

# Congress Report 2004

The 136<sup>th</sup> annual Trades Union Congress  
13-16 September, Brighton



# Contents

	Page
<b>General Council members 2004 – 2005-03-15</b> .....	4
<b>Section one - Congress decision</b> .....	7
<b>Part 1</b>	
Resolutions carried.....	8
<b>Part 2</b>	
Motion remitted.....	30
<b>Part 3</b>	
Motion Lost.....	31
 General Council statement on Europe.....	 32
 <b>Section two – Verbatim report of Congress proceedings</b>	
<b>Day 1</b>	
Monday 13 September .....	34
<b>Day 2</b>	
Tuesday 14 September.....	73
<b>Day 3</b>	
Wednesday 15 September.....	119
<b>Day 4</b>	
Thursday 16 September .....	164
 <b>Section three - unions and their delegates</b> .....	 187
<b>Section four - details of past Congresses</b> .....	197
<b>Section five - General Council 1921 – 2004</b> .....	200
<b>Index of speakers</b> .....	205

## General Council Members 2004 – 2005

Dave Anderson  
*UNISON*

Jonathan Baume  
*FDA*

Sheila Bearcroft  
*GMB*

Mary Bousted  
*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*

George Brumwell CBE\*  
*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*

Barry Camfield  
*Transport and General Workers' Union*

Marge Carey MBE  
*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*

Brian Caton  
*Prison Officers' Association*

Bob Crow  
*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*

Kevin Curran  
*GMB*

Jeremy Dear  
*National Union of Journalists*

Gerry Doherty  
*Transport Salaried Staffs Association*

Jeannie Drake OBE  
*Communication Workers' Union*

Tony Dubbins  
*Graphical, Paper and Media Union*

Mark Fysh  
*UNISON*

Andy Gilchrist  
*Fire Brigades' Union*

Janice Godrich  
*Public and Commercial Services Union*

Anita Halpin  
*National Union of Journalists*

John Hannett  
*Union of Shop Distributive and Allied Workers*

Pat Hawkes  
*National Union of Teachers*

Billy Hayes  
*Communication Workers' Union*

Sally Hunt  
*Association of University Teachers*

Chris Keates  
*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*

Jimmy Kelly  
*Transport and General Workers Union*

Lucy Kelly  
*Amicus*

Paul Kenny  
*GMB*

David Lascelles  
*GMB*

Mick Leahy OBE  
*Community*

Paul Mackney  
*NATFHE – The University and College Lecturers' Union*

Leslie Manasseh MBE  
*Connect*

Matthew McGregor  
*Transport and General Workers Union*

Judy McKnight OBE  
*napo*

Lesley Mercer  
*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*

Gloria Mills CBE  
*UNISON*

Ged Nichols  
*Accord*

Paul Noon  
*Prospect*

Brian Orrell  
*National Union of Marine, Aviation and  
Shipping Transport Officers*

\* Retired February 2005

\*\* Joined February 2005

Dave Prentis  
*UNISON*

Alan Ritchie\*\*  
*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*

Sue Rogers  
*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of  
Women Teachers*

Dougie Rooney  
*Amicus*

Mark Serwotka  
*Public and Commercial Services Union*

Alison Shepherd  
*UNISON*

Derek Simpson  
*Amicus*

Steve Sinnott  
*National Union of Teachers*

Liz Snape  
*UNISON*

Keith Sonnet  
*UNISON*

Patricia Stuart  
*Transport and General Workers Union*

Ed Sweeney  
*Amicus*

Mohammed Taj  
*Transport and General Workers' Union*

Paul Talbot  
*Amicus*

Sofi Taylor  
*UNISON*

Jenny Thurston  
*Prospect*

Tony Woodley  
*Transport and General Workers Union*

Brendan Barber *General Secretary*



# Section 1

## Congress Decisions

***Listed below are the decisions taken by the 2004 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

### 10 Organising and recruiting women at work

Congress recognises that the trade union movement is failing to attract sufficient new recruits amongst working women, and believes that the TUC must take urgent action to assist affiliates to recruit women members, by addressing the issues of major relevance to women in the workforce.

Congress calls upon the General Council to develop a comprehensive package of measures entitled 'a new deal for working women', to press the Government for legislative and any other action necessary to implement the measures, and to campaign for and publicise the 'new deal for working women', in order to help affiliates to organise and recruit women at work.

Congress notes that women workers continue to suffer discrimination on core issues like pay, pensions, training and promotion, and this Congress believes that action to gain 'a new deal for working women' should be placed, as a priority, at the centre of the bargaining agenda for the TUC and its affiliates.

Specifically, the 'new deal for working women' package should include:

- i) compulsory equal pay audits for all employers to tackle pay discrimination;
- ii) reform of the national insurance rules and the state pension scheme to increase security in retirement for women workers;
- iii) proposals for increasing opportunities for training and skills development amongst women, including audits of action taken by employers and skills councils;
- iv) comprehensive measures to ensure working women can achieve a work-life balance;
- v) a requirement for employers to conduct specific risk assessments to identify health and safety risks to women workers.

#### GMB

### 11 Organising black workers

Congress welcomes the TUC Equality Audit report as a positive step forward in identifying what action trade unions are undertaking to put equality principles into practice and where improvements need to be made.

Congress believes that self-organisation is the fundamental principle on which equality strategies should be based and that collective bargaining on race equality is key if institutional racism in the labour market is to be defeated. It further believes that the organisation and recruitment of black workers is vital if future progress is to be made in addressing the problems that black workers face in the workplace and in encouraging increased participation in the trade union movement.

Congress further believes that current employment legislation that excludes companies employing 20 or fewer workers from recognition rights is discriminatory, as evidence shows that the majority of employees in these companies are female and from ethnic backgrounds.

Congress calls for unions to build on the considerable work of the TUC and its affiliates in the area of recruitment and organisation of black workers. This work needs sustained, committed support through:

- i) identification of the role of the trade union in achieving basic entitlements and informing black workers of their rights;
- ii) promotion of all the additional benefits that union membership and organisation bring;
- iii) development of programmes of organising and networking activities; and
- iv) strengthening of, and engagement within, union structures and campaigns.

A key part of the process is the continued monitoring, according to ethnicity, of the black membership and activist levels and campaigns that specifically target young black workers and other low-participation sub-groups.

It is important to ensure that black trade union members and activists are fully involved in developing and participating in such organising and recruitment activities.

Congress calls on the General Council to:

- a) develop a detailed strategy for organising black workers across the trade union movement and increasing participation in the trade union structures;
- b) include in the strategy indicators by which its progress and success can be measured;
- c) work with the General Council to promote this strategy amongst affiliates and to encourage unions to formulate their own race equality strategies and schemes; and
- d) campaign with other organizations to seek to remove discriminatory recognition legislation applying to small companies.

#### TUC Black Workers' Conference

### 12 Equality/human rights commission

Congress is opposed to any proposal to create a joint equality commission and human rights commission on the grounds that the two commissions have separate and distinct remits and that to merge their work would do justice to neither.

Furthermore, Congress believes that a single equality commission will not serve women, unless:

- i) a single equality act is firstly introduced which should include a duty to promote equality across all strands in the public, private and voluntary sectors;
- ii) it has separate sections on issues particular to each discriminated group;
- iii) it has a structure that allows for a clear and equal voice on each equality strand;
- iv) trade unionists and members of each equality strand are represented among the commissioners;
- v) the overall budget for the commission is much greater than for the three existing ones; and
- vi) the duty to undertake formal investigations, to enforce the law and to support legal cases is included among the commission's priorities, and that sufficient funding is provided for these purposes.

#### TUC Women's Conference

### 16 Fair deal for women

Congress applauds the TUC's campaigning work on equalities over the past year. Congress however, recognises the significant inequalities still faced by women at work.

Congress condemns the continuing pay inequalities across all sectors and notes that women working full time still earn, on average, 19 per cent less than men.

Congress deplores this continuing pay discrimination which devalues the work of public and private sector workers.



Low pay, term-time and part-time working are all areas where women are particularly at risk of discrimination.

Congress recognises the many additional demands placed on women, particularly around employer inflexibility and caring responsibilities, and calls on the General Council to campaign for:

- i) effective equal pay legislation;
  - ii) mandatory pay audits and full funding to tackle the gender pay gap across the economy, in particular the public sector;
  - iii) a requirement on private contractors to carry out pay audits;
  - iv) a requirement on employers to promote equal treatment for part-time workers;
  - v) investment in training and career development;
  - vi) flexible arrangements for all women workers who have care responsibilities for children, elders and other dependants;
  - vii) action to ensure equal access to pension schemes and their benefits; and
  - viii) funded initiatives to encourage work/life balance.
- Congress calls upon the General Council to demand that the Government ensures that:

- a) a 'Fair Deal for Women' becomes a political reality; and
- b) initiatives to close the gender pay gap are fully funded, legally enforceable, and address past inequalities, as a matter of urgency.

#### **UNISON**

### **17 Violence against women**

Congress notes that the experience or threat of violence affects the lives of women and girls everywhere, cutting across boundaries of wealth, race, and culture.

Congress congratulates trade unions that have adopted policies and taken action to address violence against women, and welcomes the UK Government's introduction of the Domestic Violence Bill. However, as evidence shows that acts of violence against women in the UK include honour killings, forced marriage, rape, sexual

violence, trafficking, female genital mutilation, physical abuse and others, Congress believes that further action is needed.

Congress believes in the creation of a world in which women and girls are afforded their basic human rights, and that this can be achieved if:

- i) governments world-wide abolish laws that discriminate against women and establish new laws that provide protection and equality for women;
- ii) governments and armed groups around the world end impunity for violence against women during times of conflict and post-conflict; and
- iii) public attitudes that normalise and accept violence against women are challenged and changed.

Congress therefore calls on the General Council to:

- a) lobby the UK Government to develop a national strategy to address all aspects of violence against women in the UK, based on the commitments it made in the 1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action; and
- b) take action through the trade union movement membership, and where appropriate in collaboration with Amnesty International UK and other organisations, to promote awareness of violence against women, and challenge attitudes that normalise and accept violence against women.

#### **Accord**

### **19 Diversity in the workplace**

Congress supports the call for the people's game to draw on its mass appeal in taking a lead to address all inequalities of access, be they race, disability, gender or economic income.

In doing so, Congress notes the success of the work undertaken by the Professional Footballers' Association and its partners in campaigning against racism through 'Kick It Out', football's anti-racism campaign.

Congress wholeheartedly supports the PFA in calling for the governing bodies of football to address themselves to the changing agenda within the game, and to tackle continuing exclusions, particularly those that relate to the lack of opportunities being afforded to former black players as coaches and managers, to young Asians as players, and to all ethnic minority communities as administrators.

#### **Professional Footballers' Association**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted.*

Add a final paragraph:

Congress further notes the latest initiative to widen access to the health professions launched by ministers on 10th August. Congress calls on the General Council to support positive measures such as these and press for their extension to other parts of the economy, both public and private.

#### **Chartered Society of Physiotherapy**

### **20 Judicial Review on the Sexual Orientation Regulations 2003**

Congress notes the decision in the Judicial Review case brought by Amicus, NASUWT, NATFHE, NUT, PCS, RMT and UNISON on the Sexual Orientation Regulations 2003.

Congress welcomes the restrictions that the judge has accepted to the regulation 7 areas of the legal challenge, thus providing protection to lgb workers in faith organisations.

Congress also supports and welcomes the appeal against the ruling on Regulation 25 (marriage exemption). This appeal will provide the best opportunity to achieve equality in the field of pensions.

Congress therefore:

- i) congratulates those unions involved in the appeal and those offering financial support;
- ii) calls upon the TUC General Council and affiliated unions to support the appeal to the High Court and any appeal to the European Court of Justice that may be required; and
- iii) recognises the costs involved and calls for a further financial appeal both within and outside the trade union movement.

#### **TUC Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Conference**

### **21 Disability rights and Europe**

Congress recognises that achieving full civil rights for disabled people depends on constant campaigning by the union movement.

Congress supports the draft EU Disability Directive which, if adopted, would improve disabled people's rights by making discrimination unlawful in social security provision, in the design of manufactured goods, and by requiring private companies to demonstrate compliance in order to qualify for European or other governmental contracts.

Congress also believes that the Government should ratify Protocol 12 of the European Convention on Human Rights which would provide a free-standing right to be protected against discrimination in the delivery of any right guaranteed by UK law.

Further, Congress believes that in addition to political campaigning, unions can also achieve major improvements in employment practices through workplace-based campaigns aimed at embedding social inclusion for disabled workers at work.

Congress calls on the General Council to:

- i) press affiliated unions to develop projects aimed at negotiating best practice for disabled people at work;
- ii) campaign through the ETUC, the European Commission, and the UK Government to have the draft Disability Directive put forward by the Commission at the end of the European Year of Disabled People; and
- iii) campaign for Protocol 12 to be ratified.

#### **TUC Disability Conference**

### **34 35-hour working week**

Congress welcomes the TUC's campaign 'It's About Time' and the initiatives taken to highlight the small number of public holidays in Britain.

Congress recognises that the tendency to increase the hours of the workforce is deleterious to the health and welfare of workers in the UK.

Congress registers the important achievements of the union movement in France by having secured from a previous Socialist Party government a statutory 35-hour working week.

Congress accepts that currently individual unions have a wide variety of agreements to secure favourable working time arrangements with employers.

Congress views the National Minimum Wage as a model for securing a statutory safety net for all workers. In the same manner, Congress agrees to commence a long-term campaign for the establishment of a statutory 35-hour working week, sustained by appropriate Parliamentary legislation.

#### **Communication Workers' Union**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted.*

Insert new paragraph 3:

Congress also notes that in some public sector workplaces where 35-hour weeks are currently worked, this Government will increase the working week to 37.5 hours without any assessment of the impact of this change on the health, welfare or well-being of staff.

#### **Society of Radiographers**

### **47 Opposition to performance-related pay (PRP)**

Congress expresses its concern that there is an intention to introduce performance-related pay (PRP) for public service employees. The success of PRP in the public sector has yet to be proved, is known to lower staff morale, and is in conflict with the team-working ethic that is inherent across the public sector.

The NHS is an example of a public service which is a diverse provider of services to the public, where it is not possible to apply a universal system to objectively measure performance, linked to pay, without introducing subjective interpretation and inequalities.

The introduction of PRP will undermine the mutual support and cooperation inherent in NHS staff, destroying the partnership working which is necessary to introduce and promote health reform.

Congress believes any move to introduce PRP will act as a disincentive for recruitment to the public sector when staffing levels are already in decline.

Congress calls on the General Council to promote partnership working and joint service development, and oppose any attempt to implement cash-led PRP schemes in the public sector.

#### **Society of Radiographers**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted.*

Insert new paragraph 4:

Likewise, higher education operates through teamwork and collaboration across all staff grades. PRP would fundamentally undermine this, replacing cooperation with competition between colleagues.

#### **Association of University Teachers**

### **49 Decontamination of surgical instruments**

Congress is mindful of the importance podiatrists place on treating their patients with decontaminated and sterile instruments. It is the case that at present the NHS takes a fragmented approach to the procurement and decontamination of clinical instruments. The provision of disposable instruments may be convenient but does pose a significant environmental problem as their disposal is in the main only solved via landfill.

