

Congress Report 2010

The 142nd annual Trades Union Congress
13-16 September, Manchester

Contents

	Page
General Council members 2010 – 2011	4
Section 1 - Congress decisions	7
Part 1	
Resolutions carried.....	8
Part 2	
Motion remitted.....	29
Part 3	
General Council statement.....	30
Section 2 – Verbatim report of Congress proceedings	35
Day 1	
Monday 13 September	36
Day 2	
Tuesday 14 September.....	72
Day 3	
Wednesday 15 September.....	114
Day 4	
Thursday 16 September	155
Section 3 - Unions and their delegates	163
Section 4 - Details of past Congresses	171
Section 5 – Members of the General Council 1921 – 2010	174
Index of speakers	179

General Council Members 2010 – 2011

Bob Abberley
UNISON

Jonathan Baume
FDA

Sheila Bearcroft MBE
GMB

Christine Blower
National Union of Teachers

Mary Bousted
Association of Teachers and Lecturers

Joanna Brown
Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists

Tony Burke
Unite

Jane Carolan
UNISON

Gail Cartmail
Unite

Brian Cookson
NASUWT

Bob Crow
RMT

Jeremy Dear
National Union of Journalists

Mark Dickinson
Nautilus International

Gerry Doherty
Transport Salaried Staffs Association

Maria Exall
Communication Workers Union

Sue Ferns
Prospect

Mark Fysh
UNISON

Allan Garley
GMB

Steve Gillan
POA

Janice Godrich
Public and Commercial Services Union

John Hannett
Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers

Dave Harvey
National Union of Teachers

Billy Hayes
Communication Workers Union

Sally Hunt
University and College Union

Tony Kearns
Communication Workers Union

Chris Keates
NASUWT

Paul Kenny
GMB

Michael Leahy OBE (chair)
Community

Angela Lynes
UNISON

Leslie Manasseh MBE
Connect

Len McCluskey
Unite

Lesley Mercer
Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

Gloria Mills CBE
UNISON

Julia Neal
Association of Teachers and Lecturers

Ged Nichols
Accord

Matt Wrack
Fire Brigades Union

Paul Noon
Prospect

Brendan Barber *General Secretary*

Tim Poil
Nationwide Group Staff Union

Dave Prentis
UNISON

Alan Ritchie
Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians

Dougie Rooney
Unite

Malcolm Sage
GMB

Mark Serwotka
Public and Commercial Services Union

Alison Shepherd
UNISON

Derek Simpson
Unite

Eleanor Smith
UNISON

John Smith
Musicians' Union

Liz Snape MBE
UNISON

Patricia Stuart
Unite

Mohammad Taj
Unite

John Walsh
Unite

Fiona Wilson
Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers

Tony Woodhouse
Unite

Tony Woodley
Unite

Section 1

Congress Decisions

Listed below are the decisions taken by the 2010 Trades Union Congress on the motions and amendments submitted by unions. The numbers given to resolutions and motions refer to their number in the Final Agenda, or to that of the Composite or Emergency Motion.

Part 1

Resolutions Carried

6 Anti-union laws

Congress reiterates its total opposition to the anti-union laws introduced by Tory Governments in the 1980s and '90s. Congress deplores and condemns the failure of three Labour governments to repeal these vicious laws.

All of this has caused great difficulty for unions considering industrial action.

Congress further condemns:

- i. the increasing frequency of judges to oversee democratic trade union balloting procedures on spurious legal and moral grounds
- ii. the intention of the Tories to make these laws even more draconian.

Congress agrees that it is even more vital now for the General Council to:

- a) campaign actively for the repeal of all anti-trade union laws
- b) offer full support and solidarity to all workers in struggle, including those whose action is deemed 'unlawful' under this draconian and archaic legislation.

TUC Trades Union Councils' Conference

7 Blacklisting

In March 2009 it was revealed that the Consulting Association was operating a blacklist in the construction industry; over 40 major construction companies were using the blacklist, which contained the names of over 3,000 construction workers.

Congress notes that while construction workers have been worst affected by blacklisting, workers in many other professions have experienced the destructive effects of the blacklist.

Conference further notes that following the revelations about the Consulting Association, the then Labour Government undertook to introduce legislation to outlaw blacklisting.

Conference welcomes the UCATT-commissioned report *Ruined Lives*, which developed a detailed critique of why the draft regulations were entirely inadequate.

Congress notes with extreme regret that the Government refused to countenance any strengthening of the regulations, which are so weak that they will not prevent blacklisting.

Congress calls on the General Council to mount a campaign to ensure that new legislation is introduced to ensure that the disgusting practice of blacklisting is stamped out once and for all. New legislation should include:

- i. blacklisting becoming a specific criminal offence
- ii. protection for workers undertaking unofficial industrial action
- iii. protection from blacklisting for workers undertaking 'activities associated with trade unions' and not the narrow definition of 'trade union activities'
- iv. an automatic right to basic compensation for any blacklisted worker
- v. an automatic right for any worker to be informed, should a blacklist be discovered on which their name appears.

Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians

8 Public Interest Disclosure Act

Congress notes that the Public Interest Disclosure Act came into force in July 1999. It protects most workers against unfair dismissal or being subjected to any other detriment by their employer for making disclosures about wrongdoing, also known as 'whistle-blowing'.

Congress further notes that the Act covers all employees, trainees, agency staff, contractors and home-workers, regardless of length of service or age. However self-employed/freelance/short-term workers and volunteers are not protected. Their more vulnerable employment status makes it much less likely that they will report wrongdoing for fear of losing their employment or not being employed again.

The exploitation of these workers is common and particular problems exist with regard to employment status and non-payment of the National Minimum Wage.

These problems are made worse by the fact that the UK lacks legislation to enable third parties, including trade unions, to take an employer to an employment tribunal for breaches of employment and discrimination laws, on behalf of a worker, without the need to identify individual vulnerable workers.

Congress therefore reasserts its support for additional measures to support enforcement of employment/workers' rights and to tackle exploitation, and will campaign to extend protections to these workers, including the ability for trade unions to take cases against employers in principle, without the need to identify individual vulnerable workers.

Equity

10 Equality impact assessments (EIAs)

Congress believes that equality should be at the heart of all trade union collective bargaining and is an essential pre-requisite to protect rights to services within the public sector.

Congress notes that:

- i. public sector employers have a statutory duty to conduct EIAs
- ii. EIAs have the potential to identify potential discriminatory effects of an employer's policies, procedures and practices
- iii. many higher education institutions and further education colleges have not rigorously carried out EIAs
- iv. use of EIAs across the public sector is not widespread.

Congress recognises the weakness of the Equality Act and the lack of any detail on the new equality duties.

Congress calls upon the General Council to:

- a) continue to raise awareness among affiliated unions as to the importance of EIAs
- b) encourage affiliates to gain official recognition for the role of equality officers in their collective bargaining with employers
- c) organise a campaign through affiliates within the public sector to conduct comprehensive and effective EIAs, placing pressure on both the Government and employers
- d) urge affiliates to campaign to ensure the new specific duties within the Equality Act are more advantageous and effective than previous provisions and mount a vigorous campaign to remedy the equality deficit in trade union collective bargaining.

University and College Union

The following amendment was ACCEPTED

In paragraph 2, at end of sub-paragraph ii), add:

'and mean policies can be developed and implemented to promote equality and lead to a more efficient and fair allocation of resources.'

In sub-paragraph iii), line1, after 'colleges' insert 'public bodies and central government departments'

Add after 'duties' at end of paragraph 3 'with the risk of EIAs not being conducted.'

In paragraph 4, sub-paragraph a), add at end:

'including the resources required and the consequences of failure to properly complete EIAs'

FDA

11 A workplace agenda for women

Congress welcomes achievements for working women over the last decade including:

- i. family-friendly working - more than doubling maternity pay from £55.70 in 1997 to £123.06 in 2009
- ii. fair pay - National Minimum Wage from £0 in 1997 to £5.80 in 2009
- iii. part-time and flexible working; childcare and carer support
- iv. women and training, especially unionlearn and the opportunities it has brought to women in manufacturing
- v. tackling domestic violence
- vi. gender duty and Equality Bill developments.

However, Congress recognises:

- a) key issues from the Women's Charter agreed at TUC Women's Conference and the TUC Congress motions on ending women's poverty and women and pensions remain priorities
- b) pressures from employers and others to cut back action for women's equality and oppose further progress
- c) particular difficulties in paid time off for women reps.

Congress calls on the General Council and TUC Women's Committee and affiliates to:

1. remain continually vigilant, oppose attacks and support organising women, whilst campaigning and bargaining for women's equality at all levels
2. prepare a report of achievements on women's equality and to highlight outstanding issues for working women as a Trade Union Workplace Agenda for Women
3. be part of the International TUC Women's campaign for Decent Work for Women
4. defend unionlearn and the rights of union learning reps to champion skills in the workplace and develop innovative training for women at work.

Congress resolves to fight a Tory Party looking to make savage cuts to workplace rights and public services.

TUC Women's Conference

12 LGBT rights in the new political situation

Congress notes the new coalition Government's 'programme for government' and its positive commitment to improving hate crime recording and asylum rights, and to tackling homophobic bullying in schools. However, Congress is very concerned about the following:

- i. the announced £6bn cut in public funding, with larger cuts yet to be announced, and in particular the impact on LGBT community organisations and LGBT users of public services
- ii. the lack of commitment to the full implementation of the Equality Act
- iii. the encouraging of greater 'freedom' within the state school system in terms of curriculum and governance, including the encouragement of more faith schools

iv. the continuing religious exemptions to LGBT employment rights.

Congress reaffirms its commitment to full LGBT equality in society and positive action to achieve this aim. Congress deplores the proposed cuts in public funding that will disproportionately affect working class LGBT users of public services. Congress supports the TUC challenge to the European Commission on the legality of the current religious exemptions to LGBT employment rights in the UK.

TUC Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Conference

13 A workplace agenda for disabled workers

Congress welcomes achievements for disabled workers over the last decade, including extending the Disability Discrimination Act to all workplaces, the Disability Equality Duty, and funding for Access to Work.

However, Congress remains concerned that:

- i. disability discrimination prevents disabled men and women getting and staying in work
- ii. fear and lack of information are still major factors preventing disabled people getting their reasonable adjustments
- iii. the current economic situation further worsens the position of disabled workers across workplaces.

Congress calls on the General Council, TUC Disability Committee and affiliates to:

- a) campaign for redundancy matrices, sickness absence, health and safety, bonus, capability and other procedures explicitly to include protection from disability discrimination, while continuing to monitor the impact of the global economic crisis on disabled workers; and provide affiliates with a negotiating toolkit to assess workplace policies and procedures to identify disability discrimination and include examples of model agreements
- b) identify specific industrial disability equality issues to be addressed - including industrial injuries to those who drive at work now wrongly classified as road traffic accidents - and support for agency workers on responsibility for reasonable adjustments
- c) develop and support a positive trade union workplace agenda for disabled workers demonstrating the importance of trade union membership to disabled workers, backed up by monitoring, participation and trade union education.

TUC Disability Conference

16 Defence of the welfare state

Congress condemns the Government's emergency Budget, which announced cuts of £11bn in welfare, including measures to force more people off Disability Living Allowance; cap Housing Benefit; uprating benefits in future by consumer price index (CPI) rather than retail price index (RPI); a three-year freeze to Child Benefit; the abolition of maternity grants; and cuts to tax credits; while giving tax breaks to business worth over £24bn.

Congress believes that these cuts represent a fundamental undermining of the welfare state as a safety net to ensure a decent standard of living for those unable to work.

Congress recognises that the cuts will disproportionately affect women, black people and those with disabilities.

Congress notes that alongside these cuts the Government has announced that it will cut 8,000 staff from Jobcentre Plus, affecting workers delivering welfare services in central and local government.

Congress further notes that the delivery of the Government's Work Programme will be outsourced to the private sector, despite the DWP's own evidence that publicly-delivered welfare programmes are more effective at supporting people into work.

Congress reaffirms its beliefs that:

- i. compulsory workfare schemes are in contradiction to the notion of welfare rights
- ii. welfare should be delivered by publicly-employed staff acting through publicly-accountable agencies.

Congress believes the Government is fundamentally attacking the welfare state and instructs the General Council to:

- a) mobilise an ongoing broad-based campaign to defend the welfare state
- b) campaign to increase the poverty-level of UK benefits
- c) support the development of more unemployed workers' centres.

Public and Commercial Services Union

19 Restoring ethical banking: ending the sales-commission culture

Congress welcomes the establishment of an Independent Commission on Banking and also welcomes the establishment of the new Consumer Protection and Markets Authority. Congress believes that these bodies have an opportunity to build upon the work to stabilise and support the UK banking system since the banking crisis of 2008 by ensuring that banks provide the services their retail and business customers need at fair prices instead of trying to maximise product sales and profits.

Congress notes that unions in the financial services sector are regularly informed of the pressure staff experience to sell products to customers. Congress also notes that some employees feel that they have no option but to succumb to this pressure because they rely upon bonuses to make salaries up to a decent wage.

Therefore Congress welcomes the work undertaken by the Which? Independent Commission on Banking and agrees with the Commission's analysis that 'the sales-based culture [is] disliked by customers and branch staff alike'.

Congress also welcomes the recommendation by the Commission that: 'Remuneration for frontline and branch staff should not be linked to sales and should reward customer satisfaction, the fair treatment of customers and the fair resolution of complaints. There should be no commission or bonuses received for selling to customers.'

Congress believes the Government must ensure that there is no return to the short-term decision-making culture that did so much to precipitate the banking crisis, and that ending sales-based commission to top-up low pay is an important step in this direction.

Accord

The following Amendment was ACCEPTED

Add new final paragraph:

'Congress calls on the General Council to lobby the Government to pursue the previous Government's proposals to set up a working group to consider to what extent financial services firms' staff targets and incentives lead to poor outcomes for consumers and employees and how they can be reformed.'

Unite

27 High Pay Commission

Congress notes that the coalition Government has asked Will Hutton of the Work Foundation to

investigate high pay in the public sector. The examination leaves out an investigation of high pay in the private sector.

Congress therefore agrees to set up a shadow 'High Pay Commission' to investigate high pay across the whole of the economy, and in particular the difference between the highest pay and the lowest pay within the top FTSE 100 companies. It shall examine the history of high pay and current trends. The Commission will deliver its report with recommendations by no later than Congress 2011.

Communication Workers' Union

The following Amendment was ACCEPTED

In paragraph 2, line 4, insert after 'trends':

'and include an examination of the contribution that the introduction of a national maximum wage would make to addressing the increasing gap between rich and poor in society'

Unite

28 National minimum wage and apprentices

Congress welcomes the fact that the coalition Government has agreed to maintain the National Minimum Wage, one of the most significant achievements of the Labour Government.

Congress further welcomes the fact that apprentices in the UK will receive the legally enforceable protection of a National Minimum Apprenticeship rate from October 2010.

However, Congress is concerned that measures will be taken that will undermine the National Minimum Wage, such as freezing all rates or cutting back on the enforcement budget.

Congress calls on the General Council to:

- i. establish a campaign aimed at significantly increasing all rates of the Minimum Wage but with particular focus on the National Minimum Apprenticeship rate
- ii. organise a specific publicity and awareness campaign aimed at apprentices so that they are aware of their new statutory right and its enforcement process
- iii. monitor all issues and developments around the new National Minimum Apprenticeship rate, including possible abuse and lack of progression through apprenticeship levels 2, 3 and 4.

Congress further instructs the General Council to press the coalition to commit itself to:

- a) an annual review and increase in all rates of the National Minimum Wage and the National Minimum Apprenticeship rate
- b) increasing existing levels of expenditure on enforcement
- c) stepping up the publicity and awareness campaign with particular reference to the new rights available to apprentices from October 2010.

Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers

29 Internships

Congress supports internships as a way of helping young people to gain experience of the workplace and opportunities for permanent employment. Congress is concerned that some employers offer poor quality placements and effectively use interns as unpaid labour.

Congress congratulates the TUC on its website for interns and calls on the General Council and individual unions to oppose the exploitation of interns and work with employers to develop high quality placements with the appropriate remuneration.

The Society of Chiropractors and Podiatrists

36 More freight on rail

Congress acknowledges that the UK's freight transport infrastructure is the country's economic circulatory system, interlinking rail, road and water networks as well as boosting economic growth and enhancing employment. It further recognises that freight taken by rail produces 70 per cent less carbon emissions than the equivalent road journey and can also play a significant role in reducing road congestion, which is estimated to cost the economy £17bn a year.

Congress welcomes the fact that total rail freight traffic has grown by more than 60 per cent in the last 10 years, which have seen rail's share of the surface freight market rise to 11.5 per cent. Congress notes the considerable suppressed demand for rail freight across sectors such as construction, with forecasts showing the potential to double tonnes carried by 2030, including a fivefold increase in container rail freight.

Congress accepts that the initial and final leg of a freight journey must go by road but believes that a more sustainable future will require more long-distance journeys to be undertaken by rail supported by enhanced rail freight infrastructure.

Congress therefore urges the General Council to support the campaign to get more freight on to rail, lobby the coalition Government to prioritise rail freight while also protecting jobs across the freight sector, and to call on the Government to ensure that HGV regulations are properly enforced for the health and safety of workers and the travelling public.

Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen

37 The Strategic Defence Review and its implications for the Royal Fleet Auxiliary (RFA)

Congress recognises the remarkable work done by the RFA and its civilian crews in support of our armed forces. Congress notes in particular the recent relief work undertaken by RFA ships following the Haiti earthquake and in support of the multinational counter-piracy deployments off Somalia.

However, Congress is alarmed by repeated reviews of the RFA's operations, usually undertaken under the guise of 'value for money'. Congress is concerned at the wasted effort and damaged morale that has been caused because the RFA has repeatedly had to demonstrate its unrivalled efficiency and professionalism to these successive reviews, even though a series of in-depth reports was carried out within the space of just a few years that confirmed the efficiency of the RFA in very clear terms. Against the backdrop of government spending cuts, Congress is concerned that fresh attempts will be made to commercialise or downsize the RFA.

Congress urges the General Council to assist campaigns to oppose any such moves and to resist short-term savings that could have a detrimental long-term impact on the RFA's operations. Congress also notes the strategic importance of protecting the RFA's status as one of the biggest employers and trainers of British merchant seafarers and calls upon the General Council to strongly oppose any moves that would erode this.

Nautilus International

The following Amendment was ACCEPTED

Insert new paragraph 3:

'Privatisation and commercialisation of the RFA would result in the MOD losing command of the key element of the Royal Navy's support structure and would represent a betrayal of the brave seafarers who have played a vital role in numerous conflicts, with many paying the ultimate price with their lives.'

National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers

44 HMRC resources and the deficit

Congress notes with concern the potential effects of the coalition Government's intention to cut public service expenditure by £6bn in 2010, and its intention to further cut departmental budgets by up to a quarter in years to come. Congress deplores the severe consequences that such cuts will have on the pay, conditions and job security of public sector workers who were not to blame for that deficit, or the wider economic meltdown, in the first place.

At a time when Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs' own estimate of the 'tax gap' continues to be in the region of £40bn, Congress finds it both ironic and nonsensical that such cuts will only further erode HMRC's capacity to collect the taxes necessary to fund public services, contribute to a healthy UK PLC, and ensure that every UK citizen benefits from continued investment in high quality public services, such as schools and hospitals. If the tax gap were reduced there would be less need to cut public service expenditure in order to address the deficit.

Congress calls on the General Council to develop and support a campaign against the cuts in HMRC, but also to press and persuade the Government to put more resource into HMRC's cadre of senior professionals: the tax, legal, accountancy and policy experts working in the public sector whose job it is to counter and tackle fraudulent evaders and those making use of complex schemes and artificial arrangements to avoid tax.

FDA

45 Public sector cuts

Congress notes with concern cuts in public services in particular affecting those who require podiatry care. Congress notes the references to cuts not affecting health services but knows that podiatry services are being cut through vacancy freezes, cost improvement plans, reduced access and the redesign of services. The majority of citizens who use podiatry services are the elderly and those at high risk due to illnesses such as diabetes and rheumatoid arthritis. Cuts lead to longer waiting times and increased risks for these vulnerable groups.

Congress knows that cuts in the funding of podiatry create more pressure on the health economy as high-risk patients go untreated. It has a detrimental effect on progress that has been made on the prevention agenda, which does so much to educate the public about the importance of good foot care. This is an intolerable situation that the vulnerable should not have to experience. For clinicians, the effects can be devastating: increased caseloads, higher levels of stress and inevitably higher levels of absenteeism through sickness. This pressure also leads to a change in the culture of an organisation, resulting in increased levels of bullying, reduced morale, and a greater turnover of highly skilled staff.

Congress calls on the Government to act on its pledge not to cut health funding and to ensure podiatry services are not cut and that those who need podiatry care will continue to receive the NHS treatment they need, when they need it, delivered and managed by NHS podiatrists.

The Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists

46 Private Finance Initiative

Congress recognises that in the United Kingdom both Conservative and Labour Governments have sought to justify the Private Finance Initiative on the ideological grounds that the private sector is better at delivering services than the public sector, and that it is now the preferred method for public sector procurement.

Further, Congress condemns this method of procurement and recognises that it has failed and

placed an unnecessary burden on the British taxpayer. Congress therefore demands a return to a public financing structure to finance our prisons, railways, hospitals, schools and all other public infrastructure.

POA

47 Sick pay

Congress notes that in the current climate, there is a policy of reducing the level of public expenditure. Local government is particularly hard hit. This reduction is often at the expense of public sector employees.

One example is the attempt by several local authorities to move away from the national agreement on sick pay, with a specific proposal to cease payment for the first three days of sickness absence.

These workers deliver services to the public. It is in everybody's best interests for these services to be of the highest quality. It is not in anybody's best interests for those delivering these high quality services to be trying to deliver them when they are ill. Children with severe and complex difficulties are especially vulnerable.

There are many public service workers who are bound by professional codes of practice, which could be contravened by attending work when they are unfit to do so.

Congress affirms that it considers that nationally agreed terms and conditions of employment - particularly those set out in part II of the national agreement on pay and conditions of service - must not be eroded at a local level, and will resist any attempts to do so by local authorities.

Association of Educational Psychologists

The following Amendment was ACCEPTED

In paragraph 1, add at end:

'This is evidenced by the circulation to councils of the LGE advice on 'reducing workforce costs', which gives the green light to councils to attack many Green Book conditions, including sick pay'.

In the final paragraph add at the end 'including supporting affiliates in combating the LGE advice'.

UNISON

49 NHS hospital car parking charges

Congress notes that previous Health Secretary Andy Burnham announced to the Labour conference in 2009 that over the next three years he wanted to phase out car parking charges for in-patients, giving each a permit for the length of their stay, which family and friends could use.

Congress also notes continuing media interest in English NHS hospitals car parking charges, particularly the best and worst as identified by the BBC on 9 June after consumer watchdog Which? published its research findings. Epsom and St Helier University Hospitals NHS Trust was the worst; over a period of one year the hospital clamped 1,671 cars and made nearly £2m profit.

Congress believes that this is a national disgrace in terms of an unfair charge on patients, visitors and NHS staff.

Congress further believes that all NHS car parking in England should be free not only for in-patients, family and friends, but also for out-patients.

Congress also notes with concern that in many English NHS hospitals, car parking charges for staff have increased significantly over recent months. For example, at the Royal Marsden Hospital, Sutton, the charge for some staff has increased from £90 per annum to £500 per annum.

Congress believes that this level of increase is not appropriate or justifiable.

Congress calls on the General Council to campaign and lobby the Government for:

- i. the abolition of car parking charges for in-patients and out-patients, as well as family and friends
- ii. fair and reasonable car parking for NHS staff.

Society of Radiographers

50 Malnutrition and dehydration

Congress is appalled to note that in 2010 one-third of all adults admitted to hospitals and other care settings continue to suffer from malnutrition, and many are also suffering from dehydration. This can lead to reduced quality of life, increased dependency, longer hospital stays, and can ultimately cause death. In addition, malnutrition costs the UK economy an estimated £13bn each year.

Over the last 20 years, numerous reports have been produced by different bodies highlighting the ongoing prevalence and detrimental effects of malnutrition across a range of settings and age groups - but especially in older adults.

Key bodies forming the Council of Europe Alliance produced the flyer, 10 Key Characteristics of Good Nutritional Care. The Care Quality Commission, the new health and social care regulator, will be assessing provision of nutrition and hydration in these settings. A new nutritional assessment tool will be used from October 2010.

Despite this, levels of malnutrition and dehydration remain unacceptably high. Most reports have issued guidance addressing the significant problem; however the statistics show guidance alone is not being effective.

It is time to convert guidance into requirement. Congress is therefore instructed to lobby the Government to introduce a statutory regulatory framework of comprehensive nutritional standards for all health care settings in order to reduce this great burden on health and quality of life.

Congress also recognises that issues around health care affect everyone and calls on all unions to raise awareness within their membership of the importance of identifying and tackling malnutrition.

British Dietetic Association

The following Amendment was ACCEPTED

Insert new paragraph 6:

'This framework should also set standards for:

- i) minimum spending on food and care per individual
- ii) transparent ownership of care settings

to ensure that vulnerable people, low-paid care workers and taxpayers do not pay the price for extortionate rents and exploitation of the vulnerable by any profiteer.'

GMB

51 Investing in our future

Congress believes that the coalition Government's austerity measures will damage the recovery and consign a generation of young people to the scrapheap of the unemployed. Congress maintains that the country needs investment in jobs, not austerity.

Congress deplores the savage cuts that have taken place since 12 May 2010 to youth and community provision, the scaling back of financial assistance for post-16 students and reduced investment in 16-19 education and training provision.

Congress is alarmed that the scrapping of 14-19 academic diplomas, the de-recognition of vocational qualifications in school performance tables and the creation of new technical academies for 14-19 year-olds will recreate a two-tier system of education that will

stigmatise and disadvantage thousands of young people.

Congress asserts that securing the economic recovery requires investment in skills and jobs and parity of esteem across all forms of education and training for young people.

Congress commits the General Council to hosting a summit on jobs and youth, involving unions, and student and other civil organisations, and publishing and promoting a detailed strategy for change.

NASUWT

52 Young people and the recession

As the financial crisis unravels, youth unemployment has soared to record levels. Unemployment amongst 16- to 24-year-olds now stands near the politically sensitive one million mark. The recession means large-scale unemployment among those completing their education. Young people are forced into jobs in low-paid, low-skilled sectors, as competition for graduate opportunities and apprenticeships becomes far greater.

This affects young people's health, friendships and family life. A recent Prince's Trust YouGov report found young people are likely to suffer 'permanent psychological scars' as a result of being unemployed.

The credit crunch compounds the difficulties facing young workers. Increases in transport and other costs often have a disproportionately greater impact on young workers. Very few young workers are able to own their home, either sharing rented accommodation or continuing to live with parents. Graduates suffer the burden of student loans, which also discourage younger students from entering higher education or studying away from home. Far too many young workers are burdened with financial worries making it difficult to make ends meet on a daily basis. Protecting young workers against debt, and securing acceptable living standards for them, is an essential part of a sustainable economic policy.

Congress notes the brutal cuts already implemented by the Government and resolves to fight against them. Unity across the public sector and wider trade union movement has never been more vital. By investing in education we safeguard education jobs, while providing education opportunities for those young people not in employment, education or training (NEET).

Congress believes it is the responsibility of the whole trade union movement to campaign for decent jobs and opportunities for young people.

Tax payers' money should be spent on investing in public services and creating jobs, instead of funding bonuses for bank bosses. Congress opposes the privatisation agenda. Money should be invested in a new social housing building programme to tackle the massive housing waiting lists and create new jobs for those unemployed within the construction industry and as well as supporting the cultural sector.

Trade unions and trades union councils nationwide are already supporting a mass mobilisation of young people to campaign for these aims through the Youth Fight for Jobs campaign. Congress calls on TUC young members to come together on the issue of youth unemployment to fight for real jobs on trade union rates of pay that offer the guarantee of a secure future for young people.

Congress calls on the General Council and affiliates to:

- i. launch a widespread campaign against the cuts in public services, using all available methods including the media and public demonstrations, working with trade unions, trades union councils, service users and communities
- ii. ensure redundancy arrangements are extended to all young workers

iii. defend jobs and conditions in all sectors, to ensure people are fairly compensated in the event of job losses by campaigning for employment rights for all workers from day one

iv. campaign for decent, permanent jobs for all young people, linked to the needs of communities and the environment

v. improve conditions and opportunities for the self-employed, and for freelance, temporary and agency workers

vi. campaign for a living wage in line with the European decency threshold, and for proper training and conditions in line with trade union agreements for all and to assist those working in creative industries (where hourly rates are not applied) to formalise their working arrangements and strengthen enforcement mechanisms

vii. liaise with unions' youth networks to produce literature on young people's rights and organising; provide organising training and funding for young people by young people; and work to recruit and organise young workers by referring to previous victories and ongoing struggles

viii. build for a national demonstration against youth unemployment across the trade union movement by the end of 2010

ix. campaign to work towards the equalisation of the National Minimum Wage (NMW) for all workers from the age of 16

x. pressure the Government to enforce the law in cases where employers violate the NMW and increase the size of the enforcement team; Congress recognises the violation of NMW is both immoral and illegal - the Vetta v London Dreams Motions case has proven that interns are entitled to the protection of NMW laws

xi. encourage the growth of, and work with, bodies seeking to organise the unemployed to harness their collective strength, while supporting them individually

xii. campaign for apprentices to receive at least the full adult rate of the NMW from day one, unless that is superseded by a beneficial collective agreement, with at least one day a week set aside for paid training and a guaranteed job at the end of the scheme.

TUC Young Members' Conference

55 Inclusion

Congress notes the progress that has been made in all aspects of social inclusion during the last 13 years. Congress is concerned about the threats to this progress that are now being made, and that the social and educational progress of children and young people will be marred by proposed changes to the policy and practice of inclusive education.

Inclusion is conducive to the health and well-being of children and their families; inclusive practice in education promotes active citizenship, high self-esteem, improved academic outcomes and shared responsibilities.

Inclusive education is also cost-effective and promotes:

- i. empathy between children
- ii. integrated communities
- iii. improved life chances.

Congress therefore seeks an assurance from the Government that every child still matters and has the entitlement to inclusion, and that schools can expect resources to make this a meaningful educational experience.

Association of Educational Psychologists

56 Threats to local authority education services

Congress notes with deep concern that the coalition Government's early announcement, within days of taking office, of £6.2bn public expenditure cuts to be implemented this year, included a disproportionate reduction of £1.1bn in local government expenditure. In addition, informed forecasts for the next three-year comprehensive spending review commencing in 2011, point to further significant cuts of at least 5.5 per cent per annum for local councils, in real terms, over this period. These sharp reductions will directly affect key local authority education and children's services, on which many schools and colleges rely, including support for educational improvement, children with special educational needs, schools' utilisation of educational technology, education welfare, and the early years' sector.

Congress further notes that the coalition Government's projected promotion of various types of highly autonomous state-funded schools, outside the local authority family of schools in their area, will add to these pressures on important council education services, despite their long-standing positive reputation confirmed annually by the Audit Commission's detailed national school surveys in England.

Congress therefore affirms that the specialist skills and knowledge developed within these services over many years must be recognised and protected, in the interests of schools and of the nation's children and young people, and calls on central and local government to ensure adequate funding and ongoing developmental support for these services and the professionals they employ, over the coming period of further educational reforms.

Aspect

60 Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) referrals

Congress fully accepts the importance of protecting children and vulnerable adults from those who might cause them harm and recognises the need to maintain lists of adults barred from working with such groups. However, Congress believes that the current ISA referral regime is flawed in that it is not properly understood by providers of regulated activities, and does not apply sufficient rights to referred individuals for representation and appeal.

Congress calls on the General Council to press the Government for changes in the referral system to ensure that its operation is fair to referred individuals and that the referral criteria used are consistent, clear and easy to follow.

Association for College Management

The following Amendment was ACCEPTED

Add at end of first paragraph:

'The Scheme must allow individuals to have full rights to state their case and to appeal against a bad decision. The cost must not be charged to those who need registration in order to work.'

In paragraph 2, line 1, after 'Congress' insert 'welcomes the work done by unions to campaign for changes to the Scheme and'.

National Union of Teachers

62 Social care

Congress applauds the work of social carers in both the public and voluntary sectors and their day-to-day work that significantly improves the lives of millions of individuals and families. Congress condemns the continuing media attacks on frontline social carers, who are all too frequently blamed for the ills of society and the extreme actions of individuals; and who are not afforded a voice or right of reply.

Congress recognises the daily challenges faced by social carers in professions that are undervalued and who continue to suffer from lower pay, under-investment in skills and training, poor career development and a lack of political and managerial support. Therefore, Congress calls on the General Council to defend the work of social carers from media attacks and to highlight the essential and valuable work of social carers.

Community

65 The BBC's remit

In March 2010 the BBC announced its intention to close both the BBC Asian Network and 6Music as part of its strategy review. Although 6Music has since had a reprieve, plans to close the Asian Network appear to be going ahead.

Congress believes that the BBC, as the main UK public service broadcaster, funded by the licence fee, has a duty to represent minority interests. At present very few British Asian artists are offered broadcasting opportunities within the BBC's mainstream output, and Congress fears that closing the Asian Network and attempting to incorporate Asian talent within other BBC radio stations may lead to the evaporation of the BBC's focus on championing new music from Asian artists, whatever their genre.

Congress believes that, instead of the proposed closure of the Asian Network, the BBC should expand its coverage of the diverse cultures that make up modern British society. It is also vital that these should be national services available to all rather than localised stations. In addition, Congress asks the General Council to remind the BBC that highlighting the wealth of talent in our under-represented communities can not only provide much needed employment opportunities for artists from BME groups, but will also undoubtedly broaden the diversity of listener base for BBC programming.

Musicians' Union

66 Arts funding

The new coalition Government has already asked Arts Council England (ACE) to make cuts of £19m to its budget and the upcoming comprehensive spending review could force the Department for Culture, Media and Sport to make cuts of more than 25 per cent to its budget. If cuts of 25 per cent or more are passed on to ACE, jobs in the creative sector will undoubtedly be at risk.

The creative industries are currently growing at more than twice the rate of the rest of our economy and they contribute £11.4bn to the UK's balance of trade. They constitute a greater proportion of GDP than any other country in the world - and yet they receive a very modest amount of funding from the Government. At a time when our general economy is struggling, it would be illogical to cut jobs and therefore cause permanent damage to one area that has consistently maintained growth.

If the creative sectors must make cuts, the main priority must be to protect jobs. Congress believes that it would be preferable for ACE to rein in artistic ambition and the funding of new projects in the short term in order to maintain frontline services and jobs for the future.

Congress calls upon the General Council to campaign to protect employees in the creative sector and to urge the Government and ACE to ensure that jobs are not sacrificed for the sake of funding creativity.

Musicians' Union

67 England bid to host the 2018 World Cup

Congress supports the bid to bring the World Cup to England in 2018. In these difficult times, this is one goal that can unite the nation and at the same time provide huge economic benefits for our country and our people. As the 2010 competition in South Africa has shown, football has a unique capacity to heal divisions and bring people together and in the coming years the anticipation and excitement leading up to the tournament will undoubtedly have a very positive impact throughout the land. The spin-offs in terms of increased economic activity and employment are compelling and the enthusiasm of our citizens in bringing the Cup home are indeed worthy of universal support.

English football can proudly boast some of the best players in the world and the most entertaining football, and Congress feels strongly that the opportunity to host the World Cup in England is long overdue. Trade unionists have always been passionate about our national game and Congress therefore backs the call to bring the Cup to these shores and hopefully see England triumph once again.

Professional Footballers' Association

The following Amendment was ACCEPTED

Insert new second paragraph:

'There will also be opportunities to promote football, and sport in general, in our schools and colleges and to encourage young people to link up with those from other countries competing in the World Cup, to promote education for all, anti-racism and international friendship.'

Association for College Management

68 Haiti

Congress believes that, as many of us work to figure out appropriate strategies to support the people of Haiti, it is important to note that the most vulnerable people can experience a slower response to the consequences of the original disaster.

For example, women experience the most negative consequences of catastrophic events, in particular higher rates of injury and death, displacement and unemployment, increased incidence of HIV, domestic violence, increased poverty and the disproportionate responsibility for care.

This is especially true for women marginalised by race, sexual orientation, class, health issues, ability, age and legal status. Additionally, in times of crises and environmental emergencies, poor and marginalised women, who are least responsible for the horrific conditions in which they live, are often neglected.

Congress therefore calls on the TUC Race Relations Committee and General Council to:

- i. seek and make links with at least one specific women's organisation/network in Haiti
- ii. develop and sustain a productive relationship with the Haitian trade unions through TUC international links
- iii. commit to continue to secure resources for the aid effort
- iv. look to organise a visit to Haiti to assist with reconstruction efforts.

TUC Black Workers' Conference

70 Supporting international development

Congress reaffirms the ILO Philadelphia Declaration that 'poverty anywhere is a threat to prosperity everywhere' and notes that half of the world's workers continue to exist on less than \$2 a day. We believe that contributing to the struggle against global poverty is a moral imperative but also a vital part of trade union

solidarity. International development is about much more than overseas aid, but Congress welcomes the commitment of the leading UK political parties to spend the UN target of 0.7 per cent of gross national income on aid and urges the Government to put that commitment into law without delay.

Congress believes that trade unions have a huge amount to contribute in the field of international development and welcomes the work being done by the ITUC, the TUC and individual unions. Drawing on funds from individual members and from the Department for International Development, they are already assisting unions in developing countries to challenge and reduce poverty, hold leaders and politicians to account, build quality public services, and promote equality. Congress urges the Government to continue funding trade union work in this area, as governments across the developed world do. And Congress urges unions to promote the work of the TUC and its appeals for funding for trade union projects in the global south.

Accord

71 Vietnam

Congress appreciates the incredible achievements of the Vietnamese people in rebuilding their country since Vietnam's liberation 35 years ago from one of the most brutal wars in history, which destroyed the infrastructure of the country.

Congress recalls with respect the three million Vietnamese killed and four million injured in the fighting and bombing.

Congress notes that over eighty million litres of defoliants, including the dioxin Agent Orange, were sprayed on forests, farms and villages and that the legacy of this terrible poison still lives in on with over three million people affected and many birth deformities and health problems still today. Congress further notes that no reparations have been paid for this appalling damage.

Despite the devastation of the country, Vietnam has rebuilt at an incredible rate and greatly improved the living standards of its population. Congress congratulates the Vietnamese trade union movement in the role that its members played in the liberation of the country and subsequent reconstruction.

Congress further congratulates Trade Union Friends of Vietnam and the Britain Vietnam Friendship Society and affiliated unions for the work they have done to maintain contacts with Vietnamese workers and their families, and urges affiliates to consider their work. Congress calls on the General Council to establish closer links with the Vietnamese General Confederation of Labour.

Bakers, Food and Allied Workers' Union

77 Asbestos on ships

Congress records its concern at the Government's announcement of a review of health and safety legislation. Congress notes that statistics show that the workplace death and injury rates for merchant seafarers continue to be well in excess of those ashore, and is therefore alarmed to note evidence that asbestos is still being widely used onboard merchant ships being built today in certain parts of the world.

Congress further notes with profound concern that asbestos may often be introduced into ships certificated as being asbestos-free, because of the continued use of the material in a wide range of equipment and components.

Congress notes that there are national, EU and international regulations designed to prohibit the use of asbestos and asbestos-containing materials and is

disturbed at the evidence showing that these rules are not being adhered to.

Congress therefore calls upon the General Council to campaign for the relevant national, EU and international bodies to take appropriate action to ensure compliance with the relevant regulations regarding the use of asbestos products onboard ships.

Congress also urges the General Council to press for rules to require the mandatory training of seafarers in identifying asbestos products and in the precautionary measures that have to be taken when asbestos is identified.

Nautilus International

78 Industrial injuries

Congress deplores the fact that despite the Industrial Injuries Disablement Benefit (IIDB) scheme being designed as a compensation payment, there are people losing other benefits when it is paid.

Congress is concerned that people suffering from prescribed diseases, particularly lung diseases, are being robbed of the small amounts of compensation they receive at a time when they need it most.

Congress notes that the Government Consultation Report in 2007 concluded that 'the people who need the resources the most, are those who receive them'.

Congress asks why, in 2010, those who need resources the most are having them taken away.

Congress welcomes the work done by the TUC in relation to IIDB and recognises that the small amounts of compensation paid in relation to the severity of the injuries need to be increased.

Congress requests that the General Council raise the unfairness of the system with the Government to ensure that this issue is not forgotten.

National Union of Mineworkers

79 Cosmetic use of sunbeds

Congress recognises the key role that unions can play in health awareness and in campaigns to promote well-being.

The Labour Government introduced legislation to understand and create awareness of the risks associated with prolonged usage of sunbeds and to limit access to units on the high street by banning anyone under the age of 18 from using these facilities.

However, with changes in climate and despite this legislation, there continues to be an increase in the incidence of skin cancer and associated conditions in this country to the extent that the UK has a higher incidence rate than Australia. The unnecessary use of sunbeds as a cosmetic procedure has the potential to increase the risk of skin cancer and death from cancer and to place unreasonable demands on NHS cancer services at a time when the Government is trying to reduce costs, streamline service delivery and promote healthy lifestyles.

Affiliated unions have considerable influence with members and the resources to highlight the dangers that misuse of sun beds for tanning pose to the general public.

Congress calls on the General Council to work with the Government and relevant charities to further restrict the use of sunbeds to treatment of clinical conditions under the control of appropriate medical, nursing and allied health professionals.

Society of Radiographers

80 Reform of General Council

Congress notes that, at present, the 12 largest unions in the TUC have guaranteed representation on the General Council. In total they hold over 30 seats.

There are nearly 50 other unions also affiliated to the TUC, each having fewer than 100,000 members. These unions are allocated just 11 places on the General Council, according to the TUC's rules and the structure of elections for Section C. However, these unions represent almost three-quarters of a million workers and have a broad range of experience, as well as organising diverse groups of members.

Congress further notes that it is nearly 10 years since the rules governing the composition of Section C were last revised. Since then the number of trade unions affiliated to the TUC has reduced in number from 76 to 58.

Congress believes that all unions have an important role to play in our movement. To be at its best the TUC must harness all the talents of its affiliates, and we should work more closely together in order to achieve this. Congress believes that the best way to do this is through full representation on the General Council for all affiliated unions, large and small. This would put an end to the divisive and damaging battle for the 11 seats reserved for the smaller unions seeking election to the General Council.

Congress therefore resolves to initiate a review of the rules governing the composition of the General Council with a view to addressing these issues.

Equity

81 Report-back on Congress motions

Congress notes the need for a public report-back on the actions taken following the previous year's Congress decisions.

Congress therefore calls on the General Council to arrange, as part of its annual report to Congress in future years, for a specific, written report-back on the actions taken on all motions carried or remitted at the previous Congress.

Broadcasting Entertainment Cinematograph and Theatre Union

Composite 1 Employment rights

Congress believes that the right to bargain collectively through a recognised trade union and the right to strike are fundamental human rights.

Congress welcomes the recent decisions of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), which have supported the ILO's recognition that the right to strike is 'an indissociable element of the right to collective bargaining'.

Congress welcomes the decision of the ECtHR to elevate the right to collective bargaining in status to that of an essential element of Article 11 of the European Charter of Human Rights.

Congress deplores the fact that British law imposes obligations on trade unions in relation to strike ballots that are unprecedented in Europe and that the law seeks to frustrate trade unions on technical grounds from their right to take collective action, rather than to provide a framework for assessing whether there is genuine worker support for the proposed action.

Congress deplores the increasing use of the courts by employers to prevent legal industrial action by our members and the recent succession of court cases against affiliates whose members have voted overwhelmingly in favour of industrial action to defend safety, jobs and conditions only for the courts to rule out the action on minor technical grounds. Congress is concerned that this wave of litigation by the employers is undermining the already limited right to take action.

Congress fully supports the view of the TUC General Secretary that 'the right to take peaceful industrial action goes far wider than any particular dispute and is a hallmark of a free society. All fair minded people should now see ... fundamental freedoms are now being eroded.'

Congress congratulates Unite, PCS and RMT for their defence of their members' interests and defeat of ridiculous legal action based on technicalities of the anti-union laws.

However, Congress notes the success of the media company Johnston Press in securing an injunction against the NUJ on the basis that it 'employs no journalists'. This is despite the group's claims in its annual report, in company bulletins and external publications that it employs 1,900 journalists and more than 7,000 employees. Johnston Press made the claim despite group-wide decisions on a pay freeze, closure of the pension scheme, and terms and conditions.

Congress is concerned that the financial cost of defending legal actions such as that by Johnston Press could make it impossible for smaller unions to do so. Congress is therefore concerned that legal precedents could be established that affect all unions due to the lack of funds available to some.

Congress calls upon the General Council to pursue, within its existing policy on employment rights established at the 2009 Congress, a campaign that uses the ECtHR's decisions to challenge existing UK laws, which are designed to undermine trade union democracy and rights of workers. The campaign should include:

- i. the exclusion of companies employing less than 21 workers from statutory collective bargaining rights
- ii. the limited scope of protection against unfair labour practices during organising campaigns for recognition
- iii. the opportunities for employers to enter into agreements with non-independent trade unions to prevent access to statutory recognition procedures.

Congress agrees to consider:

- a) supporting affiliates taking challenges to the European Court of Human Rights, such as RMT's current challenge that the ability to organise industrial action is restricted by UK law in breach of Article 11 of the European Convention of Human Rights
- b) how to ensure that all unions can defend themselves against legal action designed to deny members their rights, where there is a good prospect of success.

Congress believes that, ultimately, the best way to defend our members' interests is to put an end to the UK's repressive anti-trade union laws. Congress further reiterates its support for the repeal of the anti-trade union laws. Noting the sheer difficulty and complexity of conducting industrial action ballots under current legislation, Congress calls on the General Council to campaign vigorously for a review and repeal of the anti-union legislation introduced by the previous Conservative Government.

Congress further welcomes the Lawful Industrial Action (Minor Errors) Private Members Bill introduced by John McDonnell MP, which if enacted will prevent employers from using minor technical errors to stop industrial action.

Congress resolves to fully support the Bill and requests that the General Council:

1. supports the lobby of Parliament called for 13 October 2010
2. ask MPs to attend the Second Reading of the Bill on 22 October 2010.

Mover: Unite

Seconder: National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers

Supporters: Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union

National Union of Journalists

United Road Transport Union

Composite 2 Trade union outreach

Congress recognises the importance of reaching out to diverse sections of the population to make the case for trade union membership. We acknowledge the importance of publicity and recruitment campaigns on issues that are important to the majority of trade unions, such as job losses, pensions and pay.

Congress also recognises that the majority of trade unionists are now women, and that the cuts will have a disproportionate impact on disabled people; lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people; people from black and minority ethnic communities; and young people.

However, Congress recognises the on-going attack on public service broadcasting and the consolidation of media ownership and control in the hands of anti-union figures. Congress agrees to support media unions in their fights to stop cuts, end monopolies and find new financial models to support media diversity and quality journalism.

Congress therefore calls on the TUC to continue to play a progressive role, in particular in its work on equality. Together with a campaign on these issues, a meeting should be sought with broadcasters who have a public service remit to seek greater recognition of the role that trade unions continue to play. The TUC should also urge broadcasters to recognise the pressing need for action to ensure that all sections of society are portrayed realistically and by avoiding the use of stereotypes.

Mover: Communication Workers' Union

Seconder: Equity

Supporter: National Union of Journalists

Composite 3 Child poverty

Congress is deeply concerned at the direction of coalition Government decisions to make spending reductions by cutting back on the sources of vital financial support for working parents. Congress condemns policies such as the regressive Budget, abolition of the Child Trust Fund from 2011 and the withdrawal of the extension of free school meals, recognising that the effects of benefit reductions will increase levels of child poverty after 2012. Congress condemns the Government for taking steps that will lead to an increase in child poverty so soon after reaffirming the commitment to its abolition by 2020. Congress values the universal reach of Child Benefit and resists any attempt to restrict this by means-testing.

Congress remains aware that poverty damages the social and educational prospects of almost four million children, depresses the national level of achievement, and perpetuates the unjust social class divide in achievement and subsequent life-chances. It condemns the hypocrisy of politicians who claim to support social justice at the same time as implementing policies that increase injustice.

Congress recognises the vital role Child Benefit plays in any anti-poverty programme, and notes that restricting the reach of benefits for children or removing them altogether inevitably hits low income households hardest. Tackling low pay, addressing benefit withdrawal rates and protecting benefits that reduce in-work poverty are all necessary and effective measures of ending child poverty. Congress does not

hesitate to remind the coalition of its commitment to eradicating child poverty by 2020 and will watch its progress towards this goal with keen interest.

The work unions are doing to increase members' incomes and to raise awareness of rights and support has now taken on a new urgency.

In view of this, Congress calls on the General Council to:

- i. support the 'Claim It' campaigning work of affiliates
- ii. lobby the coalition to reaffirm its commitment to ending child poverty by 2020 and to publish impact assessments of all spending decisions in the light of this
- iii. continue to lobby the Government to publish a detailed plan on how it will meet its stated 2020 target
- iv. support affiliates' campaigns against low-paid, insecure employment
- v. co-ordinate a vigorous campaign against any proposals to end the universal reach of Child Benefit.

Mover: Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers

Seconder: Association of Teachers and Lecturers

Composite 4 Manufacturing and industrial policy

Congress asserts that the future recovery of the UK economy will depend upon the growth generated by the manufacturing sector. Manufacturing continues to be a major contributor to the wealth of the UK - worth over £160bn to the economy and generating 46 per cent of UK export earnings. Congress notes the continuing challenges faced by British manufacturing companies as they emerge from recession, including liquidity and credit availability, rising energy costs, skills retention and environmental targets.

In the current economic climate the Government cannot allow manufacturing to decline as the need for a more balanced economy in this country will enable us to compete with EU countries in a globalised market. Congress believes that the emergency Budget failed to address manufacturing needs.

Congress recognises that to meet these challenges and to continue to provide jobs to the UK's regions, active industrial policies are required. Congress welcomes the belated interest in industrial policy by the previous Government.

Congress condemns decisions by the coalition Government that have removed industrial support from manufacturing companies - most notably the loan to Sheffield Forgemasters.

Congress also condemns the coalition Government's decision to cut the Future Jobs Fund, which was targeted at tackling youth unemployment.

Congress therefore calls on the General Council to develop and lobby for active industrial policies both in the UK and, through the ETUC, at a European level to ensure that manufacturing can play a strong part in a sustainable recovery and a low carbon economy.

Congress calls upon the General Council to work with affiliates to develop a strategic manufacturing campaign designed to pressurise the Government and based upon the following 10 pillars for manufacturing investment and jobs:

- i. building a framework of policies to defend strategically important industries
- ii. continued financial support through interventionist policies
- iii. targeted support for small- and medium-sized enterprises
- iv. better use of government purchasing power to secure manufacturing jobs in the UK

v. maximising the opportunities that the low carbon revolution offers

vi. delivery of an education and skills framework that meets all industry's needs

vii. creating a university structure that builds on the science base so necessary to secure high-skilled jobs

viii. creating the right investment environment for research and development including working with academics and their representatives on creating a funding regime that supports and fosters high quality research and whereby funding is not dependent on economic impact as currently proposed in the Research Excellence Framework

ix. creating a level playing field to deliver security and fair pricing for energy

x. building a framework of legislation that promotes transparency and engagement for all stakeholders in the future of manufacturing.

Congress further calls for the General Council to campaign for the Future Jobs Fund to be reinstated.

Mover: Unite

Seconder: Community

Supporters: Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers

University and College Union

Composite 5 Pensions

Congress notes with alarm the continuing campaign against decent pension provision under the coalition Government.

Congress condemns the scale and pace of government cuts across the public services. The cuts combined with changes to taxes and benefits, represent a real transfer of wealth from poor to rich, impoverishing women in particular. Congress believes that such plans will further entrench poverty and inequality in our society leading to social divisiveness and must be strenuously opposed.

Congress deplores the short-sighted decisions taken by the coalition Government which adversely affect workers and pensioners while insulating employers. Delaying the earnings link restoration, watering down the 'triple-lock', cutting the indexation of past and future service and reducing pension protection on outsourcing, combined with a faster increase in the state pension age, all form a devastating programme for generations of pensioner poverty.

Congress reaffirms its support for the provision of quality occupational pensions in the public and private sectors. Congress opposes the sustained campaign seeking to undermine pensions and condemns corporate attacks on workers' pension provision in recent years, in particular the closure of final salary pension schemes. Congress condemns those private sector employers who have abandoned their responsibility for decent provision but believes the answer is to rebuild occupational pension schemes.

Congress notes the review of public sector pensions currently being undertaken by John Hutton, deplores the propaganda about 'gold-plated' schemes, condemns the repeated offensive references to 'pensions apartheid' and CBI scaremongering about public schemes creating a 'black hole' in government finances, which the Government intends to use to cut the living standards of millions of public sector workers in retirement. Congress notes that statements from the coalition Government suggest that working people can expect significant attacks on pension rights over coming months. Congress commends the TUC for its work so far in robustly defending public sector pensions and in co-ordinating union responses to Hutton.

As one of the first national battles around public sector pensions in this parliamentary term, the success or failure of action to defend pension entitlements at the BBC will be crucial. Congress notes Robert Peston's comments that the plans could be a blueprint for the rest of the public sector.

Congress rejects accusations that current public sector pensions are neither affordable nor sustainable, and notes the NAO report of March 2010 that demonstrates that public sector pensions will be no larger a share of GDP in 2060 than currently. Congress deplores the continuing misrepresentation of public sector 'pay-as-you go' pension scheme costs, which ignores current and past contributions and pretends that costs will all fall due at once. Congress reminds the Government that in previous years, when contributions exceeded pensions in payment, it simply kept that money. The Government has had a cheap loan from public sector workers' pension contributions but now balks at paying the pensions that are due.

Congress is appalled by the political manipulation and lies which portray public sector workers' pensions as 'gold-plated'. Congress deplores both the attacks on public sector pensions and the presumption of the coalition Government that public sector pension provision will have to be further diluted, involving an increase in retirement age, an increase in employee contributions, and a diminution in existing pension benefits.

Congress reaffirms that the changes already made (including higher retirement ages, higher contributions from employees and cost-capping for employers) are adequate to ensure their long-term sustainability. Congress notes that in 2005 public sector unions worked together to defend public sector pensions. No union's arguments in defence of its members' pension schemes should suggest any cuts in the schemes of any other worker.

Congress notes that in the public sector all staff are equally members of common pension schemes, in contrast to some private sector employers where defined benefit arrangements are more prevalent for directors and the most senior staff. Congress recognises that many public sector managers are paid significantly less than comparable private sector counterparts at a time when public accountability of managers has never been greater. It notes that senior civil servants and NHS managers already have an earnings cap applied to their pensions, and deplores the singling out of a tiny handful of cases in which this may not be the case. It recognises that attacks on the pension arrangements of senior public servants are part of a wider agenda to undermine all public sector pensions. Congress rejects any suggestion that pensions for senior public servants should be cut and believes that this would be divisive and unfair, and would serve to undermine the TUC's defence of pension provision as a whole.

Congress condemns the ongoing campaign being conducted by some politicians and sections of the media to seek to divide private and public sector workers on the basis of the right to a decent pension at retirement, which is merely an attempt to create a 'race to the bottom' in pension provision whereby each attack on pension rights is gradually extended to all groups of workers. Congress reaffirms its view that the real pensions' problem lies in the private sector, where employers' abandonment of occupational pension schemes means that workers face poverty in retirement and taxpayers face higher welfare costs. Rather than extending this to public sector pensioners, we need decent pensions for all.

Congress condemns the BBC's plans to attack future staff pension benefits and undermine the value of pensions already earned, effectively leading to the closure of the Corporation's defined benefit schemes. Congress welcomes the strong stance, including the

threat of industrial action, taken by the unions in response to the BBC's pensions robbery.

Congress rejects the proposed government plans to switch the basis for pension increases from the retail price index (RPI) measure of inflation to the consumer price index (CPI), which will reduce public and private sector occupational pensions and state second pensions and could lead to existing and future pensioners losing thousands of pounds.

Congress is strongly opposed to the Government's policy to accelerate the increase in the age at which men and women are entitled to claim their state pension, which will disproportionately affect workers who cannot afford to retire early or those in physically demanding occupations. Congress rejects the Government's 'work until you drop' policy that is against the interests of workers' health, safety, dignity and quality of life and could increase long-term costs to our NHS.

Congress calls on the General Council to:

- i. defend the welfare state
- ii. defend public sector pensions and campaign for decent private sector pensions
- iii. promote measured, informed and rational debate over public sector pension reform
- iv. engage with the Hutton Commission on public pensions and co-ordinate union responses to the interim and final recommendations of the Hutton review of public service pensions. Work to ensure that proper equality impact assessments are carried out at the earliest possible stage, including the impact on part-time workers
- v. argue for the maintenance of the 2005 PSF agreement
- vi. develop research and publicity material to support the campaign to defend quality occupational pensions and demonstrate the value of these to working people as a whole and develop the case for extending the provision of occupational pensions to those not currently covered by such schemes
- vii. publish a report into the economic costs of inadequate pension provision in the private sector and commission research into the true cost of living increases applying to pensioners and create a pensioners' cost of living index
- viii. highlight the financial and social costs to the UK of the Government's pension reforms
- ix. monitor and publicise government breaches of the coalition agreement.

Congress calls on the General Council to support and co-ordinate the closest possible collaboration between affiliates in defence of schemes under threat (public and private sector), state pension rights and any future threat to the public sector pension scheme provisions, and to campaign for high quality pensions including affordable final salary schemes in both the public and private sectors. This should include:

- a) an urgent high-profile, public campaign including the regional rallies and the national demonstration
- b) support for the ETUC day of action in September
- c) a national press and publicity campaign to tell the truth on pensions and expose the true cost of tax relief on pensions for the top 1 per cent of earners
- d) co-ordination of union resistance to arbitrary attacks on good quality occupational pension schemes
- e) resisting moves by employers and industry regulators to level down pensions in the private sector
- f) lobbying against current or future moves to raise the state pension age
- g) co-ordination of industrial action where appropriate and to fully support any workers forced to take industrial action in defence of pension rights.

Congress calls on the Government to:

- 1) engage in meaningful negotiation with unions on any changes to public sector pension schemes
- 2) consider the case for reviewing each public sector pension on a scheme-specific basis
- 3) require the private sector to negotiate with unions over workforce and executive pension arrangements
- 4) be transparent about the true cost and impact of pension reforms on individuals and the public finances.

Congress resolves to defend public and private sector pensions against attacks from the coalition Government.

Mover: GMB

Seconder: UNISON

Supporters: National Union of Teachers

Fire Brigades' Union

Educational Institute of Scotland

FDA

National Union of Journalists

Public and Commercial Services Union

Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

Transport Salaried Staffs' Association

NASUWT

Composite 6 Housing

Congress agrees that the provision of decent and affordable housing is a hallmark of any civilised society. Not only does access to a secure home provide warmth and shelter, it is also:

- i. fundamental to the achievement of important social goals, such as tackling poverty and improving health and educational inequalities
- ii. a driver of good jobs, apprenticeships and skills.

Congress notes that following the general election, the coalition Government has abandoned planned increases in the number of affordable homes, scrapped plans to tighten regulation of the private rented sector, and caused untold misery and uncertainty through its vindictive attacks on Housing Benefit recipients. The Conservative Manifesto promised to 'make Britain the most family-friendly country in Europe' yet the House of Commons Library has estimated women represent three-fifths of those directly affected by cuts to housing benefits and will pay 72 per cent of the cost of the Budget changes to taxes, benefits and tax credits.

Congress also notes that reforms to the planning system and prejudice against recipients of Housing Benefit and social housing tenants are being magnified by the coalition's ideological spending cuts. Nearly three-quarters of new housing starts in the 2009-10 financial year were part-funded by the public sector. As such, further cuts now will have major consequences for waiting lists, long-term affordability, new social housing and jobs.

Congress opposes any weakening in the existing section 106 rules, which would result in fewer homes for social rent being built.

Congress is also opposed to the government proposal that council and housing association tenancies be limited to a fixed-term thereby denying long-term security of tenure to future tenants.

Congress calls on the General Council to develop a campaign to oppose the coalition's housing policy, for all social housing tenants to have long-term security of tenure, and to lobby for positive alternatives that highlight the social and economic benefits of building more social and council homes. Congress notes the importance of ensuring that such a campaign facilitates local activity, so that regional TUCs and affiliates can

take part in planned referendums on new developments that threaten to give those who have homes a veto over homes for those who do not.

Mover: UNISON

Seconder: Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians

Supporters: Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers

Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

Composite 7 Climate change

Congress agrees that the overwhelming body of scientific opinion supports the conclusion that climate change is real and significantly attributable to human activity. The Copenhagen climate change summit made clear that a step change in policy is needed to deliver the necessary emissions reductions to curtail dangerous climate change.

Congress further agrees that sustainability not profit should be the determining factor in measuring a successful recovery from the current economic crisis.

As recognised by the Committee on Climate Change, 'a road map to decarbonise the power sector is key to wider economy decarbonisation'. Congress is therefore disappointed that, although making supportive statements, the coalition Government has delayed key decisions that would ensure a secure and balanced low carbon energy supply for the UK. Evidence in the recent TUC/EIUG report revealed uncertain policy frameworks' impact on energy prices and green investment in energy-intensive sectors. Urgent action is needed, including:

- i. reforms to support a stable floor price for carbon
- ii. a regulatory framework that encourages investment in staff and skills as well as infrastructure renewal
- iii. strategic government support to stimulate innovation and UK supply chains
- iv. pursuit of a binding global carbon reduction agreement to prevent carbon leakage.

Congress calls on the General Council to pursue these objectives as part of an active industrial strategy that also prioritises investment in high quality green jobs and skills in energy-intensive industries to increase efficiency and enable a positive contribution to a low-carbon economy.

Congress instructs the General Council to:

- a) seek early meetings with Government ministers to emphasise the need for early progress to decarbonise energy production and to establish an ongoing basis for consultation with relevant unions
- b) lobby for regulatory reform in order to support low carbon investment
- c) press for a more pro-active approach to promote development of skills to support sustainable development
- d) support a campaign for 1 million green jobs that would create employment that delivers in areas of need, i.e. transport, housing and energy and has positive environmental impact.

Mover: Prospect

Seconder: Communication Workers' Union

Supporter: Community

Composite 8 Coal in a balanced energy policy

Congress reaffirms its commitment to a balanced energy policy as a necessary part of the solution to climate change. The commitment of the coalition Government to carbon capture and storage (CCS) is therefore welcome but there is an urgent need for

generating companies to come forward with immediate plans to replace current coal-fired power stations with new CCS plants.

In the absence of any incentive to encourage investment now, the country is at risk of being unable to meet electricity demand as existing plants (both coal and nuclear) close. It is also essential that, if carbon abatement targets are to be met, constraints on carbon emissions apply equally to oil and gas as well as coal. Failure to make immediate progress on these issues will reduce the available market for coal and endanger the survival of the indigenous coal industry, wiping out thousands of skilled well paid jobs. Congress is asked to press the Government on these issues.

Congress recognises that the deep-mined coal industry in Britain plays a major role in our ability to maintain a source of energy supply, which is of benefit to the people. Congress is deeply concerned that the number of British coal mines in production is not sufficient for the coal needed to guarantee the security of supply.

Congress notes that the average age of the workforce in deep mines is increasing and therefore the skills and experience needed to mine coal are in danger of being lost.

Congress is determined that the TUC, through its structure, continues its support for a British coal industry that is environmentally sustainable and agrees to step up support for the existing deep mines in production whilst starting a new campaign to support the development of new coal mines.

Congress asks the General Council to examine ways in which the Government can be encouraged to see the urgency of the situation and to act now to take the steps necessary to secure the skills and access to the coal beneath our feet.

Mover: National Union of Mineworkers

Second: BACM-TEAM

Composite 9 Government transport policy

Congress notes the proposals for transport set out in The Coalition: our programme for government, and £683m cuts to the transport budget. Congress is concerned that these cuts jeopardise improvements to the nation's infrastructure, which have an essential part to play in delivering economic growth and improved productivity as well as making significant contributions to social inclusion and environmental improvements.

Congress notes the Government's commitment to fair pricing for rail travel and making Network Rail more accountable. Congress believes, however, that these objectives are incompatible with the existing model of ownership and regulation that, even by granting longer franchises, put the interests of private operators first.

Congress is concerned that the coalition Government's rail franchising policy review is likely to give train operating companies more control over infrastructure and allow cuts to unprofitable services. Congress is alarmed that the discredited company National Express will continue in the industry following the cancellation of the Greater Anglia and Essex Thameside franchise competitions and despite advice given to the previous Secretary of State for Transport.

Congress recognises that both franchises serve Stratford station, a vital part of the Olympic transport infrastructure, and the projected timescale for their re-letting will result in uncertainty in the months leading up to the Olympics as well as continued profits for the asset-stripping National Express Group.

Congress is alarmed that the Potters Bar coroner has felt compelled to recommend action to address the 'continued risk of other deaths' and yet despite this warning the coalition's Rail Value for Money Review

will further jeopardise rail safety by weakening safety standards and axing even more safety critical jobs.

Congress is critical of train operators and Network Rail who continue to put corporate and personal financial interests ahead of all other interests. The rail industry continues to be characterised by:

- i. excessive executive reward
- ii. continuous attempts to close ticket offices or reduce opening times
- iii. redundancies
- iv. high fares, excessive increases and limited regulation
- v. sharp practices, such as placing more and more restrictions on off-peak travel
- vi. train operating companies' immunity from any real commercial risk.

Congress believes that these problems can only be overcome through an industry with services being run in the interests of passengers, not for private profit. Congress urges the General Council to:

- a) promote and support affiliates in taking forward the policy for a publicly-owned and accountable rail industry run on a not-for-profit basis where profits are reinvested in the industry
- b) extend free public transport to other vulnerable groups and a subsidised fares strategy to encourage modal shift
- c) defend and extend the availability and reliability of public transport
- d) ensure a decent standard of living and working conditions for those working in the public transport industries
- e) urge the Transport Secretary to bring the East Anglia and Essex Thameside franchises back into public ownership in March 2011 to ensure continuity of service before, during and after the 2012 Olympics
- f) call on the Transport Secretary to adhere to the advice given to his predecessor and ensure National Express Group no longer operates in the UK rail industry beyond March 2011.

Mover: Transport Salaried Staffs' Association

Second: Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen

Supporters: National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers

Unite

Composite 10 Defending public services

Congress believes that the 2008 crisis is being used as the pretext for a global onslaught on public provision and welfare entitlements. Congress condemns the emergency Budget, which will result in the loss of over one million jobs and drag the economy into depression, noting that this coincides with austerity programmes being imposed by the IMF and EU and other institutions driving cuts and liberalisation.

Congress rejects the Government's belief that attacks on public services and the most vulnerable in society are a legitimate means by which economic recovery can be secured. Congress rejects the argument that cuts in jobs, public services, pay and pensions are necessary to pay for the national deficit. Congress also rejects the notion that the deficit has to be halved in four years. Congress deplores the coalition Government's demolition of the public services it took years of Labour investment to rebuild. Their 'regressive' Budget shows a blinkered approach to the economic crisis and pushes deficit reduction to a wholly unjustifiable extreme. £44bn of additional cuts per year represents a savage and opportunistic attack on public services, which:

- i. threatens another three-quarters of a million people with the dole
- ii. endangers a private sector heavily reliant on public expenditure on goods and services
- iii. depresses consumer demand across the economy
- iv. brings us to the brink of a double-dip recession.

Congress notes with concern that women, many part-time and low-paid, will bear the brunt of benefit cuts. Women also comprise 65 per cent of the public-sector workforce the coalition is targeting.

Congress notes the forecast of the Government's Office for Budget Responsibility that an additional 100,000 will be added to the unemployment figures as a result of this budget and that the CIPD has forecast that the loss of jobs in the public sector could be as high as 750,000. The two-year pay freeze makes scapegoats of workers who were not responsible for the financial crisis.

The deficit has arisen because the banking sector collapsed sparking a recession. Bailing out the banks cost £1.3tn and the recession hit tax revenues and increased unemployment; it is not because public spending has been out of control.

Congress opposes the attempts by the Government to make ordinary workers and the unemployed bear the brunt of reducing the deficit. The poorest and most vulnerable in society would be disproportionately affected and the economic situation would worsen.

Congress notes the establishment of the Hutton review and opposes any attempt to deal with the national deficit through cuts to public sector pensions.

Congress believes the Government is using the deficit as a thinly-veiled guise to engage in an ideological dismantling of the state and an attack on workers and the most vulnerable in our society, which goes far further than even the dark days of Thatcher. The coalition has no mandate for hard-right economic policies. Without Liberal Democrat connivance the Tories would rightly be voted down in the Commons. The public did not vote for a Tory Government nor policies aimed at destruction of their public services and the dismantling of state education and the NHS. The labour movement has a right to oppose them.

Congress recognises that public investment and expenditure has been vital in propping up employment and demand, as well as providing essential help and support to those struggling with redundancies, reduced incomes, repossessions, and rising joblessness. The cuts now proposed will devastate public services with a consequent decline in living standards for all, particularly women and those in poverty.

Congress notes the vital contribution public expenditure makes to the wider economy through public procurement, which accounts for at least one-third of spending on goods and services across the rest of the economy. Spending cuts will therefore also have a direct impact on private sector employment. Congress recognises that public spending drives growth, which benefits recovery in both the public and private sector.

In addition, Congress condemns the reform agenda being pursued (e.g. the Education Act), which will transform the nature of public services away from universal provision for all, towards segregated and differential provision. The austerity agenda will further weaken public services by opening up new areas of public service to outsourcing and privatisation.

Congress further notes the introduction of regressive tax measures as opposed to revenue-raising, progressive taxation measures and is concerned that this economic strategy will result in a double dip recession. Similar measures of austerity in Canada in the 1990s also led to a widening of inequalities.

Congress believes there is an alternative: collection of the taxes avoided, evaded and uncollected from

wealthy individuals and companies, which account for £123bn, and more, not less, investment in public services.

Congress sends solidarity to our comrades in Greece, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, Italy and elsewhere who are fighting the cuts and agrees there is an urgent need to establish a similarly wide-ranging united front of resistance against the attacks being carried out in the UK.

Congress calls on:

- a) the Government to consult the General Council regarding the comprehensive spending review
- b) the General Council to lead a co-ordinated campaign across the labour movement with other working class organisations and local communities for progressive means of ensuring the recovery and improving the public finances.

Congress resolves that all TUC affiliates will urgently work together to build a broad solidarity alliance of unions and communities under threat and organise a national demonstration, lobby of Parliament and national days of protest against the government austerity measures. Congress calls upon the General Council to:

1. reject cuts and privatisation and call for innovative public services funded through a progressive taxation agenda, including a 'Robin Hood Tax' on the banks and financial institutions to ensure that they clean up the mess they created, make an appropriate contribution to meeting the cost of their recklessness and act with more responsibility in the future
2. demand fair pay, pensions and equality of treatment and defend the terms and conditions in national agreements that provide equality-proofed pay systems
3. defend public services from measures that will increase inequality
4. consider convening a Convention of affiliates and representatives of users of publicly-funded services and the welfare state to establish a broad alliance against the cuts and maximise the impact of such opposition campaigns
5. publicise the recklessness and illegitimacy of the coalition's austerity programme
6. mobilise maximum opposition to these proposals, including support for ETUC action on 29 September and for continued campaigning at local, regional and national level and fully involve trades union councils in mobilising for these events
7. build a robust campaign in defence of public services, seeking to publicise and build this fight across the labour movement and local communities as a whole
8. support and co-ordinate campaigning and joint union industrial action, nationally and locally, in opposition to attacks on jobs, pensions, pay or public services
9. oppose the unacceptable inequalities within our society, taking every possible step to fight for social justice including defence of the jobs, pay and pensions of public service workers
10. further develop the arguments against these policies through research and the production of pamphlets and other materials
11. present a clear alternative to the cuts, including public ownership, higher rates of tax for the rich and closing corporate tax loopholes
12. co-ordinate a national union recruitment campaign in the national media to highlight what trade unions have to offer.

Congress further calls on the General Council to pursue these policies with the STUC, WTUC and ICTU, and internationally.

Mover: UNISON

Secunder: Unite

Supporters: GMB

Public and Commercial Services Union

National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers

Fire Brigades' Union

NASUWT

Prospect

Communication Workers' Union

Composite 11 The NHS

The NHS is facing huge challenges in delivering high quality patient care in the current climate. These include:

- i. pressure to make massive efficiency savings
- ii. false distinctions between 'frontline' and 'non-frontline' jobs
- iii. further radical restructuring of NHS organisations
- iv. even greater stress on competition, risking fragmentation of services and the NHS becoming simply a provider of services that no-one else wants to take on
- v. loss of clinical expertise as posts are cut or downgraded
- vi. weakening of staff morale and flexibility as national terms and conditions of employment, including pensions, are eroded.

Congress recognises that 'no change' is not an option. The NHS has to respond to an ageing population, the rising demand for new drugs and technologies, and the public health impact of obesity, problem drinking and lack of exercise. NHS staff are ready to meet this challenge but cannot do so without proper involvement in the planning of services, sustained investment, and much more emphasis on health promotion.

Congress condemns the White Paper, Liberating the NHS, altering irrevocably our public NHS by opening it up to privatisation through EU and international competition law and prioritising cash customers rather than NHS patients. The White Paper heralds the biggest 're-disorganisation' in NHS history, introduced at frightening speed. Congress is appalled by the anti-manager rhetoric accompanying these proposals, which nevertheless rely on managers and other healthcare staff to implement the changes while finding huge savings, including in management costs.

Congress calls on the General Council to:

- a) monitor the impact of key health policy decisions in terms of both equity and the fundamental long-term future of the NHS
- b) support the health unions in trying to protect NHS services - making the link between quality employment, quality staff engagement, quality teamwork and quality services
- c) use the NHS Together campaign, if and when necessary, as a means of showing public support for the NHS
- d) give TUC backing to on-going campaigns to promote good health
- e) challenge proposals legislatively, and by working with patient and campaigning organisations.

Mover: Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

Secunder: UNISON

Supporter: FDA

Composite 12 Academies, free schools and state education

Congress strongly supports the General Council's continued opposition to the fragmentation, centralisation and privatisation of state education, and in particular to academies, trust schools and 'free schools' as another variant of privately-managed but taxpayer-funded schools. Congress also deplores the privatisation of local authority education departments, which provide vital services to schools across their local area and ensure that all schools are supported according to their specific needs.

Congress reiterates its support for a state-funded, publically-managed and democratically accountable education system. Congress rejects the coalition Government's academies legislation, believing that such a policy will widen the gap between rich and poor, fuel inequity of entitlement to high quality education and fundamentally undermine local communities' involvement in their schools.

Congress believes further that the planning of school provision should be returned to local authorities, which should also have control over schools' admissions criteria, the employment of school staff and the use and disposal of school land and buildings.

Congress recognises that a majority of the public opposes the removal of schools from the maintained sector and supports the principle of a good local school for every child.

Congress notes that academies are drawing money away from further education colleges. One college has lost £500,000 because of the creation of a new academy. New 'technical academies' will also divert money away from FE colleges, reintroducing selection at fourteen and creating a two-tier system.

Congress further believes that the governance of schools should be by, and on behalf of, school communities with the full involvement of parents, local community representatives, staff and local authorities.

Congress welcomes the joint campaign of affiliates in pursuit of the defence of state education. Congress believes that this joint campaign, with education staff, governors, parents and communities working in co-operation with other educational organisations such as the National Governors Association and the Anti-Academies Alliance, is crucial in building a broad public consensus against the privatisation of our schools and colleges. Congress welcomes the inclusion of school privatisation policies in TUC events aimed at defending public services.

Congress instructs the General Council to:

- i. intensify the campaign in defence of public services and in particular of state education
- ii. oppose the coalition Government's plans for academies and to campaign for all schools to remain within the maintained sector
- iii. oppose cuts to the Building Schools for the Future programme and further education funding
- iv. lobby the Government to re-integrate academies and trust schools into the state maintained system and to put an immediate stop to the controversial initiative of allowing the setting up of 'free schools'
- v. lobby the Charities Commission to ensure that organisations such as the New Schools Network, which have overtly political aims, are not granted charitable status
- vi. support unions taking action where academies undermine the pay and conditions of their staff
- vii. keep affiliates informed, through briefings, guidance and other documents, on the latest government developments
- viii. establish a campaigning group within the TUC both to oppose government moves to break up the maintained school system and to put forward the

General Council's vision for comprehensive education in the 21st century.

Mover: National Union of Teachers

Seconders: Association of Teachers and Lecturers

Supporter: University and College Union

Composite 13 Defending further and higher education

Congress notes:

- i. the coalition Government's unprecedented attack on public sector pay, jobs and pensions with £1.2bn cuts to higher education (HE) and £200m cuts to adult learning (AL) already announced, and substantial further cuts to come to the HE, further education (FE) and AL budgets in the comprehensive spending review, increasing the threat of privatisation in the sector
- ii. the central importance of FE, HE and AL to the prosperity of our society and economy
- iii. for every job lost in the sector, another job is lost in the economy
- iv. over 200,000 people look set to miss out on a university place this year and up to 70 per cent of FE colleges are being forced to axe courses
- v. the level of student debt, a huge burden on many students and a disincentive to students from poorer backgrounds.

In the face of continuing attacks on the funding, quality and accessibility of our public education service, Congress reaffirms its commitment to:

- a) fair and affordable access to high-quality, publicly-funded post-16 education for students from all backgrounds with a fair contribution from business
- b) total opposition to raising the cap on student tuition fees
- c) a properly remunerated, valued and respected workforce in all areas of post-16 education
- d) a contribution from a fairer tax regime that precludes further demands on the less well-off.

Congress notes that the continuing pressure on FE corporations from funding cuts has resulted in large numbers of redundancies, more restructuring and pressure for a pay freeze. However, Congress is alarmed that despite such problems the sector has spent considerable sums on consultants.

Congress believes much of this expenditure should itself have been provided by government rather than leaving colleges to spend in this way when loyal staff are losing their jobs; and while salaries fall further behind those working in schools and universities.

Accordingly, Congress calls on the General Council to:

1. raise public awareness of the high cost of consultants in FE
2. press FE colleges to dramatically cut such expenditure with immediate effect and divert subsequent savings towards protecting pay and jobs

And calls on the General Council to promote:

- A. a co-ordinated campaign to defend post-school education amongst affiliates and the general public and in particular raise awareness of the negative impact of widespread job losses in FE and elsewhere in post-16 education
- B. the central role of FE, HE and AL in delivering improved outcomes from the health and social care workforce for the public, and the considerable contribution that individuals make to the economic wealth of the UK
- C. the contribution made by FE colleges to post-16 education and the economic recovery of the nation
- D. the joint national education unions' campaign to oppose raising the cap on student tuition fees in HE,

including the UCU and NUS mass national mobilisation of students and staff in November

E. a fair contribution from business through tax, to preclude further demands being placed on families, students and communities.

Mover: University and College Union

Seconders: Association for College Management

**Supporters: Association of Teachers and Lecturers
Society of Radiographers**

Composite 14 Graduate unemployment

Congress notes with concern the increase in graduate unemployment in the United Kingdom as a consequence of the economic recession, which is continuing to affect both the private and public sectors. In November 2009 graduate unemployment increased by 44 per cent, and now 59 per cent of all graduates are not working in a field or profession related to the subject matter of their degrees. This is despite evidence of skill shortages, e.g. in science and engineering disciplines, and it will hold back progress in tackling women's under-representation.

Congress is also concerned that future cuts in public spending will only exacerbate the problems associated with graduate unemployment, which could result in a 'lost' generation of disillusioned young people saddled with debt and unable to secure employment that utilises the skills and knowledge base gained through their time in higher education. Graduates in regions outside London are likely to be hardest hit.

Congress fears that increasing graduate unemployment will also lead to many graduates seeking employment abroad because of the lack of support for employers to establish new graduate employment opportunities. This is particularly serious for the health and social care sectors of public service where UK graduates are sought after abroad.

Congress therefore calls on the Government to offer concrete help, support and assistance to graduates looking for work and to ensure that the continuing high level of unemployment is tackled as a matter of urgency. Congress calls on the TUC to prioritise initiatives to recruit graduates when they do start work.

In addition, the effects of the recession and the reductions in government spending must not be used as an excuse for cutting back on university places when, in fact, the need for high level skills during the recovery could scarcely be greater.

Mover: The Educational Institute of Scotland

Seconders: Prospect

Supporter: Society of Radiographers

Composite 15 Criminal justice

Congress welcomes a review by the coalition Government into sentencing and rehabilitation within the criminal justice system within England and Wales.

However, in order for that review to have credibility and the confidence of the public, it must be a root and branch review that looks at the causes of crimes such as alcohol abuse, drugs, mental illness and social exclusion, and must not focus solely on the costs of sentencing and rehabilitation and the passing of responsibility to resolve social problems to the private sector, whose main purpose is to satisfy shareholders.

Congress rejects the notion of 'payment by results' set out as part of the coalition Government's criminal justice agenda. In a major speech on sentencing reform in June, the Justice Secretary acknowledged the unacceptable growth in the prison population - almost doubled in 16 years - and supported the increased use of community sentences. However, he made no

reference in his speech to the Probation Service, the lynchpin of community-based supervision, and failed to acknowledge its key role in protecting communities and rehabilitating those who commit crime.

The coalition Government's commitment in its policy programme to a rehabilitation 'revolution' is a return to a previous privatisation agenda that will undermine the work of the Probation Service as it struggles to deal with threatened cuts to its budget. The concept of paying by results is a nonsensical and sinister element of this plan and undermines the primary purpose of the justice system to act fairly and impartially, free from external influence. Introducing a profit motive to the dispensation of justice threatens the professional integrity of the Probation Service, the job security of its highly trained and skilled staff and the appropriate delivery of its interventions to the diverse communities it serves.

Congress supports the work of Probation staff and totally rejects the introduction of a profit motive. It will support the Probation trade unions in any action taken to maintain the Probation Service as a properly resourced and trained public sector justice organisation.

Mover: POA

Seconder: napo

Composite 16 Health and safety at work

Improving workplace health and safety is a priority for all unions. Congress is concerned that the current economic climate and resulting cutbacks by employers are leading to workers putting their health and safety at risk. Congress reaffirms its belief that effective health and safety policies and practices are even more essential at a time when thousands of people each year are killed or seriously injured in UK workplaces.

Congress notes that in 2008-09, according to HSE figures that are seen as an underestimate of actual accidents at work:

- i. 1.2 million working people were suffering from an illness they believed was caused or made worse by their current or past work
- ii. 180 workers were killed at work and these figures do not include deaths in work-related traffic accidents, at sea or by occupational illness
- iii. 131,895 other injuries to employees were reported under the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations (RIDDOR)
- iv. 246,000 reported injuries occurred
- v. 29.3 million days were lost overall, 24.6 million due to work-related ill-health and 4.7 million due to workplace injury.

CSP research also shows that one in four people in the UK regularly work all day without taking a break because they have too much work to do or there are too few members of staff. An estimated 9.3 million working days are lost each year through musculoskeletal disorders caused or made worse by work, and 11.4 million due to stress or depression. This costs the economy over £35bn. Last year alone around 1,180 people were fatally injured at work or in work-related road incidents, and agriculture remains one of the most dangerous industries in which to work.

Congress is appalled that the coalition Government intends to put profit before the health and safety of workers and the public and is deeply dismayed by suggestions that health and safety legislation might be disappplied from some groups of workers, thereby creating a two-tier approach to health and safety in which the lives of some groups of workers are more expendable than others. Congress rejects the argument that the safety of the public is compromised by health and safety provision for emergency service workers. The safety of the public is best protected in relation to

emergency incidents by ensuring that emergency services are fully resourced in relation to training, equipment and staffing levels and opposes the exclusion of the emergency services from health and safety.

Congress opposes deregulation in the health and safety sector. Indeed there is a strong case for tighter regulation and more resources in this area, with more inspectors carrying out more inspections. Congress is particularly concerned that cuts implemented as part of the forthcoming spending review will further diminish already stretched HSE resources. It is essential to ensure a firm and consistent approach to enforcement, supported by adequate resourcing for HSE and related inspectorates.

Congress asserts that an unequivocal priority of the Government and employers must be protecting all workers from accidents, assaults and abuse and is alarmed and deeply opposed to the Conservative Party policy of introducing self-regulation into safety, where companies could purchase a private safety audit, barring Health and Safety Executive inspectors from a company's sites, unless an emergency occurred.

Congress notes the Government's review of health and safety and alleged compensation culture, led by Lord Young of Graffham. Congress is concerned that the review is predicated on ill-informed perceptions of health and safety regulation and is being pursued with unnecessary haste and insufficient transparency and, in Lord Young's hands, millions more workers, children and adults would be condemned to serial exploitation and abuse. Congress is concerned that Lord Young's review of health and safety legislation could result in a weakening of the laws protecting people at work in the name of reducing 'red tape' and burdens on business and is also concerned that the review's 'independence' is politically driven by right-wing interest groups. Congress condemns the deeply insulting comments by Lord Young to the Times that 'people occasionally get killed, it's unfortunate but it's part of life'. Congress asserts that the antiquated and demeaning views expressed by Lord Young are a throwback to the past and are unacceptable for the Government's chief health and safety advisor.

Congress is also concerned that the Task Force on Farming Regulation could have adverse implications for workers' health and safety.

The Government has also proposed limiting the application of the Working Time Directive despite the UK's long working hours already causing stress, injuries and other illnesses.

Congress notes that prompt access to NHS services such as physiotherapy helps prevent long-term problems developing, allowing workers to return to work more quickly and reducing numbers forced to claim benefit support. Occupational health services also have a vital role to play in preventing health risks and supporting workers affected, but are becoming easy targets for cutbacks despite Dame Carol Black's report Working for a Healthier Tomorrow, which called on employers to play a more pro-active role.

Congress rejects the claim of a compensation culture in health and safety. Furthermore Congress agrees that employers who are guilty of infringements of health and safety legislation should also pay the full cost of NHS treatment and rehabilitation.

Congress believes it is essential to ensure professionalism of health and safety professionals, including minimum standards to practise and advise on health and safety.

Congress calls on the General Council to:

- a) campaign to ensure that workers' protection is not compromised by the Young review
- b) ensure proper consultation with unions and other stakeholders before any changes are implemented

- c) co-ordinate opposition to any watering-down of and deregulation in the health and safety sector and to campaign vigorously against any attack on health and safety standards
- d) highlight the benefits to the economy of safe working practices that promote good health for employees, underpinned by decent legal standards and rapid access to treatment where needed
- e) campaign to ensure that working hours of all workers are reduced to a safe level.

Congress calls on the coalition Government to:

- 1) subject Lord Young's review of health and safety and compensation to evidential evaluation
- 2) work with the TUC, HSE and businesses to ensure that existing health and safety law is implemented and enforced appropriately
- 3) confirm its commitment to Workers' Memorial Day on 28 April 2011
- 4) implement all European health and safety directives in full.

Mover: NASUWT

Secunder: Prospect

Supporters: The Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

Bakers, Food and Allied Workers' Union Community

National Union of Teachers

Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians

Fire Brigades' Union

Transport Salaried Staffs' Association

Composite 17 International asbestos ban

Congress notes that while asbestos has been banned in many developed countries, it is still commonly used in the developing world and in many of these countries its use is increasing.

Congress further notes that Russia and Canada remain two of the largest exporters of asbestos; however, in recent years the asbestos industry has transferred much of its production from fully developed nations to countries such as Brazil, India, Indonesia and Pakistan. There has also been a growth in asbestos products being exported to developing countries including Angola, Argentina, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Thailand and Uruguay.

Congress welcomes the demonstration that took place outside Canada House on 1 July 2010 (Canada Day) in protest at that country's leading role in the asbestos trade.

Workers in developing nations are at particular risk of death after being exposed to asbestos due to a lack of regulation, with workers remaining untrained, not warned about the dangers of asbestos, and not provided with protective equipment.

Congress calls on the General Council to campaign for a complete and total global ban on asbestos; this campaign to include lobbying of national and international institutions and the consideration of calling for international and bilateral trade penalties to be imposed on countries that continue to export asbestos or that are involved in its production.

Mover: Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians

Secunder: Association of Teachers and Lecturers

Composite 18 Palestine

Congress condemns the Israeli blockades of the Palestinian territories, particularly the Gaza strip where

there is a severe and ongoing deterioration in the living conditions of those living there.

The actions of the Israeli military, under the orders of their Government, in mounting a deadly assault on activists on the Mavi Marmara and other ships seeking to take humanitarian aid to Gaza, is particularly condemned.

Congress furthermore condemns the Histadrut statement of 31 May which sought to justify the Israeli action and the failure of the Histadrut to condemn settlement construction. Congress endorses the 3 June 2010 statement of the Palestine General Federation of Trade Unions, criticising the Histadrut and calling for an immediate end to the military blockade on Gaza and for a full independent inquiry into the attack on the Mavi Marmara.

Congress believes that the effective annexation of massive swathes of land by Israel in defiance of international law, using walls and checkpoints and destroying Palestinian homes in the process, is a deliberate strategy to undermine the viability of the West Bank and thereby the potential for an independent Palestinian state.

Congress calls on the UK Government and the EU to take much stronger political steps to ensure Israel abides by UN resolutions.

Congress instructs the General Council to work closely with the Palestine Solidarity Campaign to actively encourage affiliates, employers and pension funds to disinvest from, and boycott the goods of, companies who profit from illegal settlements, the Occupation and the construction of the Wall.

Congress instructs the General Council to bring to Congress a report on the impact of the boycott and investment withdrawal strategy, together with the outcome of the PGFTU/Histadrut discussions recently facilitated by the ITUC and TUC. Congress agrees to join unions around the world for maximum coordination internationally for active solidarity to end the siege of Gaza and for a free Palestine.

Mover: Transport Salaried Staffs' Association

Secunder: GMB

Supporters: UNISON

Public and Commercial Services Union

Fire Brigades' Union

Emergency 1 Trapped Chilean miners

Congress expresses solidarity with the 33 workers trapped underground in the San José mine, Chile, since 5 August 2010 and hopes for a safe return to the surface to be re-united with their families and friends.

Congress congratulates the humanity and solidarity shown by wanting to rescue the miners. They have not spared any efforts to bring them out alive and are doing everything they can to try to rescue them as quickly as possible, which is not always the case.

Congress supports the calls for the Chilean government to ratify the International Labour Organisation Convention 176, on Safety and Health in Mines, and reiterates the call for the UK to do the same.

Mover: National Union of Mineworkers

Emergency 2 Royal Mail

On Friday 10 September, the Government published an updated report by Richard Hooper on the Postal Services Sector. This report argues for the privatisation and break-up of Royal Mail in line with the previously stated policy of the coalition Government.

Congress therefore agrees:

- i. that the report is neither independent of Government policy, nor representative of the needs of Royal Mail customers and staff

- ii. that the modernisation of Royal Mail is most efficiently carried through as a wholly publicly-owned service
- iii. to support the Keep the Post Public Campaign initiated by the CWU.

Mover: Communication Workers' Union

Secunder: Unite

Emergency 3 Industrial action against cuts on London Underground

Congress salutes the brave action of members of RMT and TSSA in striking on 6 and 7 September 2010 in defence of jobs and safety against a politically driven, cost-cutting exercise that threatens 800 jobs on London Underground.

Congress welcomes the prompt support for the industrial action by the TUC and agrees the cuts will mean a more hostile environment for passengers travelling on the Underground as well as impacting adversely on the safety of passengers and staff and discriminating against those who have a disability.

Congress condemns the cynical opportunism of London Mayor Boris Johnson who, having been elected in 2008 on a platform opposing cuts in booking office opening hours on the Tube, is now proposing even deeper cuts.

Congress welcomes the broad opposition to the cuts including cross-party opposition from London MPs, the majority of London Assembly Members, the former Mayor of London and passenger groups.

Congress condemns the walk out by Tory members of the London Assembly on 8 September rendering the Assembly inoperative and preventing a motion opposing the cuts being passed.

Congress sees the London Underground cuts as another forerunner for additional cuts to come in October when the coalition government delivers its spending review. Congress therefore requests that the General Council assists in leading a broad coalition of unions, community groups and service users in the campaign against such cuts and resolves to continue supporting the rail unions in their dispute with London Underground.

Mover: Transport Salaried Staffs' Association

Secunder: National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers

Emergency 4 Bangladeshi garment workers

Congress gives its full support for the 3.5 million Bangladeshi garment workers struggle for a 5,000 Taka minimum wage. The Bangladeshi garment workers are the lowest paid workers in the global economy. Eighty per cent of these workers are young women.

Congress calls for the immediate release from prison of the Garment Workers Trade Union leaders in Bangladesh.

Congress recognises the plight of governments against powerful global companies that can threaten both their economy and political stability. However, these governments must make harsh choices and recognise that the correct alliance is with their workers, their trade unions and the global trade union movement to reign in the power of the global companies. Congress condemns the use of state forces to break the struggle and to harass, beat and threaten workers and their union leaders.

Congress reiterates its demands for genuine democratic trade unions throughout the world to collectively bargain with employers.

Congress calls on affiliates to raise the struggle of the garment workers with their members and where they have collective bargaining arrangements with employers that produce and retail goods from

Bangladesh. In conjunction with our international partners, maximum leverage must be applied to EU and North American companies like WalMart, ASDA, Tesco, H&M and Marks and Spencer to demand their suppliers pay the 5,000 Taka minimum wage.

Congress will work with affiliates and global partners to raise the rights of the Bangladeshi garment workers with political leaders in the UK, the EU, North America and Bangladesh.

Mover: Unite

Secunder: GMB

Emergency 5 Connaught

Congress is extremely concerned by the 8 September 2010 announcement that Connaught and its subsidiary Connaught Partnerships have been placed into administration.

Congress notes the appointment of KPMG as administrators, and further notes this is the biggest corporate failure since Woolworth went into administration.

Congress is alarmed that Connaught workers have been left without information about their future, while others have been dismissed by conference call or text.

Congress believes that reasons for the collapse of Connaught include the immediate impact of the ConDem cuts in public sector budgets, that the stipulations of Best Value were ignored and that Connaught often secured contracts by undercutting rival bids.

Congress recognises that Connaught workers are suffering severe insecurity but also recognises the wider impact of the collapse of Connaught, as many companies in the Connaught supply chain will start to cut jobs.

Congress agrees that the public sector should be the preferred option for the provision of public services and that as an initial priority all Connaught contracts should be brought in-house to ensure consistency of employment and delivery of quality services.

Congress instructs the General Council to:

- i. offer support to all Connaught workers
- ii. engage with the Government to secure the long-term employment of Connaught workers
- iii. oppose the practice of awarding contracts based purely on price
- iv. oppose future outsourcing in public services
- v. campaign to bring back in-house the service provision from any future failures of private sector contractors in the provision of local government services.

Mover: Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians

Secunder: GMB

Supporters: UNISON

Unite

Emergency 6 26,000 redundancy notices at Birmingham City Council

Congress is disgusted by the statement by Stephen Hughes, leader of the Conservative-Lib Dem Birmingham City Council, in the Birmingham Post on 13 September 2010, that the council has issued 26,000 redundancy notices to its staff.

The redundancy notices are to force staff to accept detrimental changes to their contracts of employment and if they do not they will, according to Mr Hughes, be 'fired with three months' pay' and 'without compensation'.

Mr Hughes, on a £220,000 salary, shows that he holds his employees in complete contempt. He is not fit to serve the people of Birmingham and should withdraw all redundancy threats against our members immediately or resign.

Mover: GMB

Seconder: UNISON

Supporters: UCATT

Unite

Part 2

Motion remitted

61 Reforming Ofsted

Congress supports the widespread criticism of Ofsted by some unions representing staff in the family courts and education. The effect of its inspection regime has been to diminish the quality of work with children. By concentrating on specific aspects of this work, it has had the effect of shifting the focus away from a holistic approach to children's care and education.

Furthermore, a disproportionate amount of time is spent on records, data and plans so that Ofsted may more easily inspect them.

Congress rejects Ofsted's claims that criticism of its work comes from 'vested interests' such as trade unions, acknowledging that it is the best interests of children which is central to the concerns expressed.

The coalition Government has expressed concern about the inspection services provided by Ofsted. The Children's Minister, Tim Loughton, has said that a radical reform of Ofsted would lead to a very significant reduction in bureaucracy in work with children. This point has also been highlighted in recent reports published by Lord Laming and the Social Work Taskforce.

In Cafcass (the Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service), as in teaching, Ofsted inspections have fostered an oppressive culture in some workplaces. As a result many staff have felt demoralised and de-skilled.

Congress calls on the Government to set up an urgent review of Ofsted with a view to radically reforming the inspection framework. Such a reorganisation should ensure that staff are supported and encouraged in their professional development, thus improving services to children.

napo

Part 3

General Council statement

Congress adopted the following statement:

The economy, public spending and public services

The UK's economy and society is in great danger. The new Government's reckless policy of rapid deficit reduction through unprecedented cuts to public services, procurement and investment not only poses a grave risk to the recovery but will irreparably damage our social fabric.

Ministers tell us that there is no alternative. But expert economists both here and abroad warn that government policies could well make the deficit worse by limiting growth or even causing a double-dip recession. The cuts are not a fiscal necessity, but a highly political and economically dangerous project to fundamentally reshape our country by permanently reducing the scale and scope of government.

In this statement the TUC General Council:

- sets out why we think these policies will risk the recovery, increase inequality and threaten social cohesion
- argues for an alternative approach to deficit reduction that will safeguard services, jobs and growth and make the UK a fairer and more sustainable society
- calls for a great national campaign against the cuts that will galvanise opposition through both community organising at grass-roots level and well-planned national initiatives including a rally and lobby of parliament in October and national demonstration next March.

The economy and jobs

In the wake of the financial crisis caused by greed and irresponsible speculation in the financial system, the prospects for the UK economy are still deeply worrying. While the UK pulled out of recession at some speed, the latest indicators suggest that this may prove a short-lived respite. With mounting concern that growth in the Eurozone could be slowing and growing worries about the US economy, the UK economy will be under real pressure in 2011.

The severe public spending cuts in the Emergency Budget will inevitably constrain growth, and some think could even push us back into recession. Confidence among business and consumers is already low, driven by the fear of prolonged austerity.

But there is worse to come. October's Comprehensive Spending Review and a probable Autumn Statement pose further threats to recovery. The Government will start to withdraw £32bn from the economy in tax rises and spending cuts from April 2011, on top of the £8.9bn already taken out this financial year. These cuts will not only directly affect economic activity, but further undermine confidence.

The great danger is higher unemployment. In recent months unemployment has levelled out. Although it rose sharply in the first half of 2009, it never reached the peak hit in previous recessions. Action taken by the previous government helped. Crucially, employers and unions worked to avoid job losses and keep skilled workforces together through the downturn.

Firms have not started to hire again in any significant numbers. Unemployment is stuck at around two and a half million, with young people particularly badly hit. Previous recessions show that it can take a very long

time for joblessness to fall even when recovery is secure.

There is therefore scant prospect that the private sector will now create the new jobs needed. Falling confidence suggests a stagnant labour market and at best a jobless recovery. But the prospect of further deep public spending cuts makes even this look like an optimistic scenario, as both public sector staff and employees in the many companies that depend on the public sector for orders lose their jobs.

We cannot yet know exactly how many public servants or private sector employees will lose their jobs as a direct result of cuts but the Office for Budget Responsibility estimates that 490,000 jobs could be lost while leaked Treasury documents suggest the figure could rise as high as 600,000 with as many as a further 700,000 job losses in the private sector.

In turn this will have knock-on effects across the private sector as the newly unemployed stop spending, and even those still in work - but who fear they soon won't be - save for an uncertain future.

The Office for Budget Responsibility claim that a growing private sector will be able to absorb these job losses over the next five years. But TUC research shows that even under conditions of high growth and confidence it has taken much longer to generate the two million jobs needed after past recessions¹. And of course we can expect neither high levels of growth or confidence as the cuts bite.

Making hundreds of thousands of public servants redundant at any time would cause great distress and inevitably harm services. To do so with severely reduced redundancy terms for many and at a time when there is little or no chance of finding private sector employment is callous. It will not only exact a high price from those workers and their families but is likely to do serious long-term damage to the social and economic fabric of many communities in the UK as did the economic policies of the 1980s. It is particularly unjust that the damage done to the public finances by the banking system will now be paid for by hundreds of thousands of public servants and private sector workers who bear no blame for the crisis despite the Government's attempts to shift responsibility away from the City.

Deficit reduction, fairness and public services

The Government claim that the cuts will reduce inefficiency and protect the vulnerable, rather than reduce service quality and make society more unequal.

We recognise that any new government will inevitably want to change its priorities, and unions do not oppose negotiated change or genuine efficiency savings. We welcome the decision to scrap ID cards, fewer top-down targets and greater scrutiny of the use of consultants. Plans to replace Trident should also be publicly reassessed as part of the defence review, taking into account the cost of replacement and the knock on effects of that spending on jobs in other parts of the public sector, its utility as a defensive weapon, and also the employment and skill needs of the shipbuilding, engineering and other affected industries and staff in the MoD itself.

There should be a continuous process of improvement across the public sector - including a search for economies and better efficiency - that draws on the knowledge and experience of staff. But this process is made harder when cuts and service reductions are spun as efficiency savings, rather than accurately described as cuts. And it is dishonest to suggest that such savings can plug more than a small proportion of the deficit on the timetable the government has set.

Nor are unions opposed to reform of public services. But the aim should be to make them better serve the public. The TUC will continue to press government to

put public sector workers, unions and service users at the heart of public service reform. The government's top down and ideologically motivated approach to reform and spending cuts risks not just demoralising and de-motivating staff, but fundamentally reducing the quality and coverage of public service.

Major spending cuts cannot be delivered in a fair or 'progressive' fashion. The simple fact is that public services, benefits and tax credits are used far more extensively by those on middle and low incomes than those higher up the income scale.

Market economies deliver economic growth, but left to themselves drive inequality and fail to secure long-term conditions for growth such as a skilled healthy workforce, proper infrastructure and a sustainable environment. This is why public investment, regulation, public services, wealth redistribution and a welfare state have all developed in successful economies.

Deep cuts to public services, benefits and tax credits are bound to have more impact on those with low incomes. Two separate analyses of the Emergency Budget by the Institute for Fiscal Studies confirm this².

Women, disabled people and those from black and minority ethnic communities are likely to be among the biggest victims of the cuts and the greater inequality they will bring. We are deeply concerned at suggestions that ministers are failing to fulfil their legal duties to carry out full equality impact assessments. These must be prepared in advance of, and published alongside, the Comprehensive Spending Review, where appropriate using the protocol drawn up by the Public Services Forum, which brings together unions, employers, government officials and is chaired by a government minister³.

Unlike cuts, tax increases need not bear down on those least able to afford them, and can reduce inequality across society as a whole. But the Government will use tax increases to fund just 20 per cent of their measures to close the deficit and has chosen the UK's most regressive tax, VAT, to do most of this work. A fair tax system that asks those that gained the most from the boom years to pay a proper part in mending the damage the crash has done to the public finances has not figured on the new Government's agenda.

For these reasons, a group of charities and the TUC are calling on the coalition Government to commit to a Fairness Test on any tax rises or spending cuts they introduce. The Fairness Test would be developed by the Treasury, and would ensure that decisions taken to reduce the deficit do not unfairly impact on the poorest in society.

Ministers say that the private sector can deliver better public services for less money. This is not borne out by experience. Many studies show that private sector firms have no better record in delivering services than the public sector⁴. Our experience is that outsourcing often leads to a poorer service delivered by badly paid, poorly trained and low morale staff. The danger is that we rerun the 1980s when compulsory competitive tendering caused a very significant decline in service quality.

Major redundancies, a public sector pay freeze at a time of rising prices and large-scale reorganisations in many services, particularly the National Health Service, will seriously damage morale amongst public sector workers. At least one survey⁵ has already found managers reporting declining morale at the prospect of cuts and the Audit Commission⁶ has concluded that redundancies will lead to a loss of skills and knowledge that will damage service delivery.

Moreover the Hutton review of public service pensions has called into question the new Government's commitment to the pensions promises made to millions of public servants. The unilateral Government announcement of the change from RPI to CPI indexing

of pensions, potentially significantly cutting pensions entitlements going forward, was a further major blow.

Real terms pay cuts, privatisation and restructuring, job cuts and threats to pensions all add up to a volatile cocktail that could give rise to difficult and damaging disputes, and the TUC stands ready to support and coordinate union action where members decide that industrial action is necessary to defend services and those who deliver them, and we condemn those calling for Government to limit trade union rights guaranteed by the ILO and in every human rights declaration.

Rethinking deficit reduction

The new Government has adopted a deficit reduction programme that is both deeply unfair and economically dangerous - unfair because it makes those who can least afford it bear the pain, and dangerous because it may well choke off recovery. This is morally and economically wrong.

It is also likely to do little to address the problems facing the public finances. The Government claims that countries such as Sweden and Canada were able to implement major austerity packages and enjoy a falling deficit and a growing economy simultaneously. However, a recent study⁷ of twenty-six separate austerity packages over the last thirty years concluded that:

'When countries cut in a slump, it often results in lower growth and/or higher debt-to-GDP ratios. In very few circumstances are countries able to successfully cut during a slump.'

Ireland, which embarked on deep austerity measures a year and a half ago, has continued to suffer from a sluggish economy. Its credit rating has been subsequently downgraded by all three major agencies with the latest downgrade occurring as recently as August 2010.

This does not mean the UK deficit can be ignored. Even though the UK's debt is among the most long-dated among major economies it still costs money to service. It is right to reduce the deficit or longer-term debt when the economy is doing well as that provides room for much more manoeuvre when the next downturn occurs.

The country does not face a simple choice between ignoring the deficit and adopting the Government's approach. There is an alternative based on a more sensible time scale, much more flexibility and a much greater emphasis on closing the fiscal gap with fairer taxes and the proceeds of growth. We would urge the Government to adopt an approach based on the following:

A timely and steady reduction

The deficit can and should be reduced over a longer time frame. Plans to completely eliminate the current budget deficit by April 2016 imply spending reductions of £99bn and tax rises of £29bn. Such levels are not only entirely unprecedented, but extremely optimistic as the austerity will inevitably depress the economy and lead to a lower tax take.

A longer time scale allows a greater opportunity for economic growth to play a much more significant role in shrinking the deficit, as growth will increase tax income and reduce spending on unemployment and the social effects of the downturn. A slower timetable is a more certain timetable, as it avoids the dangers of so depressing the economy that the deficit gets worse.

The speculative bubble that crashed with such damaging effects was created over decades. It is both wrong and unrealistic to expect the effects of such a damaging episode to have been reversed on the Government's rapid time scale.

It is far from clear how much of the deficit is cyclical - simply due to the economic downturn - and how much

is structural: that part that would remain even when the economy has fully recovered and is growing again. It is premature to assume that growth cannot make a bigger contribution especially if a more pro-active industrial policy is implemented as described below.

A more flexible approach

We believe that greater flexibility needs to be built into the Government's plans. With the economy so uncertain and the labour market still depressed, such a major retrenchment is very dangerous. Ministers should be clear that if their economic programme fails to deliver jobs and growth, they retain the option of reviving stimulus measures or, at least, halting the spending consolidation, especially if the economy tips back into recession.

