 years when we started coming after them on their rotten pollution standards. So that we've proven, it took us a long time, but we've proven that by being tough on the environment, you can have a clean environment, and you can also protect and create good jobs.

So I want to give you a few more suggestions, possibly. Talk about urban density, urban density, we could be reclaiming Brownfield sights, investing seriously money in reclaiming those sights. There are already a lot of jobs in there. In fact, let me read you a statistic. "Building rehabilitation annually counts for 1.9 million man years of work. In-field development, which is the reclaiming of Brownfield sights, 1.3 million man years of work." In fact, there is an example in Atlanta called the Atlantic Station, where Atlanta rehabilitated 138 acres. They created 12 million square feet of office space, 2 million square feet of retail, 5000 apartments, 11 acres of public parks, and they created more than 800 permanent jobs. Those are things that, left to their own devices, are just pollution pots, but again, with this direct initiative and a priority, we can rehabilitate that land, create park land, create good jobs and use that space so that we don't end up with more unnecessary urban sprawl.

I've already talked about clean energy. I want to just one more time take a shot at mass transit. There's absolutely no reason, if we're serious about the environment, that a coalition of labor and environmentalists shouldn't push rapid transit, rapid rail transit and mass transit as economic

priorities. They take vehicles off the road, and I'll tell you what, for those of us that do a lot of airplane travel, it can't be any worse. (Laughter.) From an environmental point of view, it's a huge benefit to us. Every billion invested in the nation's transportation infrastructure supports almost 47,000 jobs. In an era where we're losing good family-supporting jobs hand over fist, think of an investment of 20 billion over 5 years, or 20 billion over 1 year. What that could mean to taking vehicles off the road, improving the infrastructure, taking us off of airplanes, and creating jobs, is that if we think of these things as projects that are doable using existing technology and existing science, then I come back to the point that the only thing that's missing is existing political will.

And I'm not prepared, I saw a friend who was carrying his baby a while ago, I don't know where he's sitting, right there, he said that might be the only kid that lives to be 100 to see the results of what we do or don't do. With all due respect, I want more than that. I've got a granddaughter that's going to be nine and a grandson that's going to be four. I want that by the time they're my age or younger for us to have removed this issue. I'm not prepared to be fooled that it's going to take 50 or 60 years. It might take a generation, if we're honest with each other, if the political will was there because the science is there; the economics are there.

We've spent a trillion dollars in Iraq, and what do we have as a nation to show for it? We've got thousands of dead kids and maimed kids. None of us in this room can have any real guess of how many tens of thousands of dead Iraqi civilians and the generations of hatred that we fed.

No one can tell me that the economics aren't there to do it! If it's going to get done, it's going to get done by us. It's going to get done by an alliance of working people, environmental people, and as Dave Foster says, "young people."

I believe fundamentally, that labor has to do with this what it did with so many other "social issues." There was no health care until the labor movement decided that there ought to be some. There were no pensions until the labor movement decided that there ought to be some. Safe work places are still hard to get, but they were non-existent until the labor movement. If we come to recognize that many of us have been played like "fiddles" and told that we couldn't have

both a clean environment and good jobs, and say, “we’re pushing that aside, we’re going to have both” and raise that up in our priority list.

Why should there be a fight between environmentalists and mine workers? There shouldn’t be a fight between environmentalists and mine workers. We ought to both be on the same side demanding investments in clean coal technology, so that our coal miners can mine the coal and we can take the carbon, and take it out of it, and find some other way to make use of the carbon. Maybe that BP thing needs more investment. Then miners and environmentalists will come together. And what will we give to our kids then? As long as they play us off one against the other, there’s only going to be one group of winners. It’s the same group of winners that told us that we couldn’t have pensions, and we couldn’t have health care, and we couldn’t have seniority.

When we decide that we’re not going to take that anymore, then our legacy to that little boy right there, will be that he won’t have to wait to be 100. Maybe by the time when he’s a young teenager, this issue will be well on its way to being solved. I’m prepared to put my hands to work. I’m prepared to put my faith, as I’ve done for all my years in the labor movement, in the labor movement deciding that something’s a priority and building allies will solve this problem. Thank you very much.