Also it raises major concerns over the potential increase in work-related upper limb disorders (WRULDs) due to the inability to provide instruments that properly fit the hand. On the other hand, the provision of decontamination of instruments on a central basis is costly and many NHS Trusts cannot provide funding.

Congress calls on the General Council to make recommendations to the Department of Health on the issue of decontamination so that agreement can be reached to provide adequate funding to ensure that the central sterilisation of instruments is realised across the NHS.

#### **Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists**

### **50 The Government's five-year strategy for education**

Congress, while recognising that the Government's five-year strategy for education seeks improvements in provision such as 14-19 education, adult skills and the stability of school budgets, rejects those proposals which undermine comprehensive education.

Congress reasserts its commitment to promoting comprehensive education as the only way of securing equality of access to high quality education at their local schools for all young people.

Congress rejects the Government's proposed expansion of academies, private sector involvement and faith schools. Congress rejects also

the proposed reduction in the support role of LEAs.

Congress expresses deep concern about the potential for increased selection by ability or aptitude arising from the Government's emphasis on 'choice and diversity'.

While welcoming the Government's recognition that schools should be at the centre of their communities, Congress believes that the Government's emphasis on 'independence and specialism' will undermine the children agenda.

Congress expresses also deep concern about potential threats posed to national pay, conditions and jobs arising from the Government's strategy.

Congress believes further that the strategy addresses inadequately the learning needs of staff in schools and colleges and calls on the Government to redress this gap.

Congress, in noting the Government's failure to consult prior to the strategy's publication, instructs the General Council to:

- i) convene relevant affiliates in order to respond to the Government's proposals and determine a campaigning strategy on them;
- ii) seek support for its position from organisations committed to protecting and promoting comprehensive education; and
- iii) meet the Government to press the TUC's position.

#### **National Union of Teachers**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted.*

Insert new paragraph 8 before the final one:

Congress does, however, welcome the recognition in the strategy of the vulnerability of teachers and other staff to false, exaggerated and malicious allegations by pupils and the commitment to publish proposals to defend their interests.

#### **National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers**

### **51 'Every child matters' - children's services**

Congress welcomes the Government's commitment to protecting children from harm and neglect and to the provision of high quality services for all children in every aspect of their lives.

Congress calls on the Government to recognise that this laudable ambition cannot be achieved by:

- i) abandoning national frameworks for pay and conditions of service;
- ii) privatising public services;
- iii) encouraging complete freedom of parental choice of schools;
- iv) increasing local autonomy and freedom in school management;
- v) creating a false dichotomy between 'frontline' and 'backroom' services to justify job loss; and
- vi) the artificial amalgamation of distinct service provisions or functions at local authority level.

Congress calls on the General Council to campaign to seek to ensure that Government strategies to introduce more coherent and enhanced provision of children's services are based on:

- a) social partnership with the trade unions, building on the good practice developed through the school workforce national agreement (Raising Standards and Tackling Workload);
- b) a recognition that greater integration of children's services will carry significant financial implications;
- c) sustained, increased investment in public services;
- d) specific measures to tackle economic inequality and to regenerate schools and neighbourhoods; and
- e) a full and detailed evaluation of the extended schools pathfinder pilot, including the impact on equality of access.

#### **National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers**

### **56 Obesity epidemic**

Congress remains acutely concerned about the continuing obesity epidemic in the country, particularly the rise in young children now affected.

Congress calls on the General Council to campaign vigorously for the following steps to be taken to tackle this problem:

- i) extend the activities that address nutrition within Sure Start programmes;
- ii) ensure more support for local food projects that contribute positively to nutritional status and increase skills and confidence among young people;
- iii) reduce drastically the advertising of unhealthy foods targeted at children;
- iv) encourage manufacturers and retailers to promote 'healthy foods' to the public;
- v) highlight the dangers of 'special offer' promotions that encourage purchase of large quantities of unhealthy foods for children and also lead to excessive alcohol consumption amongst adolescents and young children;
- vi) seek an improvement in nutrition education in schools by supporting healthier food choices, reintroducing cooking skills within the national curriculum, and teaching young people about healthy eating and how to understand food labelling; and
- vii) encourage schools to become involved with the Healthy School Standards scheme.

#### **British Dietetic Association**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

At end of paragraph 1 insert:

and the consequent impact on their concentration, behaviour and ability to maximise their educational opportunities

Insert new sub-paragraph vii):

press for adequate funding for schools to obviate the necessity to use vending machines selling unhealthy foods as a way of providing essential revenue

Re-number existing sub-paragraph vii) as viii).

#### **Association of Teachers and Lecturers**

### **57 Inequality and discrimination in higher education**

Congress reaffirms its absolute commitment to equal opportunities. In particular Congress believes Government and public service employers should take a lead in ending all forms of discrimination and therefore welcomes the commitment of senior ministers to pursuing the equalities agenda.

Congress believes the role of higher education (HE) in promoting civic values through both teaching and research places a special responsibility on universities and colleges to ensure that equal opportunities are actively promoted at all times. Congress notes there is still a long way to go to ensure women and staff from minority ethnic groups are treated equally and to end discrimination on the grounds of age, disability and sexuality.

Congress notes the continuing pay disparity in HE suffered both by minority ethnic staff and by women who earn 15 per cent less than their male counterparts, and that women academics are more likely to be employed on fixed-term and hourly paid contracts. Congress is also concerned at the negative impact of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) on promotion opportunities for women academics and researchers.

Congress therefore calls on:

- i) universities and colleges to prioritise the promotion of equal opportunities, take strong measures to reduce the gender and ethnicity pay gaps and implement policies to tackle age, sexuality and disability discrimination - equal pay audits should be implemented across HE with urgency;
- ii) the HE funding councils to work with HE trade unions to ensure the next RAE is equality proofed; and
- iii) the General Council to support affiliated unions in pursuing these ends.

## Association of University Teachers

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted.*

Throughout: replace 'higher education' ('HE') with 'higher and further education' ('HE and FE').

Add to the end of paragraph 2:

Proper implementation of RRRR requirements would transform the situation for minority ethnic staff. They should be introduced for all equality strands.

Add to the end of paragraph 4, subparagraph iii): 'and press government to extend RRRR to all strands and to the private sector'

## NATFHE – The University Teachers and College Lecturers' Union

### 61 Maritime security

Congress expresses its extreme concern at the state of security in the international shipping industry, as demonstrated by the failure to ensure full compliance of ships and ports with this July's deadline for the introduction of post-9/11 worldwide security measures, agreed by the IMO, a specialist United Nations agency.

Congress also notes the wide differences in the international security regimes applied to the shipping and aviation industries, and calls for the stricter standards of the airlines to be developed for the maritime sector.

Congress also expresses concern at the way in which the rights of merchant seafarers are being eroded by the failure of many countries and many port authorities around the world to uphold important principles of shore leave and access to and from a ship.

Congress also expresses concern at the continuing increase in incidents of piracy and armed attacks on merchant shipping in many parts of the world and the marked intensification in the levels of violence being used against ships' crews.

Recognising that more than 90 per cent of international trade goes by sea, Congress notes the underlying threat to the principles of peaceful world trade and urges the UK Government to seek the support of other states for wider cooperation on a multilateral basis to provide improved protection for merchant ships and their crews.

## National Union of Marine, Aviation and Shipping Transport Officers

### 62 Transport

Congress believes that in order to maintain the economic well-being of the United Kingdom, LGV drivers should be encouraged to remain within the logistics industry and the industry should attract new driving recruits.

Congress asks the General Council to endorse the campaign and lobby the Government to seek to have the LGV medical examination fee available to drivers through the NHS, at no cost to LGV drivers.

## United Road Transport Union

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Add:

Tiredness kills, and Congress calls for real efforts to reduce the 'long hours culture' for professional drivers, including self-employed and agency drivers, and provide proper rest facilities.

Congress also demands action to tackle violence against transport workers, including better police

response, tougher penalties and use of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders.

## Transport and General Workers' Union

### 70 Media ownership

Congress calls on the Government to change the rules governing media ownership, to ensure that those who control the means of influencing public opinion on national and European issues are citizens of the EU with a social and political stake, not just a financial stake.

Just such a media owner is Rupert Murdoch: an avowed anti-European, pro-Bush, pro-war manipulator. Murdoch is a blatant wielder of political influence, using his four major newspaper titles (which constitute 32 per cent of the British newspaper market) to exert influence on our government and sway the opinions of our citizens. His ownership of book publishing imprints gives him an unhealthy influence over the cultural life of the UK. His control of the BSkyB satellite broadcasting system is ignored by UK and European regulators, but allows him to circumvent quotas on domestic and European production and to infiltrate biased material such as the US Fox News channel. Yet Murdoch is not a citizen or a tax-payer.

Congress notes with concern that the Communications Act has increased the scope for non-European-based individuals and corporations to gain control of UK media. Congress notes that it would be impossible for European citizens to achieve similar power and influence in the United States or many other countries.

Congress calls on the Government and European institutions to reconsider legislation and regulations governing media ownership, with a view to ensuring that those who own and control the media make a fair contribution to society and are democratically accountable.

## Writers' Guild of Great Britain

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted.*

In paragraph 1, line 1, after 'ownership,' insert:

and, in particular, to re-instate the bar on non-EU ownership of Channel 3 companies and of Channel 5,

## Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union

### 72 Licensing Act

Congress welcomes the Government's commitment to the future of live music performance and the setting up of the Live Music Forum by Arts Minister Estelle Morris. The Forum will monitor the introduction of the Licensing Act 2003 in respect of the provision of live music and attempt to encourage venues to take up the option of providing entertainment when applying for licences under the new legislation. The Forum will also monitor licensing policies, ensuring that licensing authorities include a commitment to live music and culture in general.

However, concerns remain about a number of issues, in particular the licensing and future use of common land and local authority owned open spaces. Circuses and Punch & Judy shows, which rely on the availability of open spaces, are part of our national heritage and are now seriously under threat because of the change in the licensing regime. In addition, many small venues such as restaurants and wine bars, which benefit from an exemption for two performers or less under the current legislation, will in future have to opt positively for entertainment to be included in their new premises licence. Although no cost will be incurred, the venue owners are fearful that they will be subject to onerous

licensing conditions and inspection, as experienced by many entertainment venues under the old regime. The Government is keen to demonstrate that the new law will be good for music and grassroots culture in general. Congress supports and encourages these aims.

#### **Musicians' Union**

### **73 Use of union contracts in publicly owned entertainment venues**

Congress recognises that professional entertainers and theatre companies work in many different publicly owned venues, including municipal buildings, theatres, halls, schools, colleges and open spaces. Congress notes that standard employment contracts provided by Equity are available for use by these venues and that they provide minimum terms and conditions necessary to ensure that these entertainers and companies are sufficiently protected. Despite the availability of these contracts, it is often difficult to ensure their universal application owing to the casual and intermittent nature of this form of employment for entertainers. Congress therefore calls upon those affiliated unions who have recognition with the owners of such publicly owned venues to work with Equity to ensure that the employers offer union contracts to professional entertainers and theatre companies.

#### **Equity**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Throughout, add 'and the Musicians' Union' after each occurrence of 'Equity'.

#### **Musicians' Union**

### **74 Prison overcrowding**

Congress recognises the serious difficulties that are facing prison staff due to the rise in the level of mentally ill offenders, an increase in violence in prisons and the ongoing reduction in resources available to the prison service.

Further, Congress reaffirms its condemnation of prison overcrowding as inhumane, dangerous but preventable. Congress agrees to campaign actively with prison unions for legislation to make prison overcrowding an unlawful act under European and international law.

#### **Prison Officers' Association**

### **75 Criminal sentencing policy**

Congress recognises the need for a modern criminal sentencing policy. Congress insists the Government consult more closely, through the Public Service Forum, with the criminal justice unions in order to ensure that credible non-custodial sentencing is used and that prison is reserved for those offenders who present a persistent or serious threat to society.

#### **Prison Officers' Association**

### **76 National Offender Management Service**

Congress expresses deep concern over the Government's establishment of NOMS - the National Offender Management Service.

Congress is concerned that the establishment of NOMS:

- i) was announced without any parliamentary scrutiny or consultation with the criminal justice trade unions and without the production of a business case;

- ii) involves dismantling the probation service in order to introduce the purchaser/provider model and the threat of privatisation;

- iii) will lead to competition rather than cooperation between the prison and probation services and the voluntary sector;

- iv) threatens to use privatisation to undermine the jobs, terms and conditions and health and safety of staff in the prison and probation services; and

- v) removes local accountability for the work of the probation service, threatening to increase the layers of bureaucracy and to weaken the links with the diversity of the local population.

Congress believes that NOMS, as currently proposed, will be another example of bungled administrative change which will fail, thereby putting at risk its very objectives - the reduction of crime and the protection of the public.

Congress therefore calls on the General Council to continue its work with unions in the criminal justice system to campaign against NOMS as currently proposed and put pressure on the Government to work with the unions and other stakeholders to develop an effective criminal justice system based on the principles of:

- a) diversity;
- b) full trade union rights;
- c) national collective bargaining; and
- d) public ownership.

#### **Napo**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Add to the end of sub-paragraph iv): 'who are facing an increasing prison population'.

#### **Prison Officers' Association**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Delete paragraph 1 and paragraph 2 up to the colon and insert:

Although Congress welcomes the Government announcement of 20th July which decided not to threaten the immediate future of the Probation Service by splitting it in two, it remains concerned that the establishment of NOMS, the National Offender Management Service:

Sub-paragraph ii): delete 'dismantling' and insert 'the reorganisation of'.

Sub-paragraph v): delete from 'removes... bureaucracy and' and insert 'threatens'.

Paragraph 3: delete from 'will... thereby putting' and insert 'is poorly designed and puts'.

Paragraph 4: delete from 'in the criminal... proposed and' and insert 'to'. Line 5: delete 'the' and insert 'trade'.

#### **Napo**

### **78 Our future in Europe**

Congress notes that whilst it is important for the UK trade union movement to express a view on the principles of the European Union and its constitution the fact remains that liberalisation poses real and practical challenges to our core responsibilities of representing, negotiating and organising members and potential members.

Congress notes that this is no more self-evident than in the growth of businesses that straddle national boundaries. In this respect the functioning of European Works Councils lacks the bite to help organise or the structures to deliver on an increasingly complex

employment and social agenda. Congress believes that the importance of these developments calls for fresh thinking on how we organise and may even lead to radical solutions such as pan-European trade unions.

In recognition of this the General Council is instructed to undertake research amongst affiliates on the problems being experienced and to engage colleagues in Europe in holding a seminar during the UK presidency on how we might collectively rise to this challenge.

#### **British Air Line Pilots' Association**

### **79 Migrant workers**

Congress notes the growing number of migrant workers across the world and values their important contribution to the global economy and a diverse and inclusive society. Many are highly skilled individuals whose abilities and knowledge play an important role in their host country. In particular, the contribution of migrant professionals, including refugee academics, and of foreign students to the ability of the UK to compete in the knowledge economy and to the creation of a more inclusive society should be celebrated.

Congress notes that many economically active people have been forced to flee their home countries through persecution and terror. Congress believes the health, success and maturity of a country can be judged by the way it treats both migrant workers and refugees.

Congress therefore believes the trade union movement should be taking the lead in championing migrant workers' rights at home and abroad. The free movement of labour within an expanded EU makes this especially important for the European trade union movement. Issues that need addressing include exploitation, training, language support and trafficking.