A bigger role for tax

Tax must play a much bigger role in the consolidation than it currently does. If progressive tax measures are employed - such as further reducing the tax relief offered to higher rate pensions, increasing the bank levy, introducing a Robin Hood financial transactions tax, or extending the 50 per cent tax rate to all those earning over £100,000 - then the consolidation has a better chance of achieving the fairness the Government claims it wants to see.

In addition, since the TUC first revealed the £25bn lost to tax avoidance in *The Missing Billions* in early 2008, government measures have only reduced this amount by approximately £1bn⁸. Further analysis has estimated that illegal tax evasion costs the Treasury around £70bn⁹ and approximately £26bn¹⁰ of tax goes uncollected. We believe these are vital sources of revenue that the Government is failing to tap.

Yet the government is reducing resources for HMRC and sacking HMRC workers. As each HMRC worker can generate many times their employment costs in tax revenues¹¹, this raises strong suspicions that this is a political project to shrink the state, rather than economic necessity.

Given these very large amounts of untapped revenue, it is disingenuous of the Government to claim that cracking down on benefit fraud (which currently costs the Treasury £1.5bn¹²) and welfare claimants more generally must be a leading priority in reducing the deficit.

In addition, there are worrying signs that the new Government, while sometimes talking tough, is fighting shy of curbing tax avoidance. We are concerned at indications of retreat on cracking down on bogus self-employment in construction, revising statutory residence rules as well as reports that HMRC will now take a softer line in tax avoidance disputes.

Of course the public sector should be run as efficiently as possible. Over time its priorities will change, especially when a new government is formed. But change in the public sector - just as in the private sector - should be conducted through established channels of negotiation with trade unions. Unilateral announcements by the Government of changes to pay, pensions or conditions will only exacerbate tensions with public servants and lower morale thus damaging service delivery.

In particular, efforts to justify the deficit reduction programme by perpetuating myths about the feather-bedding of public servants through high pay, generous pensions or wasteful practices is unacceptable. The TUC General Council reminds the Government that public sector workers have already experienced constrained pay rises in recent years, reductions in headcount and a major efficiency drive by the previous government as well as having renegotiated pensions in order to share costs and risks more evenly between employers and employees.

Co-ordinating international action

Without higher global growth and employment, the UK will find it difficult to use exports as a route to recovery, and increased global poverty will create further tensions and economic problems. The EU, OECD and the G20 need to co-ordinate more effectively to promote growth and create jobs, along the lines of the ILO Global Jobs Pact.

The recent decisions by a number of governments, enthusiastically encouraged by the UK Treasury, to introduce austerity packages simultaneously is precisely the wrong strategy when the global economy remains so precarious.

It is particularly important that international efforts are made to address the major trade imbalances in Europe and across the world which fuelled the banking and fiscal crises. Unless multilateral bodies resolve this underlying problem then the opportunities for ending the current crisis are far more limited and more likely to lead to protectionist solutions while the chances of future crises of a similar nature are almost a certainty.

Encouraging the right kind of growth

The Government is making a major error by moving away from the more pro-active industrial policy very belatedly adopted by the last government. The faith that reducing corporation tax, holding interest rates low and improving workforce skills are enough to generate sufficient investment and consumer confidence to address unemployment and limit the damage done by spending cuts is unlikely to be borne out, especially when the government's capital spending is to be cut by half.

The cross party commitment to unregulated free markets brought us the biggest economic crash in nearly a century. We cannot go back to business as usual. Instead, if we are to generate the growth, jobs and companies of the future in an ever more competitive global market, the state needs a new role in setting the conditions for economic success. Ending support for Sheffield Forgemasters and other manufacturing companies is exactly the opposite of what is needed. Apparent plans to downgrade, or even end the commitment, to a green investment bank is equally flawed. Without such policies we will neither reverse the UK's long-term low investment in the real economy nor build the low carbon companies that will be able to compete in this emerging global market.

To replace the failed consensus that deregulated markets and non-intervention can deliver sustained growth, we need a new approach that recognises that public investment, public procurement and regulation can drive up growth, make the UK less unequal and secure the imperative of a low carbon economy.

Campaigning for jobs, a fair economy and public services

The Government's economic policies are morally wrong, socially divisive and may even fail on their own terms.

Pledges that cuts could be achieved through efficiency savings alone, would not increase inequality and protect services have been broken even before ministers announce the full depth of their cuts programme.

Yet the new Government can claim a fresh electoral mandate. The majority of voters are worried about the effect of the cuts and are beginning to be concerned that they are both too rapid and too deep. But they do not yet share our critique or back our alternative approach.

But history shows that governments can change direction. The previous government adopted an active industrial policy as the full effects of the crash became clear. Conservative governments abandoned the poll

tax in the 1990s and similarly harsh economic policies in the 1970s.

Winning such a change in direction is no easy challenge. Much of the media reinforces the Government's message that the nation's finances are like a household's. Public sector staff have seen sustained attacks on their pay, pensions and conditions.

Yet where evidence of the cuts has hit home, such as those areas hit by scrapping Building Schools for the Future, communities have begun to mobilise.

Hardly a day goes past without evidence of different sectors speaking out against the effects of cuts. Science, the arts, environmental groups have all made strong cases against the cuts likely to hit their sectors.

New research continues to undermine ministerial claims that the cuts are progressive or fair. The impact of the cuts on the poorest and most vulnerable is already making voluntary groups speak out.

Distinguished economic commentators - including many not normally sympathetic to the trade union movement - challenge austerity. Business organisations seek to insulate their member companies from cuts in procurement but are already failing.

Government plans to fragment and marketise education and health services will lead to increased costs and poorer services. The TUC General Council reaffirms its opposition to the extension of the Academy Schools programme and introduction of so-called 'free schools', and expresses concern at the proposals contained within the NHS White Paper, which will undoubtedly lead to more bureaucracy, increased private sector involvement in the delivery of health services, service fragmentation and reduced accountability to the public.

Our case is that the Government's programme of cuts, marketisation and privatisation is a political project, not an economic necessity. The deficit is being skillfully used as an excuse to bring in a programme that if put to voters at an election would be overwhelmingly rejected.

Unions and public sector workers are unlikely to achieve a fundamental change in direction on our own. But the potential to win allies and work with others is clear.

Our challenge therefore is to build a great campaign against the cuts - rooted in every community and with a clear national voice - that can win the argument for the alternative.

We invite service users, those whose livelihoods depend on public sector investment and procurement and all those who recognise that public spending and public services are an essential thread running through any good society to join with us in calling for a fundamental change in direction.

While we are confident that the economic arguments are on our side, we recognise that most are likely to be brought into the campaign through their own experience of the cuts, either in their community or the sector in which they work, study or volunteer.

The priority for union campaigning is therefore to build the broadest possible alliance that can put the greatest possible pressure on coalition MPs both in their constituencies and at the national level to win the argument for change. Crucial to this will be involving community groups and other representatives of service users and those directly hit by the cuts.

This will require a careful combination of local work, community organisation, political engagement and national mobilisation. In each we should look for every opportunity to widen the campaign and involve new people and organisations.

Our aim is not to build a top-down national organisation where everyone agrees, but a strong and diverse movement rooted in communities and united in

opposition to this savage programme of cuts. It will succeed by involving not just established campaigners but people entirely new to political engagement. The poll tax was defeated when government MPs realised that their seats were in danger. The campaign against the cuts must deliver the same message to every vulnerable coalition MP.

The TUC and unions will support genuine new initiatives designed to help build this movement, and recognises that this will require embracing new forms of campaigning and involvement.

In particular we look to support new online campaigning tools that can help connect local campaigners up and down the country, allow cuts victims to tell their stories, build local campaigns and bypass the media with the arguments for the economic alternative.

The campaign will need careful planning and the correct balance between local, sectoral and national campaigning, all with the aim of putting maximum pressure on coalition MPs. TUC regional councils and the Wales TUC will be asked to support and co-ordinate campaigning activity across England and Wales, and the TUC will work closely with both the STUC and NICTU as we develop our campaign. The General Council sets out the following timetable for action, to which they will add further initiatives throughout the year, while continuing to emphasise the importance of working locally and in partnership with local groups.

September

- launch of the campaign at the TUC Congress
- lobby of delegates and fringe meetings at the Liberal Democrat and Conservative conferences
- support for the ETUC action against austerity with TUC participation in the demonstration in Brussels.

October

- a week of action against the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR), which will include:
 - a rally in Central Hall Westminster on 19 October on the eve of the CSR. A highly targeted lobby of coalition MPs concentrating on those with small majorities or who stood on a platform of resisting cuts until the recovery was secured. This will take place both on 19 October and in constituency surgeries later that week. Lobbying should involve service providers, service users and others who will lose out from the cuts
 - local and regional activity - including lobbying at constituency surgeries on 22 and 23 October
 - support for the STUC demonstration on 23 October.

November onwards

- continuing analysis of the effects of the CSR on different sectors and localities with local and sectoral action to follow
- already planned are:
 - UCU/NUS action on cuts 10 November
 - FBU lobby of parliament 17 November
 - special Wales TUC conference 26 November

The General Council encourages unions to use the impact of the CSR to build local campaign groups to maintain pressure on MPs - particularly coalition MPs that we have targeted - and to work with other unions and others on a sectoral basis to build awareness and opposition to the cuts announced in the CSR.

March

- a major national demonstration in March 2011 on a date to be confirmed as soon as possible.

Notes

- 1 Office for Budget Responsibility: Are the Jobs Forecasts Credible? www.touchstoneblog.org.uk, 2 July 2010
 - 2 James Browne, Personal Taxes and Distributional Impact of Budget Measures, IFS, June 2010; and James Browne and Peter Levell, The Distributional Effect of Tax and Benefit Reforms to be Introduced Between June 2010 and April 2014: a revised assessment, IFS, August 2010
 - 3 The Public Services Forum, which is made up of unions, employers, government officials and is chaired by a government minister, recently agreed a protocol on the implementation of equality impact assessments.
 - 4 For a review of this evidence see: TUC, Rethinking Public Service Reform, 2008
 - 5 'Sweeping Cuts Will Cripple Public Services, Warn Worried Managers', 19 February 2010, Institute of Leadership and Management
 - 6 Audit Commission Surviving the Crunch: Local Finances in the Recession and Beyond London: Audit Commission (2010)
 - 7 Arjun Jayadev and Mike Konczal, The Boom not the Slump: The Right Time for Austerity, The Roosevelt Institute, August 2010
 - 8 TUC, Stemming the Flood, December 2009
 - 9 Tax Research, Tax Justice and Jobs, 2010
 - 10 HMRC, 2009-10 Accounts
 - 11 An answer to a parliamentary question revealed that HMRC compliance staff generate £658,000 in tax revenues each while a recent study found that members of the Association of Revenue and Customs could generate between 30 and 180 times their salary in tax revenues.
 - 12 National Audit Office, report by the Comptroller and Auditor General on the DWP, July 2010
- Monday 13 September 2010*

Section 2

Verbatim report of congress proceedings

The following pages give a full verbatim report of the proceedings of the 142nd annual Trades Union Congress, which met in Manchester from Monday 13 September to Thursday 16 September with Dougie Rooney presiding.

Congress decisions are marked with a *

**FIRST DAY: MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 13
MORNING SESSION**

(Congress assembled at 10.00 a.m.)

The President (Dougie Rooney): Good morning, colleagues. Would delegates take their seats and would Congress come to order. Thank you. The programme of music this week has been put together by Music for Youth. Many thanks to the Lady Manners School Folk Group who have been playing for us this morning. They are three very talented and very enthusiastic young women. I think we should express our appreciation. *(Applause)*

Congress, I have great pleasure in opening this, the TUC's 142nd Congress. I warmly welcome all delegates and visitors here to Manchester.

Appointment of tellers and scrutineers

The President: The first formal item of business is to ask Congress to approve the tellers and scrutineers as set out on page 10 of the General Purposes Committee Report booklet. Please note that I need to report a change in the list of scrutineers published in the GPC's Report. Community has informed us that, due to illness, Dean Cox will replace Lew Schaffer as scrutineer. Is that agreed? *(Agreed)*

May I remind all delegates to switch off their mobile phones. If there is an emergency you will receive instructions on what to do, either from me or over the tannoy system. There are no fire alarm tests scheduled. If you hear the alarm, the alarm is for real. If any delegate requires first aid, the request should be made to a member of the Centre staff. There are also first-aid stations in the far corner of the exhibition centre.

Welcome to Sororal and Fraternal Delegates

The President: Congress, I now come to the introduction of sororal and fraternal delegates and visitors who are seated on the platform on my right. Colleagues, as usual, there are a number of international guests here this morning. The European Trade Union Confederation General Secretary, John Monks, will be addressing Congress on Wednesday. *(Applause)* Steffan Gran from the DGB Germany. *(Applause)* From the AFL-CIO we have Penny Schantz. *(Applause)* From the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions we have Gideon Shoko, who will be addressing us this afternoon. *(Applause)* Other international guests will be joining us later this week, including Anna Biondi from the Workers Bureau at the ILO; Dan Smith from the ILO; David Begg, Peter Bunting and Jack O'Connor from the Irish Congress of Trade Unions; Sharan Burrow from the International Trade Union Confederation, who will be addressing us on Tuesday and John Evans from the Trade Union Advisory Committee to the OECD, and Philip Jennings from UNI. There will be a number of representations from global union federations, individual union representatives and foreign visitors this week. They are all most welcome. This year's delegate from the Trades Union Councils Conference is Maggie Ryan.

Congress, we are expecting other guests during the week and, as they arrive, I will introduce them to you.

Obituary

The President: We now have the Obituary section of the report when we remember our trade union colleagues who have died during the past year. We list those most closely associated with the TUC in Chapter 10 of the report on pages 173 and 174.

Since the report went to press, the death has occurred of Jimmy Reid, one of the leaders of the 1971 Upper Clyde Shipbuilders' work-in. As well as being an

inspirational trade unionist, Jimmy was a uniquely articulate champion of working people. His rhetorical speech at Glasgow University declaring that the 'rat race is for rats' was printed in full in the *New York Times* and drew comparisons with the Gettysburg Address. We have also learnt of the death last month of Marion Chambers, who was President of the CPSA, one of the predecessor unions of PCS. She was a regular delegate to Congress over many years.

In asking you to stand in memory of these former colleagues, I also ask you to remember other trade union colleagues who have died in the past year, both here and around the world. At this time, I am sure our thoughts are also with those who have suffered in disasters both natural and man-made, including those who have lost their lives in the earthquake in Haiti and in the floods in Pakistan. Let us, therefore, recommit ourselves to the cause of world peace. Please now stand for a minute's silence. *(Congress stood in silent tribute, whilst a video was shown)* Congress, thank you.

Report of the General Purposes Committee

The President: Congress, I now call on Peter Hall, the Chair of the General Purposes Committee, to report to us on the progress of business and other Conference arrangements. Peter.

Peter Hall (General Purposes Committee): Good morning, Congress. The General Purposes Committee has approved 18 composite motions. Composite Motions 1-17 are included in the GPC Report and the Composite Motions booklet that you have all received. Also in the booklet is the General Council's Statement on the Economy, Public Spending and Public Services. Composite Motion 18 on Palestine has been placed on your seats. On behalf of the GPC I would like to thank all the unions which have co-operated and worked together to reach agreement on composite motions.

The GPC has also approved three emergency motions. Emergency motion 1 is on the trapped Chilean miners, to be moved by the NUM, is printed in the GPC Report and in the composite motions booklet. The GPC has also approved two further emergency motions. Emergency motion 2, Royal Mail, is to be moved by the CWU and seconded by Unite. Emergency motion 3 is on the industrial action against cuts on the London Underground, to be moved by the TSSA and seconded by the RMT. Copies of both emergency motions have been placed on your seats. The President will indicate when the emergency motions will be taken.

The GPC is recommending that Congress suspends Standing Orders rule 26(a) in order for Congress to finish at 12.30 rather than 12.45 to allow delegates to assemble outside the hall for the All Together for Public Services photo call.

Also, Congress, please be reminded that only materials approved by the GPC may be distributed within the hall. Finally, I remind delegates that the mover of each motion may speak to up for five minutes and other speakers up to three minutes. Thank you for your co-operation. I will report further to you on the progress of business and other GPC decisions when necessary throughout Congress. Thank you.

The President: Thank you, Peter. I now invite you formally to receive the GPC's Report? Can we agree? *(Agreed)* Thank you. Congress, following on from the GPC's Report, in order to conclude this morning's session of Congress at 12.30 so that we can take part in the photo call for All Together for Public Services, it will be necessary to suspend rule 26(a), which sets the times of sessions. This needs a two-thirds majority. I now move suspension of Standing Orders.

* *The suspension of standing order 26(a) was AGREED.*

The President: The GPC also reported that in addition to emergency motion E1, Trapped Chilean Miners, a further two emergency motions have been approved. Emergency motion 2, Royal Mail; and emergency motion E3, Industrial Action Against Cuts on London Underground. If time permits, I will try and take emergency motion 2, Royal Mail, after the published programme of business this morning. I will let you know if this is likely nearer the time. Would the mover and seconder please be ready. Emergency motions 1 and 3 will be taken later in the week and I will give notice to you about that.

Just a reminder to delegates, as Peter Hall reported, movers of motions will get up to five minutes and all other speakers up to three minutes, and I intend to keep strictly to these timings. In order to process business, it will also be necessary and helpful if speakers would line up ready in the seats set aside at the front of the hall. The press will move away from there to allow you to do that.

Welcome to Manchester

The President: Colleagues, we begin the business of Congress with the opening address by the General Secretary, but before Brendan speaks we have a short video to remind ourselves of Manchester's union links. *(Video shown) (Applause)*

Congress, that was an excellent reminder, delegates, of the TUC's historical links with Manchester and an important reminder of the challenges ahead.

Congress, please listen carefully. I will explain how I intend to take the debate on public services first. I will invite the General Secretary to give his address to Congress and move the General Council's statement on the economy, public spending and public services. I will then call paragraphs 3.1 and 3.1.3. Then I will call the mover, seconder and supporters of Composite Motion 10 – Defending Public Services. I will then take other speakers on the General Council's Statement and the composite motion as one debate. Following that debate, we will take the vote on the General Council Statement, followed by a vote on Composite Motion 10. Is that clear, delegates? *(Agreed)* I call on the General Secretary to address Congress.

The General Secretary's Address

Brendan Barber *(General Secretary):* President and Congress, welcome to Manchester. As we have been reminded, Manchester is the cradle of the industrial revolution, the birthplace of our movement and today still a great progressive city. It is home to three universities, two Premier League football teams, and just one Conservative councillor. *(Applause)*

Congress, my address to you usually ranges wide. I survey the year gone by and celebrate our achievements. I look to the future and the challenges that we face, stress our commitment to equality and social justice and make clear our abiding internationalism.

I could make that speech this year too. There are certainly achievements to celebrate. I'm proud that once again a record number of workers are accessing learning through their union. I am proud of the practical support that we have given to our brothers and sisters across the world, from Haiti to Palestine, from Zimbabwe to Colombia. I'm proud, too, that our movement helped inflict a crushing defeat on the BNP at the election *(Applause)*, and let's salute everyone in Barking who ensured that Nick Griffin's bid for parliament ended in such abject failure.

But, Congress, as we reflect on our achievements, we must also face up to the stark realities confronting us, because this year things are different. There is one overwhelming issue that the working people of this country face, and that is the Government's determination to drive through massive spending cuts, which will not only devastate the services we rely on, but do untold damage to our economic prospects.

That is why today in this address I am also moving the General Council's statement on the economy. This is the union case for an alternative and sets out how we will win the argument for change. I make no apologies for concentrating on this today. Congress, nobody can deny the depth of the recession, made in the boardrooms of the world's banks and spread like a contagion by the financial system. It has savaged jobs and living standards not just in the UK, not just in the advanced economies but throughout the world.

This was not just the normal ups and downs of the business cycle, painful though these can be. It was more fundamental than that. It was the complete failure of the neoliberal economic model. We made finance our master, not our servant. We forgot that markets need rules and ran our economy in the interests of the owners of wealth, not those who create it. The result was the biggest speculative bubble for decades – and, inevitably, it burst.

Rightly, governments made sure that the banking system did not collapse. They took emergency action to ensure that recession did not turn into slump. They showed that we did not have to repeat the 1930s – the last time we faced a similar finance-induced crash. Employers and unions agreed short-time working and flexible ways of keeping skilled workforces together. Alongside government action, this has made sure that unemployment has not become as bad as it was in the 1980s, yet it still hit the highest level for decades. In some regions of Britain, one in ten people are without work. Young people have been hit as hard as in any previous downturn. And with college places slashed, many good students still face life on the dole.

But the new Government would not recognise what I have said this morning. They say that the deficit is the big economic problem. Reducing that is the only political priority. And they are going to do it by unprecedented spending cuts, however dangerous they are for the recovery.

Tax has little more than a walk-on part and that mainly from VAT, always the Conservative's favourite tax – the one that bears down most on the poor and those in the middle. Coalition politicians have repeatedly told us that they would spare frontline services, that they would not increase inequality, and that they would protect the vulnerable. Over the past four months they have already broken each and every one of these pledges: Building Schools for the Future, support for kids with learning difficulties, free school meals for half a million low-paid families, NHS Direct, the guarantee of work, education or training for our young people, free prescriptions for the long-term sick, the Child Trust Fund, benefits and pensions linked to RPI, programmes to build social housing, even domestic violence protection orders – all slashed. Every public service in every community is under threat.

Think about what is happening here in Manchester: projects to rebuild 10,000 homes in rundown areas axed; £560 million of transport schemes scrapped; sweeping cuts at Bolton, Salford, Trafford and Rochdale councils; 150 firefighter jobs at risk in Greater Manchester Fire Service; £7 million of cuts in the Police Service; up to a thousand NHS admin jobs in danger; and a local breast cancer helpline that has taken 80,000 calls since it was set up is about to be closed because health trusts will no longer foot the £63,000 annual running cost.

Congress, ministers talk about progressive cuts and tell us that “we’re all in it together”, let us expose this for the insulting claptrap that it is. *(Applause)* Let’s be clear about this: cuts always hit the poorest, most vulnerable, most disadvantaged people. That is why the Institute for Fiscal Studies described the Budget as “clearly regressive”, and that is why an OECD study of Sweden’s and Canada’s cuts in the ‘90s found that inequality and poverty rates accelerated faster there than anywhere else in the developed world, and that is what yesterday’s TUC report spelled out in the first authoritative analysis of its kind.

Congress, this year’s election did not give anybody a clear mandate to start slashing public spending, but what we now have is not just a coalition government but a demolition government. *(Applause)* No government would ever get elected on a platform of doing such damage to public services, yet the Prime Minister has been clear that these are not temporary cuts but a permanent rollback of public services and the welfare state, not so much an economic necessity as a political project driven by an ideological clamour for a minimal state.

But ministers must understand this: what they take apart now could take generations to rebuild. Decent public services are the glue that holds a civilised society together and we diminish them at our peril. Cut services, put jobs in peril, and increase inequality: that is the way to make Britain a darker, brutish, more frightening place, and let no one doubt that unions and the TUC will protect and defend dedicated public service workers.

I take no pleasure in looking ahead to the prospect of difficult disputes, and our critics like nothing better than to misrepresent us. They say we are set on confrontation, that we do not care about the rest of society, and that we are just pursuing narrow self-interest. I know, and you know, it is just not like that. No one takes industrial action lightly. We are at the heart of our communities, passionately concerned to defend the integrity and the quality of the services that we provide, but we are entitled to be clear. Although the Government is pursuing a political programme that we will only defeat politically, where members – faced with attacks on jobs, pay or pensions – take a democratic decision for industrial action they will have the support of their unions, and the TUC stands ready to co-ordinate that. *(Applause)*

But we also need to be clear it is not just public services and public sector jobs that will be hit by the cuts. There is a huge threat to the private sector too, with sectors like construction already feeling the pain because the Government spends over £200bn a year procuring goods and services from business. If this is cut by 25 per cent, or more, then there will be a gaping hole in the economy, output will fall, unemployment will rise, and the deficit will get worse not better. That is what the IMF and the OECD are now warning about.

I very much hope that we can avoid a double-dip recession but I fear that the best we can hope for in the years ahead is an economy that scrapes along the bottom, one that fails to generate growth and jobs, one that betrays a generation of young people, one that hinders our transition to a low-carbon future. You cannot pick up a newspaper, can you, without reading about some group saying, “Don’t cut us, we are too important.” One day it is scientists, another it is the arts, green campaigners saying that climate change is too much of a threat, anti-poverty groups distressed about the impact on the poor, the housing lobby warning of the looming housing shortages, business saying, “Don’t cut infrastructure or skills,” and, you know, they are all right.

But too many people still accept that the only economic choice is between accepting the Government’s programme for reducing the deficit or

an irresponsible slide to bankruptcy. Voters are getting worried about the cuts, worried that they might be too fast and too deep, but so far they have yet to back the alternative. That is why we have to win the intellectual battle showing that there is a better way to reduce the deficit, one that not only avoids savage cuts but is more likely to work as it avoids the risk of the double-dip.

The General Council Statement spells out that alternative: First, we need a realistic timetable – rather than expecting the damage done by a bubble that grew for decades to be put right in just four years. Secondly, we need more flexibility – ministers need to be clear that if the economy goes into reverse, they will stop the medicine that is killing the patient. Third, we need to make growth the priority. That is the only sure way to close the deficit as it is the only way to get tax revenues flowing again. Fourth, we need a bigger role for tax. Cuts increase inequality and punish those that did least to cause the crash. That is why we back, for example, a Robin Hood Tax to make the banks pay their way, and rather than cutting Inland Revenue staff let us crack down on super-rich tax dodgers and the loopholes that they exploit. *(Applause)*

Fifth, we need a different kind of economy – where manufacturing retains its rightful place, where every region is a growth region, and where we invest in the low-carbon industries of the future.

Congress, our plan not only avoids the pain and unfairness of the Government’s approach, but it is more likely to work in the short, the medium, and the long term. We only have to look across the Irish Sea for a warning of what can go wrong. They have made huge cuts and yet the economic slowdown has been so great that their credit rating has been downgraded time and again. This, Congress, is not about us sticking our heads in the sand or avoiding difficult decisions. It is a genuine and effective programme to reduce the deficit, an alternative to austerity that encourages growth and jobs.

That is why today I lay down this challenge to our movement. We have to start and win this great debate about our country’s economic future. We have to mobilise in every community and every constituency so that the cuts become the issue that decides the next election. We have to engage with service users, charities, and community groups, everyone worried about the impact of cuts on what they hold dear in a civilised society.

You know, it can be done. Look at the brilliant and effective campaign by our schools’ unions against the Government’s attempt to herd thousands of schools into a headlong rush to academy status. They made sure that school leaders and governors were challenged to think carefully and to consult first with parents and their communities. As a result, instead of a flood of applications to change to academy status we saw a feeble dribble. *(Applause)* It is because our unions reached out beyond the confines of our movement – to parents, governors and local communities – that the overwhelming majority of schools refused to sign up to this monumental folly.

So, Congress, now is the time for us to build a diverse, dynamic and progressive alliance for change, a coalition against the cuts, not just rediscovering our campaigning roots and traditions but embracing the power of new technology to get our case across, not just making a success of our rally on October 19th ahead of the Comprehensive Spending Review but following it up with action in every region and pressure on every coalition MP, and not just planning ahead for our national demonstration next March but capturing the imagination of the British people in the process.

President, Congress, this is a heavy responsibility. The weeks and months ahead, I think, will test us as never before and at all times we must and we will speak up for everyone in Britain today, not just public servants, not just private sector workers, not just the poor, not just the vulnerable, not just those in the middle struggling to make ends meet, but everyone. Let us show there is a genuine alternative to cuts, let us win this battle for hearts and minds, and together let us shape a more hopeful future for all.

Thanks for listening and let's take this campaign forward with energy and with determination. *(Applause)*

The President: Thank you, Brendan, for that inspiring address and for moving the General Council's Statement on the economy, public spending, and public services. As you rightly said, a collective challenge over the coming months and years ahead is to build a great campaign rooted in every community and in every workplace making the case that there is an alternative to the Government's cuts agenda.

Public Services

The President: Congress, I now turn to Chapter 3 of the General Council Report, economic and industrial Affairs, and public services from page 73. I call paragraphs 3.1 and 3.13, and Composite Motion 10, Defending public services. The General Council supports the composite to be moved by Unison and seconded by Unite, and the speakers, I will mention the unions now – GMB, PCS, RMT, Fire Brigades' Union, NASUWT Prospect, the Communication Workers, TSSA, and UCU.

Defending public services

Dave Prentis (*UNISON*) moved Composite Motion 10.

He said: Congress, today we face our greatest test for a generation. Our economy is still on life support, the blight of unemployment scarring lives, wearing down communities, 600,000 jobs to go in public services, 600,000 jobs to go in the private sector, and a Government with no democratic mandate announcing an assault on all that our movement has won for our people; our pay, our pensions, our jobs, our public services, our welfare state, an attack the like of which we have never ever seen before.

This coalition is taking a chainsaw to our public services and they are hoping that no one will notice; hoping no one will notice banks posting record profits, bankers back to their bonuses; hoping no one will notice the income of the top 1 per cent of our society is now greater than the total pay bill for our National Health Service, our schools, and our local government put together; hoping that no one will notice the amount we lose every year in tax evasion by big corporations, more than enough to wipe out the deficit at a stroke, a society in which some of the backers of the Tory Party pay less in tax than a cleaner in one of our hospitals.

Congress, we will not fall for the lie that this society cannot afford decent public services. The money is there in our economy. We are under attack not because of a deficit but because of an ideology, an ideology that hates public services, that loves privatisation; an ideology that sees public service employment, millions of people caring, helping, educating, not as an achievement to be celebrated but as a problem to be tackled.

This coalition does have choices. It can stop the giveaways for the benefit of the few and it can start protecting the services needed by the many. It can have the guts to go back to the bankers, the speculators, the profiteers, and tell them on our behalf,

"You created this mess, you pay for it." *(Applause)*

The coalition say they cannot ask their friends in big business to pay tax as that would discourage enterprise. They cannot regulate financial systems or there will be fewer jobs in the City, but with breathtaking hypocrisy they take away the benefits for the poor and the disabled, they undermine the job security of low-paid workers, and they let our communities feel the pain. If there is money to bail out the banks and bonuses, and if there is money for war and Trident, then there is money available to protect our public services. *(Applause)* If money is tight, never mind the pay freeze on our members, how about a pay freeze on the bankers? *(Applause)* We have seen enough of what they have done. We have had enough of their greed and their arrogance. It is them, not our members, who should be doing more for less; more for their country and less for themselves. Now we have the arrogance of the coalition asking the public where the axe should fall and our public services the subject of an obscene lottery.

Congress, not everything that is valuable is popular, not everything that transforms lives wins applause. Will those working with young offenders be as popular as those working in childcare? Will people supporting drug users be as voter-friendly as paramedics? Who will speak up for the Cinderella services? Who will champion what is right rather than what is popular? I will tell you who, we will. We will speak up for the vulnerable. We will stand shoulder to shoulder with those who work in public services and those who rely on them. We will work together to raise public awareness, build opposition, give practical support to those in our communities fighting to defend schools, hospitals and care homes. We will build alliances with NGOs, with charities, and social movements in the UK, with our sisters and brothers taking action across Europe and, yes, we will build alliances of public service unions to break the pay freeze, and when the call is there we will move to co-ordinate industrial action to defend all that we hold dear.

Congress, we have to rise to the challenge, show our resolve, defend our welfare state, fight for our vision of a fairer society, and build a powerful coalition of our own. Our members expect nothing less from this great movement of ours than to stand up for them, to protect their jobs, their welfare state, to lead the fight together, united, fierce defenders of our members and the services that they deliver.

Finally, Congress, Bob Diamond, the new boss of Barclays, with £11 million a year, says he is worth every penny, and says he wakes up every morning with a smile on his face. But, Congress, I will tell you who is worth every penny, the members of my delegation, public service workers and every other public service worker across the land who wakes up every morning not with a smile on their face but worried whether they still have a job to go to because of the failure of the bankers like Mr. Diamond. They look after us in our times of need; it is now our time to look after them before it is too late. *(Applause/Cheers)*

Gail Cartmail (*Unite*) seconded Composite Motion 10.

She said: Congress, this is a motion that sets out the scale of the disaster facing Britain, a disaster that will damage the lives of all our families and break the communities we live in, though a crisis not of our making. It is business as usual for the banks' top bosses while we are left to cope with the unfair and unnecessary cuts. Over one million public sector and private jobs are to be sacrificed and Unite's members in construction can testify to the impact of cancelling the Building Schools for the Future and Building Affordable Homes programmes. The ConDems emergency budget, the looming Comprehensive Spending Review and the 2011 budget all, as has been

said, represent an ideological attack against the collective public services that generations before us fought so hard to create.

The reforms to liberate our NHS mean privatisation reducing England's NHS to a mere logo. The so-called efficiency savings are cuts by another name and are causing real damage. In short, the fight ahead of us is the fight of our lives, and let us be clear, all of us in Unite welcomes the TUC's commitment to stand ready to assist unions in co-ordinating industrial action in this fight and, delegates, it is women as users and workers who are first in the firing line; 72 per cent of the ConDem's cuts will be for women's income, two-thirds of the public sector workforce are women, freezes in pay and detrimental changes to pensions will set women back decades and widen the already unacceptable gender pay gap, and it is us women who will pick up the cuts in the caring duties, from emptying the bedpans to covering community and social care.

So, more today than ever before women need unions and unions need women. Our job is to defend public services and to help show the true cost of the cuts. We cannot do it alone. We need to build wide and popular support. But, sisters and brothers, we know that our values and our economic plan, investment to create jobs to reduce the deficit, is the correct stand to take, progressive taxation not the 17 per cent VAT that hits the poorest hardest. It is the alternative to the slash-and-burn cuts that will kill communities and plunge us back into recession. Sisters and brothers, this is the fight of our lives and it is the fight we must win. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Brian Strutton (*GMB*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 10.

He said: This motion says it is about defending public services. Actually, it is about defending everyone throughout our communities, private, public, young, old, it does not matter. Everyone is at risk from the reckless slash-and-burn policy of politically motivated cuts, cuts that are not obligatory because there are alternatives. Only last week the world's two largest economies, the USA and Japan, announced new stimulus packages worth tens of billions of pounds. They believe they are alternatives. It is this Government that is in denial by defining those issues in a one-dimensional way. It says deficit reduction is the be all and end all. It says it must be tackled by cutting public sector services. It says it must be done immediately. It is this Government that has adopted the extreme position saying there is no alternative, based on a political dogma that believes people on benefits are scroungers, that believes people are out of work because it is their own fault, and that believes people who provide our public services are overpaid layabouts; ideology not necessity, that is the motivation. That is why the cuts agenda is so deep and so swift and that is why the Tories are doing it. The LibDem motivation in government is altogether more cynical.

How can the Government ignore the fact that it was public spending that saved the economy from a full depression when the finance sector collapsed in a fit of greed? The economy is still fragile and still relies on public spending; a third of that spending actually goes on the private sector and public sector workers who spend their income in the private sector. There is no evidence of the private sector being able to make up for any cuts. Just look at how the banks are still carrying on, obscene bonus packages through fleecing their customers, charging 19.5 per cent for loans that they get at half a per cent. I hope Mervyn King is going to come up with an explanation for that on Wednesday.

The result is cuts on an unprecedented scale which will lead to direct and indirect job losses in the private and the public sectors. We estimate these now amount to a million extra job losses, taking the official number to 3.5 million unemployed; real people, real lives. What a waste. That is why the campaign to defend public services is a campaign to defend everyone in every community: like the people in Luton who will not get the 10,000 essential new homes they need because of the cuts; like the elderly in Gloucester whose meals on wheels prices are going up by 40 per cent because of the cuts; like the people of Hartlepool who will not get the new hospital they need because of the cuts; like the families in Croydon whose children will not get the hot school meals anymore because of the cuts: real services, real people.

But the mood will change, it will change as those cuts bite, and we need to feed that mood change from the local level and be ready to support it at national level. That is why in the GMB we begin our preparations for national industrial action next month. If this Government will not listen to any alternatives, then we need to be ready and together with our communities we will have no alternative but to take action. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Mark Serwotka (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 10.

He said: Congress, we have already heard that the attacks we are about to face will be the biggest that any of us will ever have experienced, not only attacks on welfare, attacks on pensions, attacks on jobs, attacks on pay, but massive privatisation. In fact, if these cuts go unchallenged we will see parts of the communities where our members live devastated and laid to waste. Let's be clear, these attacks will not just affect public sector workers, they will also affect public service users and members in the private sector. As we have already heard, for every 600,000 jobs lost in the public sector there will be up to 700,000 jobs lost in the private sector.

Congress, let's not fall for the nonsense. The divide here is not public versus private; the divide is the haves against the have-nots. *(Applause)* We are speaking up for the have-nots. Let us not take lectures from millionaires who have spent their lives living in a bubble of privilege about lifestyle choices of welfare scroungers. The real scroungers are the rich who avoid paying their taxes in this country of £120 billion. These are the scroungers who should be held to account: benefit fraud £1 billion, tax avoidance and evasion, £120 billion. *(Applause)* That is why, Congress, we have to be bold in our arguments. Let us be clear. We should not accept that a single job has to be lost, not a single penny should be cut in public spending, because there is an alternative. If we do not advocate the alternative, we will start choosing between what are the deserving jobs and what are the ones that have to go. The alternative is clear: the alternative is to collect the taxes that are due and to grow our way out of recession.

Congress, currently our deficit is 52 per cent of GDP. For over 50 years in this country that deficit was over 100 per cent, twice as bad as it is now, yet we built an NHS, comprehensive education and council houses. Now is the time to invest and invest in transport and housing. *(Applause)* Congress, I want to finish on this point. I hope we will all agree to support the composite. I hope we will all agree that we should not accept any cuts whatsoever, but the Government are unlikely to be persuaded so we have to be clear that industrial action is inevitable unless the Government are prepared to change direction. The responsibility on this movement, on every trade union representative, is not to wait, it is to start the planning now, getting the representatives to meet in every town and every city

and set up the community-based campaigning with service users who will support us if we stand up to defend our services. If we have to take industrial action, the onus is on us to make our action as effective as possible to ensure we can win. That is why we have to learn some of the lessons of history and those lessons are quite clear: when we stand together we are more effective. When eight unions stood and balloted against the cuts threatened to our pensions by the Labour Government, we did not even have to take the action before we had an acceptable settlement. If all public sector unions and our colleagues in the private sector stand together, not only can we win but we can offer hope and inspiration to people who are looking to us to stand up for them, to stand up for their public services, and to reject the politics of division and greed from the rich, the famous, and this Government. Support the composite. (*Applause*)

Bob Crow (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) supported the motion.

He said: I have pleasure in supporting this composite. First of all, when people come to conferences like this and see the excellent video that we had first thing this morning about the history of this great movement of ours, they will hear phrases used like "Unity of strength" and "An injury to one is an injury to all." Some people might say that is pure phrase-mongering. I do not believe that is the case at all. Over the last 150 years, we have learnt that if we stand together, we fight and win, but if we do not fight and become divided, we lose. Brothers and sisters, the reality is going to be that we can pass all the resolutions and play all the video films we want, but when those attacks start to affect all the groups of workers that you represent in this hall today, we can either lie down or stand up and fight.

The situation is pretty clear. We have the Governor of the Bank of England coming here on Wednesday, known to his friends as "Merve the Swerve". Obviously he has come here because he is hard up. The arse of his trousers is hanging out apparently as he walks into Manchester. He is going to go around with a hat for a collection because times are hard for bankers.

The bankers knew the score over two years ago. The top bankers went to see Gordon Brown and told him, "Either you put an injection of cash into the economy or the cash will start running out." They recognised the power that they had as bankers. We have to recognise the fact that if those five top bankers did not get out of bed in the morning, with the smile that Bob Diamond has on his face, the economy would run as normal. But, if workers do not get out of bed in the morning, the economy will shut down.

We have to recognise the strengths that we have as a trade union movement. The position is that this is about moving the agenda along towards privatisation. All of the gains that we have made in society (either by those in work or those not in work) regarding the National Health Service, public transport and the nationalisation of industries, have all been on the basis that the trade union movement pursued them.

People talk about extra parliamentary action on the streets. The people who investigate the vulnerable with a pair of binoculars, such as single parents on housing estates, should jump on a plane, go to the Cayman Islands and dig out the bank accounts of those people who have been stealing billions from this economy. (*Applause*) Brothers and sisters, 800 workers have already lost their jobs on London Underground. It is not about attacks on the public sector. As unemployment goes up, pay goes down for everyone.

We are already taking co-ordinated action with our sister union, the TSSA. It was my proudest moment

when Gerry Doherty and me were on the picket line defending tube workers. I say in finishing that if tube workers are under attack, then railway workers, seafarers and public sector workers, you name them, will be fools not to co-ordinate action because if there is a concentrated attack on us, there needs to be a concentrated response from this Congress. Thank you very much. (*Applause*)

Matt Wrack (*Fire Brigades' Union*) supported Composite Motion 10.

He said: Congress, it was only a couple of years ago that the mood of the public was extremely angry about the state that the economy had been thrown into by the banking crisis. It was a crisis sparked by the banks which destroyed tens of thousands of jobs in this country and tens of thousands more across the globe. It has thrown millions into poverty, wrecking the hopes of working people.

Let us just cast our minds back to that time and the names that were in the press then: Northern Rock, Lehman Brothers, Royal Bank of Scotland and Fred Goodwin – remember him? They were the hate figures of the public at the time. What we have seen since then is a sustained campaign by the media and by this Government to shift the blame away from those who sparked the crisis and to put it on the shoulders of the people who clean the hospitals, the people who feed our kids their school dinners, nurses, teachers and other public sector workers. We need to send a very clear message from here that that is a complete lie and a distortion which we reject right away.

I say that the idea of 25 per cent or 40 per cent cuts is utter and complete lunacy and we will stop them in their tracks. It will not happen. That is the message that has to go back from this Congress. It will not happen as we will not accept it. If anyone says that 20 per cent cuts are some sort of progressive alternative, do not come asking for my vote.

This is a Cabinet of millionaires who do not use public services, who do not need public services and therefore do not care one hoot about public services. (*Applause*) They may think at this stage that they are winning the press arguments. It is all very well to talk about cuts in the abstract, but when you talk about real cuts and you ask people, "Do you want your kids' school not to be maintained or repaired?" people will say, "No." When you ask people, "Do you want your hospital to be closed?" they will say, "No." This is not just a war on the poor, brothers and sisters; this is a war on the majority of the population in the interests of a tiny minority. It is an agenda on behalf of big business, the banks and the super-rich. We need to say things as they are and we will challenge them. The people who have to stand up for the majority are the people organised in this Congress here today because these cuts can be defeated. Brendan, Mark and others have outlined the alternative. There is an alternative, but we need to build a movement on a huge scale.

I will finish by saying that I think that the alternatives which we face are stark. Thirty years ago, Thatcher unleashed a programme to supposedly roll back the State, to privatise, to cut tax for the rich and to attack working-class organisations. This lot are out to finish the job. Every single gain that our movement has made, for which our parents and grandparents fought for, is under threat unless we stand together, get organised and say, "It is not on, we are not accepting it and we will build a movement on such a scale as you have never seen before. We will defeat your agenda and stop you in your tracks." Support the composite. (*Applause*)

Chris Keates (*NASUWT*) spoke in support of Composite 10.

She said: There can be no doubt about the scale of the battle that we have on our hands. It is a battle not only to defend public services, but actually to champion them. We have to do so in the face of a public punch-drunk from the unrelenting assault of government propaganda, supported by a largely uncritical media, a public being increasingly convinced that there is no alternative but a savage programme of cuts and relentless reform. We have a public which has been relentlessly drip-fed into believing that public services are for the minority and that benefits are only for people who are unemployed. Of those people who are unemployed, the public is encouraged to think that they are, by and large, the work-shy, the scroungers, the fraudsters or the ones they know from the *Daily Mail*, who falsely claim invalidity benefit but spend their time ballroom dancing.

We know the truth behind these headlines. We have to convince the public that this is not an economic crisis but a bankers' crisis. Whilst they are already back collecting their bonuses, the plans are in place to rip the heart out of our welfare state and our public services. These coalition policies are not necessary, unpalatable medicine needed to stave off economic meltdown. They are sheer economic illiteracy which will devastate our public services and the private sector alike.

This is not about bloated public services, gold-plated pensions or favourable terms and conditions in the public sector, claims which grossly distort the truth. This is a strategy designed to engage us in a sterile argument of public versus private and to trap us into the concept of equity of misery. These are not plans to tackle the nation's deficit. These are strategies to turn our public services into a free market free-for-all and to bankroll the private sector with state funding. They are carefully orchestrated deliberate strategies by oppressive opponents of public services, designed to mask until it is too late their ideological assault on the weakest in society, based on their irrational contempt of the public sector.

Labour lost the election but the Tories did not win it. This is a Tory government with no mandate from the people of this country, propped up by 57 Liberal Democrat MPs who have sold out the British people for four seats around the Cabinet table. (*Applause*) We do not want this coalition of Tories and Lib-Dems. We want a coalition of ordinary people, workers, families and communities to champion and defend the fundamental building blocks of a decent society before they are dismantled and damaged irreparably. This is the coalition this country needs. (*Applause*)

Dai Hudd (*Prospect*) spoke in support of Composite 10.

He said: Congress, President, the cynicism of the Government for our members was pretty much summed up when Eric Pickles chose Friday 13th to announce the abolition of the Audit Commission. There was no discussion prior to it and no consultation. When asked to justify it, he could only do so on the slimmest of grounds, on the fact that he had had one or two run-ins in the past with the chief executive. There were 2,000 jobs thrown into confusion. An organisation with a strong track record of protecting public finances was pretty much thrown on the scrapheap.

One of the issues I want to look at covers some of the misinformation that this Government has put out. We are supposed to have had a bonanza in pay under the previous Labour Government. The facts simply do not stack up. From 1997-2008, private sector pay went up by 55 per cent. Public sector pay went up by 54 per cent, but that masked huge restructuring and resolving some longstanding equal pay issues, many of which are still unresolved and which, with the pay

freeze, are likely to remain unresolved for several more years to come. In the Civil Service, pay went up by a measly 45 per cent.

These savings allegedly add up to £6 billion and yet in 2007, the banking community awarded itself bonuses of £6.26 billion and in February 2008, £6.73 billion, figures which dwarf any of the alleged savings that come out of the public sector pay freeze. That public sector pay freeze ignores the economies of the fact that it will take a number of people out of economic activity and therefore they won't be supporting the economy. We have heard disturbing reports today that the bonus bandwagon is back and rolling at the levels it was before the crash.

Congress, in building our coalition, we need to be as wide as we possibly can. Several speakers have spoken about the organisations being part of it, but we cannot ignore the private sector – small shops and businesses in our communities where public sector workers rely on their activities. They are organisations which have contracts supporting public sector contracts in terms of employing our members.

Congress, we have justice on our side. We have a clear vision of an alternative to what we face. In passing Composite 10, I hope we show a strong work commitment to deliver on this so that we can give hope to our members as without this commitment, their futures are pretty bleak.

Dave Ward (*Communication Workers Union*) supported Composition Motion 10.

He said: Congress, this is the most serious fight that the trade union movement has been involved in for decades. We face a coalition government of two very different political parties who came together despite two very different political manifestos. They came together to seize power and are embarking upon what appears to be a crusade to rip out the heart and fabric of our society in order to cut a deficit caused by society's most selfish and self-motivated people.

You do not need to be an economist to recognise the dangers of the Government's obsessive, blinkered and panic-driven approach to wholesale cuts. You certainly do not need to be a visionary to see the devastating long-term damage that this is going to do to our jobs, to our social values and to the people who depend mostly upon those key public services. What this country needs is a trade union movement which can mobilise workers and build a coalition of communities as part of the biggest campaign in a generation to defeat this Government's policies.

Congress, a successful and effective campaign must be centred around two key points. We should defend jobs and public services – absolutely – and take strike action, but we should also set out a credible alternative to engage the public. Our alternative must still deal with the deficit, but in a way which prioritises investments in the economy and jobs to take us out of recession. Our alternative, once and for all, must move this country away from an over-reliance on financial services and back to a country which builds things. We should build and invest in council homes and in our infrastructure, schools and hospitals, making the creation of jobs an absolute priority.

In our campaign, there is room for different tactics. There will be times when individual trade unions will have to defend their members, but there will also be other times when co-ordinated strike action is necessary. But, Congress, I utter a word of caution. In any serious fight against this type of government, we have to remember that we must build those arguments and debates out in our communities. It is not just about putting your head down and running at them. We also want to see this campaign hitting back hard at the scapegoating, prejudice and widening of inequality

which prevails in our society today. As we take the Government on, let's continue to let the racist and fascist BNP know that we are equally committed to taking them on.

I have to say that you cannot ignore the Labour Party in this debate. Whilst we need to gain assistance from those in that party who support us, we also have to recognise that there are many decent people in this country who feel let down by the last Labour government. Brendan, we really want you to lead this fight. You should make the trade unions lead this fight. If we want to see a strong Labour government emerge again in this country, they have to follow our lead and not the other way round. *(Applause)*

To summarise, the CWU has a track record of delivering members. We wholeheartedly support this campaign. I am going to come back later on and explain to you again why we need your support in our campaign to defeat the privatisation of Royal Mail. I support this composite. *(Applause)*

Andy Bain (*Transport Salaried Staffs Association*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 10 and the General Council Statement.

He said: The General Council's Statement refers to the need for a movement which will draw in people entirely new to political engagement. We will need a movement as big as the poll tax resistance with the trade unions at its centre. All over the country, this movement is starting to grow. In Islington, north London, where I come from, Islington Hands Off Our Public Services has been built around the trades council, with a growing involvement of others of all political persuasions. It also has its roots in the recent successful campaign to save the Whittington Hospital Accident and Emergency Unit. It includes supporters of different national umbrella anti-cuts campaigns: The People's Charter (which the TUC supports), the recent Coalition of Resistance and the Right to Work campaign. We work together in Islington and this new movement's strength will depend upon such unity across the country to win the difficult struggle ahead.

We still hear "We're all in it together, a passive acceptance of suffering together in a sort of Dunkirk spirit, but aimed wrongly at welfare spending and social democracy. Once the cuts start to bite and people lose jobs, services, welfare, health, education and benefits, the potential will be there to lead with a political and economic alternative, as Brendan has referred to. We can move the "We're all in it together" to a conscious and powerful demand that we, this new movement, wish to change the political agenda so that we decide what happens and not the bankers and their political representatives. We need to attack and divide the Lib-Dems and the Tories, but we also need to urge the Labour Party to an alternative that we know is necessary. New Labour cannot do that so we know what we need to do. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Sean Vernell (*University and College Union*) supported Composite Motion 10 and the General Council Statement.

He said: Congress, as people have already said, we face one of the biggest challenges our movement has ever faced and not just for ourselves. Of course this battle is about our jobs and conditions of service, but it is also about future generations. In further and higher education at this moment in time, cuts have been under way for several months now. In higher education, the Government cut £1 billion from their budget. In further education, £300 million has been cut. That is quite disgraceful in itself, but when you put alongside those another figure, that there are at this moment in time one million people aged between

16 and 25 who are unemployed at this moment in time, it is a national scandal. It is a scandal against which all of us in this movement have to fight and we have to make it a central part of our campaign.

Like many in this room, I remember the 1980s. I spent many years unemployed. I know about the degradation and humiliation felt by millions of people. We have to say loud and clear at this conference that never again can we allow a young generation of people to be put on the dole and left there to rot year after year after year. This has to be central to what we do in this campaign. *(Applause)*

People have mentioned that the money is there. That is absolutely right. There is the money that has been spent on Trident, the wars and the bankers. Mervyn King is going to be here. There is only one question to which I want the answer: when are his members going to pay back the money that they stole from our members? That is the only question I wish him to answer. This is why I think our campaign is going to be a massive one. UCU, alongside the National Union of Students, has called for a national demonstration. We invite everyone in this room to participate in it on 10th November in London. On 3rd October, we will be demonstrating outside the Tory Party Conference to show them that none of these savage attacks on our welfare state will come about.

I am glad to hear that the General Council has called for a demonstration, a march. That demonstration needs to be a mass show of strength, but for it to be on the scale which has taken place in France and Greece we need to start that fight now. People are now losing their jobs and striking. Campaigns have been set up around the country. We need to ensure that we fan the flames of resistance. We need to support every campaign and include everyone in it.

We are the hope. When people talk about racism, there is fear. When there is recession, there is division. When there is mass unemployment, there is more division. Therefore, in this movement, we need to make sure that we are the hope for future generations. Nobody else will be fighting for them. We are their hope and we need to start this fight now. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Kevin Courtney (*National Union of Teachers*) supported Composite Motion 10.

He said: I am very proud to be speaking in support of Composite 10. I was really pleased by some of the things that Brendan said when speaking this morning when he referred to the work that the education unions are doing to combat the fight against academies and free schools. Let me say how proud I am, as a member of the National Union of Teachers, to be working alongside colleagues and comrades in the ATL, the NASUWT, UNISON, Unite and the GMB. We are education unions working together to defend the concept of public service education in this country which is now so sorely under attack.

Congress, we have been talking about the arguments that we have to make and I think there are three which we have to get out to the general public: (1) that these are political cuts and not an economic necessity; (2) that here is an alternative; (3) that these are unfair as they target the most vulnerable. Let me just run through three examples and the question of the political nature of these cuts.

The whole question about free schools is that if you cancel a programme for rebuilding our existing secondary schools in this country in order to justify free market Swedish-type schools, that is a political decision flying in the face of all sorts of statements that we have an economic crisis. They are taking money from public services in order to put it into private businesses.

They say on academies that it is about freeing up schools, but their allies in the CBI tell the truth. They issued a press release last week calling for the academies' programme to go further and saying that there are many private companies who want to get into running chains of academy schools. They named Nord Anglia and Cambridge Education Associates. They have allies in the Swedish Free School Movement. They are all companies who want to come into our public services in order to take a profit from them.

They say that there is no alternative. Let me give you one person who is an alternative by himself. They have him in employment so they know the truth of these statements. Sir Philip Green, the boss of Arcadia, is now their cuts adviser helping them to make the cuts. In 2005, as the boss of Arcadia, Sir Philip Green paid his family £1.2 billion as a dividend payment. That is £1.2 billion to one family! That is an alternative by itself. Let me tell you, he is a very generous man. He paid almost all of it to his wife, who lives in Monaco, so they did not pay a lot of tax on it.

This is the alternative – the tax avoidance of £25 billion. It is the tax evasion of £70 billion. These are the alternatives that we need to get out to the population of this country. We can defend and build public services that are fit for the people of this country. We have the alternatives and we have to fight for them. (Applause)

The President: Congress, there are no speakers in opposition. I am sorry, do you want to speak in opposition? Please believe me, if you are being funny then

Jim McAuslan (*British Air Line Pilots' Association*): President, I do not think it is funny. It is not a funny debate. I just want to say something about tone if I may. Outside this hall, I will explain about the breadth of our membership.

Dave Prentis said in speaking to the motion, "Who will say the unpopular thing?" I think that is a key issue and I am going to say something that is unpopular. I admire the auditory power here, but we do not have to persuade the people in this room. It is the people beyond this room. I admire the public sector. I am a fourth generation public servant myself. I admire the public service and the work that public servants do for the vulnerable. However, to win this argument, we have to look beyond this hall. We have to look at the tone outside this hall and how it works with people outside.

This is the first gathering of TUC delegates since the general election and the tone that we set will shape the way in which the debate takes place in the months and years ahead. We are giving to the coalition Government, I believe, an open goal about resistance to what we propose as an alternative. I think that we have to do much more in being able to persuade the public beyond here. That is public and private, well-paid and low-paid, those who have and those who have not. We will not do it, I believe, simply by ridiculing the rich. I think that we will have to go out and win the argument much more widely than that. To say that we do not have to cut one penny in public expenditure to deal with the deficit that this country has at present is getting the tone wrong.

I have come to the rostrum to oppose the motion, President, because it calls on all TUC affiliates to urgently work together to build a broad coalition and I do not believe that I have my members' mandate to do that. It would be a shame if I was not to vote for this or to keep my head down and do nothing and then not deliver my members' views to the Congress. The coalition is not just Tory and Liberal; the coalition is all of us in this room. We have to work together if we are

going to change public opinion. I am just suggesting that the tone that we are adopting is not the right way to approach the months ahead so I am opposing on that basis. (Applause)

The President: I really am pushed for time and there have been no speakers apart from the last one in opposition so I am going to ask UNISON if they wish to reply. Is there any requirement for the General Secretary to reply? (*No response*) Then I will move to the vote on the General Council's Statement.

* *The General Council Statement* was CARRIED

* *Composite Motion 10* was CARRIED

HMRC resources and the deficit

Jonathan Baume (*FDA*) moved Motion 44.

He said: Congress, every developed country has a tax gap, and that is the difference between the tax that should be paid under laws laid down by Parliament and the tax actually collected from companies and individuals. There is quite a lot of analysis about that in the morning papers today and most people estimate that the tax gap in the UK is over £50 billion!

The UK deficit, which is dominating our debate and that outside of this hall, is about £160 billion. In other words, one-third of the deficit at the heart of our fiscal crisis is caused by individuals and companies who cheat the system. Of course, most people pay their taxes. FDA members and our colleagues in PCS collected about £423 billion last year, and £12 billion was collected directly through action to tackle tax cheats. The work done by senior professionals in HMRC is incredibly cost-effective. These tax, legal, accountancy and policy experts collect between 30 and 180 times their salary cost. Even at the lower end of the scale, a senior professional earning, say, £50,000, could expect to bring in another £1.5 million in taxes and duties. So, let's put it another way. Every senior tax inspector would expect to generate enough additional revenue to pay for 50 nurses in the NHS or the salaries of all of the teachers in a medium-sized school. We know from research studies that this work deters others from cheating.

Revenue and Customs is not that popular this week as 1.5 million taxpayers, and perhaps some people are in this room, have received bills for monies underpaid due to computer errors. This fiasco is no surprise for a department which has been under-resourced for years. HMRC has lost one-third of its staff since 2005, and cut expenditure by more than £1 billion a year. These cuts have, inevitably, eroded the department's capacity to tackle tax avoidance and evasion. There are simply not enough senior professionals to take on the difficult work of ensuring that everybody pays their fair share of taxes. So the tax gap is increasing.

In one case alone, HMRC has accepted £6 billion less tax due under law because it simply doesn't have the resources to litigate complex issues in the case concerned. In other words, in this single case, UK plc has lost the same amount as the Government was seeking to raise through its emergency budget in June. The Government wants to cut the budget deficit over the next five years through dramatic cuts to public services. For every £1 in tax increases, it will cut £4 of expenditure on vital public services. Every government department, including Revenue and Customs, must submit plans for budget cuts of between 25 per cent - 40 per cent. Cuts on this scale, on top of those already imposed, will further undermine the capacity of HMRC to tackle tax avoidance and evasion. For every million pounds saved by sacking senior professionals in HMRC, the country is likely to lose at least £60 million. This means an ever larger budget deficit, an ever greater cut to public services and even bigger tax increases for

the majority of honest taxpayers. This is just madness on a grand scale.

This is not a political motion. The FDA is not seeking to dictate tax policy. We simply argue that the taxes agreed by Parliament should be collected for the benefit of the whole country. Nor are we saying how the money should be used by government. Ministers might use it to cut the deficit faster. They may decide to ease cuts in public services, and that is a matter for Parliament and others. What we do argue is that if HMRC is properly resourced it can take on those who try to cheat on their taxes so that everybody pays their fair share. We do call on the Government to demonstrate that we are all in this together, that tax evaders and avoiders are not somehow exempt. It is not too late to influence the outcome of the spending review, but it will mean a concerted campaign against the proposed cuts in HMRC and a concerted lobby to put more resources into HMRC's cadre of senior professionals.

Now, we all do want to see this deficit reduced. The country already spends more on debt interest than we spend on education. Others can argue about the economics, but there can be no argument that if we boost the resources of HMRC, the deficit can be defeated. Congress, support the motion.

Paul Noon (*Prospect*) seconded Motion 44. He said: Congress, I should make it clear that Prospect does not represent senior staff in HMRC, but we do represent senior and specialist grades in other government departments and in non-departmental public bodies. We share FDA's concern about the consequences of cuts in these areas not only on our members but on the effective operation of government. Intelligent government needs intelligent staff, and it needs enough of them to make sure that the interests of the public are properly protected. Specifically, on HMRC, the applications of proper levels of resource we see as an investment, and an investment which will repay several fold in revenue recouped.

Conversely, cuts will mean that for individuals and companies who get expert advice to avoid and evade, who exploit every loophole and who are endlessly ingenious to that end and expertly advised as well, Christmas will come early. As has been reflected in the previous discussions, and the General Secretary's contribution earlier on, tax revenues are essential to address the deficit, to fund the vital work of our public services, to create a fairer society and to enable government to carry out its essential duties. So oppose the cuts in HMRC, support Motion 44. Thank you.

Dave Bean (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supported Motion 44. He said: President and Congress, the PCS is the union which actually represents the majority of members working in HMRC, and I assure Congress that there is no blame whatsoever attached to PCS members for the current debacle in HMRC regarding the millions of taxpayers facing unexpected tax demands. PCS represent members who are mainly in the clerical grades, who are low paid, under resourced, stressed and suffering low morale. In fact, when the new Pay As You Earn computer system was actually introduced in 2006/7, PCS were telling HMRC and, indeed, the Treasury Select Committee, that there was a backlog of post building up along with increasing unassessed cases, and that urgent action was required if problems were not to occur into the future, and we were proved right.

In 2009 the National Audit Office and the Public Accounts Committee also expressed concern at the state of HMRC. Congress, PCS believes that the current problems are directly linked to the fact that HMRC was formed in 2005 and since then 30,000 jobs have been

cut along with over a hundred local offices closed. Last year 40 million telephone calls went unanswered and, currently, there are over one million pieces of post left unopened. Yet a further 25 per cent or more job cuts are threatened in the Comprehensive Spending Review. The lack of resources, Congress, is creating the ever-increasing tax gap which seems to be a major theme of this year's Congress. £25 billion has been avoided by loopholes in legislation, such as using tax havens. There is £28 billion of outstanding tax that has not been collected or pursued, and £70 billion of tax evaded. That is non-submission, incorrect tax returns and just plain fraud. This is at a time when PCS knows that one tax inspector would bring in an annual average compliance yield of £658,000 per year.

PCS believes that there should be a policy to close that tax gap of £123 billion and add it to a programme of public investment and job creation measures. The economic deficit would then be covered and there would be no need whatsoever for any cuts in public spending at all.

So, Congress, a properly resourced HMRC at all grades would close the tax gap of £123 billion. A properly resourced HMRC would provide a fair and equitable tax system for all and not just for the wealthy and powerful as it is now. A properly resourced HMRC at all grades would give the taxpaying public a proper service, which as the events of the last week have proved is what they deserve and what my members actually want to deliver. Thank you.

The President: Thank you for your contributions to Motion 44. Colleagues, I will move straight to the vote.

* *Motion 44 was CARRIED*

The President: Congress, we have been joined on the platform by Harriet Harman, the Leader of the Labour Party. You are very welcome, Harriet. (*Applause*) I will be introducing Harriet formally after the next motion.

Private Finance Initiative

Steve Gillan (*POA*) moved Motion 46.

He said: Congress, the Private Finance Initiative has been justified by both the Conservative and New Labour governments over the last 20 years. They have done so with an ideology that the private sector is better at delivering services than the public sector, and without doubt it is now the preferred method for public sector procurement. Privatisation and the PFI models have been a disaster in this country. The failings of PFI and privatisation would take about five years to list, rather than the five minutes that I have got in this speech. The concerted attacks on public sector workers and the continued demonising by the right-wing media is a sad and unjustified attempt to further justify the selling off of public sector jobs to the private sector.

We must protect public sector jobs; our railways, fire services, prisons, the criminal justice system, public utilities, Royal Mail, hospitals, social housing, education; the list is endless. They should be in public hands and not in the hands of private companies whose main aim is to prioritise shareholder returns.

There has been much research into PFI by anti-privatisation campaigners, such as Stephen Nathan and George Monbiot, who have continually attempted to raise public awareness. George Monbiot summed-up the systemic flaws of PFI and the effect on Britain's finances. He stated the following in 2008: "While the government retains much of the risk, the investors keep the profits, which often run to many times the value of the schemes. The public liability incurred so far by the Private Finance Initiative is £215 billion. One

day the repayments will destroy British public finances." How true those words are. It is now up to the trade union movement to be robust in our approach in destroying the wires of the right-wing media to ensure the very fabric of our public services are not destroyed forever.

The fightback starts this week. Our movement needs to be inclusive and collective if we are to be successful. PFI and privatisation are less sustainable than ever. Taxpayers' money is used by government to subsidise Britain's PFI schemes. The Treasury lends directly to PFI projects and to government-owned banks, such as the Royal Bank of Scotland. The banks then lend money to the PFI consortia on generous terms. They then build the project and charge the taxpayer for the next 25 years for the service the taxpayer has already paid for through its loans.

The POA along with other affiliated unions have fought and campaigned against PFI and privatisation for the last 20 years. That fight continues until our public services are properly funded and protected. We need to demonstrate to the British public that there is an alternative to PFI and that there should be a public financing structure for our public infrastructure. We need an end to the reckless costly PFI privatisation agenda.

I close by saying this. The whole working classes are under direct threat. Trade union members need leadership from the unions as the uncertainty and fear sets in. Collectively and united, we can succeed and we need to show that leadership this week. This coalition Government has set its agenda. Now we need to set ours and fight to promote and protect our members collectively. Only we can do that. No one will do it for us. This is an important motion in that fight. If our collective evidence-based campaign is ignored, then collectively we will need to have to co-ordinate industrial action, ignoring the anti-trade union legislation if necessary. Support the motion.

John McNally (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supported Motion 46.

He said: The privatisation programme pursued by successive governments over the past 30 years represents a major assault not just in the rights and conditions of workers but a major threat to the economy itself and wider society. In PFI, championed by the last Labour Government, we have the profiteers perfect dream come true – risk free capitalism. Rather than the risk being transferred to the private sector, it is the government, or more precisely us, the taxpayer, who has to step in and save the day if it all goes wrong because essential public services cannot be allowed to fail. PFI has apparent short-term benefits and advantages for government, but boundless benefits for their friends in big business and in the banks. It only has disadvantages for the rest of us, the overwhelming majority in society.

PFI borders on insanity or, perhaps, more honestly, open corruption where private contractors pay for public sector building projects and lease them back for 30 years. As private sector borrowing costs are higher, the annual costs are higher, it is a licence to extort public money as governments are locked into legally binding contracts for decades. All this is so that the government can take the cost of borrowing off the public sector balance sheet. It is through ideology rather than necessity. Not only are we saddled with deteriorating services, we have to pay for it all so that a tiny minority can extract billions in profits, many times the value of the projects themselves.

Also PFI is a financial time bomb. Repayments already run into the hundreds of billions, more than enough to destroy Britain's public finances in the not too distant future. I think that one day PFI will be seen as New

Labour's most catastrophic policy error and betrayal. All privatisation, especially PFI, represents nothing more than a major transfer of wealth and power to the profiteers in big business and the banks. It is nothing more than legalised theft. We could fund the public services many times over from the receipts lost through the privatisation by the Tories of the major utilities. We agree with the terms of the motion, and we recognise that a further wave of privatisation is on its way under the current Tory/Liberal government. We must challenge and defeat it. That means not just raising awareness and campaigning – it certainly means that – but also raising the clear demand that all the services and utilities privatised under Thatcher, Major, Blair and Brown must be brought back to where they belong, back into public ownership.

Gordon McKay (*UNISON*) spoke in support of Motion 46.

He said: In the weeks leading up to the General Election we were repeatedly told by some that it made no difference whether we had a Labour government or a Tory government. In the months and years to come our members, the young, the old, and the vulnerable, are going to find out exactly what the difference is between a Labour government and a Tory government. The greatest disappointment is that to a large extent Labour brought the defeat upon themselves in that private profit and greed was promoted over that of public service, and the public would not stand for it any more.

We were told that PFI was just an accounting sleight of hand, that it was something about keeping capital spends off balance sheets. Comrades, it was never about that. It was about ideology. Two health secretaries ten years apart when they thought the public was not listening let the cat out of the bag. Alan Milburn in 1997 said, "It's PFI or bust." Well, maybe it was bust, Alan. Alan Johnson said: "PFI has always been the NHS's plan A. There was never a plan B." This is just one example of the waste, damage, and greed of PFI: Edinburgh Royal Infirmary completed in 2002 cost £193m to build, but in 2028 at the end of the contract Lothian Health Authority will have paid Consort, a private consortium, £1.26bn. The sting in the tail at the end of the repayment period is that Consort gets to keep the building. Lothian Health Authority has paid for Edinburgh Royal Infirmary seven times over and will never own a single brick. The result for Lothian is the same as it is elsewhere in the country: staff will be sacked and not replaced, beds will be shut, and clinical care will be compromised as contractual payments take priority over patient care.

I am not going to waste this Congress's time with the Tories but a quick word for the friend of the working man and woman, the Liberal Democrats. During the election the Liberals said rather than propping up PFI they would consider going back to more traditional public financing structures. After the Election the first PFI bid was submitted to the Treasury and agreed. The first traditional funding bid was submitted and rejected. Liberal Democrat hypocrisy? Surely not, comrades.

Congress, there is an alternative: public services built, staffed and owned by the public. Not only is it the right thing to do, it is the financially responsible thing to do. I am proud to be one of UNISON's million voices, but it is not enough, Congress. I want two, five, and ten million voices supporting not mine but your public services. Please support. (*Applause*)

The President: Thank you. Congress, I should have said, and I do not think I did, that the General Council support Motion 46, Private Finance Initiative, and also

the comments that have been made, so I am going to go straight to the vote.

* *Motion 46 was CARRIED*

Address by the Rt. Hon. Harriet Harman QC MP, Interim Leader of the Labour Party

The President: Congress, I would now like to introduce the Rt. Hon. Harriet Harman MP, Interim Leader of the Labour Party. Harriet is a lifelong friend of the TUC and the wider labour movement. In the 1970s she was the legal adviser to Trico Equal Pay and Grunwick Strike Committees. In the 1980s as a new MP she campaigned robustly and efficiently on issues close to the heart of Congress on health, equalities, and the National Minimum Wage. In government she shaped and delivered ground-breaking legislation on issues such as the minimum income guarantee for pensioners, child care, domestic violence and legal reform. Since the election Harriet has put up a formidable challenge to the Government's economic policy and led the fight against the cuts in Westminster and beyond. With all this in mind, Harriet, I invite you to address Congress. *(Applause)*

Harriet Harman: Thanks very much for that introduction, Dougie. It is a great pleasure to be here at this important conference, the first since the General Election. It is an honour to address Congress and I want to start by saying that I strongly believe the trade union movement is vital for the future of this country. The fact is that in workplaces with trade unions people at work earn more, have better pensions and are less likely to be discriminated against or treated unfairly. The trade union movement is outstanding men and women in workplaces up and down the country, day in and day out, working together, standing up for people at work. The trade union movement is, and has always been, a champion for social justice. What you do makes a difference and changes people's lives for the better.

This is the first TUC since the General Election. With Labour out of government for the first time in 13 years and faced with the prospect of a government determined to use the deficit in the public finances as an excuse for a thoroughly right-wing agenda, people might expect us to be demoralised. People predicted that we would turn in on ourselves; some feared we would descend into an orgy of recrimination, but the opposite is the case.

There is a remarkable spirit of unity. We are outward facing, determined to be an effective opposition, and we are in good heart. That is due to a number of things. We deprived the Tories of an overall majority and the landslide they expected to be theirs by right, and I want to thank everyone from the trade union movement for the part you played in stopping that happening. There is no unity of purpose or shared principle lying behind the Tory-LibDem partnership. Their incoherence and lack of shared values, contrasted with ours, only makes us stronger.

We have a dynamic new team in the Parliamentary Labour Party. A quarter of our MPs are new, and far from being nervous apprentices waiting in the wings they have thrown themselves into Parliament with vigour. This is not an intake which is keeping its head down and learning the ropes. From all around the country these are confident men and women, many from the trade unions, who expect to blaze a trail straightaway and they are.

One of the most important things that has occurred since the Election is that we have had an unprecedented increase in people joining the Labour Party. Clearly, the sight of David Cameron and Nick Clegg in the Rose Garden of No. 10 had a stunning

effect: it triggered a surge of new members into the Labour Party. More than 32,000 have joined since polling day and the surge is still going strong.

Half of our new members are people who voted Labour but who now feel strongly that voting is not enough and want to play their part in getting Labour back into government. A third are people who voted LibDem because they believed that the LibDems were a progressive, anti-Tory party and are dismayed that their vote has helped put the Tories in. They are joining us to put that right.

Labour is fighting back and all around the country in council by-elections making progress, winning back public support. Since May 6th, we have pulled ahead of the Tories reversing the seven per cent lead in votes they had at the General Election. After our great results last Thursday in Norwich and Exeter, the votes cast in all by-elections since the General Election are as follows: LibDems 25,000, Tories 34,000, and Labour 41,000.

So already Labour is responding to people's concerns about jobs and public services, and mobilising against Tory-LibDem decisions which will harm this country. How does an axing 700 school building projects help the construction industry get back on its feet? How does scrapping the Future Jobs Fund help young people get into work?

Yes, the deficit must be reduced and we had a robust plan to do that, but their budget threatens the fragile economic recovery. It is a budget based on rewritten history and false excuses. They say there is no alternative, but the truth is this is exactly what the Tories want. Their plans are not driven by economics; they are driven by ideology, the Tory hostility to the role of government. The reality is that you do not get borrowing down by pulling the plug on government support for business. You do not get borrowing down by throwing people out of work and onto the dole. You do not get borrowing down by stifling economic growth, and you should not get borrowing down by hitting the most vulnerable.

The Tories have a twin-track excuse to justify their public spending cuts, blaming Labour's management of the economy and arguing that the vulnerable can just be supported by the "big society". The reality is that investment in public services and grants to community and voluntary groups support the fabric of the good society. Spending on public services does not "crowd out" neighbourliness and community spirit any more than public investment, backing up business, "crowds out" private investment. The reverse is true. Communities need the support of the public services and industry thrives when government is on its side, and now they are going to cut the support to the most vulnerable, the disabled who cannot work. So much for the new politics; this is the same old nasty party.

Congress, if the biggest threat the Government poses to our economic recovery is their cuts, the biggest threat they pose to our democracy is their plan to rig the electoral map to give the Tories more seats in Parliament. It is blatant gerrymandering to redraw the constituency boundaries with over three-and-a-half million people excluded from the electoral register. The people most likely not to be registered are young people, private tenants, black and minority ethnic people and those who live in urban areas, exactly the people whom the Tories have never represented. The Tories' redrawing of the constituency boundaries based on the electoral register as it will stand in December this year will mean that those people will not be counted.

You cannot have equal constituency boundaries on the basis of unequal registration and before changing any boundaries the Government must sort that out. Just because these people are not on the electoral register

does not mean they do not exist – they do. We see them in our MP surgeries all the time and we see them being turned away at the polling stations. What we propose is a new “presumption of registration” which would mean that even if people do not apply they will still be registered to vote. If the Tories had any democratic principles, that is what they should agree to.

In exactly the same way, they are taking a nakedly partisan approach to funding of political parties, determined to break the link between Labour and our affiliated unions. Congress, there is all the difference in the world between one tax exile from Belize paying millions of pounds to the Tories and millions of hard-working trade union members paying their levy to Labour. We will defend the right of trade unionists to support our Party and we will defend the right of trade union members, alongside local communities, to campaign, to demonstrate, to protest, to voice your concerns.

We cannot be told that vital jobs and services are to be axed, that the most vulnerable will be hit hardest, but that it is somehow undemocratic to protest against it. Far from trade unionists being eager to go on strike, nothing could be further from the truth. No-one wants to see services disrupted, least of all those who need the services and, of course, those who work hard day and night to provide those services. We will not be silenced by the right wing characterising protest as undemocratic. Trade unionists have the democratic rights to protest. We will not be deterred by suggestions that this is illegitimate; it is perfectly within the law. We will not be cowed by accusations that this is irresponsible and putting services at risk; the very opposite is true. The trade unions have always been amongst the strongest defenders of public services so when it comes to protecting people and the services on which they depend we are not going to be managerial and we are not going to be meek. We will stand alongside local communities and be determined in defence of jobs, defiant against the assault on our democracy, and dogged in protecting the most vulnerable.

The coalition of the Tories and Lib-Dems should be in no doubt we are about to see a new coalition in Britain, a coalition of communities, trade unions and Labour, fighting back. Congress, as we look to the future we take great pride in all we achieved under the leadership of Tony Blair and Gordon Brown. Our political opponents will make a determined effort to denigrate everything we did. We will not let them. For every child who instead of being cooped up in a flat is playing in a brand new children's centre, that is our legacy. For every patient who instead of waiting in pain is cared for by doctors and nurses in a brand new hospital, that is our legacy. For every villager in Africa whose life has been transformed by the cancelling of Third World debt, that is our legacy. That is Labour's legacy and that is your legacy too, and together we will fight to defend it.

We are looking ahead to our conference here later this month. Labour women will be mobilising. We will be meeting on Sunday to chart our new demands. Already over 700 Labour women are registered and I warmly welcome our sisters in the trade union movement to come and help us shape the future. And, of course, after extensive debate and discussion we will be unveiling our new leader. All five leadership candidates have been a credit to the Party and I will be proud to hand over to our new leader a party which is on a sound financial footing, which is growing, which is united, and which is winning votes again.

During my time as leader of the Labour Party I have had nothing but friendship and support from the trade unions. I thank you for that and I know that you will give the same backing to our new leader. These last

few months have been an extraordinary period for British politics and for the Labour Party. We may have been defeated in the election, but we are not defeated in our spirit. We are witnessing an emerging political movement amongst progressives in Britain beginning to see that the Tory-LibDem government has no mandate. They are seeing the difference between what they thought they voted for and what they ended up with. The labour movement is their vehicle for progressive change. We will work together – Labour and the trade unions - to fight against poverty, to fight for fairness, and fight for those who most need our help. Congress, together we will fight back. Thank you. *(Applause)*

The President: Thank you, Harriet. I hope it is obvious from the warmth of our response how much we all appreciate the leadership you have given, particularly to campaigns for justice and equality, and on behalf of the TUC Congress I thank you. *(Applause)*

Sick pay

The President: Congress, I now move to Motion 47, Sick Pay. The General Council supports the motion which is moved by AEP and seconded by UNISON.

Kate Fallon (*Association of Educational Psychologists*) moved Motion 47.

She said: Chair, Congress, and Harriet, good afternoon. This is my first time as a delegate to Congress and although I am delighted to be here I am a little nervous, so please bear with me. *(Applause)* I am here representing over 3,000 educational psychologists who work across England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, many of them within the public sector delivering services for local authorities. They offer help and support to a large number of children and young people in schools, nurseries, homes, and other settings. Many of these children and their families are in very vulnerable situations with severe and complex needs and our members are proud to be able to deliver high-quality services to those vulnerable groups who would otherwise find it very difficult to access specialist input. They are also very proud to be part of a public service system which values its staff and enables them to deliver those high-quality services safely. They work in partnership with other local authority staff both in schools and in children's own homes.

However, across the UK we have to contend with many attempts now by local authorities to change the terms and conditions of service of our members, terms and conditions negotiated and agreed at a national level. What has caused particular alarm recently is the news that a number of local authorities are proposing to remove payment to employees for the first three days of sickness absence. We know that local authorities are being encouraged to increase their productivity by reducing the numbers of days' work lost because of sickness absence and many unions, including ours, have been working in partnership with local authority employers to implement schemes where sickness absence is monitored but where positive strategies are put into place to improve the health and wellbeing of our staff. We perceive this as good practice.

However, the reducing of sick pay as a strategy to decrease sick leave is flawed and potentially dangerous. If people come into work when they are ill because they cannot afford to lose pay, there are two immediate consequences. Firstly, the quality of service delivery is compromised. If staff are not fit to attend work, their competency and judgment may be impaired. This inevitably has a negative impact particularly among vulnerable service users and their families. Secondly, working when you are ill increases

the likelihood of passing that illness on to your clients. Some of the children with whom educational psychologists and their colleagues work have life-threatening conditions which make them particularly susceptible to contracting even a mild common cold virus which may then have potentially fatal consequences. Attending work when ill would also bring educational psychologists and other professionals into conflict with their professional code of practice such as those outlined by the Health Professions Council, leaving them open to allegations against their fitness to practise which then potentially leads to them not being able to practise at all.

However, there is another insidious effect of attempting to implement such actions as all staff become fearful and worried when they are healthy and at work because they feel that these proposals indicate that they are not to be trusted. Their working environment begins to feel unsafe, morale is lowered, and staff generally become less effective. We also know that reducing sick pay is yet another example of the actions which have a particularly negative impact upon women.

The attempt to reduce sick pay is not an attempt to increase productivity; it is an attempt to save money. Everyone here is united in their support of delivery of high-quality public services. The proposal to remove the first three days of sick pay puts immense pressure upon local authority staff to attend work when they are unfit to do so. People who go into work when they are sick will not deliver high-quality services to vulnerable children and their families and may even actually harm them.

The proposals may lead to an unsafe working environment which could adversely affect the quality of all services that are delivered. These proposals mean that at the beginning of the 21st century we find ourselves in a situation where workers in the public sector cannot afford to be sick but as a decent society priding itself on being able to deliver high-quality services to the vulnerable I do not believe that we can afford to let sick people try to deliver those services. Congress, I ask you to support this motion. Thank you. (Applause)

Bob Oram (UNISON) supported Motion 47.

He said: The attack on sick pay has to be seen in the context of the local government employers' recent advice to councils entitled: "Reducing workforce costs". That document is a classic Tory menu for cuts. It includes attacks through contractual changes and cuts in service through organisational redesign. We have only just come out of recession and we know that growth is weak so if 25 per cent of the 2.1 million people who work in local government lose their jobs, they stop spending. Their local shops go out of business and the government loses tax. If there are not enough jobs to pick up the slack, the economy grinds to a halt. This is key stage 2 economics, but who cares about real people when you are one of the multimillionaire comen now running the country?

Thatcher tried to cut her way out recession in 1979 and she made the economic situation much worse. What these comen are doing is Thatcher with knobs on. Even amongst those who think that massive cuts are necessary, the same ones amongst them (like those 60 economists in *The Times* a few weeks back) think that if we do cut, it should be later when growth is much stronger.

The circulation of this *Reducing the Costs* document represents a total disregard of the Green Book, a national agreement, and encourages its break-up via local negotiations. The employers did not consult or circulate the document so the other unions, with UNISON, have registered a formal dispute. This is

alongside the absolute disgrace of refusing to make a pay offer to local government workers this year and also not to award a £250 lump sum to those earning below £21,000, as promised by Boy George in the June budget.

It is not just a procedural issue. When we spend money on public services, we are not throwing money away. We are investing in people so that they can play an important role in making society function. Without education, people cannot do skilled jobs. If services are cut, the things which help society move on will not get done.

Going back to the "Reducing workforce cuts" document, what is it asking councils to do? First of all, it is to move to a service model based on volunteer staffing. That is brilliant - what else can they dream up? It could be to make immediate savings by freezing traditional recruitment by making use of more short-term contracts and agency workers. It could be to cut costs through sabbaticals, secondments and career breaks and encouraging employees to buy leave or take unpaid leave. It suggests that a whole number of contractual changes should be carefully considered in reviewing redundancy payments, negotiating reductions in salaries through collective agreements with the unions or, on an individual basis, reducing work hours. Those are the short-term measures.

For the long-term, it suggests re-prioritising and redesigning services ("easy council" models), merging departments and de-layering structures, reallocating work and redesigning jobs, adopting more shared services and, of course, more use of outsourcing and commissioning services. It will be a significant threat to the vital services provided by local authorities. Support this motion. (Applause)

* Motion 47 was CARRIED

Criminal Justice

Colin Moses (POA) moved Composite Motion 15.

He said: Congress, we are here under the banner of a fair society/a strong economy. You cannot have a fair society if you have unfairness in our justice system. Whether we like it or not, under a Labour government, we put 85,000 people in prison. I have to say, before I go into the body of this motion, that it is an absolute disgrace that we had to wait for a Thatcherite wearing brown suede shoes to tell us what was wrong with the justice system. That should have been told to us by the Labour government.

The POA welcomed the review by the coalition Government into sentencing and rehabilitation within the criminal justice system of England and Wales. However, it is our view that in order for the review to be successful, it must have the confidence of the general public. The Government must have a root and branch review which deals with the causes of crime – issues such as alcohol abuse, drug abuse, domestic abuse and racially-motivated crime. Of course, the greatest thing that we bear in our prisons is the fact that there are far too many people with mental health problems or who have been socially excluded. This must all be reviewed to determine how they will address the sweeping of core issues under the carpet.

All that this Government wants to do, brothers and sisters, is to sweep it all under the carpet. They will do nothing to address sentencing and rehabilitation unless we are totally involved. The review, if it is to be meaningful and credible, must not just look at the cheapest option. It must protect society and not solely focus on the costs of rehabilitation and the passing of responsibility to resolve social problems to the private sector, whose main purpose is to satisfy shareholders. Already, much of the debate is demonising the public sector prison officer, which is quite wrong. Public

sector prison officers and related grades have done a magnificent job in protecting the public.

Any alternative to our criminal justice system must be evidence-based, with full engagement with the unions and not just with lobbyists, who do it to get a pot of money. The general public must have a say on the very fabric of our society. The POA represents the largest number of frontline uniformed staff facing violence and attacks on a daily basis. We must stop the soundbites which just look for the headline. For Tory politicians, there is evidence that prison works given the correct funding and resources. The POA stands ready to assist the politicians in this crucial consultation as it is our members on the frontline who are at the cutting edge. When you are facing a knife, taking into account the stabbings that we have seen recently, it is a very cutting edge. Each day, we are protecting the public.

The last thing the POA wants is to demonise a great public service. The POA, in the coming months, will be producing evidence that public sector prisons are actually more cost-effective than private prisons. We do not believe that a free market should exist within the criminal justice system. Surely we do not wish to create a system where shareholders profit from crime. If they are lying on a beach in the Cayman Islands making profits from murderers and rapists in our prisons, that cannot be right.

So, I would say this to Ken Clarke: "Get into your brown suede shoes and come and speak to the people who know about our prisons." If you want a rehabilitation revolution, it should not be a private revolution. Keep it in the public sector. Please help us to defend public sector jobs. *(Applause)*

Jonathan Ledger (*napo*) seconded Composite Motion 15.

He said: Congress, I am picking up very much from where Colin left off. It is not often that you hear a Tory politician talking about revolution, but that was the central theme of Ken Clarke's first major speech on criminal justice reform in June. It sounded too good to be true as the Justice Secretary condemned the unacceptable growth in the prison population and highlighted the need for more community-based sentences. Of course, too good to be true it was. He quickly returned to type as he promoted privatisation and the provision of community sentences and trumpeted an approach based on payment by results.

What exactly does this mean? The only example so far is a social impact project based in Peterborough prison providing post-release supervision to prisoners serving less than 12 months. Business people are encouraged to invest their money to run the scheme with an expectation of a profitable return if re-offending rates are below a certain level. This may sound relatively benign, but we believe that it is the thin end of a very unpleasant wedge. It promotes an attitude which suggests that from the administration of justice, profit can be made. This attitude is not just morally bankrupt and fundamentally at odds with society's responsibility for the punishment and rehabilitation of those who commit offences, but it insults the prison and probation staff who, every day of the week, work tirelessly to change lives and protect the public. It is not for personal financial reward or public recognition, but because they believe it is the right and decent thing to do.

The probation service has some experience of privatisation. All of these initiatives have failed. In 2007, the provision of bail beds was contracted out to a private company, a company with no experience of working with offenders. The Ministry of Justice was inundated with complaints about antisocial behaviour, criminal behaviour on the premises and inadequate

supervision. The contract was given to a voluntary agency earlier this year. A similar experience followed the privatisation of catering, cleaning and other facilities and management tasks. I could regale you with endless tales of repairs not being done and contractors travelling absurd distances to carry out work, but I will not.

Despite these failures, the threat of privatisation is growing and we are now starting to see the true nature of Ken Clarke's revolution. The vultures of privatisation are gathering around the probation service, Congress, but if they think the service is dead and gone, they are badly mistaken. The probation service continues to be a vibrant and successful public service. It has an established infrastructure with trained and highly-skilled staff. It has unparalleled experience of working successfully with people who commit offences, established ties with local communities and policy commitments to representing and promoting diversity.

We are living in a time of coalitions. This is a time for a close coalition of all those who believe in a progressive approach to crime and punishments. We will make the case for criminal justice reform based on the pivotal roles of the prison and probation services, supported as public services with proper resources. We will make our case based on an approach that emphasises shared values and beliefs, co-operation rather than competition, altruism rather than profiteering, and trust rather than suspicion. Congress, we ask for your support at this time. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Alastair Hunter (*University and College Union*) supported Composite Motion 15.

He said: Congress, the UCU is pleased to be supporting this composite. In doing so, I want to make the case for a much greater investment in rehabilitation and, in particular, the place of education in prison as a means of improving the lives of very vulnerable people.

Statistics show that prisoners who undertake an educational course while in prison are three times less likely to re-offend. At the same time, the National Audit Office reported this year that far too many prisoners are not given the rehabilitation they need. The grim consequences of this can be seen in the further depressing fact that half of the crime in this country is committed by those who come out of prison. Kenneth Clarke has been cited a few times. He has described this as "a revolving door of crime". Well, let his government take the steps needed to close that door.

In these circumstances, UCU welcomes the review. We have lobbied for action particularly on prison education, but we fully endorse the reservation set out in Composite 15 that talk of rehabilitation is meaningless if it is expected to be delivered in tandem with cuts under the false doctrine of payment by results.

Congress, UCU represents prison educators who have a key role to play in rehabilitation. You may be surprised to learn that Manchester College, the largest FE college in Europe, runs prison education in 80 institutions and is by far the biggest provider in the field. UCU members are in the front line of this particular aspect of rehabilitation and yet, before the onslaught promised by Osborne and Cable, they face an employer who has already tried to reduce sick leave and to cut wages by up to £7,000 a year. Combined with under-resourcing in the prison service as a whole, this is a recipe for disaster.

Congress, prison officers, probation officers and prison educators deserve better. Please support them in their struggle to create a safer society. Please support this composite. *(Applause)*

Jackie Green (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 15.

She said: Our members, working in the court service, are facing savage cuts. In the Ministry of Justice, 15,000 staff are at risk. There are 157 courts across the country at risk of closure. This court closure programme will have a serious impact on the ability of the courts to deal with rehabilitation and reducing re-offending.

Some new courts have successfully integrated programmes to reduce re-offending into the work of the court. If courts close and work is crowded into the remaining courts, it will be hard to see how there will be time and space for this type of work to continue, let alone the funding, when the Ministry of Justice has already been asked to make cuts of up to £2 billion from its £9 billion budget. This is why the PCS has launched the Justice under the Hammer campaign with the aim of keeping courts open, saving our members' jobs and defending the access to justice.

Congress, it is not only the courts. The Youth Justice Board, which is committed to reducing the numbers of people in secure units, has also offered up scenarios of cuts between 25 per cent and 45 per cent. If these cuts are allowed to happen, we could see a cut in the number of regional youth teams working with young people to reduce re-offending. Management have also talked about payment by results for regional youth teams. Of course, there are social reasons for the causes of crime: the number of young people not in employment, education or training is on the increase with funding cuts for youth training and cuts in university places. Huge cuts to public spending will affect the most deprived areas in our communities and ultimately will lead to an increase in crime.

When he was Home Secretary, Michael Howard said, "Prisons work." The prison population was then 45,000. Today, it is 81,000 and now Ken Clarke tells us, "Prisons do not work." Congress, the Tories have never been interested in reducing crime or investing in our criminal justice system. When we lock up more people than any other European country, despite the fact that crime has fallen, what is not to welcome about a review of sentencing and rehabilitation? However, rehabilitation and reducing re-offending requires investment and not cuts. Please support the motion. (*Applause*)

Chris Tansley (*UNISON*) supported Composite Motion 15.

He said: UNISON welcomes Composite Motion 15, incorporating Motion 64, submitted by our sister union, napo.

UNISON believes, as the Government says that it does, that rehabilitation, as an alternative to custody, works. That is what the probation service does and it does it well. Our members who work as probation service officers, as unpaid workers and supervisors, as workers in approved premises, as case administrators and victim liaison officers deliver verifiable improvements in re-offending rates by hard work, expertise and dedication every day throughout the year. Our members in the probation service manage some of the most dangerous people released from prison who work with other agencies to ensure public protection.

The Government says that it is committed to rehabilitation. It wants to see a rehabilitation revolution to recognise the value and promise of community sentences. However, when coalition ministers announced their rehabilitation revolution, they failed to mention one key player in this – the probation service. The Government's approach is that all of this work can now be opened up to the vagaries of the private sector. This is both misguided and extremely dangerous.

UNISON acknowledges that there are already good partnerships between the probation service, the local community and voluntary sector providers in areas like rehabilitation, employment, training and housing, but critically the voluntary sector is not in competition with the probation service. The two work hand in hand in a complementary way. Indeed, many UNISON members work for the voluntary sector organisations which have worked with probation over many years, but the private sector is something completely different. The experience of the private sector in probation has been nothing short of a disaster over the last ten years. They have required ever more extensive commissioning, a superstructure resulting in decisions over a provision which should be taken locally being taken by remote regional directors of offender management and poorer services at higher cost.

The current Home Office facilities management contract, operated by the private company, Interserve, has been a complete failure for the probation service, which has been forced to sign up to it. Our members working for the company have been denied pay rises under TUPE. They have had their hours cut as the company has tried to extract maximum profit from a contract it will not win again. Over the last five years, the Ministry of Justice has desperately tried to create markets for the probation service, markets which up until now have remained a figment of their imagination. In actual fact, the Government gave the game away in a recent announcement by saying that it wanted to involve the private sector in probation because they could deliver a more cost-effective solution to community sentences and rehabilitation.

UNISON and napo work well in probation. We will continue to work together to fight these cuts and the attacks on the probation service. Congress, please support the composite.

* *Composite Motion 15 was CARRIED*

The President: Congress, that completes the business for this morning. Before we move into the photocall for All Together for Public Services, may I remind delegates that there are various meetings taking place this lunch-time. Details of these meetings are displayed on the screens and can also be found on pages 11-14 of the Congress Guide or in a leaflet included in the Congress wallet. Please note that in a change to the *Congress Guide*, the RMT's fringe meeting "Bringing Hope to the Innocent" takes place at Tuesday lunchtime and not today. I would also like to remind delegates that the Trade Union Liaison Organisation Labour Leadership hustings will take place this evening at 5.30 in Charter Suite 8 of Manchester Central.

Congress, we are breaking a little earlier for lunch so that we can join in the formal launching of the TUC's campaign against the spending cuts. We will do this outside the hall by each of us holding up a poster at the entrance of Manchester Central where the world media awaits us. Can I ask you, when I close Congress in a few minutes, to go through the exhibition area to the main hall where you can collect a poster from the stewards before you exit through the door. Please then follow the instructions from the stewards outside the hall, who will form you all into the best possible photo call position. I now formally close this first session of Congress. Thank you.

(Congress adjourned until 2.15 p.m.)

MONDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

(Congress re-assembled at 2.15 p.m.)

The President: I call Congress to order. Many thanks, once again, to the Lady Manners School Folk Group

who have been playing for us this afternoon.
(Applause)

Delegates, as you know, I intended to try and take Emergency Motion 2 on the Royal Mail during this morning's session. This did not prove possible. It looks unlikely that I will be able to take the emergency resolutions this afternoon, but I will, of course, keep delegates informed depending on the progress of business.

Can I also just say that I intend, although it may not be possible, to take all the unions which have indicated that they want to make a contribution in the resolutions because we are up against it for time. Delegates, we return this afternoon to Chapter 3 of the General Council's Report, Economic and industrial affairs, the section on welfare and social policy, page 48. I call paragraph 3.4. Unite has indicated that they want to speak.

Poverty and vulnerable employment

Ivan Monkton (*Unite*) in speaking to paragraph 3.4 of the General Council Report said: Thank you, Chair. That was a bit of a surprise. I thought I was coming in at the end of the debate, but here I am. I am from the Agricultural Sector of Unite, and I want, specifically, to speak on paragraph 3.4 of the General Council Report, the vulnerable employment and labour market regulation sections.

I want to congratulate, first of all, the TUC and the General Council for the work that they have done, but I want to tell you that there are going to be another 300,000 low paid workers who are going to be more vulnerable because of labour market deregulation. In the 1980s Margaret Thatcher and in 2010 Cameron and Clegg have decided upon an ideological attack on one of the most skilled, dedicated and loyal groups of workers there are in this country. What they intended to do, and now intend to do, is to abolish the Agricultural Wages Board. You might not have seen much about this in the newspapers. You might not have heard anything about it on the television. It has appeared early morning on The Farming Programme before six o'clock and that's about it, because, unfortunately, agricultural workers aren't just sexy enough for the media. Earlier on this morning you all saw a film and in the film was mentioned the Master and Servant Act. Let me tell you now, if the Agricultural Wages Board is abolished that is going to be the equivalent of the Lord and Serf Act. Farm workers have always needed the support of other trade unionists, always, from Tolpuddle onwards. Frances O'Grady herself did a huge amount of work – I don't know how long ago it was – maybe ten or fifteen years ago helping our union with the equality audit of the Agricultural Wages Board. We now need your support more than ever.

I know that these are difficult times. We've already had the debate this morning. There is going to be a huge fight against the cuts that the Government have announced, but please find a little bit of space, time and effort to help us. We need the General Council and all affiliates to join our campaign now. In the 1980s we beat Thatcher. We managed to stop her abolishing the Agricultural Wages Board. We've got to do the same in 2010 and 2011. Please help us. Thank you.

Child poverty

The President: I call now on Composite Motion 3, Child poverty. The General Council supports the composite motion.

John Hannett (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*) moved Composite Motion 3.

He said: President and Congress, no one can disagree that there is a need to tackle the deficit, but our view is

very clear. This should be done in a responsible way, sustainably and, of course, fairly. The cuts this Government have announced, cuts to the tune of £60 billion, are neither responsible, sustainable and absolutely certainly not fair. What's more, Congress, if past lessons are anything to go by the cuts will not tackle the deficit. Far from reducing the deficit, their measures will make the situation much worse. Let's cast our minds back. We saw the same economic policies fail with such devastating effect in the 1980s. Now, just as then, they will cost jobs and push up unemployment, reduce tax revenues and hit essential public services. They will do serious damage to the economy, damage for which the poorest in our society will pay the highest price. That is always the way when the Tories get their hands on power. The cuts will undo Labour's successful management of the economy and put the recovery that Labour kick-started at risk.

Congress, these cuts are on a huge scale, with welfare spending being one of the hardest hit -- £11 billion over the next five years -- working parents on low incomes, disabled people and women will feel the full force of the blow. That is not just our view in the trade union movement, but it is also a view shared by many economic experts across the board. But, Congress, it doesn't take an expert to predict what impact the following measures will have on USDAW members, and many of your members also. Housing benefit has been capped, benefits rates devalued, the Health in Pregnancy Grant is on its way out, Child Trust Funds have been scrapped, Child Benefit frozen, Tax Credits rolled back and the SureStart Maternity Grant has been cut. All these issues affect real people in the most hostile way.

Congress, let's not pull any punches here. Some would have you believe that these are small amounts of money, money that goes to parents who don't need it and won't miss it. Far from it. We know from our campaigning in USDAW that every one of these benefits makes a real difference to our members' lives. We know that having a baby puts a real strain on family finances, and when an USDAW member takes up her right to one year's maternity leave, she stands to lose almost £8,000. That is before you have factored in the extra costs of a new baby.

Congress, our members rely on the Health in Pregnancy Grant, which is used for essentials, and I repeat "essentials", not luxuries. I am talking about essentials like prams, cots and pushchairs. It is not being put away for a rainy day. Members are, however, putting some aside in the Child Trust Fund for their child's future, and using it to set up long-term savings plans, making regular small deposits to help secure opportunities for their children when they reach 18.

Tax Credits are an essential income for many thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of USDAW members. They can't choose to take or leave them because they rely on them to maintain a decent standard of living. Restricting their reach will have a devastating impact on millions of working families. Labour's package of support for working parents was crucial. It enabled parents to make real decisions about going into paid work. It made juggling paid work with family life manageable. In short, Labour sure made work pay.

Congress, at a time when all of this is to go, and indeed much more, our campaigning does take on and must take on a new urgency. We will hold this Government to account for failing to tackle child poverty, for failing to consider the impact that their measures will have on women, children and disabled people, and particularly for forcing working people on low incomes to carry the responsibility. Please support the composite.

John Puckrin (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*) seconded Composite Motion 3.

He said: President and Congress, it should come as no surprise that this education union is seconding a resolution on child poverty. It has always been the case that social class and poverty have been the main determinants of educational outcome and the life chances of our young people. Furthermore, government policy on academies and free schools will widen the social and educational divide. For further details on this, come to our fringe meeting tomorrow lunchtime.

For decades some politicians of all parties have sought to expose the evils of poverty; Lloyd George and Beveridge for the Liberals, Attlee and Bevan from Labour, and even Shirley Williams and Roy Jenkins from the Social Democrats. There was a Tory Prime Minister in the 19th century, Disraeli, who wrote of the dangers of creating two nations, the rich and the poor. He started a strand of 'one nation conservatism' that continued with MacMillan and Butler. This tradition was cast aside in the Thatcher years with the likes of Peter Lilley venting their bile on single parents, immigrants and benefit claimants. But when Theresa May had the courage to admit to the Tory Party's 'nasty party' image, the rhetoric from the Conservatives began to change.

But, colleagues, government has to be judged by actions, not words. Within days of taking office the coalition abolished the Child Trust Fund and scrapped the extension of free school meals to families receiving Working Tax Credit. Far from being progressive, as claimed by the Chancellor, the June Budget hit low income families worst, and this was before the £4 billion further cut in welfare that was revealed last week.

Congress, this Government has reaffirmed its commitment to abolish child poverty by 2020 but it has revealed no detail on how this can be achieved. They need to be aware that if they persist in claiming to be supporters of social justice, without providing the means to achieve it, then they will be judged as hypocrites. The current situation leads me to paraphrase George Orwell in *Animal Farm*: We're all in it together but some people are deeper in the slurry pit than others. Thank you.

Emma Ritch (*GMB*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 3.

She said: Congress, we start to get the flavour of this new Government, snatching free school meals from half-a-million children, children from low income families where free school dinners could have made a real difference by making sure that they got at least one hot, healthy meal a day, helping them to perform better at school and by taking the pressure off the food bills of hundreds of thousands of families. That is not to be, not under this Government.

This Government has not only scrapped the widening of eligibility, but they have also scrapped the new pilot schemes which were going to provide universal free school dinners in a number of local authorities. These pilots were meant to follow the successful trials in Durham and Newham, trials which produced evidence of the success of free school meals and their cost-effectiveness. It was on the basis of hard evidence that trials were being extended, but the new Government has decided unilaterally and without consultation to pull the plug on this project. It is an attack on families and it's an attack on children, pure and simple.

If the Government is serious about raising standards and reducing child poverty, then they will have to think again, but do we really expect that they will? Of course, the Tories have form when it comes to cutting

school dinners. They did it under Thatcher – "Thatcher, the milk snatcher". Even the favoured few are affected. The new caring Conservatives have also axed nutritional standards in their precious new academy schools. The Lib-Dems also have form. They cut free school meals when they took power in Hull only a few years ago, so shame on them both!

The GMB has campaigned long and hard for free school meals for all primary school children on nutritional and health grounds and because the educational achievements of our young people need to be fuelled by more than hot air. Congress, we won't stop the fight for free school meals. I support.

Jane Aitchison (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supported Composite Motion 3.

She said: Congress, I give my full support to Composite Motion 3. President, a shocking four million children in this country are living in poverty. Yes, in this country, the fifth richest country on the planet!

When Thatcher came to power in 1979 one in ten British children officially lived in poverty. Margaret Thatcher and her various admirers, who have followed her since as British Prime Minister, have disgracefully increased that figure to one in three. The current Government has done nothing for children living in poverty. In fact, with their first Budget, they threatened cuts and their welfare reforms, they look set to drive more and more children deeper into poverty in this country. Fifty seven per cent of the children living in poverty are living in households where at least one parent works, so being in work is no guarantee of getting out of poverty. The Government's cuts and the public sector pay freeze threaten to make that situation much worse.

Far too many of the members I represent, who are working flat out in these recessionary times for the Department for Work and Pensions, are very low paid themselves. Fifty eight per cent of them earn so little that they are exempt from this year's public sector pay freeze, and instead the Chancellor has guaranteed them a measly £250 pay rise this year. That works out at less than ten per cent, even for those on the National Minimum Wage. Little wonder, then, that the only businesses that seem to be opening up on our high streets are another rash of charity shops and the shops offering so-called "Pay day loans". How Scrooge-like of this Government to offer my members a £250 pay increase and how incredibly out of touch, but what do you expect from a Cabinet where 18 out of 23 of them are millionaires, the most elitist government we have seen for decades? David Cameron said that he's not the slightest bit embarrassed to have gone to Eton, a school that costs £30,000 a year 95 per cent of my members – that is a real figure – don't even earn £30,000 a year. If you look on the Eton website today, and please do because it is very interesting, you will see that £250 wouldn't pay for half-a-term's violin lessons. At the same school, they recommend that each child has £500 per term for sundries, which include tipping of the domestic staff. This isn't the politics of envy, Congress. This is the politics of poverty, of inequality and of anger.

Research shows that by the age of six a more able child from a poor background will have been overtaken at school by a less able child from a rich background. Poverty breeds inequality and disadvantage. Don't tell us that we're all in it together,

Mr Cameron, until you've put our children on an equal footing with your children. Stop cutting our jobs. (*Applause*) Stop cutting our jobs, stop cutting our services and stop cutting our pay so that we can afford to bring up our children in security, on a living wage and with an equal chance our life. Support the motion.

Angela Lynes (*UNISON*) supported Composite Motion 3.

She said: Congress, what this composite recognises is that if we are serious about tackling child poverty in the UK a combination of different conditions need to be met. We need secure employment, family friendly working, decent wages – the majority of our employers are not even going to implement the £250 that was guaranteed by the Government – and we need a supportive benefits system. But underpinning all of that, of course, we need a government that is 100 per cent committed to the goal of eradicating child poverty and willing to take active measure to ensure that this goal is achieved.

