

**Olivier Deleuze**  
**Transcript from 5/8/07**  
**A North American Labor Assembly on Climate Crisis**  
**UFT, New York City**

Good morning. Thank you very much for the invitation. It's a pleasure. It's an honor.

We in UNEP are working with the trade unions since two or three years now with Sustainlabour and International Trade Unions Confederation. It's a very constructive cooperation on capacity building related to climate change and environmental issues. Also, we are now engaging in a new initiative on green jobs. I'll tell you why, and I'll tell you why, shortly.

This cooperation for me is essential. I heard one of the previous speakers, I think it was the moderator, telling us some minutes ago that some years ago environment was some kind of "strange French issue." (Audience laughs.) Well strange and French might be synonymous. (Audience laughs.)

Today the interesting thing is that the main "actor" advocating for combating climate change is an ex-Vice President of the US. This is culturally *very* interesting. Who should have foreseen that? Who should have foreseen? This person is the principle actor, not only on "Broadway," also "on "Champs Elysee" in Paris. The main reference on climate change is a US citizen. The world changed rapidly. Also from a cultural point of view, the world changes rapidly and we should be aware of that. It's very good news. It's very, very good news. What we see report after report is that the importance of this problem is getting bigger and bigger.

Some years ago when it was a strange French issue, many people said that the climate change probably did not exist. Then sometime later, "maybe it exists, but it's not man-made." Then, "okay, it exists, it is man-made, but we do not know the consequences." Then of course some tornado came, and here and there and floodings. "Okay. It exists. It's man-made." We begin to perceive the consequences, but "we do not know what to

do”, or “we are not allowed to do anything.” Then some court, some Justice said, “Yes, yes, you are allowed to intervene.”

More and more there is a funnel effect. There is a funnel scenario where this problem has been recognized as existing, as being manmade, as having consequences. Their response is the key to that. This is the situation in which we are. In the future, this situation will be more and more like that. I don’t see a likely scenario where suddenly the climate change problem will vanish. This is where the cooperation of all the actors is important. It’s better to pilot something than be the victim of it. It’s better.

The negotiations that are on-going, that are ahead of us are quite simple in their principle but, of course, very complicated in their achievements. As you know, you have the industrialist countries where the wealth per inhabitant is high and there is a pressure on them to have absolute caps like you have more and more in the States, in the US.

Then you have the developing countries, which sometimes emit as much as the rich countries. You know, China, I don’t know if it will be 2010, 2009, or 2015, but it will be very soon depending from one model to another, that China will emit as much CO<sub>2</sub> as the US. Where the income per capita is quite lower and we have a problem of equity there, and there is the challenge, of course. There are one billion people there, three times as much here. Their emissions are as big, and the atmosphere it doesn’t care if it comes from poor people or rich people – CO<sub>2</sub> is CO<sub>2</sub>.

It is a physical thing. There is no discussion here. It’s a scientific physical thing. The international community will have to reconcile these two aspects. One aspect of people of industrialized countries that at the end from some countries will emit the same quantity of CO<sub>2</sub> as poor countries because they are bigger countries.

Of course, you also have countries that don’t emit anything like that country where I’m living, in Kenya, there is no industry. There you have *directly* a challenge of climate, not mitigation but adaptation, because in Africa there is no debate about climate change.

I mean the climate change is there. You can see it. It's not an issue of speculation. It's a debate of suffering directly from climate change.

Beside this negotiation that is ahead of us on mitigation, which is: what are we going to do with let's say China and the US because of their difference of economic situation? You have unfortunately because it's a kind of recognition of failure, you have unfortunately new challenge in the developing countries about climate mitigation. There will be cross cutting issues here, which is the final thing of the solution.

True market mechanism, the same market mechanism that there are in the states here, and the same market mechanisms that are in Europe, already. These market mechanisms will expand. This is the most likely scenario. I wouldn't say certain, because nothing is certain, but let's say that it's ninety five percent clear that this market mechanism will expand. You will have financing via these clean development mechanisms which northern companies or our northern actor will invest in the South to lower CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the South. By then there will be a certain quantity of CO<sub>2</sub> that they will put in their own balance. Then you have of course the question of the technology which is, of course, crucial because that's what it is about. It's about certain technology, better technology.

I have to say that when I'm walking here in this beautiful city, I'm wondering if the size of the cars, if it's something sustainable. I'm not sure if it's something sustainable. (Audience laughter.) I do not think without any irony, but of course, today, what is the price of the oil? Is it eighty or seventy dollars a barrel? If there is any problem, any kind of problem or turmoil in the Middle East, it would be multiplied. Then of course, suddenly, these, so to say, "strong economies" will appear not to be strong at all, to be very very threatened, to be very fragile economies.

This is the global negotiations strongly driven by these constraints and strongly driven by expansion of the markets. It is probably the market mechanism of CO<sub>2</sub> and this kind of greenhouse gases, most probably also the integration of all countries in some kind of

framework, which will not be the same for everyone, but the integrations of all countries in some kind of framework. I don't know the name, if will be the Kyoto framework or any other, let's not fight about symbols here, will be certainly via the integration of these markets. Certainly if we have the integration of these markets, why should we exchange CO<sub>2</sub> only among some states in the US while you have the same market in Europe and you will have the other markets? There will be integration. This is why we are happy to work with the trade unions like we do with business. In this situation, which is more and more likely, it's better to pilot.

I heard a friend of Canada talking about "job blackmail" that some people were facing. I wonder if the "job blackmail" is not the *status quo*. I wonder if it's not "that" which is the danger, "the status quo." At a certain moment when this situation comes and you are not prepared because you are producing products that are consuming oil, like if it will be forever seventy dollars a barrel. Two years ago it was thirty. Suddenly there is a problem. Well, those products won't be bought anymore. You won't be able to sell them anymore. The market will choose, and the consumer will say, "Okay, why should I buy their product? It's too expensive. I'll buy another one."

I guess, and I will finish by that, that the challenge for all of us, being of the UN we are not the most powerful actor in the world UN, n'est pas?, or being on the trade unions, or the business people, is to pilot this. Is to see for instance concerning these policies, what kind of support measures should we put in it so that more decent jobs are created or protected? So that the transition period from one type of economy progressively to another one can be managed. I'm happy no more to produce 4-wheel drive cars and begin to produce something else, I don't know, solar panels? I have to have job on the 31<sup>st</sup> of December and the 1<sup>st</sup> of January, and not wait for five years to have a new one. Of course this is absolutely legitimate and normal. The same with me. I wouldn't like to lose my job in six months because something happens. This kind of thing has to be piloted.

I would say UNEP is happy to work with you as UNEP is working with business and ILO and other institutions to pilot this situation. I'm really convinced that the scenario ahead of us is a fundamental change for our economies. We have already experienced these changes in our economies. The "job blackmail" is the status quo. I thank you very much.