Congress calls on the General Council to develop guidance, support and advice for migrant workers, in partnership with other organisations such as the ILO, ICFTU and JCWI, and to promote these resources as widely and effectively as possible. Congress also urges all unions to provide similar services for migrant workers within their sectors and to recruit them into union membership to give them a voice and to ensure the effective protection of their individual and collective rights.

#### **Association of University Teachers**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Add new paragraph at the end:

Congress congratulates Jim Sheridan MP in steering the Gangmasters Bill through Parliament. Congress urges the General Council to make representations to the Government on extending the principle of a registration scheme for gangmasters to other sectors of the economy where appropriate.

#### **Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Add a final paragraph:

Congress also calls on the General Council to continue to press for asylum seekers to be granted the right to work legally in the UK while their applications are being processed. This right would bring valuable benefits to society and the economy, as well as to asylum seekers themselves.

#### **Chartered Society of Physiotherapy**

### **80 Refugees and asylum seekers**

Congress notes with concern the rise in attacks on asylum seekers and refugees in the UK.

Congress condemns those politicians and media who use stereotypes and myths to help create a climate in which attacks on asylum seekers and the abuse of their human rights is seen as a valid response.

Congress reaffirms its commitment to the human right of those fleeing persecution to seek refuge and condemns those governments, including the UK Government, who impose increasingly restrictive immigration and asylum legislation in response to a hysterical media campaign.

Congress rejects the scapegoating of asylum seekers and the view that only a punitive approach to asylum will help tackle the rise of far-right parties.

Congress condemns those media who help to fuel hatred of asylum seekers and refugees based on misrepresentation, bias, and ignorance, in clear breach of industry guidelines, and applauds journalists and media workers who have refused to write articles in breach of industry and union codes of practice and have taken a firm stand against biased and racist reporting. Congress condemns the Press Complaints Commission's failure to tackle the inaccurate reporting of issues relating to asylum seekers.

Congress resolves to:

- i) campaign -encouraging all affiliates to become involved in local campaigns - around the positive cultural and economic impact of asylum seekers and refugees; and
- ii) support campaigns by media workers for a conscience clause to protect against unfair dismissal those who refuse assignments which breach the PCC code of conduct in line with the CMS Select Committee recommendation.

#### **National Union of Journalists**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Insert new paragraph 4:

Congress reaffirms its belief in the importance of adequate funding and proper service provision for asylum seekers, refugees and their families (and in particular their children).

Insert new sub-paragraph ii):

campaign for adequate targeted funding to support the education of the children of refugees and asylum seekers.

Re-number existing sub-paragraph ii) as iii).

#### **Association of Teachers and Lecturers**

### **81 Aid, trade and unions**

Congress welcomes the Government's commitment to increase the aid budget to 0.47 per cent of GDP by 2007-8 and to achieve the UN target by 2013, as well as the Chancellor's efforts to persuade other major donors to cancel the poorest countries' debt and back the International Finance Facility Initiative. Congress recognises that the increase in development aid and credit needs to be accompanied by action to promote fair trade and particularly to eliminate agricultural export subsidies, if the industrialised countries are to make the contribution required of them to enable the people of developing countries to secure the basic necessities of life. Congress notes too that integral human development requires the governments of developing countries to respect fully trade union and other basic human rights.

Congress urges the British Government during its Presidency of the G8 and EU in 2005 to press ahead

with all these aims, essential to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

Congress notes the recent ILO World Commission conclusion that globalisation in its present form is not sustainable and is concerned that inadequate public accountability and poor governance sometimes mean that aid benefits corrupt elites, not those in most need. Congress urges the Government to make available aid funds for trade union training in developing countries since independent unions are proven effective means for promoting public accountability and good governance, and for pressing governments to be transparent in using aid to lift the poorest people out of poverty.

### **Community**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Add a new final paragraph:

Congress recognises the difficulties in attempting to achieve more responsible corporate management in isolation and calls for the establishment of a global ethical investment charter. Congress challenges the General Council to develop a common ethical investment policy and to encourage affiliates to use their financial power to achieve our objective.

### **Transport Salaried Staffs' Association**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Paragraph 1, penultimate line (line 9): after 'countries' insert 'and employers throughout the world'

Add a new final paragraph:

Congress also calls on the TUC to issue advice to affiliates on how best to promote the principles of fair trade and to press the fair trade movement to uphold and promote the principles of free trade unionism.

### **Napo**

## **82 Iraq**

Congress reaffirms its opposition to the occupation of Iraq, condemns the abuse and torture of Iraqi prisoners by the coalition forces, and calls for an accurate audit of the actual cost of the invasion and occupation.

Congress believes it is now more vital than ever to support the new independent trade union movement as an essential force in the creation of a secular, democratic Iraq, free from fundamentalism and Saddam's Baathism.

Congress thus calls for the speedy withdrawal of the coalition forces and the dismantling of their military bases in favour of the Iraqi people being left free to build their country's infrastructure, public services and education system, with assistance from international agencies if required.

Congress notes in particular the role women (who constitute over 50 per cent of the population in Iraq and account for 35 per cent of the productive workforce) are playing in the reconstruction of Iraq. Congress urges the General Council to maintain and strengthen contact with Iraqi trade unionists, in particular the Iraqi Federation of Trade Unions (IFTU), by:

- i) initiating, together with affiliated trade unions, a solidarity committee to liaise with, and give practical support to, the trade union movement in Iraq, including the delivery of a structured education programme on the TUC model, and assistance with the provision of IT and other office equipment;

- ii) facilitating visits and twinning arrangements between Iraqi and British trade unionists; and
- iii) ensuring that links are made between Iraqi women trade unionists and their British counterparts.

### **NATFHE - The University and College Lecturers' Union**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Add new sub-paragraph iv):

working with the ICFTU and the ILO to press for the maximum involvement of Iraqi trade unionists in the drafting of new labour laws which conform with the core Conventions of the ILO.

### **Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Insert a new paragraph after paragraph 4:

Congress deplores the suppression of trade union activity by the occupying forces, and the physical destruction of the headquarters of the fledgling trade union organisation.

### **Transport Salaried Staffs' Association**

## **83 Colombia**

Congress condemns in the strongest terms the continued abuses against our colleagues in the Colombian trade union movement, including the ongoing assassinations, forced disappearances and other serious human rights violations.

Congress supports the view of Colombian and international trade union bodies and human rights organisations that the Colombian state, and in particular its armed forces and their allied paramilitary death squads, are responsible for the vast majority of such abuses.

Additionally, Congress condemns the fact that vast numbers of trade unionists have been arbitrarily detained by the Colombian authorities and are being held without charge for simply carrying out their legitimate trade union activities.

Congress applauds the work of the Justice for Colombia coalition (JFC) in raising awareness of events in Colombia and in providing concrete solidarity to Colombian trade unions. Congress congratulates the General Council for their continued support for JFC and in particular the campaign to freeze UK military assistance to Colombia - a campaign which is supported by at least 237 MPs from all political parties.

Congress calls on the General Council to continue supporting JFC and calls on all affiliated unions to support the organisation both politically and financially. Furthermore, Congress calls on the General Council to enhance their support for the campaign to end UK military aid to Colombia until the Colombian state fully and verifiably implements all United Nations human rights recommendations and breaks the links between the security forces and the paramilitary death squads responsible for the murders of so many of our colleagues.

### **Fire Brigades' Union**

## **91 Health and safety in commercial aviation**

Congress notes with surprise that in the field of commercial aviation much of the framework of UK health and safety regulation that has built up over the years does not apply. Whilst commercial aviation retains an enviable safety record this does not prevent us from striving for the highest possible standards by

appropriately importing key elements from established practice such as the concept of health and safety representatives. Congress instructs the General Council to investigate this situation, together with the Health and Safety Commission and unions operating in civil aviation, and to report back.

Congress further notes that there is concern on the issue of cabin air quality as evidenced by research done in Australia and by the International Transport Federation. Congress calls on the General Council to add its weight to those calling for independent epidemiological research and to press for the UK Government to take a practical lead by commissioning such research.

#### **British Air Line Pilots' Association**

### **92 Safety and preservation of theatres**

There has been much publicity regarding the use of lottery funds to refurbish some of our old theatres and concert halls, most notably the Royal Opera House and the London Coliseum. Commercial theatre has not had access to these funds; nevertheless Congress is concerned that West End theatres should be upgraded in the same way in the interests of audiences and performers.

Backstage conditions give the entertainment unions grave cause for concern. Congress cannot countenance any breach of health and safety regulations but understands how difficult it is to keep these historic buildings maintained to the standards required of workplaces for union members today.

Congress believes that a visit to the theatre, whether it be in the subsidised or private sector, should be an exhilarating, life-enhancing experience, and supports the Society of London Theatre and the Theatres' Trust in their efforts to make significant improvements to the public and backstage areas of our theatres. The thrill of live entertainment should be readily available to all, and audiences must be encouraged, not discouraged.

#### **Musicians' Union**

### **93 Bullying and harassment**

Congress recognises that the level of bullying and harassment in the NHS remains unacceptable. Despite continued assertions by management at all levels that the problem is being addressed, the reality is that the lives of a considerable number of staff continue to be made intolerable due to the failure of large numbers of individual employers to take this problem seriously.

Whilst written procedures are usually in place within NHS Trusts to deal with this problem, the reality is that these procedures are often ignored or made difficult to pursue, thus leading to demoralisation, stress and resignations.

Employees appear to have few rights under the law to pursue these matters externally, except in that minority of cases which may involve race/sex discrimination or sexual orientation.

Congress calls on the Government to tackle the problem of bullying and harassment and recognise the effect it has on those who are affected. The Government should, therefore, examine ways of extending legal protection for all the victims of this endemic problem where the employer, in the face of overwhelming evidence, has failed to act.

#### **British Dietetic Association**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Paragraph 1, line 1, after 'NHS' insert:  
,education and other public services

Paragraph 2, line 1, after 'Trusts' insert:

and other public sector employers

Add new paragraph at the end:

Congress also calls on the General Council to raise awareness of the serious nature and impact of bullying and harassment, and to press public sector employers to tackle the problem in a serious and effective manner.

#### **Association for College Management**

### **Composite 1**

### **Fairness At Work**

Congress welcomes the advances made by this Labour Government, but is extremely concerned at the failure to repeal Tory anti-union laws and to honour commitments given whilst in opposition. This at a time when trade union members continue to face constant attacks and intimidation in the workplace without firm and proper protection from employment law.

The Government should recognise the positive contribution that trade unions make to society and should make an explicit commitment in the manifesto that they will assist union growth. Congress calls on the Labour Government to afford our members at least the same benefits as are afforded to our colleagues in the wider international trade union movement and provide fairness at work for every member of our movement.

Congress welcomes the changes within the Employment Relations Bill to address some problems and anomalies in the 1999 Employment Relations Act.

However, Congress is deeply disappointed that the proposed changes will not address the fundamental weaknesses within the existing employment legislation. Congress therefore calls on the General Council to continue to press the Government to improve and build on the present framework of employment legislation.

Congress believes that the next Labour Government must prioritise a positive framework of legislation, which will conform to the UK's obligations under ILO Conventions and the European Social Charter, including:

- i) providing the right for every employee to be represented individually and collectively by a trade union, regardless of the size of the workplace. There should be an extension of recognition laws to include small firms;
- ii) the removal of restrictive ballot thresholds and the right to individual representation in every workplace;
- iii) training and pensions should be included as a bargaining issue under statutory recognition procedures;
- iv) restoring ACAS's duty in promoting collective bargaining as one step towards restoration of the UK's international law duty to promote collective bargaining. The government must commit to restoration of national sectoral bargaining;
- v) providing employment rights from day one for unfair dismissal and redundancy;
- vi) providing paid time off for family-friendly leave;
- vii) guaranteeing a right to reinstatement where recommended by an employment tribunal in cases of unfair dismissal;
- viii) strengthening protection for migrant workers;
- ix) ensuring the right to take industrial action in accordance with ILO Conventions;
- x) protecting from dismissal workers taking lawful strike action including secondary action, with interim relief beyond eight weeks;
- xi) amending insolvency law to protect workers' pensions and rights;



- xii) requiring that all contractors (and subcontractors) to public bodies (and private bodies with public functions) abide by a fair employment clause;
- xiii) repealing the obligation to hold ten-yearly political fund review ballots;
- xiv) ensuring company directors are properly liable for cases of corporate killing;
- xv) legally obliging employers to run equal pay audits; and
- xvi) repealing the sections of the Fire Services Act 2003 and those in the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004 which give the Government powers to undermine collective bargaining by imposing pay and conditions in the fire and rescue service in contravention of ILO conventions and the European Social Charter.

Congress deplores the negative attitude adopted by the Government towards European Directives, thus excluding many workers in the UK from the same entitlement to decent workplace rights enjoyed in other parts of the EU.

Congress therefore calls on the Government to support the development of EU employment rights, including the passage and proper implementation of the Posting of Workers Directive and the Temporary Agency Workers Directive (complete with full equal treatment provisions).

In addition, the Government should end the individual opt-out from the Working Time Directive including in the transport sector and prevent employers including bank/public holidays as part of the statutory four weeks' leave.

Congress calls on the General Council to campaign for reform of the British insolvency and administration laws in order to better protect jobs and pensions and to help reduce the cost burden of the administration process, drawing on the best of US and European practice.

Congress is alarmed at the increasing undermining of internal trade union democracy by the operation of sections 64, 65 and Chapter VIIA of the Trade Union and Labour Relations Consolidation Act 1992.

Congress notes the significant barriers to internal disciplinary action against members who fail to adhere to union rules, and the waste of trade union resources arising from ill-conceived and vexatious complaints to employment tribunals of unjustifiable discipline.

Congress is concerned by the impediment to legitimate trade union activity arising from the ability of disaffected members to use complaints to the Certification Officer about alleged breaches of trade union rules to distract from and disrupt the service to other members.

Congress asserts the right of trade unions to be self-governing organisations and calls upon the General Council to commission an urgent review of the effects and impact on trade union organisation of:

- a) sections 64 and 65 of the Trade Union and Labour Relations(Consolidation)Act 1992 and related case law as established through employment tribunals; and
- b) complaints to the Certification Officer of alleged breaches of union rules.

Subject to the outcome of the review, Congress calls upon the General Council to formulate proposals for the repeal of the appropriate sections of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 and to campaign for such reform.

Congress reaffirms its policy of repeal of anti-trade union laws and calls on the General Council to organise a national rally and lobby of Parliament for trade union and employment rights at the earliest possible opportunity, to demand UK law is brought in line with ILO conventions.

**Proposed: Transport and General Workers' Union**

**Seconded: Graphical Paper and Media Union**

**Supported: National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers**

**National Union of Mineworkers**

**Communication Workers' Union**

**Fire Brigades' Union**

**Bakers, Food and Allied Workers' Union**

**National Union of Journalists**

**National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers**

**Prison Officers' Association**

## **Composite 2      Agency workers**

Congress notes the lack of progress towards the adoption of an EU Temporary Agency Workers Directive in the last 12 months. The failure to adopt a Directive means that thousands of agency workers do not enjoy the same employment rights as other workers.

Congress congratulates the TUC on its 'Working on the Edge' campaign which has drawn attention to this issue. Congress urges continued pressure on the Government to withdraw from the alliance of countries blocking the progress of the EU Temporary Agency Workers Directive.