Unfortunately, that commitment and the life changes of millions of children are in danger of becoming casualties of a decision that the coalition Government is now taking. Since May we have heard the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions indicate his intentions to move the goalposts, to reclassify child poverty so that the definition does not reflect growing prosperity or the gap between those at the bottom and those at the top of the income scale. Then in the emergency Budget, let's not forget that it was the poorest families who were hardest hit. Child Benefit has been frozen for three years; a vicious squeeze on Housing Benefit and all benefit payments linked with the Consumer Price Index rather than retail prices, with the consequence that millions of claimants will see the amount they receive reduced year on year. One respondent to a recent project by UNISON on the impact of low pay on our members' families talked about how benefits were brilliant, how they made all the difference, and they do. You can't cut a family's benefits and expect it not to impact on the children in that family. So, Congress, let's not let the coalition Government get away with pretending that we're all in this together, and let's not let them quietly massage the definition to make the figures look better than they really are or drop the child poverty target altogether.

What is at stake, Congress, is the future of our children and our grandchildren. But, Congress, as the composite also indicates, tackling child poverty also requires tackling low pay and insecure employment. As survey after survey demonstrates, more poor children in the UK live in households where at least one parent is in work and that number is growing. Nearly six out of ten poor children live in families that are in working poverty. This is the legacy of the last time that the Tories were in power. The flip side of the flexible labour market coin, and it is in this context that we must recognise the role that all of us, as trade unions, have to play, organising in every workplace, winning decent incomes, all as part of a joined up approach to fighting and eradicating child poverty once and for all. Please support.

Hazel Danson (*National Union of Teachers*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 3.

She said: The Chancellor, a privately educated millionaire, claimed in his Budget speech in June that it was a progressive Budget. However, the research commissioned by the End Child Poverty Campaign shows that this Budget hit families with children hardest and that the poorest families are set to lose the most. It was a Budget that cut any expansion of free school meals. This is not something that would touch the children of the privileged Eton set. I don't think their website records how many pupils are on free school meals there. But we know that hungry, poorly nourished children can neither learn well nor thrive at school. These are basic requirements. For some children their school meal is the only hot meal they receive.

The Budget also cut access to safe play. It may be that Cameron, Clegg and Osborne don't understand how important this is or have never had to use a safe play area, but not all children have safe, private gardens or country estates to roam in. It will be these children, once again, who lose out from these unnecessarily imposed cuts, imposed on the poorest by the most privileged.

There is an alternative to cuts, and this morning we discussed what that should be. For there is also an economic case for ending child poverty. Research by the Joseph Rowntree Trust suggests that the net economic benefit of ending poverty is in the region of £25 billion. Moving all families above the poverty line would in time save huge amounts of money from picking up the pieces that poverty causes. This is not a quick fix option. It requires investment, not cuts. But that, Mr Osborne, would be progressive. We know that the consequences of poverty are wide-ranging and long-lasting and poverty remains the biggest determiner of educational outcomes. Many unions here represented in Congress are part of the End Child Poverty Campaign, made up of more than 150 organisations from charities and welfare organisations. The trade union movement is, rightly, at the core of this campaign, not simply because of the economic case but because ending child poverty fixes our core values of fairness and equality. We, colleagues, want to deliver it by the moral code, a moral code which rests on the immense human cost of allowing children to grow up suffering the physical and psychological deprivations of poverty and unable to participate fully in our society. We have to be the ones to champion this cause. Please support.

Yvonne Swingler (*Unite*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 3.

She said: Our children haven't caused this economic crisis so they must not become its victims. As trade unionists we don't just represent our members. We represent their families, too. Standing up for children must be central to what we do as a movement. Ending child poverty is paramount, but it won't just happen because we want it to. We need policies and action.

As trade unionists our pay bargaining in the workplace means families have more money. That is action to end child poverty. As a senior woman Unite representative, I know that bargaining for part-time workers, bargaining on equal pay and bargaining for domestic abuse policies, all these are actions to end child poverty. But what have we got from our ConDem Government, or as I find myself calling them, the "ConDims"? Not only are they proposing no action to end child poverty but their policies will increase it. Their cuts will hit women hardest and poorer families the most. The Child Trust Fund is a good start in life for a baby, but they have taken it away. Freezing Child Benefit is like taking food out of a child's mouth. In many cases, Child Benefit pays for the weekly shop. It does for my daughter. Taking away free school meals for all is taking away the only substantial meal some children will have. Demolishing the £190 Health in Maternity Grant is taking away the choice of healthy food from the pregnant woman and her growing baby.

None of these ConDem policies create jobs. They just take money away from women and children. We must end child poverty, not create it. This Government's family policy has The Treasury at its heart. We want a family policy with children at its heart. We must achieve our target to end child poverty. Our children are our future. Please support.

* *Composite Motion 3 was CARRIED*

Defence of the welfare state

The President: We now move to Motion 16, Defence of the welfare state. The General Council supports the motion.

Janice Godrich (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) moved Motion 16.

She said: Congress, this coalition Government is making it clear that it is the poor who should pay for the crisis. Instead of taking on the bankers and the tax dodgers, this Government is taking them onto the payroll. Sir Philip Green has been appointed to review public spending, and former banker, Steven Green, as a Trade Minister.

When George Osborne said, "We're all in this together", he means all of us, whilst the rich and powerful are exempted. It is the poorest, those who didn't cause the crisis, who were made to pay in the emergency budget with £11 billion of welfare cuts, but there was £24 billion in corporate tax breaks. Last Thursday George Osborne announced a further £4 billion of welfare cuts. There was no detail as to who would be targeted by these cuts. Will it be the long-term unemployed, single parents, the disabled, pensioners or carers? Will it be more of our DWP members' jobs cut or privatised, leaving worse services for all of those people?

Already there have been cuts. By March 2011 there will be 8,000 fewer staff in Jobcentres. The £11 billion welfare cuts announced in June were bad enough. The attack on Housing Benefit, which in effect is a form of social cleansing, will force families out of their homes and whole communities out of our major cities. The three year freeze on Child Benefit is, in real terms, a cut of over 10 per cent and will increase child poverty. Linking benefits to the CPI instead of the RPI will mean the poverty rates of UK benefits will get worse. Cutting £1.4 billion from the Disability Living Allowance will not help disabled people live more independently.

This Budget was not progressive. It was regressive. It is an attack on the founding principles of the welfare state, universal comprehensive benefits paid on the basis of the need to stop people descending into poverty. The creation of the welfare state rejected the old Tory model of means testing and benefits became a citizen's right. We need to defend the welfare state that the trade unionists have fought for over generations. It is a hallmark of a civilised society that those unable to work do not live in poverty. Cameron wants to turn the clock back to the Victorian age, to the workhouse, to a moralistic division between the deserving and the undeserving poor, but in this back to the future model it will be the private sector deciding who is deserving or not.

We know that the ideological drive to attack welfare is firmly rooted in the policies of the New Labour Government when Blair signalled the marketisation of welfare by choosing the likes of David Freud, a merchant banker and arch privatiser, to report on welfare delivery. He concluded: "I have no doubt that this will be an annual multi-pound market." It couldn't be clearer what the real agenda is. Even the poorest and most vulnerable in society must be ground even further into the ground in order to increase profits for the profiteers. If the Government was serious about getting people back to work, it should be introducing positive measures to challenge the discriminatory attitudes held by employers, encourage a flexible workforce and provide free affordable childcare and other pertinent provisions. The demonisation of those on welfare is paving the way for an unprecedented assault on them, with equally unprecedented bonanzas for the private sector, including the most unscrupulous profiteers, who will – in fact, they already have – put in

the most unrealistic bids for welfare delivery contracts. They don't need to worry, because they know full well that if it doesn't work then the Government or, to be more precise, we, the taxpayers, will bail them out.

Congress, our motion calls on unions working with welfare groups and organisations, for example, the National Pensioners Convention and Save Council Housing, to form an alliance to defend our welfare state. Those who are now planning the destruction of the welfare state were born into privilege, were brought up in privilege, and now exist in privilege. There is more chance of Jeremy Clarkson being spotted on one of Boris's bikes than a member of this Government claiming Jobseeker's Allowance.

Congress, this morning we passed a resolution committing the TUC to organise a national demonstration against the cuts. All of us must go and build for a massive turnout at this demonstration. We must express the anger here in this hall to a wider audience and, most importantly, state that there is an alternative and build the confidence of workers and the unemployed to stop the destruction of the Welfare State. I move.

Gerard Dempsey (*Unite*) in seconding Motion 16, said:

President and Congress, this motion concerns fighting for the defence of our welfare state. Unite fully supports the motion by PCS. It is a direct attack by the ConDem Government against each and every worker in this country and their families. It's a crisis not of our making. We should not be paying a single penny, we should not be losing a single job in the public or the private sectors and we should not be witnessing our members' and their families' benefits being savaged and clobbered. It's an attack on the most vulnerable. It is against basic decency. The lick-spittle Liberals have sold out. What for? For four Cabinet seats. And it's back to the same old Tories. The "There is no such thing as society" crap. For good measure we have also got Frank Field and Alan Milburn thrown in from New Labour, or the leftovers.

The Government's smash and grab Budget is aimed at ordinary working people, while those who were found with their snouts in the trough have returned to business as usual with their obscene pay and bonus cultures, the bankers and fat cats. It is they who should be coughing up. There is more than £100 billion in their avoidance scams. Instead, what does the ConDem Government do? They go for the easy targets. The most vulnerable and poorest in our communities.

The welfare state and public services are an essential part of any civilised society, pooling the risk across the population and providing support and services to us all. Yet politicians are attacking and scapegoating the long-term sick and the disabled as if they are responsible for society's ills rather than its victims. It forces people to compete for jobs that don't exist rather than helping people to get back to work. It is perverse. Yet we have seen thousands and thousands of decent Remploi workers losing their jobs and the factories cut. We must oppose attacks and caps on benefits such as Housing Benefit, Disability Benefit, Attendance Allowance and Health in Maternity Grants. These crude attacks are against the most vulnerable in our society, including single parents, pensioners and the unemployed.

Comrades, it's time politicians stopped blaming the victims. The Government's welfare plan removes the already paltry entitlements and fails to value the important work of parents and carers. We are opposed to the abolition of Income Support and to compulsory work for benefits. We oppose the sacking of thousands and thousands of PCS workers working in our Jobcentres to be replaced by a private company

which is out to profit from the plight of the vulnerable. People at the sharp end of the crisis need more help, not less.

Finally, Chair, we must organise a broad based campaign to fight and defend our welfare state, uniting workers, uniting pensioners with students and community groups. Congress, I urge your support. Thank you.

Sasha Callaghan (*University and College Union*) spoke in support of the motion.

She said: Congress, much of what the ConDem Government is doing around welfare reform is pretty much a chronicle of a death foretold. We are not surprised. We were warned. We know what they have done in the past, but the biggest shock has been the relentless and determined attack on disabled people, an unprecedented attack. Like some kind of evil conjurer, David Cameron with the help of the *Daily Mail*, the *Daily Express* and the BBC with the saints and sinners agenda, has transformed disabled people, miraculously, from being pathetic stereotypical recipients of benefits and objects of pity and charity into stereotypical benefit scroungers, determined to defraud the Government and all of us on every single possible occasion.

The introduction of the Employment and Support Allowance, and the fact that that aspect of the welfare reform agenda has almost gone ahead unchallenged, has now given this Government the confidence to go on to attack disabled people in receipt of Disability Living Allowance. DLA is a benefit for people in work and out of work. It has got nothing to do with increasing welfare dependency, but that is conveniently forgotten by George Osborne and his friends.

Listening last week to Nick Clegg, trying to convince us that there was nothing to be afraid of, I thought the person who sounded most afraid was Mr Clegg himself. He was like some frightened little boy trying to persuade himself that if he kept the lights on the monster wouldn't jump out from under the bed to get him. Well, the monster's there and it's us as disabled people! The Government is right to be scared. When it talks about lifestyle choices, disabled people have to say something to the Government. A lifestyle choice, to be a disabled person living in poverty? I don't think so. George Osborne is a man who has never done a socially useful day's work in his life can come and talk to us, lecture us, as disabled trade unionists about lifestyle choices. Well, what about the lifestyle choices of the bankers, who choose to pay themselves enormous bonuses, whilst ordinary bank workers are put on the dole? Or the lifestyle choice of many of those members of the Cabinet who choose to have second and even third homes whilst disabled people are in danger of being made homeless. Don't talk to us about lifestyle choices.

We've been told it's fight or flight. Well, it isn't. For disabled people this is fight or die. It is a straightforward choice. Disabled people will die. They are dying already. So I have to say to you, Congress, it's a simple choice. Fight or die. We choose to fight.

* *Motion 16 was CARRIED*

Industrial injuries

The President: I now move to Motion 78 – Industrial injuries. The General Council supports the motion.

Chris Kitchen (*National Union of Mineworkers*) moved Motion 78.

He said: Delegates, I believe that the TUC made an excellent job yesterday in highlighting how this

Government's cuts will disproportionately affect the poorest and most vulnerable. The Industrial Injuries Disablement Benefit is one benefit that this Government and its spin doctors cannot label as a benefit for the scroungers or the lazy in our society. It is a benefit that compensates workers for accidents and diseases caused by their work, individually assessed for their level of disability.

Congress, we must ensure that this benefit continues to compensate workers for their injuries to ensure that they retain a fair quality of life and are not discriminated against because of their disablement. The trade union movement should make sure that, whilst we, rightly, fight all the cuts which this Government is imposing, we do not allow benefits like the Industrial Injuries Disablement Benefit to become not fit for purpose and that it continues to keep pace with the cost of living increases whilst continuing to resolve some of the unfairness that does exist within the system. Thank you.

Neil Vernon (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) seconded Motion 78.

He said: Congress, we are increasingly finding that our members suffer disability as a result of accidents at work, most of which are entirely preventable if companies took health and safety responsibilities seriously. Workers are being treated unjustly by the welfare system, and those most deserving of sustained support are suffering the greatest level of mistreatment. Congress, the construction industry has a high level of disablement claims. The physical work our members do, the inclement conditions they are forced to work in, the failure of construction companies in their duty of care to employees, the lack of safety measures and often the lack of occupational health provision means that all too often workers are injured and can lose their ability to work and are dependent on a settlement from the state for their disablement. But the payments are too low. More than that, it takes a 30 page form to claim. The system is clearly set up to prevent claims and limit payments.

People are made to feel as if they are somehow undeserving of this benefit, and the very fact that the benefits are means tested in relation to other benefits, such as Jobseeker's Allowance, Income Support and Pension Credit, is, in our view, no way to treat workers in our society who want to work. Despite what the rabid right-wing press likes to say, as a result of industrial disablement or injury, they are prevented from doing their job. In effect, you are forced into poverty because the state benefit you are given does not reflect the reality of the disablement that you are faced with. Industrial disability can severely impact on potential earnings. The ability to retrain for another job is welcomed but not always viable because of the nature of a worker's disablement. Also the Reduced Earnings Allowance has been stopped for injuries which took place after 1990. As a movement, we need to redress this issue and challenge this Government, which is on an ideological mission to slash benefits. The level of these payments is unacceptable. We need to stand shoulder to shoulder with our members who are prevented from working and doing their jobs. We must fight to ensure that our members have some form of financial security. Congress, I second the motion and urge you to support.

* *Motion 78 was CARRIED*

President's address and vote of thanks

The Vice President (*Sheila Bearcroft*): Good afternoon, Congress. It gives me great pleasure to ask our Congress President to address you. Dougie.

The President: Congress, it is a great honour to be your President; it is a great privilege to be the first person from my union, Unite, to hold this position, and it is a great pleasure to be the first person from my old union, the Amalgamated Engineering Union, to be the TUC President since Jack Tanner in 1954. If the truth be told, that wasn't a good year. The Tories were in power; the economy was struggling and a dismal England team was knocked out in the second round of the World Cup. Congress, some things never change.

I want to begin by saying thank you; thank you to Derek, Tony and everyone at Unite for their support over the past year. Thank you to my colleagues on the General Council for the way they have conducted their debates, and thank you to everyone at the TUC, not just Brendan, Frances and Kay, but all the TUC staff. It is because of the support that I have received from so many people that my year as President has been so special. There have been countless highlights. I was proud to attend the ITUC Congress in Vancouver where I saw for myself the depth and diversity of our global movement. In a year when we have witnessed tragedy in Haiti, I am proud to work with colleagues to advance our work in international aid. But, for me, this is not just work about disaster relief, vital though that is. It's about railways, roads, clean water, electricity and supporting industries both here and in the developing world. It's about investing in our futures. It's about helping people to help themselves, which is the very essence of trade unionism.

Last month I was also proud to travel to South Africa where I visited our inspirational comrades in COSATU. They are fighting massive unemployment, discrimination in pay practices and the pernicious legacy of apartheid with dignity and determination. I was privileged to meet trade unions, to take part in National Women's Day celebrations and visit Soweto. But, for me, the biggest honour was speaking at a massive rally in Pretoria on the day when 1.3 million public sector workers took strike action. It was the most moving and powerful display of collective action I have ever seen, and today let the message go from this hall that we stand in solidarity with our South African comrades in their struggle for decent wages and decent housing. *(Applause)*

I also discussed with COSATU and Swaziland trade union representatives the proposed day of action that will take place in various countries throughout the world to highlight the need for democracy in that country. I am delighted to state that last week, on 7th September, I took part in a small demonstration outside the Swaziland High Commission in London with staff from the TUC's International Department, UNISON and representatives of Action for Southern Africa. This is a cause we must support.

Congress, there have been many highlights closer to home. I enjoyed attending a number of conferences, especially the four TUC equality conferences where the standard of debate and discussion was exceptionally high. My theme as President this year is Equality for All.. With the gap between rich and poor at record levels and social mobility in decline, with our public services under attack, I believe there has never been a greater need for equality than now. The case for equality is not just moral. It's economic. At a time when our economy is struggling, it is absolutely crucial that we harness the talents of everyone in society, black and white, men and women, young and old, gay and straight, able bodied and disabled. We all deserve an equal chance in life. We all have something to give and we all have the potential to better ourselves.

But, colleagues, if we are to make Britain a more equal place, then we must fight this coalition Government's brutal cuts. These cuts will impact most severely on the poorest, the most vulnerable and the most

disadvantaged communities. These cuts are wicked. These cuts will choke our growth, undermine the private sector and risk the recovery. These cuts, even by The Treasury's own reckoning, will cost 1.3 million jobs. Congress, it is just plain wrong that ordinary people should suffer because of the greed of the super rich. To the bankers and speculators who caused this mess, let us say we will not pay for your crisis. There must be no going back to business as usual or bonuses as usual. We need to build a new and different kind of economy, an economy where manufacturing and engineering industries regain their rightful place as the engines of growth, prosperity and jobs. It is time that this country rediscovered the virtues of designing and making things and then selling them to the rest of the world. That is the best way to rebalance an economy and the best way to build a stable and sustainable recovery.

But we cannot just leave this huge task to the whims of the market, because the industries of tomorrow need support to flourish. Let me give you just one example. The oil is running out and, with the environmental catastrophe in the Gulf of Mexico fresh in our minds, surely, we have got to invest more in electric cars, and where better to begin than to build a network of charge points linked to our National Grid system? Not only would this build the infrastructure of the future and help Britain become a world leader in what is sure to become a massive global industry, but it would create tens of thousands of skilled green jobs. All it needs is the right support from government. But, colleagues, don't hold your breath.

I was dismayed by the coalition's decision to withdraw an £80 million loan to Sheffield Forgemasters, a loan remember, not a grant, which would have enabled that company to become one of only two in the world capable of manufacturing large forgings for PWR power stations, nuclear power stations. The development of offshore wind farms will require a fleet of maintenance and supply boats and could be built in a refurbished shipyard in the UK. There is a massive opportunity to recycle millions of tonnes of steel and other metals. That could be achieved through the decommissioning of redundant nuclear plant throughout the UK. Congress, those people who say that backing industry doesn't pay are on the wrong side of the argument.

Let me tell you about a company called Ferranti where I began my working life as an apprentice mechanical fitter. It was an engineering company which made radar systems for aircraft. A good firm that nurtured a skilled, and mainly female, workforce, but like many companies it hit hard times in the mid-1970s as the oil crisis took hold. So the trade unions within the company got together and started a campaign to save the firm. We enlisted the support of the Industry Secretary, Tony Benn, and persuaded the government to take a 50 per cent stake in Ferranti. It cost them £7 million, a lot of money in those days. But in 1980 the government sold that stake for £54 million, a £47 million profit for the taxpayer in just six years.

So the lesson is surely clear: sometimes the state can deliver where the market cannot. But what I learned above all else during my time at Ferranti was the value of trade union solidarity; workers sticking together through good times and bad.

Congress, this movement has been my working life. I left at school at 16 with no qualifications, and trade unionism has been my university, my education, my inspiration. I became a branch official at 18, then a shop steward, then a convenor, and I've been a full-time officer for the past 25 years. Everything I have achieved in that time I've achieved because of our great movement. I haven't just learned about politics, economics and business. I've learned about people, leadership and friendship. And I've been privileged to

work alongside some great trade unionists, like Alex Ferry of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Workers, Mick McGahey of the NUM, and Jimmy Knapp of the NUR. I am talking about people from ordinary working class backgrounds who, because of our movement, achieved extraordinary things. They were the beneficiaries of a system of workers' education in Scotland, where the likes of Robin Cook and Gordon Brown first cut their political teeth. That was the labour movement at its best, a great coalition of workers, trade unions and politicians, a coalition that urgently needs rebuilding.

Congress, trade unionism is the greatest force for progressive social and economic change that I know. Fighting injustice is our mission. Winning for workers is our goal and delivering equality for all is our defining purpose. It's why we are gathered here this week. It's why our forbearers met in this city 142 years ago, and that's why we are proud to be trade unionists.

So let's make equality our number one priority, let's fight those cuts, together let's build a fairer and better Britain. Onward to victory! Thank you for listening to me.

Vote of Thanks to the President

Derek Simpson (*Unite*) in moving the Vote of Thanks to the President, he said: Congress and President, I think that speech says a lot. I am in something of an advantageous position to move this vote of thanks. I have known Dougie for a long time. I first met him in 1978. We had the football analogy, of course, because that was the year that England didn't qualify for the World Cup and Scotland did, although they have had a struggle since.

You're not all Scottish, are you? (*Chuckling*) Okay. As I say, I knew Dougie then, in fact, way back when he had hair.

I have been casting around for humorous stories. Jack Dromey, who had the privilege of negotiating with Dougie, remembers the time when his hair used to frizz when he got mad, and he did, but in 1978, when I first met him, he was, as he described, a young trooper. I met him at the National Committee of the Amalgamated Engineering Union. I was a counterpart, in a sense, because we were on different sides of what is called the 'political divide'. Dougie, I think, man-marked me. Every time I went up to the rostrum, he felt obliged to come and tell everybody what a load of rubbish I had said. He might have been right. I've changed a bit since then, but so has he. Although he did it in a different style to what we now see before us, because when Dougie went to the rostrum, he didn't do it with the calm equilibrium that he has just approached this rostrum. He used to come down the aisle as though he was doing the New Zealand haka, staring, glaring, bellowing and terrifying everybody who got in his way. Well, he has calmed down a bit since then, as we can all see. I have to say, as the general secretary, finally, of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, he is one of the finest officers that we have. He learnt that it's not just about representing people; it's not just about having a dedication, which he clearly has, and has demonstrated on many occasions. You've got to know what you're talking about. You've got to be in a position to understand. I have to tell you that there is no one who knows more about the industry for which he is our union's national officer, the energy industry, than Dougie Rooney, and that's probably on both sides of the negotiating table. He has equal respect from employers as he does from the people he represents. He knows that industry back to front. You can't catch him out on energy. That is his dedication.

It's a problem because when you're that dedicated you don't do much else. I asked our delegation if they could give me some funny stories, some humorous stories, perhaps a little bit of an embarrassing story. I even offered a financial reward but nobody knew 'owt about him, because he is too busy working.

Look, this year, although I think giving votes of thanks before we have finished the Conference is a little bit strange, it is a little bit like the Pakistani sports commentator giving next week's test results, I have to say that I am pretty certain that we are going to have a great Conference, with a great President, who has shown that it's not just a question of sitting in the right place until you move round the table, because when you've got there, you've got to be able to do the job.

Dougie, you've done the job. It's a privilege. I am proud for you, I'm proud for our union and I am proud for the work you have done. I think that this Congress has benefited as a result of your contribution. Good luck for the rest of the Conference.

Paul Kenny (*GMB*): I am not as clever as Derek, I need a few notes. I am very proud and honoured to second the vote of thanks to the President, to Dougie Rooney. Dougie has demonstrated his roots throughout his career, and even in his speech today. From a shop steward at Ferranti's, up through his trade union appointments, up through till today as the TUC President, his has shown a proud commitment to the union and fighting for people. You are, Dougie, I know you are, passionate and dedicated to fighting for equality and justice; it is not just a byword, it is something you have lived by all your time. You have lived by those values of fighting for working people everywhere across the globe.

I got off the train on Saturday at the station and I was met by a big newspaper sign that said, "Rooney in sex scandal" and I thought this is going to be one lively week. (*Laughter*) Then I saw the words, "Rooney paid" and I was reassured because I knew you would never pay for anything. (*Laughter*) I knew it could not be you, Dougie, anyway.

Dougie is a keen golfer, I know that much, and I want to thank him from the GMB members within the Scottish Whisky industry; they are eternally grateful to Dougie for his unselfish and dedicated personal campaign to sustain their jobs. Thank you very much, Dougie. (*Applause*)

Those around the movement and elsewhere who have underestimated your polite manner and that Mona Lisa type smile that you have, have done so at their peril. On more than one occasion Dougie has pulled up employers, politicians, and even if I admit it a few members of this august body, if their actions and language ran against his own core values. President, I know that you are incredibly proud of your own union, Unite, and you are incredibly proud of its grandfather, if you like, the AEU. You are also proud about our great movement and the values you have cherished all your working life, that fairness, equality, and decency for all that you described in your speech. President, Dougie, warm wishes from everybody for a really wonderful week. Your Clem Atlee good looks and your steely good humour encompass your values of an equal and decent society. The very best wishes for this week, mate. Have a great week. Thank you very much. (*Applause*)

The President: I would like to thank Derek and Paul as well, and also equally say to you, each and every one of you, please have a great Congress but let's get going and let's sort this coalition government out once and for all. (*Applause*)

Employment rights

The President: I call Composite Motion 1, Employment rights. The General Council supports the composite motion.

Len McCluskey (*Unite*) moved Composite Motion 1.

He said: Brothers and sisters, this movement has lived in the shadow of the anti-union laws for over a generation, laws drawn up to stop us doing our job of supporting working people, but over the last 12 months the shadow has become darker still. Unscrupulous employers have been rushing to the High Court to get democratic strike votes declared illegal on technicalities. Many unions have suffered from this judicial intervention on the bosses' behalf, and Bob and other colleagues will give you their experiences.

For us in Unite it has been our cabin crew, members at British Airways, who have borne the brunt. They had a 9:1 majority for strike action struck down by a judge on her interpretation of a technicality; not because we failed to do it right (we of course had the highest legal guidance) but on her interpretation of a technicality which of course enabled Willie Walsh the time he needed to train up an army of strike-breakers. They then had a second ballot in the wake of the most disgraceful intimidation and bullying that produced an 8:1 majority for industrial action, again put under an injunction because we allegedly failed to notify all our members sufficiently that there were 11 spoilt ballot papers. That was overturned on appeal by the Law Lords, even they were embarrassed by that, but British Airways was still taking the case to a full hearing. The law has been used to stop our BA members standing up for their legitimate interests but it has done nothing to stop BA management embarking on a vicious anti-union witch hunt suspending dozens of our members and sacking longstanding reps for trivial reasons.

Let me make one thing crystal clear today. Some people may want to disown the BA dispute and our cabin crew members but I and my union, and I believe this movement, are proud of them and should salute their fight for justice against a ruthless employer, a hostile lying media, and of course the law. (*Applause*) In this country, the birthplace of trade unionism, the fundamental democratic right to strike is now hanging by a thread. Any employer now knows that they do not have to negotiate seriously; they do not have to deal with workers' grievances. All they need is an expensive lawyer and a compliant judge, and there are plenty of them about, and they can get industrial action declared unlawful – unlawful – because of minor technical breaches of legislation deliberately so complex it is almost impossible to fully comply with. But this is not enough for some. The CBI and the right wing think tanks are urging the Government to tighten the law still further making balloting procedures still more complex, and by counting abstentions as a no vote. If this was applied in a general election, of course, we would not have a government. Maybe that is not a bad thing at the moment. The real reason is obvious. They want us to stand by while they attack us so that in terms of the law they want to try and stop the resistance that will inevitably build up against the savage cuts aimed at the poorest and most vulnerable in our society.

Let me be clear again, especially to anyone in Unite who misunderstands: the cuts will not be stopped by pandering to the Murdoch press. Our members can, should, and will stand up and fight these cuts and if that means taking strike action so be it. In the words of Henry V, "He that hath no stomach for this fight let him depart." (*Applause*)

This composite rightly says we need to get behind John McDonnell's bill to end the scandalous legal interference in the right to strike but this should not be John McDonnell's Bill. Why isn't it the Shadow Cabinet's Bill? Why not the Labour Party's Bill? (*Applause*) Never again should we have 13 weeks of a Labour government, never mind 13 years, which leaves the anti-trade union laws intact and our movement still at the mercy of the worst employers. I hope whoever is elected Labour leader will take that on board.

In finishing, Chair, our challenge today is to the ConDems and the court, and I make this appeal to this Congress. Next time a legitimate strike ballot is challenged by the employers let's have thousands outside the High Court telling the judges and the ruling elite that this movement will fight to defend the right to strike, will fight for our values, will fight for our freedoms and will fight for our people. (*Applause*)

Bob Crow (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) seconded Composite Motion 1.

He said: I have the pleasure of seconding that excellent contribution by Len McCluskey. People need to wake up about the laws of this country. They talk about, "Is it illegal strike action? Is it legal strike action?", but the reality is that in 2010 in this country, whether you have a ballot or you don't have a ballot, it is illegal to take strike action. It is a breach of contract. All these laws, as we were told under Thatcher, were to give the unions back to their members. Well, I will tell you about a lot of contradictions that take place. Let me tell you two stories.

There was a group of workers called Network Rail Operational Staff who had a ballot and voted in favour of industrial action, and were taken to court and the ballot was declared illegal, and there was a company called Jarvis, that had a contract from Network Rail, knew it was going bankrupt, had their payrolls being run out in the Caribbean, and stole our members' wages because they knew they were going bankrupt. Our members have been left with not only those who had their pensions cut by ten per cent but all of the pensioners who worked for Jarvis have had their pensions cut as well. Where was the ballot by Jarvis when they sacked all of our members? I do not remember them sending the matrix system over to the RMT and saying, "These are the people we are going to sack next week." The point is that these laws are there to harness us down.

When we walked down to those courts, as Len McCluskey said, and the RMT members are outside waving their flags, I thought we had a bit of a chance. Our solicitor (as normal always conservative people) said, "You know, you're uphill against this one, Bob, but you've got a reasonable chance." But when me and my president, Alex Gordon, walked into the court that morning I knew we had no chance. Mrs. Justice Sharp was sat on the bench and I said, "Good morning, your Lady," and she said, "Guilty," and I knew for a start that we had no chance of winning that one. (*Laughter*)

Brothers and sisters, we work in an industry that has mobile workers, like yourselves. Today, for example, they may be working in Leicester, the following day they may be working in Nottingham, and it changes by the day. Some people in one grade are demoted, and so on, but they will not even accept names and National Insurance numbers. We have to produce a matrix system that has to be 100 percent perfect. There can be no error of judgment whatsoever.

I think it is absolutely scandalous that we even have to debate whether we should be supporting John McDonnell's Bill. The criticism should also be that for 13 years the Labour Party had the opportunity to repeal those anti-trade union laws but sat on their

hands and have now left us in a situation where we are going to be attacked in the future. You can imagine the Tories going out of office with a scorched earth policy so that you could not reverse that legislation. What the Labour Party should at least have done was to have removed those small injustices so that it gives the people the opportunity to fight back when these cutbacks take place.

Brothers and sisters, pass this motion but let's not forget where we were. It is no good walking down to Tolpuddle in the second week in July and laying a wreath and saying, "Thank God the Tolpuddle Martyrs broke the law or we wouldn't be sitting here," and then the following week worrying about civil disobedience. If it was good enough for the Tolpuddle Martyrs 160 years ago, it should be good enough for British trade unionists today. *(Applause/Cheers)*

The President: I can remember a time when Bob would say, "I don't believe in going through a red light," but there you are. *(Laughter)* You are not allowed to reply to that, anyway.

Christine Bond (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 1.

She said: BECTU supports this campaign to review and repeal anti-trade union legislation. This legislation affects all our members. BECTU, as I said, stands for Broadcasting, Entertainment, Theatre and Cinematograph Union. These are the industries that are becoming part-time freelance. Our contracts are short-term, casual, fixed-term. Over 11,000 of our members are freelancers. Our experience is that once a serious dispute is raised, the minimum time for initiating an industrial dispute to being able to take action is three weeks. Too often our members' contracts are only a few days to a few weeks. They have no rights. Structurally this means that our members are faced in job after job with industrial issues that cannot be addressed. They are denied the right to collectively respond to issues in their workplace or contract. They can end the contract with notice but then they lose their job and lose any contractual rights. Our members are excluded from experiencing a recognised human right, the right to strike. BECTU calls on Congress to mount a vigorous campaign for review and repeal of anti-trade union legislation, a campaign to allow our members to have a basic human right, the right to strike. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Donnacha Delong (*National Union of Journalists*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 1.

He said: I have a question for you. Do you know who you work for? It may seem like a strange question but for more than 500 journalists who thought they worked for Johnston Press in May it turned out they do not. This is despite the fact that there is a Johnston Press stamp on the pay slips. It is beside the fact that there is a Johnston Press company handbook given to every employee. Their grievance, disciplinary, and health and safety policies are on the Johnston Press intranet, and the company claims in its annual reports and company bulletins and in external publications that it employs 1,900 journalists and 7,000 employees. But as soon as the people working, as they thought, for Johnson Press sought to take action against the people who had initiated a pay freeze, closed their pension plan, and was introducing a new system that was going to lead to massive redundancies, Johnston Press went to court and took out an injunction against the union, not on a technicality but said they did not employ anyone, that every journalist who works for a newspaper owned by Johnston Press works for that

newspaper and that newspaper alone. The company basically got a court to accept that it had all the power and none of the responsibility.

The NUJ was stuck in a position where we had to end our strike action. We had to call it off. We had legal advice that, basically, even though we had all of this proof that Johnston Press claims it employs people, that did not matter in court. Yet as we discussed it in our national executive, the amount of money it was going to cost us because they took action against us was going up, and up and up. They delayed in the court and took another couple of hours. They wanted us to repudiate the action and we said we would not repudiate. We just cut it off. The price went up, and up, and up. The reality is if we want to withdraw our action and accept the injunction because there is nothing else we can do, we have to pay for their legal advice. This is a huge problem for small and medium unions like the NUJ, and like many of us here; this is a massive problem.

This motion calls on the TUC and the General Council to consider ways that we can come together to avoid the situation which is increasingly likely, that either a union will be bankrupted by trying to establish its own rights to take strike action, or something potentially even more dangerous than the precedent that has been set by Johnston Press and established in the court that will impact every union. We know that other companies are probably going to take what Johnston Press has done and use it as a precedent in our industry, and also maybe in some of yours, but next time who knows what precedent could be set and what impact that could have not just on us but the entire movement. We need to come together. An injury to one is an injury to all. We need to ensure that we can defend every trade union member in this movement and support the smaller and medium-sized unions who may not have the finances of the bigger unions. Thank you. Please support. *(Applause)*

Dominic McFadden (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 1.

He said: Thank you very much, President. Most of us in this hall negotiate on behalf of our members. However, you would not really want to be sitting at the negotiating table with the employer armed solely with a well reasoned argument. The truth is we occasionally need to take industrial action. To date PCS has never successfully been served with an injunction. However, like everybody else we have to jump a number of hurdles to ensure the lawyers cannot get us with an injunction.

Since the 1980s employment legislation has made it increasingly difficult for our members to exercise their fundamental human right to take strike action. As an example of some of those changes, in 1981 the Civil Service went on strike against the Government's unilateral tearing up of a pay agreement. At that time it involved all the Civil Service unions in one dispute with one employer, our employer, the Government. However, since then it is now contentious, just like the NUJ were saying, as to who our employer actually is.

Earlier this year in a dispute over redundancy terms, the PCS had to notify not just the head of the Civil Service over action but also 120 so-called separate employers, despite the fact that one of those so-called separate employers has no say whatsoever over the redundancy scheme. We had to provide that data to each one of those so-called separate employers. All of this means that at any stage we may fall at any of those hurdles. When the ballot result is done we then, in a very limited amount of time, have to courier a statutory notice to the head of the Civil Service and again to these so-called separate employers.

The motion is very simple and the composite is very simple. The right to withdraw our labour is a fundamental human right that we need to uphold. I ask you to support the motion, support the lobby of Parliament on 13th October, and support the challenge to the European Court of Human Rights. Support the motion. *(Applause)*

Veronica Killen (*University and College Union*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 1.

She said: I am speaking in support of Composite Motion 1 and particularly in support of the Lawful Industrial Action (Minor Errors) Private Members Bill introduced by John McDonnell MP calling for support of the lobby of Parliament on 13th October, and also asking MPs to attend the Second Reading of the Bill on 22nd October, and to support it. It needs 100 MPs to be present for it to be able to be discussed and that is an issue in itself in terms of the state of democracy here in the British Parliament.

Just very briefly, and I am sure you have probably seen some of the literature already about the bill, I want to share some words with you from John Hendy QC. The bill has been introduced in response to the recent raft of court cases which have sought to challenge the legality of the trade union ballot. In each and every case the ballots were overwhelmingly in favour of strike action and the technicalities seized upon in the courts would have had absolutely no impact upon the results of the ballot. We have seen a succession of court cases aimed at preventing legitimate strike action. This highlights the extent to which British law imposes shackles upon trade unions. It is unprecedented elsewhere in Europe. These laws are inconsistent with the European Convention on Human Rights, the European Social Charter, and International Labour Organisation conventions. The Lawful Industrial Action Bill is focused and it is modest. It will mean that ordinary working people, our members, who have voted overwhelmingly in favour of industrial action, will not have their democratic will overruled on technical legal grounds.

I concur with previous speakers about the state that we are in and why have we come to this. Sisters and brothers, why are we in such a weakened state as a trade union movement? It is not just because of Thatcher and the anti-trade union laws of the 1980s; you expect Tories to behave like that. Just to share a bit of humour, and Boris Johnson often lets some gaffs go but underlying some of the gaffs is real truth. He made a comment about the bike scheme in London and it was on the lines of, "Well, what's the point of being a Tory if you can't turn the clock back to 1904?" That is exactly the direction we are going in.

We have also had, as was said previously, 13 years of a Labour government, which is an absolute shame. We saw in the video this morning that the foundation of the Labour Party was through the trade union movement, through the LRC. We have a party; we just need to make it function properly. The Labour Party is the trade union movement in politics. We must show this to the party at all levels. It is a shame that John McDonnell did not get on the leadership ballot. It is a clear sign of the decline in democracy. He is one of the few MPs with integrity; he means what he says and he follows that through with action. This is what we should be doing as a trade union movement; we should be leading the way through example. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

* *Composite Motion 1 was CARRIED*

Anti-union laws

The President: I now move to Motion 6, Anti-union laws. The General Council supports the motion. It will

be moved by Brian Caton on behalf of the Trades Union Councils' Conference.

Brian Caton (*POA*) moved Motion 6.

He said: Thank you very much. President, colleagues, it was good to hear the previous debate on the composite. I am not going to say, "I told you so." I have said it too often from this rostrum. I am moving Motion 6 on behalf of the TUC Trades Union Councils' Conference. I am proud to call upon this Congress to support this motion following a period since the last TUC Congress where we have experienced across the whole of the trade union movement clear examples of what bad laws mean to working men and women in our country. Of course, this is not new but the actions of our judicial system have been proved to be as biased in favour of big business and the capitalist system as at any other time in the last 100 years.

The POA, the union that I was proud to serve for over 30 years, has suffered from the judicial system for 17 years, 17 long, hard, difficult years. We have warned this Congress over almost the same number of years that if they would do it to us, then for certain they would do it to us all. So, it may be said that the TUC, and indeed its affiliates, cannot support the breaking of the law. That is true for all of us in civil society, but of course we do not live under fair and civilised laws. Our laws are not fair, they are not civilised, and for sure they are not administered in a fair and proper way.

When bosses force through the changes on working men and women the law does not step in to crawl over the minor detail and rule that it cannot happen. When government make our public services more dangerous for workers and users, the judicial system does not put the changes under a microscope and rule that it cannot be done. Just look at the recent rulings we have heard about on industrial action and the farcical judgments used to disallow the trade union movement and individual unions to fight back. It is a pity that the judicial system of this country, and government, were not so fastidious when it came to big business and banking fat cats when their greed and criminal activities almost bankrupted our country.

This motion does not ask anyone to break the law, although I will say again the trade union movement was born out of the bravery of those who did exactly that. It does ask for support for those who find themselves falling foul of our courts and judges taking the capitalist government's side through their narrow and bigoted interpretations. Congress, if we believe these laws are wrong, and I am sure that we do, and if we wish them to be changed, then all we need to do is act in support of each other, or we should make a decision to unite to break bad laws and to force the changes necessary to bring a fair, just, and civil society. I ask Congress to support the views of the trades councils who are at the heart of our trade unions in our communities. Please support the motion. *(Applause)*

John McCormack (*University and College Union*) seconded Motion 6.

He said: I am also a member of the Trades Council's Joint Consultative Committee. We saw this morning in the video reference to the Masters and Servants Act, an example that shows anti-trade union laws are not new phenomena. They have been around for centuries but few people can deny that the legislation passed in the 1980s and 1990s was amongst the most vicious of all and, sadly, colleagues, this legislation is still there in tact after 13 years of a Labour government.

Let's remember how it happened. It was preceded by the demonisation of the trade union movement by the

Tories and their friends in the media. It was predicated on the basis of curbing trade union power. I have a message for them. Trade unions have no real power but we know who does: those who actually decide whether we get a wage rise or not, or can impose a wage freeze, that is power; those that can make thousands of people redundant or close a workplace down at the stroke of a pen; that is power; those that can unilaterally withdraw long-standing travel concessions from BA staff on the basis of vindictiveness; that is power and, colleagues, those that work in the City and in the banks who sit in front of a computer screen playing real time monopoly with your money and mine creating the biggest recession we have seen in decades; that is power.

What the trade unions have is strength, strength through solidarity, and it is that strength which is attacked and undermined by the current state of legislation. That power is an essential counterbalance to the power and the abuse of power of the employers, of the City, and yes, of government itself. So we have to ensure that if we are to defend our members, if we are to fight the fight that needs to be fought on their behalf, we cannot do it with one hand (and sometimes two) tied behind our backs. The current state of industrial and anti-trade union legislation can be summed up in two words: injustice and injunction. I hope that everyone will support the bill that John McDonnell is putting forward.

At this Congress, this year we will be debating and identifying a whole raft of campaigns that are necessary to defend the working class. We cannot do that effectively while this legislation is there, so what this motion asks you for is in parallel and hand-in-glove with all the campaigns that we commit ourselves to this week; that we continue to campaign for the repeal and the abolition of this anti-trade union legislation. Colleagues, continue the fight. Support the motion. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Tam McFarlane (*Fire Brigades' Union*) spoke in support of Motion 6.

He said: Congress, these laws have always been a vital issue for us but the reason for the urgency in this motion is of course because of the political context we find ourselves in. Like everyone else in this hall, we in the Fire & Rescue Service have seen a sustained and aggressive assault on our basic employment rights. Egged on by politicians and emboldened by recent judgments we have seen employers trying to force through detrimental changes to shift systems, working routines in our conditions of service, and the current tactic of choice is to pay lip service to negotiation and then to use employment legislation to issue notices threatening to dismiss every fire fighter unless they agree to sign the new and worse contracts of employment, entire fire brigades facing the sack in a "take it or leave it" deal. This tactic started in South Yorkshire and it has now spread to London where thousands of the capital's fire fighters, the same men and women who gave their all at incidents like King's Cross, Clerkenwell, and of course 7/7, now being bullied by unscrupulous managers trying to force through detrimental changes to their working lives.

Of course, we will not put up with that. We will take action to defend our people but by doing so we are made vulnerable to ever more ridiculous and vexatious loopholes in this corrupt legislation. Of course, these anti-union laws do not just affect unions. Their outcomes are of enormous concern to society itself as working people are left open to exploitation, jobs for the future disappear, and vital services and industries are cut to the bone, all with a nod from the law. So, of course we need to up our campaign in the future but we also have to give solidarity to those who need it now. Clearly, it is in our interests and it is even in our

members' nature to achieve lawful action but we have to recognise that there are going to be occasions where it is simply impossible for some groups of workers to take action that fits through all the hoops of this legislation. On those occasions we need to ensure that those workers have our full support and solidarity to achieve a just outcome.

So, let's up our campaigning and our work on this issue and get these unjust laws that bind unions, exploit workers, and leave vital services vulnerable, repealed once and for all. Thanks for your support. *(Applause)*

Glen Birchall (*POA*) spoke in support of Motion 6.

He said: The POA in supporting Motion 6 does so from a position of knowledge, frustration, and of course anger. It was bad enough when anti-trade union legislation was introduced under a Conservative government but to have sat through three terms of office under a Labour government who did nothing to change this legislation is a bitter pill, a pill that we believe was a significant factor in the result of the last General Election. Therefore, Congress, the POA calls on you to support this motion.

My union, the POA, has suffered as a result of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994. We have been taken to court on a number of occasions for trying to persuade our members to follow the policies of the union, a position that every union leadership should be able to take for granted. Our National Chairman and General Secretary at the time, Brian Caton, who moved this motion on behalf of the trades council conference, faced imprisonment. Can this be right in the 21st century? Recently we have witnessed our sister trade unions falling foul of anti-trade union legislation, legislation which is designed to take away the democratic right of the worker and the trade union, opening up the doors of the courts to the employer and government in an attempt to smash trade unions.

In supporting this motion we will send a clear message to the coalition Government and any government in waiting that the TUC, the millions of workers who voluntarily join our organisation, stand side by side in one campaign to repel anti-trade union legislation. An example of how draconian this legislation is for my members is that if they support the TUC's Work Your Proper Hours Day, it will be deemed by the employer as industrial action. In today's modern society we must have laws that are fair and just and not laws that are designed to support government and employers in getting their own way at the expense of the worker. Please support. *(Applause)*

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*): Dougie, thanks. Congress, this motion as you have seen highlights the compelling case for changes in our employment law and most of the text you will see is entirely consistent with Composite 1 which Congress has just carried. All of us will have been outraged at those instances, and we have heard some of the cases today, where members have made a democratic vote for industrial action and yet found courts ruling that action unlawful on the flimsiest of grounds because of tiny technical breaches that would have made absolutely no difference to the outcome of the ballot. That is why the TUC is giving full support to the Private Member's Bill that John McDonnell is taking to the House of Commons, and I hope all Labour MPs will be there in a few weeks' time to show their support for that Private Members Bill.

Our campaign for reform of the law must go on. The General Council needs to make clear that there is one aspect of this motion that they cannot accept, that is the final paragraph which implies that a blank cheque is being given to any group of workers taking action of

whatever form, including unlawful action. Now, the reality is that unions always have to make careful judgments in any disputes through their democratic procedures, including taking sensible account of legal considerations. To do other than that would simply expose union funds to costly claims from vindictive employers and that certainly would not be in the interests of the union as a whole or, indeed, of the movement as a whole.

So, with that sole proviso, let's push ahead united in our campaign for a new framework of positive rights for workers and for unions. Thanks, Dougie.
(Applause)

* Motion 6 was CARRIED

Blacklisting

The President: I am now going to call Motion 7, Blacklisting. The General Council supports the motion.

Alan Ritchie (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) moved Motion 7.

He said: Blacklisting is one of the biggest crimes against society today. A worker who dares to whistle-blow, a worker who dares to raise safety fears, a worker who dares to question management, and a worker who dares to be a witness in a tribunal, then finds themselves on a blacklist. It is not just the worker this affects. Often that individual is the main breadwinner of the family. You put that whole family on the breadline. Every democrat should be repulsed by blacklisting. It was hoped that this sickening practice had ended with the demise of the Economic League. In 2003 a consultation was undertaken by the Labour Government on specific regulations to finally outlaw blacklisting. The employers stated that blacklisting no longer existed. My predecessor, George Brumwell, attended a meeting with the DTI and they stated there was no evidence to substantiate blacklisting. Legislation was never introduced. In the construction industry UCATT members know all too well blacklisting still continued.

The scale of systematic blacklisting that was unearthed in March 2009 was astonishing. The Consultancy Association were exposed for having blacklisted over 3,000 construction workers. Forty major construction companies used their services. Blacklisting was conducted on an industrial scale. Companies working on hospital projects and the Olympics were using the money they were getting from the public purse for blacklisting trade unionists. We never heard the *Daily Telegraph* or the *Daily Mail* criticise the misuse of public funds; the silence was deafening. Workers were blacklisted for various reasons. Companies said publicly they took safety seriously but privately they ensured that workers who were committed to making construction sites safer were blacklisted. It is a disgrace in an industry where on average six workers are being killed every month because of bad health and safety; such actions are beyond contempt.

The Labour Government promised to introduce regulations to outlaw blacklisting but that commitment was the dampest of damp squibs. These regulations are so weak they will not end blacklisting, a typical case of weak ineffectual ministers being dominated by their civil servants. Once the draft regulations were published, UCATT lobbied for their strengthening. Sadly, they were not strengthened and they came into effect in March this year. That is why UCATT puts this motion in front of Congress today. These regulations will not deter one employer who wants to blacklist a worker. These regulations will only allow someone who is blacklisted to be a claimant in an employment tribunal but it is so weighted against the employee that the employer has nothing to fear. If

a worker's name appears on a blacklist then he should have an automatic right to be told, an automatic right to basic compensation.

I do not believe that the Consultancy Association was only operating blacklists in construction. It would be naïve to believe that blacklisting has ended, and nor is blacklisting limited to the construction industry. Our sister unions have raised concerns about blacklisting occurring in many areas. Unless by chance you have the blacklist you cannot prove if your members are being blacklisted. UCATT believes the only way to stamp out blacklisting is to make it a criminal offence. If employers are prepared to blacklist a worker and force them out of work, denying them the right to earn their living, putting families on the breadline, wrecking lives, then this is criminal. As trade unionists we must unite together to ensure that effective laws are introduced to stamp out blacklisting. We owe it to the workers who have been blacklisted, we owe it to the workers who can be blacklisted in the future, and we owe it to the future generations of workers who must not be denied employment for simply being a trade unionist. Delegates, I ask you on behalf of UCATT to support Motion 7 and end the scourge of blacklisting in this country. (Applause)

Les Bayliss (*Unite*) seconded Motion 7.

He said: Congress, Unite fully supports the UCATT motion. Twelve months ago we all welcomed the Labour Government's belated promise to deal with the disgraceful practice of denying our members work because of their trade union activities, activities such as fighting for agreed pay and conditions, and safe working. Nowhere is this outrageous practice more prevalent than in the construction sector. I take no pleasure in saying that the regulations we have lack the teeth and scope to deal with the problem. Our comrades in UCATT commissioned a report which showed where the regulations failed but still the government, a Labour government, failed to listen. How can it be right that employers can discriminate against members and do so in the knowledge that if found out the penalty paid will be pocket change in contrast to our members in construction being deprived of earning a living because they have been trade union activists?

Congress, we must never forget the thousands of our members who suffered at the hands of the Economic League, the same Economic League that blacklisted me and many others in engineering in the 1980s under Thatcher, and of course Ian Kerr's Consulting Association. Kerr received just a £5,000 fine for his illegal activities. Congress, it is a disgrace. The real penalty for those activities should have been a spell behind bars. Congress, we are calling for changes to the regulations and for new legislation. We know we have a battle against this government pressured by the CBI and the Institute of Directors to further undermine trade union rights. We ask for your support as we regroup and prepare to fight and outlaw blacklisting. Let's end discrimination and blacklisting against decent working people. Let's make it clear, Unite will challenge the employers with industrial action, if needed, to end the blacklisting in our industry. Please support. (Applause)

* Motion 7 was CARRIED

Public Interest Disclosure Act

The President: I now call Motion 8, Public Interest Disclosure Act. The General Council supports the motion.

Natasha Gerson (*Equity*) moved Motion 8.

She said: Working in the performing arts can be a hazardous business. If you think about it for a

moment, actors stepping onto a stage or film set can be surrounded by electrical equipment, be asked to handle dangerous props, required to stand in a fixed position while pyrotechnics are fired off, cars are crashing, fires are raging, and stage fights are breaking out all round. In less extreme situations but none the less injurious to health and safety it is commonplace for film extras to stand around for hours in the cold and wet waiting to be called. There are dancers risking broken limbs performing on unsuitable surfaces, technicians handling poorly maintained and often dangerous equipment, and actors having to negotiate poorly lit backstage areas crisscrossed with cables and littered with scenery and props, and added to this can be the absence of any first aid trained personnel. All of this is done for a minimum wage or below or for no wage at all, or what is laughingly called profit share and in the knowledge for performers that their next job could well be their last.

In the face of these dangers and dreadful working terms and conditions our members are too often faced with a stark choice, take it or leave it because complaint or whistle-blowing to expose dangerous and illegal practices ends in them being effectively blacklisted as there is no provision for their trade unions to take on their cases without exposing them to further risk. The popular image of cosseted artistes enjoying the pampered lifestyle on high fees and salaries is for the vast majority of Equity members a myth. Our members are in the main low paid, badly treated, and facing long periods of unemployment.

In these circumstances it is easy for unscrupulous employers in pursuit of profit to exploit and abuse our most vulnerable workers with no fear of any meaningful sanctions. Whilst this is commonplace in our industry, this situation is not confined to Equity members as we heard in Motion 7. Our sister unions, NUJ, BECTU and the MU, represent workforces which are increasingly freelance, self-employed, or working on short-term contracts, and as employers increasingly learn about the cost saving and legislation-avoiding benefits which they can accrue by changing employment status of their workers, this problem will become more acute across all sectors.

It really is time to end this iniquitous situation where individuals are faced with further risk for exposing illegality and breaches of health and safety legislation. It really is time to put a stop to the insidious march of anti-trade union practices. It really is time to stop the discrimination against individual workers based on the nature of their employment contracts. Please support the motion. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Rehana Azam (GMB) seconded Motion 8.

She said: The Public Interest Disclosure Act is a vital tool in the workplace, particularly at a time of economic distress when young people in particular find it hard to find permanent jobs and have to take up agency and short-term work instead. So, there are currently a great many vulnerable workers, whether they are covered by the legislation or not, afraid for their jobs and afraid of speaking out. I have listened firsthand to the fears of vulnerable workers, migrant workers, the self-employed, contracted workers who work in the public and private sectors, who all perform a vital service to the public, workers worried about raising any issue because they fear the consequences, workers who deserve more support.

The principle of trade unions being able to take cases against employers on behalf of these workers is only right without the need for individual members to reveal their identity. We support tougher action on enforcement of basic employment rights, rights like the minimum wage, because we all know that non-payment of the minimum wage is still rife and too

many workers are missing out on basic entitlement. The more the trade unions can do to take up minimum wage cases without putting individuals at risk, the more confident they will be of coming to us with their concerns. As things stand third parties can complain to Revenue and Customs without naming workers but unions are kept at arm's length from the investigation and enforcement process. It should be possible for the trade union representatives to act as roving enforcement officers because workers are a lot more likely to give evidence to us. Thanks to the HMRC we are more visible in the workplace and we are more likely to gain workers' trust.

To sum up, Congress, we need a sustained and determined effort to guarantee effective enforcement of key protections, enforcement which has to be fully funded because it is no good having employment rights on the statute books if you cannot apply them in the workplace. *(Applause)*

* *Motion 8 was CARRIED*

Address by Gideon Shoko, Deputy General Secretary of the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions

The President: It gives me enormous pleasure to welcome Gideon Shoko, Deputy General Secretary of the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions. Zimbabwe was a country with such a bright future only a couple of decades ago. Then it became the by-word for despotism, thuggery and disastrous economic mismanagement: ordinary people were left unemployed, homeless, diseased and brutalised. More recently things have improved although the problems facing its people are far from over. Throughout it all the one shining light, the one real hope for Zimbabwe and its people, has been the Zimbabwean trade union movement. They gave a voice to the oppressed and the downtrodden and they impressed everyone they met with their quiet courage, their resolution, and their basic humanity.

Gideon is the General Secretary of the Zimbabwe Railway Workers Union as well as the Deputy General Secretary of the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions, and Chair of the Railway Section of the Africa International Transport Federation. He has been arrested three times in the last eight years but never convicted of any crime. Congress, let us greet Gideon as a comrade and as a brother. Gideon, you are very welcome. I invite you to address Congress. *(Applause)*

Gideon Shoko: Thank you, Mr Chairman, Mr President, and the delegates. On this, the occasion of the TUC Congress, the ZCTU and its affiliates send their warmest solidarity greetings. We are inspired by your eagerness and swift action in aiding the working people of Zimbabwe's fight for total freedom and democracy. It has not been a lonely struggle for us because of friends like you.

The long struggle for the people of Zimbabwe is not over but has only just peaked, hence our calls to you, our long-time friends, to continue and even augment the solidarity that you have afforded us.

A window of opportunity opened with the coming in of the unity government. So many people had hung on to the hopes of an improved economic and political situation but those hopes are fast fading and the people are now at a crossroads.

The formation of the coalition government was not the ideal situation for the people of Zimbabwe hence ZCTU made its views on this matter known. Trade unions were pushing for a neutral transitional authority to run the country instead of a coalition government. We ask ourselves - how could the downtrodden and abused go into coalition with the perpetrator? Not surprisingly,

since inception, the coalition government has been sounding distress signals with conflicting public pronouncements on various issues on a weekly basis.

The formation of the unity government has not brought much relief to the ordinary worker or Zimbabwean. The average worker in industry or the public sector earns about a third of what a family of six requires for a reasonable standard of living. For a farm worker the situation is far worse, with most earning a tenth of what they need in a sector which is dominated by the ZANU PF elite who are not willing to negotiate with GAPWUZ, the farm workers' union. Workers and the population at large, where they can, are surviving by selling whatever they can get their hands on, just to cover the most basic necessities. This leaves workers with a harsh choice: what do they pay for and what do they drop? Should they pay for their children's school fees or for electricity or water, or maybe for medicine or their transport to work?

The reality for most workers is that some of these essentials will have to be sacrificed. The quandary is which ones? The unemployment rate is 90 per cent and so most people have been accommodated by the informal sector. Only 10 per cent of people are formally employed while 90 per cent of the 14 million Zimbabweans are living in absolute poverty.

However, government has neither made any policy interventions to nurture the informal economy nor officially recognised the important role the sector is playing in keeping Zimbabwe going.

ZCTU has taken the initiative through its affiliate, the Zimbabwe Chamber of Informal Economy Associations (ZCIEA) to organise the sector and push for policy interventions that recognise the informal economy.

Capacity utilisation remains below 35 per cent with industrial production and performance limited by chronic electricity and water cuts. Throughout industry you will find examples of workers who have not been paid for six months. In my own union, railway workers are being paid sporadically, one month they might get half their salary and then be forced to wait another two months for the other half.

How can workers live day to day in this situation, let alone plan for their future? The retail sector is thriving as shop shelves have filled with South African and other regional produce but sadly this has not made any difference to the pay packets of most shop workers. Salaries remain dangerously low, with employers arguing overheads swallow up all of their profits.

This argument is not unique to the retail sector with both industry and government arguing that there is no cash to pay their workers. The country is facing a cash flow problem that is severely affecting the operations of trade unions. When the multi-currency system was introduced in February 2009, all the savings that the ZCTU and its affiliates had were wiped away, meaning we had nothing and we had to start all over.

It was also the time when workers were earning minimal allowances hence unions were not receiving any dues and in turn the ZCTU also received nothing.

When workers started earning salaries in June 2009, the country was already facing a cash flow problem and employers were unable to remit union dues. This put a strain on union financial resources and ZCTU and its affiliates survived on support from fraternal trade unions.

This situation still prevails today as employers are still not remitting union dues and ZCTU affiliates are owed thousands of dollars by employers. It is therefore sadly not an exaggeration to say that without resource support from other trade unions worldwide, ZCTU and its affiliates would not be in existence as we speak.

Currently, the Government has embarked on constitutional reform, a process that ZCTU is not part

of. Our point of departure with government is on process where ZCTU believes in participatory democracy while government wants representative democracy.

People should be given a chance to author their own constitution. Instead, the Executive is leading the process with active participation of political party leadership and a limited role for other democratic forces like civic society, churches and trade unions.

Feedback from the current consultations on the constitution confirm our concerns, particularly when we regularly hear that in fact ordinary Zimbabweans are too intimidated to really speak their minds and those that do have later been threatened, or worse, by the ZANU-PF militia.

Lastly, the support and encouragement by the TUC gives inspiration to the ZCTU as a whole to keep on fighting for workers' rights and instils the belief that with more people of your character and determination on your side, victory in the struggle for the workers' cause is certain. We commend our brothers and sisters of the TUC and its affiliates for their vision, courage and determination in helping promote and defend the rights of workers in Zimbabwe. I thank you. *(Applause)*

The President: Well, Congress, if you were not inspired before, I am sure you are now. Gideon asked for our solidarity. TUC Aid, the development arm of the TUC, has launched a multi-country appeal to help trade unions in Burma, Palestine and Zimbabwe. I hope that you will give generously when you get back to your branches and offices. There will also be a bucket for donations at the TUC Information stand throughout Congress this week.

Health and safety at work

The President: Congress, we now turn to Composite Motion 16, Health and Safety at Work. The General Council supports the composite motion.

Brian Cookson (NASUWT) moved Composite Motion 16.

He said: Colleagues, brothers and sisters, worldwide more people die as a result of workplace accidents and injury than in wars, a distressing and sad fact that we annually commemorate on Workers' Memorial Day.

The Government and employers should have an unequivocal priority to protect all workers from accidents, assaults and abuse, but instead are hell-bent on deregulation and removing or diluting the regulatory requirements, putting profit before people's lives. Lord Young may find it easy to trivialise the issues by quoting examples where health and safety legislation has been interpreted in ways that the biased media, following its normal practice of reporting out of context, can then exploit. However, the frightening statistics that are acknowledged as being a significant underestimate reveal that rigorous enforcement and compliance and a properly-funded HSE should be top of any agenda.

No, Lord Young of Graffham. The fact that 180 workers were killed at work in 2008-2009 is not unfortunate and it is not a part of life – it is a travesty that should be addressed with absolute urgency. It would seem that in Lord Young's hands, millions more workers, children and adults will be condemned to serial exploitation and abuse in the pursuit of increasing profits and the expense of not only worker safety but public safety.

The NASUWT research 'Safe to Teach' found incontrovertible evidence of employers flouting the law on health and safety in schools. Removing or

diluting health and safety legislation puts children and young people at risk in schools. The right wing ideology pushed by this ConDem Government focuses on a false premise of independence and freedom where exploitation and profit are paramount and public welfare is low or even non-existent in priority.

Lord Young, the architect of Thatcher's privatisation agenda, is now enthusiastically creating the conditions for privatisation to flourish. Colleagues, I can see the future in the past. The age and philosophy of the 19th century mill owner will soon return. Free schools and technical academies will abound in the empty factories left behind by a devastating and vicious economic policy designed to make us all pay for the absence of legislation that led to the bankers' crisis. Workers and the public will be dispensable commodities in a world where profit is king.

The removal of statutory planning requirements and the casting aside of health and safety legislation to allow schools to be set up in empty offices, abandoned factories and the rooms above pubs and chip shops places pupils, employees and the public at great risk. It demonstrates the utter contempt shown to children and us by this ConDem Government. The axing of the BSF programme and claiming that school building standards are irrelevant to education is a fundamental attack on society and public services, destroying the huge progress made in the last 13 years. Sweeping away planning legislation and abandoning vital health and safety regulations are just parts of an agenda which will roll back the public sector and remove all obstacles to profiteering. In Thatcherite terms, "If you can get away with it, then it is all right." This is in no way an acceptable mantra and we should object profoundly to the hypocrisy behind it.

Workers' protection must not be compromised by the Young review. We must oppose any watering down and deregulation of the health and safety sector and campaign vigorously against any attack on health and safety standards. Our campaign must go forward to build a coalition with the community (parents, grandparents and the general public) to expose what the ConDem cuts will mean for children, young people, the workforce and wider society. There is a strong case for tighter regulation. We must preserve and build on the vital role of the HSE. Please support the motion. *(Applause)*

Neil Hope Collins (*Prospect*) seconded Composite Motion 16.

He said: In Chester, Welshmen break the law when they stay within the city walls past sunset; in York, any Scot carrying a bow and arrow can be killed legally; in the Houses of Parliament, it is illegal to die apparently – I am not quite sure what the penalty would be for that one – and of course I and all other men in the country are legally bound to spend two hours a day practising our archery skills. When each of these laws was introduced, presumably they were seen as legitimate and needed. Each of them is still on the statute. All of them are now ridiculous, redundant and unneeded purely because they were not enforced. If you want to kill a law, you just do not enforce it. You cut the resources for the people who do the enforcing and the law becomes irrelevant.

I believe that the biggest threat to workers' health and safety in this country comes from the cuts in the public resources, the very things that we have been debating this morning. Those cuts will tighten the funding stranglehold on my members – the inspectors and scientists working for the Health and Safety Executive – and for our colleagues in UNISON, enforcing the same legislation in the local authorities.

Since the mid-1990s, the HSE has shrunk by about a quarter and now employs around 3,200 full-time

equivalent people. If the Government gets its way – and we are looking at, say, 20 per cent cuts – the same number of people who are in this hall as delegates would no longer be working for HSE. In the same timeframe, the funding as a proportion of GDP for HSE has halved. This is a department, like all of yours, colleagues, which has taken cuts already. We are now in a situation where the number of fatal investigations open is the same as the number of inspectors working in the Field Operations Directorate.

This Government thinks that it is putting profit before lives, but it has even got that wrong. The businessmen I speak to turn around and say, "If you think managing health and safety is expensive, you wait until you have an accident." That does not include the cost of ill-health. It costs £35 billion for people suffering from occupational mental health and musculoskeletal disorders in this country. Do not let the cuts in resources force the Health & Safety at Work Act into the zone of trivia quizzes like those statutes with which I started my speech.

Government cuts will not hurt the poor; they will kill them. Any workplace fatality is not unfortunate; it is a disgrace. Support Composite 16. Support the members who enforce these laws but, most importantly, do not let the workers and families of this country become the casualties of the cuts. Thank you.

Phil Gray (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*) supported Composite Motion 16.

He said: Health and safety at work is fundamentally important to employees and it should be to employers, but we are concerned that in the current economic climate and the resulting cutbacks by employers, it will lead increasingly to workers putting their own health and safety at risk and Lord Young's report may exacerbate that problem.

Earlier this year, the CSP published research reported around the world showing that in the UK, a quarter of employees regularly work all day without taking a break because they have too much to do or there are too few staff to enable them to do it and another third of staff regularly work through their lunch breaks.

The current economic situation is likely to make this worse where people worry about the future of their employment. Long hours, lack of breaks and neglect by employers pose a serious risk to health including back pain, stress, lack of exercise, depression and indeed heart disease. This lack of health has real cost. Employees pay the price with their own health and there is a cost to employers, in reduced productivity, and to the State, with more people ending up on long-term benefits and out of work.

Work is good for us, so research tells us, and can contribute to physical and mental health wellbeing, but not when overworking and employer neglect means that people are working when they are ill or when they should be taking breaks. One of the effects of all of this is the huge numbers of people who end up with musculoskeletal disorders. Something like nine million days a year are lost because of that and another eleven million because of stress etc. Some of those people will end up on long-term incapacity benefit. Sixty per cent of people who have long-term illness have a musculoskeletal disorder and 22 per cent of all people on Incapacity Benefit also have a musculoskeletal disorder.

Physiotherapy and other forms of intervention are cheap, quick and effective, but they are not being invested in. Instead, Congress, we have the scandal of employers and the Government turning round and saying that the problems of the huge numbers of people on Incapacity Benefit are their own fault. Well, they are not. Neglect by employers and neglect in investing in early intervention when research shows

that it can work is the real problem. Health and safety is enormously important to us all, enormously important to the nation and very important to employees. Thank you, Congress.

Joe Marino (*Bakers, Food and Allied Workers' Union*) supported Composite Motion 16.

He said: In health and safety, there are different types of employers: the good, the compliant and the illegal. The law underpins health and safety and gives minimum protection – and I mean minimum protection – to workers at work. It forces the good to be good, it forces the compliant to comply and it prosecutes the illegal.

What we need to do is to mount campaigns to make sure that we protect the health and safety legislation that we have. I will give you one example. I refer to paragraph (iii) of the composite on RIDDOR (Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations). What is beginning to happen in industry now is that employers are increasingly putting pressure on workers to return to work early so that they do not have to then declare incidents under RIDDOR. They are doing that by misusing the arguments about redeployment and about rehabilitation. That is something that our health and safety representatives are reporting to us on a regular basis. Trade unions need to be, through their health and safety reps, vigilant about this attack on health and safety in workplaces and on working people.

We need strong unions to ensure their protection. Yes, we have the legislation and we need to protect that. We have the health and safety representatives and we need to give them the full support to carry out the tasks they do. But I want to finish, very briefly because of time, on this one issue. The General Council Report mentions in one paragraph the Young Report. The General Council and the TUC have done a lot of good work on this. Let us not kid ourselves. That review has not gone away. It is waiting there to come and attack us. This Government will use the Young Report in order to attack health and safety legislation. We can do one of two things about it. We can sit back and wait for that to happen or we can start the campaign now to protect health and safety legislation and to put the alternative argument.

The alternative argument that we should be campaigning on is that health and safety is important. Rather than cutting resources, we should be out there explaining why there is a need to increase resources for health and safety to protect our people. When our members go to work in the morning, we want them to come back in the evening in the same condition as they went. We do not want them to have missing limbs or industrial injuries and we certainly do not want them dying. That is the campaign and we have to start it now. We should not wait for the Young Report, but start attacking those who are attacking us. I support. (*Applause*)

The President: Thank you. I understand, Joe, that this is your last Congress. I just want to express, on behalf of Congress, our appreciation for the contribution that you have made to the TUC and to your own union over many years. (*Applause*)

Jerry Glazier (*National Union of Teachers*) supported Composite Motion 16.

He said: I wish to concentrate on the impact of the excessive working hours' culture in education and its impact in particular on teachers. When I first joined the profession in 1975, future expectations across society were that we were all going to be working a lot less. Those headlines were compounded by the

anxieties and fears that we would not know what to do with all that extra time, inactivity and potential boredom.

Sadly, 35 years later, nothing could be further from the truth. In education, the notion that teachers work short days and enjoy long holidays has largely been banished except in the most virulent sections of the right wing press. In addition to time spent teaching (an obvious necessity) teachers have to have a contract that has no limits on the number of hours they must work, contrary to working time regulations, which are currently under threat. The vast majority of teachers work in excess of 50 hours a week. It is not just the unions saying that; it is an official DfE statistic. That represents more time spent outside the classroom than it does inside the classroom on teaching. The balance is completely wrong.

None of the time outside the classroom can be classed as overtime, but it is expected and enforced by external pressures on schools and colleges. All workers need a reasonable life/work balance. Problems associated with long hours are well-known, but are worth repeating. Excessive working increases the risk of injury, heart disease, stress, depression, anxiety, headaches and bowel problems. Excessive working can lead to increased smoking, drinking, poor diet, poor family relationships and a general sense of poor self-esteem and well-being. Research conducted by the NUT confirms the impact of excessive working. A recent survey revealed that two-thirds of respondents lost sleep because of work pressures. 40 per cent admitted that they resorted to alcohol, smoking, unhealthy eating and, more worryingly, other substances to cope.

So, Congress, this is an important composite. We need to give it our full support and we need to ensure that our members are protected now and in the future. Thank you.

Andy Wilson (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) spoke in support of the composite.

He said: All of us here know that health and safety in many workplaces is barely existent. In my sector, construction, fatality and accident numbers have dropped in the past two years. However, this was a result of the economic downturn rather than improved safety levels in the industry.

Health and safety in construction has been seriously compromised by the following. There are too few inspectors leading on to too few inspections and, finally, too few prosecutions. The number of inspections and prosecutions has massively decreased in recent years. Therefore, the Tory plans on safety can only be seen as utter lunacy. For example, they still hang onto their "one in, one out" policy, where any new law must include cuts in old laws. They also promoted an X Factor style scheme in which the general public nominates the most unpopular regulations. Worst of all, the Conservatives want to drastically cut the powers of the HSE inspectors by allowing firms to arrange their own MoT-style safety audits provided by the private sector. HSE inspectors would then be refused entry unless an emergency occurs. We know what such an emergency would be. It would be one of our workers killed or seriously injured. Who in their right mind would want to introduce a policy like that?

What it shows to us is the Conservatives' complete indifference towards workers' lives. They are pushing their agenda of even more deregulation, pleasing the employers who want fewer safety laws. It does not matter to them if our workers get killed on the way. UCATT has already held a demonstration against the Tory policies during the election campaign. Now that the ConDems are in power, we need more action, more

demonstrations and more campaigns showing them that we will never accept cuts in regulation and safety. What we need instead is a tightening up of regulation, together with the introduction of statutory duties, directors' duties and an extension of the Gangmasters Licensing Act.

There is still a lot to do so let us join forces and fight the Tory plans for a health and safety madhouse. Congress, please support.

Matt Wrack (*Fire Brigades' Union*) supported the motion.

He said: The Young Review sums up some of the difficulties that we have with this Government. It was a particularly ill-thought out and half-baked review of health and safety. One of the themes to be addressed by Lord Young was whether emergency service workers should be covered by health and safety legislation.

The way that we found that out was not by correspondence to fire service employers or correspondence to ourselves. We found that out through an article in *The Times* newspaper where Lord Young said, "I want to exclude all the emergency services from health and safety. Technically speaking, the firemen could say they would not go to a fire because it was too dangerous. We just have to get some sense back into the system."

I have rarely read anything as insulting to fire fighters as that comment from Lord Young. There are no cases of fire fighters refusing to attend fires. Clearly, in any emergency situation, the fire service determines what it is reasonable and safe to do and what, on some occasions, cannot be done.

It is a particularly half-baked and ill thought out distraction based upon an agenda set by the *Daily Mail*. The reason we find it particular insulting is that since the introduction of health and safety legislation, there have been 50 fire fighters killed despite it. In the past eight years, we have seen 17 fire fighters killed at fires. Ironically, the Young Review in relation to emergency service workers was begun only 18 months after we had produced a report on our concerns about increased fatalities at fires. As a result of that, the FBU met Lord Young and we forcefully put our case, as you can imagine. He assured us at that meeting, and following that meeting, that he would not be proceeding to make any recommendations regarding the fire rescue service or other emergency services. We are awaiting the outcome of that.

It is demonstrative of the approach that this Government and many employers regrettably have towards working people, who are seen as fodder for production, for the work that needs to be done. Fortunately, in the fire and rescue service, we have a highly unionised workforce. We have a fairly well-regulated industry. Other industries, as we have heard today, are clearly less well-organised and less regulated. We clearly need to defend the coverage of legislation in relation to health and safety. We need to defend our rights as health and safety representatives through our trade unions and, yes, if workers are injured or killed, we have to insist that we protect the right for compensation where employers are negligent. (*Applause*)

Felicity Premru (*Transport Salaried Staffs' Association*) supported the motion.

She said: I am a new delegate. (*Applause*) I will try that again next year!

Congress, multinational companies have recently been found responsible for an entirely preventable disaster, not BP polluting the Gulf of Mexico, that ecological and humanitarian disaster which will impact for years, but an explosion on the outskirts of London. In

December 2005, a huge vapour cloud ignited at the Buncefield Oil Depot when 250,000 litres of petrol leaked from one of its tanks. Forty-three people were injured. The blast was heard 100 miles away. Miraculously, no one was killed (probably because it was early on a Sunday morning) but it could have been very different. Five companies controlled by Total and Chevron were found guilty of grave failures and fined £9 million plus a record £1.3 million for the pollution caused. Of course, no one received a criminal conviction.

If the Tories have their way, led by a man who has described health and safety regulations as "a music hall joke", they will cut them to shreds in order to take the overwhelming red tape for companies away. Accidents like Buncefield and like the rail disasters at Hatfield, Kensal Rise and Cumbria will escalate with the corporate culprits let off lightly.

As we know, Lord Young goes back a long way and certainly has a fine track record in this area as a director of Margaret Thatcher's Centre for Policy Studies think-tank, set up to promote the free market mantra, and in Thatcher's first government, as Sir Keith Joseph's right-hand man, at the start of the process of privatisation, which has done so much damage to our society in the last 30 years. If they cut health and safety, there will be more tragic and preventable cases like the death of Simon Jones on his first day at work in 1998.

What will we be letting our children in for in future generations? Congress, they can sneer as much as they like at the cocktail cabinet, in the *Daily Mail* and in the Murdoch press at stilted, trivial and invented stories. They can keep on caricaturing trade unions and red tape all they like. Health and safety is at the core of trade unionism and the legislation is a hard one. Trade unions protect people. Let us unite, fight and keep it that way. Please support Composite Motion 16.

* *Composite Motion 16* was CARRIED

International asbestos ban

Alan Ritchie (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) moved Composite Motion 17.

He said: Asbestos is killing 4,000 workers a year in the United Kingdom and this will not peak until 2018. That is because successive British governments decided to ignore the danger of asbestos in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. With powerful lobbying from the asbestos manufacturers, governments decided that Nelson's eye was best for British industry.

It was this movement which exposed this killer and I am particularly proud of my union, UCATT, which led the campaign to ban the import of asbestos into this country. Unfortunately, the job is not finished, not in the UK or internationally. Today, still too many workers are exposed to asbestos because of a lack of knowledge and a lack of identification. This affects workers in schools, workers in hospitals and workers in offices. The construction workers have the same issues. By being classed as bogus self-employed, they have no employment rights. If they complain about working with asbestos, they can be sacked on the spot. That is why we must keep up the pressure in this country on asbestos.

However, if it looks bad in our country, it is 100 times worse in the developing world where dictatorships flourish and multinationals are given a free hand to exploit the population, where trade unions are either illegal or have state restrictions which make it impossible for them to function and the asbestos producers now find their markets restricted in the developed world. That is why they are now focusing

on the Third World. This is where asbestos manufacturers see growth.

It is a disgrace that a country like Canada, among the top 15 of the world's richest countries, continues to support their asbestos industry. Earlier this year, a BBC investigation exposed a shocking multi-million global asbestos trade and the dramatic consequences for workers. They revealed that last year over one million metric tonnes of asbestos was mined, led by Brazil, Russia and China, while Canada exported more than 150,000 tons of white asbestos crystallite. Canada alone has made a profit of over \$100 million from asbestos. It had been hoped that Canada's asbestos trade would have ended when the main mine in Quebec encountered financial problems, but it now appears to have been rescued. This was achieved by the Quebec government and investment from businesses in India.

It is shocking because Canada hardly uses any of its material domestically. That is why UCATT, together with other unions and asbestos support groups, staged a protest at Canada House on Canada Day, on 1st July of this year. The international trade union movement has been successful in banning asbestos in 52 countries worldwide. This is why the emphasis has now shifted to the developing world. The need for cheap building materials is further fuelled by an international lobby led by Canada's state-funded asbestos lobby, The Crystallite Institute. This is particularly active in Latin America. The danger to workers of asbestos is even greater in the developing world with the lack of regulations, training and protective equipment. If not stopped immediately, this will lead to a global epidemic of asbestos-related cancers. The International Labour Organisation ('ILO') estimates that asbestos exposure is already responsible for over 100,000 deaths worldwide every year and 125 million people have been exposed to the fibres.

This motion is about international solidarity. Asbestos is an international problem. As trade unionists, we are internationalists. We have a long tradition of defending workers from fascism in Spain and opposing apartheid in South Africa, to name but a few. That internationalism must again come to the fore. As trade unionists, we must defend the Third World workers, who will die because they are forced to work with asbestos to make the global profits of the asbestos manufacturers. It is our duty as trade unionists to protect any worker whose life is under threat. Whether they live in Glasgow, Liverpool, Manchester, London, Delhi or Bogata, we will defend them. Congress, I ask you to support Composite Motion 17.

Alice Robinson (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*) seconded Composite Motion 17.

She said: Firstly, ATL would like to congratulate UCATT on their tireless work in raising the issue of the use of asbestos on a global scale. It was heartening also to read the comments of Dougie Rooney, the TUC President, on the positive impact of collaborative work of the trade unions internationally in the *Congress Guide*.

Canada, Australia and Russia remain the largest of exporters of asbestos. ATL deplores the despicable hypocrisy of countries which clearly understand the consequences of their actions in exporting this raw material, often to parts of the world which have experienced natural disasters.

Asbestos causes a long and painful death in the case of mesothelioma. This disease affects not only those in the construction industry in developing countries around the world, but also affects enormous numbers of innocent students and teachers exposed to asbestos in newly-built schools and colleges. The only desire of students in these areas is to escape a life of poverty.

The teachers' desire is to help these students achieve their goals.

We know, the devastating effects of this disease from the personal experience of teachers in the UK, such as Carole Hagedorn. Carole contracted this disease whilst working in a school in the UK. For this reason, ATL have amended this resolution to include the word "death" as we believe this strengthens the focus and leaves Congress in no doubt about the devastating impact of asbestos upon not only those who suffer from the effects of the disease, but also upon their family and friends.

For this reason, ATL was pleased to take part, along with UCATT and the GMB, in a demonstration outside Canada House earlier this year. We ask for the support of Congress in trying to persuade the UK government to become more proactive in seeking to establish an international ban on the export of asbestos to help protect the lives of innocent people around the world. ATL proudly seconds this resolution.

Dotun Alade-Odumosu (*GMB*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 17.

He said: Our members know only too well the suffering that asbestos-related diseases cause. The asbestos legacy is still with us here in the UK. Schools are one example. In particular, our members who are caretakers are legally responsible for ensuring the safe maintenance and removal of asbestos. Often they do this work without proper support or funding from headteachers.

It is a huge wrong because the harm caused by asbestos exposure cannot be denied. Tragically, for example, 18 year old Sophie Ellis died from asbestos cancer – I was not going to use that word – only weeks ago so this is an issue which affects us all. This is why it defies belief that nations such as Russia and Canada are exporting this killer mineral on the basis that it is safe and harmless. The Canadians do not use the asbestos themselves, but they are happy to propose subsidies for asbestos mining and to export that around the globe. It is an absolute scandal.

Congress, we cannot tolerate the export of First World health problems to developing nations. We need international co-operation and pressure to ensure that asbestos production, manufacture and export are banned worldwide. We need enforcement across borders to ensure that this is upheld and we need to ensure that all those countries where asbestos is still used understand the dire health consequences.

The deadly effects of asbestos exposure were first identified in the UK in 1896, such a long time ago. It took almost a century for a ban to be imposed – I wonder why. Our international brothers and sisters cannot afford to suffer and die for another century. No one, in this country or abroad, should have to suffer from the negligence of their employers for a material whose dangers have been known for so long. We must act now. Our fight for plural plaques goes on and the global fight to ban asbestos goes on. Please support this motion.

* *Composite Motion 17 was CARRIED*

Asbestos on ships

Steve Gudgeon (*Nautilus International*) moved motion 77.

He said: I am a serving shipmaster at Nautilus International and this is my first time at Congress. (*Applause*)

I am here to move Motion 77, Asbestos on ships. Last year, our union members alerted us to a newly-built chemical tanker that had been sent to a repair yard in

Rotterdam. Soon after the work started, staff discovered suspect asbestos in key components on the ship. Experts were called in and were horrified to find the deadly material in more than 3,500 parts. It took them more than half a year to remove the substance and to make the ship safe.

The massive health hazards posed by asbestos have been known for many decades and thousands of workers, many of them former seafarers, have died or suffered a debilitating disease as a result of exposure to dust and fibres. The terrible effect of exposure to asbestos has resulted in national and international regulations to curb its use in the shipping industry. However, our investigations have revealed that these regulations have been flouted with impunity. Although a worldwide ban on the use of asbestos on new ships has been in place since 2002, there is evidence that it is being blatantly ignored. One of the ship survey organisations has found the substance on 95 per cent of ships checked in the last four years.

The problem even affects ships which have been certified as asbestos-free, sometimes because they have been built with the material present in components and sometimes because the substance has been introduced through spare parts. Spare parts that have been stamped asbestos-free, on analysis, have been found to contain up to 30 per cent asbestos.

Shipping is the most international of all industries and our worry is that asbestos is still being commonly used in more than 100 countries around the world. More and more ships are being built in new shipbuilding nations where asbestos use is taken for granted. We have been told of ships being contaminated after asbestos fire blankets were used during welding work in foreign ports.

As if all of this was not bad enough, seafarers face additional exposure hazards because their vessel is not only their workplace, but also their home for considerable periods, thus increasing the possible exposure time. Seafarers are not trained in identifying asbestos and are therefore much more likely to be contaminated than workers ashore, who generally benefit from easy access to informed risk assessment, inspection and controlling mechanisms.

Not only do seafarers face the very real risk of exposure to asbestos during repair or maintenance, but workers involved in shipbreaking, often working in atrocious conditions in the Third World, have their lives put in danger, often having to work with no personal protective equipment.

Congress, it is becoming chillingly clear to our union that whilst there is national and international regulation in place which seeks to outlaw asbestos on board ships, there is a major problem of non-compliance. We need to explore why and where the control mechanisms are failing to deliver and to see how seafarers can be better prepared to understand and identify the dangers of asbestos. We need to devote much more energy to collecting data and information on asbestos-related incidents and ultimately we have to raise awareness again amongst seafarers, shipowners and regulatory authorities. This union notes the Australian government's stand against non-compliance by refusing entry to vessels containing asbestos and we would encourage other governments to follow.

For shipping, sadly, asbestos is not a thing of the past. It remains a problem of the present and of the future. In 2010, the maritime industry is still, on a daily basis, responsible for exposing its workers to asbestos and thus creating victims for decades ahead. It is just not good enough and we need your support to ensure that our members and seafarers worldwide are properly protected and do not continue to inherit the deadly legacy of this material. Thank you.

Barrie Worth (*Prospect*) seconded Motion 77.

He said: I am also a first-time delegate. (*Applause*) Congress, it is 25 years since the UK government banned the importation, supply and use of blue and brown asbestos. It is over a decade since white asbestos was similarly banned. Yet, as I speak, it is still being fitted into ships today. This is despite similar prohibition in place across the European Union and many other countries. There is however no global agreement to ban asbestos. The situation is further exacerbated because asbestos mining remains lucrative. As we heard from our delegate from UCATT in the previous motion, Canada is still a leading exporter. It is a disgrace.

Over 4,000 people a year die in the UK alone due to asbestos-related diseases. The total death toll by 2050 is estimated to be over 90,000 in the UK. As Captain Steve Gudgeon from Nautilus International said, this is not just an issue for seafarers.

In *Prospect*, we have members at Devonport, Rosyth, Faslane and other locations involved in shipbuilding and repair. We therefore share Nautilus's alarm at the continued use of asbestos in ships, in particular the apparent criminal activity which enables ships to be certified as asbestos-free when they are clearly not. Far more robust enforcement is urgently needed. This issue not only affects seafarers and shipworkers, but once the fibres are airborne, they can affect any one of us, even Tory millionaires.

Congress, it is clear that training is essential if seafarers are to have a chance of spotting the dangers and mitigating them. Help to protect seafarers, and landlubbers like myself, against this hidden danger. Support the motion.

George Fraser (*GMB*) supported Motion 77.

He said: Congress, in the UK, we are only too well aware of the tragic long-term effects of asbestos and asbestos-related diseases. Thousands of people every year suffer painful deaths because they have been exposed to asbestos, an invisible killer which takes a slow and terrible toll on its victims. There must be an absolute duty to protect everyone who is at risk from its dangers on land and at sea. There is as much danger from asbestos on ships as there is from buildings and that danger on ships affects many people; passengers, mariners, dockers, maintenance engineers and especially those poor unfortunates involved in shipbreaking, a problem that the developed world is dumping on the developing world. That is why there must be mandatory training in identifying asbestos for all people in the marine transport sector – all people, from the laying of the keel to the breaking of the keel.

The GMB is proud to be heavily involved in an asbestos education programme in Mumbai and Elan for workers involved in ship-breaking. Our general secretary has visited the region and seen first-hand the terrible price that unregulated, unprotected, daily exposure to all asbestos types has wreaked on the poorest sections of Indian society. Young children, with no PPE, are trying to eke out a living stripping out this lethal material from ships. If the dreadful working conditions that they endure do not kill them then breathing in the deadly fibres that work their way through their systems certainly will.

We cannot tolerate the export of First World health problems to those in developing nations and we certainly cannot risk the lives of everybody in the marine transport sector in doing so. Please support.

* Motion 77 was CARRIED

Trapped Chilean miners

Chris Kitchen (*National Union of Mineworkers*) moved Emergency Motion 1.

He said: On Sunday 22nd August, 18 days after being trapped, it was confirmed that all 33 mineworkers were still alive 700 metres below the surface. The men survived on very small amounts of tuna, milk, crackers and a can of peaches which they shared between the 33 of them. Their rations would have lasted only three more days had the rescue crews not made contact.

The miners have now been trapped underground for 40 days. It has been said many times that miners are a tough breed, but nothing could have prepared the men for what they have to now endure, or their families waiting on the surface to be reunited.

The miners have divided into three working groups, each working a shift of eight hours, and each with a designated leader. The men work and sleep in rotation, which ensures that some miners will be awake at all times as a crucial point of safety for the men. The first group is in charge of the collection and distribution of the capsules containing supplies sent by the rescue workers. The second group is in charge of safety and work to protect the other miners from falling rocks caused by the drilling above. The group is also in charge of fortifying the area where the miners are trapped. The third group monitor the health of the miners and keep the area clean.

Disasters of this proportion do not always result in sufficiently vigorous rescue operations and mines have closed leaving workers trapped, as occurred on 19th February 2006, when 65 Mexican miners at the Pasta de Conchos mine, owned by Grupo Mexico, were trapped after an explosion. The bodies of these workers are still in the mine and their families and trade unionists from around the world, upon many occasions, have called for their bodies to be recovered. To date, these calls have been ignored and I am sure you will support the Mexican mining unions with their continued efforts on behalf of the families.

By contrast, the Chilean government has been doing everything it can to help rescue the miners. However, in testimony to the Chilean Congressional Committee investigating the tragedy, the owners have apologised for the accident but, at the same time, have tried to push blame elsewhere, including on the miners now trapped in the mine.

Safety and health in mines should be paramount for mine owners and workers alike. It is with this in mind that we call for the ratification of the ILO Convention 176. In conclusion, in calling for the unanimous support of this emergency motion, I would like to quote the words of Jose Ojeda, the miner who wrote the first note tied to the drill which alerted the rescue crews to the group being alive: "We all work for one another and we give each other strength." That is something which, as trade unionists, we know is true and will help the miners succeed and be brought out safely. Thank you.

Alex Gordon (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) seconded the motion.

He said: I am proud to be asked by the NUM to second Emergency Motion 1. The fate of those Chilean miners has touched people, workers and trade unionists particularly the world over. Firstly, of course, it is due to the remarkable pictures that were made available over the last few weeks on the internet and on television channels where you could almost reach out and touch the men incarcerated in that mine.

Secondly, I believe it is because of the tremendous political strength shown by the families, the colleagues and the comrades of those miners in Camp Esperanza (Camp Hope), which was set up to demand the safe

return of their loved ones, putting pressure on the mine owners and on the Chilean government to ensure that they are safely delivered back to the surface to be reunited with their families.

I just want to say that a number of trade unionists in this room who belong to transport unions have just come back from the World Congress of the International Transport Workers' Federation in Mexico. I am so glad that my colleague from the NUM mentioned the case of the Mexican miners buried alive back in 2006 because in Mexico City two weeks ago, British trade unionists – members of my union, Unite, ASLEF and the TSSA – were marching in the streets in support of the Mexican Miners' Union, the Mexican Electricians' Union and the Mexican Metro Workers' Union, who are engaged in a life and death struggle for their health and safety and for their union rights in that country. That sits alongside the struggle of the Chilean miners that we are focusing on in this emergency resolution.

The motion rightly calls for all possible humanitarian support swiftly to bring these workers to safety, but also links this call to the regrettable failure of the Chilean government to ratify ILO Convention 176 on safety in mines and to the scandalous failure of our own Government to do the same. Conference, pass this unanimously. I support.

* *Emergency Motion 1 was CARRIED*

The President: Congress, that concludes this afternoon's business. However, there are just a few final remarks. May I remind delegates that there are various meetings taking place this evening. Details of these meetings can be found on page 14 of the *Congress Guide* or in the leaflet included in your Congress wallet. Please note that in a change to the published guide, the North West TUC supported fringe, "Striking the Balance", the Micron Theatre Company performance, listed as taking place tonight, is in fact taking place on Tuesday night in the People's History Museum.

I would also like to remind delegates to complete and return their equality monitoring forms that have been sent to them. Delegates should have received yellow forms which should be returned to the delegation leader. If any delegate has not received a form, they should see the delegation leader. Delegation leaders should return these green forms in the box provided at the back of the hall or to the TUC's information stand.

(Congress adjourned at 5.30 p.m.)

**SECOND DAY: TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 14TH
MORNING SESSION**

(Congress re-assembled at 9.30 a.m.)

The President: I call the Congress to order. Many thanks to the Rochdale Youth Brass Quintet, who have been playing for us this morning. I know they have left the stage, but I think we should show our appreciation and ask the TUC team to convey our appreciation to these young musicians. *(Applause)*

May I remind delegation leaders that the ballot for Section C of the General Council takes place this morning. Unions eligible to vote for Section C should collect their ballot papers from the table situated by the side of the media office in the exhibition area. Ballot papers will only be provided in exchange for the official delegate form. Please note that the ballot closes at 12 noon today.

Report of the General Purposes Committee

Peter Hall (*General Purposes Committee*): Good morning, Congress. I can report that the General Purposes Committee has approved a further emergency motion. Emergency Motion 4 on Bangladeshi Garment Workers will be moved by Unite and seconded by the GMB. The President will indicate when it is hoped that the emergency motions approved so far will be taken. I will report further to you on the progress of business and other GPC decisions when necessary throughout Congress.

The President: Thank you, Peter. Do we agree to approve the GPC Report? *(Agreed)*

Delegates, as has been reported, we now have three emergency motions: Emergency Motion 2, Royal Mail; Emergency Motion 3, Industrial action against cuts on London Underground; and Emergency Motion 4, Bangladeshi garment workers. I will take these emergency motions when a suitable opportunity arises and will endeavour to give Congress as much notice as possible.

Trade union outreach

Tony Kearns (*Communication Workers Union*) moved Composite Motion 2.

He said: I think it is important that we set out our stall here. We had a big debate yesterday – and quite rightly it was in the press with a lot of publicity – about how the TUC, and the unions which are affiliated to the TUC, are going to fight the slash and burn policy from this Government on the public sector. I think equally as important, as far as the Communication Workers Union is concerned, is the fact that issues of equality are not a side issue. We think they are part of the core issue.

I think it is important that Congress recognises the fact – and it is a fact – that the majority of trade unionists are now women. Cuts are going to have a disproportionate effect on disabled people, on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people, on people from black and minority ethnic communities and, of course, on young people. Estimates say that 25 per cent of all young white school leavers will not have a job. That rises to 42 per cent if you are a young black school leaver. It is quite clear that the cuts that this Government is going to make will have a disproportionate effect on minorities.

I think it is important that we remember that trade unions represent 28 per cent of all employees in the UK. Obviously, we wish it was higher and we can all work to make sure that it is higher. That represents almost seven million people in the workforce in the UK. By nature, that means that we represent all sectors

of society. We know what it means to represent those people who feel disadvantaged and isolated in this community.

There are a number of key issues that unite us all, as the debates proved yesterday, They are: protecting jobs in difficult times; providing adequate pensions for the future; and protecting pay against rising inflation, but we cannot lose sight of the fact – and we have to make the point again and again – that equal opportunities and equality is not a side issue. It has to be core to the work that we do on a day-to-day basis. Inequality, both economic and otherwise, is going to be exacerbated by the policies of the new Government.

The Institute for Fiscal Studies quite rightly did a survey and it says that this will be the longest, deepest, sustained period of cuts to public service spending since before World War II. These are not progressive policies; these are regressive policies. I get sick and tired of hearing this Government say that we're all in this together. No, we're not all in this together. As was said yesterday, if you are a millionaire and you live in the privileged, isolated millionaire's bubble that most of the leaders of this Government live in, they are not living in the same world as our members, who are women on low pay, disabled people who are going to have their benefits cut and young people who will have their housing benefits cut. They are not living in the same world that our members are living in and it is our job to make sure that we represent those people. *(Applause)*

Not only are the Government's measures regressive, but they disproportionately affect the poorest in society. As I said, the Fawcett Society has undertaken a judicial review and they are arguing now that under equal opportunities laws, the Government should have assessed whether the budget proposals will increase or reduce equality. The Government did not assess this. Why? It is because they do not care. It is a simple fact that this Government does not care, but we do. That is our job and the purpose of this motion is to ensure that it stays in the mainstream of the work we do.

You see, society is not going to be more equal under the cuts that this Government is making, but less equal. Take the research that the Fawcett Society has done, to which reference was made earlier. Seventy two per cent of the cuts will come from women's income. That is a fact from the Fawcett Society. That is why they are undertaking the judicial review. The remaining 28 per cent will come from men's income. As the Fawcett Society says, women already earn less and have less control over their finances than men and yet some £5.8 billion of the £8 billion cuts forecast will be taken from women. In what way is that a society which is based on equality? In what way can it be said that we are all in this together? No, we are not.

The ex-Mayor of London, Ken Livingstone, says that when cuts in child benefit and family-related tax credits are discounted, women in London will pay for 66 per cent of the cuts. Moreover, women who are disproportionately represented in the public sector and in receipt of low pensions, will suffer more from job cuts and attacks on public sector pensions. Likewise, people with disabilities: bear with me while I give you the statistics. The Government's aim is to cut spending on the number of people receiving the Disability Living Allowance by 20 per cent. Incapacity benefit is going to be cut. Mortgage aid for the disabled will be cut, affecting 64,000 people and so on and so on. We have to say, "Who stands up for these people?" I maintain that it is core to the work that we do and it is our responsibility to stand up for those people. Thank you.

Jean Rogers (*Equity*) seconded the motion.

She said: Equity believes that portrayal is the key to changing attitudes in society. As creators and

performers, we come from all sections of society and we wish to portray all sections of society. We are not just white males. For the first time in our 80 year history, we have a female majority on our council. Our members are young, middle-aged and old. They come from all ethnic groupings, gay, lesbian, transgender, able-bodied and disabled.

For some time, we have been campaigning on the issue of portrayal against stereotyping, age discrimination and sexism in the media. Over 8,500 men and women have signed our petition calling for equal representation of women in film and TV drama. Recent research shows that for every two male roles on television and in film, there is only one for a woman, and whilst leading parts are often played by men over 45, women in this age group start to disappear from our screens. That does not include Joanna Lumley, Dame Judy Dench or Julia Walters, but they are just the tip of the iceberg. If you are a black middle-aged actress, you do not stand a chance.

This sends out negative messages to viewers about what is acceptable. No wonder many older workers suffer anxiety, lack of confidence and bullying even in the workplace. Our members with the Disabilities Committee are working to persuade writers to write stories about their lives. Ignorance of people who are different from the norm can be tragic. Remember the mother who took her life and that of her adult disabled daughter because she could no longer face the victimisation from her local community and the racial discrimination and violent prejudice sometimes suffered by our black brothers and sisters.

Stereotyping distorts the picture of who we really are and it takes away our right to be heard. Thus, a doctor is denigrated to a quack; a journalist is a hack; an actor a luvvie; a young woman a tart; an older woman a slag; and a trade unionist is a bully boy. This motion calls on broadcasters to portray fairly, realistically and proactively all in society, including the trade union movement. The film *Made in Dagenham* is a very good start. If trade unions are going to change public attitudes, we have to change the portrayal of the people we represent and show them in all their wonderful diversity. Please support this motion. Thank you.

Tom Davies (*National Union of Journalists*) supported the motion.

He said: I am speaking in full support of the whole motion and particularly the third paragraph which provides some kind of media context from the perspective of our members. Obviously, as a trade union movement, we need to engage with the media and use the media to improve portrayal and promote the importance of trade unions etc. We also need to look at the state of that media and the fragile situation it is in at the moment.

We will hear later on in this conference about the threats to the BBC and the attacks on its staff pension rights. Also, across the board, we have 200 plus jobs going at the *Daily Mirror* and we have Rupert Murdoch seeking to consolidate his hold on Sky. We also have Richard Desmond moving in on Channel 5, a notoriously anti-union and bullying proprietor. We have jobs going across local papers.

Having a good campaign for a good media strategy and a good portrayal requires good journalism and that means comprehensive coverage. It means properly-resourced newsrooms and properly-rewarded journalists. The backdrop to all of this is that we are struggling against an economic model in journalism that is failing. The consolidation of media ownership under large companies which saw media outlets as mere cash cows. It bred rapacious profiteering in the good times and vicious cost and job cutting in the bad

times. Even now, as they return to profit, our members are not seeing benefit; they are facing more and more pressure.

It matters from an equality perspective as well because in a low paid, exploitative industry, who can afford to work in it? It is people who can afford to work for long spells for nothing, whose background enables them to do that, who can afford to stay at home, all of which makes an industry already regarded by many as too white and middle-class even more so. If anything it is white and upper middle-class. This concentration of media ownership and these kinds of developments go hand in hand in limiting diversity and the variety of representation that we need.

On top of that, we also have technological change, which prevents opportunities as well as causing problems, which has swept our industry. It requires new models and new ways of looking at how we make journalism sustainable, diverse and pluralistic. It could include things like working with co-operatives, setting up mutual models and alliances of readers and producers. At the NUJ, we are looking at these things very hard at the moment.

The importance of good journalism matters to us all. It was mentioned in the paper yesterday how not one mainstream national newspaper now has a specific industrial correspondent. That has an impact on how the trade union movement is portrayed. We also hear about good stuff that journalists do. There was the motion yesterday about asbestos in the developing world and how the BBC did a very good exposé on it. That is the kind of thing which is under threat. That is the sort of stuff that we, as a whole movement, need to defend.

Basically, equality of sustainable journalism is a trade union issue. It is one in which we all have to engage. Engaging with the media requires engaging with our struggles. Please support. (*Applause*)

Peter Murray (*National Union of Journalists*) spoke to paragraph 2.5 of the General Council Report. He said: I want to speak to the section on the English Defence League under section 2.5 of the Report. Quite correctly, the movement generally has supported the campaigns and demonstrations against this odious organisation which threatens to wreak havoc on the streets of the UK if they take over. Effectively, they are the shock troops on the streets of the UK for the far right political parties.

We have wholeheartedly supported demonstrations against them. Photographers (NUJ members) -- in fact some of the people taking the photographs right now -- have been cataloguing the activity of the EDL, trying to make sure that they are exposed for what they are and that that information gets out to the public. However, one of the drawbacks with all of that is that the police are very often making life extremely difficult for photographers, some of whom are with us at the moment. They make life difficult for them by forcing them to leave areas that they want to control themselves, often quoting laws that do not even exist, to move people on. At the G20, for instance, people were told that they would have to move 100 yards away from the areas where a lot of demonstrations and protests were going on. They were told, "Move 100 or 200 yards away or you will spend the rest of the day in jail."

Other photographers taking pictures of demonstrations were taken up by the police and rammed up against the side of police vans. It took a phone call to our general secretary to get one individual released from police custody. In one recent demonstration against the Israeli occupation of Gaza, one photographer was searched four times in 45 minutes by the same police officers. There are many

other cases that you may have heard about. There is the famous case of an architecture researcher who was detained by the police for photographing St. Paul's Cathedral in London.

So, there is a serious side to it and there is an absolutely absurd side to it but, comrades, this is being done in your name and in ours. What we want is that you should help to keep a probing eye on the EDL and the other fascist organisations like it. Help us keep the police in line and allow our photographers to do their jobs. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

* *Composite Motion 2 was CARRIED*

Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs)

Alan Whitaker (*University and College Union*) moved Motion 10.

He said: I should say at the outset that we accept the amendment added to this motion by the FDA, which we feel has the effect of making a good motion even better.

This motion is about the importance of equality impact assessments to trade unions as part of improving and supporting bargaining, as part of our campaigns against cuts in public services and as part of our response to the Equality Act. Challenging unfairness and discrimination at work is a core concern for UCU members and for all trade union activists. Further and higher education are both rife with inequality and unfair treatment. UCU branches and local reps work hard to protect individual members and, as many reps and members know, even when we work really hard to defend an individual member who has been treated unfairly, it is hard to win. Even those who win often suffer damage to their careers or self-confidence.

The public sector duties were a major breakthrough in helping us to prevent unfairness and discrimination. If fewer women are being promoted than men, we can demand to know what steps are being taken to create a level playing field. Where female and black and minority ethnic staff are disproportionately on hourly-paid or fixed-term contracts, we can demand to see the statistics and ask what is going to be done to ensure that such staff do not face discrimination. If an employer wants to make staff redundant, they have to be able to demonstrate that they have considered the equality implications and sought to make the process as fair as possible with the added bonus of giving reps more time to challenge the redundancy itself.

At UCU, we know that many of our employers do not undertake EIAs with any rigour. As they tackle significant financial constraints through budget cuts, redundancies, reorganisations and service reductions, this legal duty is conveniently forgotten. The Equality and Human Rights Commission has, at our request, even issued separate guidance to FE and HE reminding them of their duties and reminding them that they could expose themselves to costly legal challenges.

It is now critical that the TUC co-ordinates and communicates to affiliates what an essential tool EIAs are in challenging the cuts to jobs and services. It can be done. The comrade from the CWU has already mentioned the Fawcett Society challenge to the emergency budget. Despite repeated requests, the Treasury has not provided any evidence that such an assessment took place. As the comrade mentioned, it is quite likely that the Treasury actually does not care.

We can do the same with our employers. If every branch requests an EIA for every decision the employers are taking on cuts, we will not only see employers having to justify their knee-jerk reactions, but we will raise in a strategic way the equality agenda that we all want to progress. These positive duties are a powerful, collective tool for UCU branches and local associations and for the trade union movement as a

whole. They can prevent many of the individual grievances and disciplinary cases which soak up reps' time and are often frustrating for members and reps alike.

But – and there is always a “but” – the Equality Act is coming and next month sees the first phase of implementation. Last month the Government issued a consultation on the new public sector duty regulations which are needed to implement the public sector duty of the Act.

The good news is that the duty now covers not only race, gender and disability, but age, gender reassignment, religion or belief and sexual orientation. The bad news is that it completely dilutes the existing duty with no more equality schemes, no more action plans and no longer a prescribed process of equality impact assessment. This makes UCU's recommendations to Congress even more of a challenge with an even more urgent need to co-ordinate and campaign and to have equality officers officially recognised to help us protect what our members have fought hard for.

I urge all unions to respond to this consultation as part of our strategy to keep and improve EIAs. I also urge Congress to support this motion. Congress, I move. *(Applause)*

Sue Gethin (*FDA*) seconded Motion 10.

