

**EQUITY – Give us the Words.****Speech by Tom Spencer, MEP, President of GLOBE International**

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I speak this afternoon on behalf of the 60 GLOBE parliamentarians attending the Conference, who with our friends in Parlatino are the “Parliamentary Chapter” of this event. There are more parliamentarians here than ever before, more concerned than ever before. Parliamentarians charged with ratification and the resolution of internal national conflicts over climate disruption. As this process draws closer and closer to reality; closer and closer to legislative action that impacts upon our constituents, expect to see more and more of us.

For this is a political process that depends for its ultimate success on the consent of the electorates. So we must speak the language the world understands. Of my half million constituents in Surrey, I could probably find 5000 who know what a COP is. I doubt if I could find five who know what a COP/MOP is! But I could find even fewer who have not heard of El Nino.

My appeal is that you give us a story we can tell, in language that engages with reality and with the real world.

As always I am full of admiration for the negotiating skills on display here – the brilliance of brinkmanship, the ballet of the blocking move, and the sheer athletic audacity of asking the taxpayers of the world to compensate the fossil fuel lobby for a hundred years of climate abuse.

But these are side-shows of the circus. There is only one great issue that hardly dare speak its name in the streets of Buenos Aires. How are we to end the global apartheid that we imposed upon ourselves in COP1? The common but differentiated responsibilities, that seemed so reasonable but have grown to mean that the developed world may buy up the best options and bank them against future commitment periods. The worst oppression is that which is self imposed by the victim, because their view of the world is dominated by historic hurt rather than by future fulfillment.

2

This is more than 'voluntary commitments', though I salute the Argentines for having the courage to table the issue. Voluntary commitments are intellectually and ethically indefensible if they are to be made in an institutional vacuum. If trading mechanisms are right inside Annex 1, they must be right globally. But they can only work if they are set in global institutions with global property rights, traded in a global market with global regulations.

We should not be talking the half truth of commitments.  
We should be talking the whole truth of entitlements.

That requires us to engage courageously with the issue of 'Equity. Not to flirt with it. Not to treat it as a useful adjective, but to place it centrally in our work-plan. It is high time that Washington, Beijing and New Delhi ended their dance of the doomed and acknowledged that without equity there can be no bankable success for any of them.

We need a contraction budget, with a convergence mechanism, that sets national targets for us all. We know how to do it. The language exists on the back of a dozen diplomatic envelopes. Now is the time to bring it into the light of day.

The choice is stark. Trust each other enough to sketch the language of equity into the preface to the work programme. Or be faced, on Friday 13<sup>th</sup>, by the "unlucky COP", the full stop COP; the COP where the competitive techniques of negotiators triumphed over the co-operative instincts of a world climate settlement.

You may, if you wish, continue to believe that we will make some chance encounter with the right policy mix. Believe if you will that like a great flock of birds we will suddenly wheel towards sanity. But I beg to doubt it. I think there is a higher chance of an asteroid strike on this fair city.

We need a compass. We need a destination. We need agreed language.

If you find the words, the world will understand. If you fail, the world will scoff and turn away to its individual desolations.