Congress is appalled by the often illegal working and living conditions of agency workers, many of whom are migrant workers, in particular cases of agencies charging fees, inserting penalty clauses and making illegal deductions from wages. Illegal pay and conditions often combine with a failure to abide by basic health and safety standards, jeopardising agency workers and others in the workforce.

Congress calls on the Government to:

- i) to implement the Temporary Agency Workers Directive at the earliest opportunity.
- ii) drop the demand for a qualifying period before employment rights apply to agency workers in the proposed EU Agency Workers Directive in order to include the greatest number of agency workers, especially young workers;
- iii) introduce a system of licensing for all employment agencies and increase the resources available to government enforcement officers so that any agency flouting the law may be successfully prosecuted;
- iv) extend employment protection rights for all agency workers as part of the Section 23 review of employment status; and
- v) introduce protection for whistleblowers so that any worker whose immigration status is unclear can make a complaint about an agency and not be immediately threatened with deportation.

Congress notes the significance for unions organising agency workers of the ECJ decision in Allonby which potentially opens public sector pension schemes to predominantly female agency workers. Congress calls on the Government to legislate for equal access to occupational pensions schemes for agency workers and will brief affiliates on developments.

Congress also calls on the Government to rigorously enforce existing legislation on employment agencies to ensure workers receive:

- a) their full rights, including the minimum wage;
- b) no illegal deductions from wages;
- c) no charges for finding employment;
- d) accommodation meeting minimum standards; and

- e) proper training and health and safety awareness for each placement.

Congress calls on the General Council to develop a campaigning strategy which intensifies the 'Working on the Edge' campaign to support the above policy objectives and calls on all unions to reach out to agency workers in unionised and non-unionised workplaces to ensure their rights are respected and to campaign for equal terms and conditions to staff who are directly employed.

**Proposed: Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians**

**Seconded: Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers**

**Supported: NATFHE – The University and College Lecturers' Union**

### Composite 3 Union organising

Congress notes the trade union movement has begun to stem membership decline and has signed thousands of new recognition agreements since the introduction of statutory recognition. However, only 36 per cent of the workforce is covered by collective bargaining.

It is vital that the TUC should measure itself by how well it helps unions to win in the workplace and to bring more people into unions.

Congress believes that building membership and organisation is the most urgent priority for the coming year. Unions do not exist simply to recruit new members, but unless we grow in numbers we cannot grow in influence with employers, the government or other agencies. A growing union movement is the most effective way of eliminating unfairness at work and improving the working lives of our members.

We must also extend organisation beyond traditional areas and in particular increase membership and bargaining across the private sector. The TUC is highly regarded as providing an excellent range of services to affiliates and their members in terms of education, advice and research, to name just a few. Congress is aware, however, that some affiliates take into their membership self-employed individuals, for example, podiatrists who are private practitioners. These workers have somewhat different needs to employees, yet are still keen to play an active role in their trade union. Congress calls on the General Council to investigate the needs of this group of members with a view to provide, where necessary, additional services.

Growth based on active organising and other member-centred campaigns is also the most effective way of building a positive profile with people at work and the wider public.

Congress recognises that such growth demands a fundamental review of how unions use their resources. Focusing resources within a democratic structure, rather than consuming resources within a bureaucratic one, will release time, money and people to concentrate on the organising challenge. This is an essential investment in our future. Increasing membership and organisation may also require unions to reshape traditional structures to encourage participation and new forms of activism, built around key roles and functions within the workplace.

Congress therefore calls on the General Council to:

- i) build organising into everything we do;
- ii) conduct a comprehensive review of the resources available to the trade union movement to organise, and of how to increase this pool of resources;
- iii) help make all unions 'organising unions' - with support and training for union representatives and officers;

- iv) explore how best unions and the TUC can use new technology to support union efforts to organise and keep members;

- v) make the TUC Organising Academy flexible enough to assist a wider range of affiliates, and union organising academies;

- vi) develop a one-movement approach to organising, strengthening the TUC's role in enhancing positive inter-union relations and removing harmful competition - the TUC should examine all its functions to see how effort can be directed to helping unions grow;

- vii) make a reality of our commitment to organise beyond our current areas of strength - reaching out to 'new' workers (migrant workers, agency workers) and 'new' jobs (poorly organised workplaces and sectors); and

- viii) urge the Government to acknowledge the positive contribution of unions by taking measures to remove obstacles to working people joining unions.

- ix) make the promotion of the positive benefits and role of trade unionism central to the work of the TUC; and

- x) explore ways of encouraging and facilitating trade unionism amongst students and young people.

Congress calls upon all unions to:

- a) shift and target resources towards systematic organising campaigns;
- b) train and encourage reps to take on organising work;
- c) audit all activities in terms of their organising impact;
- d) use appropriate organising objectives to manage and review these campaigns; and
- e) make full use of the organising opportunities provided by the Information and Consultation Regulations.

**Proposed: Transport and General Workers' Union**

**Seconded: Connect**

**Supporters: Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists Prospect**

### Composite 4 Parents, carers and work/life balance

Congress recognises that all workers have responsibilities and interests outside work and many workers, particularly women, are carers of children or dependent relatives. Congress warmly welcomes the Labour Government's commitment to helping parents and carers balance work and family life and the important measures already taken such as the significant increases that have been made since April 2003 in paid maternity leave, the introduction of paid paternity and adoption leave, and the ongoing investment in childcare and early years services and the announcement that the right to request flexible working will be extended to carers.

Congress believes that effective practices to promote work/life balance will benefit businesses, their workforce and society. Employers and unions have a joint responsibility to develop workable solutions that meet the needs of the business and all employees. Congress notes the successes of a number of union-negotiated flexible working packages in both the public and the private sector.

Congress is alarmed that at the current rates of Statutory Maternity Pay, many women on maternity leave are earning less than the minimum wage. Government needs to give a high priority to income replacement, without which rights such as parental

leave and time off for dependants are meaningless to low-paid workers. Parents must be given support to be able to make genuine choices about how to balance work and family responsibilities.

Congress urges the General Council to support affiliates' campaigns in this area and in particular to take an active role in campaigning for:

- i) paid parental leave; and
- ii) for maternity pay to be paid for 52 weeks rather than the current 26 weeks.

Congress notes recent EOC research showing that a high proportion of parents and carers said that their voting intentions would be influenced by government policy and provisions on work/life balance. Congress, therefore, believes it is in the interests of both the current Government and working people that more is done to enable working men and women to balance work and family life better.

Congress therefore calls on the Government to introduce a right to:

- a) paid parental leave which is flexible and targeted at both mothers and fathers;
- b) work flexibly for parents and carers of dependent relatives;

Congress also calls and also to:

- 1 increase SMP and Maternity Allowance to ensure a decent income for mothers in the first six months of the child's life;
- 2 increase paternity leave time and allow it to be taken flexibly;
- 3 increase Statutory Paternity Pay to 90 per cent of average earnings and introduce a Paternity Allowance along the same lines as Maternity Allowance

Congress believes that, as part of the Government's strategy to eradicate child poverty, more must be done to ensure that children do not spend their early years in poverty. The Government's childcare and early years strategy must include the very early years of the child's life and also ensure that large families on low incomes have access to adequate Government support for childcare. Congress urges the Government to reform the tax credits system so that support is offered per child and is not heavily weighted in favour of families with just one or two children.

Workers have a right to lifelong learning opportunities and time to participate in civil society. Congress believes that, in particular, the Government must provide adequate social protection for all workers who take time out of the labour market or work part time, as the gender pay gap is in part attributable to the low value attached to part-time work. The voluntary approach to equal pay has failed to close the pay gap and the Government should introduce mandatory equal pay reviews. Employment Tribunals should be given a statutory role in enforcing equal pay awards and should be allowed to hear representative claims on behalf of groups of workers.

Congress calls on the Government to introduce:

- A mandatory equal pay reviews; and
- B representative actions in the Employment Tribunals.

Congress calls on the General Council to campaign for and develop training for union officers and reps in negotiating flexible working packages.

**Mover: Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers**

**Seconder: Chartered Society of Physiotherapists**

**Supporter: British Orthoptic Society**

## Composite 5 Racism and the 'Redwatch'

Congress, noting that the BBC documentary the Secret Agent revealed that the BNP target trade union officials and use the 'Redwatch' internet site to intimidate anti-racist and anti-fascist campaigners, and bearing in mind the TUC's 'Unite Against Racism' campaign, calls upon the TUC General Council to:

- i) press the Home Secretary and other relevant authorities for the immediate closure of such sites;
- ii) fully and immediately support any affiliate whose members risk intimidation as a consequence of far-right internet activity;
- iii) offer urgent advice and guidance to affiliates on this issue;
- iv) continue to campaign against the BNP in local communities, through the regional TUCs and at a national level in the run-up to the General Election; and
- v) campaign for legislation to enable unions to deny membership to those belonging to racist and fascist organisations.

Congress, believing that the educational policies of far right groups threaten the multi-cultural ethos of schools and colleges, agrees to focus on education as part of its ongoing campaign.

**Mover: Association of Teachers and Lecturers**

**Seconder: UNISON**

**Supporter: National Union of Teachers**

## Composite 6 Age discrimination and equality

Congress welcomes the potential for the new age equality legislation to help eliminate unfair age-based treatment of workers and those undertaking training or further and higher education.

However, Congress is still disappointed at the failure of the Government to bring forward a comprehensive overhaul of equality legislation and a Single Equality Act providing an upward harmonisation of standards of protection across all equality grounds.

Congress urges all parties to include such a Single Equality Act in their manifesto and first programme of legislation if elected.

Congress is deeply concerned that if the Government sets a statutory fixed age at which all employers are able to force workers to retire then employers will defer pension entitlements to align with that age.

Congress is disappointed that the Government is proposing to reduce the compensation available to those aged over 41 years of age from 1.5 weeks' pay per year of service to 1 week's pay per year of service. This contrasts with the practice in other countries, for example Ireland, where similar arrangements have been harmonised upwards.

Congress further believes that this proposal is in breach of the original European Directive 2000/78/EC Article 8: "The implementation of this Directive shall under no circumstances constitute grounds for a reduction in the level of protection against discrimination already afforded by member states in the fields covered by this Directive". Congress calls upon the Government to alter its proposals to protect compensation arrangements for older workers.

Furthermore, Congress calls upon the General Council and all affiliated unions to campaign for the new age equality regulations and related legislative changes to address the following:

- i) unfair dismissal and redundancy awards should not be age-based and must not be levelled down for any workers;
- ii) the Government should prohibit age discrimination on access to pension schemes, and allow

workers aged 18 to 21 to claim the full adult rate of the National Minimum Wage; and  
 iii) there must be a specific provision in the legislation that its introduction must not lead to a reduction in the level of protection or benefits for workers.

**Mover: FDA**

**Second: BACM-TEAM**

### **Composite 7 Pensions**

Congress welcomes the campaigning undertaken by the TUC and affiliated unions to defend and improve members' pension benefits in the public and private sectors to achieve an improved and durable framework of pension provision for all workers. The marches helped secure publicity for the campaign to defend pensions. The rally was supported by all age groups and covered a demand for the return to a decent state pension and employer-related occupational pension provision.

Congress reaffirms the importance of safeguarding the occupational pensions' benefits of members and preventing arbitrary and unjustified reductions in benefits. Congress opposes the "work till you drop" approach of employers and government and is particularly concerned about the closure and erosion of occupational pension schemes and the replacement of defined benefit schemes with money purchase schemes. Congress believes that, after retirement, all employees should receive a pension income that bears a decent relationship to their pay.

Congress deplores the ongoing discrimination against women in both state and occupational schemes. Congress calls on the Government to overcome the barriers to pensions for the lowest paid and women.

Congress welcomes government measures encouraging occupational pensions and making them more secure, but recognises that such measures will not result in any major increase in pension contributions. Congress believes that employers who make no voluntary pension contributions, or make only small contributions, enjoy an unfair competitive advantage compared to employers who make a decent level of contribution, and that this condemns their employees to an impoverished retirement.

Therefore congress calls for new legislation to compel all employers to make a contribution to their employees' second pension of a minimum of 10 per cent of earnings; for all employees to make a minimum contribution of 5 per cent of earnings; and for a reform of tax relief on pension contributions to share it more equally, so as to provide much greater assistance to the lower-paid.

Congress calls on the Government to commit to securing a basis for decent pensions for all employees by extending compulsion, and to re-direct the Pension Commission and its policy focus beyond the question of whether compulsion is needed to how best it can quickly be implemented.

Congress deeply regrets the proposed compulsory increase in the public sector pension age to 65, and notes that many civil and public servants whose jobs are contracted out are forcibly removed from their occupational pension scheme, even when they continue to do the same job. In addition Congress calls on the Government to call a halt to the proposed changes in 2005 to the Local Government Pension Scheme.

Congress reinforces standing TUC policy that no employees should be compelled to work beyond their current 'normal retirement age'. Congress notes that there are some members of occupational pension schemes who wish to continue working for the same employer after their normal retirement age as a matter of choice and their employers value their continuing

contribution. However, Congress is concerned that, when this choice is exercised, current Inland Revenue regulations make it impossible for the employee to draw their pension in addition to their continuing salary. This is an unfair and anomalous situation because if the employee moved to another employer they would be able to enjoy the benefit of their pension and receive a second income from their continued employment.

Whilst recognising that this is not the greatest injustice in UK pensions legislation, Congress nevertheless calls upon the General Council to lobby HM Government to have this anomaly removed

Congress calls upon the Government to include pensions as a transferable benefit under TUPE regulations. And calls for the introduction of mandatory admitted body status agreements into all public sector contracts, to ensure full legal pensions protection and guarantee continued access to their existing pension scheme (or one with at least equivalent benefits) for public sector workers transferred to the private sector. Every time this issue has been raised at Congress the Government have made encouraging statements whilst failing to put the problem right. If the Government wishes to instill confidence in the future of pensions as a viable retirement vehicle then it must act now.

Congress urges the Government to face up to the crisis, and agrees to step up its campaign to deliver adequate state and occupational pensions for all including:

- i) a universal state pension at a level which obviates the need for additional means tested pension benefits which increases each year in line with prices or earnings, whichever is the greater.
- ii) secure additional pension provision through effective support and encouragement of occupational pension provision in which the costs are shared equitably between employers and employees and continue to defend and promote final salary pension schemes within the public and private sectors.
- iii) improved state pension provision for workers without access to occupational pension schemes.
- iv) campaign to secure sufficient retirement income for all workers;
- v) work with the EOC on tackling discrimination against women in retirement and to eliminate all remaining forms of discrimination within schemes, including on grounds of sexual orientation and marital status.
- vi) ensure at least 50 per cent of trustees are member nominated.
- vii) campaign to ensure the Pensions Protection Fund and the welcome Financial Assistance Scheme introduced by the Government to assist members are adequately funded.
- viii) make pensions a bargaining issue and provide TUPE protection for pensions
- ix) resist the imposition of a common pension age of 65 across the public sector.
- x) support unions in their individual and collective fight on pensions, coordinating appropriate support for industrial action by affiliates, and strengthen cooperation with the pensioners' organisations in order to mobilise effective and appropriate campaign activities' and further action including a national pensions day and exert maximum pressure on every constituency MP, as well as employers and the Government.

Congress notes the increased levels of uncertainty amongst workers on pension issues, which is largely related to a lack of general awareness on pension issues together with the unenthusiastic approach of many employers to defined benefit pension schemes. Congress is concerned that many workers may

inadvertently make inappropriate decisions in respect of securing their income in retirement.