She said: Equality is an issue which should not be regarded in isolation. Equality mainstreams through all of our working lives. Indeed, equality should be at the heart of all trade union collective bargaining and is an essential prerequisite to protect rights to services within the public sector. An essential tool in delivering this agenda is equality impact assessments, but why are they so important? They are important because they have the ability to identify potential discriminatory effects on employers, policies, practices and procedures. Policies can be developed and implemented to promote equality and to lead to a more efficient and fair allocation of resources.

As trade unions, whilst we recognise that equality impact assessments are extremely important when it comes to the reorganisation of public sector departments, in practice, the use of equality impact assessments are not necessarily widespread and are not always effectively conducted. What is the point of having an equality impact assessment if it is not fit for purpose and purely plays lip service to the statutory duty? Full and effective training in conducting equality impact assessments for both employers and trade unions is required in order to produce a validated outcome for our members. They need to be systematically employed in consultation with the unions in order to influence decision-making. This in turn gives the unions greater power to influence the terms of what an equality impact assessment will achieve in respect of major policy and organisational impact change.

At this Congress, we have heard a significant amount about the impact that the deep public sector spending cuts will have on public services, benefits and tax credits. As highlighted in the General Council's Statement, women, disabled people and those from black and minority ethnic communities are likely to be the biggest victim in respect of the cuts and the greater inequality that they will bring. Rightly, there is deep concern that ministers are failing to fulfil their legal duties to carry out full equality impact assessments.

In addition, it is incumbent upon us, as trade unions, to ensure that our reps are trained to deliver our equality agenda in the collective bargaining area. It is also essential to ensure that, at this time of deep public sector spending cuts, equality issues are not marginalised. It is a challenge for us all to ensure that

the equality agenda remains at the heart of our collective bargaining. As unions, we need to maintain this as a high profile issue and highlight it at every opportunity. It is encouraging to note that one of the Civil Service equality and diversity awards this year is in respect of transformative equality impact assessments and I am proud to say that the FDA is supporting this category. It is a key issue for us at the moment, now and in the future and I hope it is for you too. I urge you to support this motion. Thank you.

Sue Bond (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supported the motion.

She said: President, Congress, yesterday we voted for a co-ordinated campaign against the Government's public spending cuts, cuts which will not only hit hardest the poorest and most vulnerable in society, but also deepen inequality on a scale that we have not seen in generations, with a particularly devastating impact on women, black communities and disabled people. So, forcing bodies that deliver public services to carry out equality impact assessments and tackle discrimination will be an increasingly important tool in the range of tools that we have in our fightback. Has the Government carried out this assessment on their cuts programme? No, it appears they have not. Well, what a surprise!

This brings us to enforcement because without the threat of enforcement, do you really think that any of them will bother to comply? A speaker in the health and safety debate yesterday said that if you want to kill a piece of legislation, you simply do not enforce it. So what do you think the Government has just done to the Equality and Human Rights Commission, the statutory body with responsibility for enforcing equality law? You have guessed it. It plans to slash its budget by more than half with further cuts to come.

PCS represents staff there and many now face being thrown on the scrapheap, but this is not only about the savage job cuts. It is even worse. If the Commission is weakened by cuts of 1,000 knives, haemorrhaging the irreplaceable expertise of its staff (my members) then every group of workers, every trade union and every community will suffer too if we are left with an equality watchdog with no teeth and insufficient resources to challenge employers who fail to comply with the law. All these public sector cuts are damaging and unnecessary. We can prove that and we can show the alternative. For this Government to sabotage the one body with the power to hold employers to account whilst making brutal attacks on whole communities and disadvantaged groups is plain criminal.

Please support this motion and, in doing so, I ask the TUC and affiliate unions to support our fight for a properly-resourced equality commission able to do the job that we need it to do. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Eleanor Smith (*UNISON*) spoke in support of the motion.

She said: Congress, despite the reorganisation and job cuts taking place across the public sector, we must keep in mind that all organisations in the public sector are bound by their legal duties to eliminate discrimination and promote race, gender and disability equality. Although the forthcoming Comprehensive Spending Review will be like no other in recent history in the UK, we have to make sure that we use the equality impact assessments to ensure that women, black, disabled, LGBT and young people do not bear the brunt of the cuts.

The purpose of conducting an equality impact assessment is to ensure that the policies and activities help to promote equality and, at the very least, do not disadvantage any particular group. This means that

any new or existing policy that is likely to have an equality aspect must be examined in detail. This involves the employer gathering information to see if the implementation of the policy would have any direct or indirect discriminatory effect, consulting with the relevant stakeholders and then adapting policies if necessary.

Public sector employers are under a statutory duty to measure the impact of their decisions on different groups with regard to race, gender and disability. As such, all public sector employers should carry out the equality impact assessments on restructuring, redundancies or cuts proposals. UNISON and the TUC have funded a report entitled "Don't forget the spending cuts! The real impact of Budget 2010". The report reveals how deeply regressive the cuts would be.

Our concern, of course, is that the current duties would be watered down by the ConDem Government. That is why we must remain vigilant and continue to lobby for the new equality duties to be robust and implemented consistently across the public sector. We will need all the trade union representatives in the workplace to be consulted by their employers concerning equality impact assessments. Where the public sector employers are not using the equality impact assessments we, the union movement, must demand that they do. We need to ensure that we use the tools that we have to our advantage. If there is a serious breach, we must demand that the Equality and Human Rights Commission, which is charged with the enforcement of law, flexes its muscles. Please support the motion. (*Applause*)

* *Motion 10 was CARRIED*

A workplace agenda for women

Clare Williams (*UNISON*) moved Motion 11 on behalf of the TUC's Women's Conference.

She said: I have to say that I am delighted to be able to move this motion on behalf of the Women's Conference which I see, along with every other woman who participates in it, as the parliament for women in this country. I think that we should acknowledge that the TUC has been at the forefront of the campaign to improve and to get a decent women's agenda both in our workplaces and in wider society. Trade union women have been at the cutting edge in coming up with ideas and innovative ways to promote women's equality in our society.

Some of the achievements of women have been absolutely formidable and I think that it is worth taking a couple of minutes to recognise them. They are achievements such as women's rights on family-friendly policies, the doubling of maternity pay, the national minimum wage, childcare, part-time and flexible working, the introduction of unionlearn, training, gender duty and tackling domestic violence to name but a few.

I think we should commend the courage and commitment of women throughout our history who have shown dedication to promoting equality for women. There is Mary Macarthur who, in 1910, led the chainmakers in a ten-week strike for a minimum wage and won an historic victory, and the women machinists at Ford, who campaigned for equal pay and who are now the subject of the film *Made in Dagenham*.

However, we have to acknowledge that, 40 years later, we are still tackling the fight for equal pay for women. The disproportion in wages stands at 17 per cent for full-time workers and 38 per cent for part-time workers, which no one would think is right. My union, UNISON, has over one million women members. We welcome the work of the whole trade union movement in progressing the women's agenda on equality.

Let us not forget that it was the Labour movement which gave us equality legislation in Europe, bringing in the Part-Time Workers' Directive, giving rights to millions of part-time working women for the first time, women who were being attacked through privatisation, having their sick pay, their holiday pay and their pension rights attacked. It is clear that this Tory-led coalition government is seeking to undo all the advances that this movement has achieved on behalf of working women. They do not want to bring in gender equality duties. They are dithering on whether to bring in modest measures such as voluntary reporting on gender in pay. I think that this coalition only talks about equality and we will not see any action from them unless we make them do it.

Also we must be clear that we need to protect all women's rights for women who work in the public and in the private sector. We need to send a powerful message to this Government. Women should not, and will not, pay the price of an economic crisis caused by a corporate elite dominated by men. *(Applause)*

The reality is that in our society only 2 per cent of CEOs are women and a mere 17 per cent of directorships are held by women. I think it is right that this motion calls on the General Council, the TUC Women's Conference and affiliates to remain constantly vigilant and to oppose any attempt to attack those hard-won equality rights for women at work, including the increasing right wing attack that is being led by organisations such as the TaxPayers' Alliance on facility time for trade union reps.

It is right that we prepare a report on the achievements of women's equality. The Women's Charter, which was agreed at the TUC Women's Conference, emphasises the issues that need to continue to be addressed and points out the continuing huge gaps in inequality, particularly in relation to pay, to pensions, to equal pay and to poverty. I think it is right that the TUC uses this Women's Charter to take forward our ability to tackle those issues and to ensure that we have a workplace agenda for women.

We know that the cuts that are coming will hit women hardest. That has been talked about quite a lot. We must challenge these cuts at every stage of the way. With 70 per cent of public sector workers being women, I think that it is absolutely essential that women are not only at the heart of them, but are leading our campaigns against these attacks. These are campaigns such as the one in the Northern region and Cumbria where we have launched the Public Services Alliance to take our alternative agenda and plan into workplaces and communities. We need to make sure that women are at the heart of what we do and, as a movement, we must stand together, shoulder to shoulder, so that this Government does not attack the hard-won equalities. Please support and make sure that you deliver a workplace agenda for women. *(Applause)*

Diana Holland (*Unite*) seconded Motion 11.

She said: In March, when *Unite* moved this motion and the TUC Women's Conference voted to bring it to Congress, we believed it was important. Now, after the ConDem Government's attacks on workers, on equality and on our welfare state, this motion is more important than ever. Women workers, pregnant workers, working mothers and carers have not caused this global economic crisis, but they are paying the price. As Shadow Minister Yvette Cooper has shown, of £8 billion worth of cuts and tax changes in the Budget, £6 billion comes from women and £2 billion from men. This is not fair, it is not just and it is certainly not equality.

When David Cameron and his friends were at school with their satchels, their books and their little top hats, they must have been taught the principle, "Women and children first." Maybe they got it wrong. David, "Women and children first" does not mean first to target, first to threaten and first to cut. *(Applause)*

This is a year of centenaries for working women. It is 100 years since International Women's Day was established, 100 years since the women chainmakers' strike for a minimum wage, which we celebrate in Dudley this Saturday, and 100 years since the birth of Barbara Castle, author of the Equal Pay Act.

As mentioned earlier, on 1st October, the new film *Made in Dagenham* will be released, which tells the story of the equal pay strike of Ford sewing machinists at Dagenham and Halewood in 1968, the struggle which led directly to the 1970 Equal Pay Act. They were just 187 women in a workforce of 55,000, but they showed that by getting organised, they could really make a difference. As Bob Hoskins, one of the stars of the film, has said, "It amazes me that even after it became illegal, companies are still getting away with abusing women's rights." We have come a long way, but we still have a long way to go to achieve the aims of our Women's Charter.

Congress, I have conducted a little equality audit of my own. It is an audit of the Cabinet and it shows that the ConDem Cabinet has 11 times more millionaires than mothers. No wonder they do not understand. This motion calls for a powerful, united campaign for women in all our workplaces to celebrate our achievements, to oppose cuts and attacks and, last but not least, to keep moving forward on equality. Congress, I second. Please support. *(Applause)*

Kathy Duggan (*NASUWT*) spoke in support of Motion 11.

She said: Congress, the concerns expressed in this motion are now becoming a reality. The Government's emergency budget and public sector cuts introduced, and to be introduced, by the coalition Government will have specific implications for women. Research done by the House of Commons Library on behalf of Yvette Cooper, the Shadow Welfare Secretary, has revealed that women will shoulder nearly three-quarters of the burden of the Budget.

The Fawcett Society has filed papers seeking a judicial review of the Government's Budget. They believe that under equality law, the Government should have undertaken an equality impact assessment on whether its budget proposals would increase or reduce equality between women and men – some chance! We must support every initiative that seeks to expose the Budget's disproportionate and negative effects on women's financial wellbeing. 65 per cent of public sector workers are women so the pay freeze takes more from women.

More women than men are in receipt of benefits and tax credits so the Budget takes more from women. More women than men use public services so the Budget and the cuts take more from women now and in the future. Mothers and carers will lose up to £1,200 a year as a result of changes announced in the Budget, including the abolition of the Health in Pregnancy Grant, the incredibly short-sighted and ill-judged cuts in the *SureStart* grant, and the cruel and cynical freezing of child benefit. Parents whose youngest child is over five years' old will be moved from income support to *Jobseeker's Allowance*. This callous change will have a huge and negative impact on the financial wellbeing of parents on the lowest income who, with young babies, will lose over £1,200 a year and be worse off. Women are more affected by housing benefit and changes to pension arrangements.

Congress, this motion calls upon the TUC to campaign for decent work for women. We must continue to advocate decent work for women and gender equality at work in the tax and benefit system and in our communities. I support. (*Applause*)

Lorraine Monk (*University and College Union*) supported the motion.

She said: Mary Wollstonecraft, in 1791, wrote that for women to be equal, they have to be treated not like birds in a cage or baubles to decorate a man's life, but to be more than just a trophy wife. I wonder what she would make of our media today where films still tell the stories of men's lives, where newscasters have a smiling woman at the side of them and the tabloid newspapers promote that the best job for a woman is still to be the wife of a footballer. We have come a long way, but there is still a long way to go.

Wollstonecraft concentrated on education as the key to women's equality and the improvement of life for everyone as a result. We have come some way, but there are still barriers to girls and women progressing. In education, sexism from boys and men is still present and expectations are still different. When women begin to make achievements, we get a panic that boys and men are falling behind. Cuts in schools, colleges and universities will hit women disproportionately, both as teachers, as lecturers and as students. We have already been faced with redundancies in both colleges and universities across the country. Guess who the majority of the people are? It is sessional workers and who are sessional workers? They are the ones most easy to get rid of, the ones taking part-time work because of the needs of time to care and raise children, still perceived by most people as women's work.

There is the promotion by the Government of privatised education and the influence of academies and other independent schools. Who are they independent of? They are independent of us, the community. They are promoting inequality and they can get away with it. Let us remember that education shapes people's lives. In the promotion of religious schools too, we have a real problem. Make no mistake, in a democracy we must have religious toleration, but we must recognise that most organised religions of all kinds are based on the premise that God made man and forgot about woman.

Sisters and brothers, I can see my time is running out, but we have to look at how many women speakers there were yesterday and how many general secretaries are still men. I am proud that our UCU general secretary is a woman. Perhaps we should have women-only shortlists for general secretaries as well. (*Applause*)

We use the epithet of 'brothers and sisters' because we see ourselves not as individuals like the right wing, but connected together in a family and equality is the basis of that. Never mind the tone. The Suffragettes never worried about "the tone", which we all heard about yesterday. The Suffragettes fought for what they believed in, just like we have to, because an injury to one is an injury to all. Congress, please support this motion. (*Applause*)

Christine Cuthbert (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) spoke in support of Motion 11.

She said: It is a scandal that in the 21st century, in such a short space of time, a government can push women's position in society back to the 19th century. I can tell you that 72 per cent of the proposed cuts will be borne directly by women. Job losses and pay freezes in the public sector, cuts in tax credits and other benefits such as the freezing of Child Benefit, closures of nurseries and so on will hit women hard. Access to flexible

working arrangements will be lost and reduction in income will impact on retirement income causing poverty well into the future. It does not make economic sense to cut jobs and reduce flexible working arrangements, thereby losing valuable experience and tax income. The long-term impact does not bear thinking about.

As has been mentioned a number of times, the Fawcett Society has lodged papers seeking a judicial review because it is clear that the Government has failed to carry out an equality impact assessment on the cuts. The very fact that the Fawcett Society has taken this action indicates the very real concerns about the serious impact that these cuts will have. Their combativity has to be reflected by the TUC and all unions. We have to be prepared to fight the cuts on all fronts, through legal challenges, campaigning, opposing the alternative and coordinated industrial action.

In my own area, the Bristol Anti-Cuts Alliance has been set up, led by PCS and the NUT, and there is to be a demonstration and march on October 23rd. There is a lot of support from other unions in the region. The regional TUCs must get behind these initiatives and not drag their heels.

PCS represents members in the Department for Work and Pensions, the government department responsible for paying benefits to the most vulnerable in society. The Department has already been on the receiving end of massive staff cuts. Any further cuts will mean that what has become an extremely difficult job will become impossible and the vulnerable women, lone parents and so on will suffer as a result.

The DWP has also had the dubious pleasure of being one of the lowest paying government departments. 66 per cent of the staff are women and tend to be working in the lower grades where some only receive pennies above the minimum wage and it has been some years since some members received a pay rise which was anywhere near inflation rates, CPI or RPI. Members are receiving benefits they administer to supplement their income.

Women tend to choose jobs in the public sector because there has been more access to flexible working conditions and work/life balance. The cuts will mean that these types of jobs will disappear, meaning that women with caring responsibilities will become trapped in the home. Cuts and reduced public services will force women back into the home, leaving them struggling to make ends meet and disenfranchising them from taking part in union and political activity.

David Cameron says that he wants to give power back to the people. It appears that that will not include women. There is an alternative to cuts which has been outlined already at this conference. We must work together with the communities to oppose these attacks and not to find ourselves in a position where the years of progress for women are lost overnight. I support the motion.

Jackie Marshall (*POA*) supported Motion 11.

She said: The POA welcomes the achievements of the trade union movement over the past ten years and we should applaud the Labour government for supporting these changes, but there is more to do. Currently, employers only have to consider applications for work/life balance and/or flexible working. We know from experience that far too many applications are refused by the employer when realistically they could do more to support those in need.

Even today, in the 21st century, we know that women are treated as second-class citizens in relation to pay and pensions. The coalition Government, in bringing in a pay freeze for those earning more than £21,000,

have discriminated against women because the majority of part-time workers are female. As a female part-time worker, you may only earn £10,000 a year, but because the pro rata pay scale is more than £21,000, these workers will not receive a pay award.

Therefore, in supporting this motion and recognising the achievements that we have gained to date, we must not sit on our laurels. It is clear that women need unions but more so, unions need women members. By supporting the doing part of this motion, Congress will give clear direction to the General Council and to the TUC Women's Committee but more so to every worker and employer that this organisation will not stand aside and watch our female counterparts be discriminated against. We will not allow any government to attack the achievements that we have made to make our working lives better under the guise of public savings and protection of the economy, an economy that was the making of fat cat bankers. Please support the motion.

Alexandra Mackenzie (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*) supported Motion 11.

She said: President, Congress, the CSP welcomes this motion, particularly as nearly 90 per cent of our own members are women. We are very concerned that the Government's policy of cutting public services will have a massive and disproportionate impact on women. Around two-thirds of the public sector employees are women and the figure is even higher for the NHS.

Cuts to the public sector workforce will therefore inevitably have the effect of targeting women and will leave more women in poverty as the job market tightens. Women are also prime users of public sector services. It is a fact of life that we still take the main responsibility for the health and welfare of our children and our older, sick and disabled relatives. As a health worker myself, I see this every day. So, any gaps in public services will almost inevitably have to be covered by more unpaid labour from women.

I fear that the cuts proposed will impact on other areas of women's lives too. We have not yet resolved the gender pay gap. Women working full-time are still, 40 years after the introduction of the Equal Pay Act, paid on average 16 per cent less than men. This discrimination follows women into retirement so any attempts to reduce pension rights, which this Government is so keen to introduce into the public sector, will mean more women living in poverty in their final years.

At the TUC Women's Conference this year, we welcomed the launch of the Labour government's strategy to tackle all forms of violence against women and girls. For the first time, this strategy took a cross-departmental approach, linking the police, probation service and health and social services in partnership with the voluntary sector. The strategy is broad, covering sexual violence, trafficking, domestic violence and forced marriage. It emphasises the importance of public servants both in spotting and supporting women in this situation. It would be a tragedy if the good work that the strategy has set in motion was lost due to cutbacks.

Finally, we know that the current government is less than keen on some of the outstanding elements of the new Equality Act which have yet to be put into effect. Provisions for tackling gender pay inequality in the private sector, new public sector duties and socio-economic duties all look likely to be lost. These threats to the progress already made by women in recent decades make it more important than ever that the TUC and affiliates work together to make bargaining for inequality a priority. Please support the motion. (*Applause*)

* *Motion 11 was CARRIED*

LGBT rights in the new political situation

Maria Exall (*Communication Workers Union*) moved Motion 12.

She said: I move Motion 12 from the TUC LGBT Conference. Our fight for equality goes on despite these darker times. We will judge this ConDem coalition Government's commitment to equality by what they do, not by what they say. It is very easy to issue a press statement or launch a PR campaign, but it's much harder to put in place a strategy to tackle homophobia and transphobia, and then back that strategy up with necessary resources. There is no sign that they want to do that. It is impossible to take seriously the paper conversion of the Conservatives to equality when they are cutting support to the very organisations that can promote equality. They say warm words but they implement vicious cuts.

The Lib-Dems provide socio-liberal cover for David Cameron's nasty party, but their collaboration with the cuts proved that the Liberal-Democrats are not a party of equal rights in any meaningful sense. We need positive action to fight discrimination, yet the public sector bodies and LGBT voluntary organisations that challenge the persistent homophobia and transphobia in our society will have their funding slashed. We all know equality measures are the first to be jettisoned when budgets are tight. It is not just slashed budgets that are a problem. As this motion highlights, the Tory-led Government's current policies on education and welfare will lead to greater inequality and increased discrimination for LGBT workers.

Their extension of the academies programme and their encouragement of free schools will mean more faith schools, whose designated religious ethos compromises our employment rights. Another big problem is the Government's stated intention to contract out public services to charities and other voluntary bodies on a massive scale. For it is in the third sector that we find many of the faith-based organisations whose employment practices make them a virtual no-go area for LGBT people - for any LGBT person who wants to be out at work, that is.

We sit very uncomfortably in the Tory vision of the big society. This is why the TUC LGBT Committee, after the failure of the Equality Act to deal with this issue, asked the General Council to challenge the legality of the current religious exemptions from obligations on LGBT employment rights in the UK, via the European Commission.

It is not only a matter of justice for the tens of thousands of LGBT workers who are, and will, be directly affected by the exemptions, but it is also about whether we want a society where public services, which should be for all, are delivered in such a discriminatory and divisive way. Do we really want to turn the clock back to an era when LGBT people went to work in fear of their sexuality being revealed and then losing their jobs? Do we really want public services run by religious extremists who think LGBT people need exorcism, not equality? Well, I've news for you, Congress. Philippa Stroud is already there, advising Iain Duncan Smith and the Department of Work and Pensions on reforming welfare. Yes, you remember who she is. She is the Conservative candidate who failed to get elected after her views on how we should be 'cured' were made public. This Government has no mandate for their reactionary policies and they have no mandate for their cuts agenda.

Congress, please support this motion. LGBT equality cannot be divorced from equality in society in general. Economic equality and LGBT equality are linked. Let's fight the cuts and let's fight discrimination and prejudice. Let's go forward to equality. I move.

Nick Day (*GMB*) seconded Motion 12.

He said: Congress, I second this motion on behalf of the TUC LGBT Committee. The financial crisis is similar to a night at a casino. The bankers have been placing all of our chips on the losing bets, and we go home empty handed and in debt at the end of the night. The bankers were so addicted that they started to borrow more and more as the chips ran out. Now our government has decided that it is time to pay the money back. So who do they want the money from? Not the bankers, surely, who frittered away our money; not the regulators who looked the other way, or maybe those of us who didn't even know the bankers were doing this on our behalf? Yes, we are left with the deficit and the bankers get a cut in Corporation Tax for their banks.

But how are they getting away with this? We've all heard about climate change deniers, but now we have the ConDems, the deficit reality deniers. They lie about the extent of the deficit. They pretend our situation is almost comparable to Greece. They do not tell us that our debts are longer term, more secure and there is almost no danger of them defaulting. They forget to tell us that with a shattered economy, after the Second World War, we came together to create the National Health Service. But these ConDems are so hell bent on their small state ideology that they are willing to risk a double dip recession. They will let us head towards a housing market collapse; they will throw working people on the scrapheap, creating a larger welfare bill than that they are unwilling already to fund. Francis Maud boasts that the cuts are deeper than Thatcher's, but what he will not admit is that, when times are hard, it is the vulnerable, our minorities, who always fare worse. Make no mistake, these vicious cuts will seriously affect LGBT members; housing advice; preventing hate crime; charities supporting HIV positive working people, and ending homophobic bullying in schools, which even the ConDems, apparently, prioritise in their manifesto.

Congress, the legislation we have fought for in the last ten years means nothing if we do not defend our members from cuts. This week we must get our message across. The Government is wrong to put ideology over economic reality, and the unions will be there, on the front line, protecting our vulnerable members and essential services. Please support this motion.

Lesley Mansell (*University and College Union*):

Congress, it is thanks to you, the TUC, and all of you, every trade union member, that we have made real progress towards full liberation for LGBT people. Make no mistake, this LiberalCon Government is using the economic crisis as a smokescreen to curtail our rights.

I am going to focus on the Equality Act. Firstly, the Government is still considering some of the provisions like equal pay, positive action in recruitment and diversity reporting in political parties. Secondly, and of great concern, is that the new Act fails to include a requirement for public bodies to produce equality schemes and to impact assess their policies and practices in line with their responsibilities under the equality duties. Further, the responsibility not to discriminate in procurement has been removed.

There is a need for trade unions to make our demands known as all of these are going through a consultation process right now. Sally Hunt, the General Secretary of the UCU, has launched an initiative to draw up our own equality scheme, to give a positive example to higher and further education public bodies which have not carried out the full spirit and letter of the equality legislation.

The few advances that have been made are piecemeal. The UCU strategy includes training for our officers and

reps to give us the skills to use the equality impact assessments with employers for our members and also to demand the public services which we are entitled to. There is nothing in the Act to compel public bodies to show how they meet the equality duties for LGBT people or anybody else.

Yesterday, Bob Crow, rightly, outlined the aim of this government to become more corporate, moving the delivery of public services into the private sector, giving them a free hand to generate profit, but no responsibility to promote equality in the provision of goods and services.

In education we see the sinister hand of privatisation forming free schools and academies, while private companies take over speech and language services in some universities with no checks and balances on how to ensure the service is free from discrimination and promotes equality. This is the tip of the iceberg.

This aggressive attack by the Government is intended to dilute our hard won civil liberties, not the least of which was the abolition of section 28. It enforces the oppression which disproportionately affects LGBT people and increases the emotional and physical cost which results in us being the group most likely to contemplate and commit suicide, or suffer front long-term mental health problems.

Congress, I ask all unions to work together and with outside organisations, like the EHRC on the consultation process, to reinstate these provisions or devise other mechanisms for public bodies to use to ensure they meet their duty to promote equality and eradicate discrimination not just for LGBT people but for all the other protected characteristics as well. Further, we must work to extend the duties to cover the private sector and not let them off the hook. I suppose.

Jackie Lewis (*UNISON*) spoke in support of Motion 12.

She said: President and Congress, delegates don't have to have that many years under their belt or particularly long memories to recall debates at Congress establishing the very legitimacy of LGBT rights. Our unions and the TUC have fought hard to win political and legal recognition that LGBT issues are not personal issues. Rather, they are workplace and service delivery issues. We have fought hard to establish that LGBT equality is not a matter of conscience or morality, that it is not an appropriate matter for free vote in Parliament or optional for employers or managers, depending on their personal beliefs. But what we are seeing now is nothing less than an attack on the principle of LGBT rights as human rights and workers' rights.

Congress, this government has worked hard to distance itself from its homophobic, biphobic and transphobic track record. It has sought to claim credit for LGBT equality advances brought about under Labour, but scratch the surface and it's an ugly sight. Let's take their claim to be committed to tackling homophobic bullying in schools. How exactly do they intend to do this? It seems that their big idea is to give greater powers to head teachers to exclude students. It has been clearly demonstrated that levels of homophobic bullying are highest in faith schools. So what's the Government doing about that? Setting up more faith schools and ensuring that legal loopholes on LGBT employment remains wide open. As I said, scratch the surface and it's an ugly sight.

Congress, public services that meet the needs of LGBT people are rare enough now. LGBT youth groups, counselling services, gender reassignment services, services for older LGBT people, none of those win the popular vote, and many are delivered on a shoestring.

Without us vigorously defending them, few will survive.

Congress, UNISON was a proud part of the joint union legal action testing the religious exemption in the Sexual Orientation Regulations when they first came into force. It is shameful – shameful – that we still have to fight the same battle now. But let us all welcome and endorse the TUC challenge on its legality in the Equality Act. We will keep fighting until we win.

Julia Neal (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*): Congress, in supporting this motion, I should like to focus on the third part, highlighting the Government's encouragement of greater freedom within the state school system in terms of curriculum and governance with particular reference to the provision of more faith schools.

Congress, we should be alarmed at the number of faith schools registering their interest in converting to academies. This trend is also showing in the first list of Michael Gove's Free Schools, published only last week, when six new faith schools were included.

Academy status will give religious groups far greater control over schools and what they teach. Over 300 schools run by religious groups have formally registered their interest in converting to academy status, and although they have not all materialised yet, the danger is real. All state funded faith schools that become academies will automatically become religious academies, meaning that in addition to complete powers over the curriculum their discriminatory admissions and employment policies will be enforced.

The moderating influence of the state and the community will be removed, and it is highly likely that trade union influence will be diminished as well. There will be little scope for consultation with parents and local people. Many private faith schools have traditionally resisted state funding knowing that this would bring restrictions on what they could teach and some may not have the criteria to gain maintained status.

The Academies Bill, as it stands, would remove these restrictions, allowing such schools to digress from the National Curriculum, and this would appeal to religious groups currently running fee paying schools, giving them complete powers over what they teach without the need to raise their own funds. The concern is, obviously, that faith schools with these freedoms could teach sex and relationship education in line with their own homophobic values. They could teach that same sex relationships are morally wrong, LGBT pupils would certainly suffer, homophobic bullying would not be discouraged and gay teachers and pupils would live in fear and isolation. Trans pupils might also face prejudice, too.

All three main political parties would like to further expand faith schools, and it is a fact that a higher proportion of anti-gay bullying occurs in them than in others. How is this to be tackled if such schools are permitted to teach pupils that being gay is sinful? Young people in faith schools have just as much right to a balanced, inclusive curriculum, which encourages the acceptance of diversity and a good range of religious and cultural perceptions. Surely, Congress that is a basic human right. Please support this motion.

Betty Gallagher (*Unite*) spoke in support of Motion 12.

She said: Congress, they told us that they are not the old Tories. They told us that they are a modern party, and they told us that they would give support to LGBT people and that they will give us equality. But will they? I know they have made promises about hate crime, legislation and asylum seekers, but let's see how

fast they put these promises into action. Will it be as fast as they have introduced the cuts? I am not holding my breath. They have already taken away our other forms of support by their vicious cuts. The £6 billion cuts in public spending and voluntary sector organisations, including LGBT organisations, have been losing their funding and jobs, which has put vulnerable people at risk, including, particularly, working class LGBT people, with nowhere to seek advice or get support.

Our fight against cuts supports LGBT people who are in a minority and at the sharp end of prejudice, facing discrimination and homophobic and transphobic bullying. As we all know this bullying and harassment is not only in our workplaces but in our children's schools, too. In all schools, religious or non-religious, we shouldn't allow this government to hide behind the churches so that they can discriminate against people who are different from the norm. But who decides what's the norm? We say no to all discrimination.

So the ConDem government is still going to introduce the Equality Act on 1st October. What does the Act mean? Does it mean equal is equal? Or is it only the bits they want you to have? Are they going to pick and choose which parts come in and which parts we have to wait for? We don't have equality when faith organisations can openly discriminate against LGBT people. What does one's sexuality have to do with teaching in schools? A teacher is a teacher, just like a plumber is a plumber, or a bus driver is a bus driver. It wouldn't matter to the church or the faith school if the plumber who came to fix the burst pipe was gay, or if the bus driver who drove the children to school was a lesbian. So why should it be different for a teacher? That's why we should support the TUC in their legal challenge to overturn this exemption and end this prejudice. Congress, I urge you to support this motion. Thank you.

* *Motion 12 was CARRIED*

A workplace agenda for disabled workers

The President: I will now call Motion 13. The General Council supports the motion.

Richard Cooke (*Unite*) moved Motion 13.

He said: Congress, I have a speech impediment so I use this poem as its rhythm helps me, so perhaps you will not then moan. The Disabilities Conference chose to send the Unite motion to Congress this year, and no wonder, as this motion is absolutely great. It says so much about our fears. So now the Unite motion becomes the TUC Disabilities Motion called "A workplace agenda for disabled workers".

With a new government we also have a new fight. Our fight is that we need a new set of rights for disabled workers. Disabled workers are the first people to be made redundant. Discrimination stops us from applying for jobs and getting work. One in seven disabled people have lost their job in the past year. It is for the public sector that we are more likely to work, so, as you all know, the situation will get worse if public services are cut. Also we should celebrate the fights we have actually won. Only half of disabled people are employed compared with two-thirds of the rest of the population. Driving accidents at work are classed as road traffic accidents. They should be changed. This should be changed so that they can also be compensated.

Agency workers are not aware of their rights, so we must make them aware of them. We know our campaigning role is still rather vital. Achieving disability rights is something we just missed. We must ensure that unions put monitoring in place. However, the TUC must always be our lead by campaigning for

equality reps and disability champions, or disabled people often feel they just merely breed.

Belfast recently made a major move. Northern Ireland's brilliant Equality Commission launched a forum for disability champions, meeting four times a year looking at all successful cases. We must continue our campaign in the whole of the UK for statutory disability union reps, or we are just merely blown away.

Equality is not just for the good times. As we said at the Disability Conference: "Nothing about us without us". It was said that it might be world peace next. Well, that is not really the subject I am speaking about. I move this very important motion. Thank you very much.

Mandy Hudson (*National Union of Teachers*) seconded Motion 13.

She said: Congress, it makes me very proud to be able to second this motion from the TUC Disability Committee. I think this is very important because at a time of spending cuts and the worsening economic situation, it is vital that the trade union movement supports its disabled workers.

As Richard has just said, the proportion of disabled workers actually in employment is less than that of the rest of the population, so as a trade union movement we have a responsibility to support those disabled people who are not yet in work. We also have a responsibility to support those disabled people whose circumstances mean that it is very difficult for them to get work. I believe that this motion from the TUC Disability Conference shows a way forward for the whole of the trade union movement.

This motion talks about creating a toolkit of good practice, and I know that there is good practice out there within the trade union movement in all trades and in all situations where hardworking representatives have fought for the rights of disabled workers.

In the past when it came to people acquiring impairments or their impairment getting worse during employment, even the trade union movement showed those people the door, really, but now we realise that with reasonable adjustments we can continue in work for much longer. The difficulty at the moment is that those reasonable adjustments are harder to fight for. I would urge you within your workplaces to continue to support disabled workers, to look creatively and flexibly at how they can continue at work and make an effective contribution. I believe that without disabled workers society isn't complete and the workplace isn't complete without our skills, because we have a lot to offer.

The motion isn't just about disabled workers who go through from birth with their disability and face the barriers of poor education and whatever. It is about those people who acquire impairments along the way. It is important to support those people who experience injury in the workplace to make sure that they get suitable compensation and adjustments to be able to help them to continue in work.

The final paragraph of this motion talks about how it is important for disabled people to become active within trade unions. I first became an active member of my trade union 20 years ago when we were fighting to protect the rights of disabled people from ethnic minority populations when their funding was in danger. I have stayed an active member because I believe that it is important to voice the concerns of disabled people within education but also within the broader trade union movement, because we know that without people actually presenting our case, we won't be able to move forward. I thank you, as a trade union

movement, for all the work that you do, and I thank you for supporting this motion.

Leslie Manasseh (*Prospect*) spoke in support of Motion 13.

He said: Congress, let me start off with a few more facts. Almost seven million people, or some 19 per cent of the working population, have a disability. At this very moment in time, 1.3 million disabled workers are actively looking for work. Disabled people don't just suffer from a massive employment gap, but they also suffer a pay gap with their pay some 10 per cent lower than non-disabled colleagues.

Disability itself, as we know, is a very complex issue covering a vast range of conditions. Regrettably, some forms of disability appear more respectable than others. Workers, for example, who have a mental health issue suffer an unemployment rate of around 80 per cent. Just as multi-faceted as the problem is the type of discrimination workers suffer. Some is obvious and direct – the failure of employers to make reasonable physical adjustments to the workplace – but too many forms of discrimination are less obvious and less direct. They hide in decisions made behind closed doors, in opaque recruitment and selection procedures, in discretionary and individualised performance management systems, which include bottom line accounting as well as in the simple failure of imagination by employers. The point is that making provision for disabled workers is never high on an employer's agenda. All too often the ideal employee is seen as able-bodied, and it is this pernicious assumption which explains the employment gap, the pay gap and why, in Prospect surveys, we find our disabled members fair less well in performance management systems and pay systems and are much more likely to suffer harassment at work than other groups.

Whilst as trade unionists we can be proud of our work and achievements both on an individual and collective level, there is much more to do. As we know, the recession is having a disproportionate effect on disabled workers. As employers seek to cut costs, reasonable adjustments can all too easily be held to be unaffordable. Cuts in public sector jobs, as we know, will hit disabled workers particularly harshly. As employers seek to freeze pay and benefits, equal pay for disabled workers will remain an ever more distant goal. We have to remain, for our part, ever vigilant in the workplace if we are to check and reverse this trend, and we must open up those closed doors and those secret processes. Too many disabled workers have to battle on their own not just with their disability but with an employment world which, all too often, does not make room for them or recognise their contribution. It is our job to make that battle easier. Please support.

Kim Silver (*UNISON*) spoke in support of Motion 13.

She said. Colleagues, firstly, a big thank you to Unite for taking into account the points in our amendment at the TUC Disabilities Conference when submitting this motion to Congress.

There has never been a more important time to fight for disabled people's rights. Government cuts must be fought hard if we want equality in our workplaces and in society. The Cabinet Office estimates that 11 million disabled people are eligible for protection under the Disability Discrimination Act. That is a lot of people. Actually, no, it's not. It's not when you consider that the Cabinet Office estimates that approximately 36 million disabled people are not covered by the DDA. That is a staggering number of people who may face legitimate discrimination by employers in recruitment, selection, redundancies and dismissal procedures just

because they do not meet the rigid and narrow DDA definition of a disabled person.

So what can disabled people look forward to from the Government's plans for economic recovery? In a nutshell they will face: regression to poverty, isolation and discrimination. During the past 15 years we have seen the transformation from segregated physical environments to more inclusive building and information systems; choices in work, not just workshop employment and reserved occupations, such as lift attendants or car park attendants, but changes to opportunities for disabled people to be involved in public life. Fifteen years ago people like me were barred from holding public office as a magistrate. Eleven years ago we fought the law and the law lost.

Colleagues, our society has come a long way. People have fought for equality and our non-disabled trade union colleagues have stood shoulder to shoulder with us, fighting for justice. But what about the future? We have a government now that doesn't listen to us. It thinks it knows best, but it is wrong. It will learn the hard way. We need stronger and more effective anti-discrimination and trade union legislation, but not education, as education and persuasion do not work. We need the specific duties of the Equality Act to be implemented. We need the additional cost of living with a disability to be recognised, not to the planned persecution of disabled people who are reliant on state support to stop them going cap-in-hand to the charities. The planned attack on disability benefits and capping Housing Benefit is a recipe for an unequal society. A big society? What a big joke! We, sisters and brothers, need to get our act in gear and mobilise our members in the next chapter on democracy in Britain. We need to persuade the electorate to cast their democratic vote to determine who is in-charge. The electorate must change the political landscape of English local authorities in Northern Irish local councils, the Scottish Parliament, the National Assembly for Wales and the Northern Ireland Assembly in the elections to be held in 2011. So we need a workplace agenda for disabled people with independent, economic means making a contribution to the economy. Most definitely, brothers and sisters, we need to continue the trade union allegiances to disabled people's rights. Please support.

James Stribley (*GMB*) supported Motion 13.

Congress, I am a first-time speaker at the TUC (*Applause*) and a proud Remploy worker. On March 8th 2008 the Remploy factory in York closed its doors forever, throwing around 47 disabled people on the scrapheap, but the top heavy management which failed them were able to keep their jobs. The chances for ex-Remploy workers to get decent jobs were few and far between.

Some employers see disabled people as a potential problem and choose not to employ us. So the workers stuck together and started a campaign to re-open Remploy York as a co-operative, but it soon became obvious that we were banging our heads against a brick wall. But with the support of our union we started up the York Disabled Workers Co-operative. We are providing new opportunities in York for decent skilled employment for disabled people. Our mission is to produce ethically manufactured products and employ disabled people on decent terms and conditions. We will make garden products which will help in improving the biodiversity of the garden, such as beehives, ladybird homes, bat boxes, bird tables and nesting boxes. We have started producing samples and we will be starting full production soon. We have an open day on 28th October. With the support of the TUC we will be taking on a young apprentice. He or she will have the opportunity to learn woodworking skills that could stand him or her in good stead for the

rest of their lives. That is why we are passionate about the York Disabled Workers' Co-operative, a unique venture set up by disabled workers, organising for disabled workers, for the benefit of disabled workers, with no fat-cat directors on huge bonuses and no expensive jollies or large expense accounts. There is no one rule for the bosses and another for the workers.

We have good terms and conditions that exceed ILO standards. We are just starting and we thank the Battersea & Wandsworth Trades Council for giving us assistance. We need more help. So go to our website, which is yorkdwc.co.uk. Please write it down and support us and give your support to independent decent jobs for disabled people.

You will probably ask yourself what has Remploy done to support this? I will tell you what they have done. Nothing! Remploy is still turning into a jolly for the boys. We have seen new managers. I support this motion. Thank you.

* *Motion 13 was CARRIED*

National minimum wage and apprentices

The President: I call Motion 28: National minimum wage and apprentices. The General Council supports the motion.

Paddy Lillis (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*) moved Motion 28.

He said: The National minimum wage has been a major success. It has stopped the worst levels of wage exploitation that were occurring in the workplace, given legal protection over wages that did not exist before, and set in place an enforcement mechanism that workers can use if they are not being paid the minimum wage. Next month its scope is being extended to cover all apprentices. Yet we need to be vigilant. Although the coalition Government has asked the Low Pay Commission to make a recommendation for 2011, we still feel wary. This is because there is no certainty that they will accept any recommendation in full. As part of the overall cuts they could slice the enforcement budget, and in future years they may decide to freeze the minimum wage, limiting its effectiveness in protecting the low paid. Congress, that is why we must take action now.

This motion calls on the General Council to do a number of things, including establishing a campaign aimed at significantly increasing all rates of the national minimum wage. Obviously the best way of tackling low pay is through trade union membership and collective bargaining. However, for a whole variety of reasons there are many low paid workers who are not covered by these processes. These low paid workers only have the national minimum wage as their protection from wage abuse at work, and that is why its annual increase is so important.

We also need, specifically, to focus on apprentices. This is because first year apprentices will now get the protection of a national minimum apprenticeship rate from October – the first time ever that such legal protection has been available for apprentices. To support this welcomed development, we ask the General Council to organise a publicity and awareness campaign around the new national minimum apprenticeship rate and its enforcement mechanism; to seek a significant increase in the national minimum apprenticeship rate so that we make apprenticeships an attractive and realistic option for young people to consider; and to watch out for any abuses of it being used as a cheap labour option by monitoring completion rates for apprentices in areas such as retail and hairdressing. We must also check that it has not been used as a way of limiting apprenticeships to the lowest level category, which means focusing on

progression rates throughout apprenticeship levels 2, 3 and 4.

We must also put pressure on the coalition Government. That is why we are asking the General Council to push the Government to commit to an annual review and an increase over the full term of this Parliament of all rates for the national minimum wage; to increase existing levels of expenditure on enforcement; to show those employers who think the recession and a new government are a green light to exploitation that they are wrong; and to step up the publicity and awareness campaigns that are still needed to help tackle the limited knowledge of the minimum wage that exists amongst many low paid workers.

Colleagues, the minimum wage and the minimum apprenticeship rate have a key role to play in helping to tackle the serious issue of low pay which still faces this country. Clearly, other measures are also needed to supplement it, but the national minimum wage is the baseline on which we build.

This motion, and in particular its focus on apprenticeships, aims to ensure that the baseline is fully protected. Please support.

Mark Lynch (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) seconded Motion 28.

President and Congress, the minimum wage has made a fundamental difference to a huge number of workers across many industries. It has meant that truly poverty wages should be a thing of the past. But as trade unionists we must remain vigilant that the minimum wage must not be undermined in any way whatsoever. We must never return to the days before the minimum wage existed, when security guards were paid just £1.50 an hour.

Congress, UCATT is passionate about apprenticeships. This is one path through which construction workers can become fully skilled. But there is a huge struggle because construction employers always take the short-termist view. They don't want to employ anyone and they certainly don't want to train anyone. They have been dragged kicking and screaming to employ apprentices. Often we find that when they do employ apprentices they try not to pay them the correct rates. The new apprentice minimum wage is an important step forward. It will ensure that the employers pay their apprentices properly and the phrase "the unpaid apprentice" is consigned to history. By paying apprentices the minimum wage you will drastically reduce drop-out rates until we are sure that apprentices are able to complete their courses and attain skills for life.

As a word of caution, the new apprentice rate is a first step. We must ensure that the rate is increased year on year and not set a rate that is frozen for years in order to devalue apprenticeships. It is essential that the new apprentice rate is fully enforced and is not used by employers to lower rates of pay to young workers who are not on genuine training courses. Nor should the apprentice rate be used to decrease higher apprentice rates which currently exist in many industries. The minimum wage was a great achievement for the previous Labour government. Since its inception, rates have increased, meaning that year after year the value of work has increased. We know that both the Conservatives and the Lib-Dems originally opposed the minimum wage. It is up to the union movement to protect the minimum wage from future attacks. Please support the motion.

Lorna Merry (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) spoke in support of Motion 28.

She said: Congress, as the union representing workers in the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills and HMRC, the departments which administer and enforce the national minimum wage, we share the concerns expressed in this motion that the ConDems will seek to undermine the national minimum wage by stealth. The abolition of the agricultural minimum wage recently reveals their real agenda, and we have to be ready to campaign to defend the principles and the practice of the national minimum wage.

HMRC group members working in this area are already seeing a reduction in the level of enforcement activity as the budget freeze this year has reduced their funding in real terms. We fully expect to see national minimum wage enforcement hit as HMRC implements the cuts.

PCS welcomes the call in this motion for additional expenditure on national minimum wage enforcement. Our members have the skills and will to enforce the minimum wage and have already shown that they can deliver. When Gordon Brown increased the funding for enforcement activity by 50 per cent in 2007, this resulted in an increase in the number of penalty notices issued by over 21 times.

Whilst PCS believes that the apprentice rate should not be lower than the appropriate rate for the worker's age, we recognise that the introduction of a paltry £2.50 an hour apprentice rate in October 2010 is expected to increase the pay of around 14 per cent of apprentices. This shows that pay levels remain scandalously low and highlights the importance of the minimum wage in protecting workers from exploitation.

Yesterday it was pointed out that laws that are not enforced are ignored. PCS believes that we have to ensure that this doesn't happen to the national minimum wage and that this organisation must maximise the pressure on the Government to make sure that the ConDems aren't allowed to undermine the effectiveness of this vital piece of protection for workers.

Susan Highton (*UNISON*) spoke in support of Motion 28.

She said: President and Congress, the national minimum wage is one of the genuine achievements of the last Labour Government. It is vitally important as a defence against in-work poverty, and it provides us with a platform for which we can push for further advance towards a proper living wage for all. However, we need to ensure that the national minimum wage delivers in harsh economic conditions as well as in the better times and we need to be resolute in our response to the employers' organisations which continue to call for rates to be frozen. With the current political arguments about the state of the economy and the public finances, it is convenient to forget that the energy, food and transport prices for low paid workers have risen rapidly. Because these essentials of life account for a large share of your income if you are on low pay, it means that the inflation rate you face is far higher than it is for those with higher incomes.

So the call from USDAW that we campaign to increase rates is the right one. Not only would this make life more manageable for those who receive the national minimum wage but it would also make sound economic sense, helping to maintain the demands of the economy at a time of dwindling confidence. A fair rate for apprentice jobs also has to be a priority in the coming period. We want to see an increase in the number of apprenticeships available in the public services. In the interests of fairness and simplicity, apprentice rates across the UK should rise to the same

level as existing youth rates. This is also a measure which would have a wider economic benefit.

At the current time the national average completion rate of apprenticeships is 69 per cent. However, where apprenticeship schemes are of a high quality and provide more realistic wages beyond the minimum, the completion rate is close to 100 per cent. The more young people who complete their apprenticeship, the better trained and more productive our workforce becomes as a whole. But, Congress, making sure that the minimum wages continue to deliver in the bad times as well as the good must also involve a greater vigilance. We must ensure that enforcement is not cut back in the forthcoming spending round.

In a range of evidence that our union has included in its submission to the Low Pay Commission, we have noted that some employers and employment agencies are continuing to take advantage of migrant workers. The home care agency pay practices persist that lend themselves to exploitation of many hardworking people. Congress, many of us here campaigned long and hard for the national minimum wage. This is a tribute to our TUC and respective unions. However, as the motion makes it clear, we cannot be complacent about the future. Thank you.

Jane Stewart (*Unite*) spoke in support of Motion 28.

She said: Congress, unlike USDAW I have a bit of difficulty in welcoming anything that this Government is doing. However, we have heard much this week already about the need for an alternative to the cuts regime, an alternative based on investment and growth. Fundamental to that growth is to reward workers fairly and incentivise young people to pursue the right skills through an apprenticeship programme. When we say "reward people fairly", that has to mean paying them a living wage. The national minimum wage is the mechanism to achieve this.

We welcome the progress made so far in the introduction of a nationally enforceable apprenticeship rate this October, but it is not enough. *Unite* is disappointed, to say the least, that it is only £2.50 an hour for an apprenticeship wage. That is really crap, Congress. *Unite* believes that apprentices should be paid at least the national minimum wage for their work. The national minimum wage is a baseline for all workers, despite their age, skill level or legal status. Nobody should fall below this, but at least apprentices will be under the scope of the national minimum wage legislation which is something, and it will end the exploitation where we see apprentices getting paid as little as £1.50 an hour. It is clear that some employers were using this exemption as a loophole to pay low wages which impact adversely on the take-up and completion, and at the same time reinforces the gender pay gap with women apprentices getting paid far less.

That's why, in our evidence to the Low Pay Commission this month we are demanding that apprenticeship rates, along with other rates, increase by more than inflation next year. We are demanding that the full adult minimum wage should apply to all workers regardless of their age. We should be demanding that the enforcement agencies have more resources, not less, to ensure that the national minimum wage is properly protected, especially when you consider that in this coming year 125,000 – 150,000 apprentices are in place, and over 100,000 agricultural workers are covered by this legislation due to the abolition of the Agricultural Wages Board. Young workers are our future so it is imperative that we defend them in the face of funding cuts to youth training, fewer university places and the end of the Future Jobs Fund. We must campaign to protect the youth of this country. Please support.

* *Motion 28 was CARRIED*

Internships

The President: I call Motion 29, Internships. The General Council supports the motion.

Joanna Brown (*Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists*) moved Motion 29.

She said: President and Congress, the recession has had a devastating impact on our economy but no section of our society has suffered more than young people. Who in this hall does not know of a school or university leaver who is struggling to get a job – any job – let alone a job that matches their qualifications? So for many young people taking on an internship is a great way of getting the all important experience they need to apply for their first permanent job, and because they are so desperate, all too often they are willing to enter into internships where they are not paid or even given travel expenses, even though they are legally entitled to receive the national minimum wage.

These arrangements are rife in industry but are popular with graduates in sectors such as PR and the media, and it also happens in high street companies such as Tesco's, Morrisons and Sainsbury's. Some employers argue that they cannot afford to pay interns and that if they did they would be displacing permanent jobs. The fact is that in most cases interns are doing proper jobs that could be undertaken by permanent workers. Here is the experience of one intern: "A two week internship I had at one company was extended for a further month and then for another two months with the promise of an elusive job that never materialised. All the while I was acting as a graduate member of staff, unpaid, with responsibility for a number of projects."

The TUC's position is that unless an intern is purely observing or job shadowing, he or she is a worker and should be paid as such. The existence of unpaid internships creates a more insidious problem. Interns are not entitled to claim Job Seeker's Allowance so young people can only afford to work unpaid if their parents are supporting them financially. This is cutting off the opportunity for young people from poorer families to enter popular careers like journalism and advertising.

As Alex Try, the co-founder of Interns Anonymous said: "Entry level jobs are drying up and being replaced by unpaid internships. Increasingly, only those who can afford to work for free are able to get ahead."

So what does the Good Internship Programme look like? I am, actually, happily able to give you an example from the world of podiatry. Since 2003 Arthritis Research UK has funded internships for newly qualified podiatrists who have an interest in clinical research and rheumatology. The interns do an eight-week clinical research placement during which time they receive a £1,000 per month tax free stipend, reimbursement of travel expenses and free accommodation in university halls of residence. For two years following the placement, they are helped with the cost of attending conferences and networking meetings.

One of our members who has been on this programme says: "The internship inspired me to further my knowledge of rheumatology. I am now working as a specialist podiatrist in rheumatology and I aim to be involved in a clinical research career in the future." The society believes that all interns should be able to have such a positive experience.

This motion calls on affiliated unions to oppose the exploitation of interns in your industries and to work with employers to develop high quality placements. After all, interns may not be union members now, but

they are the members of the future and we should do whatever we can to support them.

Yesterday, Andy Burnham called for legislation to ban unpaid internships, and there does appear to be cross-party support on this issue. The Universities Minister, David Willetts, said recently: "The exploitation of interns is unacceptable and employment legislation must not be breached." Well, Mr. Willetts, I couldn't agree with you more, and I doubt that I'll ever say that again, but words are not enough. The Government must now act to enforce the minimum wage for interns, so please support the motion.

Elaine Daley (GMB) seconded Motion 29.

She said: Congress, the GMB passed a very similar motion at our conference in June highlighting the increasing numbers of unpaid internships and the need to create a legal distinction between real internships and cheap labour. Yes, internships are attractive to young and older workers. For some of the more competitive professions, such as the media, fashion, the creative industries and politics, work experience, or internship, is often the only way to get a foot in the door, and we find that in some companies internships have replaced entry level jobs. Most of these placements are unpaid or pay only expenses, and interns accept this in the hope that the placement will boost their CV and make them more employable.

We are concerned that this may deter some from applying as they might not be able to afford to live for more than three months with no pay, living off the bank of mum and dad.

Companies think that by labelling someone as an 'intern' or a 'volunteer' means that they don't need to pay them a minimum wage, but the term 'intern' is not defined in national minimum wage legislation. What matters is whether the person engaged is a worker. If some of these jobs were evaluated, we would probably see that interns are fulfilling tasks that could be given to a full-time worker and, thus, they should qualify for the national minimum wage. Interns are a silent workforce. They will not want to stand up to their employer in order to be paid the proper wage for fear of losing their placement and so the abuse continues.

Congress, internships exploit workers, create a real financial barrier and prevent equal opportunities. Companies need to recognise that the work carried out by interns is real work and should be paid as such. The National Minimum Wage Act needs to be amended to recognise interns. Please support this motion.

Jean Crocker (University and College Union) spoke in support of Motion 29.

She said: We welcome the work of the TUC on fair access to the professions and agree that young workers should have appropriate remuneration and opportunities for permanent employment. Postgraduate students in universities are often asked to teach but appointment processes are not always transparent. Those employed can find that the work takes more time than anticipated, for example, if there is a huge amount of marking attached to a few hours teaching. This impinges on the time they need for their studies and means that some work is in effect done for free. Some members have expressed concern that if they do not agree to do it, it may compromise their future careers. There are hourly rates below the pay scales and a tradition that postgraduates should be grateful for the experience. In some departments a large percentage of undergraduate teaching is done by post graduates so their work is clearly needed. We find bogus self-employment and the use of the zero hours or bank contracts which seek to undermine employment rights. Unfortunately, all this does not

necessarily lead to permanent employment after they finish their degrees. Post-16 education is a highly casualised sector. Some join the large numbers of hourly paid teachers in further education of which I have been one for many years. Others become researchers for little job security. The casualised will be among the first in line for cuts. Employers may try to use workers in precarious employment and on internships to break strikes.

The UCU have a charter for postgraduate student staff. We call for transparent appointment processes and clear statements of work required. We oppose zero hour contracts and have succeeded in getting some postgraduate staff onto the pay scale. There are some very active groups of postgraduate staff in the union and membership is increasing. It is an ongoing fight. The casualised need unions and the unions need us. The TUC work on our behalf, and this motion, are valuable initiatives. Please support this motion. (Applause)

* Motion 29 was CARRIED

Investing in our future

The President: I call Motion 51, Investing in our future. The General Council supports the motion.

Chris Lines (NASUWT) moved Motion 51.

He said: Congress, we have seen all this before – the unemployed, whom the Chancellor believes are out of work due to their lifestyle choice, are often the young people thrown on the scrap heap by the recessions engendered by the last Tory government. After years and years on benefit they now see their children heading in the same direction as the opportunities are taken away from them. These young people do not have the life chances open to many other young people. Their chances come from programmes set up by the previous government that believe all young people should have the best possible chance. The coalition Government's cuts are damaging access to education and training. This has already led to cuts in access to FE and HE with tens of thousands of workplace training places and university places cut this year alone. These cuts mean there are now fewer opportunities available for school leavers and college leavers, and many more will be jobless because of the coalition's programmes. Despite pre-election promises by the LibDems, more and more young people will be forced to pay in order to continue their education and training beyond the age of 16 because of cuts in education maintenance allowances and the prospect of increased university tuition fees. This is a betrayal of today's young people.

The potential outcome of the coalition Government's slash and burn of the public sector will be another lost generation of young people as we had in the 1980s and the 1990s under the Thatcher and Major governments. Unemployment is not a price worth paying to achieve economic recovery. It does not work; it just drives the economy into a deeper depression. This coalition Government has now scrapped the Academic Diploma, a rigorous programme that we, members of the then Secretary of State's expert group, believe would stand in quality beside the traditional A-levels. I might add that this group included the Admissions Tutor to Oxford University.

The deregulation of vocational qualifications will render them useless, and add to this the Baker technical schools. He had one chance of messing up the education system and now, like one of the undead, he rises from the political grave to have a second go. We are heading full steam back to the 1950s with a reworking of the tripartite system: the Tory academies for the middle classes, schools for the rest, apart from

those deemed only fit to be given a technical education.

This Government talks about getting people out of poverty but they are going about it in absolutely the wrong way. The impact on our young people in schools today is likely to mean that they will be even more difficult to motivate as their prospects disappear. If leaving school means unemployment, these students become demoralised and de-motivated. Congress, we have to invest in education and training if we are to compete in a fast changing world. We have to have a highly educated workforce. We cannot have a system that judges the quality of education and qualifications by the numbers that fail. More and more jobs require well qualified people to do them. We fail our young people if we do not invest in an education system that allows all students to achieve their full potential.

It is the trade union movement that must stand up for young workers and those who are the future of our economic recovery. The education system generates the wealth of the nation at one removed but we cannot do it with one hand tied behind our backs. In moving this motion we look to the TUC to lead a progressive coalition, bringing together affiliates in a civil society organisation to stop the assault on young people and prevent this generation of young people being made the sacrificial lamb of this Government's destructive policies. *(Applause)*

Sean Vernell (*University and College Union*) seconded Motion 51.

He said: As the last delegate so eloquently explained, and so many other delegates before him today and yesterday, the recession hits different sections of our society in many different ways, and disproportionately in different ways. Young people are always, in every recession, the first in the firing line of assaults and attacks. Their jobs, their benefits, and their education are the first to be hit and to be savagely attacked. The last speaker explained again about the new Baker technical schools. We all remember Baker in the 1980s, the great Education Act, and all the rest of the stuff that brought about the marketisation of education and wrecked our young people's education. Again, they are trying to force this on our young people. Undoubtedly, it will lead to a reinforcing of a two-tier or three-tier, actually, education system. Already at this moment in time you are seven times more likely to go to a so-called 'posh' university if you come from a wealthy background than if you come from a poor background. That is before the attacks on education continue to take place. Clearly, this has to be stopped and a campaign needs to be launched.

UCU and its members in the last year have been engaged in industrial action up and down the country against the £300 million cuts in the college budgets, and are attempting to protect jobs and provisions. In many cases every time we have taken industrial action we have managed to save jobs and provisions. Further education has been a test bed for marketisation in education over the last 15 years. It is where all experience of marketisation has generalised to other places, where you have college after college competing for funding in a dog eat dog world, a race to the bottom in different areas of the country. The last government and this Government talked about the need for skills but at the same time they shut down engineering departments and they shut down plumbing departments because colleges cannot afford that provision. One of the biggest con tricks, I believe, in the last 30 years is how they have tried to shift the blame for youth unemployment from governments, from the employers who tried to maximize profit by making people unemployed, and instead they have tried to blame teachers for teaching trendy teaching methods, anti-industrial bias, as once was said by a

famous prime minister, or they have blamed parents for not disciplining their children, or blamed the children themselves because the young people do not have enough skills.

We have to make it clear, Congress, that the real blame for mass unemployment, for lack of jobs, is not about teachers, parents, or the children themselves, but it is about the lack of the market. It is about the system itself not providing those jobs. I remember many years ago Paul Foot, the great investigative journalist, used to say and argue that this generation of young people are the first ----

The President: Bring your contribution to an end.

Sean Vernell I did not realize that. I apologise. Sorry, Congress, I support the motion 100 percent. We have to fight against the two-tier education system. *(Applause)*

* *Motion 51 was CARRIED*

Young people and the recession

The President: I am moving to Motion 52, Young people and the recession. The General Council support the motion and I will call the General Secretary during the debate to explain the position.

John Walsh (*Unite*) moved Motion 52.

He said: I will start by thanking Congress that a year ago voted to give young members a dedicated motion of their own for the first time in its history. You can see that it is a long motion and that it asks for a lot, but we have been thinking about it for 142 years.

For too many young people choices are narrowing as unemployment runs rampant, jobs remain concentrated in low-skilled, low-paying sectors, and competition for decent apprenticeships intensifies with demand outstripping supply. The predicted long-term effects of the recession on young people's aspirations has led journalists, academics and politicians of all stripes to increasingly speak of a lost generation, a cliché perhaps but one with an ominous ring of truth about it for those of us on the sharp end of an aggressive labour market.

Whilst it was heartening to see the Labour Government commit itself to addressing the needs of young people through their Young Person's Guarantee and Future Jobs Fund, it breaks my heart to witness the ConDem coalition immediately slash-and-burn their way through our best hopes for real job creation against endemic youth unemployment. The new Government's enthusiasm for internships as a potential solution leaves me cold. Without further guarantees of minimum standards, the intern route will be open only to the rich and the exploited. Youth unemployment stands at two-and-a-half times higher than the national average with figures approaching one million, and cuts to youth services like Connexions in times of recession will only accelerate the trend.

We are not just talking about an unemployment crisis. Young people in work are likely to be low paid, suffer high levels of bullying and employment rights abuses, and only one in ten have joined a union. Trade unions used to complain that young people have become a generation of Thatcher's children and that they are no longer willing to join a trade union. The modern reality is that young people rather than having a negative image of a trade union have no image of a trade union at all. For unions to make a mark among young workers there needs to be greater union presence in those sectors where young people are concentrated.

Now, I am one of the lucky ones. I secured a high-quality apprenticeship in the north-west's aerospace industry. I was met by my union on the first day I completed my training and I have worked there ever since, but my story is far too rare. Quality apprenticeships are in high demand and I myself was turned away straight out of school and spent a year working in low-paid, non-unionised workplaces, a warehouse, a shop, a bar, before I could reapply the next year. These are the places where we will find the young and the desperate. Both Unite and GMB have shown that these kinds of workplaces do not have to be union-free zones and that young people are often desperate to join the unions when we find them and give them something to do once we have found them. Unite, PCS, UNISON and CWU, are some of the unions that have seen real growth in activism as a result of establishing young members' structures.

All we want is fairness, fair treatment and representation, fair wages whatever our age, an end to exploitative internships and training, and a return to world-beating, high-paid, high-quality apprenticeships. Ultimately, we need to be seen as a champion of young people in work and show that becoming a trade union member is not some relic of a bygone industrial age but the best way of guaranteeing decency and dignity at work in an age of intimidating change. Thanks very much. *(Applause)*

Deborah Charnley (*Equity*) seconded Motion 52.

She said: This is my first time at Congress. *(Applause)* I am a member of Equity's Young Members Committee. Members of our committee are extremely grateful to be able to attend the TUC Young Members Conference. This is a motion that we, Equity Young Members Committee, and of course the rest of our union, feel the need to support. There are a number of points on this motion that are particularly relevant to our young members. These include the need to improve the conditions and opportunities for the self-employed, freelance, temporary and agency workers. Those of us working in the cultural and creative sectors need support too, especially those just starting out in their careers. It is far too easy for young workers to be exploited with low pay and no pay work because of loopholes in national minimum wage legislation, and of course agreements not honoured.

It is extremely important for trade unionists to show support for young workers and encourage young members to become more involved with their unions. My fellow young members who attended the TUC Young Members Conference learnt a great deal. Most young people learn about trade unions from what they see in the media and what their parents tell them. It is not always positive, is it? It is important to reach out to young members, help their voices be heard and educate them in the positives of being part of a union. Now is the time when young workers need unions the most to help and advise them. Last year my union agreed to give us young members more volume to our voices and agreed to create a Young Members Committee, and then we asked our council if a young member of our committee could be here today, so here I stand. Eighteen months ago I would never have imagined I would be standing where I am now representing the young members of my union. Please support this motion and support young workers; support them and they will help your union grow stronger. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Helen Flanagan (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) spoke in support of Motion 52.

She said: I am proud to be speaking on the first motion from the TUC Young Members Conference to Congress. Young people have been hit particularly hard by the

recession, as we have already heard, and the statistics are familiar: nearly one million young people unemployed, 24 per cent of young people are workless, the number of 18-24 year olds on the dole for over six months has increased in 142 local authorities in the last year. The programme of cuts will disadvantage young people further. Already we have seen massive cuts to education. An estimated 200,000 university places have been lost and the careers service, Connexions, has been slashed. Brendan Barber spoke yesterday of the betrayal of youth by scrapping the Child Trust Fund, Building Schools for the Future, and freezing Child Benefit. Not only will these plans increase the number of NEETs (those not in employment, education, or training) but, as was said on Motion 51, there is a real danger that we will see another lost generation of young people.

Brothers and sisters, this Government intends to throw our young people on the scrap heap. The trade union movement has to take a stand. What is key to this motion is point (viii), a national demonstration against youth unemployment across the trade union movement by the end of 2010. Actually, I think the TUC should have called a national demo against the cuts in October, as it is key that we publicly challenge the situation for young people so that we can give them confidence to fight and, crucially, so that we can get them into trade unions and change the shocking statistic that only one in ten young people are trade union members. It is also key that we publicly challenge the blatant exploitation of young workers through the unequal levels of the national minimum wage. I do not think that we should accept the lie that demanding high wages will cause unemployment, or accept any lectures on economic realism.

Congress, young people deserve jobs, education and a decent living wage. Please fully support this motion and give young people a fighting chance. *(Applause)*

Patrick Dowling (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) spoke in support of Motion 52.

He said: I am supporting the motion on young people and the recession, but with reservations. UCATT supports all efforts to ensure this generation of young people is provided with training, education, skills and opportunities. We do not want to see other groups of young people left on the scrap heap with no prospects for their future. UCATT would like to caution the General Council around aspects of the motion when talking to the Government, and other organisations. Under point (v) of the motion, the line, "improve conditions and opportunities for the self-employed" could be problematic. UCATT wishes to remind Congress and the General Council that young people being self-employed often leads to exploitation and enforced self-employment. We are increasingly seeing apprentices and young starters forced to register with CIS4 before even stepping foot on a building site.

Delegates may recall the tragic case of Sonny Holland, a 20-year old self-employed apprentice who fell to his death from scaffolding on a building site in 2008. Sonny had been forced to register as self-employed with the CIS4, meaning he had responsibilities as a worker but had no rights. When he died he was not covered by liability insurance. The firm he worked for went into liquidation to avoid paying damages and re-emerged a couple of months later under a new name.

The TUC should be aware that bogus self-employment is a huge issue which can affect young workers and leave them unprotected in the workplace. Improving opportunities for the self-employed is a good aspiration. However, more must be done to enshrine the rights of those who are compelled to register as self-employed not knowing that they are forfeiting many rights and safety in the workplace. We call upon

the TUC to lobby the coalition Government to tighten the laws around the companies who practise pushing employees into bogus self-employment status and to protect young workers who should be gaining apprenticeship skills and not be placed in danger and exploited in the workplace. Bogus self-employment is like a cancer, and it is growing in our industry. We need to get it cut out. We need to get it stopped for all of our members. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Conroy Lawrence (*UNISON*) spoke in support of Motion 52.

He said: Congress, as Motion 52 very clearly sets out, it is a bleak future out there for the young. The unemployment rate for the 18-24 age group is over double the average and for 16-17 year olds is over four times higher. Despite this and all the evidence about the long-term effects of unemployment on the young, the Government's response continues to be woefully complacent. As part of its initial round of cuts, the Government closed the Future Jobs Fund on new applications with the loss of 94,000 jobs in the process. The Young Person's Guarantee, which provided a job or training placement for all young people out of work for six months, will end in March 2011. The Government have said they will replace these schemes but not until summer 2011 which means at least three months drift at a time when youth unemployment is projected to be at levels not seen since the early 1980s. David Blanchflower, a former member of the Bank of England Monetary Policy Committee, has argued that scrapping the schemes within the context of a wider programme of cuts threatens to increase youth unemployment by a further quarter-of-a-million over the next 12 months. Congress, even the OECD has raised concerns about short-sightedness saying that, despite the deficit, labour market programmes should remain adequately funded.

In this context, it is of little surprise that young people find the only options open to them are internships and other forms of casualised and often voluntary employment. The TUC has estimated that at least a third of all internships are unpaid, flouting National Minimum Wage regulations, exploiting talented young workers, and barring all those who cannot provide for themselves whilst working unpaid. As the motion argues, we need to campaign for a comprehensive package of measures which will address all these issues and prevent a wasted generation. Alongside that we need to ask ourselves a wider question about the contract between different generations. A recent newspaper article talked about how the "baby boomer" generation had it all: a comprehensive welfare state, free higher education, decent housing and pensions.

I know that all of us here would say that this kind of package and support is the hallmark of a decent society and dismantling it and saying it is unaffordable is the long term the goal of the right. Congress, for one generation to say to another that the hallmark of a decent society is unaffordable is an affront to any ideas of an inter-generational solidarity and our movement with its commitment to fairness for all should not be afraid to say it. Please support the motion. (*Applause*)

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*): Thank you, President. The General Council very much supports this motion but have asked me just to make a couple of points of explanation. The motion provides a real agenda for action on issues of huge importance to young people – youth unemployment, low pay, public service cuts, a need for stronger rights for temporary and agency workers, raising statutory redundancy pay for young workers, tackling the exploitation of unpaid

interns and developing our organising strategies to reach out more effectively to young people. On all of these issues the General Council very much welcomes the terms of the motion, but the motion also deals with the issue of the minimum wage and there are two points of explanation that are to be entered.

The first is the reference in the motion to the European decency threshold as a potential benchmark for the minimum wage. The General Council's view is that that would not be an appropriate benchmark in a UK context and indeed that the living wage model that has been developed in London and other UK cities has proved a more effective and credible campaign tool for the movement in this country.

The second point is about the age at which the full rate of the minimum wage should be paid. Now, of course, we have seen some movement on this issue. Following a decade of trade union campaigning, the Government has now finally agreed to reduce the adult rate threshold from 22 to 21 and that will come into effect in October this year. We will carry on campaigning for further movement and indeed for better rates for apprentices within the minimum wage system too, but we do take the view that this issue needs to be considered against the background of prevailing economic circumstances. It is an issue on which we need to track progress and reach judgments as time goes by rather than seeing this as an immediate objective for full equalisation right across the age range.

Those are the two points of explanation that the General Council wanted me to enter, President, but against the background of very much supporting the general thrust of the resolution. (*Applause*)

* *Motion 52 was CARRIED*

Graduate unemployment

The President: Congress, we are running behind time this morning and in order to catch up, although I have been asked by a number of unions for speakers to enter into certain debates, I have had to refuse that. With the next motion I am not taking any speakers. I will be taking Composite 14, Graduate unemployment. The General Council supports the composite to be moved by the Educational Institute of Scotland, seconded by Prospect, supported by the Society of Radiographers, and then I will be taking the vote.

Kay Barnett (*Educational Institute of Scotland*) moved Composite Motion 14.

She said: President and Congress, Composite 14 deals with graduate unemployment affecting both the public and private sectors across the UK but it has to be set in the wider context of the drastic consequences of the economic mess which we are currently facing, a mess which exacerbates unemployment and it is likely to get much, much worse as a result of the current demolition government, as Brendan Barber referred to the coalition yesterday, and their response to the economic deficit.

The scale of the current problem is considerable. Statistics from the Higher Education Policy Institute and the Higher Education Statistics Agency shown in the composite are from last November when graduate unemployment increased by 44 per cent, with 59 per cent of graduates not working in a job related to their degrees. In July this year, the same policy institute revealed that unemployment in graduates under the age of 24 rose by 25 per cent in the year between December 2008 and December 2009, and by the end of last year over 17 per cent of male graduates and 11 per cent of female graduates were out of work, and indeed the General Council report acknowledges that

across the UK there are 70 graduates for every job vacancy.

It is not just about these statistics or the scale of the problem today but the impact on what is going to happen if the Coalition Government fails to take significant steps to address the issue. It is not just about unemployment but under-employment and increasingly exploitation. Again, the General Council report points to a growing number of young people turning to internships and other substitutes for proper employment, much of which is unpaid, and we heard a lot about that earlier. Many graduates are chasing part-time work, often in areas that do not fully utilise their skills and abilities or their knowledge and experience related to their training or their qualifications. Congress, what a waste. As the motion stresses, this will continue and contribute to turning the clock back to the 1980s, to 1983 when graduate unemployment was at 13.5 per cent, and the creation of a lost generation, and again we heard about that yesterday.

It is not just about the personal cost, it is about the economic cost, the economic folly – and again what a waste – the folly of under-utilising the nation's skills base as we attempt to steer our way out of the current economic crisis and compete in an ever increasing global market, and it will get worse. The Higher Education Careers Service recently warned that if one-third of the 39,000 graduates taking up employment in the public sector each year lost their jobs that would double graduate unemployment. You have to see this in the context of the 600,000 public sector jobs that could go by 2016. A high percentage of these 39,000 jobs are deemed to be at risk as they are not considered to be frontline jobs.

The public service also employs a disproportionate number of graduates outside London and the cuts will have a dire effect on the parts of the UK most dependent on the public sector, such as Wales and the north-east of England, where one in four graduates is recruited into the public sector, most notably in the NHS. I will illustrate the extent of the problem by using an example from my own area, Scotland, and my own area of employment, teaching. Scottish graduates who go into teaching are facing an increasingly depressing situation. In 2006, 32 per cent of the new teachers found permanent posts but by August of this year only 273 of these teachers had secured permanent jobs; that is only 10 per cent. Again, what a waste. As the motion recognises, many teachers trained in Scotland will seek employment elsewhere or take up employment outside teaching. Delegates, the Government should not be acting in a way that makes this worse. They should not be acting as a demolition government. They should be taking positive action, and I do not mean by that cutting money for universities or cutting money for the new generation of students. What a waste.

I will finish by relating this back to the wider context because all unemployment and all under-employment is wrong and, as Brendan Barber said yesterday, it will do untold damage to our country's prospects as many good students face life on the dole. Finally, I am going to tell you what I believe ----

The President: No, you best just finish up there. *(Laughter)*

Kay Barnett: I will finish off by saying, graduate unemployment is really wrong, it really is a waste, a waste of talent, a waste of ability, a waste of the country's resources. Congress, what a waste! Support Composite Motion 14. *(Applause)*

Nigel Titchen (*Prospect*) seconded Composite Motion 14.

He said: Congress, concern over the increase in graduate unemployment in the UK as a consequence of the economic recession is growing. According to the Higher Education Policy Institute, unemployment amongst graduates aged 24 or under rose from 11 per cent in 2008 to 14 per cent in 2009. The recent 2010 review by the Association of Graduate Recruiters predicts a 6.9 per cent drop in vacancy levels compared with 2009, and only yesterday a report published by Demos warned that the graduate class of 2010 faces the toughest jobs market in a decade. Congress, this is particularly worrying when you consider the skills shortages in key areas of the UK workforce.

Prospect's evidence to the Will Hutton Review on fair pay identified skills shortages in the following areas: civil engineers, project managers, oil, gas, and nuclear specialists, marine and air accident investigators, graduate research scientists and engineers. In all these areas, the civil service is suffering skills gaps due to the public sector pay policies. Graduate unemployment by women is particularly worrying as figures of the UKRC demonstrate that it reinforces under-representation in careers such as computing and physics. Our challenge to the Government is to break down these gender barriers and harness the skills and talents of young graduate women.

In addition to pressing government to support graduates seeking work, we call on the TUC to prioritise initiatives to recruit graduates when they do start work. Prospect has introduced a number of successful initiatives in this area, including negotiating with employers opportunities on graduate training programmes to highlight the benefit of union membership. We have introduced special sub-schemes for graduates to help with their debt burden from university. We have set up a Young Professionals Network to give them a voice in our union. However, we do not underestimate the challenge of recruiting graduates into union membership as highlighted by the recent YouGov poll for Unions 21. That is why Prospect believes that the TUC has a key role in co-ordinating best practice amongst unions.

Congress, young graduates will play a vital role in driving the economic recovery and we must both support their quest for work and recruit them into union membership. Congress, please support the motion. *(Applause)*

Gill Dolbear (*Society of Radiographers*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 14.

She said: In 2009, 80 per cent of radiography graduates started their first job within two months of graduating indicating that the job market for radiography students was still strong. However, the recent government downward pressure on public services and finances may already be starting to have a negative effect on the job market for radiography graduates as the number of 2010 graduates with a job arranged as at July was only 59 per cent compared with last year's figure of 76 per cent. But figures only tell part of the story and I believe that it is vital we do not forget the people behind these figures. Radiography education is just one small part of public service education. The vast majority of our students do not choose to undertake their programme of study lightly nor do they take the prospect of three years of education with no or very little income lightly. Studying to become a health service professional requires a significant personal sacrifice for many, many of our students who just about manage to cope with the demands of home and family life during their period of education. The one thing that keeps them going is the prospect of a job at the end leading on to a fulfilling career in their chosen profession.

Speaking from my own personal experience of working with radiography students, it is not just about spending three years of your life gaining new knowledge and understanding, it is about developing a skill set and going through their own personal metamorphosis to become a professional capable of caring for patients. How can this country expect to cope with current workloads, yet alone grow, if we do not usefully employ our graduates? We must ensure that workforce planning is robust and accurate. We must not have a generation of disillusioned young people who are unable to fulfil their dream of working in their chosen profession. It is cruel to raise the hopes and aspirations of these people only to knock them down at the end when the reality is that they cannot find jobs. The fact that we are wasting this prospective workforce is untenable.

We cannot simply educate these people; we must nurture, support, and encourage them because they are the workforce of the future. We must acknowledge the need for robust succession planning, particularly in the public sector, yet we cannot even hope to ensure this if we do not create sufficient jobs for our new graduates. They want to make a positive contribution to the workforce, not become a public service unemployment statistic. It is a tragedy for students, for the public purse and, more importantly, a tragedy for the service to patients. I urge you to support this motion. *(Applause)*

* *Composite Motion 14 was CARRIED*

Public sector cuts

The President: I call on Motion 45, Public sector cuts. The General Council supports the motion.

Gary Gibson (*The Society of Chiropractors and Podiatrists*) moved Motion 45.

He said: The profession of podiatry is responsible for the treatment of the foot and aspects of the lower limb in both health and disease. In the NHS our profession has a broad range of specialties dealing with many aspects of care to the high-risk patient, the elderly and the vulnerable, in the local population. Such treatments aid and improve the mobility of patients throughout our society. Needless to say, it is in very high demand. Working alongside other professionals and practitioners we seek to identify those at highest risk through illnesses such as diabetes and rheumatoid arthritis. Similarly, we seek to ensure that those who are vulnerable in our society are provided with treatment to prevent them from further associated problems such as slips, trips and falls. Podiatry provides them with a pathway of care that seeks to prevent further demands being placed upon the National Health Service. Imagine the scenario – a fall can lead to hip fractures, extra occupied bed days, and further rehabilitation problems from thereon in. Some patients become housebound and that adds another aspect of care that puts demands on the NHS.

Take the national service frameworks which put an emphasis on how specialist services should be delivered. In the case of diabetes this clearly identifies the need for podiatric care and intervention. Such focused care both aids and protects patients with such an illness, providing a direct pathway into NHS treatment. In the case of those with peripheral arterial disease and neuropathy it significantly reduces the chances of lower limb amputation and thus gives a higher quality of life. It is a widely accepted fact that if you did a survey of the elderly and vulnerable within our community, you would find podiatry in the top three of the services most in demand. But the managers in the NHS have other ideas: they have to save 4.5 per cent of their budget as part of an efficiency saving. This is not an efficiency saving, it is a

direct cut and podiatry will be one of the areas that will be cut back. There is no science to it. The idea of cuts does not mean analysing the effectiveness or the importance of services or where they can make most efficiencies. No! They choose to cut services back in a broad-brush stroke. If they did look, they would realise that cutting the podiatry service will result in increased pressure on other aspects of the health economy, like primary and secondary care, which in the long term proves less effective and, more importantly, less beneficial to the patients; but, no, they choose to make cuts. Vacancy freezes, costs improvement plans, and redesigns of services, are all being used to achieve these cuts but the effect of these is already being felt and in the long term will be catastrophic. They will lead to longer waiting times and increase risks for the vulnerable groups in our society. Nobody should have to experience this reduction in care.

My concern as a trade union rep is the effect it is also having on my colleagues. With a vacancy freeze and increasing demands the caseload increases in size. People do not take lunch breaks, they work beyond the hours expected of them, and the stress levels increase accordingly. Thus an increase in sickness and absenteeism follows, but staff are fearful of going off sick because they feel it will be held against them, and with the added pressure comes a different cultural attitude within each organisation. The levels of bullying and harassment have begun to increase already with staff feeling even more pressure to deliver targets. Morale is plummeting still further with the consequential greater turnover of highly skilled staff. This is not the future, this is happening now. We therefore call on government to act on its pledge not to cut funding for health. We call on government to ensure podiatry services are not cut back and that those who need podiatry care will continue to receive the NHS treatment they need and when they need it. This should be delivered and managed by NHS podiatrists, not a cheaper less productive alternative. Yesterday when we were talking about industrial action, I was considering to myself what we would have as a logo for our profession, but thinking more laterally in terms of the effect it would have on the service users that we provide a service for, and the terminology “like it or lump it” seems very appropriate. Please support our motion. *(Applause)*

Dennis Edmondson (*British Dietetic Association*) seconded Motion 45.

He said: Delegates, we have just heard how cuts to podiatry services will severely affect the treatment of patients who need foot care, especially the elderly, but let's be in no doubt if the proposals outlined in the recent Health White Paper are allowed to come to pass what will happen to podiatry services will merely be the tip of a very large iceberg, with cuts repeated and repeated across the board raining down across the whole of the NHS. It was put eloquently yesterday as “death by a thousand cuts”. No area of healthcare or staff group will escape. It is a common theme which has been reported yesterday and today many times and I need not elaborate further.

For us, our own professional body and trade union, we are a small trade union. We are the proverbial small fish in a very large pond but it has been said, and to quote Brendan Barber, that we often punch above our weight in terms of raising nutritional issues across the board. We are also very proud that our new honorary president, Mary Turner, comes to us with such an illustrious trade union career. Yes, we are a smaller trade union but also as part of the alliance of healthcare professionals this collectively makes us stronger and as part of this alliance we are pleased to support our SCP colleagues.

Finally, we are keen to support this motion because of what it ultimately highlights, a rapid decimation of the NHS which would be left floundering, unable to provide safe, comprehensive, up-to-date healthcare for all, and opening the door to expanded privatisation. As was said yesterday, it is not about public services against the public. We are of course, those of us who work in the public sector, the public also and we rely on the NHS to provide healthcare throughout our lives just as everyone else in society. So, please continue to fight to protect our NHS. I urge you to support this motion. Thank you. *(Applause)*

* *Motion 45 was CARRIED*

The NHS

The President: I now call Composite Motion 11, The NHS. The General Council supports the composite.

Lesley Mercer (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*) moved Composite Motion 11.

She said: Congress, the NHS is no stranger to upheaval. In recent years we have seen numerous re-organisations, we have seen privatisations, we have seen cash put in, we have seen cash taken out, and we have seen cash put back in again. That is the background. What is different now post the General Election?

I can tell you, first of all, that it is the sheer scale of the latest reform. The new White Paper, *Liberating the NHS*, contains eye-watering efficiency savings that over time will affect every single job and every single patient, and at the very same time the biggest single reorganisation in the NHS's history. I do not have time to go into the details of the White Paper here but I can tell you, Congress, it represents the biggest gamble with this nation's health and taxpayers' money that we have ever seen. It is the equivalent of floating the NHS on the Stock Exchange and sitting back and waiting to see what happens.

The policy of the NHS being the preferred provider of NHS services bravely introduced by Andy Burnham, the previous Health Secretary, against much opposition, has gone, ditched, and in its place the White Paper puts a vision of every NHS organisation and every NHS worker competing on the open market against each other. It risks services becoming fragmented and destabilised. It makes it difficult to see how there can be any coherent planning. On top of this, Congress, we have major threats to our members' terms and conditions of employment, their national terms and the sense of fairness and security that goes with national terms.

Put this all together, Congress, and I think the long-term future of the NHS is now more uncertain than at any time since 1948. Will our NHS become a name without meaning as the role of the state shrinks down to that of a mere funding stream or light touch regulator, or might it eventually be scrapped altogether in terms of an insurance or voucher-based scheme where what you can afford will dictate the quality of healthcare you get?

Congress, there is no ignoring the major challenges facing the NHS as demand rises year on year and there are a few elements of the White Paper that are potentially positive, if actions follow words: the focus on health outcomes, for example; the recognition of the importance of rehabilitation where CSP members work; the emphasis on health promotion. These are good priorities and we should support them but, Congress, we must not lose the big picture here. That is why we are calling, in this motion, for the TUC to evaluate and to keep on evaluating and exposing what these reforms could mean to the long-term future of the NHS. We want the TUC to work with us, with the

health unions, and all others who care about the NHS to keep it as a universal service, a publicly funded, publicly provided and publicly accountable service. Congress, please support this composite motion. *(Applause)*

Lilian Macer (*UNISON*) seconded Composite Motion 11.

She said: Congress, you often hear people lamenting the end of the NHS. Well, this time it could actually happen. The new health white paper amounts to nothing less than a wholesale attack on the NHS. Our services will be opened up to competition and a move to any willing provider model of service delivery and competition law will increasingly be used to enforce the market. When services have been tendered they will be subject to EU and international procurement and competition law, meaning that it will be virtually impossible to bring them back into the NHS. I say the NHS but it is increasingly likely that the NHS will become nothing more than a brand logo to be attached to competing providers within a loosely coordinated system. After all, foundation trusts, which will soon be in every hospital in England, will no longer be called NHS Foundation Trusts. Instead they will be broken away from the national system completely. Much has been made of the newfound freedoms that they will get, freedom to run up massive borrowing debts, freedom to go bust and be bought out by profiteers, and freedom to make as much money as they can from patients who want to pay for care.

The white paper is aimed at England but those of us in the devolved nations should not be complacent. Such reforms like PFI and payment by results have already been exported in the past, and do not believe the myth that the NHS will be spared the cuts: it will not.

Twenty billion pounds has been demanded over the next few years, which has seen health boards predict deficits in terms of Glasgow of £60m; Lothian Health Board of £54m, and Lanarkshire of £30m. After all, if you were a chief executive of a hospital faced with the prospect of going bust if you failed and faced with the prospect of dwindling cash reserves, logically would you treat a free patient first? No, you would not. You would get as much cash from the paying patient as possible and only then turn to your poor relations. This is what happens when competition is put before care, and all of this without any electoral mandate for plans that were not included in either the Tory or LibDem election manifesto, or even the coalition Government's programme once they took power. In just two months the plans from a partly-elected PCT board are now to have no PCTs at all as they are to be abolished. There is no mandate; no consultation and no evidence base. In fact, every week a new report seems to point to the deficiencies and throwing the entire £80bn commissioning budget to GPs, and they do not want it either. Apart from anything else, forcing through such reforms ----

The President: Colleague, bring your contribution to an end.

Lilian Macer: Thank you, Congress. Please support the motion.

David Amos (*FDA*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 11.

He said: I am a member of the FDA delegation and chair of Managers in Partnership, which represents healthcare managers. It is growing significantly again this year. I am really pleased to support the motion by talking about the importance of management and leadership in the NHS. Congress, hospital managers

may be the one issue that unites a BBC Question Time TV audience when someone invariably suggests that the solution to the NHS is having none of us. However, over the past few years it has finally being recognised that there is an amazing range of roles that play such an important part in providing high quality, free at the point of use, healthcare. I do not come here to ask for your sympathy but recognition that good management cannot just be cast aside. It is not just about nurses and doctors but physios, radiographers, phlebotomists, clinic clerks, porters, technicians and medical secretaries, to name just a few out of hundreds of jobs in the NHS. As we grew the NHS workforce over the last decade our recruitment campaign was Join the Team, Make a Difference, and that team includes managers.

The Congress Agenda, which is packed full of items, includes equality, health and safety, apprenticeships and employment rights, and they all need, of course, skilled and motivated staff in unions but also managers to make things happen. Nobody would ever wish to keep poor management practice; it is bad for staff and, more importantly, bad for patients and the taxpayer. There is no doubt in my mind that great management is crucial if we are going to handle the difficult times ahead effectively and fairly. Thanks to the FDA and UNISON, MIP was created to provide a voice for managers, to give them self-protection and the skills in order to deal with the challenges ahead. Managers are up for it with the right skills to be professional and to add value. Throughout my career in the NHS I have worked alongside incredibly dedicated managers, many have come up through the ranks with clinical backgrounds, and many of these leaders combine busy clinical commitments with leadership and management. Managers are essential if we are going to make sure that the years ahead are about retention, redeployment, and re-skilling staff, not making them redundant. We need managers and trade unions to lead us along the route of secure employment and high quality health and social care services for patients and clients, and like other NHS staff managers are a resource, not simply a cost. Please support the motion. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Joyce Still (*Unite*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 11.

She said: Chair, Congress, the NHS has always been considered the jewel in the crown of the labour movement, but it is more than that, it is the example for the world to follow. This is all going to change. The Tories state that the NHS will be safe. There will be no cuts, only efficiency savings. This is a blatant lie. Do you really believe that the £15bn-20bn in savings will be reinvested? I do not think so. The white paper released by the Government is a blueprint for disaster, opening the door for private companies, many of whom have already established themselves within the NHS to become GP consortia. These people are more concerned about profit than patient care, whether it is in the form of a frontline service (and it is yet to be defined what that actually means), health promotion or any form of secondary or tertiary care. In the devolved administrations there is no such promise to protect our NHS. We are already seeing the impact of these cuts and the loss of vital NHS staff. I visited the Abortion Rights stand and they are concerned that reproductive health services and access to abortion may be seen as a soft and easy target.

In my other life I am a health visitor with a very high demanding caseload. Many health visitors are working at dangerous levels. Most of my work now relates to child protection and domestic violence. When staff leave we have to take on their work as well. When we tell management, "This is untenable, we can't work like this," we are told, "You just have to make sure you

work differently." This makes it difficult to fulfil other roles, like supporting families who have children with special needs. Where are the 4,000 health visitors that Mr Cameron was at pains to promise. Where are they going to come from? I just do not see them. Each job loss is a loss in health services for those in need and all staff are frontline staff, and all NHS staff make a vital contribution. The privatisation of the NHS, and the cutbacks and the race to the bottom in pay and pensions that privatisation will cause, will destroy our NHS. It will destroy the very reason that people like me chose to work in the NHS, because it is a universal collective public service with staff who want to deliver high-quality care. Over the past couple of years Unite, my union, has run strong local campaigns ----

The President: Bring your contribution to an end.

Joyce Still: -- stopping privatisation taking place. It was said yesterday that this is the fight of our lives.

The President: Colleague, bring it to an end. Please bring your contribution to an end.

Joyce Still: Please support. Thank you. *(Applause)*

* *Composite Motion 11 was CARRIED*

The President: Congress, you may have noticed that we have run out of time to take the remainder of the business which had been scheduled for this morning, and that includes the following: Motion 49, Motion 50, paragraph 3.14, Motion 62, and Motion 79. We will obviously be looking at the programme to see if it is possible to take that business tomorrow.

Congress, that concludes the business for the morning but can I remind delegates of the various meetings that are taking place at lunchtime. Details of these can be found on page 15 in the *Congress Guide* or in a leaflet included in your wallet. Please note that RMT fringe meeting Bringing Hope to the Innocent takes place this lunchtime.

I would also like to remind delegates to complete and return their equality forms and monitoring forms that have been sent to them. Delegates should have received yellow forms which they should return to the delegation leaders. If any delegate has not received a form, they should see their delegation leader. Delegation leaders should return their green forms in the box provided at the back of the hall or at the TUC Information Stand.

Congress now stands adjourned until 2.15 this afternoon.

(Congress adjourned until 2.15 pm)

TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

(Congress re-assembled at 2.15 p.m.)

The President: I call Congress to order and many thanks once again to the Rochdale Youth Brass Quintet which has been playing for us this afternoon. *(Applause)*

Congress Awards

The President: Delegates, we are going to start this afternoon by recognising the immense contributions made by lay activists in our unions. They are the foundation of our movement. As I am sure you know, the Lay Representative Awards show our appreciation of their work. There are no individual winners as such, but each year we do choose a number of outstanding representatives to accept the award on behalf of all

their fellow representatives. In a moment, we will meet this year's representatives, but first we will see a short film which tells you something about their achievements. *(Film shown to the Congress)*

Organising Award

The President: Congress, it is now time to meet our award winners. The Organising Award goes to Scot Walker. Scot is a Unite member and has played a key role in his union's organising campaign in the poultry and white meat industry. Scot's achievements include successfully breaking a pay freeze by orchestrating the first national ballot for industrial action in his company, speaking up for migrant agency workers, increasing union membership in his sector by over 12,000 and training more than 300 new activists. *(The presentation was made amid applause)*

The Women's Gold Badge

The President: The Women's Gold Badge goes to Mary Davis. Mary is a member of UCU and has a longstanding commitment to equality in the labour movement. Mary's ambition has always been to make trade union studies and labour history as accessible as possible, particularly to women members. Mary also helped to found the Sylvia Pankhurst Memorial Committee, which aims to establish a lasting memorial to Sylvia at College Green. Mary has been a dedicated trade unionist all her life and has contributed to her own unions NATFHE, UCU and the TUC. *(The presentation was made amid applause)*

Safety Rep Award

The President: The Safety Rep Award goes to David Lyons. David was a GMB member and worked for G4S in Kent. David was a driving force in his union's attack campaigns through his tireless work with Ministers, local and central government, employers and the police. David played a key role in reducing the number of violent attacks on security staff. Delegates, you saw in the film that sadly David passed away earlier this year, but we are honoured as his wife, Marilyn, has joined us today to receive his award. *(The presentation was made amid applause)*

Learning Rep Award

The President: Bharti is an USDAW member and works for Primark in Leeds. As a shop steward, Bharti established a lending library and a skills swap for staff. Her proudest achievement has been persuading colleagues to go on English for Speakers of Other Languages ('ESOL') courses, skills for life and training. Bharti has helped to increase membership within the company, particularly young members, and to improve employer relations. *(The presentation was made amid applause)*

Congress Award for Youth

The President: Debbie has been an activist at PCS for the last four years. She has played a key role in recruiting 250 new members into her union during the HMRC call centre dispute in 2009 and helped to win major concessions for call centre staff on flexible working. Debbie's proudest achievement has been to set up training for young members to become more involved in the union. On top of this, Debbie is also an anti-fascist campaigner. *(The presentation was made amid applause)*

Address by Sharan Burrow, General Secretary, International Trade Union Confederation

The President: I am now very pleased to introduce Sharan Burrow, the General Secretary of the International Trade Union Confederation to which the TUC and 311 other national trade union centres belong. The last time Sharan addressed Congress, she was President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions fighting to get a Labour government elected. We are all relieved that a Labour government, now headed by Julia Gillard, has managed to stay in power. I was part of the TUC's delegation to the ITUC Congress in Vancouver in June, which elected Sharan unanimously as the first woman to hold the office of General Secretary. Sharan, congratulations on your election. You are welcome to address Congress. *(Applause)*

Sharan Burrow: Brendan; Dougie; friends; brothers and sisters, greetings and solidarity on behalf of the 176 million workers organised in the International Trade Union Confederation.

Thank you for this opportunity to address your Congress. I can assure you that the TUC is a vital part not only of British society but the world trade union movement so this is indeed an honour.

Congress, this is a vital moment for global solidarity. The ITUC held its World Congress in June this year, as Dougie told you, bringing together over 1,000 delegates from 151 countries around the world, and as usual the TUC played a leading role. In particular, Brendan chaired the Resolutions Committee, a tough and a well-done role indeed.

The Congress dealt with a huge number of issues. I know that British trade unions have a particular interest in helping our fellow trade unionists in Burma, Colombia, Iran and Zimbabwe. You have led the way on organising, equality and just transition. All of these things were addressed by you and other delegates representing our members at Congress.

Another issue that I know concerns you deeply is the Middle East, where the ITUC gave special attention to the terrible plight of Palestinian workers. We adopted a detailed policy which will guide our work. I am personally committed to this and trade union leaders around the world are committed to this. We have developed a programme of work with the PGFTU and the Histadrut which will in fact involve the leadership of the TUC.

Over the next few months, I will give special attention to that programme. It will deal with the rights, as I said, of Palestinian workers in the illegal settlements; arrange a high-level trade union delegation to the Middle East; and, most importantly, develop a joint political declaration between both the PGFTU and Histadrut. This is to be discussed at our General Council early next year. I want to do everything in my power to help achieve justice for Palestinian workers and I welcome your support in that objective.

I also welcome your support on the issue that dominated our Congress. One thing was the subject of virtually every discussion: the global economic crisis with 34 million jobs destroyed worldwide, 64 million people pushed into extreme poverty, breathtaking evidence of massive human suffering, which was visited disproportionately on those least able to bear it and those least implicated in causing it, a large number of them, of course, women and migrant workers.

Delegates to the ITUC Congress were angry. They knew that the crisis was triggered primarily by massive inequality, asset price bubbles and corporate speculation. It was driven by pure greed, greed that led to a chain reaction of financial meltdown.

The financial crisis, of course, is now a massive crisis of unemployment and our members are the victims. Despite the promises of tough financial regulation, of decent work and green jobs, governments are once again bowing to the demands of the bond markets and the financial elites who caused the crisis. Unbelievably, business as usual is back. Instead of the decisive action to support the recovery that initially characterised the global response, I see, and you see, a growing complacency on the part of world leaders.

That complacency seems particularly prevalent in Europe. In Britain, your coalition Government is not just failing the financial regulation test; it is leading the charge to slash public spending without concern for jobs or the impact of loss of services on the most vulnerable. Indeed, it is heartless, it is economic folly, it will drive down demand and risk double-dip recession. The heartless component of this is beyond belief. I understand that 600-800,000 jobs could go. Yesterday, I met your Iain Duncan-Smith and I have no doubt about the challenges that you face!

The cumulative impact of austerity at home and austerity abroad is going to be devastating. The so-called "exit" strategies now being implemented could lead to a post crisis situation worse than what we had before. Long term, the best on offer is slower growth; permanently higher levels of unemployment; lower wages and living standards; and harsh cuts in public spending. This is not acceptable to us – it is simply not acceptable. Instead, colleagues, we need action on jobs, strong financial regulation and an international tax on financial transactions - the Robin Hood Tax that the TUC has done so much to advance.

A financial transactions tax would make the people who caused the crisis foot at least some of the bill. It would prevent speculative behaviour reaching the heights of obscenity that we saw leading up to the crisis. It would help pay for public services and the fiscal cost of the crisis overall. At the same time, it would help fund the UN's millennium development goals with an international contribution and make progress in the fight against climate change through climate financing.

We should be demanding a Robin Hood Tax at the UN summit on the millennium development goals in New York next week; at the G20 meeting in Korea in November; and at the climate change conference in Cancun in December. On your behalf, Congress, I will do just that.

A Robin Hood Tax could be the centrepiece of progressive and effective fiscal policy. It can drive a new model of carbon neutral economic growth that enables us to achieve sustainable development and support a world built on high-quality public services, where women can be truly equal, and where the exploitation of poor workers in developing countries is no longer an easy option for footloose multinational companies on the hunt for cheap labour.

Here in Britain, your fight against the unjust, unfair, unacceptable policies that the coalition Government has adopted with such enthusiasm is the same fight that your comrades throughout the world are also engaged in. You face some of the most ardent followers of the free market model and you have one of the hardest fights, but for that reason, your fight is critical. These are tough times, but if you can turn the tide against the forces of conservatism – and I have no doubt you can – then others around the world will know they can do the same.

The world trade union movement stands with you in your struggles against the unjust policies of this Government. I wish you victory. I know victory will be yours. Indeed, it will be ours because it will stand as a beacon of hope. Solidarity and good luck! (*Applause*)

The President: Thank you very much. Sharan, we are all impressed with the work of the ITUC in setting out a credible, progressive response to the global economic crisis and I am sure that the excellent work will continue under your leadership. Thank you once again. (*Applause*)

A stronger European Social Model

Dave Williams (*Unite*) spoke to section 4.6 of the General Council Report.

He said: I want to draw attention to section 4.6 in particular at page 108, which refers to the current situation in Turkey. We have just heard Sharan give a detailed explanation of what international solidarity means today and I was pleased to listen to a similar contribution in Mexico City. Our comrades from the RMT made some reference to that yesterday.

What is concerning is the current situation faced by an employer that has the opinion of itself, in this country, as a decent employer. Unite has recognition with United Parcel Services ('UPS'). The current situation in Turkey is that the transport workers' union, TUMTIS, has seen 161 of its members sacked for daring to join and organise a union in the workplace. Only in the last couple of days, we have seen a further three workers dismissed. This is despite assurances given by UPS that there would be no further sackings to allow talks to take place.

There has been global solidarity demonstrated on the back of decisions taken at the ITF Congress in Mexico City and workers around the world have recognised the importance of making sure that UPS know that they cannot treat Turkish workers in the way they do. Indeed, guns have been used on picket lines. We understand from a report that I have seen today that workers are being chaperoned to government forums to deny that they are members of a trade union. Indeed, they are being obliged to swear on the Koran that they are not members, and will not become members, of a trade union. Quite clearly, that is totally unacceptable.

One of the things that should be brought to your attention is that UPS regard themselves as a model sponsor of the 2012 Olympic Games in London. That is something that this TUC Congress must take note of. It should immediately get in touch with UPS demonstrating our disappointment and concern, condemning the actions of the company in Turkey.

I am able to advise you further that there has been some movement towards a meeting. In fact, Gerry O'Shea, the European Director of European Industrial Relations, is meeting with the international president, Dan Brutto, in Brussels this afternoon. There have been no arrangements yet to speak to TUMTIS. I would urge the General Council to make our position clear. (*Applause*)

Haiti

The President: I now move to Motion 68, Haiti. The General Council supports the motion.

Michael Nicholas (*Fire Brigades' Union*) moved Motion 68.

He said: On 12th January of this year, there was a Richter Scale measurement of 7.3 and, 17 seconds later, 230,000 men, women and children died and a further 1.3 million were left homeless and displaced.

Port-au-Prince, capital city of the poorest country in the western hemisphere, was in ruins. A whole country's infrastructure collapsed. All this was then followed by disease, hunger and homelessness. Be in no doubt, Congress, it will take more than a generation to recover from this natural disaster. There

are orphans in their hundreds of thousands, no emergency services to speak of and there was an inadequate government response in the immediate aftermath of the death and destruction.

We are proud, as a union, that FBU members from this region took part in the search and rescue efforts. This resolution comes from the very heart of the delegates of the Black Workers' Conference. We hope that this Congress, from its very heart and soul, can assist in any way it can to put Haiti and its people back on the road to recovery.

First, we need to acknowledge the courage, determination and resilience of the Haitian people. It should come as no surprise as this was a nation that was forged from the remnants of the slave trade. They need to know that we stand in solidarity with them in their time of need and our international links are numerous. The TUC needs to add Haiti to the list of developing countries that we commit to help.

TUC Aid co-ordinated the trade union response and we should be proud that it was quick and generous. In the region of £100,000 was raised while members raised additional funds too. The international trade union movement continues to raise funds and assists in the reconstruction work in Haiti. We must ensure that we do the same. Through our affiliation to the Jubilee Debt Campaign, we must continue to campaign for the cancellation of Haiti's debt. We have had some success there already.

The Haitian government, in association with the international community, has now drafted a reconstruction plan and we await its implementation. This could be an historic opportunity to ensure that the poorest country does not return to its former plight. It can be a prosperous country with human and workers' rights, especially if we support our Haitian trade union comrades in their efforts to build better institutions, structures and networks.

As affiliates, we should make special efforts to focus on what help is needed by the most vulnerable people in Haitian society, especially women and children, who are vulnerable to the more criminal elements in Haitian society. Sexual assaults, beatings and kidnappings have been reported. There is, Congress, an urgent need for resources and effective provisions of vital services such as health, education and water supplies.

Let us continue to organise the collection and delivery of non-perishable items. I hope that affiliates are actively encouraging branches to do this. I hope that, in the not too distant future, we can organise a TUC delegation to visit Haiti to see first-hand what assistance is necessary and with whom we need to have an ongoing dialogue in order to help constructively. We should see what projects are being planned, who is financing them and what input the Haitian people are having with regard to their own future. We are currently putting together a project called Operation Futureproof and we hope that on receiving information of that, you will respond.

Haitians need to know that the British trade union movement will help to restore a nation's dignity and pride, assist in housing the dispossessed and ensure that malnourished stomachs are fed. The present is still catastrophic. However, the future, with our help, assistance and solidarity, promises to be brighter so many thanks to the TUC's Bandula Kothalawala, who organised the TUC Aid Appeal for Haiti. Please contact him for further information for this just clause. I move. Thank you.

Dotun Alade-Odomosu (GMB) seconded the motion.

He said: This section is about global solidarity and my colleagues and I in the GMB and the TUC Aid support solidarity because, for the grace of whatever god you

are calling to, there goes us. It must be difficult to live your life in a harsh environment, but to have a catastrophe as big as this added to the equation must be awful. People in Haiti are suffering. It was the worst earthquake for 200 years. People have lost everything and these are people who are already deprived. Everything collapsed – houses, schools and hospitals – and we know that when this happens, it is the women and children who take the rap.

The damage was terrible. A lot of people died and those who survived were left homeless. That was six months ago and you might have thought that things might have improved through the efforts and donations from the ever-generous people of the UK. However, the situation is still very bad. Millions of people are still homeless. There is rubble everywhere. People are living in relief camps and the situation inside them is as bad with women and children bearing the brunt of the depressing living conditions in these camps. There are attacks on women and children, who need more protection.

