

**Address by
Kenneth S. Zinn
International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mine and General Workers' Unions
to the Third Conference of the Parties to the
Framework Convention on Climate Change
Kyoto, Japan
December 9, 1997**

Honorable Mr. President, distinguished ministers, delegates, ladies and gentlemen,

My name is Kenneth Zinn and I am here today representing the International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mine and General Workers' Unions, known as the ICEM. The ICEM is a global labor federation representing 20 million workers in 114 countries on all five continents. We are the men and women who bring you the world's energy that makes our economies run.

Tragically, these negotiations have given almost no consideration to workers' fate and to the fate of their families and communities who depend on these jobs for their very survival.

The ICEM cares deeply about maintaining a healthy and safe environment for the people of today and the children who will inherit our world. The fact that we work in dangerous industries makes us doubly sensitive to matters of environmental safety. We accept that human activities may be causing a gradual warming of the earth's climate, and believe that leaders of today should confront this problem and not leave it for the next generation to solve.

With that said, however, it is very clear that these negotiations have failed. Instead of a protocol that promotes the common good, we are debating a protocol where some will be winners and others will be losers. The negotiations have also failed to take the most basic first step-- the identification of a global atmospheric greenhouse gas concentration target. If we do not know what our global target is, how is it possible to determine the appropriate course of action to take in terms of each country's equitable share in meeting that target?

It is a scientific fact that the world cannot stop global warming if this protocol excludes countries that will be responsible for more than half of the world's emissions in just 20 years. If the parties sign a protocol that binds some countries to reduce emissions but not others, you will raise energy costs in some countries but not others, encourage the export of capital and jobs and pollution, and in the process, simply transfer greenhouse gas emissions from one part of the world to another.

We reject creating one more incentive for multinational corporations to move production from one part of the world to another. The result will be little net change in global greenhouse gas emissions but tremendous economic disruption. Global warming is a global problem and thus necessitates a global solution.

We accept the position by the developing country governments that they have overriding concerns to alleviate poverty, hunger and disease. We are committed to that same cause and our sense of global solidarity and economic justice demands that we stand with the poor and working people of those countries who are struggling to do just that.

But by the same token, the industrialized country governments must *also* worry about economic development in *their* countries, and we equally stand with the poor and working people of those countries who are struggling for jobs, growth and justice.

We believe this protocol must look out for the interests of poor and working people in *all* countries. We seek climate solutions consistent with the objectives of Agenda 21: "The overall objective is poverty alleviation and full and sustainable employment, which contribute to safe, clean and healthy environments."

Just a few days ago, the G-8 countries held a summit in Kobe here in Japan to talk about the jobs crisis. There are 36 million people unemployed in the OECD countries alone. Thus the notion that this protocol may throw more people out of work-- again, for little or no environmental gain-- is totally unacceptable.

One need only look at the double-digit unemployment rates and the shattered lives of workers and their families in the coalfields of the United Kingdom, and to the closed factories of eastern Germany to know there is a severe human cost to making these changes in a short period of time.

A study just released by the International Labor Organization shows that 1.5 million to 2.1 million coal miners alone will lose their jobs by 2010 should the governments assembled here agree to simply stabilize Annex I emissions at 1990 levels.

And that's just the tip of the iceberg. If the lowest cost fuels are removed from the energy mix, industries that are highly energy-intensive will suffer as will individual energy consumers. As the ILO study shows, the job losses will also occur in developing countries even if this protocol binds only Annex I countries to emission reductions. In our global market place, the impact of what is done by industrialized countries will flow through to many developing nations.

The answers to this problem are time, technology, and social justice frameworks that protect the most vulnerable in our societies. Time must be given to the developing countries to grow-- but grow smartly and humanely.

This protocol is more an economic than an environmental instrument. As such, we must insist that social justice concerns be included, just as we would insist for any international economic treaty.

We must take note that some of the governments who today are demanding the right to grow unfettered are also ones that disallow any freedom of association for workers to join trade unions

in their countries. "Development" without labor rights means development for some but not the many and we reject such a framework. This is as true for the industrialized countries as it is for the developing countries.

The government delegates here have an awesome responsibility-- both to the earth and to the people who inhabit it. We in the trade union movement will do our part but we must be part of a social partnership with industry, government, and other affected parties. It is essential that the world's governments get this right, and ensure that any new protocol actually accomplishes the goals of the Framework Convention without harming those people the world round who can least afford it.

Thank you.