Congress believes that this situation would be alleviated by introducing a network of lay pension representatives which would mirror current arrangements for staff, health and safety, and learning representatives. Specifically, Congress views the role of pension representatives as including:

- a) increasing awareness of pension issues amongst union members in their workplace;
- b) acting as a conduit for members' concerns and relaying these to existing pensions trustees and committees;
- c) drawing individual members' attention to the fund rules which affect them and helping members interpret the rules;
- d) in a similar way, and where appropriate, directing members to sources of information about state benefits; and
- e) supporting members in forming questions to the pension fund or personal financial advisors, and in interpreting replies.

Congress calls on the General Council to press the Government to support the principles of pensions representatives as suggested and to establish procedures for their appointment, training and release.

Congress agrees that the bedrock of pension provision is the state pension. To this Government's shame they have refused to 'restore the link'. Pensioners who have only the state pension to rely on are openly critical of the changes in pension provision that include the minimum guarantee and the pensioners' credit. They believe that these means-tested benefits are totally unfair and inadequate. Congress therefore commits to continue to vigorously campaign for the restoration of the link.

Congress requests the General Council to continue to work in close cooperation with, and hold meetings with, affiliated unions, the NPC and pensioner organisations in its campaigning and other activities to achieve the above objectives.

**Mover:** Amicus

**Seconder:** Public and Commercial Services Union

**Supporters:** National Union of Teachers  
Transport Salaried Staffs Association  
Accord  
Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen  
UBAC  
Transport and General Workers Union  
GMB  
UNISON  
Community

## Composite 8 Care of Elders

Congress agrees that all retired workers should be able to enjoy an active and secure retirement. To achieve this aim, government must be reminded that the vast majority of retired people have contributed to the welfare state since its inception, and were at that time, under a Labour Government, promised free all-round health and social care from the cradle to the grave. In a country that is now the fourth richest in the world, far richer than when this promise was made in the 1940s, retired workers have seen that commitment eroded by successive governments.

Community and district nurses are continually encountering elder abuse whilst carrying out their everyday duties. The CDNA have identified that their members feel unsupported. In particular, the abuse of medication is a major concern.

Congress therefore commits to:

- i) call on the General Council to urge the Government to ensure that the checks in place are standardised and made stricter to ensure that the abuse of medication is identified and eradicated;
- ii) campaign vigorously for the full implementation of the Sutherland Report which recommended free long-term care for older people;
- iii) encourage retired workers to become active participants in patient and pensioner forums;
- iv) press local MPs to continue opposition to foundation hospitals which will lead to the privatisation of the NHS;
- v) oppose the closure of nursing and residential homes for the elderly through appropriate campaigns involving the unions, councillors and community organisations; and
- vi) publicise campaigns, rallies and activities organised by the National Pensioners Convention, encouraging retired workers to take an active role in these events.

**Mover:** Communication Workers' Union

**Seconder:** Community and District Nursing Association

## Composite 9 Manufacturing

Congress acknowledges the vital contribution that the UK manufacturing sector makes to the UK economy and calls upon the General Council and the Government to place the maintenance of a viable and sustainable manufacturing sector at the top of their economic agenda.

Congress views with alarm the loss of over three million manufacturing jobs from the British economy since 1979, noting that the quality of replacement jobs available, and the level of earnings, does little to support the Government's stated aim of achieving a high-skilled, added value workforce.

Congress believes that there is no evidence to suggest that employment regulation has a detrimental effect on investment and jobs, and believes that until UK workers are offered a truly level playing field of employment rights and social planning, the UK manufacturing sector will lose out through off-shoring.

Congress believes that in order to make manufacturing industry work more effectively it is important that the EU Directive on Information and Consultation is fully implemented to give UK workers the same rights as other EU workers to proper consultation prior to important decisions being made by companies.

Congress is concerned at 'below-cost selling' by many major food retailers. The system should recognise both the needs of consumers and the pressures on food manufacturers, farmers, suppliers and their employees. We welcome the OFT's work on a supermarket code of practice but believe that firmer action is now needed.

Congress calls upon the Government to develop a more proactive and positive manufacturing strategy. To this end, Congress calls upon the Government to:

- i) appoint a cabinet minister for manufacturing;
- ii) intervene against grant-aided companies implementing closures;
- iii) set up a dedicated investment fund for manufacturing industry with increased state support;
- iv) end social dumping in Europe through a level playing field on employment rights;

- v) promote a procurement strategy which safeguards UK jobs and skills and fund a competitive export credit guarantee system;
- vi) create co-ordinated industrial clusters that develop a coherent response to specific procurement issues;
- vii) fully implement in the UK the recently adopted EU public procurement directives to include a legal obligation on contracting authorities to consider social, employment, disability and environmental issues when awarding public contracts; and
- viii) encourage greater investment in skills and training by employers.

Congress calls upon the TUC General Council to actively campaign for these demands.

**Mover: Amicus**

**Seconder: Graphical, Paper and Media Unions**

**Supporters GMB**

**Bakers, Food and Allied Workers Union**

### **Composite 10 Public services**

Congress commends the Government for its commitment to high quality public services and the sustained and historically high levels of investment in UK terms in state education and health.

But Congress notes that much of this increased public investment will be creamed off to pay super-profits to the private contractors involved in PFI and PPP projects rather than used to improve frontline service delivery to the public.

Congress reiterates its opposition to the continued pursuit of privatisation and increased marketisation of our public services, despite increasing evidence that privatisation is more expensive, detrimental to service delivery and creates significant inequalities.

Congress believes that increased marketisation threatens the public service ethos and undermines democracy and accountability.

Congress condemns the lack of consultation with the TUC and trade unions prior to the publication of the five-year plans on health and education and condemns the massive job cuts across the civil service. Congress also strongly opposes government policies which involve public service job cuts to finance government spending plans – better public services require more and better trained public servants not fewer.

Congress notes with concern the new agenda on 'choice' and totally rejects an agenda which seeks to undermine universality and increase long-term private sector involvement in the provision of our public services.

Congress notes Siemens plans to offshore National Savings work to India. This would be the first central government work to be off-shored with serious implications for other workers, security, democratic control and accountability. Congress calls on the Government not to extend the NS&I contract if it involves offshoring.

Congress calls on the government to honour the unequivocal promise made by the prime minister in October 2001 to end the two-tier workforce across our public services and the General Council to:

- i) use all forums to raise our concerns with government, particularly the lack of consultation on proposed reforms;
- ii) lobby for a fair wages clause in all public contracting; and a skills dowry for every public sector worker;
- iii) continue its opposition to the privatisation of our public services and the use of PFI and PPPs and

campaign to highlight the manifest failure of the private sector to deliver decent public services, to the Government and the public; and

- iv) campaign within the ETUC against privatisation and, in particular, the services Directive.

Congress calls on the Government to extend its commitment to public sector excellence by introducing a new and greatly improved funding formula for the UK fire and rescue service. Such a formula is urgently needed to:

- a) ensure that new local risk-assessed management plans are adequately financed to meet the objective of zero fire deaths in the UK; and
- b) maintain a network of emergency fire control centres based in local communities and managed by elected fire authorities.

Congress also notes with concern the quality of many newly built and refurbished schools delivered through Public-Private Partnership and Private Finance Initiative schemes, in particular the effects of the provision of inadequate facilities on teaching and learning.

Congress is also concerned at the widespread lack of any meaningful consultation with teachers and others in the school community at the design stage of these PPP/PFI schemes resulting in schools which cannot deliver the best possible facilities for pupils, teachers or other school users.

Congress believes that it is essential to involve all stakeholders in the initial development of the brief and in the resolution of any subsequent problems which arise during the actual construction or refurbishment phase.

Congress, therefore, calls upon all responsible public authorities to ensure that all school building and refurbishment programmes:

- 1) involve the fullest possible consultation with, and involvement of, all interested parties, both in the development of the brief and its fulfilment;
- 2) are designed and delivered to meet the needs of the users, rather than the providers, particularly in relation to the needs of 21<sup>st</sup> century education and reduced class sizes; and
- 3) are furnished in a manner which genuinely and demonstrably provides best value for the public purse in the long term.

Congress opposes the ongoing privatisation of large swathes of our public services through PFI, market-testing and most recently 'contestability' in the prison and probation services.

Congress notes that work in restructuring to deliver joined-up justice is constantly undermined, for example, by proposals to introduce the National Offender Management Service out of the prison and probation services, by fragmenting previously cohesive services into a range of contracts. Congress is concerned by further potential privatisation of core areas of criminal justice work such as enforcement of fines and security of court buildings.

Congress rejects:

- A) the opportunity to make profits out of the justice system and particularly incarceration of offenders; and
- B) allowing private sector enforcement agencies, outside any direct democratic public sector control, powers to force entry into homes, forcibly search people and have access to primary sources of data.

**Mover: UNISON**

**Seconder: Educational Institute of Scotland**

**Supporters: Fire Brigades' Union**

**AMO**

**Public and Commercial Services Union**

### Composite 11 Civil Service

Congress condemns government plans to cut over 104,000 jobs from the civil and public services and to seek massive so-called "efficiency savings".

These cuts were announced without adequate justification and with insufficient consultation with the unions about the impact on members' jobs and their families, career aspirations, rights to equal opportunity, and terms and conditions and were based on targets set by ministers with insufficient consideration of corresponding reductions in workload.

Congress welcomes the continuing high level of investment in UK public services and recognises the importance of ensuring that public spending is allocated in a manner that delivers the maximum benefit to all and achieves value for money.

Congress opposes public sector reforms which result in poorer services and lead to cuts in public sector jobs. Congress is concerned that the Gershon Efficiency Review will result in cuts to essential functions, including regulation, law enforcement, national security, public health and safety. The Lyons Review of Public Sector Relocation appears to be more about helping government cut the wage bill than improving standards of service.

Congress notes that these cuts will severely damage service delivery, with the public receiving a poorer, less local, service. The cuts will particularly damage and diminish the level of service to vulnerable groups in our society. Congress rejects the simplistic division of staff into front- and back-line, recognising that all workers contribute to effective service delivery. The distinction between front line services and back room support is an arbitrary one which denigrates and devalues important public service functions. The impact of this decision is felt not just by civil servants, but across the public services, including the magistrates' courts where staff will become civil servants on 1 April 2005 and are already to be subjected to a 5 per cent 'efficiency' cut by March 2008.

The job cuts and plans to relocate 20,000 jobs away from London and the south east will also damage the public, communities and staff. The relocation proposals will particularly affect the 30 per cent of London civil servants from ethnic minorities, as well as disabled workers and workers with caring responsibilities.

Unions favour improved service delivery but the Government has failed to engage the knowledge and skills of the workforce and unions in the process of change.

The plan is not only an attack on civil servants, but public sector workers generally. If successful, the Government's plan will be used as a blueprint for the rest of public sector and as a green light to press ahead with the creeping commercialisation of public services and the casualisation of the public sector workforce already seen in areas like health, education and postal services.

The Government's programme of change will not succeed unless it takes civil and public servants with them. It needs to engage more effectively with its own staff and their representatives. Congress calls on the Government and on all civil service departments to:

- i) ensure that any staffing or cost targets associated with SR2004 are based on an objective analysis of the resources needed to perform identified functions;
- ii) consult the civil service unions throughout the reform process and implement machinery that can operate across the civil service to ensure the central coordination of any human resource issues;
- iii) commit to avoid compulsory redundancies;
- iv) ensure that all programmes of departmental reform are subject to equality audits; and

- v) set realistic timetables to implement change;
  - vi) maintain, and where possible improve, public access to services;
  - vii) give full recognition to the role of professional and specialist public servants;
  - viii) move quickly towards a national framework for pay allowing for genuine negotiations on the overall pay envelope rather than a centrally imposed earnings limit;
  - ix) carry out an independent review of the system of delegated negotiations on pay and conditions of service within the civil service;
  - x) call a halt to further privatisation and Public-Private Partnerships until thorough assessment has been made of potential impact on core capability to deliver essential public services; and
  - xi) follow best practice in the design of relocation packages, pursue a voluntary approach to movement of staff, and identify alternative employment opportunities for staff not wishing to move.
- Congress calls upon the General Council to fully support and co-ordinate public services unions in opposing these arbitrary cuts by:
- a) making MPs aware of the effects of job cuts in their constituencies;
  - b) facilitating co-ordination between public sector unions;
  - c) co-ordinating and supporting appropriate campaigning by unions which might include industrial action, a demonstration and lobby of Parliament, in co-operation with user and community groups;
  - d) establishing a group of relevant affiliates to assess the impact of the efficiency review and workforce reform on public services, including education and identify the future needs of services; and
  - e) raising these issues with the Public Services Forum and Chancellor.

**Mover: Public and Commercial Services Union**

**Seconded: Prospect**

**Supporters: FDA**

**AMO**

**Communication Workers' Union**

**National Union of Teachers**

### Composite 12 Future of health and public policy

Congress believes the NHS provides an excellent quality service for patients. Congress congratulates the Government on its increased investment in health. This has resulted in increasing staffing levels, greater capacity and reduced waiting lists. Congress welcomes government initiatives to improve the health of the nation and implement health care policies which provide more access to diagnosis and treatment. However, there is still much to do: workloads are too high and shortages of staff persist.

Congress notes the prime minister's statement in June that the pace of public sector reform needs to quicken. Congress believes that any proposals for the NHS should be measured against equity of access, standards of care, the promotion of health and appropriate care for long-term conditions. Investment in the NHS needs to be maintained and staff treated fairly.

For any further reforms to succeed, deadlines must be realistic and managers and clinical staff be given the resources, including adequate numbers of administrative and support staff, necessary to achieve effective implementation and delivery.

Extending the provision of MRI services is a welcome development, but a failure to ensure that there are adequate and trained NHS health care staff to deliver this policy is an example of where improvements to healthcare may be lost because of political expediency.

The lack of planning in the delivery of this policy jeopardises any potential for the development of a comprehensive service and fails to recognise the unused capacity for the delivery of MRI services, which currently exists within the NHS.

Congress is disappointed that the Government has not engaged with, and listened more to, NHS trade unions when developing their policies. Congress calls on the General Council to:

- i) use the Public Services Forum to ensure genuine dialogue with government on public services which takes account of union concerns and ensure that all policy in the public sector is discussed with unions and implemented collectively; and
- ii) provide quality research to affiliates particularly in respect of the 'choice' agenda to help shape discussion and debate.

**Mover:** Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

**Seconders:** Society of Radiographers

**Supporter:** FDA

### Composite 13 Education

Congress, noting with concern the Government's emphasis on 'delivering' learning, the continuing domination of performance pressures, and the conditions of learning for children and young people in schools, calls upon the General Council to warn of the dangers of narrow agendas that ignore:

- i) children and young people's views about their learning;
- ii) teachers' views about the sort of learning that they are being asked to 'deliver' in schools;
- iii) the importance of learning - not just teaching;
- iv) the damaging consequences of a performance-oriented learning culture; and
- v) the need for a richer view of the contribution schools can make to changing lives.

Congress however welcomes the government initiative of Sure Start, which recognises that parents are children's first educators, being experts on their own children. In the spirit of individuals being committed to learning throughout life, Congress expresses concern at the culture gap that exists between home and school at secondary level.

Congress seeks support for parents at this level, through the provision of a major 'Keeping it Sure' initiative that empowers parents to, and convinces them of, the value of continued engagement with the education system.