Congress, Haiti is a proud nation, but it needs our help. We have to make tangible and visible efforts to help in the rebuilding of the country. Communities need to be rebuilt. Schools need to be rebuilt so that children can return to them to develop the skills which will help Haiti in the future. We need to empower everyone to help. Women have to be empowered. They have to be able to protect themselves against violence and the chauvinistic tendencies that can be shown in this type of tragedy. They must be allowed to make valid contributions in the drive to reconstruct their various communities.

Let us help Haiti. Let us visit Haiti. Let us show the people of Haiti that we care and will continue to do so. I hope the call to perform those tasks mentioned in the motion is supported by Congress. Here's thanking you in anticipation of your support for this motion. I second the motion. (*Applause*)

Alexis Chase (*Unite*) supported the motion.

She said: I think it is important to remember that in this difficult time, Haiti continues to suffer in other ways, for example, from the US intervention and the extreme poverty caused in part by the stringent financial compensation that Haiti was forced to make to France because they had the temerity to escape their enslavement.

Over the past few decades, so-called international aid has forced Haiti to hold down the minimum wage, privatise and make cut-backs in its already minimal health educational and public infrastructure. This left the country ill-equipped to cope with the tragedy that unfolded as that earthquake hit. As this motion notes, women will have suffered additional traumas, because of their inequality. If they had had a better infrastructure and universal public services, it would probably have meant fewer deaths and it would certainly have meant that so many people would not be camping out in tents and living under tarpaulins. We also know that universal services like education and healthcare do actually help to ensure that there is some kind of gender equality.

We are now seeing another tragedy unfolding in Pakistan. Twenty-one million people have been affected by the floods. Again, it is another country which is not very well-equipped to deal with the disaster they are facing.

In aiding Haiti, Pakistan and other stricken countries, we could perhaps take a look at Latin American. The Cuban and Venezuelan Brigade doctors arrived quickly in Haiti and they have arrived even faster in Pakistan. They are doing an amazing job. (*Applause*)

As a movement, we should use our strength to argue and campaign for fairer and more just economic aid for developing countries, particularly the kind of economic aid which does not impose restrictions and privatisation as a financial condition to aid. That is disgraceful. We would not put up with it here so why should they? We should support campaigns calling for France to repay the moneys that Haitians were forced to pay because they freed themselves from slavery.

Finally, I think that we need to ensure that goods that we send to Haiti and Pakistan do not include agricultural products produced by exploited workers in the illegal settlements in the West Bank. *(Applause)* In doing the right thing for Haiti and for Pakistan or anywhere else in the world where we are needed, please remember that we must do right by the Palestinians. *(Applause)*

Derek Thomson (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supported Motion 68.

He said: Congress, the devastating natural disaster which befell the people of Haiti has left the country and its people facing unimaginable horrors and hardships on a daily basis. It seems that Haiti and its people have disappeared from the media radar at this moment and this perhaps leads to the general public's assumption that after an initial period of support, rebuilding and growth has taken place. Unfortunately, nothing could be further from the truth. People are still dying and people are still homeless. It will take years to rebuild the infrastructure of the country.

Although it is essential for the people of Haiti to self-determine their future, they must be given support. Prior to the disaster, Haiti was one of the poorest countries in the western hemisphere, a price they paid for securing their freedom from slavery. The country was ill-equipped to deal with the disaster when it struck. While the response of certain countries and organisations is to be commended, I think it is indicative of the attitude and priorities of the American ruling class that rather than concentrating all efforts into getting humanitarian relief into the area, they actively delayed the landing of aid in order to get troops on the ground on the spurious basis of protecting law and order.

During the critical first days of the disaster, America focused its concerns on protecting their economic and political interests at the expense of the Haitian people. Compare this to the work done by the ITUC, the TUC and, in particular, the Cuban Solidarity Campaign, which immediately moved to provide treatment, medicine and food on the ground where it matters. *(Applause)*

Congress, Motion 68 rightly refocuses our movement. To support the strategies which assist the most vulnerable within the country, it is vital that our movement takes the lead to highlight the ongoing issues faced by the Haitian people. Moral support as well as financial support is needed. Our TUC and our affiliates must consider all available avenues and resources to build links within the country and show solidarity with the Haitian people.

Brothers and sisters, yesterday we brought forward a progressive, positive strategy to fight back against the Government's attacks. Let us take a moment to think about what we can do as a movement and as individuals to build a campaign that will raise the profile and provide support not only for the people of Haiti, but for everyone throughout the world affected by disasters, both natural and manmade. Disasters, when seen in the media, can almost feel distant. Something happened to someone thousands of miles away; something happened to someone else far away. We need to challenge inaction by summoning the international community. I firmly believe that the

moral responsibility lies with us in the trade union movement. We should educate our members, put pressure on MPs and build a class movement which recognises the importance of an international working community.

Congress, Haiti is off the radar, forgotten in the minds of many. Let us rebuild. Let us renew our international campaigns and ensure that we do all we can to alleviate the horror suffered by the people of Haiti and across the world. Please support the motion. *(Applause)*

Frank Murray (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) supported the motion.

President and Congress, I will have to take you back in history to explain what we can do for Haiti. Haiti was the second republic in the western hemisphere, the first being America, about which we were all taught at school. We do not know about Haiti. Haiti was the second. Twenty years later, Haitians freed themselves and, for doing that, they were actually blocked by France. The slaves who freed themselves had to pay reparations to France in the amount of 150 million gold francs.

Haiti could not pay that money and France generously offered to lend that money to Haiti. Haiti actually finished paying the indemnity for that in 1947. That contributed to the situation in which Haiti finds itself now. If we convert 150 million gold francs into today's money, it would come to \$21 billion. If we use the calculation that France used, it would actually come to something like \$4 trillion. Haiti and the international community are not asking for \$4 trillion. They are just asking for the \$21 billion, which would go a long way to ease some of the problems that Haiti has right now. What we should be doing is asking for the repayment of the reparations that Haiti had to pay. *(Applause)* Basically, that is my argument. I support the motion.

Shirley Rainey (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*) spoke in support of the motion.

She said: Along with many other unions, the CSP is proud to support physiotherapists in going to work in Haiti and we thought you should hear some of their reports. One physio report states that she set up care programmes for 20 or so patients and also took on the training of local staff, remaining on site for five weeks, conducting daily ward rounds and arranging care for patients across a number of sites in Haiti.

Another physio has just returned from Port-au-Prince where she worked for an organisation committed to improving the quality of life for people with disabilities. They are currently working to provide therapy in hospital and community-based settings in Port-au-Prince. The emphasis is very much on development and sustainability, helping to support and train local Haitian workers to carry out physiotherapy for patients with injuries, both related and unrelated to the earthquake. The physio who was there saw that the majority of injuries were related to the earthquake: amputations and upper and lower limb orthopaedic trauma cases. However, she says that this is changing as they move out of the relief stage.

For the first time, the majority of Haitians are having some healthcare service, which has never been accessible to them before. For example, people who have suffered long-term pathologies such as stroke, cerebral palsy or who have old injuries can now get some assessment and treatment. Therefore, things can be done and we should all be out there doing them. The international relief effort is getting less and less, but this help is still so urgently required. Hospital provision is not based on secure financial footing and a hospital with over 50 in-patients and busy outpatient

and surgical departments can cease to operate because of lack of funds. Of course, this is very frustrating for the volunteers and local staff as patient care is immediately in jeopardy.

Congress, it is not possible to exaggerate just how much this help is still needed as Haiti moves out of the relief stage post-earthquake and into an effort that is becoming more developmental in nature. There is no question that this is going to take years and the future is uncertain as many of the hospitals look set to begin charging for their services as international funds run dry. The long-term goal is for the Haitian people to become sustainable in all areas: healthcare, education, food provision, sanitation, housing and employment.

Realistically, this situation is not going to change overnight, but there are no easy or quick solutions and the help needs to continue. Let us help Haitians to help themselves. *(Applause)*

* *Motion 68 was CARRIED*

Supporting trade unionists in trouble

Nigel Gawthorpe (*Unite*) spoke on paragraph 4.4.

He said: I am rising to speak on paragraph 4.4, in particular the reference on page 98 on Latin America and the situation in Mexico where there is a full-blown attack being mounted by the government of that country on independent trade unions, notably the Miners and Metals Union, Los Mineros.

In collaboration with the mining company, Grupo Mexico, the government has tried to install puppet unions by attacking the union's leadership, notably Napoleon Gomez who, because of the death threats to him and his family, now has to run the union in exile in Canada. One Los Mineros official, Juan Linares, remains a political prisoner without bail in Mexico City under false charges stemming from allegations of fraud.

Los Mineros members, picketing a mine in Sonora, Mexico, were attacked by helicopters, tear gas and paramilitaries, who have now taken over the town. Another mine being picketed by the widows of miners who were killed in an explosion, and who were trying to recover the bodies of their loved ones, was sealed with the widows ejected from the area. These are disgraceful acts, perpetrated by the government of Mexico, in collusion with Grupo Mexico.

Led by the United Steelworkers and my union, Unite, as part of their global union, Workers Uniting, the international trade union movement, is seeking to publicise what is going on in Mexico and is determined to help Los Mineros in defending itself from a vicious right wing government operating in America's back yard. As is mentioned yesterday during the Chilean miners' emergency motion and reported in an article in today's *Morning Star*, the situation is dire indeed.

I would ask the General Council to continue to monitor the situation in Mexico and to express their support for Los Mineros in defending independent and free trade unions. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Frank Murray (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) spoke on paragraph 4.4.

He said: I would like to bring to the attention of Congress the plight of the Guyana Bauxite and General Workers' Union. In November, the Guyana Bauxite and Workers Union organised a strike for better pay. The bauxite company, which is Russian-owned with 20 per cent government involvement, promptly decided to sack 57 workers, all of them trade union activists.

Guyana is a signatory to the ILO and the strike, which started in November, is still going on. The international organisation does not really know what is going on. The Russian company, RUSAL, a Russian

aluminium company, is owned by one of the Russian oligarchs. His personal worth is about \$28 billion. He personally received £64 million from floating the company. What we have in Guyana is a company which is being run by the oligarchy and a government which is weak.

The bauxite communities are communities which are actually enclosed. They live and work in the same place. Therefore, you can see that the situation is getting very bad. Basically, what I would like Congress to do is to look into this situation and get some action going as far as that is concerned. Thank you. *(Applause)*

The President: Both of these points will be taken on board.

Palestine

The President: I am now moving to Composite Motion 18, Palestine. The General Council supports the composite motion. I will call upon the General Secretary to explain the position after the speakers who are party to the composite have delivered their contributions.

Andy Bain (*Transport Salaried Staffs' Association*) moved Composite Motion 18.

He said: On radio and TV over the last week, there have been many moving accounts of the Battle of Britain, an historic time and a heroic defence by the British people. We won and Britain was not occupied.

Britain, on the other hand, has occupied other countries. It is therefore difficult for us to imagine what life might be like living under occupation, but let us try a few examples. Your armed forces are disbanded. People are moved off the best farmland and industries are taken over. Hundreds of thousands of people from the occupying force are moved in. Water is diverted to the newly-settled people so that they have access to 50 times the volume that the locals do. It is difficult to imagine in this pleasant and green land, but water is a life and death issue in a hot country. Ethnic cleansing continues and thousands are killed. Religious sites are destroyed or converted into the temples of the occupying force. Walls are built to divide people from their land and their sources of income. Road blocks stop travel to work and essential services like hospitals. Trade in and out is blocked. Public meetings are prevented so a gathering like this would be impossible.

In such circumstances, some of you might choose to fight back, but that is not what I want to focus on. Neighbouring countries might have some sympathy, but may be bought off or threatened. Imagine then if some democrats abroad tried to persuade international bodies to put pressure on the occupying power – a good idea, but they may have powerful and wealthy friends who could prevent that. Their media could silence the truth and then when it eventually gets out, they say, "It is complicated and a struggle between two equal sides." Then, when that does not work, they might well say that the occupied people are terrorists or terrorist supporters. Frustrated foreign democrats might then try to publicise the injustice and bring essential supplies across the Channel. A ruthless oppressor would have no problem with that. They could be executed well away from the cameras. More and more outraged democrats abroad might then try to have a real impact on the oppressor. They could try to harm the oppressor's finances and, at the same time, publicise the truth.

Congress, Composite Motion 69 refers to some of the injustices suffered by the Palestinians and then goes on to propose effective actions. Whenever criticism is

made of the occupation of Palestinian land, it risks the accusation of being anti-Semitic. I will make it clear - we are not against Jews, but we are against the actions of the Israeli State.

This boycott is aimed at ending the siege of Gaza with its 1.2 million prisoners and achieving a free Palestine, which is made more difficult every day that settlement building goes on. Resolution of this Israel/Palestine conflict will have more impact on non-state terrorism than any number of wars in Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran or anywhere else for that matter.

Congress, let us now work with the Palestinian Solidarity Campaign to make this boycott have an impact by careful planning, targeting and implementation. Let us win this one. Thank you.

Paul Kenny (GMB) seconded Composite Motion 18.

He said: Our trade union movement, both here and globally, has a role and a responsibility for seeking a just and peaceful solution to the misery and death in the conflict taking place in Palestine. There is no other solution than a two-state solution with two free and independent countries – Palestine and Israel – where families can have an expectation of life without repression, without fear of terror attacks on their homes, their homes bulldozed or their homes and lands stolen. It is a simple dream that many of us expect for ourselves, that people can have a life without living in fear.

You may say, as some do, that such views are for dreamers. Well, so be it. It is better to have a vision of peace and reconciliation than the hate-fuelled agenda based on denying the fundamental rights of Palestinians or the right of existence of Israel. However, as a movement, we must do more than spout pious words or pass a resolution and with it ease our responsibilities. I saw, and I paid tribute to, our TUC General Secretary, Brendan Barber, and a colleague from the International Department, Owen Tudor, who worked tirelessly at the recent ITUC Congress in Vancouver to bring a process of dialogue between the Histadrut and the PGFTU. I congratulate Sharan as the new President of the ITUC, who can effectively bring about and drive that process.

We may knock ourselves a bit, but the influence of our TUC is massive on the global stage. With that influence, we have the responsibility for joined-up strategy and not just passionate speeches. Our strategy must be to put teeth into the policy that we passed last year. The exploitation of Palestinian workers and profit-making by retailers, banks and anybody from goods and products from illegal settlements must now be exposed, targeted and boycotted. (*Applause*) These companies – some of them household names – are making money out of what is internationally recognised as illegal settlement land-grabs. These companies are making profits on the backs of conflict and oppression. Their hands are very dirty at best and covered in blood at worst.

Now we must expose those who profit from extending the conflict. The TUC will write to all those stocking goods which may have origin in the illegal and occupied areas and demand that those companies verify their supply chains. If they fail to do so or if we suspect that the information is inaccurate then we will draw the conclusion that they are genuine goods from the illegal areas and their companies and shareholders will be targeted. If supermarkets can spend tens of millions on their ethical corporate image then our movement can spend a bit of time and effort actually bringing home the truth about the real ethical origins of their supply chains. (*Applause*)

We will not stand any longer for the exploitation and existence of those illegal settlements. We have hope and we have a legitimate and positive role in helping

to expose those who profit from misery. If we do this, we will help everyone in Palestine and Israel who wants a peaceful two-state solution. Please support and respond. (*Applause*)

Mike Kirby (UNISON) supported Composite 18.

He said: Congress, trade unionists across the world are at the centre of progressive alliances and movements. In December 2008, as the world watched aghast at the operation 'Cast Lead' against Gaza, and we condemned the actions of the Israeli state, Histadrut, the Israeli trade union centre, did not join that chorus of international condemnation. While we respect the rights of self-determination and solidarity movements across the world, sometimes we have a duty to tell our friends that they have got it wrong.

The year 2009 saw major shifts in both trade union and public opinion on Palestine. The cause was Gaza and the unprecedented disproportionate use of force by the Israeli state, and those events led to an historic decision at this Congress. As another round of peace talks continues, the prospects of a real deal will be tested later this month when Israel reviews its policies on settlements, which continue to colonise the Palestinian territories and another generation grows up under occupation. Can there be a lasting peace without a right of return, without East Jerusalem, without an end to occupation and colonisation? The Palestinian people have been suffering for too long at the hands of the occupation, and whilst we hope for a successful outcome to the current peace talks, our values as trade unionists and our commitment to solidarity mean that we cannot stand idly by while the people of Nablus, Hebron, Jerusalem and Gaza suffer on a daily basis, without homes, without jobs, without basic freedoms and, increasingly, without hope. It is our duty as trade unionists to assist in ending that suffering. That is why UNISON at all levels, along with the others in PSC, is actively involved in developing the campaign to boycott goods from illegal settlements and to pursue companies involved in the war and illegal construction.

We welcome this composite. To those who talk about the impact of boycott disinvestment and sanctions and the possible negative impact upon Palestinians, I say this. I was part of a Scottish TUC delegation to Palestine last year, and we met with a Minister from the Palestinian Authority, and he said to us, and I quote, "The boycott may affect 20 per cent of those Palestinians in employment in construction and service industries, but they don't work in export industries". He said, "For the sake of the political issue of our land, we can afford that economic sacrifice". Support this composite.

Hugh Lanning (Public and Commercial Services Union) spoke in support of the composite motion.

He said: On the day the flotilla was attacked I was in Nablus on behalf of the Palestine Solidarity Campaign. The Palestinians couldn't believe what they saw and heard, and neither could I, which was that Israel believed it was so above the law that it could attack and kill civilians in international waters. I don't know how many of you saw the atrocious Panorama programme on the issue, but it was as if the Mavi Marmara had chased down the Israeli helicopters, climbed up the ropes and attacked the commandos. It was the Israelis who were the aggressors and they remain the aggressors on a daily basis in Gaza. The latest UN figures for Gaza show that 41 Palestinians have been killed so far this year as opposed to three Israeli soldiers. Only 38 per cent of essential goods are getting through the siege. Now is the time for more pressure, not less.

Last year's decision at Congress was good. It reverberated around the world. Hundreds and thousands of postcards with the TUC and the PSC logo on them went out through NUT, FBU, Unite, UNISON and PCS. But this year the composite is better for two reasons. First, there is a clearer policy. We can target all those complicit firms and goods, all those profiting from the occupation, the Wall or settlements. I am not quite sure who is left, but we will find out.

This year is better because we are united. It's great to have the GMB on board seconding the motion, and I want to thank the GMB for their idea of shifting the burden of proof to the companies to make sure that they are clean, and also the promise to challenge the supermarkets. But for the Palestinians nothing has changed since last year. They are still under siege. They are surrounded and occupied; they are being driven off their land and driven out of East Jerusalem.

We have talked of building a mass solidarity movement. Well, let's do it. With a clear united policy the trade union movement can make it happen. The PSC, the Palestine Solidarity Campaign, in conjunction with Palestinian unions and civil society organisations, has called for a week of action in November. Let's make it the biggest demonstration of trade union support for Palestine this country has ever seen. Israel can no longer be allowed to behave as though it is above the law and treat Palestinians as though they are beneath it. Support the composite and support Palestine.

Tam McFarlane (*Fire Brigades' Union*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 18.

He said: Congress, the main points have been made brilliantly, so I am going to be brief. We should never underestimate the impact of these motions and debates on the Palestinian people. Last year, shortly after Congress, a fire-fighter, an FBU member and an international activist, was out in the southern hills of Hebron as part of a peace mission. He was working with a group of farmers in that area. Shortly after our Congress, a few days after, he was summoned to a meeting of the farmers in Hebron. He gave them a full briefing -- this was in an area where there was no internet and very few televisions -- on what was said at this Congress and the impact it had made on them. He was asked when he returned to the UK to send a message. Those farmers wanted to make it absolutely clear that they supported the campaign of boycott, disinvestment and sanctions put forward by the TUC, and they saw it as an effective way of fighting the oppression that they were under. They wanted to make it absolutely clear that that is what they wanted to happen. They also asked our member to take forward their thanks in solidarity to this Congress.

Now, it is one thing to tell an FBU member that in the southern hills of Hebron, but it is quite another thing actually to achieve it. So you can imagine how proud I am to stand at this podium and tell this Congress that those farmers in Hebron want to send their solidarity and I do soon their behalf. (*Applause*)

Congress, it is absolutely clear that when we speak the Palestinians can hear our voice and understand our support. Now we have to ensure that the state of Israel understands our anger, determination and resolve to achieve justice. We need, in our campaign, to raise awareness of the issues that are hurting the Palestinian people, and we need to increase our support for the boycott campaign. The world needs to know that working people stand shoulder to shoulder with the people of Palestine and we will not be budged until justice is there. Support Palestine.

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*): Thank you, Dougie. The General Council is asking Congress to

support the resolution, but it wanted to put on record clearly a number of points of explanation.

The General Council recognises the real and justified outrage of many British trade unionists about the actions of the Israeli Government and the suffering of the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. As well as the blockade of Gaza as outlined in the composite, which must be ended, the deadly assault on the Mavi Marmara, the Wall, the continuing construction of settlements and the treatment of Palestinian workers in those settlements all constitute flagrant obstacles to the peace process, as does the increasing encroachment on East Jerusalem. These and other outrages have led many trade unionists to call for a wider boycott, disinvestment and sanctions strategy than the strategy of boycotting illegal settlements agreed by Congress in 2009, to demonstrate to the Israeli Government our abhorrence at their actions.

Given the current direct negotiations between the Palestinian authority and Israel; the ITUC's work programme, which Sharan described a little earlier; the joint Histadrut PGFTU involvement in the ILO's project to promote the rights of Palestinian workers in the settlements; the joint commitment of the PGFTU and Histadrut to the development of a joint political statement on how to deal with the obstacles to the peace process; a high level trade union delegation to the Middle East; and, in particular, the planned PGFTU Congress in May 2011: in light of all these things, the General Council believes that, at this crucial moment for the peace process, we should actively strengthen the implementation of the existing policy by divesting from and boycotting the goods of companies, which profit from the illegal settlements, the occupation and the construction of the Wall. We should also put the burden of proof on companies to demonstrate the integrity of their supply chains, while continuing to demand that the Government and the European Union prohibit the import of such goods.

We will review the success of this campaign and developments in the peace process at Congress next year, so if further action is considered necessary it can be agreed at that point. The General Council intends to agree a concrete programme for developing this boycott campaign at their meeting in October. So, with those additional points of explanation, President, the General Council asks you to support the composite.

* *Composite Motion 18 was CARRIED*

Supporting international development

Marilyn Morris (*Accord*) moved Motion 70.

She said: Congress, International Development used to be the poor relation in government, a sub-set of the Foreign Office receiving charitable scraps from the table. Now International Development is the only department safe from the cuts. At the General Election every major party promised to meet the United Nations' target for overseas aid spending of 0.7 per cent of gross national income.

When governments around the world are cutting spending on international development the UK is still committed to that target, as verified by the Secretary of State for the Department for International Development only yesterday in the Working for a Better World fringe meeting organised by Unions 21. But it took a lot of work and there is still more to do. Even though the trade union movement and our partners in the international development community secured that major commitment across the political spectrum, we need it written into law so that governments simply can't play politics with global poverty. And we need to do more as a movement, Congress.

Yesterday we heard from Gideon Shoko from the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions. Today the Black Workers' Conference told you about Haiti. The working people of those countries and of the whole of the global south need our support. They need what we already have – trade union rights, even if they could be better; quality public services, even if they are under threat, and decent work even if there is still much more than we could do here at home. Although our colleagues abroad welcome the statements we make in solidarity with them, although the experience we have on equality, health and safety, collective bargaining and organisation is vitally important, the one thing they really need is money. We need to give more as well as do more, and the TUC Aid Appeal for Burma, Palestine and Zimbabwe, that the President told you about yesterday, is a good place to start. Please support it, not just this week but when you get home.

There are some in our movement who ask why trade unions should care about international development, and there are some on the extreme right who ask why the British taxpayer should support the work they do? We need to make the case for trade union work on international development, for funding from our members and from the Government. To our members we should say solidarity anywhere requires solidarity everywhere. If people agree that trade unionism is about the strong helping the weak, then that is true across national boundaries as it is within one workplace, one employer, one industry.

We are one movement, whichever country we live in. To the Government we should say, as trade unions, that we reach the parts that others don't. We can get into the workplaces and communities of working people around the world because we are their equals and their partners. We can deliver better wages, better health and more action against government corruption. Please support the motion.

Kathleen Walker Shaw (*GMB*) seconded Motion 70.

She said: Congress, the level of poverty we continue to see across the world isn't just a threat to prosperity everywhere. It is just plain wrong. Still more scandalous are the greedy fat cats who caused the current economic and financial crisis, who are still licking cream whilst further misery pours on millions of people across the world.

Trade unions are no strangers to the struggle against poverty over our history in workplaces, communities and at national and international level. Solidarity is what our movement is about, and although proud of the contribution that we have made, we recognise that there is still so much to do. Let's take Costa Rica. For far too many people it evokes only an image of a dream holiday destination. For us it is a country where agricultural workers, who produce the bananas and pineapples that we see in our supermarkets, live in desperate working poverty under terrible conditions. Workers are victimised, attacked and threatened for their trade union activities with women becoming an increasing target. It is a country serially criticised by the ILO for abuses of trade union rights, freedoms and labour standards. Costa Rican trade unionists are not taking this lying down, but need our support and solidarity to survive. Knowing that they are not alone lifts their strengths and gives them the motivation to go on. That is why the GMB has a partnership agreement with SITRAP, the Costa Rican agricultural trade union, providing practical support to allow them to continue organising and political support to raise complaints with the EU, the ILO and governments, putting pressure on their Costa Rican government to adopt labour legislation that is in line with ILO requirements. Together as unions we can put governments and employers under a spotlight.

Supported by £50,000 from DfID, we have an education programme for shop stewards in the sugar industry in Guyana and we are pushing to ensure that trade unions across the sugar producing nations benefit from EU money in transition of the sugar regime in ACP countries. DfID funding has also helped the GMB, with an important ship breaking project in India. But international development aid is not everything.

We welcome the vital 0.7 per cent of gross national income that goes in aid. Although it is very welcome, it is not enough, because it pales into insignificance against the amount of money lost or denied to workers across the world as a direct result of neo-liberal trade and procurement practices that rob them of any prospect of getting out of poverty; effectively, giving with one hand and taking away with a bulldozer. Governments and institutions must apply the same principles that underpin the development policy to trade and other policies affecting developing countries. The focus must be on developing economies, sustainably raising people out of poverty. I second this motion. Please support.

Denise McGuire (*Prospect*) supported Motion 70.

She said: President, on the train to Congress I was chatting with a woman and her perception was that unions were there for the bad things. I explained that unions were also there for the good things. I spoke about what we do on international development. This work is a core union work because it springs from the values of justice and equality that underpin everything we do. I am amazed by what union members have achieved with relatively little funding from governments.

The corporate clothing at Natural England is made under good working conditions in Colombia and proudly worn by our members who negotiated that. In Babcock International the union linked with a team of graduates to research and recommend a corporate social responsibility policy that is linked to the Millennium Development goals. Our branch at the Scottish Agricultural College negotiated an ethical procurement policy for the computing equipment, and in EDF the reps pushed for a more robust level of social responsibility and their European works council is now involved in auditing the policy and the way it is implemented.

Funding the work that unions do on international development is actually mainstream in many countries. In my work with UNI, the global union for the services sector, I have seen the positive impact of government funding, funding directed towards specific projects and implemented and overseen by unions. One project, Decisions for Life, links young women across the global south. It gets them to explore their life choices, including work and education. It gives them the tools to lift themselves out of poverty, to improve their lives and the lives of their families. Congress, we don't just demand government support for this work, but we also raise funds ourselves. In many areas members give the recruitment incentive vouchers to support branch campaigns, adopting prisoners in Colombia, reducing child labour and supporting education projects for girls in Guatemala. We also raise funds for TUC Aid. Those funds are devoted to helping trade union members around the world. As Marilyn said, I would urge you to visit the TUC stand and show some material support to TUC Aid.

In summary international development is international solidarity. Congress, please put your money where your vote is. Support them motion and support TUC Aid. Thank you.

* *Motion 70 was CARRIED*

Vietnam

The President: I now call Motion 71 – Vietnam. The General Council supports the motion.

Joe Marino (*Bakers Food & Allied Workers Union*) moved Motion 71.

He said: President and Congress, last week the Deputy Prime Minister of Vietnam was in Britain and he signed the biggest and most comprehensive trade agreement with this country. Many British companies are multi-nationals and are now operating in Vietnam in the economic zones. The current population of Vietnam is some 80 million people, and it is predicted to continue, rising to outstrip that of Russia.

Vietnam has become a fast growing country. It has avoided the chaos and depression of the finance-dominated banking crisis. Its plans are now to fully industrialise by the year 2020. This will be a massive undertaking with currently 70 per cent of its population involved in agriculture. No one could have predicted 35 years ago, when the country lay in ruins with four million of its people having been killed in the war and its lands polluted by chemical bombing and the pouring of 80 million litres of Agent Orange on its soil, that it would have recovered so incredibly. Even up till ten years ago power cuts were common. It is time for the trade union connections with Vietnam to begin again. Those connections were very strong during the Vietnam War. The first British trade union delegation comprising of the then ASTMS, T&G and AEEU visited North Vietnam 40 years ago. Many trade unionists here were part of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign. Many responded to the call of the Vietnamese for bicycles and other forms of practical solidarity.

There was great celebration in the trade union movement 35 years ago when Vietnam finally liberated itself from one of the cruellest wars of aggression in history. The sheer heroism of the Vietnamese people at that time was an inspiration to the world. Perhaps our relief was so great that at the time of victory we forgot to continue our solidarity and help trade unionists there to rebuild their country. Whatever the reason, links with Vietnamese unions dropped off as they began the difficult work of reconstruction.

Let us not forget the legacy of that terrible war that has lived on for the thousands of children still born each year in Vietnam with appalling deformities as a result of Agent Orange. Thousands of children have also been injured and killed by mines, bombs and incendiary devices which still litter the country.

Vietnam now grows in peace and is developing its economic prosperity. Its lands, industries, natural resources and utilities are firmly in the hands of its people. It has a growing public service and it is investing in health and education as much as it is able. The industrial sector alone has grown fast. It accounted for 20 per cent of the GDP in 1986 and by 2008 that had figure has risen to 40 per cent. People's living standards have greatly improved. Vietnam has been recognised by the international community as a good example of poverty reduction. The rate of poverty has decreased from 75 per cent in 1986 down to 13.5 per cent in 2008.

Many international high and low tech companies also operate there and pose new challenges to the trade union movement. The idea behind this motion is that we should extend the hand of friendship to them and assist them in those developments. That is one reason why we are delighted that delegates from the Vietnam General Confederation of Labour are here with us at Congress this year, and they will be addressing a fringe meeting on Wednesday lunchtime at Friends' Meeting House, and I hope that people will come along to that.

Trade Union Friends of Vietnam exists to help foster good relations with Vietnam and has held some very successful events this year, and we hope that affiliates will consider affiliating to that organisation.

This motion calls on the TUC itself to develop its relations with Vietnam and we would hope that an official invitation to the Vietnamese General Confederation of Labour General Secretary could be considered for Congress next year.

Congress, many trade unionists today have taken inspiration from the bravery and clarity of these people three decades ago. That bravery and clarity has continued as they have physically and politically reconstructed the country where forests, farms, lands and rivers had been poisoned by Agent Orange and napalm, where over 1800 hospitals had been destroyed, where 3,000 schools and colleges had been bombed flat and nearly a thousand churches. After the war there were a million orphans wandering the countryside and four million seriously injured people.

Vietnam's four hundred year history is truly inspiring. It only attained independence 65 years ago and liberation 35 years ago. In recent history, the well organised and growing trade unions have played their part in its progress. They deserve greater solidarity from us. Please support, and give that solidarity to our comrades in Vietnam. Thank you.

Phil Davies (*GMB*) seconded Motion 71.

He said: Congress, I am proud to be seconding Motion 71. It is now well over 35 years since the light of freedom was turned on in the People's Republic of Vietnam and the Americans were thrown out of Vietnam. More bombs and chemicals were dropped on men, women and children than in the whole of the Second World War. The country was virtually destroyed. The most powerful nation in the world was beaten by a peace loving nation.

I was fortunate last year to be able to visit Vietnam. We found a wonderful country, with its people full of hope for the future. Its young people now have a chance of education. This motion calls on the TUC to build stronger links with Vietnam and its trade unions. My union fully supports this, and we urge all other unions to build links, and strong links, with our comrades in Vietnam.

Comrades, despite 35 years of peace, the Americans have still not paid any compensation to the people of Vietnam. What an absolute disgrace that is! This has got to be addressed in the next few years.

Congress, on 30th April 1975 at 8.35 am the last ten marines left Vietnam and Vietnam was free. The war was over and the rebuilding of Vietnam began and continues today. Today, as trade unionists, we must continue to support our comrades in Vietnam, just as we did when we stood outside the American Embassy. Congress, I am proud to second this motion and ask you to support it.

Gerald Newson (*Musicians' Union*) spoke in support of Motion 71.

He said: President and Colleagues, Vietnam is a country which has suffered pain, war and destruction on a scale that has been unprecedented in the 20th Century, and today it is a country that is struggling and emerging from the ashes of a destructive history. Thirty-five years ago Vietnam emerged from one of the most brutal and destructive wars of the 20th Century. It was a war of liberation where a colonised people, who had been exploited for a hundred years, struggled to gain their freedom and self-determination; freedoms that should never be privileges, but basic and universal human rights.

As a New Zealander my country, by fulfilling its ANZUS Treaty obligations, which is the Australian, New Zealand and United States Pact, became militarily active in this war and we sent troops to fight. This military treaty was created after World War II for our mutual protection owing to the gap left by the withdrawal of British global military commitments and the British turning away from their traditional Commonwealth and looking instead towards Europe for new allies and a world role. The ANZUS countries, plus the Philippines and South Korea fought a brutal war that rapidly escalated and eventually resulted in an indiscriminate aerial bombing campaign which today is considered the greatest saturation bombing ever experienced by any country. Despite the military high technology applied by western powers on a rural and agricultural society, the Vietnamese eventually defeated us and led to the hurried and undignified withdrawal of troops. It has left a legacy of deep regret, division and caution for those of us who were involved, which still haunts us today.

Vietnam emerged free and proud, with its people dignified in victory, stoic in character and forgiving in nature, but it was a country exhausted and destroyed beyond recognition and hardly able to sustain even a basic infrastructure. The rebuilding of Vietnam is a programme of which the Vietnamese Government can be truly proud, as, with no practical aid or help and 25 years of American and southern hemisphere white Commonwealth post war hostility, it has struggled to reach out to the world for aid, support and recognition and rebuild a war-torn economy and country.

I ask Congress today to give practical and moral support to the Vietnamese people through traditional trade union channels and support the Affiliated Friendship Society in encouraging investment, supporting global inclusion and helping the Vietnamese people achieve the standard of living that they were fighting so hard to achieve. Today's delegation is asking for your support. Let us give it to them.

Finally, as a New Zealander at that time, I apologise for our involvement in the Vietnam War. I say to the delegation today – sorry. We cannot change the past but we can help the Vietnamese people build a better and brighter future, a future they so rightly deserve. I ask you to support this motion.

* *Motion 71 was CARRIED*

The BBC's remit

The President: I call Motion 65. The General Council support the motion.

Robert Noakes (*Musicians' Union*) moved Motion 65.

He said: President and Congress, of the recent announcements made by the BBC the decision to shut down the digital radio service Asian Network is surely among the most concerning. The Asian Network began life as a BBC local radio service in the Midlands and was promoted to national transmission with the introduction of DAB digital radio. After the extent to which the BBC supported the development of DAB radio both financially and technically, its subsequent use of the system is baffling. It simultaneously broadcasts all of its FM services plus a couple of DAB only services. The DAB only services include Parliament, 6-Music and supplementary services, such as 1-Extra and Five Live Sports Extra. Another major DAB only service is BBC7, a back catalogue repeat station. Surely, that station is a strong candidate for internet only availability, not survival at the expense of a truly original exclusive service, Asian Network.

There was, apparently, an evident failure to give Asian Network a significant profile as most of the shops I use

in Glasgow listen to Sunrise, a satellite service. It is possible to sense a conspiracy in that it was deliberately kept low profile as nobody wanted it there at all, as a jumped-up local service that grew too big.

In Scotland, historically, there has been considerable support for the BBC Gallic service, which broadcasts to a distinct community. It was reported, and has been for a long time, that there are more Urdu speakers than Gallic speakers in Scotland, so where is the equity in the decision-making process that sees one minority service being more deserving than another?

It was BBC Radio Scotland, by the way, which in the 1990s broadcast the ironically titled *Ghetto Blasting*, the programme on which Greg Dyke, when he was the DG, made his memorable utterance about the BBC being hideously white.

The decision to cease this service runs completely against the BBC's duty to reflect and serve all the diversity of the UK. The network is a diverse service in itself with music, news, languages, faiths, arts, etc. If the Asian Network service goes, there will be an adverse effect on jobs. This is, as always, undesirable, but surely the most significant negative consequence is cultural. There is a promise of the likelihood of the integration and presence of an increase of British Asian content on existing BBC radio services. Don't hold your breath, to quote someone this morning. And why should it be either/or, anyway? There should be more British Asian content on the other services as it is, but there should also be an Asian Network.

So what is the reason behind the decision? Is it to save money? What about the promises to cull the ludicrously expensive top-heavy management structure so they could invest more in programmes? Where does this proposal fit in there? The BBC continues to be obsessed with targeting services which demographically assess groups, whether by economic measurement, the gruesome ABC1 stuff, or by age. It is a strategy which is wide of the mark in terms of interest and breadth. The term "broadcasting" isn't used for nothing. It means a wide-range of material in its content, a wide-range of people who are listening and being informed, reaching as widely as is humanly possible.

Most of the music you hear nowadays on BBC Radio reaches the ears of the producers and editors via PR and promo companies. This is expensive for artistes and small producers, and contributes to the lack of diversity available. You hardly ever see BBC Radio producers out and about at gigs like you used to. They are introducing, and I should say it is a commendable principle, but why segregate it? Why does the fact that the BBC plays new artistes have to be flagged up and dressed up in a heavily labelled corner? Why do we have to keep being a server for Dial Focus Group's repetition on anything you would describe as prime time programmes?

As for integration in the music itself, well, there is a little here and there but the seeds of this missed opportunity have to be found in the past. So how can it be deemed necessary, desirable or strategically competent to discontinue the Asian Network and just where does it position the BBC's continued support for DAB digital radio? Let me say that I believe the DAB system to be seriously flawed, outdated and not fit for purpose. The technology has been publicly available for nearly 20 years without significant upgrade. What other piece of digital equipment are you using that is 20 years old – a mobile phone, a computer? I doubt if anyone could produce anything beyond a high quality CD player.

The decision to scrap the Asian Network is bizarre, ill-founded, possibly malicious and definitely counter to the BBC's wider claims of representation and diversity. I move.

Luke Crawley (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*) seconded Motion 65.

He said: As one of the biggest unions in broadcasting, we have got thousands of members working in the BBC and, specifically, on the Asian Network. I would, of course, endorse the comments of my colleague, Robert Noakes, from the Musicians' Union, and I would like to focus a little more on the employment issue surrounding the proposal to close the network.

When the BBC announced the closure, it was part of a package of proposals including 6Music, a number of cross-platform services including Blast, Switch and also, significantly, 25 per cent cuts in the workforce of the BBC website, one of the most popular in the world, never mind just in Europe. The BBC tabled the proposals and when we went to talk to them about the detail they were unable to be clear about the impact on jobs. As with so much that the BBC does, and you will be hearing more about this in the pensions debate tomorrow, there was a political dimension with the BBC complaining that it was getting out of areas which the market was currently serving. That is not the case. 6Music was doing something which nobody else was doing. The Asian Network is clearly doing something that nobody else is doing. 6Music has been saved following an extraordinarily successful web campaign. Unfortunately, the Asian Network is still facing closure.

I want to tell you a little bit of history. Once upon a time when the Asian Network was in its infancy, it was based in Leicester, a city with a considerable Asian population. It is near other cities, such as Birmingham and Coventry, which also have a good number of Asian communities, and there is no doubt that these surrounding communities nourished the station and helped it to grow in providing a valuable service to Asian people across the country. It was then, however, uprooted and transplanted down to London. We voiced some concerns about this at the time and, in hindsight, unfortunately, our fears were realised. The station was cut off from its roots and it began to lose its way. It did not seem to know exactly what it was broadcasting to or to whom. I think the focus groups had got a firm group on the direction of travel.

Given time, however, we think it could have re-established its links and made new links with Asian communities in Bradford, Manchester, Salford, Scotland, Wales and across the country, but the BBC was not prepared to give it the time to do that. Instead, they decided to close it as a national network. They have told us that they will continue to broadcast the same amount of programmes but in different places with no reduction in the amount of broadcasting altogether and they claim no reduction in jobs. I think, as my colleague said earlier, we will have to wait and see about that, because so far, and we are now some many months after the first proposal, we have yet to have a full meeting to discuss how they intend to take things forward. We believe it is a mistake. We think the BBC, as the biggest public service broadcaster in the United Kingdom, has a duty and an obligation, as part of its remit, to do what the market does not do and does not want to do. The BBC needs to expand its coverage of the diverse cultures based throughout the United Kingdom, celebrate diversity, language and culture, and allow more opportunities for these programmes to be broadcast to do just that. It should preserve the Asian Network. I second.

David Cockayne (*Equity*) supported Motion 65.

He said: President and Congress, Equity campaigned over the closure of the BBC Asian Network but, first, here are some of the things that Asians have done for us in Britain. In 1879 Frederick Akbar Mahomed published path-breaking work on hypertension and

high blood pressure. In 1889 Cornelia Sorabji was the first woman to study law at Somerville College, Oxford, and helped open the legal Bar to women. In 1986 Kumar Ranji, from India, made his test cricket debut for England against Australia at Old Trafford. He then went on to revolutionise the art of batting.

In 1910 Sophia Duleep Singh headed the Black Friday Suffragette march with Emmeline Pankhurst. Krishna Menon became a Labour councillor in St. Pancras, where his work in the arts continues today as Camden Art Festival. He joined with Allen Lane of Penguin Books and brought out the first Penguin paperbacks. Numerous Asian writers worked for the BBC from the '40s onwards launching authors such as V.S. Naipaul in the 1950s. In 1946 the Asian Music Circle was founded encouraging yoga, dance and Indian classic music, which in turn influences popular music today. In 2001 four per cent of the UK's population were Asian, and they were estimated to contribute six per cent to the GDP.

During 2009 Equity vigorously campaigned against cuts to *Silver Street*, a drama production on the Asian network, and then, with the FEU, argued against the proposals to close the Asian Network itself in 2010.

The result? As we heard earlier, 6Music was saved. The BBC Trust accepted a formal proposal for the closure of the Asian Network, which said that "the proposal must include a proposition for meeting the needs of the station's audience in different ways".

The BBC has just launched a new Asian strand which will provide six hours of drama year reduced from the previous 27 hours. The BBC is unique in serving all audiences, especially those not covered by commercial broadcasters and in providing a platform for young artistes. Both of these criteria apply to the Asian community as a whole and to its current and future creative workers. The BBC must recognise the value of radio for diverse audiences by both preserving and expanding its world-leading drama and entertainment. At £23,000 an hour, the BBC spends on radio drama about one 40th of what it costs to produce an hour of television. It should do more of it for the Asians and for all of us.

The closure will be a great loss to Equity's Asian members and the Asian community and runs contrary to the BBC's stated position on meeting diverse audience needs. It must ensure that commitments made in the Strategy Review, to better fund the production of quality content, are made generally applicable to radio drama.

Action is urgently needed to cater for Asian audiences and ourselves.

Jeremy Dear (*National Union of Journalists*) spoke in support of the motion.

He said: Congress, yesterday delegates passed a resolution backing co-ordinated industrial action against cuts. Minutes later 12,000 BBC workers, members of the NUJ, BECTU and Unite named two dates for co-ordinated 48 hour strikes against the BBC pensions robbery. (*Applause*) The *Daily Mail* today, on its front page, screams, "BBC unions have declared war on the Tories" and "Strikes will coincide with major news events: David Cameron's speech to the Tory Party Conference" and "George Osborne's announcement of savage public service cuts". But the reality is that if there is a war it is not a war that we started. But we will fight to defend our pensions and to avoid our members facing poverty in retirement.

The BBC's proposals to cap pensionable pay at one per cent means that workers, saving all their working lives, stand to lose thousands of pounds every year; tens of thousands of pounds over the period of their retirement. The BBC and, of course, the *Daily Mail* tell

us that there is no alternative. But then we balloted. More than 90 per cent voted for strike action. It forced a re-think. The BBC has now put forward new proposals. They are an improvement but they remain unfair and unacceptable. How can it be fair to ask workers to pay almost double to be worse off in retirement? How can it be fair for those at the top to enjoy six figure annual pensions whilst the majority lose tens of thousands of pounds from their deferred wages in retirement, and how can it be fair when, for over 13 years, the BBC took a partial pensions holiday, underpaying to the tune of around £1 billion, and now seek to claw that back from hardworking staffs' pockets?

We support everything that has been said about the BBC's remit, but you cannot deliver such a remit without a skilled and dedicated workforce and you don't build dedication, commitment and skills by attacking the terms and conditions of your own workers. The BBC has an opportunity to avoid strike action. We are not saying that there can be no change, but change must be fair. It must help the BBC deliver its remit, not enable the continuation of a runaway gravy-train which delivers excessive management salaries and creates an environment in which senior managers think it's okay to spend £5,000 travelling to the World Cup when they are not even working there.

The implications of this dispute go beyond the studios of the BBC. Public sector employers and government are watching the outcome. What happens today at the BBC may be replicated in the civil service, local government and health and education workplaces tomorrow. That's why co-ordinated action is necessary, why your support is vital and why the TUC must see this battle as one we must all win.

* *Motion 65 was CARRIED*

Arts funding

John Smith (*Musicians' Union*) moved Motion 66.

He said: Conference, yesterday we had an in-depth debate about the way the proposed government cuts will impact on our public services. Now I want to explain how they are going to hit our little sector compared with what we were talking about yesterday. There is no doubt that the arts are vitally important to the UK's economy. The facts and figures certainly bear this out. The UK has the largest cultural economy in the world relative to GDP, with every pound invested in arts and culture producing £2. Two-thirds of the adult population in the UK enjoy the arts. Music alone contributes nearly £5 billion to the UK economy, so at a time when our general economy is struggling, it is illogical to cut spending on this sector and potentially cause permanent damage to arts and cultural provision, which is one of the few areas which has constantly maintained growth. Between 1997 and 2006 the creative economy grew faster than any other sector, accounting for two million jobs and £16.6 billion worth of exports in 2007.

Arts and culture are also central to tourism in the UK. This was worth £86 billion in 2007 or 3.7 per cent of GDP, and directly employed 1.4 million people. In addition the cultural sectors made a real contribution to the country's social and economic recovery in the past decade, through offering work, learning, training and social and community engagement. The arts represent the creative future. They develop the creative individuals on which Britain's economy must depend.

The new coalition Government has already asked the Arts Council in England to make cuts of £19 million to its budget, and the upcoming Comprehensive Spending Review could cause the Department of Culture, Media and Sport to make additional cuts of more than 25 per cent. If cuts of 25 per cent or more are passed on to the

Arts Council, jobs in the creative sector will undoubtedly be at risk. That is not to say that the arts sector doesn't recognise the need to contribute to the economic recovery, but it has already sustained significant cuts with £112.5 million of Lottery funding being diverted to the Olympics, in addition to year-on-year grant in aid cuts.

The Government must make sure that it does not permanently destroy one of the only consistent, innovative and successful parts of the UK economy. It must not throw the baby out with the bathwater.

The creative sector will also need to be careful to ensure that jobs are the main priority if, as it seems inevitable, cuts have to be made. We in the MU believe that if push comes to shove arts organisations should concentrate on maintaining employment levels and the unique skills base in the sector, even at the cost of the short-term loss of new projects. This is in order to protect not just the jobs but the future capacity for growth. We are not anti-innovation nor ambition, but we simply want to ensure frontline services and jobs are the primary short-term concerns.

I am not just talking about the Royal Opera House and the other large artistic establishments here. There are hundreds of organisations which rely on the Arts Council and local authorities for the major part of their funding. However, all of these, when the cuts come, have a tipping point, when drastic damage could be caused, and this is between 10 per cent - 15 per cent. This could turn hardship into catastrophe. The UK is a world leader in arts and cultures. This is provided not just for an elite but because of our system of state funding it is accessible to everyone. If we want the cultural sector to continue to thrive and continue to be internationally competitive, the funding system must be protected. Once these organisations close, there is no going back. They will be gone forever. Please support.

Malcolm Sinclair (*Equity*) spoke in support of Motion 66.

He said: Congress, I am quite aware that arts funding may seem rather a side show to some of the bigger issues we have been discussing this week. Public spending on the arts is tiny. It is one per cent of the NHS budget; it is the cost of a pint of milk for each family each week, but it does support a massive industry. The creative industries are second only to the financial services in terms of generating income for the UK. Well, we may be no longer second.

Let me quote you some figures in addition to those which John has just quoted to you. The Department of Culture, Media & Sport estimate that the economic contribution of the performing arts is around £3.7 billion a year in terms of gross value added. In 2003 it is estimated that the sector's exports were worth £240 million. Nearly two million people are employed in the creative and cultural industries. The National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts has calculated that with government support a 9 per cent annual growth rate can be achieved by 2013 to the sector. This would boost gross value added to £5.8 billion and create £185,000 new jobs. It is an industry that is growing. If the way out of current economic downturn is through growth, then clearly our industry can take a lead.

The Arts Council's subsidy of £121.3 million to the theatres, which is my field, generates in the region of £2.6 billion. This case has been put to the Government and it has never been contradicted. Yet we understand severe cuts are on the way. Our experience supports the arguments put forward yesterday that these cuts are as much ideological as economic. If cuts of up to 25 per cent or more are imposed on our sector, the catastrophic damage will not just be limited to us, but

to tourism, the country's exports and to the commercial side of our business which relies heavily on the subsidised sector.

As well as revealing the ideological bent of the Coalition, what is happening to us is a paradigm of what is happening to all of us. This shows in the utter lack of consultation. Let me give you an example. The UK Film Council was abolished without any consultation or any prior notice. The people working there discovered they were losing their jobs through a press release. That well-known trade unionist, Clint Eastwood, was made to protest. Thank you.

In response to our campaign against the UK Film Council's abolition, Ed Vaizey has written to us to explain the decision and, in reply, I suggested we should meet to discuss cuts in the whole cultural sector. Have a consultation. It seemed reasonable. We are told that this will not be possible until after the Comprehensive Spending Review. He will not be meet any of us individually, but he will meet all the entertainment unions for 45 minutes. This simply isn't serious. We ask you to support this motion.

Subsidy is there to make arts available to all and not just to the monied elite, which is why this Cabinet does not appear to be listening.

Julie Flannagan (*Prospect*) spoke in support of Motion 66.

She said: Congress, Prospect supports Motion 66 and our colleagues in the Musicians' Union in opposing the cuts to funding in the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. Prospect represents members in national galleries and museums where these cuts will cause a funding crisis, inevitably leading to job losses and a skills drain. The impact will also affect the public. Already the national museums in Liverpool are discussing closing their doors for one day a week, reducing access and educational opportunities. The spectre of the re-introduction of entry charges is already lurking around the corner.

Throughout the 1990s Prospect led a campaign to end museum entry charges as a way of raising visitor numbers, particular from the poorest in our communities. This campaign was successful when, in 1997, the Labour Government instigated free entry to museums and galleries. Since 1997 visitor numbers have increased steadily to their now record levels. Many museums ensure that issues of social inclusion are at the heart of their outreach policies. There is no doubt that any return to the use of entry charges will make a visit to a gallery or a museum a costly day out, removing the ability of hard pressed parents to provide crucial education opportunities and, once more, making culture and heritage the preserve of those wealthy enough to afford that privilege.

The issue of jobs is also important to our members who are now facing redundancies, only to be replaced by a volunteer army under Cameron's Big Society.

Congress, Prospect will oppose such moves not only to protect our membership but also to protect the skills and dedication that they bring to their jobs and the subjects brought to life for many.

Cuts will also affect urban regeneration. Museums have been at the heart of many cities' attempts to rebuild, Manchester and Liverpool amongst them. Funding restrictions to the sector will halt this process, thereby cutting the ability of local authorities to build sustainable culture for their citizens.

Congress, defending funding for the arts is not some call for the defence of elitist pursuits enjoyed by the few but is actually at the heart of many of the themes we have discussed here – social inclusion, education and the defence of jobs and skills. The culture sector is not a drain on government finances, but in fact a

driver in the economy delivering spending by visitors from all over the world. Congress, please reject this short-term view and support this motion.

* *Motion 66* was CARRIED

England bid to host the 2018 World Cup

The President: I now call Motion 67, England bid to host the 2018 World Cup. The General Council support the motion.

Gordon Taylor (*Professional Footballers Association*) moved Motion 67.

He said: Mr President, Congress, as a Mancunian, I would like to welcome you all to Manchester. It is not just the birthplace of the PFA, the heart of football, but of course I am very much aware of the history of this area, and Manchester, with regard to the TUC and the Labour Party. I would endorse what Malcolm was saying about the arts, culture, and sport. I am not sure about the media; that may need another department. I would just say that the finest test of any civilization and society is exemplified by the way it looks after its art and its sport, and it is not just that healthy mind and healthy body. I have seen it firsthand in Manchester with the quality of entertainment, the quality of sports arenas, and the way we hosted the Commonwealth Games. Yesterday, the police in looking after their employment figures, like we all are, were quick to remind us that in a time of recession and cuts, and people losing their jobs, it may cause divisions. I would like to think that sport, and football, is one item that will try and bring us together.

I am reminded, really, of Billy Meredith. He was a famous Manchester City/Manchester United player who looked to form the Players' Union at the Imperial Hotel Manchester in 1907. Just two years later because of the very fact that Billy Meredith and his colleagues in the North West wanted to form a union they were told if they were in a union they would be suspended. They became known as the outcasts. Not only did they want to form a union, they wanted to be in the TUC. The season for 1909 was delayed and then in the end they were told they could join the union but they could not join the TUC. Well, we eventually got there and I hope Billy Meredith would have been pleased with what has happened with his players since.

I am reminded when looking for support for 'England United the World Invited' that this is one area we can all be together again and should be proud of. I remember the difficult times of the 1980s when there was terrible crowd behaviour, crowd control, and we decided at the PFA that it was time the game had a corporate social responsibility. That is why it was particularly pleasing when we saw South Africa host the World Cup and the behaviour of supporters, and not least the English supporters. But there was a time in the 1980s when it needed sport, and football, to try and show that football was more than just about results, to try and use football clubs as a focal point for community activities, to involve the disabled, and to have proper equality policies. I am reminded as well in Manchester of the exhibition, supported by the footballers, on Black Victorians and the contribution they have made to society in this region.

Since that time, quite unbelievably, really, and unique in the world, every club has bought into its community responsibilities. Last year over 39,000 visits were made by professional footballers to community activities using sport against drugs, against crime, and in the same way now we in this country have encompassed more players from more countries than anywhere else in the world, and they have played their part. Nowhere better is that illustrated than when we celebrated our centenary just two years ago to raise £1m for a new rehabilitation unit for the new state-of-the-art Manchester Children's Hospital.

Ladies and gentlemen, I hope that this is one subject where we can all be together again. We have the stadiums and we have the people. This country should be proud of its diversity, it should be proud of the fact that it probably contains more nationalities than any other country in the world. We have the hotels, we have the transport, but above all we have the keenness of our foreign players to play in this country where they have been welcomed, and to be able to welcome their countrymen. Ladies and gentlemen, I hope you can support the motion. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Peter Pendle (*Association for College Management*) seconded the amended Motion 67.

He said: Unfortunately, I am not an expert in football. I am a Leyton Orient supporter. *(Laughter)* What I do know is that football is the world's most widely played sport. There are more members of FIFA than there are members of the United Nations. Football is played by men and women of all ages and the women's professional game is rightly growing in importance. A successful 2018 World Cup bid will, as the motion says, bring many benefits beyond the game itself: investment, jobs, marketing opportunities, tourism, and so on. Of course, there will be social benefits. Football is played in our schools and colleges and is as popular as ever at grassroots level. A successful World Cup bid can reinvigorate football in our schools, colleges, and communities. It can lead to more interest, better facilities, improved funding, and it is not just football that could benefit. Improved facilities in schools, colleges, and the wider community will benefit other sports as we are already seeing in the run-up to the Olympic Games 2012. Colleges in the Olympic boroughs are making a leading contribution in training the young people of Newham and Waltham Forest, and Tower Hamlets and the rest, to be able to ensure that the Olympics are an overwhelming success and leave a genuine legacy for the East End of London. Those young people training now will ensure a career for the rest of their lives.

Football can bring different races together, probably more than any other sport. In South Africa we saw supporters unite behind their national teams and on a wider level fans from 32 nations embraced the spirit of competition. Perhaps the motion should not talk of an England triumph. If the bid is successful, let's hope that all of the home nations qualify to take part. *(Applause)* As we know, there are no easy games in international football now. In the major international tournaments all of those nations taking part have at least a chance of success, apparently even Lichtenstein. Please support the motion. *(Applause)*

Max Hyde (*National Union of Teachers*) spoke in support of Motion 67.

She said: We support the England bid to host the 2018 World Cup. Football is played and loved by millions. It is a family game. It is a passion that transcends national boundaries and barriers of class and gender. It is a game played in some form or other not by thousands but by 1.1 million women and girls in England and 4.6 million women across the world. *(Applause)* Forty-two per cent of the children in the FA Tesco Skills Programme are girls. Therefore, it is vital to use the good offices of the PFA to facilitate alliances to get important messages across, to promote - with sister unions - equality and international solidarity. There has been some excellent work already. Together we will keep on saying, "Show racism the red card." *(Applause)* Together we will keep on tackling homophobia and kick homophobia out of football and everywhere else. *(Applause)*

Earlier this afternoon in Parliament, in Westminster, over 80 MPs gathered together to celebrate 1GOAL,

the global campaign for education which used the power of the World Cup to generate awareness of the 72 million children not able to attend school, the majority of which, 41 million, are girls. The NUT and our sister teacher unions have long played a key role in the global campaign for education. Over 9,000 schools have signed up to 1GOAL, and that is one million children in our country. I am proud to say that two of the keynote speakers at the meeting today were the Steve Sinnott Foundation young campaigners, Rowan and Rehana.

However, there is something really important that is not in the motion as it stands. There is a huge body of evidence to show that domestic violence increases whenever there is a large sporting event. In the 2006 World Cup some parts of the country experienced a 30 per cent increase in domestic violence. In 2010 there were 221 reports in West Yorkshire alone of domestic violence after the England-Slovenia match and 284 after the England-Germany defeat, so win or lose violence happens. Let's be clear, I am not vilifying football and its supporters; what I am saying is that football can be an important part of the solution. Look at page 29, Midlands TUC, an inspirational event. I leave you to read it. Bill Shankly, legendary Liverpool manager and, as I am sure Dougie would want me to point out, Scottish footballer, said: "Someone said to me ----

The President: What I would like is for you to come to an end.

Max Hyde: Do you want me to quote or finish?

The President: Okay.

Max Hyde: He said, "To me football is a matter of life and death." And I said, "Listen, it's more important than that." So I am saying, let's work together, trade unions, to show domestic violence the red card. *(Applause)*

Sue Stelfox (*Prospect*) spoke in support of Motion 67.

She said: Prospect strongly support amended Motion 67. We particularly welcome the emphasis in the motion on the potential that football has to heal division and bring people together. We also welcome the amendment which broadens the motion to promote anti-racism and equality in sport. Leading on from this we feel that it would also be an ideal opportunity to raise awareness of the homophobia and transphobia that unfortunately exists within many sports, including football. The situation for LGBT sportsmen and women has improved in this country in recent years.

The Justin Campaign has been set up in memory of Justin Fashanu to tackle homophobia in sport and it is in alliance with a number of organisations, notably including the TUC, the PFA, and the FA. A small number of courageous sportsmen and women, such as the rugby star Gareth Thomas, have been able to be open about their sexuality. By the law of statistics, there will be gay footballers of similar status to Gareth Thomas. If they could be encouraged to find the courage to come out they would provide an example to all LGBT sportsmen and women. Unfortunately, however, there is still a long way to go before sexuality is no longer an issue in many sports, hence the need to take the opportunity to address the issue as part of the World Cup bid.

On the international front the situation is much worse. For example, in South Africa, the country that staged this World Cup, Eudy Simelane, a former star of the

national women's football team, was raped and murdered in April 2008. This was because she was openly lesbian and a campaigner on equality rights. Such so-called corrective rapes are common in South Africa despite LGBT equality being enshrined in its constitution. Strong statements against homophobia and transphobia as part of the World Cup bid will send a message around the world.

Congress, please support England's bid and let's include all strands of equality as an integral part of England's bid. Please support Motion 67. Thank you. *(Applause)*

* *Motion 67 was CARRIED*

Academies, free schools and state education

The President: I call Composite Motion 12, Academies, free schools and state education. The General Council supports the Composite Motion.

Christine Blower (*National Union of Teachers*) moved Composite Motion 12.

She said: Congress, this composite is about the future of education, about saving our schools, about a good local school for every child and for every community. It spells out our opposition to the fragmentation and privatisation of our education service and our support for a state-funded and democratically accountable education service. This coalition rushed through the legislation to create new academies and free schools with indecent haste. Not since the Dangerous Dogs Act of 1991 has legislation, other than that to counter terrorism or to deal with an economic crisis, been rushed through all its parliamentary stages in quite this fashion, and yet despite the Secretary of State's claim in the early summer that 1,100 schools had applied, only 32 academies opened this term; hardly a flood, more, as Brendan said earlier, a feeble dribble. Perhaps this is not such a surprise, really, because we know from an Ipsos MORI poll published in April which was commissioned by our sister unions, the NASUWT and UNISON, that a majority of the public want state-funded schools kept public and run in a publicly accountable way by local authorities. Schools run by local authorities are preferred to other so-called providers, such as charities, parent groups, or of course private companies. Just four per cent of the public favoured state-funded schools being run by the private sector so that means that 96 per cent were opposed to this kind of privatisation of our schools. I call that a very clear and very healthy majority. *(Applause)* Thank you.

The education unions' ongoing campaign against academies and free schools can genuinely claim to have had some successes but there is still much to do. We oppose academies and free schools, or what we may more properly call free market schools because they represent privatisation, and in the case of academies assets which should be community assets being handed over to unaccountable institutions. We oppose academies and free schools because they represent a direct threat to coherent national pay and conditions. We also oppose them, though, because international evidence shows that they quite simply do not come up with the goods for many children.

Evidence from Denmark shows that less differentiated, more economic and comprehensive systems, are more efficient at adjusting to students' socioeconomic backgrounds and thus provide more equal learning opportunities for all students. In America, charter schools do not have better outcomes, either, for the children and young people that they work with. Research results show that 83 per cent of charter schools are absolutely no better than the public school system and in lots of cases significantly worse than the equivalent public schools. In Sweden, Bertil Ostberg,

Education Minister, has warned the British Government not to introduce privatised schools. He said: "We have actually seen a fall in the quality of Swedish education since free schools were introduced," and "The free schools are generally attended by children of better educated and more wealthy families, making things even more difficult for children attending ordinary schools in poor areas."

We know from previous research that the existence of free schools in Sweden has exacerbated segregation on the basis of social class and ethnicity. That, colleagues, is a two-tier system. We all know we are not in the same boat but the fact is we are not in the same schools, either. All this talk about being in the same boat, though, reminds me of a particularly famous boat. It puts me in mind of the Titanic. A lot of people were in the same boat on the Titanic but the fact is there were very different outcomes for those in first-class from those in steerage *(applause)* and privatising and fragmenting our schools will reinforce that kind of division throughout society.

From this rostrum we have already heard about BSF cuts, and many other cuts. However, this Government has found money to fund the New Schools Network, a charity set up to assist those wishing to establish free schools. Is this a good use of public funds? I do not think so. Taxpayer-funded education, state education, should be about enriching the lives of young people, not lining the pockets of owners or shareholders of private companies. Congress, education is a right, not a privilege. We need to work together, trade unions, parent groups, the National Governors Association, the Anti-Academies Alliance, and school students themselves, to say no to this ideological attack on free state comprehensive education. We need to work together to keep the education service of which we are so proud in the hands of ourselves and not privateers and profiteers. *(Applause)*

Mary Bousted (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*) seconded Composite Motion 12.

She said: The ConDem Government promises that its policies will give back schools to teachers, parents, and pupils. Academies and free schools are sold to the public and the media as places where the head teacher will know the name of your child, where teachers are free to choose what and how to teach. Now, who could possibly object to this vision of motherhood and apple pie – only those who understand the real consequences of the coalition policy. Let us be very clear, if the Government gets its way the consequences not only for those who work in education, teachers and support staff, but also for those who are the end users, parents and pupils, are dire.

The vision promoted by Michael Gove and his ministerial minions hides a radical agenda which is this: the Secretary of State is a privateer. He wants to change fundamentally the role of local authorities forcing them to compete with one another to provide services to schools. He wants to open the doors to companies who are ready and waiting to make millions out of the money which should be spent on schools. At our fringe today ATL launched a directory of those companies. It is available on our stand. It says who they are, what money they have available to them, how they spend their finances, and what they want to do in education, and it is frightening. Expect to see a massive expansion of change of schools owned and run by the private sector, funded with taxpayers' money. These are state-financed schools with no state control. The Government's misnamed Free Schools Policy provides an open door for those interested companies that are listed in our directory to make a killing. Those misguided parents or teachers who set up a free school will soon find that their responsibilities extend way beyond knowing Emma or Henry's names. Employing

staff, maintaining buildings, marketing the school, finding economies of scale which will pay the bills, all point in one direction, get that friendly Capita, or Cognita or GEMS, to do all those difficult jobs for you and so by stealth state-funded schools paid for by our taxes become the property of the companies who run them.

Does it matter who runs your school? Yes, it does. If you are an education worker you will find that gradually you work under more constraints as the profit motive takes over. If you are a parent of a child with special needs or lower academic ability, or if you are poor and cannot afford the uniform of the academy you will find it near impossible to fight for a place in your school. Hard to educate children drag down results and no pupil premium is going to stop some schools playing fast and loose with the admissions code. If you do get into a free school of your choice, you may find that far from the curriculum and teaching approaches being suited to your child, their educational diet may consist of individualised computer programmes and worksheets as a one size fits all standardised curriculum is taught throughout the change of schools; a Ford company model, you can have any curriculum as long as it is black.

For all these reasons, it is important that the joint education union campaign on academies goes from strength to strength. Michael Gove cannot get out from under the fact that his promise of over 1,000 academies opening in September ended up with 32. This is a battle we can win together and for all the reasons I have given you today in this speech we will do so. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Kathy Taylor (*University and College Union*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 12.

She said: UCU wholeheartedly backs the NUT in its fight against academies. Academies do not just impact on schools; they impact on and have posed a real threat to further education as well. We know of at least one college that has lost half a million pounds in funding because of the creation of a new academy. This is the last thing that our sector needs right now with many colleges facing huge cuts to their adult learning budgets. If talk of academies and free schools was not bad enough, this Government has now pledged to create 12 university technical colleges over the life of this Parliament. This new generation of technical academies for 14-19 year olds is the brainchild of a former Conservative Education Minister, Lord Baker. You may well remember him.

Those in favour of university technical colleges say that they will bring more variety to the education landscape and help train teenagers to become the builders, technicians, and engineers of the future. No one should be taken in by those claims. The simple truth of that is we do not need yet another form of specialist academy. At present further education colleges working in full partnership with local schools provide high-quality vocational education for this very age group as part of the student's overall school curriculum. We could end up in a situation where the two are competing and funds are being diverted from colleges to these new institutions. Technical academies will take students out of mainstream schools and segregate them into the narrow and limiting environment. By encouraging children to choose between academic and vocational routes at the age of 14 we are paving the way for a two-tier education system with vocational learning being seen as the second-rate option. There is absolutely no evidence that these proposals will add value to what exists already. What they will add is duplication, confusion, social division, and the diversion of already scarce and reducing resources.

This coalition Government has talked a great deal since coming to power about the importance of further education; why can they not trust us to do our jobs? Further education colleges have a fantastic track record of working with 14-19 year olds, and local employers, and the country needs this expertise now more than ever. Colleagues, and Congress, please support the motion. *(Applause)*

Austin Harney (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 12.

He said: This outrageous ConDem Government is about to launch the most savage attack on the education services that support the children of the poorest working class families as well as many ethnic and disabled children. In July, this Government used the same emergency powers as the anti-terror legislation to rush this Bill through the Commons. According to the Secretary of State's statement 1,100 schools applied for academy freedoms, but this statement is untrue as they were only expressions of interest; only 153 schools applied for academy status with just 32 new academies opening this term.

The intention of this Government is to take all schools out of local authority control by becoming academies or free schools simply by a vote of the governors, but there will be no consultation with parents, teachers, support staff, or the local authority itself. In addition, governors will be appointed, not elected, and such future schools will not be covered by the Freedom of Information legislation. Each new academy and free school will receive its share of local authority money and the control fund will be reduced accordingly before they buy into the local authority services. There is no doubt removing academy funding from local authorities will damage the wellbeing and education of children with special educational needs. Such services include safeguarding issues, such as education, psychology services, and specialist support for teaching of the deaf, autism, dyslexia, and so on.

Another important factor is exclusion. Permanent exclusion rates in academies last year were almost three times higher than those in schools as a whole, and almost double the rate for the local authority maintained secondaries. Pupils with special educational needs are over eight times more likely to be permanently excluded from an academy than those pupils with no such needs. Children eligible for free school meals are around three times more likely to receive either a permanent or fixed period exclusion than children who are not eligible for free school meals. In addition, such schools will discriminate against the children of the poorest working class families, particularly ethnic children living in inner cities.

Already the growth of free schools in the United States and Sweden has resulted in increased social segregation, particularly in relation to class. There is great concern about the cost and resourcing of the academy programme, particularly at a time of the recession when schools and local authorities are facing the axe. No doubt this unsympathetic coalition Government could deprive many poverty stricken children of a school place as we can foresee school closures in the future, and which actually is included in the Education Act itself, especially those who are disabled or of ethnic origin. Thus, we could return to the days of no pauper education before 1948. Is that what you want? We need to take a stand now out in the communities or everything our grandparents fought for will be a waste. *(Applause)*

Lawrence Hunt (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 12.

He said: The abolition of Building Schools for the Future is one of the worst examples of the new Government's reckless attitude to the public sector. Abolishing a successful programme that provided work, training opportunities and excellent educational prospects to thousands of construction workers, and even our children, is an act of outright political and economic vandalism. *(Applause)* Thousands of jobs in construction will now be lost. Opportunities for young apprentices to gain skills and training whilst working on the BSF projects have been snatched away. The *Financial Times* stated on 17th August 2010 that the drop in government spending on new schools has started to take its toll on building companies, dashing hope for a sustained recovery in the sector. The aspirations of thousands of children who were invited to design their own classrooms and playgrounds have been cruelly removed. Parents and teachers have also been discarded as the Government launches a violent attack upon state education. It is not merely the hundreds of our schools rebuilding projects that have been lost; there are thousands of other schools round Britain which need refurbishing or demolishing due to the high levels of asbestos in the buildings. These will now not be touched. The cost to the economy in lost tax revenue from construction workers will be immense and the social cost from children learning in unfit environments will have an enduring impact on the children's development. The skills gap will widen as apprentices are not provided and a generation of young potential workers will be thrown upon the scrap heap.

On July 20th the Labour MP, Derek Twigg, uttered the painfully true statement, the poorest areas will suffer the most. The damage that is being done to our industries and to our country, and the myth of cutting the deficit, will lead to far greater problems for Britain in the long term. I attended a fringe meeting today on the abolition of BSF and I want to quote Chris Keats, a colleague of mine from the teaching unions, "You have to remember they have no mandate to govern, these people, no mandate whatsoever. They are only there because of 27 spineless LibDems." *(Applause)* The very fabric of our society is being rapidly unpicked. The labour movement is under attack like never before by a Con-Dem Coalition hell-bent on smashing the services that so many more deliver for so many.

The TUC must lobby the Government as a matter of urgency and reverse the stance on the Building Schools for the Future programme, give our kids their schools and give our builders their jobs. Please support the composite. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Viv Smart (*GMB*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 12.

She said: I am from GMB's Birmingham and West Midlands Region and I just want to say first how disgracefully Birmingham City Council is behaving this week threatening thousands of its workers with the dole. Congress, like our sister unions, we condemn the Government's academies and pre-schools policies. They are a bad idea and badly implemented. In terms of uptake they have been a disaster: 32 Tory academies this September with some more in the pipeline, plus a handful of free schools this time next year. It is not the instant revolution the Tories wanted. In fact, it is clear the public do not care for the Tory academies and head teachers and governors do not seem all that keen either.

So, Michael Gove's revolution has started with a whimper but let's not be fooled, the Government wants this to work and they will throw taxpayers' money at it until it does. They will bribe schools and they will bully them, starving them of other sources of finance, playing fast and loose with the school funding system. The Tories have done this before when they

introduced grant maintained schools, and now they are at it again. Congress, we are onto them and we will not let them get away with it.

I just want to highlight one of the creeping dangers of the Government's academies, which is that they destroy education provision for all the surrounding community's schools. The local authority has a responsibility for the integrated, planned and long-term provision of education and children's services, including services for children with special educational needs, but the local authority system gets thrown into total confusion when a school pulls out to go on its own as an academy. It makes for organised chaos, which is why sensible council leaders up and down the country have joined us in condemning the academy plans. Their responsibilities do not end with the high-flying elite schools which are the only schools this Government is interested in. Gove does not get it but we do, so we support this motion, we support a coherent joined up education system, and we support the campaign against academies and free schools. Please do the same. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Dave Mathieson (*Unite*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 12.

He said: As others have said in this debate, the severe attack on our comprehensive education system that Gove is trying to head up for a ConDem government threatens to undermine the structure of our society and has implications for our children as they grow up. The ConDem academies and free schools will entrench the class division and segregate society. They will divide children and parents against their neighbours. It is right that we focus our campaign work to explain and mobilise the public around the very future of our education system, and to explain how equal and fair we want to see our education system. As a trade union movement we are not just concerned about the industrial implications of the Gove policy, it is a clear threat to collective bargaining and an attack on pay and terms and conditions of staff.

Unite represents school support staff and for them the new academies and free schools are a massive attack on their future terms and conditions taking them out of national collective agreements that are covered by local authorities. The school support staff negotiating body has been put on ice. As things stand, the academies and so called free schools will not fall under its remit. These staff are on low pay. Often these staff are mothers trying to juggle the demands of society against the need and desire for income.

Unite has been proud to work alongside the other education unions over the past few months opposing the creation of the new academies and free schools. Over the summer the trade unions have been part of a broad alliance – parents, governors, and local councillors – campaigning against the opening of the first wave of academies. We will continue to campaign against the ConDem education policy. Unite is committed to a free universal comprehensive education system with every local school a good local school for every child regardless of income or ability. Please support the motion. *(Applause)*

Paula Roe (*NASUWT*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 12.

She said: President, Congress, these academies proposed by Michael Gove of the coalition Government are completely different from those academies of the previous government. They have been foisted upon the public with wholly inadequate opportunities for meaningful consultation and they are the product of hasty emergency legislation. This Academies Act is a blatant attempt to dismantle state education, despite there being little evidence to demonstrate that

academy schools or any structural changes actually raise standards of education. This is Tory policy and it will create a divided society. It will cause education apartheid and widen the educational inequality gap. We are told repeatedly today that 96 per cent of the public do not even want academies or free schools yet the coalition Government used fast-track legislation to push through a bill whilst the majority of MPs were exiting rapidly from Parliament to their holiday destinations.

It was made clear in their opposition to the bill by the unions, and by the Shadow Secretary of State for Education, Ed Balls, that academies and free schools are unlikely to attract greater funding, but free schools will have to be paid for. Free schools are not free. They will cost more and deliver less. The head teachers in them, and non-elected governors, are encouraged to look at ways of making a profit. Michael Gove has actually said that he has no ideological objection to firms making profits by running academies and free schools. Now, that is profit from taxpayers' money, but where is this flood of parents and teachers rushing to set up free schools? The first 16 announced for 2011 are mostly proposed faith schools and ones to be run by private companies. These free schools skim funding from other schools in their area. They drain pupils from these schools and they totally undermine community cohesion. We know from the National Audit Office that future academies may even need additional financial management support in their longer financial health to determine that and yet BSF funds were cut, millions of pounds ripped away from community schools for the majority in order to fund a tiny number of schools for the minority. We are faced with relentless propaganda telling the public that academies and free schools are the way forward, that there is no alternative; but there is. State education has to remain.

On 19th July the NASUWT organised a successful lobby of Parliament against BSF cuts and academies. Joined by other education unions, parents and pupils, we showed co-ordinated action; when unions and communities stand together they can challenge this coalition Government. This is the way forward. When I met my MP on the day of the lobby she commented, as I did, on the beauty of the House of Commons and its building, "Yes," she said, "it's a really good place to work, it's pleasant, it's a positive physical environment. I really enjoy coming to work it's so pleasant." "Yes," I replied, "that's what every member of staff in a state school deserves, what every child deserves, what every parent wants, in a local school." (*Applause*)

* *Composite Motion 12 was CARRIED*

Inclusion

The President: I call Motion 55, Inclusion. The General Council supports the motion.

Lynn Ambler (*Association of Educational Psychologists*) moved Motion 55.

She said: I have been told to say this is my first Congress as a delegate. (*Applause*) Our resolution is based on one agreed by Congress a few years ago when times were less hard and the future more optimistic. We seek to reiterate the movement's commitment to building a fair and equal society that is learned about by children from children in schools and communities. In 2003, UNESCO defined inclusion as a developmental approach that seeks to address the learning needs of all children, youth and adults, with a specific focus on those who are vulnerable to marginalisation and exclusion. The exclusion of those groups is part of the universal struggle for the basic human rights of equality and participation. It encompasses a process of removing barriers and

enabling all students to learn and participate effectively.

Inclusion means we respond to diversity and celebrate differences. A child is included when they are viewed as an equal partner in a school community. Inclusion encourages a sense of belonging and is a process to develop cultures, policies, and practices to include and value all children and young people. It is not merely about providing access to a mainstream school for pupils who have previously not had that access, neither is it about closing down segregated provision and dumping young people in an unchanged mainstream system. Inclusion does not have a fixed state, a blueprint, or a set of criteria. It is about the participation of all children and young people and the removal of all forms of discriminatory practices. It is driven by social justice and the need to remove inequalities.

This autumn's green paper is said to aim to improve radically the entire SEN system but we are pretty sure that Sarah Teather does not think that the identifying of children's needs is the same as we think it is. She looks to transparent funding and streamlined assessment as the answer. She has actually said that her new paper will make life easier but we ask for whom will it make life easier. We need a commitment that systems will adapt to the needs of children rather than vice versa. Let's celebrate those children as a source of richness and diversity, and not as a problem. Inclusion places a premium on full participation and upon respect for social, civil, and educational rights where everybody benefits from the realisation of a welcoming, more socially alert and productive community. The long-term influences include a heightened sensitivity to the challenges that others face, increased empathy and compassion, and improved leadership skills. Inclusive practice can be beneficial to everyone. Research shows inclusion helps the understanding and importance of working together and fosters tolerance and empathy. Similarly, research has shown positive effects for all children in areas such as reading, communication, social skills, peer interactions, development of positive attitudes and perceptions, enhanced social status, educational outcomes, and post-school adjustments.

Real inclusion is worth fighting for but it requires dedication, leadership and a shared philosophy about children's rights. Real inclusion does not rank one child against another or value one above another and real inclusion accepts social visibility and raises human dignity; it rejects morally unacceptable mantras that reduce children in social importance. Congress, I ask you to support the resolution, reaffirm your commitment to all children irrespective of their difficulties and background, and rekindle a vision of a society where all children are equal and valued, and recognised for the contribution they make. Congress, I move. (*Applause*)

Dean Cox (*Community*) seconded Motion 55.

He said: I am a first-time delegate here at TUC. (*Applause*) President, Congress, Community is seconding this motion because we believe it goes to the heart of what we do as unions. This motion is about recognising the needs of all, standing up for the vulnerable, and including the marginalised. This is about ensuring that our public services and our schools are schools for all, that as far as possible all our children are educated together and there are no educational ghettos. Congress, sadly, this is under threat. We have heard about the changes to the policy and the practices in this area but it is all about the funding.

I am the Chair of Governors at Cookley Primary School and a few weeks ago just in time for the start of the

new term the school, run by the Tory Worcestershire County Council, pulled the money for our new build. This was not a BSF school; this was a new build from county council money. It was catastrophic news for the children and for our community. This was money that had been promised ages ago under the Wyre Forest Schools Review. It was supposedly ring-fenced. Well, it seems nothing is ring-fenced from these Tory cuts. New buildings can ensure that schools are inclusive, that there is proper access for all children, and that teaching equipment is up to the appropriate standard.

Tory cuts to this funding threaten the future education of all our children. I have horrible feelings, Congress, that Tories think inclusion in education means including everyone in a class. Our class sizes are growing every term. We now have 33 children in a Portakabin classroom. That is no way to teach our children in 2010. *(Applause)* Congress, let's make a stand today, stand up for our children, stand up for inclusive education, and stand up against the Tory cuts. Please support the motion. *(Applause)*

Kelly Hockley (*Unite*) spoke in support of Motion 55.

She said: Great things have happened over the past few years to include children and young people in education decision-making, and shaping their public services. My sector, community youth workers and not for profit workers, has been at the heart of that great work. As a youth worker many of the projects I have worked on have been funded exactly for the reason of inclusion, to ensure that there are children and young people included. A recent strategy was set up, care councils, to consult and regularly speak with young people. It was my job to work with a couple of these care councils to make sure they were supported in carrying out that activity. The young people I was working with were telling councillors what to do about the high levels of school exclusions amongst looked-after children and young people. The councillors initially wanted to create a general rule for schools that looked after young people would be exempt from school exclusions thus solving the problem. This was not what the young people themselves wanted. They were prepared to say, "No, that's not fair. It's not genuine inclusion." They offered alternatives such as youth workers in schools to support those that need someone to talk to, school mentors to help young people engage with school even when things are difficult at home.

These young people are not supported by me anymore. My organisation closed because of spending cuts. They are not being supported by others in the local authorities; those workers are already overworked and over-stretched. The good work that was done will unravel and those young people will probably not get to make a reality of their ideas. Are the councillors going to listen? Are they even going to turn up to the meetings? Many youth services are already being bulldozed across the UK and if more cuts take place amongst children and young people services and more jobs lost amongst this workforce, you can say goodbye to the levels of inclusion young people have begun to experience.

Was the loss of my job and other people's jobs necessary or fair? Is demolishing of young people's services necessary or fair? Is the continued social exclusion of vulnerable and marginalised children and young people necessary or fair? No, no, it is not. That is the answer. *Unite* support what this motion calls for, skilled and trained workers to build empathy between children, to build integrated communities, and to improve life chances. The trade union movement must send a clear message that we do not think society's children and young people should grow up in a world where society thinks that the exclusion of their young

people and children is necessary and fair. Congress, please support this motion. *(Applause)*

* *Motion 55 was CARRIED*

Threats to local authority education services

The President: I am moving to Motion 56, Threats to local authority education services. The General Council supports the motion.

Susie Hall (*Association of Professionals in Education and Children's Trusts*) moved Motion 56.

She said: I am a first-time delegate today. *(Applause)* Thank you. Congress, a strong education service is of vital importance to the members of every single trade union represented in this hall. It is essential for the life chances of all children and young people, especially in these hard times during recession, rising unemployment and economic stagnation and, more than that, in today's globalised economy only a strong school system can lay the ground for the higher skilled workforce we need so urgently when we face sharpening international competition, to ensure the country's economic future.

Today school-based education is an increasingly complex multi-faceted activity. It encompasses utilising advanced educational technologies to meet a full range of special educational needs and effectively collaborating with other children's services, including social care and health, to mention just some of the major challenges our schools face, and no individual school can deal with all this on its own. This is why the overwhelming majority of local schools welcome and co-operate with their local authority's education support services, yet these services consistently commended by schools every year in the detailed Audit Commission National School Surveys are now being cut back.

Michael Gove's letter of 7th June confirmed that the Government's £1.1bn cuts this year in local government expenditure includes funding for key local authority education and children's services to be cut by £311m. So, we are seeing jobs being lost now affecting school improvement advisers, Early Years consultants, education welfare officers, youth workers and their managers, support to school governors, and many others. That is before the October 20th announcement of the Government's comprehensive spending review spelling out the further cuts to come over each of the next three years. That is not all. As we know, the newly approved Academies Act 2010 facilitates the expansion of highly independent state-funded schools in the form of academy status schools, each of which will receive a share of the money currently spent on centrally provided local authority education support services, threatening the very survival of these services as a key resource for locally maintained schools. The research evidence base for this major policy shift is slim indeed, both nationally and internationally, and no serious debate has yet taken place over its medium and long-term implications, yet this is going to affect the education of future generations.

Delegates, education by its very nature is a collaborative venture based on mutual co-operation and the collective efforts of learners, education services, families, and communities. It is therefore time to protect the expertise and professionalism of central local authority support services which work with Early Years settings, primary schools, and secondary schools every day, rather than endangering their current and future prospects. We need strong education services to support social justice and the quality of life opportunities for all children, young people, and their families. Please support Motion 56. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Lynn Ambler (*Association of Educational Psychologists*) seconded Motion 56.

She said: It is the second time I have spoken at Congress. It took me 40 years to get here so I am going to make the best of it while I can. I am here to second the resolution put by our sister union, Aspect, on the threats to local authority education. Educational psychologists work alongside other skilled professionals to deliver specialist services to schools and children. We are already experiencing the effects of reduction in budgets, restructuring, and deleting of posts. These are going to impact on the delivery to children and to young people very shortly.

Our profession has already been told there is no money for future training. It has been a longstanding problem but until this year educational psychologists' training has been funded by local authorities. Now, in the last fortnight or so, universities have been told not to recruit the 130-some places usually allocated annually for the vocational course that will start or would have started in September 2011. That is a whole year of training that has been cancelled. The knock-on effect three years down the line will be 130 educational psychologists short. Removal of training and the suspension of vocational development in ours and likely in many other professions that support education, added to the redundancies etc., is just a false economy. Ultimately, our services will implode. The worry is that the evidence base for the quality of work carried out by education service professionals will be removed when the Audit Commission is disbanded.

On ESPs there is clearly joined up thinking by the Government. It goes like this: one, run down state education; two, remove the evidence base that there was good practice; then abolish the jobs; and then threaten the survival of the profession by removing training. That is the reality of what is happening to local government and to many of the professionals that are supporting our schools. Congress, I ask you to support Motion 56 and recognise that we need to do something very quickly to protect the education professionals who work to support children in schools. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Irene Stacey (*UNISON*) spoke in support of Motion 56.

She said: President, Congress, let's not be in doubt, the cuts outlined in this motion are huge but what will make these cuts even more painful for our members and the communities they serve is the way in which they will be formulated and the way in which they will be combined with wider attacks on LEAs. In local government rather than spreading the cuts across all services, the Department for Education chose to slash the area-based grant. This was a collection of previously ring-fenced grants, many of which have been targeted at children's services. By picking on this grant in particular the Government have targeted cuts on services to children.

A significant proportion of the area-based grant provides funding for careers and Connexions services. Local authorities were notified of these cuts some months into their financial year. As a consequence they have been forced to make very swift cuts and to backdate them to the start of the financial year. Consequently, many have just made equivalent proportionate cuts leading to massive reductions of over 30 per cent in Connexions services in places. Services such as social work have been specified statutory duties which have to be complied with. Careers and Connexions services, despite their importance, are provided under general duties which make it far easier for local authorities to cut them. But to make matters worse, the cuts have to be seen alongside the coalition's wider education reforms, the reckless experiment with free schools and the attempt

to extend academies, all taking away resources from the education services provided by our LEAs, fragmenting delivery, destabilising attempts to plan provision and ensure that all schools in the community are supported according to their specific needs, and privatizing local authority education departments.

Services must be recognised and protected, Congress. This is in the interests of schools and of the nation's children, and the young children. The combination of cuts and reorganisation being advanced by the Government undermines them just as it undermines our children's future. Congress, there is so much at stake here. Please support the motion. (*Applause*)

Ken Cridland (*National Union of Teachers*) spoke in support of Motion 56.

He said: This motion has three themes: firstly, big cuts are or will be shortly cutting and hitting locally organised education services; secondly, schools are being pushed to be highly autonomous and less likely to buy into these services; thirdly, specialist skills and knowledge will be lost and training and development of specialist staff will suffer. Many of these specialist staff work under Soulbury conditions, educational psychologists, youth service officers, advisers, and school improvement officers, for example. The NUT, the AEP, and Aspect, all represented at this Congress, work together nationally and locally to represent these Soulbury staff.

What the Government and what Edubusiness are pushing for is a market approach to this work. The argument basically goes like this: the market approach is superior and schools know best and therefore buy in what they need from who they want it from. Now, sadly, this ideological driven assertion does not work well in education. In a world where individual schools are under enormous pressure from league tables, they do not always make the right decisions and even if they did schools would be under increasing financial pressure with what is coming, and will protect their own core activities and will not necessarily buy in any external provision. Also, private provision is not good at training and developing specialist staff; in fact, they often poach their own staff from the public sector. Sadly, the result will be, as we have heard so often at this Congress, some of the more needy young people will lose out again. Please support this motion. (*Applause*)

* *Motion 56 was CARRIED*

Result of Ballot for the General Council and General Purposes Committee

Dennis Connor (*Chair of Scrutineers*): Will delegates please turn to the back of the agenda and I will give the results of the ballot for the General Council and the General Purposes Committee.

General Council

Section A (Unions with more than 200,000 members)

Unite (*eight members*)

Tony Burke	Gail Cartmail
Len McCluskey	Dougie Rooney
Derek Simpson	Pat Stuart
Tony Woodhouse	Tony Woodley

UNISON (*seven members*)

Bob Abberley	Jane Carolan
Angela Lynes	Dave Prentis
Alison Shepherd	Eleanor Smith
Liz Snape	

GMB (four members)

Sheila Bearcroft Allan Garley
Paul Kenny Malcolm Sage

Communication Workers Union

(two members)

Billy Hayes Tony Kearns

NASUWT (two members)

Chris Keates Brian Cookson

National Union of Teachers (two members)

Christine Blower Dave Harvey

Public and Commercial Services Union (two members)

Janice Godrich Mark Serwotka

Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers

(two members)

John Hannett Fiona Wilson

Section B Unions with between 100,000 and 200,000 members

Association of Teachers and Lecturers

Mary Bousted

Prospect

Paul Noon

University and College Union

Sally Hunt

Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians

Alan Ritchie

Section C Unions with fewer than 100,000 members

Eleven to be elected * = elected

Name	Union	Votes
Jonathan Baume*	FDA	422,000
Bob Crow*	RMT	341,000
Jeremy Dear*	NUJ	440,000
Mark Dickinson*	Nautilus International	481,000
Gerry Doherty*	TSSA	534,000
Steve Gillan*	POA	385,000
Michael Leahy*	Community	432,000
Jonathan Ledger	Napo	318,000
Joe Marino	BFAWU	327,000
Robert F Monks	URTU	202,000
Ged Nichols*	Accord	449,000
Christine Payne	Equity	329,000
Tim Poil*	NGSU	468,000
John Smith*	Musicians Union	492,000
Simon Weller	ASLEF	130,000
Matt Wrack*	FBU	387,000

Section D Women from unions with fewer than 200,000 members (four to be elected – no contest)

Joanna Brown - Society of Chiropractors and Podiatrists

Sue Ferns - Prospect

Lesley Mercer - Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

Julia Neal - Association of Teachers and Lecturers

Section E Member representing black workers from unions with more than 200,000 members

Mohammad Taj - Unite

Section F Member representing black workers from unions with fewer than 200,000 members

Leslie Manasseh – Prospect

Section G Member representing black women

Gloria Mills –UNISON

Section H Member representing disabled workers

Mark Fysh - UNISON

Section I Member representing Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Workers

Maria Exall – Communication Workers Union

Section J Member representing young workers

John Walsh -Unite

General Purposes Committee (Five to be elected – no contest)

Mike Clancy Prospect

Phil Davies GMB

Peter Hall RMT

Dilys Jouvenat UNISON

Linda McCulloch Unite

The President: Thank you very much. Congress, that concludes this afternoon's business. It just remains for me to remind delegates there are obviously various meetings taking place this evening. Details of these meetings can be found on page 16 in the *Congress Guide* or in the leaflet included in your Congress wallet.

(Congress adjourned at 5.30 p.m.)

**THIRD DAY: WEDNESDAY SEPTEMBER 15TH
MORNING SESSION**

(Congress re-assembled at 9.30 a.m.)

The President: Congress, once again many thanks to The Blue Ribbons who have been playing for us this morning. *(Applause)* I call on Peter Hall, Chair of the General Purposes Committee to give the GPC Report.

General Purposes Committee Report

Peter Hall (*Chair, General Purposes Committee*): Good morning, Congress. I can report that the General Purposes Committee has approved two further emergency motions. Emergency Motion 5 on Connaught will be moved by UCATT, seconded by GMB and supported by UNISON and Unite. Emergency Motion 6 on 26,000 Redundancy notices at Birmingham City Council will be moved by the GMB, seconded by UNISON and supported by UCATT and Unite. The President will indicate when it is hoped that the emergency motions approved so far will be taken. I will report further to you on the progress of business and other GPC decisions when necessary throughout Congress.

The President: Thank you, Peter. Congress, as you know we lost business at the end of the morning and afternoon sessions yesterday. Following this morning's scheduled business, I intend to take the business that we did not take yesterday in the order it was lost from the agenda. That lost business was Motion 49, NHS hospital car parking charges, moved by the Society of Radiographers; Motion 50, Malnutrition and dehydration, moved by the British Dietetic Association; Motion 62, Social care, moved by Community; Motion 79, Cosmetic use of sunbeds, moved by the Society of Radiographers; Composite Motion 13, Defending further and higher education, moved by the University and College Union; Motion 60, Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) referrals, moved by the Association for College Management, and Motion 61, Reforming Ofsted, in the name of napo. This morning, in a change to the published guide, I intend to take the debate on climate change and energy before the debate on the economy and manufacturing. As has been reported, we now have a further two emergency motions. Emergency Motion 5 is on Connaught and Emergency Motion 6 is on the 26,000 Redundancy notices at Birmingham City Council. This means that we have now have five outstanding emergency motions and I will take these as a suitable opportunity arises and endeavour to give Congress as much notice as possible. Is that clear, Congress? *(Agreed)*

We start today's business with a video on the Robin Hood Tax campaign. Congress, as you may know, in February the TUC and 24 affiliated unions joined with development NGOs, like Oxfam, faith groups, like the Salvation Army, and climate change campaigners to launch the Robin Hood Tax campaign. The campaign is calling for a financial transaction tax as a way of shifting the burden of deficit reduction from cuts to taxes and providing resources to fight poverty at home and abroad.

In a moment, we will be introducing our old friend, John Monks, from the ETUC, who has led the campaign to cut down on financial speculation across Europe. But, first, we have a presentation of the Robin Hood Tax video. *(Video on The Robin Hood Tax was shown to Congress)*

Delegates, I am sure you will agree that that was an excellent video and a truly important campaign. I call paragraph 4.1 of the General Council Report.

Address by John Monks, General Secretary, European Trade Union Confederation.

The President: Congress, we now turn to an address by our old friend, John Monks, the General Secretary of the European Trade Union Confederation. This is John's last Congress as ETUC General Secretary as he will be retiring May after completing two terms. But I have a sneaking suspicion that this is not the last we will see of him, as John was elevated to the House of Lords earlier this summer as Lord Monks of Blackley. He is a real trade union baron at last. John joined the TUC in 1969 and became the General Secretary in 1993 before joining the ETUC as General Secretary in 2003. He is a Mancunian born and bred and he chairs the People's Museum here in Manchester, and will no doubt want you all to promise to visit it, if you have not already done so. John, you are very welcome here today and I invite you to address Congress.

John Monks (*General Secretary, European Trade Union Confederation*): President, delegates and fellow guests, it has been seven years, as Dougie said, since I moved from the TUC to the ETUC and left, I believe, the TUC in the very capable hands of Brendan. Brendan has done one thing that I never managed, which is to bring Congress to Manchester, which, as Doug said, is in my home town. As Monday's excellent film displayed, there is a rich history of working class and trade union struggles around here. Besides the original TUC, Manchester had the first factories, the first roots of modern trade unions, Friedrich Engels lived in the city for nearly 30 years, the Co-op started around here, the Pankhurst's and the votes for women campaigns also had their origins in this city. I have to say that yesterday there were some fears that some Glasgow Rangers fans might have re-enacted the city's most famous moment, the Petrol Massacre of 1819. Anyway, happily, on this occasion, that did not happen. You can't escape what Dougie almost advertised, which is that while you are here, please, go and have a look at the brand new People's History Museum, which tells all of these stories and many more of the struggles of working people. It is not just about nostalgia, it is about future and inspiration. I challenge any of you who go there not to be inspired by the stories and the exhibitions which are on display only a ten minute walk away from here.

Seven years back I moved to the ETUC. What's gone right; what's gone wrong? When I arrived in Brussels I went to see a high ranking Irish official in the European Commission, and he said, "Why have you bothered to come?" Jacques Delors had long gone. (I am sure that some of you will remember Jacques Delors at the TUC in 1988). "The economic liberals are in-charge. It is all about deregulation, not more regulation, and your Labour Government is in that particular camp." Straightaway, I ran into opposition when I tried to get rid of the Tory opt-out on working time, and we have still not succeeded. It is a disgrace still that in the UK workers can be pressurised individually to work more than 48 hours a week every week. They don't have to do so elsewhere in Europe, so why here? Does Britain really need to treat our workers in this second class way? Of course, we don't, but we continue to do so.

Another issue is that the EU's Charter of Fundamental Rights emphasises worker rights. As the result of a campaign by the ETUC and others, it has become legally binding on all the 27 Member States of the EU and, by the way, on Norway and Iceland as well. But the UK Government insisted on protecting the UK's restrictive strike laws from being changed by the Charter. We seethed. The CBI cheered.

This negative approach to worker rights in Europe has had serious consequences. We have had legal cases. In the European Court of Justice, the Laval and the Viking

cases, which are the most serious, have hit us hard. The Court determined that when the principles of free movement of people and services clashed with the right to strike, free movement prevails. There was an opportunity for a treaty change to right that wrong. It arose after the Irish had voted 'No' to the new Lisbon Treaty. The Irish Government, under pressure from the Irish Congress of Trade Unions, supported by the ETUC, proposed a new social protocol to re-balance the rights in favour of workers. But it was blocked, again, I have to say principally by the British government. My one message today to you is that we must sort these things out better with the next Labour leadership. This has been an embarrassment and it has been against the workers not just of Britain but across the whole of Europe. *(Applause)* So, frustratingly, the case law remains and, while it does, collective agreements are at risk from employers employing certain migrants on cheap rates. All of you will know instantly that this is a recipe for racism and nationalism and for more calls for British jobs for British workers. I reject that call, but we do insist on equal terms being applied to migrant workers.

There is some good news as well as the bad. We have secured – it was a hard battle but we did it – a directive to give equal pay to one group of disadvantaged workers, agency workers. Half of all the EU's agency workers are in the UK. I say it was a hard battle, but eventually there was a compromise and the Government supported the directive. Now you have got to get it implemented, and I know that is not going to be easy with the UK politics at the present time.

We have also secured a toughening of the role of European Works Councils. There are 900 of these in the largest companies in Europe and there are some 20,000 worker/union representatives. As a result of the changes, they will get a right to be consulted in advance – in advance! – of major management decisions. It will not be a matter of just take it or leave it, not just being consulted on implementation, but in advance of the decision being taken. That, I believe is a very important step.

I just want to mention the European Parliament here. It was a great ally. It is often reviled but on this occasion and on many others it has been a good friend of the trade union movement in this country and elsewhere.

I believe our next great challenge is whether we can we move forward on changing companies are run? Can we move them away from concentrating on short-term shareholder value? Can we have a more long-term socially responsible system, with companies responsible to everybody who is a stakeholder in the company; the workers, the community, the environment and future generations, as well as to shareholders and other owners. I believe that in the UK we have much to learn from some other EU countries on worker involvement in company decision-making. I believe we have to burst into the boardroom to make sure that managers concentrate on growing the business, not growing the share price and their own bonuses.

Let me say that I believe that influence in the boardroom will be better than influence on the picket line as a guide to trade union strategy in the future. Anyway, growing the share price and their own bonuses is what bankers did, with disastrous consequences for all of us. It is workers and their families who are picking up the enormous bills. After a decent Keynesian start, the EU governments panicked when they saw Greece floundering on the economic rocks. They felt that they could be next in line for trouble on the world bond markets. Even the strongest, like Germany and The Netherlands, started austerity programmes and, as you know, the coalition

Government here panicked and followed the stampeding herd towards austerity.

We cannot accept these proposals. I was very pleased to see the campaign launched on Monday by the TUC against the British proposals. Cutting in a recession is crazy, and we must fight it. There is to be an ETUC day of action against austerity for jobs and growth on September 29th. We will have 100,000 people on the streets of Brussels, a general strike in Spain and other demonstrations across many European capitals. I hope that you will all find ways to participate and, certainly, if not on September 29th, support the TUC campaign which clicks into gear a month or so later.

We are still waiting for more positive steps from the EU on the crisis. There is no agreement yet on Euro bonds to fund the weaker countries, nor on that Financial Transaction Tax, which we have just seen that fantastic video about, which is a tax that can help meet the costs not just of the crisis but of climate change, and for Third World development, too. Despite the opposition of the City, and I see George Osborne was supporting them just the other day, we need that Robin Hood Tax so that speculators cannot escape paying a fair share of the debts that they have dumped onto the rest of us. So keep up that work on campaigning. London is a key part of the opposition to what is going on in Europe at the present time. The French and German Governments are supportive, and we have got to get Britain into a more supportive way as well.

Anyway, there is no agreement yet in Europe on stopping the bankers screwing us all again. They are back to business as usual and they are back to bonuses as usual after their near death experience. The rest of us will be paying the bills for a generation. Mervyn King doesn't like what has happened in the City, but what will he do and what will others internationally do in the central banks to stop it happening again? Well, you are going to find out something about that a bit later this morning, and it is a very important subject that he has to address.

Yet despite our own criticisms, despite the set-backs and the inadequacies of the EU, I take the view, and this is the reason why I went to the ETUC those years ago, that the European Union has great potential for good, and I hope that you do as well. Almost unique in the world, the drive for economic growth and profit is tempered by strong welfare states, public services and influential trade unions. The European model is vastly superior for the workers of the world to the Americanised neo-liberal model which has been so dominant in the past 30 years, and it is also superior to our British model. It is more equal and we must promote it here and fight for it throughout the world. That is why UK trade unions must never turn their back on Europe. If Europe succeeds, we must be part of it. If it fails, we are affected, like it or not. If you doubt that, go to the many moving British and Commonwealth cemeteries on the Somme, in Normandy and elsewhere and tell those rows and rows of headstones that Britain has got no place in Europe, because it has and it will always have.

As the President said, this is my last gig at this Congress. I have treasured the relationship for 40 years, and at the risk as sounding as soppy as a Mills & Boon novel, or parts of the Tony Blair biography *(laughter)*, it has been for me a love affair, but people come and go. Happily, the TUC goes on and on, on to face the many challenges raised at this Congress, on to fighting for workers, to combating the racists and the petty nationalists, to grappling intelligently with the coalition Government's austerity for the many and riches for the few. Keep up the fight, never give in. Good luck to the TUC, good luck to you all. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

The President: John, on behalf of Congress, can I thank you for your address and for your contribution to your work of the TUC and the ETUC over many years. Thank you very much, John. *(Applause)*

Climate change

The President: I call Composite Motion 7, Climate change. The General Council supports the composite.

Sue Ferns (*Prospect*) moved Composite Motion 7.

She said: Congress, something quite strange is happening to public perceptions about climate change. A recent YouGov poll reported that popular concern about climate change has declined, citing the harsh winter and the row over global warming, the so-called 'Climategate scandal', as reasons for doubt, but this is a dangerous distraction. In fact, just a few weeks after the YouGov results both the Met Office and the US Goddard Institute, both world-class authorities, published data showing that global temperatures in the first half of this year were the hottest since records began. So let's be clear, in this hall and when we leave it, the science stands. We should celebrate and safeguard the UK's scientific expertise and not deride it. The Met Office, too, is part of the public sector that we all value. No serious commentator really believes that the Copenhagen Summit failed because the scientists had not done their job properly.

But a key lesson from Copenhagen is that there is still more work to be done to get the message across, including to our members and to our communities, and to create greater pressure on politicians to act decisively. The reality is that unmitigated climate change will affect every aspect of our lives. Direct effects in the UK will include more illnesses and deaths induced by heat waves, respiratory problems from increased ground level ozone and increased incidents of sunburn and skin cancers.

Prospect believes that the TUC must continue to show strong leadership on these issues from the global level to the workplace in order to influence policy and practice. It is both interesting and encouraging that the President of the European Commission has got the message. Only last week in his state of the union address, President Barosso said that in striving for sustainable growth, energy is a key driver and a central priority for action. But he went further, emphasising the importance of integrating different strands of policy on climate change, energy, transport and environment into a coherent approach on resource efficiency and a low carbon future. In Barosso's mind, there is a very clear connection with a green industrial strategy. He wants to see three million green jobs by 2020.

But contrast that ambition with what is actually happening in the UK. The Government has been quick to announce cuts of £85 million at the Department of Energy and Climate Change, £34 million of which will directly affect support to low carbon technology. It has abolished the Infrastructure Planning Commission and the Sustainable Development Commission. The previous government's proposals to establish a Green Investment Bank have at best been postponed until after the Spending Review with no guarantee that they will ever see the light of day.

This autumn the Government plans to publish proposals to reform the Climate Change Levy in order to bring more certainty and support to the carbon price. Prospect has long argued for a realistic and sustainable floor price for carbon to encourage investment. But the Government is some way behind the pace of a broad consensus that recognises the need for a more comprehensive programme of measures to

support low carbon investment and ease of transition for carbon intensive sectors.

The disgraceful decision to cancel the loan to Sheffield Forgemasters, which would have supported a vital part of the UK's supply chain for renewables as well as nuclear, will be hugely detrimental. So let's be clear. Green jobs are not only those in the environmental goods and services sector or in the renewable sector, important though those are. Our ambition should be to green employment and skills across the economy so that we have more green jobs and that all existing jobs are done in a greener way, too.

It is worth emphasising that we are interested not only in the numbers of jobs but in the quality of employment created, including opportunities for up-skilling and re-skilling. Green skills are important across a range of sectors, including energy, transport, manufacturing and construction. There is huge scope for plumbers, professional drivers, construction workers and others to broaden their skills base. A recent report by the Global e-Sustainability Initiative estimates that more intelligent use of information communications technology (ICT) could reduce overall emissions by as much as 15 per cent. That means all of us, because we all use computers and other IT applications. But we can't simply rely on the market to achieve these aims. We need a green skills and training strategy, including government investment, effective oversight by the UK Commission for Employment and Skills and effective and on-going consultation with the unions.