'Keeping it Sure' initiatives should build on the values of Sure Start and act as agents of change, encouraging parental participation in all phases of education, ensuring systematic implementation of school and agencies' contact with parents and communities.

Congress calls on the Government urgently to establish major 'Keeping it Sure' initiatives at secondary level that will make inclusion meaningful for many more families.

Congress also notes the demographic pressures currently facing the education service, in particular the fact that the average age of a teacher is now over 50 and that a significant proportion of the profession will retire in the course of the next 10 years. Congress also notes that school rolls are likely to decline over the same period which provides an excellent opportunity for significant reductions in class size across all sectors.

Congress believes that reduced class sizes play a significant role in:

- a) improving learning and attainment of all children;
- b) helping to tackle problems of pupil indiscipline;
- c) assisting with the implementation of social inclusion policies; and
- d) allowing increased individual teacher/pupil interaction.

Congress, therefore, calls on the Government to ensure that the necessary levels of teacher recruitment and resources are provided to the appropriate UK and devolved authorities to allow class sizes to be reduced and to replace the significant number of teachers who will retire during the coming decade.

Congress also recognises the dedication and commitment of classroom teaching staff and calls for a more active and systematic government programme of support and encouragement of continuous professional development (CPD) for teachers in our schools. Congress notes the teaching staff development initiatives now being promoted by the Teacher Training Agency and DfES and seeks an appropriate emphasis on whole-school staff development programmes to supplement such initiatives. Congress believes that a properly structured and specifically resourced national CPD programme can assist the teaching profession in facing today's challenges and strengthening the education service for the future.

**Mover:** Association of Teachers and Lecturers

**Seconders:** Educational Institute of Scotland

**Supporters:** National Association of Educational Inspectors, Advisers and Consultants  
Association of Educational Psychologists

### Composite 14 Transport

Congress reaffirms its support for re-nationalisation of the railways.

Congress believes that with adequate investment and the right structure the railways will play a key role in solving Britain's growing transport problems.

Congress therefore welcomes the record investment promised by the Government for rail in the spending review, together with many of the changes set out in the 'Future of Rail' White Paper.

Congress notes one of the primary purposes of the Government's review of the railways was to address the "fragmentation, excessive complication and dysfunctionality" of the privatised railway.

Congress therefore welcomes those steps that have already been taken to exert greater control over the railways. Specifically Congress notes Network Rail has taken maintenance back in house and South Eastern Trains has become the first passenger service to be taken back into public ownership. In both these instances Congress notes that performance and efficiency has improved.

Congress urges the Government to build on these positive steps by reintegrating all railway infrastructure and passenger operations under a single publicly owned, publicly accountable railway body.

Congress further welcomes that public accountability will be improved as a result of:

- i) the decision of the Government to take responsibility for setting the strategy for the railways and for its overall performance; and
- ii) the increased role for the Scottish Executive, Welsh Assembly and the London Mayor.

In the light of the self-evident failure of railway privatisation, Congress also reiterates its opposition to the London Underground PPP and calls for all



maintenance and renewals to be bought back under the control of London Underground.

Congress further believes that the regulation of rail safety must be kept separate from economic regulation. Congress regrets that the Government has bowed to the pressure of private train operators and moved rail safety regulation away from the HSE, contrary to the recommendations of the Cullen Enquiry. Congress calls on the General Council to work with the rail unions to press for a single, truly independent rail safety agency with sufficient resources and expertise to ensure improvement in the safety of staff and users of the railway.

Congress also notes that the three rail unions organised a very successful national rally and lobby of Parliament on the 20th July 2004, demanding the return to a publicly owned, publicly accountable national railway, and recognizes this lobby as part of an ongoing campaign.

A recent opinion poll revealed that no less than 72 per cent of the public want all rail services brought back into the public sector, noting that 10 billion pounds have been given to train operating companies while services have deteriorated rapidly. Congress is therefore astonished at the Government's desire to reprivatise South Eastern trains and commits to work with, and support, the ongoing campaign.

Congress regrets that the White Paper fails to address the fundamental question of ownership which Congress believes goes to the very heart of the malaise afflicting Britain's railway industry. Congress calls on the General Council to campaign with rail unions on this issue as a priority to ensure that rail can deliver effectively in the long term for rail users and their communities.

Congress further notes that as an island nation which is dependent on ships for over 90 per cent of our trade the UK needs to retain its own maritime skills. Congress therefore resolves to support all efforts to increase the employment and training opportunities for British seafarers. Specifically Congress supports the campaign to introduce a direct link between the tonnage tax and seafarers' employment.

Finally, Congress continues to support the full repeal of Section 9 of the Race Relations Act as part of the wider campaign for full equality and employment rights for seafarers, and notes that this could have been achieved if arrangements to protect the position of British seafarers had been put in place in advance of any repeal.

**Mover: National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers**

**Seconder: Transport Salaried Staffs' Association**

**Supporters: Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen**

**National Union of Marine, Aviation and Shipping Transport Officers**

## **Composite 15 Energy and environment**

Congress recognises the urgency and seriousness of the threats stemming from climate change and global warming and welcomes the lead given by the British Government in promoting ratification and application of the Kyoto Protocol to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases. It calls on the Government to give further backing to the development of renewable sources of energy.

Congress reaffirms its commitment to a balanced energy policy.

It welcomes the publication of the first annual report on implementation of the Energy White Paper, which confirms the Government's commitment to national

climate change targets. However, Congress is concerned that:

- i) despite some welcome progress in increasing generation from renewables, the UK will not achieve its goal of a 20 per cent reduction in carbon dioxide emissions by 2010;
- ii) government is too relaxed in its assessment of the consequences of growing dependence on imported oil and gas; and
- iii) there is considerable uncertainty about the implications of the EU Emissions Trading Scheme for prices, investment and employment.

Congress believes that diversity and flexibility of energy sources are key to ensuring security of supply and, to this end, calls on the Government to act to ensure that:

- a) all energy options are actively pursued and that there is increased support for research, development and demonstration of new technologies;
- b) there is an adequate supply of skilled staff to maintain the resilience of energy networks and to respond to the technical challenges arising from new sources of generation;
- c) incentives for investment under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme encourage the development of all lower-carbon generation technologies, including nuclear and coal; and
- d) there is greater transparency and accountability by Ofgem to ensure that energy sources and supply can be considered strategically.

Congress is alarmed, however, that the British proposals to the European Commission, for reducing emissions from 2005 to 2010 through the EU trading scheme, take as their base year 2002, which saw recession in British manufacturing. The proposals involve cuts on a larger scale than any other EU state. In welcoming the recent upturn in British manufacturing output and the improved prospects for the next two years at least,

Congress urges the Government to minimise the threats to British steel production, and to manufacturing in general, from having to purchase rights to emit carbon dioxide. The Government should do this by ensuring that British companies do not have to buy permits to fulfil their plans for expanding output, and ensuring that no other European Union state gains a competitive advantage from the application of the emissions trading regime, taking account of the probability that any additional reduction in emissions of greenhouse gases in the United Kingdom will be exceeded by emissions from the new EU member states which are less carbon efficient.

Congress supports the concept of supplying the nation's energy needs by exploiting the UK's indigenous energy reserves. The very thought of the UK becoming a net importer of energy by the year 2020 of up to 90 per cent of our requirements, of which 70 per cent will be gas, quite frankly beggars belief. Congress believes that with control over our own future energy requirements the issue of security of supply from the most unstable of countries is largely diminished.

Congress notes that while the Government has an ambitious plan to increase the proportion of renewable energy in UK electricity generation such targets are unlikely to be achieved. Congress is also concerned that insufficient account has been taken of the need to ensure that changes in the energy mix take proper account of the need to manage the variable loads that are inherent in the operation of the national grid.

Congress believes that there must be an ongoing role for coal within that mix, but that as the current fleet of coal fired power stations age, the market is not capable of providing sufficient incentive for new clean-

coal power stations. Congress believes that investment by the Government in a new generation of power stations is essential if its objectives of fuel diversity and security of supply are to be assured.

Congress seeks discussions with the Government on how best to achieve the agreed emission limits by utilising the already proven and readily available Clean Coal Technology plant.

Congress calls on the Government to provide public funding for research, development and demonstration in clean coal technology as part of the UK's long-term balanced energy policy, and investment in the UK's power engineering and manufacturing sector to develop expertise in design, manufacture and construction of new power stations.

The General Council is instructed to pro-actively pursue these objectives and to promote a joined-up approach to energy and environmental policy making.

**Mover: Prospect**

**Seconder: Community**

**Supporters: National Union of Mineworkers**

**BACM-TEAM**

**Amicus**

#### **Composite 16 BBC charter renewal and public service broadcasting**

Congress is concerned at threats to the future of the BBC arising from the charter renewal process and licence fee review.

Congress recognises that the BBC is the most significant commissioner and patron of arts, culture and popular science in the UK, and combines this role with its independence of government, commercial pressures and vested interests.

Congress believes the BBC is one of the few remaining UK institutions that binds us together at home and earns us admiration overseas; therefore it is imperative that it is not weakened or restricted in its role.

Congress confirms its view that:

- i) the BBC is the cornerstone of our public service broadcasting system; our primary source of original programme production; the most significant employer and trainer in both television and radio; the standard setter for independent newsgathering and output; and the leader in the spread of digital television in the UK; and
- ii) the increasing attacks on the BBC by commercial broadcasters such as BSkyB, who wish to move to a more market-based broadcasting system, should be strongly resisted.

Congress therefore instructs the General Council to campaign throughout the charter renewal process for:

- a) retention of the licence fee as the primary source of BBC funding;
- b) opposition to alternative funding mechanisms, including 'top slicing' the licence fee (thereby diverting public funds to commercial broadcasters);
- c) retention of the BBC's range of additional commercial services and opposition to sell offs such as that of BBC Technology;
- d) opposition to any increase in the independent production quota from its current level of 25 per cent;
- e) increased independence of the BBC Governors from Government and from BBC management, with no increase in Ofcom's role in regulating the BBC;
- f) reconsideration of the composition of the governors with the aim of achieving an outcome more representative of the broadcasting industry and of the country as a whole and to encourage positive steps to address the BBC's portrayal of our society by the

engagement of a truly representative spectrum of performers and presenters; and

- g) recognition of the value of strong independent news within the BBC and its contribution to the democratic participation of citizens throughout the UK.

Congress welcomes the new Chairman and Director General who have the confidence of the public and the industry.

Congress reaffirms its belief in public service broadcasting, of which the BBC is a cornerstone, but believes that all national broadcasters should continue to be under an obligation to deliver PSB programming.

Congress believes it is in the interests of the UK for the BBC to retain a leading role in the development of digital electronic technologies, in consultation with the relevant trade unions.

Congress supports the licence fee system and rejects advertising on the BBC or a subscription based system.

Congress congratulates the General Council for actively pursuing these issues in consultation with the Federation of Entertainment Unions, and encourages the General Council to use its influence to protect and preserve the BBC for ourselves and for future generations.

Congress believes that the fight to uphold public service broadcasting standards is equally important in the independent and commercial sectors.

Congress notes that, since the merger of Carlton and Granada, ITV is cutting its commitments to local news in key regions, and is closing studios and losing 550 jobs at Meridian in the South and at Central in the Midlands. Similarly, other independent broadcasters, like ITV Wales, are also cutting back on local news production.

The new 'light touch' broadcasting regulator, Ofcom, has so far refused to intervene to ensure that these companies keep to their commitments.

Congress therefore resolves to call on the General Council to make representations to Ofcom, and to campaign for Ofcom to carry out its responsibilities to the public in protecting public service broadcasting imperatives in regional and local news production in the independent sector.

Congress also notes the Government's stated intention of switching off the analogue television signal by the end of 2010. Congress is concerned that at the time of analogue switch-off many UK citizens will be unable to receive a digital signal without some financial cost, not only for the software required (through set top boxes), but potentially hardware as well in the form of upgrading of existing aerials or installation of satellite dishes. This will be a particular difficulty where people live in multi-resident dwellings. Congress recognises that many people, particularly those most vulnerable in society, rely on television for news, current affairs and entertainment, whilst for many elderly or disabled people television provides the majority of their contact with the outside world.

Congress calls upon the General Council to lobby the Government on the basis of ensuring that these vulnerable members of society are not financially burdened at the time of analogue switch-off and that they are ensured continual access to the nation's television.

**Mover: Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union**

**Seconder: Writers' Guild of Great Britain**

**Supporters: National Union of Journalists  
Equity**

## Composite 18 Learning and skills

Congress welcomes the improvements the Government's strategy has made in the nation's skills, and, a year on, the gains in the workplace of the statutory rights for union learning reps. Congress also welcomes the Government's commitment to tackling the skills gap in the UK, with the objective of raising productivity levels to those of other leading European economies. Congress further welcomes the attention and commitment of this Government to vocational education and training, to its high profile skills strategy and renewed emphasis on apprenticeships.

However, there is still no universal right in the UK to paid time off to undertake training to at least NVQ level 2. Therefore Congress calls on the Government to introduce legislation to give every adult the right to paid time off from work to undertake training at least to NVQ level 2. Congress calls for the extension of statutory paid educational leave and maintenance of adult education and lifelong learning opportunities whilst addressing basic skills issues.

Congress also notes, with disappointment, that too many employers still refuse to invest in the skills of their workforce and will not discuss training or learning with worker representatives. Congress therefore calls on the Government to bring training and learning within the scope of statutory collective bargaining, so that every worker's voice in the workplace is heard, and their views taken into account, on these two very important issues.

Congress further demands urgent action to redress the anomaly whereby consultation with unions on training and employee development is only legally required when recognition is conceded after a ballot and condemns the absence of such a provision in the Information and Consultation Regulations.

Congress also calls on the Government to set up statutory Workplace Learning Committees to ensure that employers work with Union Learning Reps in every workplace to deliver the training and lifelong learning that is relevant both to the needs of the business and the aspirations of the staff.

Despite the improvements the Government's skills strategy has brought, too many employers simply fail to meet their social and economic responsibilities to train, and as a result too many workers are still being denied learning opportunities at work. This doesn't just affect the employer, and as a result threaten the job security of workers, but also the employability of individuals, which has a major knock-on effect across the entire economy, which is suffering badly. Congress notes that the UK will never be able to make significant improvements in skills as long as some employers cling to outdated notions that they should have sole control over the training and skills agenda. This is a legacy of the 1980s and 90s when the UK fell further behind its international competitors and many sectors of the economy failed to invest in skills. Trade unions are uniquely and ideally well placed to contribute to renewing and improving the skills of their members.

Therefore Congress demands the Government introduce statutory training levies in sectors where it is evident they are failing to address skill problems. Congress also calls on the Government to keep the option of a compulsory training levy under review and to implement a levy if the current voluntary approach is not successful.

Congress welcomes the decision by the Government to establish Sector Skills Councils to replace the national training organisations and the commitment by the Government that unions will be represented on the boards of Sector Skills Councils. Congress welcomes the skills strategy's encouragement of union involvement in Sector Skills Councils (SSCs) and the positive role of union learning representatives.

Congress congratulates the General Council on the efforts it has made to bring together the union representatives on the trail-blazer Sector Skills Councils and the success of the event that it jointly hosted with the Sector Skills Council Development Agency in June 2004.

Congress therefore instructs the General Council to:

- i) do all it can to encourage unions to play a full role in the affairs of the relevant Sector Skills Council and to continue to press Government to ensure that unions are properly represented on the boards of Sector Skills Councils;
- ii) encourage affiliates to educate, inform and involve officials, both lay and full-time, in the importance of engaging with Sector Skills Councils and being involved in the development of Sector Skills Agreements;
- iii) campaign to find a more creative role for union learning representatives in working with Sector Skills Councils at NVQ level 2 and above, and to seek to have union learning representatives play a key role in the development of Sector Skills Agreements; and
- iv) ensure that all workers, whatever their employment status, are covered by the work of Sector Skills Councils and included in Sector Skills Agreements.

Congress also resolves to establish mechanisms to enable union SSC members to keep all relevant unions updated through appropriate TUC forums and affirms that each SSC should:

- a) be employment-led rather than employer-dominated;
- b) consult with and inform all unions in the sector on developments; and
- c) have adequate arrangements for trade union representation.

Congress calls on affiliates to urge employers to take full advantage of the opportunities that are now available at national, sectional and regional level. However, it must be acknowledged that there is an immense task ahead if we are to make real progress and it is essential that there is a commitment to a tripartite approach involving employers, unions and relevant government departments, especially the DfES and DTI.

Congress regrets the HE legislation introducing differential top-up fees from 2006 and the failure to guarantee that extra fee income will be additional to existing public funding levels. It resolves to continue to address the consequences of these policies.

Congress believes investment in further and higher education should come from the public purse and is concerned at recent policy proposals that new investment should arise from institutional links with business, further exacerbating the divide between wealthy institutions and those with basic funding.

Congress deplores the continuing funding gap between schools and FE colleges resulting in pay inequality between school and college staff, and fewer resources for FE college students.

Congress also deplores the introduction of differential funding, based on performance, for further education institutions and undertakes to lobby Government for its immediate removal.

Success for students on vocational programmes - the 'other' 50 per cent - will depend on substantial resources, excellent provision, and the placing of a high value on these students' achievements. They must not be neglected in comparison to relatively academic learners.

Congress calls on the Government to invest in vocational education and training resources equivalent to those dedicated to the 2010 target of bringing 50 per cent of all 18 to 30-year-olds onto higher education programmes.

**Mover:** Graphical, Paper and Media Union  
**Seconder:** NATFHE - The University and College Lecturers' Union  
**Supporters:** Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union  
 Association of College Management  
 Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers

### Composite 19 Health and safety at work

Congress welcomes the long overdue acknowledgement by the Health and Safety Commission, in its Statement on Worker Involvement and Consultation, that the involvement of trade union safety representatives leads to higher levels of compliance and better health and safety performance.

Congress believes that this evidence of the positive benefits of workers' involvement should be integrated into the Health and Safety Executive's (HSE) assessment of an employers' health and safety 'management system'. Congress calls upon the General Council to campaign for this change to inspection policy, and calls upon its own representatives at the Commission to insist that its focus should return to one of enforcement.

Congress is concerned over recent declarations from the Health and Safety Commission that they are directing the HSE to move away from enforcement to encouragement.

Congress also notes a series of failures to introduce, or call for, measures designed to protect workers such as:

- i) action on corporate killing;
- ii) regulations or code of practice to tackle stress;
- iii) action to support the introduction of roving safety reps;
- iv) action to introduce an upper limit on working temperature;
- v) action to improve the rights and functions of safety reps;
- vi) action to make violence to workers a reportable event; and
- vii) action to support an end to the individual opt-out in the UK from the Working Time Directive.

Congress welcomes the report from the Department of Work and Pensions Select Committee calling for the number of HSE Inspectors to be doubled and HSE funding to be increased. Congress calls on the Government to accept these findings, which are in line with evidence submitted by the TUC and Prospect.

Although Congress welcomes the allocation of £3m public funding over three years for the Workers' Safety Advisor Challenge Fund, Congress believes this is totally inadequate to help reduce the estimated £15-17 billion that poor occupational health and safety standards cost the British economy each year. Congress further believes that the primary responsibility for providing the funding for initiatives to prevent accidents and ill-health lies with employers, whose management failures are mainly responsible for the occupational injury and disease suffered by their workers.

Congress recognises that where flagrant health and safety crimes are committed the case for punitive action is unquestionable. Congress notes that there are too many deaths at work, and believes that such tragedies as Tebay and Morecambe Bay once again highlight the urgent need for corporate manslaughter legislation. Congress is appalled that despite repeated promises the Government have still failed to act, and calls on the TUC to campaign to ensure that death at work caused by employer negligence is a crime that does not pay, through the promotion of full criminal

responsibility and sanctions for employers whose action (or inaction) jeopardises, injures or kills workers.

Congress calls on the General Council to undertake a review of the functioning of the HSC, including the accountability mechanisms of the TUC commissioners, over the coming year, with a view to improving its effectiveness in protecting the health and safety of working people.

Congress therefore calls upon the General Council to mount a sustained campaign aimed at persuading Government to develop a new and comprehensive strategy for reducing occupational deaths, injuries, and disease. This strategy should be based upon increasing the involvement of trade unions, and generating funds for prevention from employers, and should include:

- a) enhancements to the function of safety reps including amending the appropriate legislation, specifically including Regulation 8 of the Safety Representatives' Regulations, to give trade unions the legal right to appoint 'roving safety representatives' who need not be employees of the company employing the members that they represent;
- b) introducing a 'work environment fund' (WEF) to generate resources for a wide range of health and safety purposes, paid for by a payroll-based levy on employers, with the WEF under tripartite control;
- c) proper funding and direction for the Health and Safety Executive to ensure enforcement of all health and safety legislation;
- d) the Government enacting the recommendations of the Works and Pensions Select Committee report on the HSC and introducing legislation in the forthcoming parliamentary term on corporate manslaughter, so that companies and their directors in both the public and private sector can be held to account; and
- e) recognising that violence against frontline workers constitutes a substantial proportion of workplace injuries - the strategy should encourage the police and the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships to give greater priority to working with employers and unions to minimise risks and deal with persistent offenders.

**Mover:** GMB

**Seconder:** Napo

**Supporters:** Amicus

Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers

Public and Commercial Services Union

Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union  
 Prospect

National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers

National Union of Mineworkers

### Composite 20 Working Time

Congress notes that many UK workers, including managers employed in the public sector, experience a long-hours culture that can have a detrimental effect on their work/life balance.

Congress is alarmed at the Government's own employment practice, noting that many senior civil servants are required to work excessive hours, typically without an opt-out, a situation likely to be exacerbated by proposed cuts in civil service staffing.

Congress further notes the decision of the Court of Appeal to refer a case of 'rolled up rate' to the European Court of Justice.

Congress accepts that currently individual unions have a wide variety of agreements to secure favourable working time arrangements with employers.

Congress notes that the European Commission has launched a second round of consultations on the Working Time Directive.

Congress is concerned that the European Commission's consultation exercise retains the option of an opt-out from the Directive and considers the case for increasing the scope for companies to opt out from regulations on maximum working time through collective bargaining.

Congress expresses its disappointment that the UK Government's submission to the first round of consultation on the opt-out denies that long hours working affects health and safety, continues to oppose the abolition of the opt-out and argues for a reduced role for trade unions in determining working time.

Congress is alarmed that the UK Government, in seeking to maintain the opt-out of the 48-hour week, is allowing the long-hours culture to thrive.

Congress is concerned that pressure on the European Commission to dilute the Working Time Directive will undermine efforts to reduce the working week and achieve a real work/life balance underpinned by a strong regulatory framework.

Congress reaffirms opposition to the opt-out on maximum working hours, and:

- i) opposes any dilution of the trade union role in determining working time through collective agreements;
- ii) supports recognition of 'on-call' hours as working time, in line with rulings from the European Court of Justice, while allowing social partners to negotiate balanced and adequate solutions to problems faced in certain sectors or professions; and
- iii) urges the Government to support the principle of workers being paid for holidays at the time they take their holiday.

Congress calls on the General Council to:

- a) continue with the excellent 'It's About Time' campaign and work closely with individual affiliates to highlight problems of the long-hours culture in different sectors;
- b) highlight the problems associated with long hours such as stress and the negative impact on family life; and
- c) press government ministers (not least in their capacity as employers), MPs and other employers to develop policies that lead to a genuine reduction in working time.

**Mover:** Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians

**Seconders:** Association for College Management

**Supporter:** FDA

and would seriously test the expensive annuity market in the UK.

Although efforts continue to save the scheme, if the pension scheme is wound up, 20,000 deferred pensioners could face losses of up to 70% of their pensions and 20,000 existing pensioners will not get inflation-linked rises.

Congress recognised that whilst American workers in the same company are protected by an insurance scheme, workers in the UK, until April 05, are not. Congress supports the joint unions in asking the Government to investigate and if necessary intervene to bring about a successful resolution to this issue. Joint unions also believe that the inadequate insolvency law should be made stronger to protect workers and pensions. If after all avenues have been exhausted and the scheme proceeds to wind up, the Government should give assurances that the financial assistance scheme (FAS), or Pensions Protection Fund (PPF), would include the Turner and Newall scheme members. Without this our members could face financial ruin in retirement through no fault of their own and despite years of contributions. If this is allowed to happen confidence in the Government and in pensions will be severely hit.

**Mover:** Amicus

**Seconders:** Transport and General Workers' Union

**Supporter:** GMB

#### **Emergency1 Federal Mogul/Turner and Newall**

Following a meeting between the joint unions and Turner and Newall management on 2 September 2004 at which the company made clear that no more money was available to fund the pension scheme, Congress is alarmed at the situation facing 40,000 Turner and Newall pensioners. The situation arises from the insolvency of US parent company Federal Mogul. The company chose to take 15 of the last 18 years as contribution holidays, with Federal Mogul responsible for 3 of the last 5 years. They were allowed to do this because inadequate UK law lets them and MFR regulation was too weak. With a shortfall of £300m on a going-forward basis and a deficit estimated at £875 million if the scheme was to wind up, failure to save the pension scheme would result in the single largest ever wind-up of an under-funded scheme in the UK

# Part 2

## Motion remitted

### **48 Mileage allowances**

The spiralling cost of petrol is having a financial impact on district nurses. Mileage allowances have not changed to reflect increasing petrol prices, so community nurses are having to bear the brunt of these extra costs to carry out their everyday duties. CDNA members are therefore subsidising the NHS while delivering their community nursing services. The situation across the UK is variable and compares unfavourably with arrangements for other domiciliary workers.

Congress asks the General Council and affiliates to join the CDNA in urging the Government to recognise and address the financial impact this is having on all nurses working in the community.

**Community and District Nursing Association**

# Part 3

## Motion lost

### Composite 17 Europe

Congress welcomes proposals for a referendum on the proposed constitution for the European Union. Congress therefore welcomes also that at long last genuine and constructive debate can now take place in Britain regarding the proposed constitution for the European Union.

In this respect Congress notes there are genuine concerns amongst affiliates that the proposed constitution for the European Union may undermine the democratic rights of EU states to determine their own futures.

Specifically there are legitimate fears that the ratification of the proposals as currently drafted may:

- i) centralise power to Brussels and strengthen unaccountable EU institutions at the expense of national, elected parliaments;
- ii) transfer control of economic and transport policies to Brussels, undermining the ability of any UK government to take actions such as bringing the Tube and the mainline railway back into public ownership or preventing the tendering of essential lifeline ferry services such as Calmac;
- iii) entrench neo-liberal policies of privatisation and transfer control of the public sector to the EU, threatening the existence of a National Health Service in the UK that is free at the point of use;
- iv) represent a threat to UK rights to trial by jury and introduce an EU police force which would be immune from prosecution; and
- v) introduce a single EU foreign and security policy and establish an EU army.

Congress therefore believes it would be inappropriate at the present time to take a formal position on the proposed European Constitution. Instead Congress requests that the General Council investigate the impact of the proposed Constitution and campaign to ensure that it does not undermine the national democratic rights of member states.

**Mover:** National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers

**Second:** National Union of Mineworkers

*The following amendment was WITHDRAWN*

Throughout, replace 'constitution' with 'Constitutional Treaty'

Add at the end of paragraph 1:

...and looks forward to having a fair, in-depth and balanced debate on the impact on UK workers and unions, which will provide the opportunity for unions to campaign for the European Social Model as a necessary counterweight to the internal market and the business model of labour market flexibility, inequality and deregulation. Congress recalls that most advances since 1979 in extending workers' entitlements and promoting equality stemmed from EU decisions, and deplores the campaign of press lies to undermine support for EU cooperation.

Paragraph 2, line 1: delete 'genuine'. Line 3: replace 'may undermine' with 'is portrayed as undermining'.

Paragraph 2, line 5: insert after 'futures':

...and that these worries could be exploited by the Euro-sceptic media as a cover for their real agenda, which is to replace the European Social Model with the American Business Model of labour market flexibility, inequality and deregulation.

Paragraph 3, line 1: replace 'Specifically there are legitimate' with 'Congress urges the General Council to investigate and report back on whether there is any truth behind'.

Paragraph 3, delete sub-point (iv) and renumber (v) as (iv).

Paragraph 4, sentence 1: delete 'therefore' and 'at the present time' and add at the end of the sentence 'until unions and the General Council have had the opportunity to consider it in depth'.

Paragraph 4, sentence 2: replace 'does not undermine the national democratic rights of member states' with

...strengthens the EU as a potent force for making market forces serve working people, protects the European Social Model and extends the rights of working people and citizens to decent work, equality and peace.

**Graphical, Paper and Media Union**

**National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers**

**Community**

**Accord**

**BACM-TEAM**

# Part 4

## General Council Statement

*Congress adopted the following statement:*

### **General Council Statement on Europe**

Congress welcomes proposals for a referendum on the proposed constitutional treaty for the European Union. At long last, a genuine and constructive debate can take place in Britain on the issue.

However, it would be inappropriate to take a formal position for or against the constitutional treaty until unions and the General Council have had the opportunity to consider it in depth and assess its impact on key issues such as the rights of working people to decent work, the national democratic rights of member states, public services and equality.



## **Section 2**

### **Verbatim report of congress proceedings**

The following pages give a full verbatim report of the proceedings of the 136<sup>th</sup> annual Trades Union Congress, which met in Brighton from Monday 13 September to Thursday 16 September with Roger Lyons presiding.

Congress decisions are marked with a \*

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

*(Congress assembled at 10.00 a.m.)*

**The President (Roger Lyons):** Delegates, I call Congress to order. The programme of music this week has been put together by the Music For Youth Ensemble. Many thanks to those who have been playing for us this morning. *(Applause)*

Congress, I have great pleasure opening this, the TUC's 136<sup>th</sup> Congress. I warmly welcome all delegates and visitors here to Brighton.

**Appointment of Scrutineers and Tellers**

**The President:** The first formal item of business is to ask Congress to approve the Tellers and Scrutineers as set out on page 8 of the General Purposes Committee Report booklet. Is that agreed? *(Agreed)*

May I, as ever, advise and instruct all delegates to turn off mobile phones. You should also find on your seats details of the emergency procedures. Please familiarise yourselves with these. If there is an emergency I will give further instructions. If any delegates require first aid, the first aid station is situated behind the food servery in the East Bar, the doors of which are to my left, to your right.