Congress, the coalition has pledged to be the greenest government ever, but their actions so far do not support this assertion. We urgently need positive action now, not further consultation or short-sighted cost-cutting. Our motion calls on the General Council to prioritise the agenda. The costs of failure are simply too high and too uncomfortable to contemplate. Thank you.

Tony Kearns (*Communication Workers' Union*) seconded the composite motion.

He said: Congress, I make the point about campaigning for a million green climate jobs. One of the things that struck me and a number of other unions on this subject was in terms of campaigning on climate change. We knew what we were against but nobody really said what it was we were for, so PCS, TSSA, NUT, UCU and CWU, together with academics from Brunel and Oxford universities and workers from Vestas, decided that we needed to put down, if you like, on paper what it is that we want and we came up with the One Million Climate Jobs Now. These are jobs that are going to have a positive impact on the climate. If we are to stop the gradual march of climate change, we are going to need regulation and we are going to need more international agreements. But we are going to need climate jobs in areas of alternative energy, building energy efficient social housing, integrated public transport systems, manufacturing and, as Sue pointed out, in education, training and skills.

Let us be quite clear that we are talking here about government jobs. They can be paid for, as you saw from the video on The Robin Hood Tax, by subsidies and tax. That failed previously to deal with climate change because they left it to the markets to decide. In other words, the markets failed us once again. So what particularly are the areas that we are looking at? This is no flight of fancy. These are jobs that actually need doing today in our society. These are jobs on energy. Look at what happened with the Vestas workers and the wind turbines, and the work put in by the RMT and the Vestas workers to produce an alternative source of energy in that factory – useful energy jobs supported by the trade union movement.

If you look at homes, the estimate is that six million social homes need building and at a time when 10,000 construction workers at Connaught have been made redundant. We need energy efficient homes built in this country.

In transport we need to be re-opening railways and re-opening railway stations. Look at the tram network that runs passed this building. We need the construction of safe cycle lanes so that we have more safer systems. But we can't deal with the issue of climate change, as Sue referred to, without tackling the issue of climate denial.

One of the things that gets thrown at groups that campaign is their position on coal. Let me just read you very quickly what it says about coal: "We want some of the one million jobs to be for the research, design and building of the first working coal plant in the world to capture and store all of its CO₂. If this works safely, it will be an enormous achievement. The people who lead the assault on denial are the *Express*, the *Mail* and *The Telegraph*. Here is a question for this Congress: who's side are you on? Are we going to leave it to the multi-nationals who view the resources of this planet as just something else to extract and for them to make vast profits with and leave devastation behind, or are we on the side of those people who say that there is a problem with climate change and there is a problem with jobs in this country, so let's bring the two together and create one million climate jobs. Let's do it now. Thank you.

Alan Coombs (*Community*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 7.

He said: Congress, climate change is the biggest challenge facing us today. Its reach is global; its impact can be devastating. How we as unions respond is crucial. But the Government also needs to respond. It needs to start implementing policies that enable the UK to meet its climate change and renewable energy targets.

I am a steel worker from Corus in Port Talbot. Steel workers are all too aware of the impact of poor policymaking in this area, but I believe that the steel industry and other energy intensive industries can be part of the solution rather than part of the problem. We can make the steel for the wind towers or for the solar powered buildings, but we can be part of the solution. These industries need to be confident that government policy is made for the long-term. They want to see a return on investment in new green technologies and to know that these efforts will not be undermined by carbon leakage where steel and other energy intensive materials will simply be produced in countries where there is little or no regulations of these emissions.

At my steel plant I am pleased to say that there has been substantial investment in new technology. This has significantly reduced the energy consumption. So we now make some of the greenest steel in the world. All this could be undermined if governments around the world do not renew their efforts to make a binding global carbon reduction agreement. Climate change is not an area where governments or the European Union can act alone. In fact, we are opposed to unilateral action because we believe it will lead to carbon leakage.

Congress, it is vital that we get this right. It is vital for the recovery; it is vital for the economy, and it is vital for thousands of workers across the UK. Please support.

Adam Khalif (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 7.

He said: Congress, the initial contribution by the seconder has taken away most of what I want to say, so I am going to concentrate, if I may, on what PCS's contribution I think has been to this debate. PCS is encouraging activism amongst our members around green issues and have a policy and strategy of encouraging our bargaining groups to appoint green league reps in order to identify good and bad practice, monitor progress and develop a network of branch green reps. We are pursuing agreements with employers through the Office of Government Commerce, the Cabinet Office's Sustainability Forum and negotiations through the Climate Solidarity Project.

PCS supports the composite in particular with regard to the call for a million climate jobs. We are working with other unions, the TSSA, CWU, UCU and a range of academics and NGOs in expanding the pamphlet for production later this year. This pamphlet should show that creating a million jobs is both technically feasible and affordable. It provides a detailed case for investment in insulating homes and public buildings which can cut energy waste and create jobs. It sets out an alternative for green, publicly run transport that can cut emissions and create skill jobs. It argues for public investment in renewable energy that exploits the natural wind and wave resources of the UK. It argues for a new 'Lucas plan' based on the ground breaking book in the late 1970s produced by an engineering union combine committee, Hilary Wainwright and Dave Elliott. This pointed the way for using our engineering knowledge in more socially useful ways. Most importantly, we want to start a debate within and between unions about how we can align protecting our members' jobs, pay and conditions, particularly at this time of rising unemployment, with protecting the planet on which we live. We, obviously, need to leave something behind for our children.

We want to raise these ideas to form a trade union alternative to cuts, to build on the lessons of the magnificent Vestas struggle, which showed both how and why the fight to protect jobs is part of the same fight to tackle climate change. Please support the composite.

Paul Glover (*UNISON*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 7.

He said: Congress, one of the last government's main achievements was to put climate change into the mainstream. The Climate Change Act set a binding target for reductions in carbon emissions. Measures were put in place to actively promote the development of carbon capture and storage technology and a low carbon industrial strategy was introduced to support green businesses. Some might say that the Labour government woke up too late and they didn't go far enough, and in some respects they would be right, but the key point is that they eventually got it. They came to understand that when we talk about the kinds of policies which would help to combat climate change, what we were actually on about is the UK's mainstream economic and industrial policy. We are talking about public investment, government action and market intervention.

Of course, the big danger now is that the coalition's ideological opposition to this policy will undermine the battle against climate change. As one well placed observer recently put it, despite some early promises about being the greenest government ever, the silence from the coalition on the low carbon economy has been deafening. Old orthodoxies are reasserting themselves, as is scepticism about economic intervention, resistance to new taxation and opposition to new spending commitments.

As this composite motion makes clear, the impacts of this approach are already being felt in delayed decisions on a number of key issues, such as the floor price for carbon, a regulatory framework for skills and support for innovation. So what are the costs of this ideological driven refusal to make decisions for the long-term? Of course, there are huge costs to our environment and the planet and there is a huge human cost that is inevitable if we fail to secure the emission reductions necessary to prevent climate change. But there is also a cost we pay for the wasted opportunity we have to create decent green jobs in renewable energy, public transport, electric vehicles, energy efficiency programmes and carbon capture and storage. The potential is there, as this composite points out, for a million green jobs, to build a sustainable economy to replace the wreckage left by neo-liberalism, but only if governments keep climate change in the mainstream of economic and industrial policy. Please support.

Brian Farr (*GMB*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 7.

He said: Congress, climate change is a key issue for us all. It is an industrial and organising issue as much as an emotive issue. Our response to climate change offers the opportunity for the creation of new jobs and a potential to retrain workers in many changing industries and in the sectors. But as the union for workers in the nuclear and aviation industries, we know only too well that the transition to a green economy must be a just transition. It must ensure that workers are not penalised simply because of the section of worker where they work. We must ensure that green jobs are good jobs and that skills are transferred, new skills are acquired and health and safety standards are maintained and improved. A veneer of green wash cannot be allocated to sanitise poor quality or dangerous jobs, as we have already seen happening in the rebranding of waste recycling into the environmental management.

The just transition must also ensure that all industries are considered and protected wherever possible, rather than left to market forces. It is unacceptable for our bedrock manufacturing industries, such as brick making, ceramics and glass, to migrate overseas to Africa or Turkey to avoid carbon taxes. We cannot afford as a society, or as an economy, to lose these core industries and the skilled jobs that they provide.

So we commend the work of the Energy Intensive User Group in highlighting the threat in their recent research activities. The coalition Government has pledged to continue the pro-active approach to climate change, yet at the same time it has taken the axe to industries that would provide critical skills for the new economy. This Government has denied the Sheffield workers of funding worth £80 million, and has shown itself to be less concerned with saving the environment than saving the markets.

As a priority the Government must invest in low carbon skills. It must support those vital high energy using industries that underpin our manufacturing and construction economies, and ensure that justified concerns and views of the workforce are fully heard. It must consider developing policies that will help Britain into a greener future. Thank you.

Rose Jones (*Fire Brigades' Union*): Congress, climate change is a critical issue for the Fire & Rescue Service in the UK and worldwide. It is the greatest environmental challenge facing humanity at present. Climate change will increase the risk of floods, including from surface water, rivers and from the sea. Climate change will affect the supply and availability of water and may give rise to more extreme weather

events. These hazards will have implications for the working conditions of fire fighters. It will require significant changes to fire appliances, to the equipment available to fire fighters for training, to pumping capability and water use and a greater awareness of fire fighters' health and safety.

As far back as 2006 the Department for Communities and Local Government recommended that the fire and rescue services begin to plan for climate change and to have an awareness of climate change when decisions are being made. It recognised that there was a potential for increased workloads all year round. It accepted that there is a clear and demonstrable link between hot dry summers and the number of fires, particularly wild and forest fires. The report also estimated an extra workload of up to 50 per cent more incidents of grassland fires that would stretch the resources of fire and rescue services. It acknowledged that fire crews will be tired from attending more incidents, sickness and injury levels may rise due to fatigue and equipment will be under more strain due to increased usage.

The Pitt Review into the 2007 floods across the UK also made the connection with climate change by concluding that the key message from the update is that the effects of climate change may be more extreme than had previously been estimated; that there is a greater risk of extreme sea level rise; that the risk of flooding including urban flood, will increase.

The FBU believes that the UK Fire Service is not yet prepared for the enormous implications of climate change. There is no logic to job cuts and shutting fire stations when these risks are likely to increase in the years ahead. Fire fighting is a green job and fire fighters can play a vital role in helping society adapt to climate change. So whilst we endorse and support all the areas of change and improvement asked for in this resolution, I wanted to make you aware that, for however long it takes for these changes to happen, the Fire Service has to continue to deal with floods, deal with drought, deal with storms and wild fires with probably less stations, fewer fire fighters and lack of adequate and appropriate equipment. Thank you.

* *Composite Motion 7 was CARRIED*

Coal in a balanced energy policy

The President: Congress, I call Composite Motion 8, Coal in a balanced energy policy. The General Council supports the composite motion.

Nicky Wilson (*National Union of Mineworkers*) moved Composite Motion 8.

He said: Congress, this composite is not based on some argument that the British coal industry should be invested in and expanded because of past wrongdoings driven by political dogma which decimated our industry. The stark facts are that coal usage for electricity generation is increasing dramatically worldwide. Estimates show that there are 847 billion tonnes of coal reserves worldwide. This is enough to last 130 years. At present production rates compare this to optimistic projections showing less than 50 years of oil reserves and gas even lower.

Congress, in 2003 China exported 80 million tonnes of coal. Last year they imported 104 million tonnes, despite producing 3.3 billion tonnes of coal internally for their own use. Because the Chinese Government is closing many of their illegal and unsafe mines, this importation of coal and the continuation and rising of it will last for a long time. You have to link this situation to that in India, Taiwan, South Korea and countries which are ramping up their electricity production, but are also moving away from oil to coal. Even Vietnam, which is at present an exporter of coal,

looks like becoming within a few years a net importer of coal because of its fast growing economy.

There is a wide variance of countries producing electricity from coal percentage-wise. Germany and the USA produce 49 per cent of their electricity from coal; India, 68 per cent, but bear in mind that in India only 40 per cent of the population have access to electricity at this stage, and that is growing annually very fast. The figure for China is 81 per cent; Poland and South Africa are 93 per cent and 94 per cent respectively. The crucial points for our country, where approximately 40 per cent of our electricity is still produce from coal, as this composite calls for, is the need for the government to give some incentive for the investment in new coal-fired generation, with carbon capture capability and clean coal technology from the start.

Because of the growing use of coal-fired generation globally, the potential for success of these technologies, moving from the pilot projects we have in the United Kingdom into a source of exporting these technologies worldwide is absolutely staggering. Scandalously, this country, despite having the capability of being self-sufficient at least in producing our own coal for its needs, we are importing approximately 60 per cent of the coal we use into this country. There are serious implications for this in the future. Because of the developing economies and therefore their increased coal production, this is a steady increase in the need and the price for coal. Because our country imports 60 per cent of its needs, our balance of payments will become dramatically affected in an adverse way in the future. We also have to consider the fact that the spot world market coal price is based on the dollar so exchange rates are crucial in these matters.

It is also equally important that for security of supply, which eventually the last government recognised, it is crucial that we have our own indigenous coal industry to meet our needs. At the present time most of our imports of coal come from Russia, and I think we have all seen in the past what Russia can do if it they feel like cutting off the supply to other countries. Therefore, it is imperative that for our requirements in the future we must develop and expand our indigenous coal industry and show, as we have done in the past, that not only can our coal industry be shown as the most efficient and productive in the world, but more importantly, and certainly for our members and the people who work in it, but the safest coal industry in the world. We can give an example, as we have done in the past, of the unfortunate tragedies that we read about every week about what happens in mining in other areas of the world. If we do this properly with proper investment and the new technologies, we can give that lead to the world. Thank you.

Patrick Carragher (*British Association of Colliery Management – Technical, Energy and Administrative Management*) seconded Composite Motion 8.

He said: Congress, I would like to start by thanking the TUC for its support for coal through the Clean Coal Task Group. Prior to the last election when the Energy Bill was going through Parliament, we had a proposal for an emissions performance standard. The Clean Coal Task Group recommended to the General Council that that was inappropriate and a bit premature at this stage. That was taken up by the General Council and won the day as that Bill went through Parliament. It came back as part of the coalition agreement but, actually, on closer inspection the coalition Government now appear to be backtracking on that because they must accept the logic of the TUC position.

I want to concentrate, really, on the importance of developing clean coal technology. The current

Government has largely picked up where the last one was, but progress has been pitifully slow both from the first demonstration plant and the three other plants to which the Government are committed. This is important because if coal is to form part of a balanced energy policy it has to be clean. Indeed, I think the UK and the developed world have a responsibility to develop new technologies that can be transferred to the Third World and the developing world countries.

It is also important that we get this urgently, because if we do not there is going to be a major energy gap opening up in about 2015-2016, and if that is to be filled it is likely to be filled by gas. If that gas is unabated, if there is no carbon capture within that capacity, that is going to do for the Government's emission targets in the longer term. It will also result in a fall in demand for domestic coal, which would adversely affect the employment prospects in that sector where we have a lot of high skilled jobs in relatively depressed areas of the country. So those are key issues in respect of this composite, and I would be grateful for your support for it.

* *Composite Motion 8 was CARRIED*

Housing

The President: I call Composite Motion 6. The General Council supports the composite motion.

James Anthony (*UNISON*) moved Composite Motion 6.

He said: Congress, housing is an issue which unites all of us across our movement and beyond. We all need a decent and affordable place to live. For UNISON it takes on a particular significance as many of our members work in councils, other social housing organisations and in housing benefit. Also many of our members' work takes them into people's homes, such as our social workers, PCSOs, workers in the utilities and community health staff who see firsthand the problems that poor housing cause. During the last few decades the supply of decent, especially family, homes has been outstripped by demand, inflating house prices and rents, causing overcrowding and increasing the threat of homelessness. The market has abjectly failed to provide for our housing needs. That failure has allowed those who peddle the politics of hate to cause division in our communities.

Thanks in no small part to the efforts of people in this hall, the last Labour government was finally getting the message on housing. Finally, we saw new building of council and other social housing, although not enough, and we had a concerted effort to encourage and support private sector house building. But the ConDem's answer doesn't seem to be more homes. The ConDem's answer seems to be turping people out of the homes that they have already got. Capping housing benefit will hit the most vulnerable hard, and it will price people out of living in whole areas. How much more can you kick somebody when they are down than threatening them with losing their home? Expelling poor people from wealthy areas is Shirley Porter's Westminster dream on a national level. Removing the housing targets and removing the regional spatial strategies, combined with the ConDem's ridiculous plans for NIMBY referenda, where those with houses will be able to have a veto over those who do not, will stall our housing industry. We need to work together locally through our regional TUCs to put the important case for new owner-occupied private and social rented homes.

Congress, security of tenure is vital for stable communities and to ensure that social housing does not get seen as a dumping ground. In the run-up to the general election, UNISON, along with our colleagues in

the GMB, Unite and the Labour Party, put out leaflets attacking Tory housing policy and warning social housing tenants of the threat that the Tories pose to their security of tenure. We knew it was being a successful campaign when the Tories started complaining. They accused us of lying! Well, David Cameron, I can tell you today that it is your party and you who are the liars. When you said security of tenure was safe in your hands, you lied. When you said that you would protect frontline services, you lied. When you said "We're all in this together", David Cameron, you lied. We know the truth in this hall.

We know that building decent homes doesn't just make sense for the people who need to live in them, but it makes economic sense. Let's give jobs to construction workers, to planners and to architects. Let's give business to the suppliers. Let's use house building to put demand back into the economy, get it moving again and get us out of this mess. Let's unite to campaign for investment in house building. Congress, it is not time to cut, it's time to build. Thank you.

Chris Murphy (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) seconded Composite Motion 6.

He said: Congress, accessible housing is the most important thing in any civilised society. However, access to council housing is under threat like it has never been before. The ConDems are looking to end secure tenancies and have scrapped plans to increase the building of council and social housing. These decisions will lead to increased misery for some of Britain's poorest communities. Cameron's announcement that secure tenure could be abolished is nothing short of another attack on the working class, pushing people into the unregulated, private rental market, incurring debts as that they cannot afford to buy their own property. This will force families out of communities where they have lived for generations. The policy will lead to ghettos.

This Government is waging all out war on the welfare state and using housing as their first major offensive. In the abandonment of plans for increased social housing, the Government is not just denying families desperately needed homes but also jobs and training opportunities for thousands of young people within the construction industry. This is part of a fundamental assault on working people by the upper class elite seeking to destroy the welfare state in the name of reform.

The Conservatives are also threatening to abolish the section 106 rule. The Housing Federation estimates that this would result in a 14 per cent drop in the number of affordable houses built. Council stocks must increase to reflect the demand and cut the waiting list increases for social housing. This would create much needed construction jobs, thereby boosting the economy and creating opportunities for apprentices. Join with us in calling for the protection of the section 106 extension of council house building, using directly employed building workers, giving opportunities to building workers and apprentices, to make first-class council housing for all those who want and need council housing. Thank you.

John Hannett (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*) supported the motion.

He said: The provision of housing has, in many ways, dominated my union's agenda for many years at our annual conference and not surprisingly so because the provision of decent housing goes really to the heart of what reflects, and should reflect, a decent society. We believe that housing should be affordable, it should be secure and it should offer stability as standard core rights. The vast majority of USDAW members are

employed in the retail sector, which is known as one of the largest sectors for low pay. Many of the workers we represent are struggling to find affordable accommodation, whether bought or rented. Many of them depend upon affordable housing provided by councils and housing associations.

Congress, one of the huge successes of social housing is the security of tenure. Families are able to stay in areas where they would not be able to afford to live if this security did not exist. It lets them settle down and play an active part in their communities. The people who will be hit hardest by the Government's proposal to limit council and housing association tenancies to a fixed term are the low paid, the most vulnerable. They will face the uncertainty of not knowing whether they will continue to have that or will be out on the street. It will increase the insecurity already felt by those who are the most vulnerable. It will destabilise communities, it will de-motivate people, it will kill the drive to succeed and discourage social mobility. Council estates will become ghettos of the poor because there is no incentive for people to try and improve their circumstances if, instead of being rewarded for their efforts, they will be penalised and lose their homes.

We are not just talking about people's houses or accommodation. We are talking about people's homes. They are places where they bring up their families and they grow old. Congress, tenants should have, and must have, the same right to a home as anybody else. They must have the security of knowing that they will continue to have a home if their situation unfortunately changes. Life tenancies are not responsible for the lack of social housing. The fundamental cause of the housing crisis is the lack of affordable housing supply. Forcing tenants into insecurity and fear does not solve the housing crisis, so please support this very important composite and the campaign to oppose the coalition's housing policy.

Shirley Rainey (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*) supported the composite.

She said: I say, "Shame on you", David Cameron, for promising in your election manifesto to make Britain the most family-friendly country and "Shame on you", Nick Clegg, for a hundred reasons, but in particular for saying that the coalition government will make the welfare of the next generation central to their politics and that a society must be judged on how it treats its children, but then introducing cuts that have a huge detrimental impact on women."

As everyone in this hall knows, a detrimental impact on women has a detrimental impact on their children. The cuts will mean us all seeing more of our members struggling without jobs and then in the ghastly situation that they may become homeless. A safe home for all is surely the true way of judging society. Poor quality housing affects the mental and physical wellbeing of both women and their children. It is vital that the TUC does all it can to highlight what poor housing and lack of housing means to everyone. (Applause)

* *Composite Motion 6 was CARRIED*

Manufacturing and industrial policy

Tony Burke (*Unite*) moved Composite Motion 4.

He said: I move Composite Motion 4, which sets out a ten-point plan for saving UK manufacturing. You can read more about that in this booklet which is available at the Unite stand.

Congress, this week we have heard of the need to mount campaigns to defend jobs in our public services, to protect our people at work and to protect those who are not in work. We have made it clear that Unite

is fully behind that campaign in the public sector. However, we should not forget that the wealth of our country and our economy is only going to grow if we have a viable and sustainable manufacturing sector. For the last 30 years, we have seen our manufacturing industries diminish into a fraction of the size they were. Let us look at them: engineering, aerospace, steel, car-making, printing, electronics, shipbuilding and chemicals. President and Congress, the list is endless.

There are many factors as to why this decline has taken place and there are some things that we could not do very much about, but we do not accept that we have had to plummet to the depths that we have in this country when, in the 1980s, 1990s and more recently, we have seen the German government, the French government and many other European states defend their manufacturing industries.

What should we learn from that period? What we can learn is that no successful economy can survive on services alone. We can learn that the markets do not provide all the answers. We can see other countries defending their strategic base against the ravages of private equity, speculators and spivs, and providing support for manufacturing industries when it has been needed.

I want to take the case, President and Congress, of Sheffield Forgemasters, which are at the cutting edge of their industry, ready to invest in a sustainable product. Here is a modern steel company wanting to invest £80 million in new kit to provide the only UK facility capable of providing steel parts for the nuclear power stations and, in the process, creating 180 new skilled jobs. The private banks were not available to provide the money on loan to them so the Labour government came in and offered a loan. This is no lame duck company. This is a company that was prepared to pay back that loan. We know from the Industrial Development Advisory Board, which was set up to guide government on such matters, that they argued for the benefits of this loan.

So what did the ConDem Government, led by Deputy Prime Minister, Nick Clegg, do? It cancelled the loan. Congress, let us be clear. This was a political act designed to attack the previous government without any regard for our members and the people of Sheffield, without any regard to its own energy policy in relation to nuclear power stations and without any regard to the trade deficit which will happen if the parts that would have been made at Forgemasters are made abroad. Yet this is a government which says that it understands support for manufacturing.

It is establishing a regional growth fund, so let them now say that they will make that loan available to Forgemasters from that money. Let them demonstrate that they understand the plight of manufacturing and the success of Germany and France, who have invested in their industries. It is not about just pumping money into industry; it is about having a vision shared with the workforce. It is about creating the right economic climate for products to sell and demand for manufacturing to increase. It is about investing in learning new skills and training.

Vince Cable said recently, "Science, research and innovation are vital to this country's future economic growth." So, how is it looking so far, Vince?" Well, it is not very good. The effects of the cuts that you are driving through mean that we are likely to lose up to 200,000 workers in the manufacturing industry. Just look at what is already happening in BAE Systems – 1,000 jobs to go.

Congress, I ask you to support the composite. I ask you to support manufacturing and decent jobs. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

Lee Bradshaw (*Community*) seconded the motion.

He said: This is my first time at Congress. *(Applause)* Congress, we have heard a lot about government cuts to the public sector and we know that they will also have a devastating impact on the private sector. I am talking about direct cuts to the private sector. I am talking about the loan to Sheffield Forgemasters, which the ConDems cancelled. It would have demonstrated a commitment to British manufacturing and shown that the Government is prepared to drive essential economic growth through investment. This was a hand-up not a hand-out and the ConDem Government failed on all counts. Shame on them!

This is short-sighted and short-term penny-pinching. The decision has rightly been criticised from all corners. Nick Clegg, a Sheffield MP, was prepared not only sell his party down the river, but also the people of Sheffield who he is supposed to represent.

I work for Corus Speciality Steels. We compete with Forgemasters in many areas, but I still think that this was a disgrace because it shows what the ConDems think about our industry and manufacturing in general. They pay lip service to it, but if they need to put their hand in their pocket, that is where the support ends.

Congress, our industry needs an active industrial policy, not just here in the UK, but also built and implemented with our partners in Europe. If we want to rebalance our economy, we must invest in and support manufacturing. We, as a union, should form a view about what practical policies we want to see. We started that process today and Community looks forward to working with our sister trade unions to take this forward tomorrow. Support the composite. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Paddy Lillis (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*) spoke in support of the motion.

He said: Congress, USDAW wants to highlight the scrapping of the Future Jobs Fund. We have all seen the effects of this recession, whether through redundancies, short-time working or the impact of the coalition's emergency budget. Furthermore, the unemployment figures clearly show that this recession has had a particularly disastrous effect on a whole generation of young people; young people with talents who are currently being lost to the dole queues; young people who did not cause this recession; and young people who did not benefit from the greed and excess displayed by those at the top. Young people are now facing a bleak future of injustice, poverty and unemployment.

During this recession, we have seen the highest levels of youth unemployment since records began. The coalition government currently have no plans in place to recover the hopes and aspirations of this large sector of potential workforce. Congress, under the previous Labour government, the Future Jobs Fund offered a lifeline to these young people, creating 100,000 jobs for young people between the ages of 18 and 24, dealing with long-term unemployment and making sure that young people were able to gain skills and valuable experience at the workplace.

The Future Jobs Fund offered a lifeline to young people. This decision by the coalition government to cut this fund is hurting the most vulnerable in our society. The trade union movement has always taken a leading role in protecting the vulnerable and now we must stand up again. Congress, we cannot afford to lose young people from the workforce. For that reason, we call on the General Council to champion the reinstatement of the Future Jobs Fund. Please support. *(Applause)*

Terry Hoad (*University and College Union*) supported the motion.

He said: We fully support our colleagues in Unite and Community in affirming the importance of industrial policy in providing an economic base for recovery. I want to focus, in particular, on the important role that education and research must be allowed to play in both the recovery and the country's future.

Vince Cable, last week, signalled a squeeze on public funding for science and research despite the fact that the £3.5 billion a year currently spent on publicly-funded research generates an additional annual output of £45 billion in UK companies. Cable, who was a supporter of science and research when in opposition, clearly misunderstands what our universities are already doing if he honestly expects more for less.

With just one per cent of the global population, the UK produces 7.9 per cent of the world's research publications and 12 per cent of all citations. Science parks are going up in China and India. Research funding is increasing across Europe. Our Government wants to cut funding for research, which will only hasten the decline of UK universities as among the very best in the world for research. Strong performances in research presupposes strength in undergraduate and graduate teaching for the initial development of potential researchers.

President Obama has pledged to ensure that America has the highest proportion of graduates in the world. Our government is looking to slash university funding. Once you start dismantling our research base or axing university courses and departments, it is not an easy thing to put them back together. Academics must be at the forefront of any plans for the future of university research and any remaining plans to make funding dependent on economic impacts must go.

The rest of the world understands the role education and research must be allowed to play in creating and securing jobs in the new global economy. We can only do that through investment and not cuts. I ask you to support the motion. (*Applause*)

* *Composite Motion 4 was CARRIED*

Restoring ethical banking: ending the sales commission culture

Ged Nichols (*Accord*) moved Motion 19.

He said: I speak for the union representing Halifax and Bank of Scotland staff, now employed in the Lloyds Banking Group following the collapse of HBOS in the banking crisis and its enforced takeover by Lloyds TSB. I am proposing Motion 19 and speaking up on behalf of bank customers and bank workers.

Brothers and sisters, during this week we have heard delegates lambasting bankers for the state of the economy and for their actions leading to the public sector cuts that are being pursued by the current government. Let me be clear: I will not be defending the indefensible and you will not hear me speaking up on behalf of the Freds of this world. The irresponsible actions of some at the top of our banks caused turmoil and misery for millions of ordinary citizens, but members of Accord and other unions representing bank workers have paid a price too.

Unite estimated this week that over 100,000 jobs have been lost in the finance sector during the last year. I know for a fact that nearly 20,000 jobs have gone in the Lloyds Banking Group alone since January 2009 and 400 more are going to be announced today.

Bank workers are the sons and daughters, husbands and wives and brothers and sisters of public servants, of workers in factories, in transport and in construction that are represented by other unions. Their average salary is around two-thirds of the UK average earnings.

I think that they deserve as much support and respect as workers in other industries.

This morning, we have heard that the Real IRA is threatening to attack banks and bankers and, like the tragedy in Athens earlier this year, we know that it will be the ordinary workers who become the victims of violence. Frankly, brothers and sisters, a little bit of solidarity from our fellow trade unionists would not go astray.

I am aware that I am speaking prior to the appearance of Mervyn King, only the second governor of the Bank of England to address the TUC Congress. Apparently, some of us are not too keen on him attending. I think that we should be proud that people like Mr King are coming here. The Bank of England has been given regulatory responsibility for the UK banking sector and the decisions that it makes may have an enormous impact on the members of my union and, I suspect, on the members of your unions too. Engaging and representing our members' interests is what I believe we should be doing, not walking away.

We do believe, however, that we need to change the culture of the UK banking industry so that the mistakes of the past are not repeated. We need to restore the pride, professionalism and ethics of UK banking and get away from the short-term profit and bonus culture which benefited neither the majority of the banking employees nor banking customers.

Accord believes that the provision of credit to retail and business customers is a vitally important part of what banks do, but it must be done responsibly and the last thing we want is for people to take on more debt than they can service in order for banks to hit their targets. We support the Consumer Association's view in its recent submission to the Independent Commission on Banking that remuneration for front-line branch staff should not be linked to sales and should reward customer satisfaction, the fair treatment of customers and the resolution of complaints.

We will be making a submission to the Independent Commission on Banking outlining our concerns and pressing for action. However, we believe that Congress should send a clear message that our banking culture needs to change if we are not to repeat the mistakes of the past. We must value responsibility, not ripping off customers; long-term relationships, not short-term profits; and ethics, not avarice. Congress, we ask for your support. I move. (*Applause*)

Agnes Tolmie (*Unite*) seconded Motion 19.

She said: Congress, Unite has recognised for some time that the issue of targets within the finance sector has created additional stress and pressure on staff. We have also seen a considerable increase in the level of disciplinary hearings based on members who do not deliver or achieve these imposed targets. Our members have become demoralised as they are forced to sell products to customers who do not want or need them. Sometimes customers do complain about these pressures to buy and when they do, there are some banks in the sector whose immediate response to any complaint will be to discipline that member of staff.

Public anger is understandable and it should be directed at the culprits, the chief executives, those in the higher echelons of the finance sector. Since the crisis, our members, most earning less than £15,000 a year, have been subjected to that anger on a daily basis, as Ged outlined. You are right; members in the finance sector belong to this movement and we look to this movement at this time for solidarity. I am confident, Congress, that you will provide that solidarity.

Congress, our members were not the architects of this crisis, a crisis caused by sheer, unfettered corporate

greed and irresponsibility. They are however, like the rest of the UK, paying a very heavy price. 100,000 jobs have gone from the sector, 28,000 in the Royal Bank of Scotland alone, and you own 84 per cent of that particular bank. That is 100,000 ordinary finance workers and their families already penalised by the consequences of our sales and bonus culture. It is disappointing that the UKFI (which manages your investment) has not been more forceful in tackling the target-based bonus culture in companies owned, or part-owned, by the state.

So it is business as usual with the banks. The monkeys are still in charge of the bananas. The *Which?* 'Future of Banking Commission Report' rightly identified that a new ethical-based reward culture is required in the sector which will focus on customer satisfaction, fair treatment and resolution of customer complaints as areas for reward. The adoption of an ethics-based culture will improve customer confidence and raise morale amongst a workforce who increasingly see sales-based targets as a key component of stress in the workplace.

It remains necessary to challenge targets. Performance-based pay systems (while significantly rewarding the few) bring stresses and pressures to many within the sector. It is therefore important, Congress, that a fundamental review of targets and incentives takes place to deliver fairness for customers and workers. Please support. (*Applause*)

* *Motion 19 was CARRIED*

High Pay Commission

Billy Hayes (*Communication Workers' Union*) moved Motion 27.

He said: The late Paul Foot, the campaigning journalist, once said, "It seems in this country that the slogan is, 'To make the poor work harder, you pay them less and to make the rich work harder, you pay them more.'" It certainly feels like that in the world in which we live. Income inequality is now higher than in 1989. Poverty for working-age adults without dependent children is now at its highest level since 1961. Yet, the household wealth of the top 10 per cent of the population is over 100 times' greater than the wealth of the poorest.

The coalition government has set up a High Pay Commission. It has asked Will Hutton of the Work Foundation to examine the ratio of pay between high-paid workers and low-paid workers in the public sector. It is a one-sided examination designed to attack further the whole of the public sector.

I wrote to Will Hutton asking him why, in this examination of the ratio between the lowest and the highest paid in the public sector, we do not include the whole of our economy. It does not even look at the pay in the Royal Mail or other publicly-owned corporations. However, despite the media-driven myth, income growth in the public sector has been broadly in line with the private sector but, by isolating the public sector, the Government has displayed its sole purpose of finding ways to attack the public sector further. In the TUC, we must be conscious that inequality does matter.

There is a bookstall outside and I would recommend this book to anybody who is thinking buying a book. It is called *The Spirit Level* and it states why equality is better for everyone. It examines income inequality in the developed world and it is not just about the welfare state. For example, in Japan, there is not much of a welfare state, but there is greater equality. Regarding all social ills in developed economies, people do better where there is equality. Where there is inequality, such as in our country, people do worse in terms of everything from education to crime to

housing. It reads like a novel, but it is like a manifesto in terms of its examination.

In the FTSE 100 companies from 1999-2009, the average remuneration of CEOs has increased by 295 per cent compared with a rise of just 44 per cent for the average worker. If we take pay alone, this rose from a ratio of 47:1 to 128:1. Nor does this represent the result of the success of the CEOs. Fred Goodwin saw his company, RBS, which we now own, recapitalised by taxpayers and yet he receives a £700,000 a year pension. After failing at HBOS, Andy Hornby became CEO of Boots. Richard Burrows saw Irish taxpayers save the Bank of Ireland whilst he left for the chair of British American Tobacco. It is pay cuts for employees so we need both public and private sector. Yet the FTSE 100 reported that salaries this year were up 7 per cent with average bonuses up 20 per cent.

And Royal Mail – how could we forget Adam Crozier? Adam Crozier, in his final year at Royal Mail, earned £4.48 million in pensions and bonuses in 2009/10. It would take 150 years for a post-woman to earn what he earned in one year. But Adam is not stopping there, is he? He is now at ITV and it is reported that he is getting something like £15 million in terms of benefits and packages.

We do not just need to look at the public sector, David Cameron, in terms of ratios between the lowest-paid and the highest-paid. We need to look at what is happening in the private sector because greed is not good. There is a new follow-up film to *Wall Street*. Do you remember the slogan in *Wall Street*? Michael Douglas, when playing Gordon Gecko, said, "Greed is good." Greed is not good for you and it is not good for our country. We need to say, "Don't just look at pay, but look across the whole of the public and private sector." That is why we need to shadow that Commission.

Finally, Congress, we are a movement of millions. Let us not forget that. We have a government of millionaires. This movement of millions needs to take on this government of millionaires. We need to say that inequality does matter and the best place to fight inequality is in your trade union. I move. (*Applause*)

Gail Cartmail (*Unite*) seconded the motion.

She said: Earlier this year, the National Equality Panel exposed the awful income inequality which persists in the UK. Its policy recommendations included reviewing and bringing up the level of the National Minimum Wage. Bearing this in mind, the levels of executive pay in the private sector are obscene. In the finance sector, wage ratios are as high as 100:1 between the top and the lowest-paid. You have heard about Stephen Hester, boss of RBS, which is 84 per cent owned by us, the taxpayers. Mr Hester admitted to earnings of £9.6 million to the Treasury Committee last year and that is while the average RBS bank worker earns under £20,000.

Friends of the wealthy claim that you have to pay the best to attract the best and that standards are set globally and not just here in the UK. They also claim that if you limit the level of pay at the very top then the best will go abroad to earn their fat salaries elsewhere. If a few do decide to pack their bags and seek a fortune elsewhere, I ask the question, "Are we bothered?"

So, let us put all that nonsense to one side and let us look sensibly at the benefits of establishing a fair society. Opponents of the National Minimum Wage warned that it would bring our economy to its knees. It did not but, Congress, the boardroom fat cat bankers did. Yet, while low-paid workers suffer pay freezes, those eye-boggling bonuses and pension packages continue - business as usual.

We want a Shadow High Pay Commission to look at the arguments both for and against the idea. We want it to look at ways to redress the gross imbalance that exists at present in the world of work and, while we are at it, let us speed on with ending pay secrecy. My daughter is 17 years old and she will be 74 before earning equal pay if we carry on at this snail's pace.

The demand in this motion may be ridiculed as the politics of envy, but there is nothing funny at all about the UK's pole position on economic inequality. So, let us start to knobble the funny money so rampant in Britain's boardrooms. Congress, please support the motion. *(Applause)*

Linda Hobson (*UNISON*) spoke in support of Motion 27.

She said: Many speakers have already highlighted the need to develop an alternative to the coalition government's pro-market agenda and this motion should be seen as part of our campaign to develop an alternative around which we can mobilise our members. UNISON supports the establishment of a Shadow High Pay Commission. Applied to the public sector, it provides the opportunity to consider proposals to regulate chief executive pay and also address equalities issues, low pay and the style and culture of management.

Why is it that some organisations decide that they need to pay exorbitant sums to the chief executive? In most cases, risk-taking and aggressive management comes with the decision to pay high salaries. Some of us would say that it is no accident that virtually all chief executives adopting these characteristics are men. The collapse of Enron, Lehman Brothers, RBS and the crisis in the whole banking system and financial sector which caused the recession are a stark illustration of the consequences.

We get the same macho risk-taking approach in the public sector. In our region, we have seen a highly-paid chief constable driving through the privatisation of the control room in support services, a first in the police service. Private contractors are not subjected to the same rules and transparency as the public sector. Why not? A commission on high pay should address this. With so many of our services being out-sourced, it seems meaningless to focus on the public sector without including the private contractors profiting from public money.

We should also ask why so many public service workers, especially women, are so poorly paid. I work in a hospital where many of our members are earning a lot less than £20,000. In Newcastle Council, 1,500 workers are still earning less than £7.00 an hour and more than half the workers that UNISON represents earn less than £18,000 a year. Whilst our members are angry at the pay levels of some chief executives, there is even greater anger amongst council workers at the employers' refusal to give a pay award this year, a pay award aimed at the lowest paid workers only, and amongst those health workers facing a pay freeze next year. With inflation running at over 4 per cent, this equates to a pay cut.

The work of the High Pay Commission should be located within a general pay strategy addressing inequalities in pay, attacking low pay and a certain progressive approach to management which challenges the cult of the individual, and asserts the value of team-working and the contribution of all workers. Please support the motion. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Dee Luxford (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supported Motion 27.

She said: In supporting Motion 27, I acknowledge that 63 per cent of civil servants earn less than £25,000, but I

earn a considerable amount less than that. So, yes, *Daily Telegraph*, an attack on public sector pay is an attack on the poor.

Congress, we need to combat deficit hysteria. Congress needs to examine the truth behind the panic that the Government and the media are spreading among the populous. A principle of fairness is essential for the political legitimacy of the High Pay Commission and by focusing only on the public sector, it will not have that. The bankers (not the frontline staff) argue that they need obscene bonuses to attract the best or they will go elsewhere, but is it really true that most of the high financial services would decamp to Dubai or New York if an effort was made to curb excesses at the top? If they did leave, how would this affect the UK economy? Would it matter at all? Congress, at £1.3 trillion to bail them out, can we actually afford to keep them?

Ideally, this Commission would look at the whole of the earnings distribution and not just the top and diagnose why the middle and bottom fall behind. Ideally, it would examine the relationship between talent and reward. It would seek to explain the escalating pay of those at the top. It would decide which factors are important. Ideally, it would discover how the labour market for the highest paid actually works. It would settle the argument as to whether rewards are driven by nothing more than the desire to recruit and retrain the best or if there is collusion and mutual back-scratching generating the upward spiral of top pay.

Ideally, it would expose the elephant in the room which is the national maximum wage. It would at least ask if it would be practical to use salary caps or average-to-top ratios to restrain the excesses of the highest paid. Ideally, it would do all of those things, but I fear in reality it will do none of them. That being the case, Congress, we need a plan.

Differentials of 80:1 and 100:1 or more between those at the top of a company and those at the bottom are just too high. Congress, it is incumbent upon us as trade unionists to expose this. We must expand the remit of the High Pay Commission across the whole of the economy and highlight the inequalities which affect everyone. We must not sit back and just watch a Commission which will hurt our lowest and medium-paid members. Congress, if the High Pay Commission is not willing to look at the economy as a whole then we will just have to do it for them. Please support the motion. *(Applause)*

Mark Campbell (*University and College Union*) supported the motion.

He said: UCU very much welcomes this motion, in particular the amendment from Unite. We keep getting told – and we have been told throughout this Congress – that apparently we are all in it together. This is a blatant lie and this Congress, in lots of speeches so far, has started to nail that lie.

Let us look at universities, the sector in which I work. The differences between those at the top and those at the bottom are stark. The average pay of a vice-chancellor stands at £207,318. Their average pay rise over the last three years was 20.4 per cent. On top of that, they have excellent benefits, bonuses and pension contributions, the same pensions that they want to cut for us.

Let us look at some of the examples: City University, vice-chancellor, £258,000 salary, £390,000 benefits and £33,000 pension contributions. UEL, £287,000 salary, £250,000 benefits, £41,000 pensions. UCL, £303,492 salary, almost £73,000 benefits. The list goes on. There are over 80 vice-chancellors paid more than the Prime Minister and it is not as though he does not get paid too much either, is it?

We have also seen a huge increase in the number of university executives and senior managers paid well in excess of £100,000 plus large bonuses on top of that. Let us be clear. I did note what the last speaker said and I also notice my T-shirt. When we are talking about bankers, we are not talking about finance workers. We are not talking about bank workers on low pay. We are talking about those at the top who are actually screwing those at the bottom and the rest of us.

Also, I do not think any of those people are in the same boat as our hourly-paid lecturers on zero hour contracts; junior researchers on temporary contracts working excessive hours for low pay; and junior admin workers, with university porters, at the bottom list. Then there are the massively exploited cleaners and caterers, all sub-contracted and paid less than the minimum wage. We are not in this together. They award themselves huge pay rises and then demand that we have pay cuts. No, we are not in it together.

My grandfather was a miner in South Shields. People say, "The rich will run away if we start pulling their money away from them and we will lose all these entrepreneurs." When my granddad came home from work with all the dirt and the grime on him, he had a bath. He got himself very clean in that bath. He scrubbed himself clean and he probably lost a few parasites and bugs along the way. Did he notice they were gone? No, he felt a damn sight healthier for doing it. *(Applause and cheers)*

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*): Congress, very briefly, there is support from the General Council for this motion on a hugely important issue. I will briefly explain that the idea of a Shadow High Pay Commission is already being pursued by Compass, the campaigning think-tank, which has done a lot of work with the trade union movement. Our intention is to support that Compass initiative, to be represented on that commission, and to report on the work of that commission to the General Council as it develops its work. In that way, I think we can really take this motion forward in a practical and positive way. *(Applause)*

* *Motion 27 was CARRIED*

Introduction of Mervyn King

The President: Before I call on the next motion, I have been joined on the platform by Mervyn King, the Governor of the Bank of England. I invite you to welcome Mervyn, Congress. *(Applause)* I will be introducing Mervyn formally after dealing with this resolution.

NHS hospital car parking charges

Tracey Taylor (*Society of Radiographers*) moved Motion 49.

She said: The ConDem Government has announced this week that it will not be honouring the previous Labour government's policy for NHS Trusts in England to follow the lead of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and abolish car parking charges for patients and their families. The Society of Radiographers calls upon Congress to support their campaign to abolish car parking charges for all patients and to ensure that NHS staff have fair and reasonable parking charges.

During my 24 years in the NHS, there have been few subjects that have united staff rooms and patient forums alike more than car parking – the lack of, the cost of and who is entitled to a permit or not. Patients, families and friends, already nervous, vulnerable and stressed, not only have to take the lottery of will there

be a car parking space, but then they have to pay for the privilege.

Through having to pay to park at work, NHS staff are injecting millions of pounds into the NHS each year and even when money for parking is deducted from the salaries of NHS staff, it does not guarantee them a space. Recent reports show that some trusts are making millions of pounds worth of profit from parking fees, including clamping of patients' and staff cars. Epsom and St. Helier University Hospitals NHS Trust clamped almost 2,000 cars and made £2 million worth of profit in the last 12 months.

As more and more people have moved away from public transport into their own cars, the demand for parking has outstripped the availability and we all have tales of hospital car parks used as convenient town centre parking or unofficial park-and-ride locations. However, is charging patients and employees alike, hitting the low-paid and vulnerable, the answer?

The unfairness is not necessarily the parking charge but the lack of choice. Lack of investment in public transport links and reduced infrastructure leave staff and patients alike with no choice but to get in the car. Add the burden of the local authority tax on parking spaces and, once again, patients and staff are paying for poor investment in public transport and a lack of an integrated transport system. Centralisation of services has meant that the larger trusts have become centres of excellence, but patients have to travel further for longer and the car remains the most convenient transport for the majority.

Many NHS staff work shifts to provide a 24 hour service that we, the public, want and expect. The inconvenience of reduced off-peak service, a walk to a dark bus stop late on a winter night and then the wait for that bus is, for a single female, neither glamorous nor wanted following a stressful shift in A&E or theatre.

My family and I have experienced the worry of having a parent admitted to hospital as an emergency, but add to this the early-hours-of-the-morning search for a designated parking spot, seemingly miles from A&E, and then worrying, as the hours tick by, if a ticket or a wheel clamber will be waiting for us.

Congress recognises that car parking charges in some sectors of the community are a necessary evil of modern day life, but let us exercise common sense and not profit sense when we consider the most vulnerable and needy in our society. Where evidence shows that charges are making it difficult for staff to do their job, where patients have difficulty accessing services and our friends and families are stopped from visiting because of the inflated parking charges, then trusts have an obligation to review their car parking policies.

The ConDem Government has given them freedom to do this. This Government's policy of decentralisation, greater autonomy and Big Society ideas, where we are expected to help one another, demand that trusts and local communities take control of local services and make decisions based on local conditions and views. I wonder how many NHS trusts will follow the lead of the Trafford General Hospital here in Manchester, which listened to concerns and has scrapped car parking charges for patients and visitors. Being Yorkshire born and bred, it is not often that I will concede that the wrong side of the Pennines got it right first!

Congress, I urge you to join the Society of Radiographers, back our campaign to eliminate car parking charges for all patients and challenge the excuse that car parking charges are reinvested in NHS services. There is no excuse. Congress, please support this motion. *(Applause)*

Sharon Holder (GMB) seconded Motion 49.

She said: The GMB is delighted to support this motion. The issue of hospital car park charges was debated at our own congress earlier this year. Delegates heard about the effects of these charges on both patients and their families and how hospital trusts are charging a fortune for their car parking facilities.

Car park charges can have a big impact, especially for those suffering from a long-term illness who have had to attend numerous hospital appointments. If admitted to hospital, their families and their friends would also have to pay these charges. For those visiting sick relatives daily, the costs escalate sharply, sometimes as much as £1.00 for 20 minutes. In rural areas with poor public transport, people are forced to drive to hospital and meeting the cost of these charges can be a real strain.

Hospital car parking charges amount to nothing more than attacks on the sick. At a time when a family is struggling, charging excessively high rates simply to park a car is blatantly wrong. Families experiencing a long-term illness frequently experience a drop in income. In fact, nine out of ten families impacted by cancer suffer such a reduction as a direct result. The charges undermine the principles of a free and comprehensive NHS, free at the point of need. I am sure that Nye Bevan never envisaged greedy hospital management trying to profit from the misery of working families affected by illness.

Charges not only impact on patients, but also on staff. Many NHS employees work shifts and cannot always use public transport to get to work. It is not always available early in the morning or late in the evening. They are also being forced to pay the charges simply to go to work.

We must continue to escalate the campaign to end this unfair charge, an indirect tax on the sick, their families, their friends and the hard-working NHS employees, many of whom are low paid. Motion 49 defends hard-working families from further financial hardship resulting from illnesses so please support this motion. Congress, I second. *(Applause)*

Marie Garrity (UNISON) spoke in support of the motion.

She said: Congress, in Glasgow, patients, visitors and NHS staff had always parked for free in hospitals, but in the summer of 2007, car parking charges were introduced and on certain sites, PFI-operated car parks were installed.

Our UNISON branch immediately launched a lengthy campaign. We lobbied the Scottish health minister, Nicola Sturgeon, and organised petitions and rallies. The outcome of all our hard work resulted in car parking charges being reduced from £7.00 per day to four hours free in the non-PFI sites. *(Applause)*

In January 2009, Paul Martin, the MSP, launched his Car Parking Bill, a Bill which would have resulted in car parking charges being illegal. UNISON fully supported this Bill and was involved in the launch. Unfortunately, the Bill was not passed. Had this Bill been passed, it would have ended the PFI contracts.

Like Andy Burnham, UNISON's vision is to have unlimited free car parking for patients and visitors, but also for staff. Many staff who work in the NHS live outside the area and because of the long hours and the shift patterns, this often necessitates the need to travel by car. Although four hours' free parking is an improvement, our campaign is not over yet. Staff working 12 hour shifts also find their safety compromised when using off-site parking in unlit secluded areas.

Last Friday, a hospital outside Glasgow was on the news. Car parking charges were introduced and on the

first day of implementation, five cars were vandalised on offsite parking. An investigation is ongoing as it has been suggested that local residents, unhappy that staff and patients are parking in their streets, may be responsible. Most importantly, patients attending hospital for out-patient appointments and visitors concerned with the health of their families should not have the added burden of the cost of parking.

Congress, this is a tax on the sick. Please support. *(Applause)*

Alexis Chase (Unite) supported the motion.

She said: I feel incredibly redundant because you have listened to two very good speakers who have already argued the case. I would just like to reiterate though that there are lots of studies which keep showing that ill-health and chronic illness are very much features of the lives of the working poor and the very poor living in poverty. I have seen people going into hospital worrying about car parking charges when they should be worrying about looking after their kids or visiting their parents. They certainly should not be worrying about car parking when they are about to watch their partner give birth. Please support this motion. *(Applause)*

* *Motion 49 was CARRIED*

Address by Mervyn King, Governor of the Bank of England

The President: Congress, it now gives me great pleasure to formally introduce Mervyn King, the Governor of the Bank of England. Eddie George, Mervyn's predecessor, addressed Congress in 1998. This is only the second time in the history of the TUC that the Governor of the Bank of England has addressed Congress. As delegates will know, the Bank of England has now been given new responsibilities for regulating the financial sector, regulation which many in this hall and many of the people we represent will believe is much needed. Britain can ill afford a repeat of the mistakes of the recent past when under-regulation of the global financial sector helped plunge our economy into recession. Congress, the Governor of the Bank of England only makes a very small number of public speeches each year, which is why I am delighted that Mervyn has agreed not only to address Congress but has also agreed to take part in a question and answer session giving delegates a chance to put their questions directly to him. Mervyn, you are very welcome here today and I invite you to address Congress. *(Applause)*

Mervyn King: President and Congress, I want first to thank you for inviting me to address Congress. Members of your General Council have contributed hugely to the Bank of England by serving on our board, the Bank of England's Court, and carrying on that tradition today is Brendan Barber. By bringing a distinct and important perspective to our discussions, Brendan has helped us enormously through some extremely turbulent times. Brendan, thank you. *(Applause)*

Recent times have indeed been turbulent. After a decade-and-a-half of stability, with rising employment and living standards, came the crisis and recession, the biggest economic upheaval since the Great Depression. Before the crisis, steady growth with low inflation and high employment was in our grasp. We let it slip – we, that is, in the financial sector and as policy-makers – not your members nor the many businesses and organisations around the country which employ them. And although the causes of the crisis may have been rooted in the financial sector, the consequences are affecting everyone, and will do so for years to come.

Thankfully, the costs of the crisis have been smaller than those of the Great Depression but only because we learnt from that experience. An unprecedented degree of policy stimulus, here and abroad, prevented another world slump. Even so, around a million more people in Britain are out of work compared with before the crisis. Many, especially the young unemployed, have had their futures blighted so we cannot carry on as we are. Unless we reform our economy – rebalance demand, restructure banking, and restore the sustainability of our public finances – we will not only jeopardize recovery, but also fail the next generation.

To my mind, a market economy and its disciplines offer the best way of raising living standards but a market economy cannot survive on incentives alone. It must align those incentives to the common good. It must command support among the vast majority who do not receive the large rewards that accrue to the successful and the lucky, and it must show a sense of fairness if its efficiency is to bear fruit.

There was nothing fair about the financial crisis. It was caused not by problems in the real economy; it came out of the financial sector, but it was the real economy that suffered and the banks that were bailed out. Your members, and indeed the businesses which employ them, are entitled to be angry but, however legitimate, anger will not produce change unless its energy is harnessed to a cool analysis of what happened and why. So, I want to discuss the fundamental causes of the crisis before turning to current policy.

The fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 changed both politics and economics. Within a few years, the former Soviet Empire, China, and other Asian economies, with their combined workforce of over a billion people entered the world trading system as market economies. Their focus on export-led growth allowed consumers in the West to enjoy rising living standards as the prices of traded goods fell but the trade surpluses in emerging economies implied an outflow of capital. Relatively poor countries were lending money to richer western ones – the reverse of the traditional model of development. In the process, countries like China built up huge holdings of foreign assets – running into trillions of dollars – matched by equally huge debts in the deficit countries. Such massive imbalances were never likely to prove sustainable, and so it proved.

If the first fundamental cause of the crisis was the scale of the imbalances in the world economy, the second was the inability of our banking system to absorb such large inflows of capital without taking excessive risk. In the five years leading up to the crisis, the balance sheets of the West's largest banks doubled – mainly because banks lent more to other firms within the financial sector than to the wider economy – and the proportion of capital held by banks shrank so that their leverage (the ratio of total liabilities to their equity capital) rose to unprecedented levels. Immediately prior to the crisis, the leverage ratios of some UK banks approached 50. To say that was risky is an understatement; at such levels, a 2 per cent fall in the value of a bank's assets is sufficient to wipe out its capital and render it insolvent.

Remuneration, especially the structure of financial sector bonuses, encouraged excessive risk-taking, and distorted the aspirations and career choices of too many talented young people. Investors, banks, and regulators had been swept up by the apparent success of modern finance. When investors realised that many of the assets that banks held on their balance sheets were opaque and hard to value, there was immediate and justifiable concern about the solvency of many of those banks.

At the end of 2008, these two fundamental factors culminated in the worst financial crisis in history. In

the six months after the collapse of Lehman Brothers world trade fell by nearly 20 per cent, a faster decline than in the Great Depression. Around the world, the same telling phrase was repeated: economic activity was "falling off a cliff". In its statement to the London G20 Summit in April 2009, the international trade union movement argued that, "The first priority for G20 leaders must be to restore confidence by halting the freefall in world growth." That has been achieved. World output grew by 4 per cent over the past year. Nevertheless, total UK output remains around 10 per cent below where it would have been had there not been a crisis.

So, how do we prevent this happening again? If we are to prevent another crisis, action is required on both of the fundamental causes. First, we do need to resolve the problems caused by massive capital flows from poor to rich countries; yet the imbalances are growing again. This problem can be tackled only by international co-operation – most obviously through the G20 – and I hope that the trade union movement will continue to engage with that process.

Second, our financial system requires radical reform. Slowly but surely we must move towards a banking system that does not put both the economy and your members' livelihoods at risk. In the long run, banks will have to hold much more capital and be much less highly leveraged. Part of the answer is improving the way we regulate banks and devising policy tools to control the risks taken by the financial system as a whole. The aim should not be to prevent all bank failures. Just as with every other company in the economy, banks that get it wrong must be allowed to fail without risk to ordinary depositors and taxpayers. In 2008, banks were bailed out not to protect them but to protect the rest of the economy from the banks. That may not seem fair – and indeed it is not – when other companies, such as Jaguar, had to stand on their own feet or go to the wall. So banks, too, must face market discipline. But we need to do more than reform the banking system. If the world economy needs rebalancing, so does our own. The substantial trade deficit over a number of years means that national spending exceeded production. We need a higher national saving rate, a shift in spending and production away from consumption and towards exports, and a key part of that is a reduction in our budget deficit.

There is a perfectly reasonable debate about the precise speed at which to reduce the deficit. Indeed, I supported the extra fiscal stimulus to the economy provided in the immediate wake of the crisis, and there is a further question about how the deficit should be reduced – the balance between raising taxes and cutting spending. That is not for me to say, it is for you and the politicians to debate. But it is indisputable that, because of the crisis, national income is 10 per cent lower than would have been expected and that has had a damaging impact on tax revenues. As a result, this country has the largest peacetime budget deficit in its history – over 11 per cent of GDP in the fiscal year to 2010. Although a large budget deficit is inevitable for a period after a crisis, it is also clearly unsustainable: our national debt, even relative to GDP, is rising sharply and will continue to do so for several years. It is vital for any government to set out and commit to a clear and credible plan for reducing the deficit. I would be shirking my responsibilities if I did not explain to you the risks of failing to do so.

Vague promises would not have been enough. Market reaction to rising sovereign debt can turn quickly from benign to malign, as we saw in the euro area earlier this year. It is not sensible to risk a damaging rise in long-term interest rates that would make investment and the cost of mortgages more expensive. The current plan is to reduce the deficit steadily over five

years – a more gradual fiscal tightening than in some other countries. As a result of a failure to put such a plan in place sooner, some euro-area countries have found – to their cost – a much more rapid adjustment being forced upon them.

Of course, no one can forecast the gusts, or indeed the storms, the economy may face ahead but if the recovery is slower than expected then the automatic fiscal stabilisers – the lower tax receipts and higher spending that result from weaker growth – will act to stimulate demand, and monetary policy can react too, especially when there is a credible plan to reduce the deficit.

In the wake of the worst financial crisis ever, the amount of money in our economy – broad money – is now barely growing at all. It was the failure in the 1930s to halt a marked contraction in the money supply that led to the Great Depression. So, the Bank of England has taken extraordinary measures – known sometimes as “quantitative easing” – to boost the supply of money in order to support a recovery in the economy and keep inflation on track to meet our target, and because monetary policy is a flexible instrument that can be changed in either direction each month, it is the best tool for managing the economy in the short run.

Nevertheless, the road ahead is unlikely to be straight. There is considerable uncertainty about the prospects for both the United States and the euro area – our most important export markets. Business and consumer confidence at home has weakened recently and it will be some time before our banking system will be able to finance a recovery on the usual terms. The transition to a better balanced economy will be difficult but we are already seeing encouraging signs of expansion in manufacturing and UK exports.

This morning’s figures show a small rise in the claimant count and a small fall in the Labour Force Survey measures of unemployment but the big picture is that unemployment is, yes, higher than before the crisis but lower than many had feared a year ago. In July, on one of my regular visits to different parts of the country, I met with the Scottish TUC in Glasgow to learn more about the labour market there. Our contacts with experienced union officials with a range of company and sector contacts are the best source of intelligence on labour markets. With your help, we are determined to understand what is happening in every region and country of our economy so that we can set the right monetary policy. I want to assure you that the Bank of England is there to serve the whole economy right across the breadth and length of this country.

The costs of this crisis will be with us for a generation and we owe it to the next generation to seize this opportunity to put in place the reforms that will make another crisis much less likely and much less damaging. We at the Bank of England and you in the trade union movement should work together. That is why I am pleased to be with you today. It will require patience and determination on all our parts, including your members, but the prize of restoring and maintaining economic stability – and a return to sustained rises in employment and living standards – will be worth the effort. Thank you. *(Applause)*

The President: Thank you, Mervyn. The General Secretary will now chair the Question and Answer session.

Question and Answer Session with the Governor of the Bank of England

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*): Thank you, Dougie. Congress, as you know and as on previous

occasions we have the opportunity now for questions to be put to the Governor. A number of unions gave indications that they had points they wanted to put to him. I am going to take them in groups of two or three at a time beginning with colleagues from Unite, CWU, and NUT. Agnes Tolmie, Unite, I think you have the first point?

Agnes Tolmie (*Unite*): Thank you, Governor. My question is: I work in the finance sector and I am a member of Unite. Do you believe that the banks, which were bailed out with public money and have subsequently shed thousands of jobs, will aid any economic recovery by putting so many people out of work? Thank you. *(Applause)*

Debbie Cort (*Communication Workers Union*): As a bank worker in Santander and a member of the CWU who represent relatively low-paid staff in the banking sector, I am concerned to see excessive bankers’ bonuses making a comeback. The Government is looking at high pay in the public sector and considering a pay ratio of 20:1. What do you think is an appropriate ratio in the banking sector and would you support a high pay commission looking at pay ratios in the private sector? Moreover, given that bankers’ remuneration has rewarded risk-taking and its role in the current financial crisis, is enough being done to reign in executive pay? *(Applause)*

Doreen Barrett (*National Union of Teachers*): It is widely reported that many companies were paying bonuses at a prevailing level before the economic crisis. Does Mervyn King agree that these bonuses are unacceptable and will not assist economic recovery and that the wide-scale tax avoidance now often reported is unacceptable, all the more because public spending cuts will have a devastating effect on the poorest in society? *(Applause)*

Brendan Barber: Okay. Thank you, Doreen. The bank cuts, high pay bonuses, tax treatment, all of those points, Mervyn.

Mervyn King: I think two big points come out of this. The first is the role of banks in financing a recovery. They are not in good shape. That is not anyone’s fault apart from their own but the fact is that the banking balance sheets are not in a tremendously robust state. It is interesting that many bigger companies are going round the banking system to finance directly and that is working well. The problem, I think, is for many small and medium-sized enterprises. It is quite striking that over the past year the amount of money which small and medium-sized enterprises have been able to borrow from the banks has actually been less than the amount they have repaid to the banks. That is not going to encourage the finance of recovery. The question is, what do we do about it? I think the real lesson for me is that we have to ensure that we do not allow the banks ever again to get into a state where they can damage the prospects for recovery.

Turning to bonuses, I have enormous sympathy for the concerns that people express. I think that my experience has been, yours may be different but my experience has been that most people in this country do not object to people earning more than they do, even a lot more, provided that they understand why and can see the contribution that people have made. But when large bonuses are paid to people in organisations that only two years earlier were bailed out by the taxpayer, it becomes somewhat harder to understand. *(Applause)* I do not think the answer is to rely on direct controls or even an arbitrary ratio. Why?

Not because I do not share your objective but because I fear that if banks want to pay this money to those individuals they will find a way of doing it.

What I said in my speech was that we have to go back and ask why this happened, why is it that the banks feel that they should be making these payments? In part, it is because they are using the implicit guarantee of the taxpayer to take large risks and hence they feel that they can encourage and want to pay people to take excessive risk. If we could deal with the fundamental problem of what banks are for and why they at present have an excessive incentive to take risks, then I would hope that the symptom of that, which is these excessive bonuses, would disappear.

I understand the feelings and the strength of feeling, I am surprised it often has not been expressed more deeply, I certainly understand that, but I would urge you to get to the fundamental cause rather than deal with the symptoms because I think we will not succeed if we merely rely on tackling the symptoms. We have to get at the cause of why banks have been doing this.

Brendan Barber: Mervyn, thanks for that. Our colleague from TSSA, Amarjit Singh, and then I am going to ask Gary Gibson and Alan Dudson for their questions.

Amarjit Singh (*Transport Salaried Staffs' Association*): Do you think that the Bank of England and its various committees, including the Monetary Committee, properly reflect the diversity that currently exists in the UK in terms of gender, ethnicity, and educational background? Do you believe that there is a good understanding at the bank of how economic and monetary policy decisions impact on ordinary people, and how do you believe such policy decisions may differ if those making them reflected greater diversity? Thank you. (*Applause*)

Gary Gibson (*The Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists*): Hello, Mr. King. Many low-paid workers struggle to obtain credit from banks and fall prey to pawnbrokers and loan sharks. Do the banks have a responsibility to provide a service for all members of the community and do you think there is a role for credit unions?

Alan Dudson (*GMB*): Mr King, you have been Governor of the Bank of England now for quite a few years. You spoke to the General Council in 2008 and under questioning you said that there would not be a recession and that the banks were properly regulated. Can you tell Congress what went wrong? (*Applause*)

Mervyn King: Right. Let me take that last one first. (*Laughter*) I remember coming to the General Council in June 2008 and I explained the Monetary Policy Committee's view that it had just published in the May inflation report. Let me perhaps correct slightly the interpretation you gave. I never make statements about what will or will not happen. All our forecasts are judgments about a balance of risks. We actually said in May 2008 that there would be a slowdown. We felt that the balance was more in the direction of it being, yes, a slowdown but probably not a recession. I certainly did not comment on whether the banks were being well or badly regulated since that was not our responsibility.

What I will address is what went wrong, because that is the right question. What went wrong, I think, was what I talked about in my speech, namely, the two fundamental causes: the big imbalances in the world economy and the fact that the banks were allowed to

build up their balance sheets to levels where they were ready to topple over. In September 2008, after the General Council meeting, the trigger was the collapse of Lehman Brothers. That was not the cause, it was the trigger, and after that there was an extraordinary and wholly unprecedented collapse of confidence around the world economy with people from all over the world talking about, as I said in my remarks, the economy falling off a cliff. That was not expected and indeed that kind of shocking event cannot be predicted, but it happened and the question is did we respond to it. I like to think that we did respond to it.

Now let me go back to the first question about diversity. Obviously, I am not a very good advert for diversity in the bank being male, white, and at best middle-aged, but I want to assure you that we do have a very diverse recruitment pattern. We have enormous efforts paid to gender, ethnicity, and a wide range of experience in our recruitment. Our problem, I think, is less the people we recruit and more can we find better ways of encouraging them to rise to the top of the bank. We have, and we have worked with Brendan on this, put in place a new and quite significant programme of work flexibility in the bank to make it easier for people with a whole variety of backgrounds to pursue varied careers so that we do not force people to conform to a single model.

In terms of the Monetary Policy Committee, what I think is most important is not so much diversity of gender, ethnicity, or age, but diversity of experience and opinion, and we have always valued, indeed treasured, diversity of view on the Monetary Policy Committee. We are the only Monetary Policy Committee in the world that is really as open as we are to publishing differing votes, opinions, and views about what should happen to monetary policy. We do that because we believe that a group of nine people, chosen not by ourselves but by the Government, are the best group to form those decisions. If we are in a minority, the majority probably know better than we do. I think in that crucial respect of judgment about the economy we are indeed diverse.

Finally on the banks service, yes, though I think we should think of this as the need for the banking industry to service everyone rather than pin it on a particular institution. I say that because that comes back again to the point I want to hammer home as much as I can, which is, it is not helpful to talk about individuals, people, or institutions. It is the system we have to get right. We need more competition in the banking sector so that people can indeed choose from a wider range of options. I do think that mutual organisations have a very important part to play in this and indeed some of the mutual organisations in banking were the ones that prospered in the crisis. Why: because people trusted them more. That is to my mind an important part of the future.

Brendan Barber: Okay. Thank you, Mervyn. Now Mary Locke from UNISON, and then Sandie Rowlands from USDAW.

Mary Locke (*UNISON*): Good morning. I am an NHS worker. Economists are saying the public service cuts will hit the poorest most of all. They also predict that cutting now will slow economic growth and could lead to a double-dip recession. What is your personal view? (*Applause*)

Sandie Rowlands (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*): Mervyn, my name is Sandie Rowlands and I am a rep with USDAW, a trade union organising many low-paid workers. The Government claim that

the budget was fair and progressive. Do you believe that the budget with cuts of £34bn that will hit low-paid workers, and in particular women workers, can be both fair and progressive? *(Applause)*

Mervyn King: Let me take those two in turn. On the first, I think there are two quite distinct issues: one is not for the bank and one is one I will comment on. The first one is how the deficit should be reduced. It is perfectly reasonable to make the case that it is not being reduced in a way that you think is fair. That is a question for political debate and judgment. It is not for me to comment on; that is for you to engage in debate.

The second is, and you were quite clear in your question that there were two parts to it, the speed at which the deficit should be reduced. Now, certainly there is room for debate. No one can claim that one precise speed is obviously right and everything else is obviously wrong. What I would say to you is, and this is what I tried to get across in my remarks, it is not enough just to say we should not cut, we should not reduce the deficit. We have to find a way over a number of years to reduce the deficit and it is no good just making vague statements that at some point in the future we will get round to it. If you want to oppose what is being done, I think the onus is on those to come up with an alternative, credible and convincing, plan for a better way of reducing the deficit; that is for you to engage in. But what I would say as Governor of the Bank is that we cannot afford just to put this off and hope for the best. There has to be a debate about different ways of achieving the objective but the objective is important.

Secondly, in terms of the description of the budget, it is not for me to give or choose adjectives for the budget. That is for others to engage in. What I would say, though, and it is a point I would make again, there needs to be an alternative. If people are unhappy with what is being proposed, it is perfectly reasonable to take that view. I think the onus is on them to come up with an alternative plan which over a number of years will reduce the deficit. We cannot just go on with vague promises that some day we will get round to it. That is my point. But there is plenty of room for disagreement and different views about how that should be done and that is not for me, or indeed any economist, to talk about, that is exactly what the political debate is about.

Brendan Barber: Okay. Thank you, Mervyn. We are certainly very much engaging in that battle of ideas, I can assure you. The final set of questions is from Janice Godrich from PCS, then Prospect, and UCU.

Janice Godrich (*Public and Commercial Services Union*): Hello, Mervyn.

Mervyn King: Hello, Janice.

Janice Godrich: PCS represents workers in government departments, including HMRC, and I would like to ask your views on some of the issues that we have been campaigning on. Tax Justice Network estimate the tax gap to be as high as £120bn and even HMRC by their own admission put this at, at least, £40bn. Do you agree with PCS that we should, firstly, close the loopholes that allow tax avoidance, that we should increase rather than cut HMRC staff who on average bring in £658,000 of revenue each year, and finally that we should take decisive action against the criminals engaged in massive tax evasion? Thank you. *(Applause)*

Alan Grey (*Prospect*): Mr King, we represent professionals, managers and specialists, across both the private and the public sector. The Government have said that cuts in public sector employment will be balanced by growth in the private sector. Do you agree that this is economic fantasy given that 37 per cent of private sector jobs depend on public procurement?

Pauline Collins (*University and College Union*): Thank you. Can you explain a financial economy where students face lifelong debt and where banks offer 0.2 per cent return on investment but charge 19 per cent on loans? *(Applause)*

Mervyn King: The first question on tax, the way you put it makes it almost irresistible that one should agree with it but I feel I have to say that this is not the responsibility of the Bank. It would be wrong for me to talk about what should happen to tax policy. Demarcation is alive and well in the public service but I hear your points and they sound persuasive. *(Applause)*

Brendan Barber: Janice, I would score that up as a win, if I were you. *(Laughter)*

Mervyn King: On employment, I think I would put it rather differently. Of course the Office of Budget Responsibility has talked about a large number of jobs disappearing over a five to six-year period in the public sector. If you simply asked the question, have we seen in the past episodes of five years when the private sector has generated an equivalent, or even larger, number of jobs, then the answer is yes. So, it would not be unprecedented for the private sector to create this many jobs and indeed one of the roles of monetary policy in the Bank of England is to ensure that there is enough demand in the economy as a whole to make sure that happens. Whether this is the right way of doing it is a different question but that goes back to the point about what is the best way of reducing the deficit. That is not for me to comment on. I do not think it is unprecedented for large increases in employment in the private sector.

Finally on the banks, this amazing gap between 0.2 per cent, which we can understand because bank rate is so low, and 19 per cent; 19 per cent I am sure is an interest rate on an unsecured loan, and there are such interest rates, and there are probably even higher ones. I think what is more relevant to the economy as a whole is the gap between the 0.2 per cent and the typical rate which businesses or indeed families taking out a mortgage are being asked to pay. That is nowhere near 19 per cent, it is much lower, but nevertheless the gap between the rates at which banks are lending and borrowing is very large, much larger than was the case before the crisis. The reason that is happening is because the banks' balance sheets are not in good shape and that the rest of the financial sector is nervous about lending money to banks for a considerable period on anything other than much higher interest rates than they used to, relative to bank rate. That is the nub of the problem here. We do rely on the banking system and it will take time now to nurse the banking system back into health but, and this is what I want to get across as the main message, we cannot allow a banking system ever again to go into a crisis in the state that it went into this one in. We do need reform. I do not think there is a simple short-term solution but, my goodness, we had better work hard to ensure we get the right long-term solution.

Brendan Barber: Mervyn, many thanks indeed. It is very clear that the Bank is taking on significant new responsibilities over this current period and very clear, too, that the work that you do at the Bank is hugely important to the whole of the economy and to all the people that we represent. I am very grateful, and I think Congress is very grateful too, to you for coming today to share your thoughts on some of those challenges that we face. I know that you see this very much as part of an ongoing relationship, very much working together. We value the contacts our colleagues in the regions have with your regional agents, and I very much see this as part of an ongoing conversation. Mervyn, thank you again for this morning's session. *(Applause)*

Mervyn King: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Can I just say to Congress, thank you for inviting me today and to stress that, as Brendan said, we make regular monthly visits, every member of the Monetary Policy Committee, to different parts of the country. Part of the purpose of that is to maintain regular contact with you, the trade union movement, so that you can tell us what is happening in your part of the economic scene to help us set monetary policy, and we are determined to make that a permanent relationship. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

The President: Thank you, Mervyn, once again for your address and your answers in the Question and Answer session, and also thanks to Brendan for facilitating that session. It was really very, very interesting and very beneficial. Congress, we are now going to continue with our agenda.

Malnutrition and dehydration

The President: Congress, I call Motion 50, Malnutrition and dehydration. The General Council supports the motion.

Suzanne Wong (*British Dietetic Association*) moved Motion 50.

She said: I am a first-time delegate. *(Applause)* In the UK today over three million people are suffering from malnutrition in the form of undernourishment. Research has shown that during admission to hospital two-thirds of all people become malnourished to some degree and many become dehydrated. This situation is worse among the elderly. Dehydration can lead to lethargy and confusion. It increases risk of urine infection, kidney failure, and pneumonia. Being malnourished complicates and delays recovery from illness, increases risk of hospital-acquired infection, reduces quality of life, and prolongs hospital stay. Both malnutrition and dehydration can ultimately lead to death.

The benefits of improving nutritional care and providing adequate hydration are immense. The British Association for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition estimates that the associated health costs of this level of malnutrition exceeds £13bn annually. This is the equivalent to 1.6 million hip operations or 43 new state-of-the-art hospitals. The National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence has identified better nutritional care as potentially the fourth largest cost-saving in the NHS.

Over the last 20 years numerous reports have been produced highlighting the ongoing prevalence of malnutrition and its detrimental effect on health, and recommendations have been made on how to improve the situation. But despite this, malnutrition and dehydration remains unacceptably high in hospital patients and those in other healthcare settings. What is required now to reduce this burden on health and

quality of life is a statutory framework of comprehensive nutritional standards for all healthcare settings, such as that set out by the Council of Europe Alliance in their resolution on food and nutritional care in hospitals.

They have endorsed ten key characteristics of good nutritional care in hospitals, these being that all patients are screened on admission to identify those who are malnourished or at risk of becoming so; all patients have a care plan which identifies their nutritional care needs and how they are met; hospitals include specific guidance on food services and nutritional care in its clinical governance arrangements; patients are involved in the planning and monitoring arrangements for food service provision; that all wards implement protective mealtimes to provide an environment conducive to patients enjoying and being able to eat their food; all staff have the appropriate skills, competencies, and training needed to meet the patients' nutritional needs; the hospital facilities are designed to be flexible and patient-centred with the aim of providing and delivering an excellent experience of food service and nutritional care 24 hours a day every day; that the hospital has a policy for food service and nutritional care which is patient-centred; food service and nutritional care is delivered to the patients safely; and, lastly, that hospitals support a multidisciplinary approach to nutritional care and values the contribution of all staff groups working in partnership with patients and users.

The Alliance recommends that governments of all member states should implement national recommendations for food and nutritional care in hospitals, promote implementation both in public and private sectors, and ensure the widest possible dissemination of these recommendations. The British Dietetic Association fully endorses these recommendations and I call upon Congress to support us in lobbying the Government to introduce a statutory regulatory framework of comprehensive nutritional standards for all healthcare settings and for all fellow trade unions to raise the awareness amongst their membership of the importance of identifying and tackling malnutrition. This should be of concern to everyone as it may be your relative, colleague, or friend, who is at risk. As Florence Nightingale wrote 150 years ago, "Every careful observer of the sick will agree in this that thousands of patients are annually starved in the midst of plenty, from want of attention to the ways which alone make it possible for them to take food." It is appalling that this comment is as apt today as it was at the time it was written. Don't let this issue continue for another year, let alone another 150. It must be tackled now. *(Applause)*

Mary Turner (*GMB*) seconded Motion 50, and the amendment.

She said: Congress, I have the honour not only to be the President of the GMB but this week I was asked by the BDA would I take the honour of being their honorary president. I thank them for that honour. That to me is wonderful. *(Applause)*

I am so delighted to speak on this important motion. GMB supports this motion not just because of the issues in healthcare, which are huge, but because of the issues in care of the most vulnerable in our society. Too often people are not getting the high-quality care they need. Staff are stretched and overworked and paid a pittance. The quality of food is below that which our elderly deserve and sometimes people go hungry because of lack of dietary provision. It is a resource issue. Of course the tens of millions of profits being made on the back of the residents and staff needs redirecting to provide healthy diets and decent rewards.

One of the largest providers of care homes in the UK is Southern Cross, who take £60m from local authorities, and are an interesting case. Southern Cross was fleeced by an American private equity outfit, Blackstone; residents and staff ended up in the hands of the Qatar Investment Authority, another fleecing group. The Qatar Investment Authority has no interest in decent care for the elderly. Rents in these care homes have gone up nearly 17 per cent in the last three years, 17 per cent when property values are falling, so most of the profits of £80m or so that Southern Cross gets is swallowed up by the owners who send the money offshore – I wish Merv was listening to this – to avoid paying taxes. It is money that should be spent on the homes to take care of the residents and provide healthy dietary regimes, the best for our elderly.

Why should they accept less in order that tax dodgers can offshore the hard-earned bucks of taxpayers? Why not fund staff at levels above the minimum instead of offshoring their profits? Where has the money gone, you know that song? Well, the Qataris have just bought Harrods and they have done it with money skimmed from elderly care; quite simply, it is a right royal Qatari rip-off. Do you know they charge more for a shopping bag in Harrods than they pay their carers in the homes to look after our most vulnerable. That is why GMB is calling for a minimum national standard for the level of spend for each and every resident in care to cover their food and accommodation. We are also calling for all care home providers to publish full information about their ownership, along with up-to-date accounts. If they cannot meet these standards they should all be taken back into public ownership where they should have been in the first place, and not privatised. *(Applause)* And we should have universal free national care alongside the NHS. Meanwhile, the Qatar Investment Authority needs to use their power and wealth to help reduce the rents of Southern Cross Homes and improve standards for residents. The GMB will continue with their lobby of Harrods until we get that. I promise you that. And, Merv, if you do not know what went wrong or why the banks did what they did, why they did it, it was because they were all greedy bullshitters. Thank you. *(Applause)*

* *Motion 50 was CARRIED*

Social care

The President: Congress, I am now moving to Motion 62, Social care. The General Council supports this motion.

Tom Donnelly (*Community*) moved Motion 62.

He said: Congress, I am here today to celebrate the work of social carers across the country. Social carers provide an essential support for many of the most vulnerable people in our society today. It is a sad fact of modern life that the forces of globalisation transform a society and the work of social carers has become more important than ever to ensure that vulnerable people get the help they need. The paradox here, delegates, is that the position of social care has become more important to society as the number of people who need their support continues to grow.

The role of social carers and social workers has been stigmatised. Social carers are all too often shunned by the public and attacked by the media. Attacking individuals has become a sport as it sells more papers than questions on the fundamentals of funding social care. These fundamentals show that there is a chronic under-funding of training for social carers and that the people are underpaid and under-valued. There is little or no career development structure in place for these

people. Caseloads are high. Support for frontline workers is low. This is what social care workers are up against day in, day out. This is a system that has been pushed to breaking point but it is absolutely vital to the lives of thousands that it does not break.

Congress, as unions it is our duty to take up the case for these social carers and fight their corner, not just by basic demands for fair pay, equal pay, and respect in the workplace, which is the day-to-day work of our union, but we need a wider campaign involving the TUC to fight for respect for social carers outside the workplace and in the wider community. Caring and social work is a vocation and requires dedication and sacrifice. They come with a skill that requires discipline and application to ensure professionalism. This must be recognised by the wider public as it is important for social carers in our society who will continue to grow in the coming years. Now is the time to counter the slanderous attacks from the ravenous red top media and ensure that the workers in this sector are provided with the level of respect and support that they deserve. Delegates, support social carers, support respect for all at work and, most importantly, support this motion. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Kate Fallon (*Association of Educational Psychologists*) seconded Motion 62.

She said: President, Congress, I am here today to second Motion 62 which asks Congress to show its support for social carers and defend their work from the frequent attacks it receives from many parts of the media. I am very pleased to be here and showing that support on behalf of the AEP.

Educational psychologists, teachers, and many others, work closely with social carers and will testify that their work at times warrants the description of “unsung heroes”. Over the last few days we have all expressed concern about the future of public services and our belief in the high quality of those services which are provided for the most vulnerable members of our society. Few members of our society are more vulnerable than young children living in situations where the responsible adults do not possess the appropriate skills to look after them properly, or those adults who do not have the capacity to care for themselves on a day-to-day basis because of physical or mental health issues.

There are many children and young people, and adults, today who have been able to remain living with their families because social carers and social workers, from both the public and the voluntary sectors, have worked within those families and remained with them for the long haul, delivering the high-quality services necessary for the children to have good enough parents and to assist with the day-to-day care of the adults. Unfortunately, we rarely read those stories.

So, Congress, I ask you to support this motion by literally applauding the work of social carers and perhaps we can make a direct plea to the many media representatives who are here today to use their positions of influence to highlight the positive aspects of what social carers do.

Bev Miller (*UNISON*) spoke in support of Motion 62.

She said: Congress, UNISON represents over 300,000 members employed in social services from senior social workers to domiciliary care assistants, and on their behalf it is an honour to support this motion, a motion which gives welcome recognition to the hidden army of dedicated workers who look out for the most vulnerable in our society and who are themselves one of the most undervalued sections of the public service workforce: for some reason they do not seem to get

the same media attention as schools or the NHS and yet their work is just as important.

Last year more than 600,000 children were referred to social service departments for assessment and possible protection and almost two million adults rely on social care services, a number which is set to increase significantly as people live longer and our population ages. But instead of investing in our system of social care and supporting the staff who dedicate themselves to it, successive governments have neglected it. Social workers have been underpaid and insufficiently supported as well as over-burdened with bureaucratic procedures and rising caseloads. As a result, turnover and vacancy rates are high putting the staff that remain under even greater strain and care workers, many of whom are now carrying out tasks that used to be reserved for medically qualified nurses and paramedics, get pocket money pay and next to no training.

This has been exacerbated by the sweeping privatisation of our long-term care system with private and third sector providers now making up around 90 per cent of the market. The result has been even more exploitation of staff. In June Skills for Care reported that care workers in the private sector earned on average £6 an hour less than supermarket cashiers, 8 per cent of carers earn only the minimum wage, and a further 7 per cent are paid below it. Last week UNISON brought three of those carers to give evidence to the Low Pay Commission because the private home care company they worked for refused to cover their travel time between visits. They could not even make minimum wage when they put in a day's work. With UNISON's backing they now get a better deal but many more in this under-regulated and under-unionised sector face similar problems. Many of the agencies and companies involved are cowboys but the responsibility is shared by local authorities many of whom encourage a race to the bottom by conducting grotesque eBay-styled reverse auctions when tendering contracts, and by national government which has long failed to fund the sector properly. Congress, please support the motion.

* *Motion 62 was CARRIED*

Cosmetic use of sunbeds

The President: I would like to move to Motion 79, Cosmetic use of sunbeds. The General Council supports.

Jackie Hughes (*Society of Radiographers*) moved Motion 79.

She said: I am a first-time delegate. (*Applause*) In 2008, Cancer Research UK launched its Sun Smart Campaign aiming to reduce the risks of skin cancers and highlighting the dangers of using sunbeds. In the UK each year more than 10,000 people are diagnosed with melanoma. It is the sixth most common cancer overall in the UK. In 2007, an analysis of 23 studies demonstrated that you have an increased risk of skin cancer if you have ever used a sunbed. A further study in 2009 found that people who have regularly used a sunbed before the age of 30 have a 75 per cent increase in their risk of developing melanoma. The evidence demonstrates that using sunbeds not only increases the risks of melanoma but also damages the skin significantly causing premature ageing.

The International Agency for Research on Cancer, an expert committee that makes recommendations to the World Health Organisation, recently upgraded sunbeds from probably carcinogenic to definitively carcinogenic to humans. The IARC's move to upgrade sunbeds in this way supports Cancer Research and the BMA's advice to avoid sunbeds completely for cosmetic use

purposes. They have no health benefits and we know that they increase the risk of cancer. It costs the NHS about £200m a year to treat skin care cases but it is not about the money, it is about saving lives. There are approximately 100 deaths per year from malignant melanoma; that is 100 families that lose a loved one. In July 2009, a Department of Health spokesperson said: "Sunbeds can be dangerous. We must ensure that people who use them do so safely. If necessary, we will look at new laws to protect young people."

In England and Wales the Sunbeds (Regulation) Act 2010 imposes a ban on under-18 year olds from using sunbeds and imposes certain other restrictions on use. Scotland has a similar ban. However, with one in three of all cases of malignant melanoma occurring in people under 50 and it being the second commonest cancer in 15-34 year olds, the Society of Radiographers believes it is time for more drastic action, a complete ban on sunbed usage at home, in leisure centres, and high street tanning salons. There is no such thing as a healthy tan. We question, whatever happened to pale and interesting. This Congress therefore calls on the TUC to work with the Government and relevant charities to further restrict the use of sunbeds to treatment of clinical conditions under the control of appropriate medical, nursing, and allied health professions. Help us save some of those lives. Please support the motion. (*Applause*)

Jude Brimble (*GMB*) seconded Motion 79.

She said: Congress, as a fair-skinned factor 30 user and pale and interesting, I have been tempted to use sunbeds myself in the past. I know only too well about the pitfalls of trying to get a tan, about the peer pressure, about always being the pale person on the beach hidden under a large-brimmed hat. I have learned to love my skin and I have learned to protect my pale skin, but not everybody can do this, young people, in particular, young impressionable people, who want to emulate their celebrity hero, who crave that celeb look, the sun-kissed glow that seems to translate into a message that says health, success, attractiveness. We need to bust the myths that say a good tan equals good health or a good tan equals a good lifestyle.

Congress, there is many a true word in the saying about mad dogs and the midday sun. Sunbed rays are ten times stronger than the midday sun yet people can walk in off the street, particularly young people, and use a coin-operated sunbed, no guidance, no advice, no age checking, no enforcement, no legislation, and often no trained staff, just a few glossy brochures promoting "the safer way" of working up that much desired tan. While the coin machines are totting up the profits, the young skin is stacking up the risk of exposure from the harmful UV radiation, the sort that is capable of inducing all types of skin cancer.

The truth is there is no safe way of getting that tan that people crave so much. It suggests that that is the case in the glossy brochures: a lie. That is why we not only need legislation and strong enforcement, we do need that ban. We need a high profile health campaign that educates our young people. We need to ensure that young people are not exposed and exploited but are protected and educated. It is a tragedy that young lives are needlessly being lost and cut short in the name of body fashion for a look that so wrongly promotes health and wellbeing. Congress, they say that beauty is skin deep; well, so is skin cancer. I second and ask you to support. (*Applause*)

* *Motion 79 was CARRIED*

The President: That concludes this morning's business. May I just remind delegates of the various meetings that are taking place at lunchtime, details of which are

on pages 16 and 17 of the *Congress Guide*, or in the leaflet included in your Congress wallet. Congress is now adjourned until 2.15 this afternoon. Thank you.

(Congress adjourned at 12.45 p.m.)

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

(Congress re-assembled at 2.15 p.m.)

The President: Congress, once again, many thanks to The Blue Ribbons who have been playing for us this afternoon. They are excellent young people.
(Applause)

Congress, please listen carefully. As I reported earlier, I hope to be able to take unfinished business from yesterday after the scheduled business this afternoon. That unfinished business is Composite 13, Defending further and higher education; Motion 60, Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) referrals, and Motion 61, Reforming Ofsted. After that I will attempt to take Emergency Motion E3, Industrial action against cuts on London Underground; E4, Bangladeshi garment workers; E5, Connaught; E6, 26,000 redundancy notices at Birmingham City Council. Please note that I intend to take Emergency Motion 2, Royal Mail, after scheduled business on Thursday.

Congress, we start this afternoon with a short film about the challenges facing the trade unions in Colombia. I will invite Sally Hunt who will introduce the video.

Colombia

Sally Hunt (*General Council*): Thank you, President and Congress, for giving us the time to watch this film. Colleagues, what you are about to see is a very short film, and it is one that pays tribute to the bravery of two particular Colombian trade unionists, but also in general to the Colombian trade union movement which, as we know, struggles so hard with a repressive regime. You will see that it says two things. First, it will say thank you, to you, for all the work that you have done to keep campaigning for our sisters and brothers in Colombia and, second, we hope that, on behalf of this Congress, it will send a message to the Colombian government saying, despite their lies, despite their PR and despite all the words which they use to cover up what they are doing, that we know that the situation for our sisters and brothers has not changed, that they are still in trouble, that they are still being killed, that they are still being repressed and that they still cannot organise as trade unionists in a free democracy.

Both the prisoners who will be in this film are people who I have some very special thoughts for. The first is a woman called Lilliani. Lilliani and I met in a prison in Bogata last year. She was in there for the crime of rebellion. Rebellion is the catch-all crime that trade unionists and anyone else who speaks up against the Colombian regime is arrested under and many of them stay in prison without charge for months and years. Many of them then are kept in prison under false charges so that they cannot organise. What it really means is that if you disagree with the Colombian government and you try to do something about it, this is where you will end up. The second prisoner is a man called Migel. Migel is a member of my union's sister union in Colombia, and his only crime was to speak out about the appalling attacks on human rights and, particularly, those against trade unionists. He, too, has been charged with rebellion. He, too, is still in jail.

The film was shot on a recent delegation visit by Justice for Colombia, and we thank them for making it possible for us to see this film. I am not sure that the prison guards necessarily knew what was taking place,

and I don't think it was without risk that they did the filming, so we do thank them. So on behalf, I hope, of Lilliani and Migel, and all of those Colombian trade unionists, I commend this film to you and I hope that you will take what it says away with you into your trade unions and make sure that we continue to support our sisters and brothers in their struggle. Thank you. *(Video shown)*

The President: Congress, I am sure you will agree that the video was a timely and moving reminder of the challenges that our colleagues in Colombia face, and also the bravery they have shown in the face of that adversity. We can only admire them.

Government transport policy

The President: I call Composite Motion 9, Government transport policy. The General Council supports the composite motion.

Gerry Doherty (*Transport Salaried Staffs' Association*) moved Composite Motion 9.

He said: Congress, it wouldn't surprise you to know that since my trade union is affiliated to the Labour Party that in recent times we have been inundated with candidates for the leadership campaign. It wouldn't surprise you, either, that the first question I have asked all of them is, "What are you going to do about the railways?" You know, the answer I get back from the leading contender, or at least that is what the papers tell us, is "We can find a form of words". Do you know, I have been finding a form of words for the last 13 years, and we have had enough of words. It is actions that we want now, because, quite frankly, our railways are sick and they have been sick for a long time. Maybe this debate should have been in the health debate rather than transport. But the cause of the disease can be directly linked back to the privatisation of the industry by the last Tory government in the '90s. The symptoms are there for all to see: huge salaries and bonuses for them at the top and safety standards compromised. You will remember at the time of privatisation the railway unions were vilified for saying that safety would be compromised, and then along came Hatfield, Potters Bar and Paddington, and people lost their lives.

I park my car every day at Northampton train station. When I started doing it, which was not all that long ago, it was £2 a day. It is now £7.50 a day. Some of the car parking charges are dearer than the train fares. And then there is the issue of the fares themselves. Virgin Trains is so-called, I understand, because they don't always go the whole way, but a member of our delegation works for Virgin Trains. He said, "It's amazing, you know. Somebody will come into Euston Station and ask for a second class single to Manchester, and we will give them a first class fare, and they don't believe it when we say that the first class is cheaper than the second class." That, actually, goes on on a daily basis.

You will have seen these cheap fares advertised. A couple of years ago we carried out an experiment. We tried to buy the cheap fare that was advertised between Glasgow and York. It didn't exist. We knew it didn't exist because it is our members who put them on the system. We exposed what was going on in the newspapers. What happens? They bring our members in at the weekend, put some cheap fares on the system, sell them and then threaten to sue me for libel. Those are the kind of people who we are dealing with. When we faced up to them, they backed off, but the cheap fares are designed to bring you in and then they will sell you what they want to sell you.

We all heard the lie at privatisation that, among other things, we would transfer the financial risk from the public sector to the private sector. Then what happens? National Express overbid for the East Coast Mainline, the plumb of the franchises, but they went in too heavy and couldn't make any money out of it. What did they do? They went back and tried to re-negotiate. They were told to get lost, so what did they do then? They handed the keys back. But why are they allowed to keep two other franchises and make money when the one that they couldn't make money on goes back into the public sector? It is a disgrace.

Then take Network Rail. Please will somebody take Network Rail. Ian Coucher has got himself a big estate in Scotland. He is now styled "The Laird of the Gravy Train". When it came to bonuses this year, what was his response to Government Ministers? What was his response to the newspaper reports that "we are all in this together"? Two fingers. "I'll dip my snout even further in the trough," is what he is saying. Ian Coucher is leaving at the end of October, and I can tell you that there won't be one tear in the railway industry when that man turns his back on it. But, at the end of the day – we are in Opposition now – why can't the Labour Party in Opposition say, "As soon as we are back in Downing Street the railway system will be back in public hands"? Thank you.

John Evans (*Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*) seconded Composite Motion 9.

He said: President and Congress, a famous wartime Prime Minister once described Russia as "A riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma". The same could be said of the railway industry today. We all know that 15 years ago the privatisation of the railway industry became a Frankenstein monster. It is even more complicated and unfathomable than ever. We don't even know who is responsible and who we work for within the railway industry any more.

Privatisation unleashed a Pandora's Box of uncontrollable forces, with layer upon layer of sub-contractors, multiple interfaces and regulators from the ORR and the RSSB. We ask ourselves time and time again who actually runs the railway? Who is accountable for it? It is not the government, that's for sure. Despite a taxpayers' subsidy of £5 billion a year, Secretary of State, Philip Hammond had to stand by powerless as greedy Network Rail bosses awarded themselves huge bonuses a few months ago. There wasn't a thing he could do about it. Taxpayers don't get much value for their £5 billion either. The railway costs twice as much as it did before privatisation, while passengers have to put up with eye-watering railway fare increases. It is widely accepted, for example, that come January fares will be increased by at least 6 per cent. That is a kick in the teeth for the millions of workers who are facing pay freezes this year and next.

We are told that we now live in a time of austerity and that we must live within our means and difficult times lie ahead. While the rest of us tighten our belts, the train operating companies are rubbing their hands in glee. They are quids in whatever happens.

Stagecoach, which owns South West Trains and 50 per cent of Virgin Trains stand to make profits of nearly £200 million this year. Rail franchises like Stagecoach are paid by the Government to run services. They make profits from them as well. So they can't lose. Even more absurdly, they are entitled to compensation if any of the rail unions decide to take industrial action. They can't lose. They are paid to run it, they make a profit and they get compensation if we go on strike.

If you think that Henry Kissinger winning the Nobel Prize for Peace was absurd, how absurd is the fact that

they can make profit when the trains are not even running?

Finally, as a craft union, ASLEF supports keeping the craft of train building in the UK. That is why we support Bombardier's bid to build the new fleet of Thameslink Trains in Derby. I second.

Alex Gordon (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 9.

He said: Congress, I endorse wholeheartedly the comments made by Gerry Doherty and the previous speaker on the ConDem Government's transport policy. Delegates, public transport in this country is an expensive mess. It is the inevitable consequence of 15 or more years of privatisation, deregulation, fragmentation and a craven subservience to blind neo-liberal dogmas of private good/public bad, and the situation is about to get a lot worse.

As a result of the recent history of public transport in this country, delegates, we in Britain have the most expensive rail fares of any country in Europe, as you have heard from the mover. Our rural bus networks are being held to ransom by a cabal of private bus operators who have shown themselves to be the most outstanding practitioners of corporate welfare extortion anywhere in Britain. We are facing now a potential 40 per cent worth of cuts in transport budgets in the Comprehensive Spending Review to be announced in October. This morning Congress started off with a film about Robin Hood Tax and later on you had a chance to put questions to the Sheriff of Nottingham. We now welcome a world a latter day Dick Turpins. I think there is a theme emerging at Congress this year, President. Thatcher deregulated the bus industry in 1984; Major's government privatised the rail industry between 1994 and 1996, but the cuts which have now been planned by the ConDem Government for the public transport system in this country, for investment in the future and in jobs now, in the present time, are going to be delivered through the structures which this government has inherited from a Labour government. The Potters Bar rail crash, to give you one tragic example, which took place on 10th May 2002 and cost seven passengers their lives, incredibly only finally reached a coroner's inquiry this year, eight years after the death of those rail passengers. That eight year denial of justice is an offence against those bereaved families. It is an offence against railway workers, and it is an offence against the travelling public who need and require truthful answers to urgent questions about our public transport system. The coroner has recommended that the industry continues to address, or starts to address, the continued risk of further deaths. However, this is not happening at present and it will not happen under private ownership.

Congress delegates, it is vital that there is a united voice coming clearly and loudly from Britain's trade union movement that public transport is a public good that can and will only be delivered efficiently and safely in public ownership. We take the opportunity at this Congress to reaffirm our policy for inclusive, accessible, democratic and accountable public transport, which is the right of every citizen in this country. Congress, support the composite.

Joe Welch (*Unite*) moving the amendment to Composite 9. Good transport networks are essential to people's everyday lives and to the health and economy of the UK. Transport makes up 7.5 per cent of the UK economy, employing some 1.5 million workers. During these challenging economic conditions, it is important that trade unions make sure that the transport sector comes under public control.

Congress, £150 billion has been invested in transport over the past decade by the previous Labour government. This stands in stark contrast to the coalition Government's position, which has seen George Osborne cut £683 million from the transport budget in this coming year alone. For the majority of ordinary working people good local transport is very important, providing, as it does, essential links to healthcare, employment, friends and family. People's increasing demand for travel means that public transport, in many places, is very near to capacity. The backbone of the local transport network is the bus. Across Great Britain some five billion journeys are made every year on buses. If you do not have a car to get to work, to school, to visit the shops or hospitals, the bus is the first and often the only choice of transport. Yet Transport for London and local councils across the UK have been making massive cuts which privately owned bus companies immediately look to recoup from our members by longer hours, by pay freezes and reductions on new starter rates.

If they still cannot get their profits, then they will not try to go for the tenders. They will then just cut their losses, and this means that the workers, the drivers, are then TUPE'd to another company, sometimes miles away from where they work. Often they have worked for their company for 15 or 20 years, they have made good friends, their pension and everything is lost just so the fat cats can become shareholders.

Congress, this morning hundreds of London Unite bus workers demonstrated against the cuts outside City Hall and, for the first time, other campaigning groups joined the fight, with speakers from the passenger campaign and from the National Pensioners' Convention. We need to promote and support our affiliates. We will have to campaign and gather together all transport modes, such as buses, coaches, trams and trains. We should be looking to extend free public transport to other vulnerable groups as well as introducing a fares strategy that encourages the public back onto public transport. Please support.

Ivy Carlier (*UNISON*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 9.

She said: Congress, as the composite makes clear, the Coalition's programme for government and their cuts to the transport budget have far-reaching consequences for our economy, the environment and the quality of life of the many people who rely on public transport. In no area is this more true than in relation to buses. Buses provide a low cost, low carbon transport link to work, schools and colleges, health services, leisure facilities and the shops. They are the most used form of public transport. As has already been said, they account for five billion passenger journeys a year, and they are lifeline for the 25 per cent of people in Britain who do not have a car.

Let us not forget, either, that buses are the most heavily used form of transport by those on the lowest incomes and those with disabilities. This being the case, you would think that any normal government would do all that they could to protect them and to ensure their viability, but think again. As part of the cuts agenda, the coalition Government is reviewing the Bus Service Operators' Grant. This is the only direct national funding for bus services and it involves the government reimbursing bus service providers for most of the tax that they pay on their fuel. Scrapping the grant or even reducing it will have serious consequences for the network, for bus users and the many people who work in the industry. As the Campaign for Better Transport has shown, the Bus Service Operators' Grant reduces the cost of providing services, which lowers fares. This in turn leads to a more comprehensive network of services, less congestion on our roads and a healthier living

environment in our communities. It also helps to support 170,000 workers in the bus industry and the thousands of others in bus manufacturing and support services.

We welcome the composite's call for the extension of free public transport. One of the achievements of the last government was to introduce the National Concessionary Fare Scheme, but what we have to realise is that although the current government have committed to keep it, scrapping the Bus Service Operators' Grant risks making the free bus pass of little value. Ticket prices would rise, less people would take the bus and bus routes would be scrapped. In addition, of course, jobs of our members would be lost. Congress, let us not forget what an important part of our transport system buses are. Please support.

Paul Moloney (*Nautilus International*) spoke in support of the composite motion.

He said: Congress, whilst obviously fully supporting the composite, we did want to take the opportunity to speak to section 3.2 of the General Council Report and, in particular, the paragraphs on shipping.

We would like to place on record our thanks to the TUC for the work they have done in relation to the application of the Equality Act on ships. However, there is a very real urgency for this work to continue. Both my union and our sister union, the RMT, are defending the terms and conditions of members serving on ferries from Dover, and now we have the threat to members' jobs from Stena Line. In fact, this morning we learned of comments made by the Stena Line route director for the North Sea. His justification, published in a Stena Line press release issued in the Netherlands, for the continuing replacement of more UK seafarers by those on far lower terms and conditions was that British seafarers are, and these are his words, "Unwilling to work unless you want to employ the type with fat bellies and covered with tattoos". Colleagues, that coming from a company that benefits from a tax advantage in the UK. This is a disgrace to the professional hardworking men and women who go to sea, who take full responsibility for the lives on board their vessels and who deliver an unparalleled safety record.

It is the Stena Line management who are the real dinosaurs and not the people in this room. It shows that we must continue working to ensure that the Equality Act delivers true equality on European ferries and that companies which compete by discriminating on wages are stopped. Thank you.

* *Composite Motion 9 was CARRIED*

More freight on rail

Simon Birtwistle (*Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*): Congress, this is my first time attending Congress. (*Applause*) President and Congress, we have heard during the course of this Congress about the damage caused by the cuts agenda driven by the Conservative ideology rather than the economic social considerations.

On a more positive note, I would like to focus on an industry that with investment can create jobs, reduce carbon emissions and improve the quality of life for everybody in the UK. About 12 per cent of the UK service freight market is taken by rail, and this is growing year on year. It eases congestion on the UK road infrastructure. Rail freight volumes have increased by 70 per cent in the last ten years. The benefits of rail freight are clear. Firstly, there are the environmental benefits. No one would be surprised to hear that, per tonne carried, rail produces 70 per cent less carbon dioxide than road transport. Rail can also reduce congestion. The largest freight trains in the UK

can remove up to 160 HGV journeys from our roads. One freight train can remove between 50 and 60 HGVs off our roads. There are also the safety issues to consider. HGVs are three times more likely to be involved in fatal accidents than cars due to their size, a lack of proper enforcement of driving hours and vehicle overloading. In fact, police say that HGVs are involved in 9 per cent of fatal collisions although they only make up 3 per cent of traffic.

Colleagues, in the economic situation that we find ourselves in, it is also important to focus on the financial benefits of rail freight. Investment in transport of all kinds can have great monetary benefits. However, rail can return the most to taxpayers. In fact, a recent CBI report shows that rail transport investment has the biggest multiplying factor of all. Put simply, our taxes put into the railways will see a bigger return as well as the benefit of a better rail network, but the economic benefits go further, with reduced rail congestion. The DfT estimates that £17 billion per annum is the cost of congestion, the cost of congestion being £1 per lorry mile on most congested roads.

Colleagues, road transport has an important part to play in moving freight around the UK as well. ASLEF supports our brothers and sisters in the road haulage industry in their battle to improve safety, reduce working hours and improve conditions. We believe that road haulage will always be necessary for the final leg of delivery. It is not a case of rail against road. ASLEF believes in a multi-modal freight network. However, there can be no doubt that for reasons of safety, economics and the environment the bulk of freight journeys must be by rail.

Colleagues, we have spent much time this week talking of the ConDem cuts and the damage it will do to our jobs and economy and working people. We must not let these attacks cripple our transport network. We must continue to fight for a safer and more efficient rail network. We must demand and continue funding on freight facilities through rail freight grants. We must continue to make the case for investment in industries that will get us out of recession, not strangle the oxygen from them. This motion is green and it supports jobs. It supports infrastructure investment and development that will serve this country well in the near future and beyond. I urge you to support this motion.

Tom Lannon (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) seconded Motion 38.

He said: Congress, freight on rail is an area of transportation that we must support and aim to grow in the UK as an important part of the cargo transport industry. Freight on rail is a more environmentally friendly way of transporting goods around the country. It produces 70 per cent less carbon emissions than an equivalent road journey and takes away congestion from our motorways. The TUC has a duty to ensure that we are working to reduce carbon emissions, and we need a joint policy of increased rail freight provision and intervention from the Department for Transport and a national strategy would be welcomed in this area.

A joined up approach of freight hubs would mean that necessary goods could easily be taken to their final destination by other forms of transport. The expansion of freight on rail will improve jobs and skills opportunities for construction workers at a time when the economy desperately needs boosting in this area. May I say, the construction industry badly needs this boost.

On 24th June 2010 the organisation Freight on Rail issued a statement saying rail freight figures issued by the Office of Rail Regulation show that, despite the

recession, the rail freight market's share and volumes have continued to increase in the key consumer market. This sector has grown by 6.5 per cent over the previous year. These figures show a sustained year-on-year growth for the seventh year in succession, with industry forecasts demonstrating that it can increase by fivefold in the next 20 years as long as the network is upgraded. It is vital for the provision of future jobs and skills development, for apprentices and other construction workers, that the General Council supports the growth of the freight on rail industry. This will create highly skilled, directly employed construction worker jobs, which are badly needed, and it could set a trend for eradicating bogus self-employment, which Alan Ritchie described the other day as "a cancer of the construction industry".

At this difficult time for the construction industry, we need to support the growth of as many other work routes as possible. Encouraging an increase of the freight on rail sector will save local authorities money in road repairs caused by unnecessary HGVs, which they can ill-afford to spend, including the damage they do to the infrastructure.

This growing industry will provide jobs and must be supported at a time when so many areas of the economy are stagnating. The looming crisis coming from the ConDem Government means that it is beholden upon the trade union movement to encourage job creation wherever it can be pursued in new and growing industries. Thank you.

Darren Ireland (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) said:

Congress, here in this very city of Manchester we are seeing the devastation of rail freight policy in this country. Just down the road from here at Trafford Park we have seen the closure of the DB Schenker EWS freight depot, and also in Scotland the closure of a major yard. They mean two major rail freight distribution depots in this country have gone, with their ground staff, drivers, shunters and crane operators all losing their jobs and livelihoods. We have Mervyn King here this morning. He doesn't care about our members losing their jobs. He doesn't care about putting working class people on the scrapheap. What a disgrace, Congress!

Far from encouraging more freight on rail, it is the successive policies and privatisation of our rail network which have been pursued by successive Tory, Labour and ConDem administrations, which have delivered a poorer passenger network and a poorer railfreight network. Newspapers now go by road, as do vast quantities of post and freight. Gone are the jobs where post, freight and newspaper workers helped and supported each other's livelihoods. It is the policy of privatisation that has caused this problem, the break-up and fragmentation of our rail network which now costs us, the taxpayer, £2 billion more a year.

Quite simply, Congress, it is only a nationalised rail network that will deliver more freight on rail, creating more employment and providing stability to the workforce, a network that is run for the benefit of all, not one run by the likes of DB Schenker and the other greedy privateers whose sole motive is profit, thereby contributing to the race to the bottom. It is only a nationalised network that can and will deliver a greener economy, reducing carbon emissions, reducing greenhouse gases. If it is left to the greedy privateers of this world, they will just carry on with whatever is the cheapest. They simply do not care about the working class.

Congress, yes, let's have more freight on rail; let's have more jobs for all workers, and let's together stop the ConDem cuts. I support.

* *Motion 36 was CARRIED*

The Strategic Defence Review and its implications for the Royal Fleet Auxiliary (RFA)

Martin Troman (*Nautilus International*) moved Motion 37.

He said: Congress, I am serving seafarer and this is my first TUC Congress. (*Applause*) I was going to start by saying that I bet you don't get many speakers quoting Winston Churchill, but having just heard John Evans do exactly that, you are going to get two in one afternoon. Exactly 70 years ago, as the Battle of the Atlantic was at its height, he spoke of the tremendous sacrifice of merchant seafarers in keeping the supply lines open in the fight against the Nazis. "We are a seafaring race, and we understand the call of the sea", he said. Sadly, that call simply isn't being heard these days. Successive governments seem to have been happy to watch our island nation's maritime heritage slip away as growing volumes of our trade are carried on clapped out flags of convenience ships, crewed by overworked and underpaid seafarers from low labour cost countries.

I am an officer of the Royal Fleet Auxiliary, a civilian crewed operation that has for over a century provided essential seaborne strategic support to our armed forces. With more than 750 officers and 1,450 ratings on its books, the RFA is now the biggest single employer of British merchant seafarers. As a result of the long-term decline of the Merchant Navy, it has become increasingly important in providing a pool of skilled and experienced UK seafarers and a fleet of ships that can be relied upon at a time of national crisis. In war and peace we have an amazing record of success, from providing support to military campaigns such as the Falklands and the Gulf wars and support the United Nations in Bosnia, to providing humanitarian relief in Iraq, Haiti and Mozambique, protecting ships from piracy off Somalia and helping to combat drug smuggling in the Caribbean. The RFA delivers time and time again. But time and time again we have to head off threats to our future. On the one hand, we have commercial companies sniffing around in the hope that our work will be privatised, and on the other hand we have government defence cuts and Royal Navy admirals are looking to take elements of our work under their control.

Right now RFA seafarers are waiting with concern for the results of yet another so-called 'value-for-money' review of our work, not because we are worried that it will not show the remarkable efficiency of our operations, but because there are good grounds for fearing that ministers will be lured by the siren calls of short-term savings, from commercialising some cherry-picked parts of our services. We are also seriously concerned about the desperate delay in building new ships to replace single hull tankers that, under international maritime pollution regulations, really should not be at sea any more. Very soon we shall be learning where the axe is going to fall, following the Strategic Defence Review and public sector spending cuts. There are very real grounds for worry about the future of the RFA, but we continue to be an island nation. Even if we don't collectively hear the call of the sea any more, we need to recognise our dependence on the oceans. Our economic and strategic wellbeing is as reliant upon the sea as it ever was, and the RFA has a pivotal part to play.

Colleagues, I have completed over 40 years service in the RFA, so it is not my future that I am speaking for, assuming I still have a pension, that is. My concerns are for future generations to be given the similar opportunity of a long and fulfilling career at sea, for the future of the UK shipping industry as a whole, for the future strategic wellbeing of our island nation and,

most importantly, for the long-term future of the RFA and its role in helping to achieve all of these aims. I urge you to hear our call to support the RFA and its seafarers and help us to safeguard its proud status as a world leader in military operational support. Thank you.

Mark Carden (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) seconded Motion 37.

He said: Congress, I am supporting Nautilus on the implications of the Strategic Defence Review on the Royal Fleet Auxiliary. Privatisation of the Royal Fleet Auxiliary would devastate employment prospects for UK seafarers. It is entirely wrong to describe it as an anachronism in the public sector, as Lloyd's List recently did. More media lies. Only recently an extensive review by civil servant, Martin Sands, called *The Flexible Global Reach* concluded that an involved Royal Fleet Auxiliary was the best to provide continued support to the Royal Navy and that commercial options will not provide the operational capability that is required. It is impossible to understand how a private operator could be integrated into a military command in the unique way that the Royal Fleet Auxiliary is.

Royal Fleet Auxiliary crew have consistently taken on new roles and responsibilities to match changing requirements; for example, with specialist training on helicopters, fire fighting, damage control, use of self-defence systems, specialist navigation and also naval communication and command systems. Royal Fleet Auxiliary seafarers have also embraced changes in occupational status which has allowed greater scope for operational activity, while maintaining a Merchant Navy status.

RFA personnel have consistently demonstrated professionalism, expertise, dedication, bravery and flexibility. They demonstrate the value in retaining and developing a specialist civilian crewed fleet to provide strategic support for the armed forces. Yes, the RFA's future is also key to the future of 2,500 UK seafarers. It is the largest employer of UK seafarers. Any threat to the future of the RFA would, therefore, undermine the Department for Transport's own objectives of developing and maintaining a UK maritime skills base.

Comrades, this is a Thatcher legacy, and her ideology has let the free market decide everything, which now, potentially, could include national security. The RFA is unique and we deliver a top-class, highly skilled roll. The swift response of the RFA to get a ship full of logistics support to Haiti was a classic example.

Finally, comrades, in a juxtaposition to George Osborne, I say to you that we are in this together. Let's have some direct action against public service cuts, let's have co-ordinated resistance. I support.

Alan Dennis (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) spoke in support of Motion 37.

He said: Congress, PCS members, especially those working in the Ministry of Defence, know the vital role that the Royal Fleet Auxiliary plays in supporting the armed forces. We also pay particular tribute to the fantastic work undertaken by the RFA in support of the United Nations in bringing crucial relief to the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake in January of this year. This demonstrates the essential service that the RFA provides to the nation and internationally. My union recognises the concerns expressed within this motion in terms of repeated so-called 'efficiency reviews' of the RFA and the threats faced from the Strategic Defence and Security Review.

The experience of workers within the RFA is a reflection of the wider experience and deep concerns

felt from across the whole of the Ministry of Defence, if not the civil service in general. The MoD as a whole has suffered from a constant onslaught of studies and reviews often undertaken by excessively paid consultants, costing the Ministry of Defence around £150 million a year. These studies and reviews all too often result in arbitrary cuts and/or privatisation of public sector work for short-term savings, leading to longer-term inefficiencies, inflexibility and, ultimately, greater cost. It should be remembered that the number of civilian workers in the Ministry of Defence has decreased by 35 per cent since the last major review in 1998, together with the largest privatisation agenda enforced by the last Labour administration. The Strategic Defence and Security Review could see a further 20,000 job losses, with greater numbers of public sector jobs being flogged off to the lowest bidder. Real lives will be damaged, real people will be hurt and real communities will be devastated by cuts of this nature. This new administration has no mandate. It sees its financial targets as much more important than a fit-for-purpose Ministry of Defence. It is the same attitude towards the whole of the public sector, where the Government is seeking to perpetuate the lie that there is no alternative other than to slash jobs, conditions and to privatise and sell vital assets that belong to the nation. It is an expression of ideology, not fiscal necessity.

It is claimed that the SDSR will re-shape the Ministry of Defence and the military for the challenges in the future. The reality is that it has been predominantly led by the Treasury and it is simply a jobs cuts and asset sales identification exercise, with little, if any, concern for the livelihoods of loyal workers who provide vital services to the armed services and beyond. To treat such workers who have provided years of loyal service and at times who have put their lives on the line, such as the members of the RFA is a disgrace. We, therefore, call on Congress to register their support to defend the RFA. Please support.

* *Motion 37 was CARRIED*

Address by Ann Black, Labour Party sororal delegate

The President: Congress, it is now my pleasure to invite Ann Black, this year's sororal delegate from the Labour Party, to address Congress. Ann is currently chair of the Labour Party's NEC. She is secretary of the Oxford East CLP, a regional board member and was elected to the National Policy Forum in 1998 and to the NEC in 2000. Ann is also a member of UNISON and, not least, has what some of us call a 'proper job', as she is a computer programmer at Oxford Brookes University. Ann I look forward to hearing your address.

Ann Black (Labour Party Sororal Delegate): President, thank you for giving part of my introductory remarks before I start. It is, truly, a privilege to be here as chair of Labour's National Executive, bringing the party's gratitude, their good wishes and support.

As Dougie said, I am not and never have been a professional politician. I am an ordinary grass-roots party member with a job outside the labour movement, elected by individual party members to speak for them on the NEC and the National Policy Forum. I am also an active trade unionist, so, first, I want to thank you for what the unions have given me personally. I joined NALGO nearly 30 years ago, and they provided superb training in bargaining skills, chairing meetings, organising and campaigning from which I have benefited ever since in the party, in the union movement and in my life.

They also gave me encouragement and opportunity. When our branch agreed that half our negotiating

team would be women, which was a radical idea back then, the chair looked round at me and said, "We need another woman. Why don't you do it?", and I did and I have never looked back. At that time NALGO was not affiliated to the Labour Party, but many of us were already active as individual party members because we saw the same values, the same principles and the same priorities in our party and in our union. I was proud to start paying the political levy as well as soon as UNISON was formed and gave me that chance.

So, on behalf of the party, I would like to thank those unions which are formally affiliated to Labour, who are represented at every level on all of our committees, whose members vote for our candidates and our leader and whose support is essential to us as a successful campaigning party. The links between us are for you and us to determine together and we will resist any outside interference by those who want to see us fall apart for their own benefit. But, equally, I want to thank every union member and your families, your friends and your workmates who worked side by side with us on the ground, through the last election, with our MPs, councillors and activists, and especially those who helped to fight the poisonous BNP and sweep them out of office in Barking and Dagenham, and in many places elsewhere across the country. Thank you. *(Applause)* Together we saved many seats and many decent, hardworking Labour representatives.

I read in your agenda that your priorities on pensions, public services, equalities, health and safety and rights at work are our priorities, and we have to campaign together through the years ahead, not just through sending delegates to each other's meetings but by acting together whenever the powerless suffer and whenever our values are threatened, because this is not an easy time. Against the odds, we kept the Tories from absolute power, but we remember that the Lib-Dems also threatened savage cuts, and putting the two of them together that is what we will get, especially women, the low paid, the sick, the disabled and the unemployed.

Already millions of us face a pay freeze, millions of retired people will see occupational pensions, private and public, decline faster because they will be linked to consumer prices, not the Retail Price Index. Already thousands of families waiting for homes will see their hopes disappear as regional plans are torn up and house building schemes abandoned.

Already the Government's tactics are clear. They are to hit the poorest hardest because many of them do not vote; play off disadvantaged groups against each other; get pensioners on low fixed incomes to complain about high council tax by blaming it on local government gold-plated pensions, 'gold-plated' pensions of less than £4,000 a year for low paid workers, many of them women and all of them actually paying council tax as well. Most immoral of all, they throw millions out of work and then pillory them as welfare scroungers, making a lifestyle choice to live on £67 a week, less than £50 if you are under 25. We must never forget or abandon our comrades who not only have had a pay freeze and cuts in terms and conditions, but who will soon have no jobs at all. We will remember them!

But I do not believe that most people yet know what will hit them. We have stepped off the cliff but we haven't yet hit the ground. Too many people, 62 per cent, still agree with cutting the deficit. They still think it will affect somebody else and not them. They do not realise that protecting frontline services sounds fine, but without backroom staff appointments cannot be made, other workers cannot be paid and telephones will not be answered. People will not get angry until it gets personal, until their school loses its new buildings, until their sons and daughters cannot afford higher education and until they, again, have to wait months

for NHS operations or go private, until the over 60s lose their free swimming and their bus passes or until the Government pulls the plug on their local leading technology company, as with Sheffield Forgemasters in Nick Clegg's own constituency, and they are thrown on the scrapheap. That is when we, as trade unionists and as party members, can most effectively make common cause with our communities, defending not only jobs, pay and conditions but defending the fabric of society itself.

Labour in government achieved a great deal in 13 years: the National Minimum Wage, higher Child Benefit, free nursery education, taking pensioners out of poverty, cutting waiting lists, better maternity and paternity pay, civil partnerships, peace in Northern Ireland, and also freedom of information and banning fox hunting and, unlike a former leader, whose name escapes me, I personally do not regret either of those. We should not forget local councils either. I live in Oxford where a Labour council brought in a living wage of £7 an hour, and I am speaking here in Manchester where another Labour council also pays a living wage. That is no coincidence. Labour working with the unions can and will deliver at every level.

Yes, a Labour government could have done more on protecting agency workers, on fairer taxes, on accepting strike ballots which express the clear will of members rather than wriggling out through irrelevant technicalities. You were right to remind us of this and to keep reminding us, but what that means is that we must now work together to keep our time in opposition as short as possible, to return to power and to finish the job with you keeping us up to the mark, but no one now can say there is no difference between a Labour government and a Tory government.

Finally, I hope and believe that whoever is elected as Labour's next leader, and if you are entitled to vote and have not yet done so, I urge you to do so, I hope that they will be committed to mutual respect and constructive partnership with the trade unions and the union movement. I promise to do all that I can to encourage them in this. I look forward to welcoming many of you to our conference in Manchester in two weeks time. Thank you, Congress. *(Applause)*

The President: It has been a long tradition of the TUC and the Labour to exchange fraternal and sororal delegates. I will be coming here again in two weeks' time and will be bringing greetings from the TUC to the Labour Party. In the meantime, Ann, it is a privilege to be able to present you with the Gold Badge of Congress. *(Gold Badge of Congress presented to Ann Black amidst applause)*

Ann Black: Thank you very much, Dougie. I will put it on my mantelpiece with my Olympic swimming medals. *(Applause)*

Pensions

Naomi Cooke (GMB) moved Composite Motion 5.

She said: Congress, the seizing of power by the Tory/Liberal coalition was the worst news for pension savers since Robert Maxwell found the cash in the Mirror Group Pension Scheme. The Tories and Lib-Dems promised pensioners fairness, but all they have done is to dilute the triple guarantee they promised for the basic state pension, cut occupational pensions throughout the economy and increased VAT.

In the private sector, from construction firms in dire straits because of cuts in public spending, to some of the world's most profitable companies, employees'

benefits are under attack. The coalition solution is to allow employers to pocket the savings from changing indexation from RPI to CPI and to decimate member protections.

To those employers who do not even bother providing a pension scheme for their workers, the Government says, "Don't worry, we will water down the 2012 reforms intended to make occupational provision universal", but to the ten million people in the UK with public sector pensions, the Government's message is even more direct. Anyone who says that giving public sector workers a pension is unaffordable will be applauded, whatever the truth.

The Tories and Lib-Dems have spent years maligning public sector pensions and years spreading misinformation to vilify care assistants and dinner ladies, who dare to take responsibility for themselves and save for retirement. The Government will not tell you that most people in the Local Government Pension Scheme get less than £3,000 a year from their pension savings. The Government will not tell you that funding the LGPS accounts for less than 5 per cent of council tax, but it makes billions of pounds of investment in British companies. Also, they will not tell you that whatever cuts they make to current and future workers' benefits, deficits from the past will remain, deficits the last Tory government caused when they used the LGPS to reduce people's Poll Tax bills in trying to save that doomed policy by fleecing members' pension funds.

The coalition promised that accrued rights would be safe and then slashed the indexation of pensions already in payment, costing pensioners thousands of pounds. The coalition government is not interested in the real pensions divide. The divide is that those in the boardroom benefit from top-of-the-range defined benefit schemes of hundreds of thousands of pounds in pension contributions whilst those on the shop floor have their pension schemes wiped out.

There are directors, like David Brennan of AstraZenica, a man with a million pound pension of his own, whose company's attack on employees' pensions is even harsher than the devastating cuts proposed at the BBC. The GMB will challenge any employer making needless cuts to workers' pensions. When necessary, we know that our members will stand up and be counted, members like those at AstraZenica, one of the world's most profitable pharmaceutical companies who are on strike in Macclesfield today fighting to protect their pensions.

The public needs to be clear. The Government will not protect them in retirement. Big business will not protect them in retirement. It is down to every individual and every union to stand up and say that what the Government is doing is wrong. It is wrong to impose a budget on the British people which hits the worst off hardest. It is wrong for the Government to force through cuts to employees' terms and conditions without negotiation and without assessing the disproportionate impact that their cuts will have on women and on low earners.

Without good-quality defined benefit schemes as the base line for occupational pension provision, everyone's tax bill will rise. If your neighbour does not have sufficient savings for retirement, they will be dependent upon benefit and you will pay for it through higher tax and higher national insurance. Employers have saved themselves billions by cutting occupational pensions for everyone except those at the top. This has to change.

We can support reform to pensions when it is negotiated and when it is justified, as the GMB did in Lafarge Industries, as we did in United Biscuits, local government and in many other corners of the public and private sectors, but we are not going to let any

employer run roughshod over GMB members' pensions, core terms and conditions. I believe that the 11 unions listed in this composite and every other union in this hall is committed to protecting their members' pensions and will rally to this call to defend quality provision.

Congress, support this composite motion, support workers in the private sector who take a stand to defend their pensions and support members in the public sector facing a retirement in tatters. This is a fight which we must organise and this is a fight that we must win. Congress, I move. *(Applause)*

Steve Warwick (*UNISON*) seconded the motion.

He said: Congress, I think we are all amazed by the way in which the debate about future pension provision in the UK has been distorted so that those with some of the most modest pension incomes are seen as getting gold-plated pensions, for example, when the average pension for members in the Local Government Pension Scheme is £4,000 a year and for women in that same scheme, the average is about £2,600 a year. This is seen as gold-plated, living in the lap of luxury, and all this while the £200,000 average for directors in the UK's top companies scarcely raises an eyebrow, let alone a government inquiry.

It would seem that the ConDem government – I wish they were gone - is not satisfied with just attacking our working lives. Now they come for our retirement years as well. This should not be a debate about public or private sector pensions, but about fair pensions for all workers. Those at the top in the private sector earn over 25 times the average and it is a debate in which, when you dare to question what those at the top get, you are accused of the politics of envy. Well, Congress, who would not be envious?

Some kind of security in retirement is what we would all like. In our movement, it is what we all want for each other. So, whilst the number who can look forward to a guaranteed sum in retirement is dwindling and if we are all in this together, as Cameron claims, should we not ask, "Why not them too?" The reason in all too many cases is because private sector employers have taken the decision not to make adequate provision for their workforces. Fifty per cent of employers pay nothing at all and two-thirds of all employees receive no employer contribution to their pensions. We clearly need to fight back and address this misinformation.

As such, this composite identifies the need for a comprehensive approach to campaigning on pensions where we defend public sector pensions while campaigning for decent private sector provision too. We have developed the unanswerable case for equality in pensions for all. This has to be the way forward in the face of those who, for ideological ends, want a race to the bottom and to pare back all the gains made by previous generations. Please support the composite. *(Applause)*

Gill Goodswen (*National Union of Teachers*) supported Composite Motion 5.

She said: The Hutton Commission clearly signals an all-out attack on public sector pensions. The NUT, as have other unions, has been extremely doubtful about establishing an independent commission to examine public service pensions. Even the most neutral commission would be tempted to make recommendations to justify its existence. We also question whether the Commission actually is, or will be, neutral. The Government says that the Commission is independent, but ministers have already prejudged the outcome by threatening higher contributions and retirement ages.

It is clear that the Government intends to cut the living standards of millions of public sector workers in retirement regardless of the evidence. The necessary changes to make the scheme sustainable in the long run have already been made. The 2005 Public Services Forum Agreement between the previous government and the TUC led to agreed reforms involving higher employer contribution rates, cost-sharing and higher retirement rates for new joiners. It was recognised on all sides that public service pensions are a key benefit of public service employment. A pensions cut is a pay cut.

We must hold firm and work hard together to ensure that we are not driven into a situation where we allow the posh twins (sorry, the PM and the Deputy PM) and their cronies to set public sector workers against private sector workers. The real problem with UK pensions, as has already been said, is inadequate private sector pension provision. Over 80 per cent of final salary schemes have been closed to new members. The average employer contribution to money purchase schemes is less than half of that in final salary schemes. Public sector pensions are a fair reward for years of service and are not gold-plated.

We need simple messages. The average public sector pension is only £7,000 a year. Reduce that and the state makes no saving as people are so poor they draw pension credit instead. Half of all pension tax relief goes to the top 10 per cent and a quarter goes to the less than one per cent who earn over £150,000. So who should make the sacrifice that we keep being told these times require? Workers in the public and private sectors will continue to work together to ensure that the clever smoke-and-mirrors illusions being laid in front of the public are clearly and logically challenged, a challenge to which we will rise together. Thank you.

Matt Wrack (*Fire Brigades Union*) supported Composite Motion 5.

He said: I think the discussion this afternoon clearly fits into the wider debate about the agenda that we face as a result of the election and the attacks on working people and public sector workers that the Government has launched. Pensions are at the heart of that debate. We have had this sustained attack on the so-called gold-plated pensions that public sector workers supposedly enjoy.

I just want to make a couple of points about our own industry, the fire and rescue service. Our pensions emerged tailored around the type of work that our members do. That is something that is often neglected. What you will not be reading about in the press campaigns in coming months is that most of our members are actually paying 11 per cent pension contribution so they are paying very substantial parts of their salaries towards their pensions rights. Yes, there is earlier retirement in the fire and rescue service precisely because of the physical demands of the jobs that our members are asked to do. I would ask the public to think about this: whether they want 65 year old firefighters coming to pull them out of fires.

That is the agenda about which we hear from the pension team at the Department for Communities and Local Government when they say the retirement age in the fire service can be increased. Challenge them on the issue of the physical demands and we are told that they can be redeployed into other work. If you go to the fire service employers, there is no other work into which other people can be redeployed. We have had scandalous cases in the fire service already, which we have successfully taken to court, where people have ended up in precisely the position of being unable physically to do the job and having no job and no pension. It is absolutely outrageous. This is the other

side of the story of the so-called gold-plated public sector pensions.

We are told that the driving force behind this is increased life expectancy. Well, brothers and sisters, I do not think we should apologise because our people are not dying soon enough to suit the pension schemes. *(Applause)* The truth is that in life expectancy, as in everything else, there are huge class differences. Your wealth, your income and where you live has a huge impact on your life expectancy. Perhaps what we should be seeing is that the pension age of millionaires should rise to 80 and for low-paid public sector workers perhaps it should be reduced.

What we are really seeing is an attempt to drive a nasty and vicious wedge between those who work in the public sector and those who work in the private sector. That is one which this movement has to reject. We have to champion decent occupational pension schemes across the board, public and private, and to defend decent state pensions to avoid a vicious and nasty race to the bottom which we all face. We have fought a long battle for the right to retire in dignity and we will not allow that to be undermined by this Government. *(Applause)*

Alan Munro (*Educational Institute of Scotland*) supported the composite.

He said: Despite the recent insulting references to gold-plated pensions by the Deputy Prime Minister and the ignorance that he and others in power have displayed of the facts of public sector pension schemes, it is imperative that we engage with, and inform, the Hutton Inquiry of the financial realities in retirement which are, and will be, experienced by our many members.

Hutton should not be allowed to forget the public pension reforms which have recently taken place, reforms which were made to ensure that the schemes involved are both affordable and sustainable into the foreseeable future. Key changes included the pension provision age to be 65 in the NHS, teachers and civil service schemes, changes to ill-health retirement from one to two or even three-tier schemes, capping employers' contributions and cost-sharing in the majority of schemes.

As teachers, we understood that the changes would reduce the value of our pension benefits from approximately 22 per cent to 19 per cent of salary. However, we also understood that the effect of these changes would provide long-term stability to the schemes. Let us also remember that these schemes were scrutinised by the Government's own actuaries and approved by the Treasury itself.

The publicly-stated position adopted by the coalition Government is based on two flawed approaches, firstly, the desire to move away from assessing the cost of so-called unfunded schemes using the social time preference discount rate of 3.5 per cent. This is wrong-headed, as is clearly explained in the TUC's own evidence. Congress, the 3.5 per cent discount rate is sound and should be retained. Secondly, the coalition Government roll up projected payment with current debt. This has led to scaremongering quotes, talking of pensions allegedly going to cost 85 per cent of GDP. As the chair of Straight Statistics has stated, the liability to pay public sector pensions is stretched over many, many years, from now until the last public sector employee dies in fact. It is a statistical howler to compare this with the figure for GDP for a single year.

So, the challenge for us, Congress, is to move the focus of the debate by engaging with Hutton, asserting that the solution lies with improving occupational pension provision in the private sector and not – I repeat not – decimating current public sector provision, thus ensuring that all workers have an entitlement to high-

quality pensions and comfort in retirement. We must reject the idea that we should take part in a race to the bottom where the poorest provision exists. Congress, support the composite. Thank you. *(Applause)*

David Watts (*FDA*) supported Composite Motion 5.

He said: The FDA endorses the arguments that you have heard from the other speakers in support of fair pensions. Everyone has a right to a decent pension whether they work in the private sector, the public sector or another part of the economy. The true pension scandal, as other speakers have said, is the collapse of adequate pension provision in the private sector. Reference has already been made this week to those companies which took pension holidays a few years ago and now are seeking to retreat from their commitments.

It is in no one's interests to engage in the race to the bottom which has been described by other speakers. We know that the pension is paid for by the employee themselves. Matt Wrack has referred to the level of contributions which apply to firefighters. Many other workers make direct contributions from their pay packets. In other cases, like the civil service, the pay is expressly abated to take account of the benefit of the pension. All workers contribute to their pensions through National Insurance. Pensions are deferred pay. Pensions are not an optional extra.

FDA members reject the pension gap of two-tier pensions, brought out so fully by some of the previous speakers, by the National Association of Pension Funds and by the TUC's PensionsWatch survey. We do not support different pension schemes for the bosses, the directors or the most senior staff with another one for everyone else. In the civil service, all staff, however senior, are members of common pension schemes on equal terms. That is one of the strengths of the civil service pension arrangements.

FDA members know that the Government has its eye on our pensions and on your pensions. The Government should be ensuring adequate pensions for all and not degrading them by changing the uprating mechanism and the other methods they have in mind. I urge you to support this composite.

Peter Murray (*National Union of Journalists*) supported Composite Motion 5.

Congress, when we drafted our section of this composite some time ago, we did not expect to be coming to Congress having just named dates for strike action to defend the BBC pension scheme. Those dates will be 5th and 6th October, to coincide with the Tory Party Conference, and 19th and 20th October, to coincide with the publication of the Comprehensive Spending Review. Nor did we expect the reaction from the *Daily Mail*, "BBC unions declare war on the Tories." It is ironic that just above that headline, the paper is giving away free DVDs of David Attenborough's Life on Earth films. Now, who produces them? David Attenborough himself would be one of the first people to say that it is BBC staff who produce those films – BBC filmmakers, producers and riggers, who make up the 90 per cent of people who have voted to oppose the BBC's pension plans.

It is not just workplace reps like me who have drawn up those dates; it is the people who are part of that vote and who have wholeheartedly rejected this robbery of our pension schemes. The BBC was initially proposing numbers which would mean that 25 per cent-30 per cent of people's pensions in the BBC would be lost. It would be robbed and taken away from them. After having voted in colossal numbers, they came back to us with an amended suggestion, which meant in effect that people on an average wage inside

the BBC would be expected to pay between £50-£60 a month more but in return they would get back less. That makes an awful lot of sense!

Congress, we have decided that these proposals are not fair, they are not necessary and they are absolutely not acceptable. However, it is not just me who is saying that. Last night, BBC staff called a meeting of the BBC Trustees, the custodians of the pension scheme, and they said that it was not acceptable or necessary. This folly will leave a legacy of lasting mistrust amongst staff towards senior management, which will be probably unforgivable, so why have they done it? We believe that it is politically driven. We believe that if this succeeds, it could become a template for others in the public sector. That is why we must win this and we will win this. Congress, with the support of the TUC, I am certain we will win. That is also why co-ordinated industrial action across all sectors means that others will win too when similar battles are fought.

So, when Baroness Warsi, the Chair of the Conservative Party, asks Mark Thompson how he is going to ensure that BBC coverage of the Party Conference is not disrupted when we go out on strike in a couple of weeks' time, I do not know what his answer will be. However, I know what our answer is: settle this dispute. Do not rob us of our pensions and we will not go on strike. *(Applause)*

Chris Baugh (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supported Composite Motion 5.

He said: Perhaps I should start by dispelling the rumour that PCS has in any way moved to the right now that we find that the Governor of the Bank of England apparently agrees with us on chasing the tax dodgers. *(Applause)*

We obviously reject, as other speakers have indicated, the talk of gold-plated public sector pensions and the deception that they are either unfair or unaffordable. Our submission to the Hutton Review obviously reflects that point. In the context of rising pensioner poverty, an ever-receding retirement age, a bonfire of occupational schemes, and a change in advance of the Hutton Review in the indexation from RPI to CPI, which wiped billions from the value of public sector schemes, it is clear that the Hutton Review, in our view, forms part of the Government's wholesale attack on all of the social gains won by the trade union movement in post-war years.

It is for these reasons that PCS believes that it is important that we remember the lessons of 2005. While we need to make our own submissions to Hutton – and there will, of course, be separate negotiations – the common threat means that we need a common response. After being told by New Labour in 2005, on the Sunday, that the changes were not negotiable, the Government reached agreement with public sector unions by the Thursday. That change of heart, of course, was down to the fact that three million public sector workers were about to take industrial action in the build-up to a general election. It was that which won the important protection and, we believe, gives a flavour of what is both possible and necessary.

PCS and Congress will want to give our full support to the broadcasting unions at the BBC who are first in line in the attack and first in line for taking action. While this Government might be shameless in trying to shift a crisis of private finance into a so-called crisis of public spending, the looming attack on pensions is a very high-risk strategy. It underestimates our capacity to win hearts and minds, our capacity to win support in communities and the latent power of a six million strong trade union movement, which has been reading its own obituary since six agricultural labourers first gathered under a tree at Tolpuddle. It ignores the massive potential for winning millions (particularly

young people) back into the ranks of the trade union movement when we are seen to speak and we are seen to take industrial action not just in defence of our own members' interests, but in the interests of working people generally. Congress, please support.

Iain Loughran (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 5.

He said: Congress, we particularly support the amendment which calls for the TUC to engage with the Hutton Commission and to co-ordinate the union response. The response should be this. CSP members highly value the NHS pension scheme and were prepared to accept changes just two years ago which included more money out of their pockets going into the scheme to keep it viable.

However, with a new government comes a new review, but what are we reviewing? Are we assessing the impacts that any of these changes might have on equality? I sincerely doubt that. Every change proposed by this Government so far has been a cut – a cut for women, children and minorities, a cut for those least able to afford it – and pensions once again are back on the chopping block. Worse still, equality, one of our most basic principles, is on the block too. The Government makes the laws but cannot be bothered to follow them so let us make them. Let us make them do a proper equality assessment of any pension proposals they put forward and let us see how fair they really are.

We all have on our Congress badges the words "Equality for all" so let us make sure that these words become a reality for all. I support. *(Applause)*

Hilary Hosking (*Transport Salaried Staffs Association*) spoke in support of the motion.

She said: Recent research has shown that there could be a distinct possibility that we could live until we are 100. If that is the case, my current age means that I am right in the middle of a mid-life crisis at the moment.

Seriously though, unfortunately, the reality is that most of us will not live that long. In some areas of the country, the life expectancy is much lower than 100 and even lower than the 70-plus being bandied about as a suggested retirement age. Poverty, living conditions and job-related diseases obviously mean that workers may not live long enough to reach, let alone enjoy, their retirement. Who wants to be forced to work for what could be 55 years, knowing that the likelihood of any decent period of retirement is not an option?

The TSSA amendment incorporated into this composite mentions, "Work until you drop". Well, conference, I do not want to work until I drop, thank you. When the Labour government increased the age from which I could draw my pension, that was bad enough, but working until I am so worn out that I cannot enjoy my hard-earned free time is unthinkable.

So, Congress, support this composite in order to send a clear message to the Government that the workers are not prepared to take their actions lying down. Congress, I support. *(Applause)*

John Rimmer (*NASUWT*) spoke in support of the motion.

He said: We are speaking in support of the motion and against the Government's continued lies about the public sector workers' gold-plated pensions referred to in paragraph 8. Congress, public service pensions are not gold-plated. The average public sector worker's pension is around £5,000 per annum. The average teacher's pension is around £9,000 per annum. This is not gold-plated by any stretch of the imagination.

The propaganda supported by the media and put about by the coalition Government is somewhat misleading to say the least. The pension of Fred Goodwin, the disgraced head of the Royal Bank of Scotland, which is £700,000 per annum, is gold-plated. Even after the Select Committee's investigation, he still has a gold-plated pension. There are many other examples.

The truth needs to be reported by the media and across the internet. For every pound that taxpayers pay to public service pensions, they pay £2.50 in tax relief for private sector pensions. Public sector workers make major contributions to their pensions throughout their working lives. This coalition Government has effectively stolen thousands of pounds from our pensions by linking them to the Consumer Price Index rather than to the Retail Price Index. This Tory-led alliance, supported by a spineless minority of 57 Liberal Democrats, are making savage, fruitless and economically illiterate attacks on the public sector workers' salaries, jobs and pensions in a vain attempt to fund the economic recovery. *(Applause)*

They should be attacking the culprits – the bankers and the gamblers in the City – who caused this economic malaise. Instead, they have given the bankers and the City even more money by cutting corporation tax by four per cent from 28 per cent to 24 per cent. The same bankers are already rewarding themselves with bigger bonuses and salaries while unemployment rises and the people of this country suffer. The ConDem alliance continues with its regressive and divisive legislation attacking the quality of life of ordinary working families. We need to win the hearts and minds of the public by exposing the Government's blatant attempts to bury the truth about public sector pensions. Support this motion, support this amendment, support public service and the public service pensions. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Alan Carr (*University and College Union*) spoke in support of the composite motion.

He said: UCU is in the front line in defence of pensions. University employers are demanding savage cuts, cuts which are completely unnecessary. Our pension scheme, the Universities Superannuation Scheme, is in robust good health, in surplus at its last valuation, and certain to remain so at the next. But none of this is good enough for the employers, who want to cut their costs and their contribution rates by almost 50 per cent. None of this is good enough for this Government, which has been egging on university employers to decimate the USS pension scheme in order to set an example to others.

Last July, in a move which was completely unprecedented, the independent chair of our Joint Negotiating Committee, exercised his casting vote in favour of an employers' hit list. This has fundamentally undermined the democratic governance of our pension scheme, a government structure which has protected USS against the scandals which have afflicted many other privately-funded pension schemes.

University employers have two objectives that they are trying to achieve. Probably the most important one is to remove our union from its current position as an equal partner in the management of the scheme. The second is to decimate our pensions in order to save money for themselves in a way that would cost many members over £100,000 in lost pension expectations.

As Congress no doubt knows, UCU members in higher education are not the most militant trade unionists on the face of the earth, but they are not mugs and they will not tolerate an attack on their pensions so let me send a very clear message to employers and let me send it calmly, quietly and deliberately. Mess with our pensions and you will provoke the greatest industrial

dispute that we have ever seen in the UK higher education system. *(Applause)*

The motion pledges support from the TUC to all workers forced to take action in defence of pensions. That is the most important aspect of this motion. We welcome your support. We need your support. Our fight is your fight. Together, we can win and, as the mover of this composite said, "Together we must win." Thank you. *(Applause)*

Jim Gamble (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) supported the composite.

He said: Congress, I would first like to declare an interest. I am a member of the Local Government Pension Scheme and I have been a member long enough to remember the Thatcher government pension robberies when they gave themselves pension holidays. We did not hear complaints from the public or the media at that time.

Since then, we have witnessed the mass exodus of services through outsourcing. There has been no protection of pension rights resulting in the situation that we have today, with more people claiming than contributing. I have heard public and media condemnation of so-called gilt-edged pensions. Congress, I wish!

Most local government pensions are below £2,500. In fact, our prudence will barely bring us above the pension protection levels, saving the Government from having to pay us this in our old age. Yes, our prudence will reduce benefits. I say to the private sector, "Do not condemn us for being successful and for negotiating better terms and conditions for our members. We did this through our unions. If you want the benefits of better terms and conditions to match ours, join a union. I know UCATT will welcome you."

Congress, we must all stand together and fight to protect those pension rights that we have worked so hard to accrue. Just this month, the London Pension Funds Authority has set out measures designed to reduce the costs associated with the Local Government Pension Scheme. This is just one example of the oncoming battle that we face. They propose changes to accrual rates from the 60ths to 65ths, raising the retirement age to 66 and raising the contributions. We have one saving grace and that is that the judges themselves are on 1/40ths.

UCATT has grave concerns about these proposals. Many in the construction industry have had to retire early due to injuries sustained at work, most with no right to a pension until they reach retirement age. This is for those who have worked hard all of their lives. Congress, it is a scandal that our pensions are under attack in this way after going through many reforms in recent years. Join us to call on John Hutton to retain the status quo on the Local Government Pension Scheme and reward the lowest paid workers, who most certainly will not be receiving gold-plated pensions on their retirement. We support this and we ask you to support this composite.

Luke Crawley (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*) supported Composite Motion 5.

He said: Why are pensions so important and why do they generate so much emotion? I think it is because all workers should have the right to expect that after a lifetime at work, they will have earned a decent pension which will allow them to live out their retirement with dignity. It is a fairly simple thing, but I think it is fundamental.

We have heard about the oncoming attacks on public service pensions at the BBC. We are now in the front line of that attack. As I said at the beginning about

expectations, my members at the BBC had an expectation that when they came to work there at lower salaries, part of the deal was the fact of a good final salary pension. The attempts by BBC management to force staff to accept a much worse pension have backfired in the most spectacular way. We now have better than 90 per cent majorities in all of the three unions involved for strike action, unprecedented in the BBC and actually pretty unusual in the trade union movement.

We met the BBC. We gave them dates for strike action. As Pete has already said, they include two days of the Conservative Party Conference and then again on 19th and 20th October, which will include the announcement of the ConDems' public sector spending cuts. Without wishing to borrow Pete's joke – it is too good a one not to use again – as a union, you know that you are doing something right if you are being pilloried by the *Daily Mail*. In this case, they put us on the front page, a great place to be, saying, "BBC unions' war on Tories." The *Mail* dubs our actions as "political". Well, there's a surprise – trade union members engaging in politics. Who would have thought it?

Is it political? Of course it is political. The BBC's attempt to steal pensions already earned and to make it all but impossible to earn a good pension from future service is a brutally political act. It has been characterised as a dress rehearsal for the assault on pensions of civil servants, teachers, local government and health workers and other groups in the public sector. The reaction of BBC workers should fill us all with hope. They believe that the promise of a decent pension after a lifetime of work is just that – a promise. They are prepared to strike to make sure that the BBC keeps its promise.

The lesson to be learnt from this is very simple. An organised workforce can stand together and fight attempts to take away their pension. In the coming battle over public sector pensions, with the help of the TUC and other unions, if we stand together then united we will win. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Bob Maguire (*Communication Workers Union*) supported the composite.

He said: Congress, it is a long time coming once again for the CWU. We have been fighting privatisation now for somewhere in the region of 15 years. Once again, the ConDem government have proposed to privatise Royal Mail. When you read the Hooper Report, it is on the basis of, "You need to privatise it to safeguard the universal service obligation." We do not believe that for one moment because what we actually believe is that this coalition wants to get its greedy hands on the assets of our pension. We believe that if they cash up the assets of our pension, they can actually reduce the national deficit. There is no other reason to actually privatise Royal Mail but to get their hands on our pension.

We went through a massive, bitter dispute last year and we came out with a modernisation agreement which was proposed by Hooper. We negotiated and we got the agreement. That was to safeguard the future of members in Royal Mail. It also allowed the CWU a future voice in how the business will be shaped in the future.

We know, as a trade union, that we need assistance with regard to our pension plan. Yes, there is an £8 billion deficit, but was that our members' fault? No, it was not. What Royal Mail did was to take a pension holiday for 13 years. They dwindled away the money that our members paid in week on week on week for their retirement. They have now shut down our final salary scheme and re-imposed another scheme and yet the Government still want their hands on our pension.

We have put forward plans (which were agreed by Royal Mail and the pension trustees) which would reduce the deficit over 38 years rather than the initial 17 years. Lo and behold, the regulator is challenging that. Why are they challenging that? Quite simply, it is an excuse to try and privatise Royal Mail and to get their greedy mitts on our pension moneys.

Congress, we ask you to support us in our campaign to ensure that Royal Mail is not privatised and to keep your post public. (*Applause*)

* *Composite Motion 5* was CARRIED

Defending further and higher education

Sally Hunt (*University and College Union*) moved Composite Motion 13.

She said: UCU represent 120,000 members, both in further and higher education, people who educate millions of people in our country year in and year out. They are people who conduct valuable research in hundreds of specialised areas like the humanities, medicine, the arts and sciences. There are some that you may not necessarily think are important and you might not have heard of, like the study of olfaction. Have you ever heard of olfaction? I doubt it. It is the science of smell. That is quite important in the debates that we are having because that is the sort of study which can help us explain why, when we see what the Government is planning in education and the public sector, there is a faint whiff of hypocrisy.

We have members throughout the country who do other very useful things in terms of academic study. We have people who do, for example, forensic accounting. Those people calculated that more than £2.5 million was spent on the private education of just 12 members of the Cabinet and every single one of those then took up the opportunity of a free higher education. Every single one of those is now perfectly happy to deny hundreds and thousands of young people the opportunities that they themselves were given by cutting £1.4 billion from our budget.

Of course, these huge cuts really mean very severe job cuts for our members and we are deeply worried about that, but what is more important for all of us here are the effects that those cuts are going to have on our students, both current and future. Many of our members are economists. They will tell you that there are few cuts more damaging to our future prosperity in this country than those that will affect the generations who will lose out through the cuts in education because in cutting spending in that area and in cutting investment and learning, the Tories and the Lib-Dems are closing their eyes to the lessons of history. They are closing their eyes to the fact that it was government investment which made the British university system the envy of the world. Learning is actually important for its own sake and it is not solely a driver for growth. (*Applause*)

They are closing their eyes to the fact that it is only through life-long learning, adult and further education, that people can retrain and re-skill and they are ignoring the fact that our society relies upon what our union members do. Our teachers, nurses, engineers, accountants and scientists are trained in colleges and universities. We even try to educate politicians but there is only so much you can do with the materials that you have! (*Applause*)

For more than a century, Congress, the pledge that each and every generation has made to its successor has been to expand learning and to increase opportunity. Our new political leaders appear ready and willing to rip up that covenant. This month, you will see 200,000 people on the dole queue with the qualifications to go to university. The majority of further education colleges this year are axing courses

and cutting staff. At this most challenging time for our members and our students, this is when we have to act.

Some of our members conduct research into the human mind and they study self-delusion. They study when people say one thing and then they do the exact opposite. This is quite important when you look at what this Government is doing. They help us understand that when this Government says that it cannot afford to pay more, what we have to do is stand and fight and resist what is actually a lie. It is not a "Big Society"; it is a society for a few and the rest of us are being asked to pay the price and to be excluded from it.

Our members teach us trade union studies. They have taught us a valuable lesson, which is that our movement is at its strongest when it stands together. I am going to end, Congress, by asking each and every one of you to go back to your branches and organise to join NUS and UCU when we demonstrate in defence of education in London on Wednesday 10th November. Join us in sending this Government a message: "Don't you dare cut education. Don't you dare close down opportunity. Don't you dare gamble with our children's futures. Just don't you dare because we, in the trade union movement, are going to stand in your way and we are going to stop you." Thank you. I move. *(Applause)*

Peter Pendle (*Association for College Management*) seconded the composite motion.

He said: I am pleased to be able to second this composite motion on the attacks on further and higher education. Sally has already spoken more eloquently than I could ever hope to do so I will focus on the part of the composite which ACM put forward.

ACM is particularly keen to address the issue of the use of consultants in the further education sector. Last year, a freedom of information request from the trade unions revealed that 79 colleges spent £51 million on consultants. Now, we all know the arguments against using consultants so rather than bore you all and as it is ACM's last Congress before our merger with ATL, I thought I would tell you a true story to illustrate the point.

A shepherd was herding his flock in a remote pasture when suddenly a brand new Porsche advanced out of a dust cloud towards him. The driver, a young man in a Paul Simon suit, Gucci shoes, Rayban sunglasses and an Yves St. Laurent tie, leant out of the window and said to the shepherd, "You know, you need to make sure you declare the right figures to the EU to get your Common Agricultural subsidy. If I tell you exactly how many sheep you have in your flock, will you give me one?" The shepherd looked at the man and then looked at his peacefully grazing flock and calmly answered, "Sure, why not."

The guy parked his car, whipped out his Apple iPod, surfed to a NASA page on the web where he called up a GPS satellite navigation system to get an exact fix on his location. He took a satellite digital photo. He exported it to an image processing facility and, within seconds, he received an email on his BlackBerry that the image has been processed and the data stored. He then accessed an online database through an Excel spreadsheet with hundreds of complex formulas. He uploaded all of this data via another email onto his BlackBerry and after a few minutes he received a response. Finally, he printed out a full-colour 150-page report on his hi-tech miniaturized HP Laser printer.

He then turned to the shepherd and said, "You have exactly 1,586 sheep." "That is right" said the shepherd, "I guess you can take one of my sheep." He watched as the young man selected one of the animals and looked amused as he stuffed it into the boot. Then the shepherd said to the young man, "If I can tell you

exactly what your business is, will you give me back my sheep?" The young man thought about it and said, "Okay, why not?" "You are a consultant", said the shepherd. "Amazing, that is correct", said the young man, "but how did you guess that?" "No guessing required", answered the shepherd. "You showed up here even though nobody called you, you wanted to get paid for an answer I already knew to a question I never asked and you do not know anything about my business." *(Applause)* "Now", said the shepherd, "Give me back my dog." *(Laughter and applause)*

Congress, if we are going to have cuts in colleges, let us at least make sure that it is the self-serving parasites who go and not hardworking lecturers, support staff and managers. Support the composite. *(Applause)*

Richard Evans (*Society of Radiographers*) supported the composite.

He said: Damage to further and higher education through cuts is damaging this country and it is happening now. The effects in healthcare are just one example, but it is obviously the one that I am going to talk about although all the sectors are affected.

Health professions rely on higher education to deliver not only qualifying degrees, but also career development postgraduate courses. In radiography, we are talking about the supply of clinicians to deliver breast screening, ultrasound, radiotherapy and X-ray procedures. Ways of working in the NHS have developed extraordinary roles and degrees of clinical responsibility for allied health professionals and nurses. These are the envy of colleagues around the world and are helping to deliver world class services to the people of this country.

It happens that skills development through career progression is also great value for money, but it does not happen without the further and higher education sector. No education, no services. We are seeing the effects right now.

It is not just graduate-level practitioners who are suffering. In recent years, there has been great progress in career progression for all grades and levels of NHS staff providing opportunities in clinical professions for everyone. Training and development for assistant practice is delivered by higher education and further education institutions, but it is disappearing. Cuts in higher and further education are taking us backwards. It makes me sick, but I will not be alone as the health of the nation is at stake.

Brothers and sisters, the ConDem coalition is aptly named. Cuts in higher education are a condemnation. They are misguided, mistaken and, I suspect, they may be just plain malicious. They have to be stopped for all our sakes. Please support the composite. *(Applause)*

Hank Roberts (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*) supported the composite.

He said: Here is a litany of decline in UK education. The graduation rate has gone from third highest down to 15th in just eight years. We are now behind Slovakia and Poland. Thousands cannot get university places. Graduate unemployment is rising. Student debt is the highest ever. Tuition fees are set to double. The casualisation of education contracts is increasing. Further education has the second highest use of such contracts after the catering industry.

Regarding pay cuts, I have just heard of a pay increase offer of 0.2 per cent. At 3 per cent inflation – in reality it is more, of course – it is a clear pay reduction offer. That is interesting English, isn't it? Differentials increase. One vice-chancellor earns £474,000 a year – nice work if you can get it – and 19 more earn £300,000, and yet college and university departments are closing and now whole institutions are threatened.

On privatisation, massive inroads have been brilliantly catalogued by UCU in their pamphlet, *Privatising our Universities*. Worse is to come. The list of privateer firms, anxious to complete the privatisation in colleges and schools, is detailed in ATL's pamphlet, *Not open for business*. I suggest you get one. Legislation will allow for more private universities. Competition and the market will rule. The nightmare is unfolding and we are told that we have no choice. Our debt must be paid off so the severest cutbacks are inevitable and unavoidable. Is this true?

First, let us not be under any illusion about what is happening and why. This is really a class-based attack by the very rich and the super-rich. This Government is acting for them. For 100 years or more, we have successfully acted to achieve a more equal society. They aim to fundamentally realign the balance of power, wealth and our democracy in their favour and against us. They aim to keep more of "their" wealth, which is actually ours, and allow us to have ever less although we have created it. They aim to finish off (and rapidly) the public sector that we created and built. Their plan is not to properly educate our children, only the children of the rich. If skilled labour is needed, they will be imported, asset-stripped from other countries.

Congress, we have heard that there is an alternative. Personally, I have another. The people of Iceland said, "Let us have a referendum." They had one and voted not to pay. Why should they? They did not do it. Icelandic MPs have called for the former prime minister, the finance minister, the commerce minister and the foreign minister to be put on trial for violations of the laws of ministerial responsibility by intent or gross negligence. "Hear, hear: punish those responsible", I say, "and not us." (Applause) Brendan, when you invited the top banker in the country to come here, I thought you were going to conduct a citizen's arrest, but that did not happen. Never mind; wishful thinking!

To conclude, what should we do in the face of this attack? It is straightforward and it is simple: whatever it takes. (Applause)

Derek Earnshaw (UNISON) spoke in support of Composite Motion 13.

He said: Congress, whilst we support the composite, we do not think we should lose sight of the aspiration of free education. UNISON believes that education should be free and that HE, FE and adult learning should be paid for out of general taxation. We also believe that top-up fees should be scrapped. We are concerned that an increase in top-up fees will have a further detrimental effect, dissuading students from poorer backgrounds from entering higher education and making HE a place of privilege once more.

The previous government had already begun to introduce cuts to this sector. However, the new government has added their own cuts with even more expected. With our universities and colleges recognised as world-class institutions, such moves can only be described as short-sighted in the extreme. Their plans to allow further private providers into the market will also undermine the nature of education in the UK. The creation of a market which threatens to dumb down and create artificial competition will put barriers up between institutions rather than opening them up for the spread of knowledge for the wider good.

The cuts agenda will also impact on the quality of services as jobs are cut and our students are packed into crumbling facilities. Added to these so-called efficiencies and shared services, it will be used as a cover for a wider agenda to scare workers into ever-increasing hours with poorer pay, terms and conditions.

We reject this agenda as one that can only worsen the education system which has been provided to our students. As a first step in a united campaign to defend the sector, the joint unions in HE and FE organised a day of dissent on 21st June. We have to follow that up with further joint events involving all unions working together from the start. We also need to make sure that such events are tied in to wider campaigns to defend public services.

The Government needs to understand that education does not stop at the school gate and that the key to prosperity in a global knowledge-based economy is the skills and knowledge provided by our post-school education system. This needs significant levels of state investment and not cuts, privatisations and false markets. Please support the composite. (Applause)

Dave Jones (Unite) spoke in support of Composite Motion 13.

He said: I am senior convener at Manchester University so this is another Mancunian who is proud to welcome the Congress back to Manchester. The sector has already, as you have heard from Sally, suffered £1.4bn in cuts. We have also suffered redundancies. My colleagues at Manchester Metropolitan suffered a setback in redundancies just six months ago and despite our best efforts in negotiations the employers will not agree with us a national redundancy avoidance agreement ahead of the further proposed funding cuts that we expect towards the end of this year. It has to be said that there is money in the higher education system and that we can adapt without redundancies. A vice chancellor's average basic wage is £120,000 with expenses, and also their accommodation is paid for. Along with them, their top 20 senior management are on between £80,000 and £90,000 a year, also with expenses.

Congress, if that lot took a gap year we could do all the savings that the Government are asking us to do. The employers have peddled the *Daily Mail* rhetoric in an attempt to put fear into our members' hearts. We do not buy it. We are not lucky to have jobs, the employers are lucky to have us. Our members work in higher education because they care. They care for your children as they progress through the student experience. Another thing, they are vetted workers, they are security checked, and they are accountable to their institutions. When higher education institutions use private contractors nobody knows if they have been given security clearance or if they have in fact been vetted. Our members also respect the galaxy of nationalities and faiths that coexist on our campuses throughout the country. It does not bear thinking about, Congress, as to what would happen if a contractor with extreme views were to gain access to all areas on our campuses.

Higher education is not a massive sector within the trade union movement so when we start to shout, which we surely will, we need to know that you are all with us. Please support the motion. Please support higher education. Reject privatisation because you and your children, and your children's children, deserve it. Higher education is a right, not a privilege. Let's move. (Applause)

* Composite Motion 13 was CARRIED

Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) referrals

The President: I call Motion 60, Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) referrals. The General Council supports the motion.

Peter Pendle (Association for College Management) moved Motion 60.

He said: No joke, I am afraid this time. This is something that is very dear to my members and affects everyone working across the education sector. We welcomed the fact on 15th June that the Government announced it was to review the criminal records and vetting and barring regime to scale back to commonsense levels. It was particularly pleasing to hear Theresa May say, "We are listening to the criticisms and will respond with a scheme that has been fundamentally remodelled." Nevertheless, all that has happened so far is that implementation has been suspended. We need to keep pressure on to ensure that the Government do as they say.

The criticisms in question were largely ones concerning the need for a vastly increased number of workers and volunteers to be police-checked and to register with the Independent Safeguarding Authority. It is generally accepted that the new arrangements were totally out of proportion to the risks. The costs of passing through the registration and vetting process will almost certainly fall on the workers who can ill afford yet another cost to be incurred before they take up or continue their employment. It may take many months before the all clear is given and both the employer and the worker are stuck in the meantime.

Another equally worrying aspect of the vetting and barring scheme that has been causing ACM and other unions great concern has been the ISA referral scheme. There are two aspects to this. The first is that the legal obligations placed on the employers are onerous and complex. The official guidance is 37 pages long, including a 14-page referral form that also requires numerous documents to be attached. The second aspect is that the individual employee or volunteer who is referred to the ISA for a decision to bar them from working with children or vulnerable adults has very restricted rights of appeal. They can only appeal on matters of fact or law and they are not allowed to make any personal representations. They can only make written submissions. This just does not accord with the principles of natural justice and so we warmly welcome the NUT's amendment on this.

Clearly, it is absolutely vital that those who pose a genuine risk to children and vulnerable adults are barred from working with them; we fully support this intention. The proposed system simply does not provide enough safeguards for the individual who is threatened with their career being taken away from them. We need a proper system of representation for those people who are referred. Teaching is a career plagued by innocent teachers and lecturers suffering malicious and vexatious allegations. It is bad enough that they can be suspended for months on end during disciplinary investigations.

So, we call on the Government's review of the scheme to include the referral system as well as the extent of police checks and ISA registration. There still has been no word about the procedure or timing of the review so it is important for all of us to continue to press the Government at this stage to address these issues in the review. Colleagues, please support this motion. *(Applause)*

Helen Andrews (*National Union of Teachers*) seconded Motion 60.

She said: The NUT of course accepts the need to protect children and vulnerable adults. It supports the establishment of an independent national body to carry out the vetting exercise. However, millions of workers will be subject to this ISA system and as part of that system ISA case workers are required to consider an individual's attitudes and beliefs, their self-management, and lifestyle. Consequently, if you spend too long playing computer games the system may determine that you show an excessive interest in

violence. If you are interested in bungee jumping, you may have a risk-taking personality. In both cases you may be barred from your job, your career, your livelihood. Any appeal against such a judgment would be a paper exercise without proper representation from your trade union. The previous government determined that a proper appeals process would simply be too expensive and to be a part of this system any individual must themselves pay a registration fee. The system is not only unfair; it contravenes the Human Rights Act.

The NUT has been working hard with a group of other unions in the health and education sectors to try and ensure a less subjective, a more systematic way of carrying out the vetting and barring process. We demand a proper appeal process with an appeal hearing with evidence subject to cross-examination, and with a right to representation. We continue to argue that a mandatory public protection system should be paid for from the public purse, not as a tax on individual workers. The consequences of the decisions by the ISA can be far reaching, affecting people's jobs and their health. The duties of the Independent Safeguarding Agency must be carried out fairly, consistently, and with transparency. Congress, please support this motion. *(Applause)*

Rosie MacGregor (*UNISON*) spoke in support of Motion 60, as amended.

She said: Congress, let's be clear, all of us here surely support the principle of public protection but it is important that the processes we employ to this end are not disproportionate to the need and it is equally important that we do not assume that everyone is a risk. In this context the TUC coalition, of which we are members, shares three main concerns surrounding the approach and implementation of the Independent Safeguarding Authority. These are: the cost of the scheme on individuals, many of whom are on low pay and part-time staff; the duplication with existing regulation by statutory professional registration bodies; and the need to ensure that individuals have the right to a fair hearing.

We have been active in lobbying ministers, the ISA, the Home Office, and government departments, in furtherance of our concerns. In May 2010, the Government stated its intention to review the criminal records and vetting and barring regime and scale it back to commonsense levels, but will this happen? We welcomed, surprisingly we welcomed, something from the Con-Dem Government, we welcomed the Government's recent announcement of the halting of the voluntary registration stage of the vetting and barring scheme pending a review to consider the scale of the scheme as a whole. We believe that the removal of controlled activity would simplify the scheme and reduce the number of individuals who are required to register.

Under safeguarding legislation it is up to the individual applicant to pay the registration fee but our view remains that employers should pay this fee as part of their recruitment responsibility. We note that current legislation provides a limited right of appeal and that the only way to challenge the appropriateness of a decision is via a judicial review, costly and lengthy. This being the case we welcome the suggestion in the amendment to the motion that the scheme must allow individuals to have full rights to state their case and to appeal against a bad decision. We also agree that it is important the cost must not be passed to those who need registration in order to work. Please support the motion. *(Applause)*

Steve Baines (*POA*) spoke in support of Motion 60.

He said: I am standing here today as a worker without any trade union rights, without the right to be able to take industrial action. That right was taken away from me and 35,000 of my colleagues by the previous Tory Government using anti-trade union legislation to do so. It is a disgrace. One day I hope to be able to come back to this rostrum and tell you that that wrong has now been righted, but that will take time. *(Applause)*

The POA in supporting this motion does so having witnessed the problems that we see in our juvenile estate and also the problems and costs that may escalate to every prison if the current system continues. The POA will always accept that children and vulnerable adults must be protected from individuals who wish to cause them harm. We sometimes hear of failures but these are rare and unacceptable occurrences, but they should not bring about legislation which is open to abuse and which is not fair or equitable to the vast majority of our workers. No system and no legislation should have closed procedures. We must see an open and transparent appeals process which must be available to all employees or individuals who are referred under this legislation.

Our concerns are that our employers will abuse this system and will use this to sack our employees. We live in a society where complaints by those in our care are dealt with by external bodies and, whether there is any truth in these complaints or not, stigma sticks. Even when talking about habitual complainants, each complaint is dealt with by the authority and the employee suffers. Even the police, when dealing with these allegations, will often arrest rather than just simply speak to people concerned and this has serious ramifications if that person wants to seek alternative employment or promotion.

Therefore, Congress, we ask you to support this motion and demand that the General Council press this Government for the necessary change and finally seek change to the ridiculous situation where somebody has to pay £64 of their own money if they wish to seek work with an employer where vulnerable people are in their care. Thank you. *(Applause)*

* *Motion 60 was CARRIED*

Reforming Ofsted

The President: Now I call Motion 61, Reforming Ofsted. The position of the General Council is that it is seeking remission. I understand that Napo is prepared to remit. I will call on Napo to explain the position.

Tim Wilson (Napo) spoke to Motion 61.

He said: I intend to speak to the motion, President, if that is agreeable to Congress.

The President: Yes. You have five minutes and it will depend on what you say at the end.

Tim Wilson: President, Congress, it is with a heavy heart that I concede full debate of the important concerns will not be possible. Napo had given clear indication of our intent and it is regrettable that, despite the efforts of those involved, in the interests of agreement between all parties we will ask for this motion to be remitted. However, Napo does appreciate the good support and encouragement from other union colleagues, in particular NUT, ATL and UCU. Congress, let me be clear, this motion is not criticising the individual hardworking staff in Ofsted. It questions the ethos and culture of Ofsted as an organisation, in particular it addresses Ofsted's use of an inspection methodology which has become unfit for purpose and which logically is overdue for review.

(Applause) The methodology has led to a grotesque distortion of what is deemed acceptable practice in the service it inspects, exaggerating bureaucratic process and thus eroding the time and energy devoted to children and families to the detriment of real child protection.

Cafcass, as you will know, is the service for children in the family courts. Ofsted is the Government inspection body for standards in education. In 2007, the last government made Ofsted responsible for inspecting social care organizations, including social services and Cafcass. Nothing wrong with that, you may say, it is good to have joined up thinking across all arenas where child protection could be an issue. Cafcass is a service which since its inception in 2000 has not had a smooth ride; the results of reorganisations, regular backlogs of unallocated cases, and an arbitrary management style, have often left its staff punch drunk.

Three years ago when Ofsted took on the inspection of Cafcass's work it began with a number of questionable assumptions which indicate it was intent on finding evidence to support its perception of Cafcass rather than gathering evidence and then looking at what conclusions could be drawn from that evidence. It is of course difficult to measure outcomes in social work but in Cafcass the imperative as a result of Ofsted's methodology has been to make important what could easily be measured rather than to find objective ways of measuring what is important.

Cafcass's traditional way of working with families is quality based, face-to-face, and fairly intensive. Following a number of adverse Ofsted reports, a fundamental change was ordered in the priorities of Cafcass staff. Suddenly the priority was to achieve satisfactory Ofsted reports rather than a reduction in backlogs. Case records, plans and assessments, suddenly became more important than contact with children and families, and work which had been deemed satisfactory was declared unsatisfactory a short time later. Paperwork mountains made for an increasing delay in allocations from the case backlog and Napo members were soon reporting that 80 per cent of their time was being spent on case recording, all in order to provide the information as Ofsted required.

Not surprisingly, these changes have met with resistance from Napo members in Cafcass, motivated as they are to continue to provide the quality work necessary to safeguard children, notwithstanding the disproportionate burden of bureaucracy. Often this has led to members being told their work is unsatisfactory due to minor overlooked detail. Now to be deplored is how Cafcass has caved in to Ofsted diktat and abrogated its duty of employee care. There has been a huge increase in numbers of staff placed into capability proceedings, the purpose being to intimidate critics into submission. The bullying has extended to those staff who dared to engage in professional debate outside Cafcass. As might be expected, good experienced staff have begun leaving the service. Turnover within the past year has increased from 10 per cent to 33 per cent in some areas.

Ofsted says that Cafcass now provides a better service as a result of its intervention. Its hawkish PR machine dismisses Napo and other union critics as "mere vested interests", but judges have begun openly venting their frustration over poorer service and expensive delays. The Association of Directors of Children's Services has complained about lack of consultation with Ofsted and the Association of Lawyers for Children says there is no sense of children's interests being put first. Congress, the thesis is this: Ofsted, surely a case for further inspection. Napo members in CAF/CASS say it is. Thank you.

President, in requesting remittance Napo acknowledges that the content of Motion 61 will be taken up and addressed by the General Council with, we hope, positive outcomes for our members. Thank you, Congress. *(Applause)*

* *Motion 61 was REMITTED*

Industrial action against cuts on London Underground

The President: Thank you. Congress, as indicated earlier, I am now in a position to take emergency motions, starting with Emergency Motion 3, Industrial action against cuts on London Underground. The General Council supports the Emergency Motion.

Gerry Doherty (*Transport Salaried Staffs' Association*) moved Emergency Motion 3.

He said: We are all in this together, the Cabinet tells us. Then you examine the Cabinet and you discover that of the 23 members of the Cabinet 18 of them are millionaires. Now, is anybody seriously telling me that the cuts that they are preparing are going to hurt millionaires in this country? It will not be their kids that are going to a school with a leaking roof. It will not be their mother that will have to wait 18 months – the last time my mother had to wait 18 months – in pain for a hip replacement. It will not be their grandmothers who will be frightened to switch on the heating during the winter when it is a choice between warmth and food. They will be cosseted by their money.

So, don't let them tell you we are all in this together but do let me tell you who is in this fight together. The TSSA did not join the trade union movement to sell out our members' terms and conditions. I did not stand as general secretary of the TSSA to sell out my members' jobs. Brendan Barber said earlier in the week that workers do not take industrial action lightly. TSSA members, believe it or not, have not taken strike action in London Underground since the General Strike in 1926. We do not take industrial action lightly but when we have Boris Johnson coming along and saying there are 800 jobs coming out even though there are more passengers travelling. What is a trade union supposed to do except stand up and back its members when they say they want to withdraw their labour? *(Applause)*

Bob Crow said earlier this week that it was the proudest moment in his life when he stood in the picket line with me last week and I have to be honest, Bob, I cannot reciprocate that compliment. I will tell you why. I have a wee Glasgow wife back home, and four kids, and if she hears me saying that I was prouder to stand in the picket line with Bob rather than walk her down the aisle, well, I'll tell you, hell hath no fury like a Glasgow housewife scorned, and I ain't going to do it. *(Applause)* But I will say this, I was extremely proud to stand in that picket line with Bob last week. I was extremely proud that TSSA members and RMT members (because we are talking about co-ordinating action) stood there and did it. I went on the radio that evening and they said, "Your strike hasn't had any effect." I said, "Why not," and they said, "Because 40 per cent of the trains are running." I said, "There could have been 100 per cent of the trains running but passengers could not get in the station to get on the trains. It didn't matter."

So, we have learned a lesson, we do have power. I know who my enemy is, he is an ex-Bullingdon Club Lord Mayor who stands for election and says he is going to get a no-strike deal with the trade unions and then for 18 months has not even lifted the phone to either Bob or myself. I know who my enemy is and it ain't Bob, it is Boris. *(Applause)* President, you

mentioned earlier in the week Jimmy Reid, great orator as he was. I knew Jimmy. You also mentioned his rat race speech and we also heard his speech about Nye Bevan, but Jimmy Reid taught me something else, he said, "We don't just build ships in the Clyde, we build men." Well, I am Clyde built and I am up for this fight. Are you up for it? *(cries of Agreed)* Are you up for it? *(louder cries of Agreed)* Right, I will tell you what we do in the Clyde when we are preparing for a fight. We loosen our tie. We undo our top button. We take our jacket off. We roll up our sleeves and we spit on our fists. I am ready for the fight. Are you ready? *(Loud cries of Agreed)* Let's go to it, then. *(Applause)*

Jackie Darby (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) seconded Emergency Motion 3.

She said: President, Congress, I do not think RMT could possibly be as belligerent as that! *(Laughter)* London Underground workers took strike action last week and are now carrying on a continuous refusal to work overtime because we are fighting to defend London's Tube services. After months of trying to make London Underground bosses listen to our serious and considered safety concerns over their cavalier proposals to cut the jobs of 800 station and ticket office staff, leaving many stations and public areas completely unstaffed on London's Tube network, their response has been that our arguments have been noted. In other words, the justified fears expressed by the Tube unions for the safety of the public and staff working on the London Underground are being ignored.

Well, they could not ignore us when 10,000 London Underground staff took strike action last Tuesday. London Underground bosses arrogantly refused even to discuss reducing the dangerous levels of cuts to essential safety-critical jobs at ACAS with our unions. Colleagues, we carry 3.1 million passengers per day on London Underground, a network that was designed to carry fewer than 2 million passengers. London Underground staff can safely evacuate a large station, such as Oxford Circus, in under five minutes. On 7th July 2005, colleagues, when London was reeling from the deadly terrorist attacks on our public transport system London Underground staff were able to evacuate the entire network in less than 15 minutes. This would not be possible on any equivalent system in any other city of the world. The level of care for the safety of the travelling public would not be possible if these current waves of job losses are permitted to stand.

London Underground says there will be no compulsory redundancies. Let me tell you how this works. You are displaced for 14 weeks during which time you are expected to find yourself a job. If you are unsuccessful at the end of 14 weeks, you are offered the choice of voluntary severance with full company redundancy pay or dismissal with statutory redundancy pay. It is that cynical. No significant impact assessment has been carried out by London Underground on the effect of these cuts, instead bosses keep repeating the mantra there will be no impact on safety, presumably with their fingers crossed. That, colleagues, is why London Underground is prepared to take industrial action to fight these damaging cuts.

Congress, my union is proud to be in the forefront of resistance to these savage public spending cuts. Your support is valued by us and is essential for a successful outcome. Keep supporting the Tube workers, Congress. We will keep fighting for your safety. *(Applause)*

The President: Thank you very much. Congress, although you have indicated your support in response

to Gerry, I still have to formally take this vote, so I am going to take the vote on Emergency Motion 3.

* *Emergency Motion 3 was CARRIED*

Bangladeshi garment workers

The President: I now move to Emergency Motion 4, Bangladeshi garment workers. The General Council supports the Emergency Motion. It is to be moved by Unite and seconded by the GMB.

Steve Davison (Unite) moved Emergency Motion 4.

He said: I am moving the emergency motion for the Bangladeshi garment workers who are currently in struggle, a most militant struggle in fact, to actually have enough money to eat; not enough money to have a quality life, but just enough to eat. In July of this year the most exploited industrial workers of the world rose up in anger and took strike action in order to get a new minimum wage. What were they asking for? They were asking for an increase from 8 pence an hour to 25 pence an hour; absolutely unbelievable from the perspective of where we sit. That action took the form of strikes. It took the form of occupations, of sit-ins. It took the form of street protests and blockages of streets. It took the form of fighting with the riot police and the forces that were launched against them. It also took the form of burning the factories down. Why, you think, would people want to do that, take away their livelihood? Quite frankly, when you go to work every day but you do not earn enough to eat every day, then you pose the question, what is the point. That is the desperation of 3.5 million workers, 80 per cent of them women and mostly young women. Therefore, I know you will give the support that I am asking for in this resolution.

Now, as it happened, I was there on a delegation with our sister union, the United Steelworkers, the Workers Uniting delegation, actually to meet the ship wreckers, another exploited group of workers where five workers are badly burned or injured every week and one worker dies every other week for the princely sum of 22-32 cents an hour. That is for another day. Whilst we were there we were caught in the eye of the storm and thought, "Well, what should trade unionists do in this situation?" So we bought an advert in the biggest selling newspaper in Dhaka, the capital, that was read by thousands. I suspect that your Bengali is about as good as mine. What it said, very simply, is that Workers Uniting stands in solidarity with the brave garment workers of Bangladesh and supports their claim for the full amount of 5,000 taka a month. That was instantly reproduced by the garment unions and spread throughout the factories having the impact of giving solidarity that gave heart to those workers in that struggle. It also had another effect because we actually met with the Minister of Labour. The outcome of that was that we were banned from Bangladesh when he indicated to us that the best thing we could do would be get on the next plane and not come back. Well, we are not going to accept that advice. What happened in the meeting with the minister is that he said, "But, look, what government in the world would not want its workers to have decent wages? What government in the world would want to have to do what we do? But we are powerless in the face of the global multinationals that have more power than us, that can disinvest and drive our country into absolute poverty." He said, "You must play your part. You must get to grips with these multinationals."

Asda, Wal-Mart, H&M, you know the culprits, you know who they are. Have a look at the label on the back of your clothes; not necessarily now, I do not want any more jackets chucked around here. See what

it is, but do not feel guilty, feel angry. Get organised. Give these workers the support they need and let's overturn the ban on trade unionists visiting Bangladesh by getting there as quick as we can, and let's kick up a little bit more of a stink. I ask you for your solidarity, your active solidarity, in defending the most oppressed workers in the world. I will finish on this note: when the most oppressed workers rise up they are an inspiration to all. The Cambodian garment workers are now on strike. This will spread. We must play our part. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Sheila Bearcroft (GMB) seconded Emergency Motion 4.

She said: Congress, having spent many years in the clothing industry it is with a strong sense of passion that I second this motion, an industry rife with exploitation and social injustice in which we as trade unions at national and international level have long campaigned for decent wages, working conditions, standards, and trade union rights, an industry where we clearly still have much to do. Our sisters and brothers in the Bangladeshi garment industries, the workers union, are struggling for a minimum wage, 5,000 taka a month, £46; huge, isn't it? They are also asking for additional measures such as provision of housing, childcare, healthcare facilities, and rations of staple foods to supplement the minimum wage. It is with particular sadness that we remember it was in Bangladesh that the tragic and untimely death occurred of our dear trade union friend and colleague Neil Kearney. Neil was tireless in the fight against exploitation and injustice in the sector. Neil would expect us to continue this struggle. We have seen so much of this industry leave our shores but, sadly, all too seldom to improve the lives of workers in developing countries where outsourcing has thrived on driving down wages, workers' rights, and conditions. The government in Bangladesh may fear that its economy is at the mercy of powerful global companies but it needs to support its workers, not turn on them in violent acts of suppression.

We must put a spotlight on what is happening in Bangladesh and call on political leaders in the UK, Europe, and the USA to intervene. We must demand that companies sourcing or producing from Bangladesh do not attempt to wear a corporate social responsibility badge and do nothing. They should be forced to put back part of their profits into building vital schools, hospitals, and welfare provisions instead of lining the pockets of managers and shareholders through the exploitation of workers, both adult and children, in the developing world. I stood on many lines of protest saying, "Don't buy children's blood." Yes, look at your labels. Don't buy the sweat and the deaths of people in the clothing and textile industry in the developing world. We must insist companies operating in Bangladesh demand suppliers to factor the 5,000 taka minimum wage into their price negotiations and to commit to involving trade unions in their supply chains.

Congress, let us continue the lifelong work of Neil Kearney, who I am proud to say was a GMB member. GMB is fully committed to ensuring Neil's goal, the goal of us all, of lifting workers in Bangladesh and elsewhere in the world out of poverty, is realised. Please support this motion. (*Applause*)

* *Emergency Motion 4 was CARRIED*

Connaught

The President: I now move to Emergency Motion 5, Connaught. The General Council supports the Emergency Motion.

Alan Ritchie (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) moved Emergency Motion 5.

He said: Congress, last week the social housing contractor, Connaught, went into administration in a black hole of £42m. It was the biggest corporate failure since Woolworths. Four thousand four hundred highly skilled craft workers had their lives thrown into turmoil. It was through no fault of their own their jobs were on the line. The workers' situation was made worse by the failure of the administrators, KPMG, to speak to the unions or to provide information. When KPMG did finally turn up to a meeting in Sefton they were flanked by bouncers. I think it was correct that one of our UCATT officials said they were getting more information out the KGB than KPMG. Contractors, Morgan Sindall, will take on around 3,000 of the workforce. Of course, this is good news in the short term but we have to fight to ensure that further cuts are not made to these contracts. The reality is that these contracts have already been stripped to the bone through outsourcing. Further cuts will make it impossible to deliver a decent service to thousands of local tenants.

Congress, 1,400 workers have already been made redundant. These workers have been cheated in the most brutal and callous fashion. They found out they were paid off by text and by conference call, or when they arrived for work they found the depot gates locked. In the 21st century it is a complete and utter disgrace that workers have been treated in this fashion. As we all know working people live on a week to week basis and not like Cameron's cronies. As visions of unpaid bills and mortgage payments loomed, not knowing where the next wage was coming from, it was no surprise that some workers were reduced to tears. Yet again, as Gerry said, it exposes the all together fallacy because the David Camerons of this world will never face this. It is the workers and their families that we represent who suffer. UCATT is doing everything it can to ensure that workers made redundant are rehired and it should be by the local councils. It was the councils who let these contracts out and the councils, we believe, have a moral duty to take these essential services back in-house, retaining the existing workforce. (*Applause*)

Congress, we need to understand the failure of Connaught, if it is not known. In January UCATT warned that Connaught's bid for contracts in Norwich, for example, was not viable. Despite UCATT's warnings, despite the millions of pounds less than the nearest tender, the council did not listen. They went for the lowest bid and on Monday those mistakes led to 350 workers being made redundant, and as the Con-Dem cuts bite other contractors could go bust. That is why outsourcing is not the answer to provide public services. Outsourcing is always more expensive. Outsourcing always results in poorer services. That is why we need to draw the line in the sand and say enough is enough. These Connaught contracts must be brought back in-house as a matter of priority and if the Con-Dems dare even suggest that outsourcing of public services should be encouraged then this trade union movement must tell them no, not now, not ever.

Congress, it is imperative that we give maximum support to the Connaught workers and their families who have lost their jobs and who fear for their future. We must ensure that no more Connaughts come and talk of a fair society; the reality is workers are being treated as commodities. This is not a fire sale of office equipment. These are human beings. They deserve to be treated with dignity and respect. Whether they are tenants, workers, or part of the community, these are not statistics, these are real lives. We know that Cameron's Cabinet of millionaires do not care so this trade union movement must go back to its role, it must go back to its traditional role of defending our

communities, defending our families, defending our workers. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Malcolm Sage (*GMB*) seconded Emergency Motion 5.

He said: The Connaught situation has been moving fast but the future of Connaught workers still remains unclear. This is unacceptable. There is a responsibility on all parties swiftly to support the workers at risk. It seems that a portion of jobs will transfer to firms that have taken on former Connaught contracts and further details are anxiously awaited. Other workers have been left in limbo by Connaught's collapse and they need immediate assistance. We know that there are hundreds of Connaught Gas Force employees who have been caught up in this situation. We are deeply concerned that if the situation is allowed to drift Gas Force will start to lose customers and that will impact on jobs. We know that the Gas Force part of the company could be sold quickly and we call on the administrator to make a quick sale. This is not only about maximising profits but about protecting skilled jobs. Some Connaught workers do not even know if they are being paid this week so we call on KPMG, the councils, and others, to make the long-term job security of all former Connaught workers a priority and be prepared to bring contracts back in-house. Our view is simple: the Connaught workers have been doing vital maintenance jobs, work still has to be done and here is a skilled workforce to do it, so we do not see any reason for the administrators to resort to redundancies.

Congress, there is a lesson to be learnt from this episode. When you outsource an ever increasing range of public services on the basis of untenable bargain basement prices you get waste, worry, and confusion. You cannot always rely on private sector firms to provide essential public services. It is time to stop passing workers round like parcels to another. With the Con-Dems planning to cut, cut, and cut, regardless of the consequences, we can expect to see more contractors going to the wall. The damage from the cuts will be widespread. We are asking local authorities to examine the financial risk attached to contracts they outsource and we are calling on the relevant parties to act now to help the stranded Connaught workers. (*Applause*)

Colm Magee (*UNISON*) spoke in support of Emergency Motion 5.

He said: Congress, we continually hear the phrase, "the unacceptable face of capitalism" and the effect that it has on our members' terms and conditions and their way of life, but if ever a situation clearly demonstrated the accuracy of that statement then surely it must be the plight of the Connaught workers and the monstrous way in which they have been treated: workers being asked to call in to a phone conference only to be told they have lost their jobs, and members receiving text messages with the same result. Some members we have recently received text messages saying they were sacked only to be told later that this has been rescinded, "We're sorry, it was a clerical error."

Congress, what an age we are living in. We have been reminded all week about the harsh conditions in Victorian times, and even before, that ultimately led to the formation of the TUC in Manchester. This crowd will probably have used semaphore in those days to sack workers if they had been around at that time. Congress, unfortunately, this is only the beginning whereby the private sector is being used to do the jobs that people in the public sector can do. These contracts should always have been in-house and, Congress, we should be using our collective strength to

resolve that they are immediately returned to in-house provision by the local government services. The collapse of Connaught leaves authorities to pick up the pieces. Less than 24 hours after Connaught went into administration other companies were like vultures. Within 24 hours Morgan Sindall had made a bid of £28m for the profits remaining. Social housing tenants are left with half-finished building work. We need to oppose and vigorously campaign against the muddle of public service delivery in which contracts can be won purely on price.

Congress, this is our time. We are in difficulties but we will fight back. I heard Gerry talking earlier but don't let the tie and the jacket fool you. I think it was because he could not swim. We know how to fight. We are ready to fight. Please support Emergency Motion 5. *(Applause)*

Dave Mathieson (*Unite*) spoke in support of Emergency Motion 5.

He said: Congress, my colleague from UCATT has described how Connaught, a social maintenance contractor, has gone bust. So far it has led to 1,400 out of 4,200 employees actually losing their jobs. These workers are casualties of the privatised competitive market that drives down terms and conditions and keeps driving them down, and that encourages more companies to undercut each other. Unite members in Glasgow last year were due to be transferred to Connaught and at the last moment, 12 hours before they were to transfer, Connaught could not come up with the money for the pension scheme. They were left in limbo for two weeks.

It is a disgrace that this Government and previous governments have not dealt with this situation. These workers are some of the first casualties of the Government's massive cutback in public spending. When they cut back in public spending it does not just affect the public sector workers, it affects every worker in this country. The consequences for the private sector are devastating. The Treasury's own figures predict that spending cuts will lead to half a million public sector jobs going and over half a million private sector jobs to go; 600,000 to 700,000 private sector jobs will go by the end of this parliament. We cannot let this Government get to the end of this parliament. But the reality is worse. Prof. David Blanchflower has concluded that the Treasury's own estimates are based on totally unrealistic assumptions. The private sector growth at a time of such deep cuts will not happen. In the short term the private sector job losses are more likely to be greater than the Treasury's current figures.

We do not want to see any more Connaughts. We do not want to see any more job losses. Unite fully support the actions in this motion. Connaught is the latest example of the failure of privatisation, the failure of private companies to deliver public services. In the immediate future we must campaign, demand this Government ensure that every Connaught worker has a job and that nobody else is displaced. Please support the motion. *(Applause)*

* *Emergency Motion 5 was CARRIED*

26,000 redundancy notices at Birmingham City Council

The President: I now call on Emergency Motion 6, 26,000 redundancy notices at Birmingham City Council. The General Council supports it.

Joe Morgan (*GMB*) moved Emergency Motion 6.

He said: Comrades, a lot of you will be aware that on Monday it was reported that the Chief Executive of Birmingham City Council, Stephen Hughes, issued

redundancy notices to all of their non-education staff, 26,000 redundancy notices have been issued. Mr. Hughes has issued these notices to the staff to enable the council to force them to accept new inferior contracts of employment. He was quoted in the *Birmingham Post* as saying, "No job in the council is safe, no job," well, apart from one job. His job is going to be safe and no one is going to touch him. He said no job is safe. Incidentally, Mr. Hughes is on £220,000 a year and they are trying to make sure he does not give any pay rise to our members within the council this year, as well as last year. He is saying he has to do this because he has to find £330m of cuts.

When he is speaking to the media and speaking to the press he keeps saying to them, "Well, it is about removing allowances, really, from the employees' wage packets," allowances that really are not what they should be in this day and age. He keeps saying why should employees continue to get mileage allowances and why should employees keep getting car parking allowances, which, unfortunately, the media and in some instances the general public seem to think is okay. What this fellow is deliberately hiding is that some of the lowest paid people in the council actually rely upon these allowances to survive. For example, a care worker would lose a third of their wages because that is made up of allowances. It is not about car parking and about mileage allowances; it is about people being able to survive. He also wants a totally flexible workforce so that he can move workers from one job to another at will.

Birmingham City Council is the largest local authority in Europe and this man is treating his employees with total contempt. He has stated that if the 26,000 employees do not accept the new contracts, he will dismiss them all with no compensation and enforce the new contracts on them. He wants to sack 26,000 employees. How he is going to run the council once he does that God only knows but obviously he does not have the intelligence to think that far.

Stephen Hughes is a bully. He is a bully of massive proportions. Pretending to have redundancies in order to reduce terms and conditions of employment should not be legal but, unfortunately, comrades, it is. We in the GMB believe that this is an abuse of the law and the law should be changed. When I was a kid growing up in Liverpool I was taught that the only way you handle a schoolyard bully is to smack them really hard right between the eyes, and that is what we intend to do to you, Stephen Hughes. I want to send a clear message out to you now, and that is, if you want to fight me you picked on the wrong union because I am telling you now the GMB are not going to stand by and allow you to bully our members. You want a war, pal? You've picked on the wrong union and we are going to take you on, and you will not win. *(Applause)*

Comrades, this bully should resign and resign now. The notices should be withdrawn immediately. We have called for a mass meeting next week to prepare for the fight and, believe me, comrades, it is going to be a fight not just for us in Birmingham or for us in the GMB but for every single one of you in this hall. It is going to be a massive fight of epic proportions. We have had a LibDem-Conservative coalition for over six years in Birmingham now and look what happens, as soon as the national coalition comes into power this is what Birmingham does. This is a taste of what is to come nationally and I am telling you now that we as a movement must not make the same mistake that we made under the last Tory government and hope that things do not get too bad. We have to fight and we have to fight to win. Please support Emergency Motion 6. *(Applause)*

Angela Lynes (*UNISON*) seconded Emergency Motion 6.

She said: My colleague from the GMB has covered most of the points but I would like to add that I hope we will be standing beside you, Joe, when you are dealing with your members, and ours, at the meeting next week. Congress, UNISON has no hesitation in supporting this motion. Our members in Birmingham deserve better than this draconian and politically motivated attack. The council said that the notices will not result in anyone being made redundant but, in effect, they are telling our members that if they do not submit to these attacks on their terms and conditions they will be making themselves redundant.

Congress, that is no way to manage a change of support staff through a difficult period. Stephen Hughes, the Chief Executive, is the driving force behind this agenda. This announcement is the latest in a series of aggressive, ill-considered, and highly damaging actions. Mr. Hughes has repeatedly crossed the line that separates the political decision-making from the responsibilities of a public servant. He is continually put up for media interviews in place of elected politicians. A chief executive should be there to inspire the trust and confidence of the workforce. It is little wonder that a recent workforce survey in Birmingham showed that just 17 per cent of the staff had any confidence in Mr. Hughes. The Labour group on the council has now said that he should consider his position, pointing out that he has lost the confidence of the dressing room. UNISON has already called for the resignation of this politically motivated bully. I do so again today and ask for the TUC's support. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Neil Vernon (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) spoke in support of Emergency Motion 6.

He said: As has already been said, over the last few years we in Birmingham have seen the stark reality of a Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition with their attacks on frontline services and the workers who provide those services. Only recently our members in the outsourced housing repairs and maintenance services have seen over 200 redundancies. Now our members who work directly for the city council face these Section 188 notices, an act that makes it clear that anyone who refuses to accept new contracts will be fired without compensation, a tactic usually used by the most excessive private sector firms.

As has been said and we have to keep reiterating this, Birmingham's problem today will be yours tomorrow. 26,000 staff out of the 50,000 have been sent these notices threatening changes to their working conditions and terms that will have a real financial impact on their earnings. The fact that it is a Lib-Con council and they can so casually threaten to throw workers on the scrap heap is a terrifying reminder of what the national government may have in store, and what they are capable of. These cuts and redundancies will affect the poorest people in Britain and some of the lowest paid workers. Both the users of Birmingham City Council services, which will now be cut back, and the workers, who need work so desperately at a time of recession, will be damaged long-term by these decisions. The public sector may not recover from such quick and deep cuts and we urge the council to think through their strategy again.

We need to galvanise support now from the trade union movement and the wider community. Our fight is not just about self-interest but it is about the fundamental right to decent public services. The fight back has already started so I ask the question: where are the Labour MPs who represent Birmingham? Are they still on holiday? Why are they not speaking out? *(Applause)* They need to speak out now and condemn this action. Congress, I ask you to join our fight and please support this motion. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Dave Mathieson (*Unite*) spoke in support of Emergency Motion 6.

He said: Congress, as well as being concerned about the future job, pay, and terms and conditions, of my friends working in Birmingham City Council, I am concerned for the users of Birmingham City Council's services. We are not entirely sure what will remain when the current Con-Dem Birmingham Council coalition and the Chief Executive, Stephen Hughes, has gone. We are horrified by the scale of attack on those working hard to deliver the vital services that Birmingham needs, street cleansing, recycling, leisure facilities, and our vital youth services, the services that help to make neighbourhoods decent ones to live in, the services that help a collection of houses to become a community. The Con-Dem council rather than stand up to the Government and refuse to demolish the local communities that they were directly elected to stand up for and tell the Government there are alternatives, they have instead stood back and are enthusiastically going along with swinging the axe to our members.

The cuts of £300m over the next few years will rip the services from the communities in Birmingham. The economics of their decision is not difficult to work out. Birmingham City Council workers spend their wages in their local communities, in their local high streets. When you cut their wages, when you push a lot of them onto the dole, it destroys and closes their high street. Birmingham's tactics in blackmailing staff to accept poorer pay and terms and conditions or lose their jobs, we will not stand by and watch this happen. We will stand up and fight for our members. Congress, we spent five hours on Monday saying we will stand up and fight. I now beg you to stand up with the Birmingham workers and defend their rights. *(Applause)*

* *Emergency Motion 6 was CARRIED*

The President: I apologise for going slightly over time. Congress, that concludes today's business. Can I remind delegates that there are various meetings taking place this evening? Details of these meetings are found on page 17 of the *Congress Guide* or in the leaflet included in your Congress wallet. Congress is now adjourned until 9.30 tomorrow morning.

Congress adjourned for the day.

FOURTH DAY: THURSDAY SEPTEMBER 16TH

(Congress reassembled at 9.30am)

The President: Congress, That's All Folk, and that is the name of the group. Last year when we had difficulties at General Council and we held Congress up on the last day for over half an hour, maybe more but certainly half an hour, this group entertained the then Congress for that period of time. So, not only are they great young men and women but we owe them thanks for entertaining us last year and this year, and we wish them well. So, please be upstanding for this group. Thank you. *(Applause)*

I call Congress to order. Good morning to you all, Congress. Congress, after the scheduled business this morning I intend to take the remaining emergency motion, which is Emergency Motion 2 on Royal Mail. Will the unions involved please be ready?

Congress

The President: I call paragraph 9.4, Congress, and I call the General Secretary to speak to the paragraph.

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*): Thank you, President. Good morning, Congress. This paragraph in the Report sets out the rule changes which we need to make in order to implement the conclusions of the Congress consultation carried out over the past year. The message that came through from the consultation was clear, you want to retain a high profile motions-based annual Congress. You want to be able to hold the General Council to account as you have done this week, and you were clear that you wanted Congress to continue to represent the full diversity of the trade union movement. But there were concerns: Congress is costly – it costs unions and it costs the TUC.

The questions we asked were: Are we getting the best value for money? Could we make the same impact but at less cost? And could we retain our annual democracy and protect our diversity without the expense of a full four-day Congress every year? The answers that came back were, yes, we could. Twenty-eight unions representing 85 per cent of our total membership responded to the consultation. The overwhelming majority supported the changes that are before you today. Twenty-three unions representing 75 per cent of our affiliated membership back the change.

So, from next year, every other year we will hold a three-day Congress at Congress House in London with fewer delegates but with the same rights to submit and debate motions. That will give us big savings running into hundreds of thousands of pounds, savings for unions and for the TUC. We will be able to divert resources that currently go on travel and accommodation into recruitment, organising, and the sort of campaigns that we have committed ourselves to undertake in the debates at Congress this year.

Our judgment is that there is no reason why these London-based Congresses should have a lower profile. Indeed, since much of the media is London-based there is every reason to believe that our profile could be enhanced. We believe that with discipline and perhaps fewer additional features we can get through all the business in good order within three days. Delegations will be smaller and there will be a heavy onus on unions to ensure that their delegations reflect their union as a whole. This must not become a Congress of full-time officers, and I am sure in your union you will not let that happen.

Following the 2011 Congress, the first year in this new format, we are committed to review the arrangements and to see if further changes are needed. We will continue to hold a full Congress like this every other year because we do recognise that there are additional

benefits in having more people involved and in the full range of fringe activities. We are saying today that the changes we are proposing are important if we are going to be able to fulfil our primary purpose of promoting trade unionism and implementing the policies and campaigns that we have agreed this week.

Congress, I am moving this paragraph of the General Council Report and formally moving the rule changes that are set out in the report for Congress to adopt. Thanks, Congress. *(Applause)*

Dave Harvey (*National Union of Teachers*) spoke to paragraph 9.4.

He said: President, I think it is widely acknowledged that we have had a good Congress. We have agreed a range of excellent resolutions and we have had a determined and a united Congress. In fact, the NUT thinks it has gone so well this week that we should keep it just the same next year. *(Applause)* We should not shorten Congress, we should not restrict ourselves to Congress House in Central London but, most important, we should not downsize. For this reason the NUT is moving the reference back of this paragraph that Brendan has just moved.

The Executive Committee of the General Council began this cost-cutting review last October. It is as though we have not had a General Election that in the meantime has brought in the most testing period for our movement for a generation. It is time to raise our game or as Brendan said it is time to rise to the challenge. It is not the time to downsize. That is the main problem. I think most people would probably not be too fussed about a three-day or a three-and-a-half-day Congress where voting arrangements, as Brendan said, will remain the same. We may even cope with London as the venue, although we think that will have an adverse effect on the fringe.

What we should not accept is a smaller Congress. There will be less than 300 delegates, according to the proposed rule changes, so how can we ensure a proper balance of lay reps and full-time officials? I think one of the main highlights this week has been the excellent contributions from lay reps, many of whom speaking for the first time. They are the authentic voice of the workplace. *(Applause)* I have nothing against full-time officials, some of my best friends are full-time officials, but we will lose a great deal at a time when we are reaching out to campaign in communities and workplaces if we have fewer lay activists.

How can we ensure that we will get this balance? How can we ensure about a gender balance? How can we ensure that it will not negatively impact on the diversity of delegates? The sad "statto" that I am I have been looking through the report this week: there are 49 unions represented and of those 49 unions 40 have male general secretaries. Most unions in Congress will only have one or two delegates next year in the smaller Congress. I am sure, as Brendan said, that he wants this diversity, this balance, to remain, I am sure he wants that to remain, but I think that what we will find is that most delegates will be men and most will be full-timers.

We have had substantial media coverage this week. Will a downsize event have that same profile that we want and need in this period? We are correctly telling the Tories that they are doing the opposite of what is needed to strengthen the UK's economy. Congress, support this reference back, tell the General Council that it is doing the opposite of what is needed to challenge the Government. *(Applause)*

Jane Aitchison (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) spoke to paragraph 9.4.

She said: President, Congress, we have all felt really proud to be here this week on behalf of our members. We have been part of what has been called the most important TUC for a generation. We have all played our part in furthering the aims of our members and setting down a real and important marker against the Government's threatened cuts. We know that next year will be tough but we are ready together in building opposition to the Con-Dem Government. I look forward to seeing you all here again next year and having even more brothers and sisters with us for an even bigger and more influential Congress. *(Applause)*

It is likely that next year it will be even more needed, not less, but instead this paragraph is proposing not a 40 per cent cut but a 50 per cent cut. If the Con-Dem Government were doing this to us we would be out on the streets. It beggars belief that we are going to cut ourselves. *(Applause)* The threats of the Con-Dem Government mean we must be looking to build the TUC, not shrink it. Of course there are financial considerations, as always, but with a sort of sense of *deja vu* I find myself saying the cuts are not inevitable, there is an alternative to these cuts as well, building unity, rebuilding the TUC to the kind of strength that this movement once had. That must be our priority. That is the alternative to these cuts proposed today. If a Congress could be afforded here in 1868, I feel confident that we can keep finding the money now.

Congress, we cannot afford not to have a full TUC every year. Our members and potential members have felt inspired all week by the real alternatives that we have put to the Tory cuts and to the right-wing media's lies. I want us to continue providing that inspiration all year, every year. Brendan may come back and try to argue that it is not size that matters, it is what you do with it. *(Laughter)* Well, brothers, and especially sisters, we know that is not true. *(Laughter/applause)* We know that unity is our strength but I want to add two more important slogans to our trade union vocabulary today: Size matters. Bigger is better. Oppose this. *(Cheers/applause)*

Anita Halpin (*National Union of Journalists*) spoke to paragraph 9.4.

She said: Size matters, so you have the shortest delegate in the room, although I have lost a bit of weight. *(Applause)*

Good morning, brothers and sisters. Glad to be with you again. I am rising to spell out particularly the caveat the NUJ had within the consultation. We are one of those key elements of the TUC, the small specialist union. We have within our own democracy had to make difficult choices but the one thing we have not touched is delegation size, and our delegates are all in fact lay members at our own conference. *(Applause)* Indeed, our executive is a lay executive.

Now, some of you delegation leaders will have been quite rightly bothered by the office to hand in your yellow monitoring sheets, something that the equalities committees have asked for over the years; they need the information to actually test what we were asked by the TUC to do some number of years ago, to make all our individual rule books equality proof. If you like, we had to do our own equality audit of our rule books. I was told that there are still delegations who do not return those forms. We never get a complete picture. If we look at the streamers here – equality, unity, respect, diversity, and voice – all of those would for us add up to a representative delegation meeting. Looking round here we do not have all that much to be proud of, still, in terms of diversity.

In considering your positions on this motion, take that into account. It is not a case of (and I always get this

wrong) better fewer but better. No, size does matter and if you are short you can still make a point. If you are a lay delegate in my union and you are on the delegation, you will be forced to speak. I think larger unions are beginning to allow their delegations more freedom and are respecting their various skills, diversities, and input, and allowing them up to the rostrum. I remember once chairing a big May Day Rally in London when there were a lot of men in grey suits on the platform. My answer was to go out and buy a grey suit.

Please, can we have fewer grey suits and the same spread and depth of debate next year? Remember, the best media coverage we had was on Monday's debate when we actually said we are going to do something, we are going out there to do something. Think carefully what you do with this proposal. Thank you very much, Congress. *(Applause)*

Bob Crow (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) spoke to paragraph 9.4.

He said: President, delegates, I am asking that this item be referred back to the General Council. I appreciate that Brendan as General Secretary, and the General Council and the Executive, have a job to do in the financial stewardship of the Congress. If they were not doing that, then they would not be doing their job properly; and they are doing their job properly.

However, I do believe that if you accept this rule change we are going to go down the slippery road of a biennial Congress. That is what will happen. After next year when you have smaller delegations, it will be an A and B Congress. Brendan is a big football man and his team is not doing particularly well at the moment, but sometimes in life it is not where you start, it is where you finish. However, he is a bit like Alec Ferguson who wants to put out a team for the Carling Cup and a team for the FA Cup; sometimes that does not work out well. Alec Ferguson the other night put out a B team and ended up with egg on his face when they could not beat a smaller club.

However, it is not about, are we bigger. There have been a lot of macho words used by women in this debate. Greta Garbo once said, by the way, "Those men that think they are macho are not mucho." *(Laughter)* I am glad it is the women now that are promoting the "machoism" within this Congress. However, I do personally believe this is our opportunity as a Congress to advertise to the British working people, those with work and those who do not have work, to promote the Trades Union Congress in Britain. I think by going to a London-based Congress every other year with smaller delegations will seem that we are only serious every other year.

I appreciate that questionnaires were filled in and some unions never filled in their questionnaires. However, I do not think that anyone believed there was going to be the severity of cuts and attacks taking place in the trade union movement. *(Applause)* If we are not careful, the trade union movement will shrink to such a state that we will have to have smaller delegations, so now is not the time to shrink in size. Now is the time to go out there and tell those people that are under attack that we can organise and we can get them into the trade union movement, and I urge you delegates to reject the rule change and continue until we organise workers in this country into trade unions and show that we are a fighting organisation. *(Applause)*

Vicky Knight (*Fire Brigades' Union*) spoke to paragraph 9.4.

She said: President, Congress, comrades, the Fire Brigades' Union feels that we must raise questions

regarding the potential impact on equality in these proposed rule changes. Congress, whilst understanding the drivers for change in organising the TUC Congress, the FBU's concerns focus around the high potential for a negative impact on the diversity out there on the Congress floor, and all the events, by the way, surrounding Congress itself, like fringes, meetings, campaigns, lobbies, the things that the press see. If the press see a less diverse face of the TUC, that is a huge concern for the FBU. *(Applause)*

Brothers and sisters, it follows that reduced delegations will result in a reduced diversity and we are well aware that our movement recognises a gender imbalance at executive levels in most trade unions. We also know that if we reduce delegations, for example for my union at a rate of almost 50 per cent, then the number of women at Congress therefore has the potential to be reduced by up to 50 per cent, and then the numbers of BME, LGBT, and disabled Congress delegates will have that knock-on effect too, we must only assume.

Congress, only 17 General Council members are women and 47 per cent of the TUC is women. There are not 47 per cent women delegates in this Congress hall, and that is at a normal Congress. It does not make any sense. There has to be an adverse impact on equality. Knowing this and knowing that there are no inbuilt safeguards, and there is no way to monitor the impact or the negative impact on equality at Congress, how can this be acceptable? If Congress will also be one day shorter, there will not be any less number of contributions. Where is all the business going to fit? It does not work. There is just likely going to be more male grey-suited speakers not necessarily focusing on the equality impact of the TUC's issues.

Finally, a question to you all: it is 2011, the height of austerity cuts, pay freezes, attacks on our pensions, our terms and conditions, and this is the year that we are going to sever the time for debate, those very debates that inform, arm, and equip us to respond in unity against the people that want to do us in? Congress, I just leave you with one thought. I understand there were 26 responses from affiliates to the consultation exercise. The cuts that we are feeling are proportionately more than the percentage of responses that we are making this decision on behalf of; not 50 per cent of us felt strongly enough to respond. I just leave you with that thought, Congress. Please do not let these negative changes have an impact on our diversity and our voice. *(Applause)*

Paul Kenny (GMB) spoke to paragraph 9.4.

He said: It is great to know that there is such an inclusive Congress when people talk about size really matters; so, thank you very much for that.

The comments that have been made are all genuine and they are all heartfelt, and they are all decent questions. They are the questions that were raised in our union and I am sure many others in the hall. From our point of view, and just to answer a question before it is put, actually our delegation does have a 50:50 gender split and there are substantially more, a ratio of about 8:1, lay members to full-time officials, and that will not change. The issue for ensuring a gender and lay member balance surely rests not with the General Council but with the decision-making bodies in your own unions. That is the reality to make sure that we get a representational role with the body on this floor, not by suggesting the General Council advise and guide. Change the position in your own organisations.

The issue is this. Of course it has been a great week and it has been a great week because we have actually focused, for once maybe, on a central policy and a central strategy that metes out to the people out there. It is not about making speeches here in the case of an extra day or an extra day-and-a-half. It is actually

an issue about campaigning every single day, every single week, every single month, not confining our activities and our messages to one week of one year. *(Applause)*

The other thing is, and I will be straight with you, for my union it will mean substantial savings and probably around the hall it is three-quarters of a million, but I would much prefer that that money was spent fighting and campaigning against the cuts than actually sitting in hotel rooms wondering what we are going to do next. That is where our finances should be going. *(Applause)* Of course there are objections, concerns, and real worries, I understand all of that, but if we are being honest about it we have a strategy, we have a policy, and the new rules give us the ability to move that about. The reality is we want actions, frankly, not speeches from four or five people all week. We want actions directed to deliver the policy and strategy that has unified our movement this week. Let's carry that forward. That is the real issue. There is no impact, as far as I can see, in terms of extending our diversity issues. We will have to police ourselves and the unions will have to make sure that their delegations represent their membership and their diversity. I say, please support the General Council recommendation. Thank you. *(Applause)*

The President: Colleagues, are there any other speakers? There are no other speakers. The NUT has moved referral back of paragraph 9.4. Is there a seconder? Yes. Does the General Secretary wish to exercise his right to reply?

Brendan Barber (General Secretary): President, I will be very, very brief because Paul Kenny, I think, made most of the points I wanted to make. I will just emphasise a couple of key issues, perhaps. It has been said in the debate, is this a move towards moving away from an annual Congress to a biennial Congress. The General Council proposition is crystal clear, this is about keeping our annual Congress and simply changing the format every second year. The commitment is there to diversity, absolutely, but, as Paul Kenny said, that is down to what you do in your unions to ensure that delegations reflect the diversity of our membership. It is not something that the TUC can centrally deliver.

The key question and argument has been that size matters. Really to echo Paul's point, absolutely size matters but size matters most of all in the size of our movement out there in the workplaces of this country. The debates and the resolutions at our Congress are an important part of the democratic life of the TUC. Above all else, our effectiveness is what we actually do out there in the workplaces in the communities of this country.

At our first Congress there were 34 delegates here in Manchester. That created a movement that has carried on delivering massive progressive social change ever since. A few extra delegates is not what makes the difference, it is what we do out there that really matters. So, support the rule change and I look forward to seeing you in London next year. *(cries of 'some of us')*

The President: Thank you. So that we are absolutely clear, Congress, referral back has been moved and seconded of paragraph 9.4. I am going to put that to the vote and before you make any moves I am going to put that as all those in favour to show, and all those against referral back then to show. Congress, hopefully you are absolutely clear. *(Show of hands)* Carried. Sorry, it is defeated, rather. Sorry, my mistake. It was, it was defeated. *(Many calls from the floor)* Well, we will have a card vote, then. I am sorry. It was unusual. It is being proposed that we have a

card vote. Can the tellers take their place? Will delegates and photographers please be seated and keep the gangways clear? (*Card vote taken*)

The President: Congress, in favour of reference back of paragraph 9.4: 947,000; against reference back: 5,035,000 (five million and thirty-five thousand); therefore, the paragraph stands.

Paragraph 9.4 of the General Council Report was ADOPTED.

Reform of the General Council

The President: I call Motion 80, Reform of the General Council. The General Council supports the motion

Corinna Marlowe (*Equity*) moved Motion 80.

She said: President, Congress, some of the motions to Congress ask for things which no right-minded person would oppose. This one is a bit more challenging. We are asking Congress to consider changing the structure of the General Council. I am a member of Equity. It means fairness. Our badges say, "Equality for all". Lots of us here are from UNISON and Unite with good words about speaking with one voice and working together, but there is something about the current structure of the GC which is inequitable, which damages unison and unity and the great ideals of the union movement.

In section C we have to play musical chairs and grandmother's footsteps; neither are very grown-up games. It is musical chairs because the smaller unions are allowed only 11 seats when there are nearly 50 of us, so when the music stops there is a very undignified scramble. There could be some interesting conflicts: bank workers battling bakers; footballers kicking fire-fighters; miners mauling musicians; probation officers punching pilots; railway workers wrestling with radiographers, script writers struggling with psychologists. You get my drift, but it really is no joke.

The TUC structure should unite us equitably, not set us against each other even if in 2007 we did hear some good gags about banjo players. Thanks, Bob. We need a diverse, dynamic coalition for change, Brendan told us on Monday, and the GC is a good place to start. It needs a wider variety of views. Although TUC affiliations have fallen by 18 in the last 10 years, the new affiliated unions have mostly been small, specialized, and growing ones, which are highly valued by their members. In today's difficult economic climate let's help our great movement by encouraging the newcomers. Let's give them a fuller voice. We think we all need to work together. No more musical chairs.

It is grandmother's footsteps. You know the game. You are there with your back to us, we creep towards you, and when you turn round if you see us moving we are out. We are not supposed to be seen moving towards the chairs or we will be out of the game for three years. Rule 7, section G, states: "Canvassing or the bartering of votes for any position or purpose shall be strictly forbidden." It is absolutely ridiculous to have an election where candidates are not allowed to canvass; and the rule is not kept. Of course there is lobbying. What is that lobby for? There are plenty of chats, phone calls, texts, emails, and notes passed at the back of the room when teacher is not looking, and it is just hypocritical and really very silly to pretend it is not happening. We should not have to pretend. If we want someone to vote for us why can't we say so openly?

Please can we just be sensible and admit this rule is absolutely unworkable, and think about changing it. If the rules cannot be changed to give more seats for small unions, please can they at least be changed to

allow open canvassing and get rid of the current disgusting, surreptitious horse-trading. (*Applause*) No more grandmother's footsteps, no more childish games, let's have the courage to change. (*Applause*)

Luke Crawley (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*) seconded Motion 80.

He said: I do not think this is a complicated motion. I think as has been very eloquently said, it addresses representation. There are around 50 or so unions with less than 100,000 members and they are battling, you may say; between them they only have 11 seats on the General Council. In consequence, many of these unions are not represented on the General Council.

This proposition is asking for a review of the number of seats available for smaller unions and I believe that the number of seats following that review should be increased. Smaller unions have a range of experience across many industries and because of their small size they have very close contact with their membership, all of which I think means they have a distinct contribution to make to the General Council. The failure of the reference back a few moments ago means that the General Council is going to play an even more important part in deliberations about what the TUC is going to be doing and I think it would be helped by having the presence of more smaller unions.

I will just make a quick point about Rule 7, no lobbying. It seems very strange, and I have to say I was not aware of it until it was pointed out to me; why no lobbying? It seems to deny the basic political instincts of trade unions. The previous speaker suggested it may go on anyway and of course I could not possibly comment on that, but in many ways it would be astonishing if it did not. However, the motion is just asking for the TUC to review the position, and I hope they do that. Please support the proposition. (*Applause*)

Barbara White (*Musicians' Union*) spoke in support of Motion 80.

She said: The larger unions are automatically represented on the General Council and they meet every two months at Congress House. TUC policy is set out by Congress each year but between Congresses policy initiatives, etc., are the responsibility of the General Council. This would be fine if all unions were represented on the General Council but, of course, they are not.

I am proud to belong to a small specialist union, a craft union. Because we are small our union understands our problems, which are sometimes similar to those experienced by the big unions but quite frequently something only our union will understand. Smaller unions can closely relate to the industries in which their members work and this should be nurtured and represented within the TUC by all small unions having an automatic right to be on the General Council.

Small unions are proud to be part of the TUC and they are more than willing to play their part when they are given the chance, and to stand shoulder to shoulder with their brothers and sisters. There is something quite undignified about small unions having to fight for the 11 places on the General Council. This can be divisive and set smaller unions against each other. All unions are deserving of a place on the General Council. All unions have an important role to play in our movement and need to share experience and knowledge. All of our unions mean a great deal and they are invaluable to the members.

This motion is not making any demands; it is simply requesting a review of the rules. In 2007, the Professional Footballers Association brought a similar

motion to TUC Congress. Let's get the ball rolling and please support this motion. (*Applause*)

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*): Congress, the General Council is asking you to support this motion. As the motion rightly points out, it is now ten years since the number seats on the General Council reserved for unions with fewer than 100,000 members, section C, was increased as part of a wider consultation and review at that time. You will recall that review led to the introduction of seats for trade unionists with disabilities, LGBT trade unionists, and young members, all subject to election by the whole of Congress.

The motion points to changes in the number of affiliated unions over the ten years since that last review and, of course, there have also been significant mergers among the larger affiliates so we think the call for a review is timely. But the motion does, in particular, call for full representation on the General Council for all affiliated unions, large and small, and by making such an assertion at the start of the review it looks to be coming down on one side of what was a major debating point in that last consultation. At that time, a number of unions expressed the view that all unions should be represented on the General Council but others took the view that guaranteeing representation for every union, with unions varying in size from between a few hundred members and well over a million members, would risk turning it into a conference, really, rather than a council and would be less effective as the body to determine and implement TUC policy between Congresses.

There was a compromise reached in that last review, though, to try to respond to the concern about the involvement of smaller unions to make it clear that every union would have the opportunity to attend General Council meetings, and indeed to contribute to debates, without giving every union full membership status. So, we have seen significant changes over that last 10-year period and the General Council are saying, yes, let's have the review that is proposed, but that that should not be understood to imply acceptance of the principle referred to in the motion of a seat being provided for every affiliate. That can be considered in the review but acceptance of the motion should not be seen to accept that principle. So, on the basis of this explanation we are encouraging you to support the motion. (*Applause*)

- *Motion 80 was CARRIED*

Report back on Congress motions

The President: I now move to Motion 81, Report back on Congress motions. The General Council supports the motion and I will call the General Secretary in during the debate.

Jane Perry (*Broadcasting Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*) moved Motion 81.

She said: As things stand, comrades, we get the annual report from the General Council on its work since the last Congress. However, there is no direct unequivocal response to each of the motions we pass or remit. It is not good enough to say that the answers lie within the report; that is not the same thing. For motions passed where even those who drafted the motion cannot find the responding work within the subsequent report is not satisfactory. It is true that we pass motions that take immediate effect, motions for the medium to long-term and motions that are an aspiration. Indirect responses are at best unhelpful and at worst they deny us the opportunity to learn from the successes and failures in implementation, the opportunity to see what our aims face in the cold light of reality. All we are asking is for the General Council to share its

experiences of trying to implement the motions we pass or remit just as a short paragraph on each. Comrades, please support Motion 81. (*Applause*)

A delegate (*Equity*) formally seconded the motion.

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*): Very briefly, Congress. As our colleague from BECTU has explained, this is really looking to review the way in which we report back on motions that are carried at Congress. As she acknowledged, the way we do that at present is to seek to ensure that the General Council Report does feedback giving a report on all the actions taken but rather than doing it through an itemised list, motion by motion, we seek to incorporate appropriate references to motions in reporting on all of our work, and of course all of that work does take account not just of the motions that have been carried at Congress but also events that have developed during the course of the year, initiatives maybe by government as well as our own work.

We hear the concern that at the moment sometimes delegates do not always find it easy to identify where in the report there is account taken of particular resolutions that have been carried by Congress, and we will try and take account of that as we prepare the report in future years, but I hope Congress would agree that we need to do this in a way that brings into the report a proper account of government actions and events and we need to do that to ensure that the report is properly comprehensive. Thanks, Congress.

- * *Motion 81 was CARRIED.*

Royal Mail

The President: I now call Emergency Motion 2, Royal Mail. The General Council supports the Emergency Motion.

Dave Ward (*Communication Workers Union*) moved Emergency Motion 2.

He said: This to our union certainly feels like the longest running emergency of all time. Congress, after defeating Labour's privatisation plans CWU is back again today asking for your support to defeat the coalition Government's full-scale privatisation plans and the break-up of one of the last great British institutions. Congress will have seen last week the publication of the so-called independent Hooper Report which actually made the case for the Government to privatise Royal Mail. It is crucial to this debate and crucial to our ongoing campaign that we actually set out the proper context of the Hooper Report.

Firstly, CWU rejects any notion that Hooper's report is independent. It is blatantly written in a way that talks down the prospects of the industry to justify a predetermined government position. Secondly, it fails to take account of one of the biggest developments in our industry for many years, the fact that we now have a modernisation agreement that has been backed by our membership 2:1. That agreement includes new job security, improved job security arrangements for our members, it includes a three-year pay and conditions deal, and crucially for the company it includes a complete programme to transform the business, to bring in new machinery, and all the things that Hooper said would never happen are now going to happen. It also talks about changing the culture of Royal Mail. In that agreement the company, senior managers in the company, accepted a shared vision of modernisation that talks about Royal Mail having a public service ethos; and that is what is crucial to this debate. Thirdly, Hooper's report would fail any academic or

economic test as some kind of serious analysis of the postal industry. We see Hooper's report as nothing more than a match-fixer for the Government. The truth is we have moved on, the industry has moved on, and he has not. That is why as part of our campaign we are going to make sure that we expose the flaws in that report time and time again.

Congress, having set out the context of Hooper, I also have to point out that we are not here saying today that there are no problems in Royal Mail; there are. I have to state the disastrous way that competition was introduced by a Labour government whereby the competitor has now taken 60 per cent of the profitable upstream parts of Royal Mail's business and handed back to Royal Mail the final mile delivery, all the unprofitable bits of the business left with Royal Mail, means the reality is this, Royal Mail has been set up to fail. Unfair competition, combined with a pension deficit of over £8bn, is a problem that must be resolved irrespective of privatisation. We support that line and in the interests of our members we are going to continue to campaign for the pensions deficit and competition to be dealt with.

However, what we do not accept is that you need to privatise Royal Mail to fix those problems. Neither will we ever accept that this Government is somehow bailing out our members' pensions in order to deal with the pensions deficit. The facts are these: they own the company, they caused the problem in the first place, and they are also taking, as one of my colleagues mentioned the other day, £25bn worth of assets that belong to our members out of the scheme, and we are going to make sure that we are involved in that debate and protect our members' pensions.

Congress, let me make it absolutely clear, we have not gone through in the CWU the painful barrier of modernisation, necessary as it was, not always popular with our members, we have not gone through that to suddenly hand over to private investors who are going to reap the benefits by further attacks on our members' jobs and further attacks on the service. We are not going to put up with that. Rather than support modernization, the truth is that privatisation will actually take us backwards. It is going to stop the modernisation of Royal Mail in its tracks and it is going to mean the end of the universal service. The one price goes anywhere service six days a week that this country has cherished for many, many years to 28 million addresses will finish under a privatised Royal Mail. Do not let anybody be fooled by the Government saying they are going to look after Post Offices. If you split Royal Mail from the Post Office network, which is what the proposal is also about, you will see hundreds more Post Offices closing and our communities will be cut off again.

Congress, I said the other day in the debate on defending public services that it is not as simple as putting your head down and running at them. I want to make it clear that we have a campaign. We have prepared a strategy that recognises we are dealing with a different government. We are going to target 71 key marginal seats of Tory and LibDems, and we are going to make sure that every day they walk in their constituency they see our campaign right in their face. We believe we have the strategy to defeat this Government. What we need is your support to execute that strategy, and we know we can count on it.

Congress, privatisation is not in the interests of the country, it is not in the interests of our customers, and it is certainly not in the interests of the workforce, and it is not in the interests of our communities. What we know is in everybody's interest is that we keep the post public. *(Applause)*

Tony Burke (*Unite*) seconded Emergency Motion 2.

He said: Comrades, I am proud to second this emergency motion. *Unite* has 10,000 members employed in the Royal Mail, and that is why we are giving the CWU our fullest support in regard to this motion.

Let's be clear. This is an attack on public services and one, as we have said all week, which has to be resisted. It has got to be resisted not only for CWU and *Unite* members and other people who work in the Royal Mail, but it is for our people, the vulnerable in society. They will be the ones who will suffer from privatisation of the Royal Mail. I am talking about pensioners, disabled people, the unemployed and single parents.

The case for privatisation of the Royal Mail has not been made. Don't be fooled by the workers' shares con trick that is being perpetrated at the moment. This is the ConDem Government pursuing Tory dogma on privatisation at all costs. As Dave said, the Royal Mail delivers post to every corner of our islands, to every city, every town, every village, every house and every business, so where is the sense in liberalising the service when the Government has already, as Dave has said, allowed 22 competitors to cherry-pick the most lucrative parts of the Royal Mail at the expense of what is described as "the final mile". It is that final mile that we all rely on.

What about the commitment to a universal service obligation, the promise to deliver a letter anywhere in Britain for the same price six days a week. Postal workers deliver 75 million items every working day, but it is not only a delivery service but it is a care service. They see more people in a week than Vince Cable would see in a year. This is a business that employs 170,000 workers and we have already lost 62,000 jobs over eight years. It is a profitable business as well.

We have to look at where, if they are going to do this privatisation, they are going to look to fund it. Well, European postal operators have not shown much interest, but there is one company which has done, and that is TNT. They tried to get involved last year. This is a company that told our members that, having bought a stake in TNT, we face a similar sort of situation where they threatened our members employed in that company that if they didn't take a 10 per cent cut in pay, there would be massive job losses. Congress, it makes absolutely no sense to privatise what is our Royal Mail.

It is a real service for real working families. So I ask you to reject privatisation, support the Royal Mail and support the motion.

* *Emergency Motion 2 was CARRIED*

TUC Accounts

The President: Could I now draw your attention to Appendix 3 from page 184 of the General Council Report, the TUC's accounts. The auditor is present on the platform. Does Congress accept the accounts as set out in the appendix? *(Agreed)* Thank you, Congress.

Adoption of the General Council Report

The President: That completes the formal business of Congress. I now ask Congress to adopt the General Council Report. Is that agreed?

* *The General Council Report was ADOPTED*

Vote of Thanks

The President: Congress, there are a number of colleagues who are leaving the General Council. Gerry Gallagher of UNISON, who joined the General Council in 2007, Gerry has been a UNISON member for over 35

years and has served on UNISON's National Executive for ten years.

Christine Payne from Equity was elected to the General Council in 2008. In 2005 Christine became the first female General Secretary in Equity's 75 year history, and she is also the vice-president and treasurer of the International Federation of Actors.

Brian Caton joined the Prison Service in 1977. In 1996 he was elected Assistant General Secretary of the POA, becoming General Secretary in 2000. He joined the TUC General Council the following year. In his time, he has been a passionate and vocal advocate for his members in the Prison Service. Brian will be very much missed on the General Council, and it is an honour for me to be able to present you, Brian, with the Gold Badge of Congress. (*Gold Badge of Congress presented to Brian Caton amidst applause*)

Brian Caton: Congress, thanks Dougie and thanks Brendan. I want to thank the TUC for giving me the great honour of receiving the Gold Badge. It is something that means a lot to me. I do not want to make any kind of Oscar speech, but I think it is right that I thank people for various things that I have been allowed to do. I would like to thank all those who have allowed me over the years to represent my union on the General Council of the TUC. I would like to thank the General Council and particularly the staff at TUC headquarters and elsewhere for the help that they have given me and my union during that time.

When I joined the POA in 1977 my union, I think it is fair to say, was not really that well understood and did not do much to change the fact that people did not really understand what we did, and the fact that the POA was not very vocal at that time did not help it. I am proud that I have been part of the massive change to that position, alongside Colin Moses and my successor as General Secretary, Steve Gillan, and all the NEC members who I have served alongside in the POA. But I have to say that we couldn't have changed the union without the help of many people, including Brendan and John Monks and, more than anybody else, you, Congress, for the reaction and the support that you have given us when we have given some quite controversial speeches over the years to yourselves. Some were accepted, and I thank you for that, and those that were not I will not say anything about.

I leave the General Council and I have left my union in very good hands, and I hope a lot better than it was when I took over. I leave at a time, unfortunately, when you face a massive struggle. For you, it means that you are going to have to fight and fight very hard. For my members in the Prison Service and our members working in secure hospitals in the National Health Service it means even more. It means a return to disorder, to riots, to injuries and I will say that it will mean that there will be deaths in our prison system. The restrictions on our ability as a movement to fight and fight well during that time is heavily restricted due to the unfair and unwarranted anti-trade union laws. For prison officers it will mean that they will have to break those bad laws. I know that you have heard that many times from me and others in the POA over the years. I wish it was not that way. I wish that the Government had given us back our dignity and our rights. Whether they ever will, I don't know, but what I do know is that the strength of purpose of the POA and anti-trade union laws will not stop them means that if we have to take strike action, shut our prisons down and do whatever we can to protect our members' health, safety, welfare, conditions of service and pay, then I know that the POA will reluctantly do that as a united union.

Unfortunately, I was not allowed to ask the question that I wanted to ask of the Governor of the Bank of

England, Mervyn King, yesterday. It was a simple question based on the fact that I believe that they broke the law. He covered up for fat cat bankers and City multi-millionaires. My question was quite a simple one. Which jail would you like to go into, Mr. King? (*Laughter*) Unfortunately, that was not possible. But despite what he said, and what is reported in the newspapers, that we needed to get away from strike action, and we would regret it for our children's sake, I will say this in saying goodbye to you, Congress, I think you need to do those things for your children's sake and for your grandchildren's sake and for the sake of the future of our great country. Thank you very much. (*Applause*)

The President: Congress, also leaving us is Alistair Hunter, who was elected to the General Purposes Committee in 2008. Congress, I am sure you will want to show your appreciation for the contribution and commitment of all the colleagues who are leaving the General Council and the GPC. (*Applause*)

Congress President 2011

The President: Finally, Congress, I can announce that the next President of the TUC, who takes office from the close of Congress, is Michael Leahy. I wish him well and I hope he enjoys his year as President as much as I have. (*Applause*)

Vote of Thanks to the President

Brendan Barber (General Secretary): Congress, I call on Sheila, the Vice President, to move the vote of thanks to the President.

Sheila Bearcroft (Vice President): Thank you, Brendan. Congress I have great pleasure in moving the vote of thanks to our President. Dougie, you have done a great job this week. You have been a credit to your union and a credit to the movement and, once more, you have brought credit back to the name of Rooney. (*Laughter*) Your fairness, integrity and thoughtfulness has been a model. You have treated all speakers the same, be they the most senior general secretaries or a first time delegate. Your attention to detail is what we would expect of someone brought up in the engineering industry. You were strict with any delegate who was a bit tardy in getting to the rostrum, but you showed great consideration to the nervous first time delegate. Above all, you were here from start to finish. You counted the delegates in and you counted them out. That requires three essential qualities for any Congress President: great patience, total dedication and a strong bladder.

It is my pleasure on behalf of all delegates to present you with the Gold Badge of Congress. Dougie, you also asked for a photo album of your year of office. The album is here. You will see it contains photographs of your year of office, and you might have thought that our colleagues down on the floor were taking photographs for the media, but I can now reveal that many of those photographs will find their way into this album. It comes to you with our best wishes and our appreciation. I move the vote of thanks to the President. (*Applause*) (*The Gold Badge of Congress was presented to the President*)

The President: Congress, thank you.

Vote of Thanks

Brendan Barber (General Secretary): President and Congress, it is now my job to move a vote of thanks to everyone who has been involved in the smooth

running of Congress this year. So let me thank the staff of Manchester Central. I thank the stewards who, as ever, have kept us in good order. *(Applause)* I thank the sign language interpreters as well. They have been able to put your words into action with great skill and speed, even faster, in fact, than Mikel Arteta was able to find the Manchester United net last Saturday.

(Applause) Let me also thank everyone else who makes such an important contribution to Congress; the stage crew, the verbatim reporters, the scrutineers and all the TUC staff who, I can tell you, work enormously hard for the months in the lead-up to Congress as well as at Congress itself to make Congress a success. Thanks, too, to colleagues on the GPC and the team supporting them for keeping us on track throughout the week.

Congress, let me also join Sheila in expressing my appreciation for everything that Dougie has done this week. I think he has been a really great President. He has been firm but fair and a genuine pleasure to work with. As Sheila said, it doesn't matter whether you are the Governor of the Bank of England or, perhaps, a nervous first-time delegate, Dougie has treated everyone with the same courtesy and respect. Dougie, thanks for your service as President. It's been a joy to work with you and all good luck for the future.

(Applause)

Congress, after the pleasures of Liverpool last year, it has been great to have been in Manchester this week, a city, of course, with a unique and radical history, where the industrial revolution took hold, where Marx and Engels recorded the conditions faced by the working class, and where the TUC was born back in 1868. Let me say that 142 years on, I think we have shown this week that our movement is not only alive and well but facing the future with confidence and determination.

There has been only one disappointment with Manchester, and that has been the weather. There is a bit of an urban myth about this city, of course. People famously say that it rains here most of the time. Well, I don't think that is true. From what I have seen, it seems to me that it rains all of the time.

Congress, despite the way in which we have been reported by some sections of the press, I think what we have done this week is really that we have got our message across. We have shown that it is the poorest, most vulnerable and most disadvantaged who are going to bear the brunt of the coalition's cuts. We have shown this Government that our movement will join together and work together to resist its ideological war on the public sector. Above all, I think we have shown the people of Britain that there is an alternative to brutal cuts and better ways of getting our economy moving forward. In the weeks and months ahead, we have got to keep making our case, leading the debate, winning the argument and capturing the imagination and support of the British people. So let's go from here in Manchester to build our coalition against the cuts, to speak up for everyone in Britain, and next year when we meet let's make sure that we are winning the battle to save our public services. Thanks for coming to Congress, and let's go forward with confidence.

(Video shown)

The President: Congress, let us redouble our efforts to translate our ideals into realities. I now declare the 142nd Congress closed.

(Congress closed at 11.02 a.m)

Section 3

Unions and their delegates

Accord

Simmons House, 46 Old Bath Road Charvil, Reading, Berks RG10 9QR
 t 0118 934 1808 f 0118 932 0208
 Out of hours media number t 07973 642592
 e info@accordhq.org
 e (officials and staff) firstname.surname@accordhq.org
 www.accord-myunion.org
 m 9,964 f 21,058 total 31,022
 main trades and industries
 the Lloyds Banking Group
 Gen sec Ged Nichols
 Delegates
 Carley Anderson Stephen Brown
 Dianne Cousins Chris Goldthorpe
 Marilyn Morris Ged Nichols
 Male 3, female 3, total 6

ACM

Association for College Management
 35 The Point, Market Harborough
 Leicestershire LE16 7QU
 t 01858 461110 f 01858 461366
 e admin@acm.uk.com
 e (officials and staff) firstnamesurname@acm.uk.com
 www.acm.uk.com
 m 1,512 f 2,043 total 3,555
 main trades and industries representing leaders and managers across education. ACM also operates under the name of Association of Managers in Education (AMiE), which is a joint venture with ATL
 Chief exec and gen sec Peter Pendle
 Delegates
 Jacek Juszczuk Peter Pendle
 Male 2, female 0, total 2

Advance

(Includes membership of the Union for Bradford and Bingley Staff and Associated Companies (UBAC), which transferred engagements to Advance late in 2009)
 2nd floor, 16/17 High Street
 Tring, Herts HP23 5AH
 t 01442 891122 f 01442 891133
 e info@advance-union.org
 www.advance-union.org
 m 2,038 f 5,607 total 7,645
 main trades and industries All staff employed in Santander and Santander businesses in the UK
 Gen sec Linda Rolph

AEGIS

Aegis the Union
 Aegon UK plc, Edinburgh Park
 Edinburgh, EH12 9SE
 t 0131 549 5665
 e fiona.steele@aegon.co.uk
 m 1,090 f 1,267 total 2,357
 main trades and industries represents staff at Aegon UK – part of the international finance group that provides pensions, life insurance and investment products
 Asst gen sec Fiona Steele

Delegates

Brian Linn Fiona Steele
 Male 1, female 1, total 2

AEP

Association of Educational Psychologists
 4 The Riverside Centre, Frankland Lane
 Durham DH1 5TA
 t 0191 384 9512 f 0191 386 5287
 e enquiries@aep.org.uk
 www.aep.org.uk
 m 791 f 2,595 total 3,386
 main trades and industries educational psychologists in local educational authorities and other public and private organisations (England, Wales and Northern Ireland)
 Gen sec Kate Fallon
 Delegates
 Lynn Ambler Kate Fallon
 Male 0, female 2, total 2

AFA

Association of Flight Attendants
 AFA Council 07, United Airlines Cargo Centre
 Shoreham Road East, Heathrow Airport
 Hounslow, Middx TW6 3UA
 t 020 8276 6723
 e afalhr@unitedafa.org
 www.afalhr.org.uk
 total 533 (male/female split not available)
 main trades and industries airline cabin crew
 LEC president Saad Bhatkar

ASLEF

Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen
 9 Arkwright Road, London NW3 6AB
 t 020 7317 8600 f 020 7794 6406
 e info@aslef.org.uk
 www.aslef.org.uk
 m 17,866 f 666 total 18,532
 main trades and industries railways (drivers, operational supervisors and staff)
 Gen sec Keith Norman
 Delegates
 Simon Birtwistle Alan Donnelly
 John Evans Simon Weller
 Male 4, female 0, total 4

Aspect

Association of Professionals in Education and Children's Trusts
 Woolley Hall, Woolley, Wakefield
 West Yorkshire WF4 2JR
 t 01226 383428 f 01226 383427
 e admin@aspect.org.uk
 e (officials and staff) firstname@aspect.org.uk
 www.aspect.org.uk
 m 1,635 f 2,526 total 4,161
 Gen sec John Chowcat LI.B (Hons)
 Delegates
 John Chowcat Susie Hall
 Male 1, female 1, total 2

ATL

Association of Teachers and Lecturers
 7 Northumberland Street
 London WC2N 5RD
 t 020 7930 6441 f 020 7930 1359
 e info@atl.org.uk
 e (officials and staff) initialandsurname@atl.org.uk
 www.atl.org.uk
 m 32,646 f 89,577 total 122,223
 main trades and industries teachers, headteachers, lecturers and teaching support staff in nursery,

primary, secondary schools, sixth form and further education colleges

Gen sec Dr Mary Bousted

Delegates

Victoria Barlow	Sam Bechler
Jeff Bevan	Andy Brown
David Byrne	Jane Dennis
Joyce Frost	Julie Gillespie
Christine Gregory	Shelagh Hirst
Martin Johnson	Mike Loates
Joseph O'Reilly	Victoria Poskitt
John Puckrin	Hank Roberts
Alice Robinson	Simon Stokes
Ralph Surman	Daniela Wachsening
Joyce Walters	Lesley Ward

Brian Ward
Male 12, female 11, total 23

BACM-TEAM

British Association of Colliery Management – Technical, Energy and Administrative Management

6a South Parade, Doncaster DN1 2DY

t 01302 815551 f 01302 815552

e gs@bacmteam.org.uk

www.bacmteam.org.uk

m 2,412 f 125 total 2,537

Gen sec Patrick Carragher

Delegates

Patrick Carragher

Male 1, female 0, total 1

BALPA

British Air Line Pilots' Association

BALPA House, 5 Heathrow Boulevard
278 Bath Road, West Drayton UB7 0DQ

t 020 8476 4000 f 020 8476 4077

e balpa@balpa.org

www.balpa.org

m 7,980 f 420 total 8,400

main trades and industries airline pilots, winchmen and

• ight engineers (commercial)

Gen sec Jim McAuslan

Delegates

Reg Allen Jim McAuslan

Male 2, female 0, total 2

BDA

British Dietetic Association

5th Floor, Charles House

148/149 Gt Charles Street

Queensway, Birmingham B3 3HT

t 0121 200 8080 f 0121 200 8081

e tusecretary@bda.uk.com

e (officials and staff) initial.surname@bda.uk.com

www.bda.uk.com

m 238 f 6,302 total 6,540

main trades and industries the science and practice of dietetics in the private and public sector

Head of employment relations Debbie O'Rourke

Delegates

Dennis Edmondson Suzanne Wong

Male 1, female 1, total 2

BECTU

Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union

373–377 Clapham Road

London SW9 9BT

t 020 7346 0900

e info@bectu.org.uk

e (officials and staff) initialandsurname@bectu.org.uk

www.bectu.org.uk

m 17,529 f 7,516 total 25,045

main trades and industries broadcasting, film, digital and online media, theatre, cinema and

related sectors

Gen sec Gerry Morrissey

Delegates

Christine Bond Luke Crawley

John Handley Jane Perry

Winston Phillips Nicholas Ray

Male 4, female 2, total 6

BFAWU

Bakers, Food and Allied Workers' Union

Stanborough House, Great North Road

Stanborough, Welwyn Garden City

Herts AL8 7TA

t 01707 260150 f 01707 261570

e bfawuho@aol.com

www.bfawu.org

total 22,786 (male/female split not available)

main trades and industries food

Gen sec Joe Marino

Delegates

Vi Carr Joe Marino

Tony Richardson Roy Streeter

Male 4, female 0, total 4

BOSTU

British Orthoptic Society Trade Union

4th Floor, 14 Bedford Row

London WC1R 4ED

t 020 7306 1135

e bos@orthoaptics.org.uk

e (officials and staff)

membership@orthoaptics.org.uk

www.orthoaptics.org.uk

m 44 f 825 total 869

main trades and industries orthoptists

Employment relations officer Lesley Anne Baxter

Delegates

Lesley Anne Baxter

Male 0, female 1, total 1

BSU

Britannia Staff Union

Court Lodge, Leonard Street

Leek, Staffordshire ST13 5JP

t 01538 399627 f 01538 371342

e bsu@themail.co.uk

e (officials and staff)

firstname.surname@britannia.co.uk

www.britanniasu.org.uk

m 990 f 2,502 total 3,492

main trades and industries finance sector union

representing staff working in Britannia Building Society

and its group of companies

Gen sec John Stoddard

Delegates

Lisa Beverley John Stoddard

Male 1, female 1, total 2

Community

The Union for Life

67/68 Long Acre

Covent Garden, London WC2E 9FA

t 020 7420 4000 f 020 7420 4095

e info@community-tu.org

e (officials and staff)

initialandsurname@community-tu.org

www.community-tu.org

m 53,316 f 14,172 total 67,488

main trades and industries industries in and around

steel and metal, textiles, footwear and leather, betting

shops, social care

Gen sec Michael J Leahy OBE

Delegates

Matt Ball Lee Bradshaw

Alan Coombs Dean Cox

Keith Davies Pat Donnelly

Tom Donnelly Michael J Leahy OBE
 Joe Mann MBE Paul Mills
 Roy Rickhuss Lew Schaffer
 Mark Spencer
 Male 13, female 0, total 13

CSP

Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

14 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4ED
 t 020 7306 6666 f 020 7306 6611
 e enquiries@csp.org.uk
 www.csp.org.uk
 m 4,332 f 31,769 total 36,101

The Chartered Society of Physiotherapy is the professional, educational and trade union body for the country's 47,000 chartered physiotherapists, physiotherapy students and assistants.

Director of employment relations and union services Lesley Mercer
 Delegates

Phil Gray Iain Loughran
 Alexandra Mackenzie Lesley Mercer
 Shirley Rainey
 Male 2, female 3, total 5

CWU

The Communications Union

150 The Broadway, Wimbledon
 London SW19 1RX
 t 020 8971 7200 f 020 8971 7300
 e info@cwu.org

e (officials and staff) initialandsurname@cwu.org
 www.cwu.org
 m 175,455 f 42,352 total 217,807
 main trades and industries Royal Mail Group, BT, O2 and other telecoms companies, Cable TV, Accenture HR Services, the Alliance and Leicester and other related industries

Gen sec Billy Hayes
 Delegates

Pat Clouder Amanda Collick
 Debbie Cort Allan Eldred
 Maria Exall Jackie Gatward
 Billy Hayes Mick Kavanagh
 Tony Kearns Martin Keenan
 Vera Kelsey Andy Kerr
 Bob Maguire Les Marriot
 Lesley McClean Jim McKechnie
 Amarjite Singh Julia Upton
 Dave Ward Dave Wilshire
 Male 12, female 8, total 20

EIS

Educational Institute of Scotland

46 Moray Place, Edinburgh EH3 6BH
 t 0131 225 6244 f 0131 220 3151
 e enquiries@eis.org.uk
 e (officials and staff) initialandsurname@eis.org.uk
 www.eis.org.uk
 m 14,453 f 45,717 total 60,170

main trades and industries teachers, lecturers, associated educational personnel (Scotland)
 Gen sec Ronald A Smith
 Delegates

Kay Barnett Helen Connor
 Kay Miller Alan Munro
 Ronnie Smith Ken Wimbor
 Male 3, female 3, total 6

Equity

Guild House
 Upper St Martin's Lane
 London WC2H 9EG
 t 020 7379 6000 f 020 7379 7001
 e info@equity.org.uk
 e (officials and staff) initialandsurname@equity.org.uk

www.equity.org.uk
 m 18,295 f 18,230 total 36,525
 main trades and industries performance workers in theatre, film television, radio and variety; fashion models

Gen sec Christine Payne
 Delegates

Martin Brown David Cockayne
 Natasha Gerson Corinna Marlowe
 Christine Payne Jean Rogers
 Malcolm Sinclair
 Male 3, female 4, total 7

FBU

Fire Brigades' Union

Bradley House, 68 Coombe Road
 Kingston-upon-Thames, Surrey KT2 7AE
 t 020 8541 1765 f 020 8546 5187
 e office@fbu.org.uk
 e (officials and staff) firstname.surname@fbu.org.uk
 www.fbu.org.uk
 m 41,200 f 2,696 total 43,896

main trades and industries
 local authority fire brigades

Gen sec Matt Wrack
 Delegates

Warren Gee Rose Jones
 Vicky Knight Tam McFarlane
 Alan McLean Micky Nicholas
 Mick Shaw Matt Wrack
 Male 6, female 2, total 8

FDA

The union of choice for senior managers and professionals in public service

8 Leake Street, London SE1 7NN
 t 020 7401 5555 f 020 7401 5550
 e info@fda.org.uk
 e (officials and staff) firstname@fda.org.uk
 www.fda.org.uk
 m 9,417 f 8,049 total 17,466

main trades and industries civil service, public bodies and NHS

Gen sec Jonathan Baume
 Delegates

David Amos Jonathan Baume
 Sue Gethin David Watts
 Male 3, female 1, total 4

GMB

Britain's General Union

22/24 Worples Road
 London SW19 4DD
 t 020 8947 3131 f 020 8944 6552
 e info@gmb.org.uk
 www.gmb.org.uk
 m 317,337 f 284,393 total 601,730

main trades and industries public services – primarily local government, school support staff, care, NHS and education; also security, civil air transport, food production, distribution, retail, energy, utilities, catering, construction, shipbuilding, aerospace, defence, engineering, chemicals, leisure, textiles and clothing

Gen sec & treasurer Paul Kenny
 Delegates

Kathy Abu Bakir Dotun Alade-Odumosu
 Yvonne Arkwright Richard Ascough
 Rehana Azam Mark Bartlett
 Sheila Bearcroft Allan Black
 Elizabeth Blackman Jude Brimble
 Brenda Carson Ida Clemo
 Naomi Cooke Caroline Cotterill
 Elaine Daley Phil Davies
 Nick Day Pat Delahunty
 Harry Donaldson Alan Dudson

Brian Farr
 Alan Garley
 Audrey Harry MBE
 Keith Hazlewood
 Mary Hutchinson
 Jan Jepson
 Eillean Keller
 Steve Kemp
 Ann Leader
 Ann McLaren
 Dolores O'Donoghue
 Emma Ritch
 Tim Roache
 Malcolm Sage
 Lena Sharp
 Viv Smart
 Jennifer Smith
 Martin Smith
 James Stribley
 Bernie Taylor
 Mary Turner MBE
 Andy Worth
 Male 32, female 33, total 65

George Fraser
 Sharon Harding
 Paul Hayes
 Sharon Holder
 Kamaljeet Jandu
 Peter Kane
 Joan Kelly
 Paul Kenny
 Evelyn Martin
 Joe Morgan
 Benjamin Rankin
 Mick Rix
 Lisa Ryan
 Mary Scullion
 Kath Slater
 Gary Smith
 Angela Smith
 Ian Stevenson
 Brian Strutton
 Billy Tonner
 Kathleen Walker Shaw

HCSA

Hospital Consultants and Specialists Association

1 Kingsclere Road, Overton
 Basingstoke, Hampshire RG25 3JA
 t 01256 771777 f 01256 770999
 e conspec@hcsa.com
 www.hcsa.com
 m 2,741 f 595 total 3,336
 main trades and industries hospital consultants,
 associate specialists, SpR grade and staff grade
 Gen sec Stephen Champion

MU

Musicians' Union

60/62 Clapham Road
 London SW9 0JJ
 t 020 7582 5566 f 020 7582 9805
 e info@musiciansunion.org.uk
 www.musiciansunion.org.uk
 m 21,526 f 8,014 total 29,540
 main trades and industries employed and self-
 employed musicians including live and recording
 artists, writers, composers and teachers
 Gen sec John F Smith
 Delegates
 Tom Edwards Danny Longstaff
 Gerald Newson Robert Noakes
 John F Smith Barbara White
 Male 5, female 1, total 6

NACO

National Association of Co-operative Officials

6a Clarendon Place, Hyde, Cheshire SK14 2QZ
 t 0161 351 7900 f 0161 366 6800
 e (officials and staff) initials@nacoco-op.org
 www.naco.coop
 m 1,388 f 732 total 2,120
 main trades and industries retail distribution,
 insurance, dairy industry, funeral services, motor trades
 (retail), retail pharmacy, travel industry, agriculture
 Gen sec Neil Buist
 Delegates
 Neil Buist Bob Lister
 Male 2, female 0, total 2

NACODS

**National Association of Colliery Overmen,
 Deputies and Shot-rers**

Wadsworth House, 130/132 Doncaster Road
 Barnsley, South Yorkshire S70 1TP
 t 01226 203743 f 01226 295563
 e natnacods@googlemail.com

m 350 f 0 total 350
 main trades and industries mining
 Gen sec Rowland Soar
 Delegates
 Terry Fox Rowland Soar
 Male 2, female 0, total 2

Napo

**The Trade Union and Professional Association for
 Family Court and Probation Staff**

4 Chivalry Road, London SW11 1HT
 t 020 7223 4887 f 020 7223 3503
 e info@napo.org.uk
 www.napo.org.uk
 m 3,048 f 6,453 total 9,501
 main trades and industries probation staff (NOMS) and
 family court staff (Cafcass)
 Gen sec Jonathan Ledger
 Delegates
 Jonathan Ledger Tim Wilson
 Male 2, female 0, total 2

NASS

National Association of Stable Staff

Bretby Business Park
 Ashby Road
 Bretby
 Burton upon Trent DE15 0YZ
 t 01283 211522
 e office@naoss.co.uk
 www.naoss.co.uk
 m 1,063 f 891 total 1,954
 main trades and industries represents stable staff
 employed by licensed race horse trainers
 Gen exec Jim Cornelius
 Delegates
 Jim Cornelius
 Male 1, female 0, total 1

NASUWT

5 King Street
 London WC2E 8SD
 t 020 7420 9670 f 020 7420 9679
 e chris.keates@mail.nasuwt.org.uk
 www.teachersunion.org.uk
 m 77,430 f 201,715 total 279,145
 main trades and industries education
 Gen sec Chris Keates
 Delegates

Keith Anderson	Tariq Arafa
Lynn Bayliss	Dave Bryson
Julian Chapman	Graham Cluer
Brian Cookson	Paul Daly
Graham Dawson	Nigel De Gruchy
Stuart Drake	Kathy Duggan
Celia Foote	Stuart Gannon
Alan Homes	Karen Hopwood
Mary Howard	Chris Keates
Chris Lines	Maurice Littlewood
Mick Lyons	Derek Moore
Trevor Morgan	Jennifer Moses
Suzanne Nantcurvis	Darren Northcott
Alan Phippen	John Rimmer
Patrick Roach	Paula Roe
Sue Rogers	Peter Scott
Eric Skyte	Hopkin Thomas
Ian Timpany	Tracey Twist
Chris Weavers	Jo Wright

Male 26, female 12, total 38

Nautilus International

Oceanair House
 750/760 High Road, London E11 3BB
 t 020 8989 6677 f 020 8530 1015
 e enquiries@nautilusint.org
 e (officials and staff) initialandsurname@nautilusint.org

www.nautilusint.org
 m 16,410 f 349 total 16,759
 main trades and industries merchant navy and all related areas
 Gen sec Mark Dickinson
 Delegates
 Mark Dickinson Steve Gudgeon
 Paul Moloney Martin Troman
 Male 4, female 0, total 4

NGSU

Nationwide Group Staff Union

Middleton Farmhouse, 37 Main Road
 Middleton Cheney, Banbury
 Oxon OX17 2QT
 t 01295 710767 f 01295 712580
 e ngsu@ngsu.org.uk
 e (officials and staff) firstname@ngsu.org.uk
 www.ngsu.org.uk
 m 3,535 f 9,251 total 12,786
 main trades and industries all staff within the Nationwide Building Society Group, including Nationwide and Nationwide International Ltd
 Gen sec Tim Poil
 Delegates
 Bill Blumson Tim Poil
 Kerry Wagg
 Male 2, female 1, total 3

NUJ

National Union of Journalists

Headland House, 308 Gray's Inn Road
 London WC1X 8DP
 t 020 7278 7916 f 020 7837 8143
 e info@nuj.org.uk
 e (officials and staff)
 firstnameandsurnameinitial@nuj.org.uk
 www.nuj.org.uk
 m 18,144 f 11,786 total 29,930
 main trades and industries journalists
 Gen sec Jeremy Dear
 Delegates
 Tom Davies Jeremy Dear
 Donnacha Delong Anita Halpin
 Peter Murray Michelle Stanistreet
 Male 4, female 2, total 6

NUM

National Union of Mineworkers

Miners' Offices, 2 Huddersfield Road
 Barnsley, South Yorkshire S70 2LS
 t 01226 215555 f 01226 215561
 e chris.kitchen@num.org.uk
 total 1,695 (male/female split not available)
 main trades and industries coal mining
 National sec Chris Kitchen
 Delegates
 Chris Kitchen Nicky Wilson
 Male 2, female 0, total 2

NUT

National Union of Teachers

Hamilton House, Mabledon Place
 London WC1H 9BD
 t 020 7388 6191 f 020 7387 8458
 www.teachers.org.uk
 m 69,856 f 225,268 total 295,124
 main trades and industries teachers
 Gen sec Christine Blower
 Delegates
 Helen Andrews Dorren Barrett
 Rachael Baxter Christine Blower
 Julia Brandreth Dave Brinson
 Chris Brown Amanda Brown
 Colin Caswell Kevin Courtney
 Caroline Cowie Ken Cridland

Hazel Danson	John Dixon
Emily Evans	Nina Franklin
Jerry Glazier	Gill Goodswen
Ian Grayson	Tim Harrison
Marilyn Harrop	Dave Harvey
Phillippa Harvey	Mandy Hudson
Janey Hulme	Max Hyde
Yemisi Ilesanmi	Clare Jones
Betty Joseph	Alex Kenny
Roger King	Julie Lyon-Taylor
Andrew Morris	Ian Murch
Martin Reed	Ken Rustidge
Neill Walker	

Male 17, female 20, total 37

OURS

One Union for Regional Staff

26 High Street, Mold
 Flintshire CH7 1AZ
 t 01352 751512
 e Karen.Hughes@thecheshire.co.uk
 m 152 f 545 total 697
 main trades and industries represents staff at the Derbyshire Building Society and Cheshire Building Society groups of companies
 Chair Karen Hughes

PCS

Public and Commercial Services Union

160 Falcon Road, London SW11 2LN
 t 020 7924 2727 f 020 7924 1847
 e (officials and staff) firstname.surname@pcs.org.uk
 www.pcs.org.uk
 m 121,326 f 180,236 total 301,562
 main trades and industries government departments and agencies, public bodies, private sector information technology and other service companies
 Gen sec Mark Serwotka
 Delegates

Jane Aitchison	Chris Baugh
Dave Bean	Sue Bond
Paula Brown	Eddie Childs
James Cox	Christine Cuthbert
Alan Dennis	Rachel Edwards
Robbie Faulds	Helen Flanagan
Janice Godrich	Jackie Green
Austin Harney	Gavin Hartley
Joel Heyes	Adam Khalif
Hugh Lanning	Dee Luxford
Fiona MacDonald	Dominic McFadden
Paul McGoay	John McNally
Lorna Merry	Glenys Morris
Emmet O'Brien	Andy Reid
Mark Serwotka	Derek Thomson

Male 19, female 11, total 30

PFA

Professional Footballers' Association

20 Oxford Court, Bishopsgate
 Manchester M2 3WQ
 t 0161 236 0575 f 0161 228 7229
 e info@thepfa.co.uk
 e (officials and staff) initialandsurname@thepfa.co.uk
 www.givemefootball.com
 m 2,713 f 0 total 2,713
 main trades and industries professional football
 Chief exec Gordon Taylor OBE, BSc(Econ),
 Delegates
 Bobby Barnes Nick Cusack
 Gordon Taylor
 Male 3, female 0, total 3

POA**The Professional Trade Union for Prison, Correctional and Secure Psychiatric Workers**

Cronin House, 245 Church Street, London N9 9HW
 t 020 8803 0255 f 020 8803 1761
 www.poauk.org.uk
 m 26,172 f 9,800 total 35,972
 main trades and industries persons employed in any penal or secure establishment or special hospital as a prison officer, a nursing grade, operational support grade, a non-industrial stores grade and NHS secure forensic staff
 Gen sec Steve Gillan
 Delegates
 Steve Baines Glen Birchall
 Brian Caton Steve Gillan
 Jackie Marshall Colin Moses
 Glenn Patton
 Male 6, female 1, total 7

Prospect

(Includes membership of the union Connect, which merged with Prospect at the start of 2010)
 New Prospect House
 8 Leake Street, London SE1 7NN
 t 020 7902 6600 f 020 7902 6667
 e enquiries@prospect.org.uk
 e (officials and staff)
 firstname.surname@prospect.org.uk
 www.prospect.org.uk
 m 94,807 f 28,602 total 123,409
 main trades and industries engineering, scientific, managerial and professional staff in agriculture, communications/ICT, defence, electricity supply, energy environment, health and safety, heritage, industry, law and order, shipbuilding, transport
 Gen sec Paul Noon
 Delegates
 Phil Back Katherine Beirne
 Mike Clancy Paul Cooper
 Patmjit Dhanda Sue Ferns
 Julie Flannagan Derek Golding
 Alan Grey Charles Harvey
 Neil Hope Collins Gareth Howells
 Dai Hudd Joanna Maguire
 Leslie Manasseh Denise McGuire
 Andy Mooney Steve Nicholson
 Paul Noon Sue Stelfox
 Suresh Tewari Nigel Titchen
 Barrie Worth
 Male 17, female 6, total 23

RMT**National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers**

39 Chalton Street, London NW1 1JD
 t 020 7387 4771 f 020 7387 4123
 e initial.surname@rmt.org.uk
 www.rmt.org.uk
 m 70,430 f 9,069 total 79,499
 main trades and industries railways and shipping, underground, road transport
 Gen sec Bob Crow
 Delegates
 Martin Bullock Mark Carden
 Dennis Connor Bob Crow
 Jacqueline Darby Victoria Evans
 Alex Gordon Peter Hall
 Garry Hassell Owen Herbert
 Craig Johnston Frank Murray
 Matthew Partridge Nick Quirk
 Adrian Rowe
 Male 13, female 2, total 15

SCP**The Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists**

1 Fellmongers Path, Tower Bridge Road
 London SE1 3LY
 t 0845 450 3720 f 0845 450 3721
 e enq@scpod.org
 e (officials and staff)
 initialoffirstnameinitialofsurname@scpod.org
 www.feetforlife.org
 total 8,888 (male/female split not available)
 Chief exec and gen sec Ms Joanna Brown
 Delegates
 Joanna Brown Gary Gibson
 Male 1, female 1, total 2

SoR**Society of Radiographers**

207 Providence Square, Mill Street
 London SE1 2EW
 t 020 7740 7200 f 020 7740 7233
 e (officials and staff)
 firstnameandsurnameinitial@sor.org
 www.sor.org
 m 3,293 f 16,397 total 19,690
 main trades and industries National Health Service
 Chief exec officer Richard Evans
 Delegates
 Gill Dolbear Richard Evans
 Jackie Hughes Tracey Taylor
 Male 1, female 3, total 4

SUDBS**Staff Union Dunfermline Building Society**

Caledonian House, Carnegie Avenue
 Dunfermline KY11 8PJ
 t 01383 627749 f 01383 627800
 e june.price@dunfermline.com
 m 73 f 221 total 294
 Chair Ms June Price

SURGE

(formerly the Skipton staff Association)
 The Bailey, Harrogate Road, Skipton
 North Yorkshire BD23 1DN
 t 01756 705826 f 0870 6013230
 e brian.mcdaid@skiptonunion.co.uk
 www.skiptonunion.co.uk
 Registered office (not for correspondence)
 The Bailey, Harrogate Road
 Skipton, North Yorkshire BD23 1DN
 total 1,302 (male/female split not available)
 main trades and industries
 the unions representing staff employed by the Skipton Building Society and wholly owned subsidiaries
 Chair Brian McDaid
 Delegates
 Lynda Kemp Brian McDaid
 Male 1, female 1, total 2

TSSA**Transport Salaried Staffs' Association**

Walkden House, 10 Melton Street
 London NW1 2EJ
 t 020 7387 2101 f 020 7383 0656
 e enquiries@tssa.org.uk
 e (officials and staff)
 surnameandfirstnameinitial@tssa.org.uk
 www.tssa.org.uk
 m 19,859 f 8,439 total 28,298
 (excludes members in Republic of Ireland)
 main trades and industries administrative, clerical, supervisory, managerial, professional and technical employees of railways, London Underground, buses, road haulage, port authorities and waterways in Great Britain and Ireland. Also

employees in the travel trade, hotel and catering industries

Gen sec Gerry Doherty

Delegates

Andy Bain	Gerry Doherty
Hilary Hosking	Felicity Premru
Amarjit Singh	Mitch Tovey

Male 4, female 2, total 6

UCAC

Undeb Cenedlaethol Athrawon Cymru

Prif Swyddfa UCAC, Ffordd Penglais

Aberystwyth SY23 2EU

t 01970 639950 f 01970 626765

e ucac@athrawon.com

www.athrawon.com

m 806 f 3,140 total 3,946

main trades and industries education –

teachers and lecturers

Gen sec Elaine Edwards

UCATT

Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians

UCATT House, 177 Abbeville Road

London SW4 9RL

t 020 7622 2442 f 020 7720 4081

e info@ucatt.org.uk

www.ucatt.org.uk

total 127,433 (male/female split not available)

main trades and industries construction and building

Gen sec Alan Ritchie

Delegates

Kev Clarke	Patrick Dowling
------------	-----------------

Jim Gamble	Dave Hinnigan
------------	---------------

Lawrence Hunt	William Hutt
---------------	--------------

Tom Lannon	Mark Lynch
------------	------------

Chris Murphy	Nigel Riley
--------------	-------------

Alan Ritchie	Andy Thurstanance
--------------	-------------------

Neil Vernon	Andrew Wilson
-------------	---------------

Male 14, female 0, total 14

UCU

University and College Union

Carlow Street, London NW1 7LH

t 020 7756 2500 f 020 7756 2501

minicom 020 7278 0470

e hq@ucu.org.uk

e (officials and staff) initialsurname@ucu.org.uk

Membership and subscription enquiries

membership@ucu.org.uk

www.ucu.org.uk

m 62,140 f 57,261 total 119,401

main trades and industries academic and academic related staff in higher education, further education, adult education, land-based education and prison education

Gen sec Sally Hunt

Delegates

Sasha Callaghan	Mark Campbell
-----------------	---------------

Alan Carr	Pauline Collins
-----------	-----------------

Jean Crocker	Oliver De Peyer
--------------	-----------------

Terry Hoad	Patricia Hulme
------------	----------------

Sally Hunt	Alastair Hunter
------------	-----------------

Brian Ingham	Veronica Killen
--------------	-----------------

Lesley Mansell	John McCormack
----------------	----------------

Lorraine Monk	Linda Newman
---------------	--------------

Pete Robbins	Kathy Taylor
--------------	--------------

Sean Vernell	Roger Walters
--------------	---------------

Alexis Wearmouth	Alan Whitaker
------------------	---------------

Cecile Wright

Male 12, female 11, total 23

UNISON

1 Mabledon Place

London WC1H 9AJ

t 0845 355 0845 f 020 7551 1101

text tel 0800 0967 968

e (officials and staff) initialsurname@unison.co.uk

www.unison.org.uk

m 431,050 f 943,450 total 1,374,500

main trades and industries local government, health care, the water, gas and electricity industries, further and higher education, schools, transport, voluntary sector, housing associations, police support staff

Gen sec Dave Prentis

Delegates

Bob Abberley	James Anthony
--------------	---------------

Roger Bannister	Kenny Bell
-----------------	------------

Stephen Bennett	Mandy Berger
-----------------	--------------

Josie Bird	Wendy Bond
------------	------------

Jean Boswell	Stephen Brown
--------------	---------------

Jean Butcher	David Calderwood
--------------	------------------

John Campbell	Liz Cameron
---------------	-------------

Ivy Carlier	Jane Carolan
-------------	--------------

Gabrielle Carton	Mark Clifford
------------------	---------------

Liam Connell	Louise Couling
--------------	----------------

Lesley Discombe	Christine Durance
-----------------	-------------------

Derek Earnshaw	Neelo Farr
----------------	------------

Jenny Forbes	Sue Forster
--------------	-------------

Sharon Foster	Mark Fysh
---------------	-----------

Bernadette Gallagher	Marie Garrity
----------------------	---------------

Paul Glover	Dettie Gould
-------------	--------------

Sandra Green	Moz Greenshields
--------------	------------------

Margaret Greer	Mike Hayes
----------------	------------

Rona Hendry	Susan Highton
-------------	---------------

Fran Hill	Linda Hobson
-----------	--------------

Paul Holmes	John Jones
-------------	------------

Dilys Jouvenat	Denis Keatings
----------------	----------------

Mike Kirby	Abiola Kusoro
------------	---------------

Conroy Lawrence	Maureen Le Marinel
-----------------	--------------------

Chris Leary	Jackie Lewis
-------------	--------------

Jeanette Lloyd	Mary Locke
----------------	------------

Angela Lynes	Lilian Macer
--------------	--------------

Rosie MacGregor	Ann Macmillan Wood
-----------------	--------------------

Colm Magee	Carole Maleham
------------	----------------

Gill Malik	Angie Marriott
------------	----------------

Irene Mbwanda	Gordon McKay
---------------	--------------

Margarat Mckee	Lucia McKeever
----------------	----------------

Bev Miller	Gloria Mills
------------	--------------

Ann Moses	Sushil Munakhya
-----------	-----------------

Wendy Nichols	Caryl Nobbs
---------------	-------------

Bob Oram	Benson Osawe
----------	--------------

Suzanne Osbourne	Phil O'Shea
------------------	-------------

Vicky Perrin	Lynn Poulton
--------------	--------------

Dave Prentis	Ann Price
--------------	-----------

Davena Rankin	Mark Roberts
---------------	--------------

Eric Roberts	Julie Robinson
--------------	----------------

Jon Rogers	Jessie Russel
------------	---------------

Maureen Rutherford	Tom Sexton
--------------------	------------

Rizwan Sheikh	Alison Shepherd
---------------	-----------------

Kim Silver	Eleanor Smith
------------	---------------

Liz Snape	Irene Stacey
-----------	--------------

Sian Stockham	Steve Sweeney
---------------	---------------

Linda Sweet	Chris Tansley
-------------	---------------

Narmadha Thiranagama	Peter Thorne
----------------------	--------------

Jean Thorpe	Jan Tomlinson
-------------	---------------

Debbie Turner	Steve Warwick
---------------	---------------

Win Wearmouth	Clare Williams
---------------	----------------

Anthony Wilson	
----------------	--

Male 39, female 66, total 105

Unite the union

35 King Street, Covent Garden

London WC2E 8JG

t 020 7420 8900

Unite House, 128 Theobald's Road

Holborn, London WC1X 8TN

t 020 7611 2500

www.unitetheunion.com

m 1,116,593 f 353,105 gender unknown 4,866 total

1,474,564

Joint gen secs Derek Simpson, Tony Woodley
Delegates

Julian Allam	Paul Baugh
Les Bayliss	Mark Bird
Sandra Boothman	Mary Brannigan
Jennie Bremner	Tony Burke
Dean Burn	Gail Cartmail
Chris Cawley	Alexis Chase
Irene Clark	Anne Cockram
Danny Coleman	Doug Collins
Andrew Cox	Channa Cropper
Hitesh Dave	Ellen Davies
Steve Davison	Gerard Dempsey
Jim Donaghy	Jack Dromey
Moira Elliot	Ian Evans
Betty Gallacher	Gill George
Jimmy Grime	Michael Hague
Kevin Henman	Kelly Hockley
David Hogg	Diana Holland
Roger Jeary	Lorraine Jeffries
Dave Jones	Jimmy Kelly
Roy Khan	Frank Llewellyn
Jon Locke	Mohammed Malik
Chris Matheson	Dave Mathieson
Len McCluskey	Linda McCulloch
Dwyer McKerr	Jackaleen McMonagle
Lawrence Mitchell	Ishmail Mohammed
Ivan Monckton	Ann Morgan
Anne Morrison	Andrew Murray
Michael Anthony Owen	Susan Pass
Doug Rooney	Sue Sharp
Rosina Shepherd	Les Sibley
Derek Simpson	Jane Stewart
Joyce Still	Pat Stuart
Yvonne Swingler	Mohammed Taj
Paul Talbot	Kev Terry
Meurig Thomas	Mark Thompson
Charlie Thomson	Agnes Tolmie
Jimmy Towers	Ken Tuckwell
William Scott Walker	Sharon Wallace
John Walsh	Joe Welch
Charlie Whelan	Donna Williams
Tony Woodhouse	Tony Woodley
John Boodle	David Williams
Nigel Gawthorpe	Richard Cook

Male 58, female 27, total 85

Unity

Hillcrest House, Garth Street
Hanley, Stoke-on-Trent ST1 2AB
t 01782 272755 f 01782 284902
m 3,239 f 1,714 total 4,953
main trades and industries the ceramics industry (all areas)
Gen sec Geoff Bagnall
Delegates
Geoff Bagnall Simon Bickerton
Male 2, female 0, total 2

URTU

United Road Transport Union
Almond House, Oak Green
Stanley Green Business Park
Cheadle Hulme SK8 6QL
t 0800 52 66 39 f 0161 485 3109
e info@urtu.com
m 12,000 f 250 total 12,250
main trades and industries drivers, warehousing, ancillary workers in the logistics and food sectors
Gen sec Robert F Monks
Delegates
Robert F Monks David Phillipson
Mel Thornton
Male 3, female 0, total 3

USDAW

Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers
188 Wilmslow Road, Manchester M14 6LJ
t 0161 224 2804 f 0161 257 2566
e enquiries@usdaw.org.uk
www.usdaw.org.uk
m 166,066 f 220,506 total 386,572
main trades and industries retail, distributive, food processing and manufacturing, laundries, catering, chemical processing, pharmaceutical, home shopping, warehouses, insurance agents, clerical, milkround and dairy process, call centres
Gen sec John Hannett
Delegates
Henry Adams Samantha Bell
Jess Braithwaite Jeff Broome
Pat Buttle Peter Capper
Jim Carty June Cavell
Paula Colbourne Mark Conteh
Alex Davis William Drummond
John Hannett Chris Henry
David Johnson Clare Jones
Shaun Jones Paddy Lillis
Ann Lloyd Karl Lockley
John McGarry Angela Owen
Sandie Rowlands Dennis Stinchcombe
Elizabeth Taylor Sheila Thomas
Janette Thomas Simon Vincent
Mark Wheatley Fiona Wilson
Barbara Wilson Peter Wolfe
Male 18, female 14, total 32

WGGB

Writers' Guild of Great Britain
40 Rosebery Avenue, London EC1R 4RX
t 020 7833 0777 f 020 7833 4777
e admin@writersguild.org.uk
www.writersguild.org.uk
total 1,333 (male/female split not available)
main trades and industries television, radio, • Im, books, theatre, video games and multimedia
Gen sec Bernie Corbett

YISA

Yorkshire Independent Staff Association
c/o Yorkshire Building Society
Yorkshire House, Yorkshire Drive, Rooley Lane
Bradford BD5 8LJ
t 01274 472453
e kmwatson@ybs.co.uk
Registered office (not for correspondence):
Principal Office, 16 Higher Downs, Bradford
West Yorkshire BD8 0NA
m 409 f 935 total 1,344
Chair Karen Watson

SUMMARY

Number of affiliated unions: 57
Membership:
Male 3,078,854
Female 2,889,131
male/female split not available 167,141
Total 6,135,126

Section 4

Details of past Congresses

No.	Date	venue	President	Secretary to the Parliamentary C'tee or (from 1921) General Council		Members Represented	
				delegates	unions		
1	1868	Manchester	WH Wood (Manchester Trades Council)	WH Wood	34	—	118,367
2	1869	Birmingham	TJ Wilkinson (Flint Glass Makers)	George Potter	47	40	250,000
3	1871	London	George Potter (Working Men's Association)	George Potter	57	49	289,430
4	1872	Nottingham	WH Leatherland (Organised Trade Association)	George Odger	77	63	255,710
5	1873	Leeds	W Lishman (Leeds Trades Councils)	George Howell	132	140	750,000
6	1874	Sheffield	W Rolley (President, Trades Council)	do.	169	153	1,191,922
7	1875	Liverpool	J Fitzpatrick (Secretary, Trades Council)	do.	151	107	818,032
8	1875	Glasgow	J Battersby (Compositors)	do.	139	109	539,823
9	1876	Newcastle	JC Laird (President, Trades Council)	H Broadhurst	140	113	557,823
10	1877	Leicester	D Merrick (Boot and Show Finishers)	do.	152	112	691,089
11	1878	Bristol	GF Jones (Secretary, Trades Council)	do.	136	114	623,957
12	1879	Edinburgh	D Gibson (President, Trades Council)	do.	115	92	541,892
13	1880	Dublin	J Murphy (Ironfounders)	do.	120	105	494,222
14	1881	London	E Coulson (Bricklayers)	do.	157	122	463,899
15	1882	Manchester	R Austin (Engineers)	do.	153	126	509,307
16	1883	Nottingham	T Smith (Boot and Shoe Riveters)	do.	166	134	520,091
17	1884	Aberdeen	JC Thompson (President, Trades Council)	do.	142	126	598,033
18	1885	Southport	TR Threlfall (Typographical Association)	George Shipton	161	136	580,976
19	1886	Hull	F Maddison (Typographical Association)	H Broadhurst	143	122	635,580
20	1887	Swansea	W Bevan (Carpenters and Joiners)	do.	156	131	674,034
21	1888	Bradford	S Shaftoe (Basket Makers)	do.	165	138	816,944
22	1889	Dundee	RDB Ritchie (Dundee Trades Councils)	do.	211	171	885,055
23	1890	Liverpool	W Matkin (Carpenters and Joiners)	C Fenwick	457	211	1,470,191
24	1891	Newcastle	T Burt (Miners)	do.	552	213	1,302,855
25	1892	Glasgow	J Hodge (Steel Smelters)	do.	495	225	1,219,934
26	1893	Belfast	S Munro (Typographical Association)	do.	380	226	900,000
27	1894	Norwich	F Delves (Engineers)	S Woods	378	179	1,100,000
28	1895	Cardiff	J Jenkins (Shipwrights)	do.	330	170	1,000,000
29	1896	Edinburgh	J Mallison (Edinburgh Trades Council)	do.	343	178	1,076,000
30	1897	Birmingham	JV Stevens (Tin Plate Workers)	do.	381	180	1,093,191
31	1898	Bristol	J O'Grady (Cabinet Makers)	do.	406	188	1,184,241
32	1899	Plymouth	WJ Vernon (Typographical Association)	do.	384	181	1,200,000
33	1900	Huddersfield	W Pickles (House and Ship Painters)	do.	386	184	1,250,000
34	1901	Swansea	CW Bowerman (London Compositors)	do.	407	191	1,200,000
35	1902	London	WC Steadman (Barge Builders)	do.	485	198	1,400,000
36	1903	Leicester	WR Hornidge (Boot and Shoe Operatives)	do.	460	204	1,500,000
37	1904	Leeds	R Bell (Railway Servants)	do.	453	212	1,422,518
38	1905	Hanley	J Sexton (Dock Labourers)	W C Steadman	457	205	1,541,000
39	1906	Liverpool	DC Cummings (Boilermakers)	do.	491	226	1,555,000
40	1907	Bath	AH Gill (Cotton Spinners)	do.	521	236	1,700,000
41	1908	Nottingham	DJ Shackleton (Weavers)	do.	522	214	1,777,000
42	1909	Ipswich	DJ Shackleton (Weavers)	do.	498	219	1,705,000
43	1910	Sheffield	J Haslam (Miners)	do.	505	212	1,647,715
44	1911	Newcastle	W Mullin (Cotton Spinners)	C W Bowerman	523	202	1,662,133
45	1912	Newport	W Thorne (Gasworkers)	do.	495	201	2,001,633
46	1913	Manchester	WJ Davis (Brassworkers)	do.	560	207	2,232,446
47	1915	Bristol	JA Seddon (Shop Assistants)	do.	610	215	2,682,357
48	1916	Birmingham	H Gosling (Waterman)	do.	673	227	2,850,547
49	1917	Blackpool	J Hill (Boilermakers)	do.	679	235	3,082,352
50	1918	Derby	JW Ogden (Weavers)	do.	881	262	4,532,085
51	1919	Glasgow	GH Stuart-Bunning (Postmen's Federation)	do.	851	266	5,283,676
52	1920	Portsmouth	JH Thomas (Railwaymen)	do.	955	215	6,505,482
53	1921	Cardiff	EL Poulton (Boot and Shoe)	do.	810	213	6,417,910
54	1922	Southport	RB Walker (Agricultural Workers)	do.	723	206	5,128,648
55	1923	Plymouth	JB Williams (Musicians' Union)	Fred Bramley	702	194	4,369,268
56	1924	Hull	AA Purcell (Furnishing Trades)	do.	724	203	4,327,235

Details of past Congresses

No.	Date	venue	President	General Secretary	delegates	unions	Members Represented
57	1925	Scarborough	AB Swales (Amalgamated Engineering Union)	do.	727	205	4,350,982
58	1926	Bournemouth	Arthur Pugh (Iron and Steel Trades Confederation)	WM Citrine	696	207	4,365,619
59	1927	Edinburgh	George Hicks (Building Trade Workers)	do.	646	204	4,163,994
60	1928	Swansea	Ben Turner (Textile Workers' Union)	do.	621	196	3,874,842
61	1929	Belfast	B Tillet (Transport Workers)	do.	592	202	3,673,144
62	1930	Nottingham	J Beard (Workers' Union Group, T&GWU)	do.	606	210	3,744,320
63	1931	Bristol	Arthur Hayday (General & Municipal Workers)	do.	589	210	3,719,401
64	1932	Newcastle	John Bromley (Locomotive Engineers & Firemen)	do.	578	209	3,613,273
65	1933	Brighton	AG Walkden (Railway Clerks Association)	do.	566	208	3,367,911
66	1934	Weymouth	Andrew Conley (Tailors and Garment Workers)	do.	575	210	3,294,581
67	1935	Margate	William Kean (Gold, Silver and Allied Trades)	Sir Walter Citrine	575	211	3,388,810
68	1936	Plymouth	AAH Findlay (Patternmakers)	do.	603	214	3,614,551
69	1937	Norwich	Ernest Bevin (Transport and General Workers)	do.	623	214	4,008,647
70	1938	Blackpool	HH Elvin (Clerks and Administrative Workers)	do.	650	216	4,460,617
71	1939	Bridlington	J Hallsworth (Distributive and Allied Workers)	do.	*490	217	4,669,186
72	1940	Southport	William Holmes (Agricultural Workers)	do.	667	223	4,886,711
73	1941	Edinburgh	George Gibson (Mental Hospital Workers)	do.	683	223	5,079,094
74	1942	Blackpool	Frank Wolstencroft (Woodworkers)	do.	717	232	5,432,644
75	1943	Southport	Anne Loughlin (Tailors and Garment Workers)	do.	760	230	6,024,411
76	1944	Blackpool	Ebby Edwards (Mineworkers)	do.	730	190	6,642,317
77	1945	Blackpool	Ebby Edwards (Mineworkers)	do.	762	191	6,575,654
78	1946	Brighton	Charles Dukes (General and Municipal Workers)	Vincent Tewson	794	192	6,671,120
79	1947	Southport	George W Thompson (Draughtsmen)	do.	837	187	7,540,397
80	1948	Margate	Florence Hancock (Transport & General Workers)	do.	859	188	7,791,470
81	1949	Bridlington	Sir William Lawther (Mineworkers)	do.	890	187	7,937,091
82	1950	Brighton	HL Bullock (General and Municipal Workers)	Sir Vincent Tewson	913	186	7,883,355
83	1951	Blackpool	A Roberts (Card, Blowing & Ring Room Operatives)	do.	927	186	7,827,945
84	1952	Margate	Arthur Deakin (Transport & General Workers)	do.	943	183	8,020,079
85	1953	Douglas	T O'Brien, MP (Theatrical and Kine Employees)	do.	954	183	8,088,450
86	1954	Brighton	Jack Tanner (Amalgamated Engineering Union)	do.	974	184	8,093,837
87	1955	Southport	CJ Geddes (Union of Post Office Workers)	do.	984	183	8,106,958
88	1956	Brighton	WB Beard (United Patternmakers Association)	do.	1,000	186	8,263,741
89	1957	Blackpool	Sir Thomas Williamson (General and Municipal)	do.	995	185	8,304,709
90	1958	Bournemouth	Tom Yates (National Union of Seamen)	do.	993	185	8,337,325
91	1959	Blackpool	Robert Willis (London Typographical Society)	do.	1,017	186	8,176,252
92	1960	Douglas	Claude Bartlett (Health Service Employees)	George Woodcock	996	184	8,128,251
93	1961	Portsmouth	Edward J Hill (United Society of Boilermakers)	do.	984	183	8,299,393
94	1962	Blackpool	Dame Anne Godwin (Clerical Workers)	do.	989	182	8,312,875
95	1963	Brighton	Frederick Hayday (General & Municipal Workers)	do.	975	176	8,315,332
96	1964	Blackpool	George H Lowthian (Building Trade Workers)	do.	997	175	8,325,790
97	1965	Brighton	Lord Collison (Agricultural Workers)	do.	1,013	172	8,771,012
98	1966	Blackpool	Joseph O'Hagan (Blastfurnacemen)	do.	1,048	170	8,867,522
99	1967	Brighton	Sir Harry Douglass (Iron & Steel Trades)	do.	1,059	169	8,787,282
100	1968	Blackpool	Lord Wright (Amalgamated Weavers' Association)	do.	1,051	160	8,725,604
101	1969	Portsmouth	John E Newton (Tailors and Garment Workers)	Victor Feather	1,034	155	8,875,381
102	1970	Brighton	Sir Sidney Greene (Railway)	do.	1,061	150	9,402,170
103	1971	Blackpool	Lord Cooper (General & Municipal Workers)	do.	1,064	142	10,002,204
104	1972	Brighton	George Smith (Construction Workers)	do.	1,018	132	9,894,881
105	1973	Blackpool	Joseph Crawford (Colliery Overmen, Deputies)	Lionel Murray	991	126	10,001,419
106	1974	Brighton	Lord Allen (Shop, Distributive & Allied Workers)	do.	1,032	109	10,002,224
107	1975	Blackpool	Mrs CM Patterson (Transport & General Workers)	do.	1,030	111	10,363,724
108	1976	Brighton	Cyril Plant (Inland Revenue Staff Federation)	do.	1,114	113	11,036,326
109	1977	Blackpool	Mrs CM Patterson (Transport & General Workers)	do.	1,150	115	11,515,920
110	1978	Brighton	Mr D Basnett (General & Municipal Workers)	do.	1,172	112	11,865,390
111	1979	Blackpool	Mr T Jackson (Post Office Workers)	do.	1,200	112	12,128,078
112	1980	Brighton	Mr T Parry (Fire Brigades)	do.	1,203	109	12,172,508
113	1981	Blackpool	Mr AW Fisher (Public Employees)	do.	1,188	108	11,601,413
114	1982	Brighton	Mr A Sapper (Cinematograph and TV Technicians)	do.	1,163	105	11,005,984
115	1983	Blackpool	Mr FJ Chapple (Electrical and Plumbing Workers)	do.	1,155	102	10,510,157
116	1984	Blackpool	Mr RW Buckton (Locomotive Engineers and Firemen)	Norman Willis	1,121	98	10,082,144
117	1985	Blackpool	Mr JF Eccles (General, Municipal and Boilermakers)	do.	1,124	91	9,855,204
118	1986	Brighton	Mr K Gill (TASS)	do.	1,091	88	9,585,729
119	1987	Blackpool	Mr FF Jarvis (National Union of Teachers)	do.	1,065	87	9,243,297
120	1988	Bournemouth	Mr C Jenkins (Manufacturing Science Finance)	do.	1,052	83	9,127,278
121	1989	Blackpool	Mr AMG Christopher (Inland Revenue Staff)	do.	1,006	78	8,652,318
122	1990	Blackpool	Ms AW Maddocks (NALGO)	do.	985	78	8,405,246

Details of past Congresses

No.	Date	venue	President	General Secretary	delegates	unions	Members Represented
123	1991	Glasgow	Mr A Smith (GMB)	do.	937	74	8,192,664
124	1992	Blackpool	Mr R Bickerstaffe (NUPE)	do.	892	72	7,762,469
125	1993	Brighton	Mr A Tuffin (UCW)	John Monks	874	69	7,303,419
126	1994	Blackpool	Mr J Knapp (RMT)	do.	878	68	7,298,262
127	1995	Brighton	Mr L Mills (BIFU)	do.	828	67	6,894,604
128	1996	Blackpool	Ms M Prosser (TGWU)	do.	821	73	6,790,339
129	1997	Brighton	Mr T Dubbins (GPMU)	do.	827	75	6,756,544
130	1998	Blackpool	Mr J Edmonds (GMB)	do.	811	74	6,638,986
131	1999	Brighton	Lord MacKenzie (UNISON)	do.	809	77	6,749,481
132	2000	Glasgow	Rita Donaghy OBE (UNISON)	do.	772	76	6,745,907
133	2001	Brighton	Mr Bill Morris (TGWU)	do.	766	73	6,722,118
134	2002	Blackpool	Sir Tony Young (CWU)	do.	765	70	6,685,353
135	2003	Brighton	Nigel de Gruchy (NASUWT)	Brendan Barber	783	69	6,672,815
136	2004	Brighton	Roger Lyons (Amicus)	do.	723	70	6,423,694
137	2005	Brighton	Jeannie Drake (CWU)	do.	727	66	6,452,267
138	2006	Brighton	Gloria Mills (UNISON)	do.	742	63	6,463,159
139	2007	Brighton	Alison Shepherd (UNISON)	do.	762	59	6,471,030
140	2008	Brighton	Dave Prentis (UNISON)	do.	723	58	6,537,545
141	2009	Liverpool	Sheila Bearcroft (GMB)	do.	695	61	6,201,359
142	2010	Manchester	Dougie Rooney (Unite)	do.	645	57	6,135,126

Note – From 1869 to 1884 inclusive the numbers set out in the 8th column included representatives of Trade Councils, thus causing some duplication

* Actual attendance. Credentials were issued to 659 Delegates.

Section 5

Members of the general council 1921-2010

Names of members of the Parliamentary Committee which functioned from 1868 to 1921 are included in Reports up to 1976. From 1921 the General Council became the executive body of the TUC. Dates given below are of the year of the Congress at which appointment was made to the General Council, or in the event of election to fill a casual vacancy the year in which it took place.

Abberley, B – 2005-10
 Adams, J - 1992-98
 Airlie, J - 1990-91
 Alderson, R - 1984
 Allen, AW - 1962-78
 Allen, J - 1994-95
 Allen, S - 2000 -01
 Allen, WP - 1940-47
 Anderson, D - 2000-04
 Anderson, WC - 1965-72
 Auger, L – 2005-07
 Baddeley, W - 1963-72
 Bagnall, GH - 1939-47
 Baird, R - 1987
 Baker, FA- 1976-84
 Bartlett, C - 1948-62
 Bartlett, J - 2009
 Basnett, D - 1966-85
 Baty, JG - 1947-54
 Baume, J – 2001-10
 Bearcroft, S - 1997-2010
 Beard, J - 1921-34
 Beard, WD - 1947-66
 Bell, J - 1937-45
 Bell, JN - 1921-22
 Benstead, J - 1944-47
 Berry, H - 1935-37
 *Bevin, E - 1925-40
 Bickerstaffe, R - 1982-2000
 Biggs, J - 1991
 Binks, G – 1998-2002
 Birch, JA - 1949-61
 Birch, R - 1975-78
 Blower, C 2008-10
 Boateng, AF - 1994
 Boddy, JR - 1978-82
 *Bondfield, M - 1921-23, 1925-29
 Boothman, H - 1921-35
 Bostock, F - 1947
 Bothwell, JG - 1963-67
 Bottini, RN - 1970-77
 Bousted, M - 2003-10
 Bowen, JW - 1921-27
 Bowman, J - 1946-49
 Boyd, JM - 1967-74, 1978-81
 Brett, WH - 1989-97
 Briginshaw, RW - 1965-74
 Britton, EL - 1970-73
 Brooke, C - 1989-95
 Bromley, J - 1921-35
 Brookman, K - 1992-98
 Brown, J - 1936-45
 Brown, Joanna – 2009-10
 Brumwell, G - 1992-2004
 Buck, LW - 1972-76
 Buckton, RW - 1973-85
 Burke, T - 1993-2002, 2008-10
 Burrows, AW - 1947-48
 Bussey, EW - 1941-46
 Cameron, K - 1981-83, 1991-99
 Camfield, B - 2000 - 06
 Campbell, J - 1953-57
 Callighan, A - 1945-47
 Cannon, L - 1965-70
 Carey, M – 1998–2005
 Carolan, J – 2005-10
 Carr, J - 1989-92
 Carrigan, D - 2001
 Carron, WJ - 1954-67
 Carter, J - 1989-92
 Cartmail, G – 2005-10
 Caton, B – 2001-2009
 Chadburn, R - 1981
 Chalmers, J - 1977-79
 Chapple, FJ - 1971-82
 Chester, G - 1937-48
 Chowcat J - 1998
 Christie, L - 1988-92
 Christopher, AMG - 1977-88
 Coldrick, AP - 1968-71
 Collinridge, F - 1961-62
 Collison, H - 1953-69

Conley, A - 1921-48
 Connolly, C - 1995
 Connor, Sir Bill - 1997-2003
 Cook, AJ - 1927-31
 Cookson, B - 2010
 Cooper, J - 1959-72
 Cooper, T - 1996-99
 **Cousins, F - 1956-64, 1966-68
 Covey, D - 1989-98
 Cramp, CT - 1929-32
 Crawford, J - 1949-32
 Crawford, Joseph - 1960-72
 Crow, R – 2003–04, 2006, 2010
 Curran, K – 2003- 04
 Daly, L - 1971-80
 Daly, JD - 1983-89
 Dann, AC - 1945-52
 Davenport, J - 1921, 1924-33
 Davies, DG - 1986-96
 Davies, ED - 1984
 Davies, DH - 1967-74
 Davies, O - 1983-86
 Deakin, A - 1940-54
 Dean, B - 1985-91
 Dear, J – 2002-10
 De Gruchy, N - 1989-2002
 Dhamrait, M - 1995-2000
 Dickinson, M – 2009-10
 Doherty, G – 2004-10
 Donaghy, R - 1987-99
 Donnett, AM - 1973-75
 Doughty, GH - 1968-73
 Douglass, H - 1953-66
 Drake, JLP - 1990-2007
 Drain, GA - 1973-82
 Dubbins, AD - 1984-2007
 Duffy, D - 1988-91
 Duffy, T - 1978-85
 Dukes, C - 1934-46
 Dunn, V – 2001-2002
 Dwyer, P - 1992-94
 Dyson, F - 1975-78
 Eastwood, H - 1948
 Eccles, JF - 1973-85
 Eccles, T - 1949-58
 Edmonds, J - 1986-2002
 Edmondson, LF - 1970-77
 Edward, E - 1931-46
 Ellis, JN - 1988-91
 Elsom, R - 1996-97
 Elvin, HH - 1925-39
 Evans, AM - 1977-84
 Evans, D - 1991-99
 Evans, L - 1945-52
 Evans, RL - 1985-91
 Evans, W - 1996-99
 Evans, WJ - 1960-62
 Exall, M – 2006-10
 Farthing, WJ - 1935-43
 Fawcett, L - 1940-51
 Fenelon, B – 1998
 Ferns, S – 2005-10
 Figgins, JB - 1947-52
 Findlay, AAH - 1921-40
 Fisher, AW - 1968-81
 Ford, SWG - 1963-70
 Forden, L - 1958-65
 Forshaw, W - 1933-34
 Foster, J – 1999-2003
 Foulkes, P - 2006
 Fysh, M – 2001-10
 Gallagher, G – 2007-09
 Gallie, CN - 1940-46
 Garland, R – 1983
 Garley, A – 2005-10
 Gates, P – 2001,2003
 Geddes, CJ - 1946-56
 Geldart, J - 1991-94
 George, E - 1988
 Gibson, A - 1988-99
 Gibson, G - 1928-47
 Gilchrist, A - 2000 -04
 Gill, K - 1974-91
 Gill, WW - 1983-86
 Gillan, S - 2010
 Gladwin, DO - 1986-89
 Godrich, J - 2003-10
 Godwin, A - 1949-62
 Golding, J - 1986-87
 Gormley, J - 1973-79
 Gosling, H - 1921-23
 Graham, JA - 1982-83, 1985
 Grant, J - 2002
 Grantham, RA - 1971-74, 1983-91
 Gray, D - 1982-83
 Green, GF - 1960-62

Greendale, W - 1978-85
 Greene, SF - 1957-74
 Gretton, S - 1969-72
 Grieve, CD - 1973-82
 Griffiths, AE - 1963-69
 Guy, LG - 1977-82
 Hagger, P - 1988-94
 Haigh, E - 1982
 Hall, D - 1996-97
 Hall, E - 1954-59
 Hallsworth, J - 1926-46
 Hallworth, A - 1955-59
 Halpin, A – 1996, 1999, 2001- 08
 Hammond, EA - 1983-87
 Hancock, F - 1935-57
 Handley, RC - 1938-39
 Hanley, P - 1968-69
 Hannett, J – 2004-10
 Harrison, HN - 1937-47
 Harvey, D – 2008-10
 Hawkes, P - 1992-2004
 Hayday, A - 1922-36
 Hayday, F - 1950-72
 Hayes, W – 2002-10
 Haynes, E - 1964-68
 Henry, J - 1989-90
 Hewitt, H - 1952-63
 Heywood, WL - 1948-56
 Hicks, G - 1921-40
 Hill, AL - 1955-57
 Hill, D - 1992
 Hill, EJ - 1948-64
 Hill, J - 1921-35
 Hill, JC - 1958
 Hill, S - 1963-67
 Hillon, B - 1987-97
 Hindle, J - 1930-36
 Hodgson, M - 1936-47
 Hogarth, W - 1962-72
 Holloway, P - 1997-2000
 Holmes, W - 1928-44
 Houghton, D - 1952-59
 Howell, FL - 1970-73
 Hunt, S – 2002-10
 Isaacs, GA - 1932-45
 Jackson, Sir Ken - 1993-2001
 Jackson, T - 1967-81
 Jarman, C - 1942-46
 Jarvis, FF - 1974-88
 Jenkins, C - 1974-87
 Jinkinson, A - 1990-95
 Johnson, A - 1993-94
 Jones, J - 1934-38
 Jones, JL - 1968-77
 Jones, JW - 1967-69
 Jones, RT - 1946-56
 Jones, RT - 1921-32
 Jones, WE - 1950-59
 Jordan, WB - 1986-94
 Jowett, W - 1986-87
 Kaylor, J - 1932-42
 Kean, W - 1921-45
 Kearns, T – 2008-10
 Keates, C – 2004-10
 Kelly, J – 2004-07
 Kelly, L - 2004
 Kenny, P - 2000-10
 Keys, WH - 1975-84
 King, J - 1972-74
 Knapp, J - 1983-2000
 Laird, G - 1979-81
 Lambert, DAC - 1984-93
 Landles, P - 1995-2003
 Lascelles, D – 2001-05
 Lawther, W - 1935-53
 Leahy, M – 1999-2010
 Lee, P - 1933
 Lenahan, P - 1991-92
 Leslie, J - 1925
 Littlewood, TL - 1968-70
 Lloyd, G - 1973-82
 Losinska, K - 1986
 Loughlin, A - 1929-52
 Love, I - 1987-94
 Lowthian, GH - 1952-72
 Lynes, A - 2010
 Lyons, CA - 1983-88
 Lyons, J - 1983-90
 Lyons, R - 1989-2003
 Macgougan, J - 1970-78
 MacKenzie, HU (Lord) - 1987-99
 Mackney, P – 2002-06
 Macreadie, J - 1987
 Maddocks, A - 1977-90
 Maddocks, WH - 1979-81
 Manasseh, L – 2001-2010

Martin, A - 1960-70
 Mayer, M – 2007-08
 McAndrews, A - 1949-54
 McAvoy, D - 1989-2003
 McCall, W - 1984-88
 McCarthy, CP- 1983-84
 McCluskey, L – 2007-10
 McCulloch, L - 2003
 McCullogh, E - 1958-62
 McDermott, JF - 1949-57
 McGahey, M - 1982-85
 McGarvey, D - 1965-76
 McGonigle, A - 1992
 McGrath, H - 1995-98
 McGregor, M - 2004
 McGurk, J – 1932
 Mckay, J – 2002-03
 McKnight, J - 2000-07
 Mercer, L - 2000-10
 Mills, G - 1994-2010
 Mills, LA - 1983-95
 Moore, JH - 1922-23
 Morgan, B - 1995
 Morgan, G - 1981-89
 Morris, W - 1988-2002
 Morritt, M - 1989-91
 Morton, J - 1975-84, 1987-89
 Murnin, H - 1921
 Murray, JG - 1980-82
 Neal, J – 2007-2010
 Naesmith, A - 1945-52
 Nevin, E - 1985-88
 Newman, J - 1990-91
 Newton, JE - 1953-69
 Nicholls, D - 2005
 Nichols, G - 2000–02, 2005-10
 Nicholas, HR - 1965-66
 Nicholson, B - 1983-87
 Noon, P – 2001-10
 O’Brien, T - 1940-69
 Ogden, JW - 1921-29
 O’Hagen, J - 1953-66
 O’Kane, E - 2003
 Openshaw, R - 1948-56
 Orrell, B – 1999-2008
 Owen, J - 1948-52
 Page, M - 1988-89
 Papworth, AF - 1944-48
 Parry, T - 1968-80
 Patterson, CM - 1963-84
 Payne, C – 2008 -09
 Paynter, W - 1960
 Peel, JA - 1966-72
 Pemberton, S - 1974-81
 Pickering, R - 1985-96
 Pinder, P – 2001-2003
 Plant, CTH - 1963-75
 Poil, T – 2005-10
 Poole, L - 1957-58
 Poulton, EL - 1921-29
 Prentis, D - 1996-2010
 Prime, AM - 1968-76
 Prosser, M - 1985-95
 Prudence, J - 1995-99
 Pugh, A - 1921-35
 Purcell, AA - 1921-27
 Purkiss, B - 1994-99
 Qualie, M - 1923-25
 Reamsbottom, BA - 1992-2001
 Richards, T - 1925-31
 Ritchie, A – 2005-10
 Rix, M – 2001-2002
 Roberts, A (Sir) - 1940-62
 Roberts, A - 1967-71
 Robinson, SA - 1959-69
 Rogers, S – 2002-08
 Rooney, D – 1998-2010
 Rooney, M - 1990-2002
 Rosser, R - 2000 - 2003
 Rown, J - 1921-34
 Russell, JG - 1982-86
 Sage, M – 2009-10
 Sanders, B - 2007
 Sapper, AL - 1970-83
 Scanlon, H - 1968-77
 Scard, D - 1990-2000
 Scargill, A - 1980-82, 1986-87
 Scott, J - 1961
 Scrivens, EM - 1982-86
 Serwotka, M – 2002-10
 Sexton, J - 1921
 Sharp, L - 1957-65
 Shaw, A - 1929-38
 Sheldon, J - 1992-97
 Shepherd, A - 1995-2010
 Sherwood, W - 1934-36

Simpson, D – 2002-10
 Sinnott, S – 2005-07
 Sirs, W - 1975-84
 Skinner, H - 1921-31
 Slater, JH - 1974-82
 Slater, JW - 1972-73
 Smillie, R - 1921-36
 Smith, A - 1921
 Smith, AR - 1979-92
 Smith, E – 2007-10
 Smith, GF - 1959-78
 Smith, H - 1922-24, 1931
 Smith, J – 2007-10
 Smith, LJ - 1980-87
 Smith, P – 1999-2002
 Smith, R - 1957-66
 Smithies, FA - 1983-89
 Snape, L – 2001-10
 Sonnet, K – 2001-06
 Spackman, EW- 1945-46
 Spanswick, EAG - 1977-82
 Spence, WR - 1931-41
 Stanley, BC - 1983-85
 Squance, WJR - 1936-39
 Steele, NJ - 1983-90
 Stevens, L - 1983
 Stevenson, RB - 1984-89
 Stott, W - 1936-39
 Stuart, P – 2004-10
 Swales, AB - 1921-34
 Sweeney, E - 1996-2006
 Swindell, B - 1962-65
 Switzer, B - 1993-97
 Symons, E - 1989-95
 Taj, M - 2000-10
 Talbot, P – 1999-2008
 Tallon, WM - 1957-66
 Tami, M – 1999-2000
 Tanner, J - 1943-53
 Taylor, S – 2003 - 05
 Thomas, JH - 1921, 1925-28
 Thomas, KR - 1977-81
 Thomas, P - 1989-91
 Thomson, GW - 1935-47
 Thorburn, W - 1990
 Thorne, W - 1921-33
 Thorncroft, GB - 1948-52
 Thurston, J – 1999-2004
 Tiffin, AE - 1955
 Tillet, B - 1921-31
 Todd, R - 1984-91
 Townley, WR - 1930-36
 Tuffin, AD - 1982-92
 Turner, B - 1921-28
 Turner, J - 1921-24
 Turner, M - 1981-86
 Turner, P - 1981-88
 Twomey, M - 1989-96
 Urwin, CH - 1969-79
 Vannet, M - 1997-2001
 Varley, J - 1921-25, 1926-34
 Wade, JF - 1983
 Walkden, AG - 1921-25
 Walker, RB - 1921-27
 Walsh, B - 1950, 1957-59
 Walsh, J – 2005-10
 Ward, B - 1985
 Warrillow, E - 1997-1999
 Warwick, D - 1989-91
 Webber, WJP - 1953-62
 Weakley, J - 1985, 1987-94
 Weighell, S - 1975-82
 Whatley, WHP - 1979-85
 White, J - 1990-92
 Whyman, JR - 1983, 1985-89
 Wilkinson, F - 1993-96
 Williams, A - 1985-91
 Williams, DO - 1983-86
 Williams, JB - 1921-24
 Williams, RW - 1938-46
 Williamson, T - 1947-61
 Willis, R - 1947-64
 Wilson, F – 2007-10
 Winsett, J - 1986
 Wolstencroft, F - 1928-48
 Wood, L - 1979-84
 Wood, W - 1936-37
 Woodhouse, T – 2008-10
 Woodley, T – 2003-10
 Wrack, M – 2006- 10
 Wright, LT - 1953-67
 Yates, T - 1947-60
 Young, AI - 1989-2001
 *Resigned on appointment as Minister of Labour
 ** Resigned on appointment as Minister of
 Technology, 1964

Index of Speakers

A

Adale-Odumosu, Dotun
Haiti 95

Aitchison, Jane
Child poverty 53
Congress 155

Alade-Odumosu, Dotun
International asbestos ban 69

Alan Coombs
Climate change 117

Ambler, Lynn
Inclusion 110
Threats to local authority education services 112

Amos, David
The NHS 91

Andrews, Helen
Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) 148

Anthony, James
Housing 119

Azam, Rehena
Public Interest Disclosure Act 64

B

Bain, Andy
Defending public services 43
Palestine 97

Baines, Steve
Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) 149

Barber, Brendan
Anti-union laws 62
Congress 155, 157
High Pay Commission 125
Palestine 99
Questions to the Governor of the Bank of England 128
Reform of the General Council 159
Report back on Congress motions 159
The General Secretary's Address 37
Vote of thanks 161
Young people and the recession 88

Barnett, Kay
Graduate unemployment 88

Barrett, Doreen
Question to the Governor of the Bank of England 128

Baugh, Chris
Pensions 143

Baume, Jonathan
HMRC resources and the deficit 44

Bayliss, Les
Blacklisting 63

Bearcroft, Sheila
Bangladeshi garment workers 151
Vote of thanks to the President 161

Birchall, Glen
Anti-union laws 62

Birtwhistle, Simon
More freight on rail 136

Black, Ann
Address by Labour Party sororal delegate 139

Blower, Christine
Academies, free schools and state education 107

Bond, Christine Employment rights 60

Bond, Sue Equality Impact Assessments 75

Bousted, Mary
Academies, free schools and state education 107

Bradshaw, Lee
Manufacturing and industrial policy 121

Brimble, Jude
Cosmetic use of sunbeds 133

Brown, Joanna
Internships 84

Burke, Tony
Manufacturing and industrial policy 120
Royal Mail 160

Burrow, Sharan
Address by general secretary ITUC 93

C

Callaghan, Sasha
Defence of the welfare state 56

Campbell, Mark
High Pay Commission 124

Carden, Mark
The Strategic Defence Review and its implications for the Royal Fleet Auxiliary (RFA) 138

Carlier, Ivy
Government transport policy 136

Carr, Alan
Pensions 144

Carragher, Patrick
Coal in a balanced energy policy 118

Cartmail, Gail
Defending public services 39
High Pay Commission 123

Caton, Brian
Anti-union laws 61
Gold badge of Congress 161

Charnley, Deborah
Young people and the recession 87

Chase, Alexis
Haiti 95
NHS hospital car parking charges 126

Cockayne, David
The BBC's remit 103

Collins, Pauline
Question to the Governor of the Bank of England 130

Connor, Dennis
Result of ballot for the General Council and General Purposes Committee 112

Cooke Naomi

Pensions 140

Cooke, Richard

A workplace agenda for disabled workers 80

Cookson, Brian

Health and safety at work 65

Cort, Debbie

Question to the Governor of the Bank of England 128

Courtney, Kevin

Defending public services 43

Cox, Dean

Inclusion 110

Crawley, Luke

Pensions 144

Reform of the General Council 158

The BBC's remit 103

Cridland, Ken

Threats to local authority education services 112

Crocker, Jean

Internships 85

Crow, Bob

Congress 155

Defending public services 41

Employment rights 59

Cuthbert, Christine

A workplace agenda for women 77

D**Daley, Elaine**

Internships 85

Danson, Hazel

Child poverty 54

Darby, JackieIndustrial action against cuts on London Underground
150**Davies, Phil**

Vietnam 101

Davies, Tom

Trade union outreach 73

Davison, Steve

Bangladeshi garment workers 151

Day, Nick

LGBT rights in the new political situation 78

Dear, Jeremy

The BBC's remit 103

DeLong, Donnacha

Employment rights 60

Dempsey, Gerard

Defence of the welfare state 55

Dennis, AlanThe Strategic Defence Review and its implications for
the Royal Fleet Auxiliary (RFA) 138**Doherty, Gerry**

Government transport policy 134

Industrial action against cuts on London Underground
150**Dolbear, Gill**

Graduate unemployment 89

Donnelly, Tom

Social care 132

Dowling, Patrick

Young people and the recession 87

Dudson, Alan

Question to the Governor of the Bank of England 129

Duggan, Kathy

A workplace agenda for women 76

E**Earnshaw, Derek**

Defending further and higher education 147

Edmondson, Dennis

Public sector cuts 90

Evans, John

Government transport policy 135

Evans, Richard

Defending further and higher education 146

Exall, Maria

LGBT rights in the new political situation 78

F**Fallon, Kate** Sick pay 48

Social care 132

Farr, Brian

Climate change 118

Ferns, Sue

Climate change 116

Flanagan, Helen

Young people and the recession 87

Flanagan, Julie

Arts funding 105

Fraser, George

Asbestos on ships 70

G**Gallagher, Betty**

LGBT rights in the new political situation 80

Garrity, Marie

NHS hospital car parking charges 126

Gawthorpe, Nigel

Supporting trade unionists in trouble 97

Gerson, Natasha

Public Interest Disclosure Act 64

Gethin, Sue

Equality Impact Assessments 74

Gibson, Gary

Public sector cuts 90

Question to the Governor of the Bank of England 128

Gillan, Steve Private Finance Initiative 45**Glazier, Jerry** Health and safety at work 67

Glover, Paul Climate change 117

Godrich, Janice

Defence of the welfare state 55
Question to the Governor of the Bank of England 130

Goodswen, Gill

Pensions 141

Gordon, Alex

Government transport policy 135
Trapped Chilean miners 71

Gray, Phil

Health and safety at work 66

Green, Jackie

Criminal justice 51

Grey, Alan

Question to the Governor of the Bank of England 130

Gudgeon, Steve

Asbestos on ships 70

H

Hall, Peter

General Purposes Committee report 36, 72, 114

Hall, Susie

Threats to local authority education services 111

Halpin, Anita

Congress 155

Hannett, John

Child poverty 52
Housing 120

Harman, Rt Hon Harriet

Address by Interim Leader of the Labour Party 47

Harney, Austin

Academies, free schools and state education 108

Harvey, Dave

Congress 155

Hayes, Billy

High Pay Commission 123

Highton, Susan

National minimum wage and apprentices 83

Hoad, Terry

Manufacturing and industrial policy 122

Hobson, Linda

High Pay Commission 124

Hockley, Kelly

Inclusion 111

Holder, Sharon

NHS hospital car parking charges 126

Holland, Diana

A workplace agenda for women 76

Hope Collins, Neil

Health and safety at work 66

Hosking, Hilary

Pensions 143

Hudd, Dai

Defending public services 42

Hudson, Mandy

A workplace agenda for disabled workers 81

Hughes, Jackie

Cosmetic use of sunbeds 133

Hunt, Lawrence

Academies, free schools and state education 108

Hunt, Sally

Colombia 134
Defending further and higher education 145

Hunter, Alastair

Criminal justice 50

Hyde, Max

England bid to host the 2018 World Cup 106

I

Ireland, Darren More freight on rail 137

J

Jones, Dave

Defending further and higher education 147

Jones, Rose

Climate change 118

K

Kearns, Tony

Climate change 116
Trade union outreach 72

Keates, Chris

Defending public services 41

Kenny, Paul

Congress 155
Palestine 98
Vote of thanks to the President 58

Killen, Veronica

Employment rights 61

King, Mervyn

Address by the Governor of the Bank of England 126

Kirby, Mike

Palestine 98

Kitchen, Chris

Industrial injuries 56
Trapped Chilean miners 71

Knight, Vicky

Congress 155

L

Lanning, Hugh

Palestine 98

Lannon, Tom

More freight on rail 137

Lawrence, Conroy

Young people and the recession 88

Ledger, Jonathan

Criminal justice 50

Lewis, Jackie

LGBT rights in the new political situation 79

Lillis, Paddy

Manufacturing and industrial policy 121
National minimum wage and apprentices 82

Lines, Chris

Investing in our future 85

Locke, Mary

Question to the Governor of the Bank of England 129

Loughran, Iain

Pensions 143

Luxford, Dee

High Pay Commission 124

Lynch, Mark

National minimum wage and apprentices 83

Lynes, Angela26,000 redundancy notices at Birmingham City Council
153

Child poverty 54

M**Macer, Lilian**

The NHS 91

MacGregor, Rosie

Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) 148

Mackenzie, Alexandra

A workplace agenda for women 78

Magee, Colm

Connaught 152

Maguire, Bob

Pensions 145

Manasseh, Leslie

A workplace agenda for disabled workers 81

Mansell, Lesley

LGBT rights in the new political situation 79

Marino, Joe

Health and safety at work 67

Vietnam 101

Marlowe, Corinna

Reform of the General Council 158

Marshall, Jackie

A workplace agenda for women 77

Mathieson, Dave26,000 redundancy notices at Birmingham City Council
154

Academies, free schools and state education 109

Connaught 153

McAuslan, Jim

Defending public services 44

McCluskey, Len

Employment rights 59

McCormack, John

Anti-union laws 61

McFadden, Dominic

Employment rights 60

McFarlane, Tam

Anti-union laws 62

Palestine 99

McGuire, Denise

Supporting international development 100

McInally, John

182

Private Finance Initiative 46

McKay, Gordon

Private Finance Initiative 46

Mercer, Lesley

The NHS 91

Merry, Lorna

National minimum wage and apprentices 83

Miller, Bev

Social care 132

Moloney, Paul

Government transport policy 136

Monk, Lorraine

A workplace agenda for women 77

Monks, JohnAddress by general secretary European Trade Union
Confederation 114**Monkton, Ivan**

Poverty and vulnerable employment 52

Morgan, Joe26,000 redundancy notices at Birmingham City Council
153**Morris, Marilyn**

Supporting international development 99

Moses, Colin

Criminal justice 49

Munro, Alan

Pensions 142

Murphy, Chris

Housing 120

Murray, Frank

Haiti 96

Supporting trade unionists in trouble 97

Murray, Peter

English Defence League 73

Pensions 142

N**Neal, Julia**

LGBT rights in the new political situation 80

Newson, Gerald

Vietnam 101

Nicholas, Michael

Haiti 94

Nichols, GedRestoring ethical banking: ending the sales commission
culture 122**Noakes, Robert**

The BBC's remit 102

Noon, Paul

HMRC resources and the deficit 45

O**Oram, Bob** Sick pay 49

P**Pendle, Peter**

Defending further and higher education 146
Independent safeguarding authority (ISA) 148
England bid to host the 2018 World Cup 106

Perry, Jane

Reform of the General Council 159

Premru, Felicity

Health and safety at work 68

Prentis, Dave

Defending public services 39

Puckrin, John

Child poverty 53

R**Rainey, Shirley**

Haiti 96
Housing 120

Ritch, Emma

Child poverty 53

Rimmer, John

Pensions 143

Ritchie, Alan

Blacklisting 63
Connaught 152
International asbestos ban 68

Roberts, Hank

Defending further and higher education 146

Robinson, Alice

International asbestos ban 69

Roe, Paula

Academies, free schools and state education 109

Rogers, Jean

Trade union outreach 72

Rooney, Dougie

Adoption of the General Council Report 160
Congress Awards 92
Obituary 36
President's Address 57
Suspension of standing orders 36
TUC Accounts 160
Welcome to Manchester 37

Rowlands, Sandie

Question to the Governor of the Bank of England 130

S**Sage, Malcolm**

Connaught 152

Serwotka, Mark

Defending public services 40

Shoko, Gideon

Address by Deputy General Secretary Zimbabwe
Congress of Trade Unions 64

Silver, Kim

A workplace agenda for disabled workers 81

Simpson, Derek

Vote of thanks to the President 58

Sinclair, Malcolm

Arts funding 104

Singh, Amarjit

Question to the Governor of the Bank of England 129

Smart, Viv

Academies, free schools and state education 109

Smith, Eleanor

Equality Impact Assessments 75

Smith, John

Arts funding 104

Stacey, Irene

Threats to local authority education services 112

Stelfox, Sue

England bid to host the 2018 World Cup 106

Stewart, Jane

National minimum wage and apprentices 84

Still, Joyce

The NHS 92

Stribley, James

A workplace agenda for disabled workers 82

Strutton, Brian

Defending public services 40

Swingler, Yvonne

Child poverty 54

T**Tansley, Chris**

Criminal justice 51

Taylor, Gordon

England bid to host the 2018 World Cup 105

Taylor, Kathy

Academies, free schools and state education 108

Taylor, Tracey

NHS hospital car parking charges 125

Thomson, Derek

Haiti 96

Titchen, Nigel

Graduate unemployment 89

Tolmie, Agnes

Question to the Governor of the Bank of England 128
Restoring ethical banking: ending the sales commission
culture 122

Troman, Martin

The Strategic Defence Review and its implications for
the Royal Fleet Auxiliary (RFA) 138

Turner, Mary

Malnutrition and dehydration 131

V**Vernell, Sean**

Defending public services 43
Investing in our future 86

Vernon, Neil

26,000 redundancy notices at Birmingham City Council
154
Industrial injuries 56

W**Walker Shaw, Kathleen**

Supporting international development 100

Walsh, John

Young people and the recession 86

Ward, Dave

Defending public services 42

Royal Mail 159

Warwick, Steve

Pensions 141

Watts, David

Pensions 142

Welch, Joe

Government transport policy 135

Whitaker, Alan

Equality Impact Assessments 74

White, Barbara

Reform of the General Council 158

Williams, Clare

A workplace agenda for women 75

Williams, David

A stronger European Social Model 94

Wilson, Andy

Health and safety at work 67

Wilson, Nicky

Coal in a balanced energy policy 118

Wilson, Tim

Reforming Ofsted 149

Wong, Suzanne

Malnutrition and dehydration 131

Worth, Barrie

Asbestos on ships 70

Wrack, Matt

Defending public services 41 Health and safety at work
68

Pensions 141