**Welcome to Sororal and Fraternal Delegates**

**The President:** Delegates, I now come to the introduction of sororal and fraternal delegates and visitors who have so far arrived at Congress who are seated behind me. As you would expect, for the British section of a global internationalist trade union movement, we have a number of trade unionists from outside the country here this week, some of whom will be addressing Congress, others taking part in fringe events and some here to network, to visit old friends in the British trade union movement and to make new ones. Our international speakers this year come from Latin America and the Middle East as well as our traditional guests from the United States' trade union centre, the AFL-CIO, Harold Schaitberger of the International Association of Firefighters, who is with us today. We also have the General Secretary of the Cuban Federation of Workers, Pedro Ross. The President of the Oil Workers of Colombia, Hernando Hernandez, is on his way. I will introduce those who are not yet here when they arrive. We also have coming from the Middle East, Amir Peretz from the Histadrut, Israel, and Shaher Sae'd from the Palestinian General Federation of Trade Unions. I will say more about them later. I will also be introducing comrade Vavi Zwelinzima, the leader of COSATU in South Africa, when he arrives tomorrow. Other international guests on the platform are Annie Watson, Director of the Commonwealth Trade Union Council. Unfortunately, Annie is here for the last time as Director of the CTUC because the organisation is being incorporated into within the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the work performed by the CTUC will be carried forward within the ICTFU.

We will also be receiving Wolfgang Lutterbach from the DGB Germany and my old Amicus colleague, Brendan Mackin, who is now President of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions who will be joining us together with David Begg, the General Secretary and Peter Bunting.

From the American trade union centre, the AFL-CIO's Europe office, we have Penny Schantz and Jerry Zellhoeffer.

We will be having some of our familiar friends here. Bill Brett is direct of the ILO office in London. He will be here shortly. John Monks, the General Secretary of the European TUC, a well-known fixture in this Congress, he has been here, he was seen by many delegates last night has now had to return to Brussels on urgent business and we will report further as necessary.

Roy Jones is here to represent the Trade Union Advisory Committee to the OECD.

There will be a number of other representatives of Global Union Federations, individual union representatives and other foreign visitors here today. You are all most welcome, and I hope that delegates will take the opportunity to meet with the foreign visitors and discuss the issues which bring us altogether as a global union family.

This year's sororal delegate from the Trade Union Councils' Conference is Dorothy Heath. Welcome Dorothy. I am very pleased to welcome someone very familiar to this Congress, the sororal delegate from the Labour Party, Mary Turner, who will address us on Wednesday morning. We are expecting other guests during the week and I will introduce them when they arrive.

**Obituary**

**The President:** In leading in on Chapter 13 of the General Council's Report, said: Congress, it is traditional for us at the beginning of our annual Congress to remember all those colleagues who have died since we last met. In our Report, we, unfortunately, have to list Jack Boddy MBE, former General Secretary of the National Union of Agricultural and Allied Workers; Dan Duffy, former lay chair of the T&G Executive; Bryn Griffiths, former President of the GPMU; Lord Greene of Harrow Weald, former General Secretary of the NUR and former President of Congress; Lord Murray of Epping Forest, former General Secretary of the TUC; Eamonn O'Kane, General Secretary of the NASUWT; Albert Powell, former President of the Society of Graphical & Allied Trades; Lord Scanlon, former President of the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers and, since the General Council Report was printed, the death has also occurred of Max Pinto, a member of the TUC staff at Congress House.

In remembering those who I have named, I ask you also to remember all of those other trade union colleagues who died during the past year who served the trade union movement in their own workplaces and in their own ways. In addition, I ask you, colleagues, to remember the tragic deaths of so many people in the very recent terrible events in Beslan, Russia. I also ask you to remember all of those who died in conflicts in different parts of the world over the past year. Colleagues, let us recommit ourselves to the cause of world peace and join me in standing for a minute's silence to remember them. *(Congress stood in silent tribute)*

**The Vice-President (Tony Dubbins):** Congress, I now call upon the President to address Congress.

## President's Address

**The President:** Sisters and brothers, I have great pleasure in welcoming you to the 136<sup>th</sup> annual Trades Union Congress, representing, as it does, six-and-a-half million working people and their families. In particular, a warm welcome to our new affiliates, Skipton Building Society Staff Association and Derbyshire Group Staff Union, who are with us today, and a welcome back to the United Road Transport Union, who are also with us today.

This, our Congress, spans the public and private sectors, almost all industries and services, and is proof that trade unionism can flourish across the board, both in relatively well organised areas, as well as those with major potential and those in the greatest need of union strength and support.

Trade unionism is all about improving the lives of working people and their families – that means campaigning for better rights and higher standards – my theme for this Congress, as TUC President. Our mission is to campaign for our aims and values, assist affiliates to achieve their goals and maximise their effectiveness, and promote trade union solidarity – at home and abroad. Our members and their families deserve nothing less from us. This Congress enables us to raise the profile of the movement's campaigning on rights and standards. It enables us to reflect on how we have tackled the problems and secured advances over the past year, and to prepare for the year ahead. 2005 will indeed be a crucial year for us all, with an election likely within 12 months, and a crucial year for unions to organise and to recruit, to maximise our influence in the world of work and across society as a realistic and credible agency for change.

After the last Congress we drew up a TUC submission to the Labour Party as part of the 'Big Conversation'. It was entitled *The Place of Work in a Fairer Society*. We recognise the big advances achieved since 1997. A stable economy, low inflation, high levels of employment. Indeed, only last week the claimant count was down for the 14<sup>th</sup> month in succession, to 835,000, the lowest since 1975, a jobless rate of 2.7 per cent, something we could only dream of during those 18 Thatcher years. We recognise the improved minimum wage, the union recognition rights, improved individual rights at work, the huge investment in public services, especially the NHS and education, commitments to science and innovation, and much, much more.

But, colleagues, there is unfinished business, for serious problems remain. In our meetings with the Prime Minister, the Chancellor and other Ministers, we have urged a progressive blueprint for the third term, one that takes more account of and addresses the outstanding needs of working people and their families. Discussions took place leading up to the Labour's National Policy Forum in July, and we welcome the pledges made at the Forum as part of the manifesto process. On public services, with progress on the two-tier workforce problem, on fairness at work, on pensions, on manufacturing and associated procurement, and many other key issues. On 28 July the General Council recognised the progress that had been made, and also the absolute need for full delivery of the Warwick pledges.

To use a footballing analogy – it's a line up that promises much, but it's the results in the coming season that really count.

On rights and standards, working people deserve the best, and certainly need to match the best in Europe. When it comes to workplace rights, the UK must be in the Champions League.

Congress, in essence, we need to develop a new agenda for the workplace, one that develops from high employment to high quality employment with more rights and higher standards. With those rights and standards come realistic responsibilities – to help achieve high levels of quality service delivery, high levels of productivity and continuing advances in skills and innovation.

But for this to be achieved requires the fullest involvement of the workforce, and the first stage of implementation of the Information and Consultation Directive in March next year provides a golden opportunity for advance through dialogue and partnership. We can certainly do without lectures from Digby Jones on the relevance of trade unions. Digby, you're completely out of touch if you believe workers are so well off they don't need unions. Try telling that to the millions working over 60 hours a week, the longest hours in Europe; try telling that to the working families unable to afford decent childcare; try telling that too agency and contract workers denied the most basic employment rights; try telling that to the workers suffering from bullying, from stress, from gender discrimination and unequal pay and from racial discrimination. Digby, try telling that to the workers whose jobs are threatened with ill-thought out and needless outsourcing.

Try telling that to the families of those who died at the hands of the gangmasters, and those who face health and safety risks to their life and limb every day of their working lives. Digby, it's not us, in the unions, who are out of touch with the aspirations of the British people, or stuck in a time-warp. The reality is that too many employers are behind the times, out of touch and putting exploitation of the flexible under-regulated labour market before investment in skills and capital projects. We want to complete internationally on quality, innovation and high standards – not low pay, job insecurity, pitiful re-investment in training and equipment, and non-union exploitation.

Digby Jones and the CBI know full well that the unions have campaigned constructively on the skills strategy to combat skills shortages, on measure to aid our manufacturing sectors, which are still haemorrhaging jobs, on public services, to ensure quality, to ensure quality service delivery, re-stating the public services ethos, and on inequalities, which lead in so many parts of the economy to discrimination, appalling mistreatment and economic inactivity.

Further, Digby, if life is so good for Britain's workers, whatever is happening to their pensions? Unions are playing a crucial role in defending pensions, which are under attack almost everywhere except, of course, the boardroom where promoting inequality is a major pastime.

The TUC held a major rally on 19 June to raise awareness of all the pensions issues, and we are campaigning to convince Government and employers that the decent employers who make adequate pensions provision for all employees should not be undercut by those who do not. Once again, it's an issue of rights and standards. On the 19<sup>th</sup> June at the rally, the TUC featured a 14 foot inflatable pig, which

stars on the cover of the General Council Report. Unfortunately this massive 14 foot pig had a tendency to take off, and with great difficulty had to be firmly tethered – certainly proof that pigs will fly before employers get to grips with the pensions crisis.

We certainly need more partnership on pensions, and a good model is the union learning rep scheme involving thousand and thousands of new workplace reps. A majority of new learning reps are female and many are from ethnic minorities. This scheme certainly shows what can be done when working people are given statutory rights to prioritise learning. In the same way as we have done for years on health and safety issues, another vital union task in Britain's workplaces. We have also seen progress achieved through the Union Learning Fund and the Partnership Fund, with discussions currently underway for the implementation of a Union Modernisation Fund and a new Union Learning Academy.

Thus we develop a positive agenda with Government, and whilst there are frustrations and some occasional fall-outs, I urge Congress never to take the Labour Government for granted.

I am just back from a visit to the United States, where I met our trade union colleagues who are in the fight of their lives to try and elect John Kerry. Since Bush replaced Clinton the US trade union leadership representing 13 million members has been denied even a meeting with the President. And labour protections are being progressively destroyed, along with over one million jobs since Bush took office. It's make or break for them and the working people they represent. The unions are desperate for a Democratic victory, even if Kerry's policies are not considered perfect on all fronts.

American colleagues asked me what the British Labour Government had done for British workers. I was able to produce copies of the brochure issued by Amicus and other affiliated unions entitled *300 gains from our Labour Government*. And colleagues the list is growing. It is certainly worth defending. I urge Congress and especially the activists across the movement never to take the Labour Government for granted. There will need to be a united drive for a third Labour term if we are to prevent the return of the only realistic alternative, another Thatcherite regime. The kind that applied a scorched earth policy to our industries and slashed public services, destroying workplace rights and standards, creating fear, insecurity and mass unemployment for millions.

However, to strengthen our resources and assert our representativity, we need to build on the employment rights already won, to organise and recruit. Decent rights and standards can only be achieved with a strong membership base. Never has there been more need for strong unions, and we need to build on our 6.5 million affiliated membership which, although the largest voluntary organisation in the country, must be enlarged further through our efforts. This is our task. No one will do it for us.

We must get better at trumpeting our many successes, individual and collective, alleviating unfairness, winning compensation for injury, fighting discrimination and insecurity, every day of the week, up and down the land. The media do not always help, exaggerating negative issues and always the breakdowns in negotiations, whilst rarely covering, and certainly not in the same headlines, the agreements,

such as recently at British Airways, or in the firefighters dispute, where the TUC gave considerable assistance.

Earlier this year the General Council undertook a Strategic Review aimed at renewal of the movement, and in particular priority for organising and campaigning. Our work must be based on collaboration rather than competition, and apart from organising the new public sector jobs being created, we must develop and implement a real strategy for the private sector, a task currently being undertaken as a major priority initiative by the General Council's Organising and Representation Task Force.

For now we have so much more labour mobility. We have to replace the public and private sector jobs that go, through recruitment amongst the millions currently unorganised. We must reach out to all those millions who claim they would join a union if there were one for them. Well, yes, there is. There is a union for everyone in the world of work. Don't believe Digby Jones. We are your potential colleagues and we want to secure that potential. Together we can shape the future.

This emphasis on recruitment is not limited to our shores – it is top of the agenda of unions throughout the world. In Europe we are taking the initiative, and in co-operation with the European TUC we have called a major Europe-wide union organisation conference for next year. In this era of globalisation, we need to give even greater commitment to international solidarity.

At home we have been campaigning to prevent the BNP from spreading its poison, and I applaud the work of all groups who fight the bigotry and hatred of the BNP, including Regional TUCs, trades councils, local unions and Unite Against Fascism. We salute your campaigning work.

Further, Congress, congratulations to the police for deciding to ban BNP members from police forces throughout the country. The far right did not make the breakthrough they wanted on 10<sup>th</sup> June, as many had feared, but they did pick up some council seats and in aggregate won nearly one millions votes. So we must remain alert and continue the campaigning.

Around the world, the TUC continues its constructive work with those whose rights and standards are denied or are under attack. I have been privileged to visit South Africa during my year in office – to share the joy of ten years of freedom whilst also sharing pain at the gigantic problems being faced, such as the HIV-AIDS epidemic. We continue to work with the South African unions with assistance wherever we can, and the General Secretary of COSATU will be addressing Congress later in the week.

I also led a peace mission to meet the trade union centres of Israel and Palestine, conveying a TUC offer to provide training and assistance to both movements in that troubled region. A full report of our visit is in the General Council Report on pages 95 and 96. I am very pleased to be able to announce that the leaders of both trade union centres are on their way to Congress and will be addressing us tomorrow.

On Iraq, Congress will know that we have argued that armed conflict should only take place with the full backing of the UN. But once soldiers were committed

we were constrained in our comments, anxious not to expose our troops, men and women, to greater dangers than they already faced. At the same time, the TUC has worked with the International Confederation of Free trade Unions and the Confederation of Arab Trade Unions to cooperate with and assist the democratic, representative trade unions of Iraq, including the Iraqi Federation of Trade Unions. We are also encouraging Global Union federations to provide support at sector level, and this is now underway to the benefit of Iraqi working people. A special fund 'TUC for Iraq' is to be launched at this Congress, to increase the resources we can make available for the rebuilding of democratic trade unions in Iraq.

I also led a human rights delegation to Colombia, the most dangerous place on earth to be a trade unionist, with killings, disappearances, torture and dismissals out of control. Whilst there, we lobbied for the release of trade unionists imprisoned by the regime, and subsequent to our visit at least 12 were freed, including the leader of the oil workers union Hernando Hernandez. I am very proud and privileged to say that Hernando will be coming to our Congress. Unfortunately, after our visit, the leader of the Agricultural Workers Union, Luz Perly, whom we met, has since been imprisoned, and recently several other union leaders were brutally murdered by the army. The TUC has asked the Foreign Office to intervene, and I can report we are securing co-operation from the Ministers on our concerns.

In addition a joint TUC/Foreign Office Liaison Committee meets regularly, enabling us to review rights and standards for fellow trade unionists in many lands. At the same time we have warmly welcomed the Department for International Development (DfID) initiative in publishing 'Labour Standards and Poverty Reduction' linking core labour standards with trade and aid, as well as providing much-needed support for bilateral union contacts and exchanges and projects, including Colombia.

I have a special message from the trade unionists I met inside the main gaol in Bogotá, the capital of Colombia. They are especially grateful for the solidarity, political and material, that they receive from members of British trade unions. Thousands of miles away they might be, but, colleagues, your aid and support is sustaining them whilst they are in indefinite detention. Never underestimate the power of union solidarity, even in the face of the most severe repression. I promised to relay this message to Congress, and I ask affiliates to use it in building support for international solidarity, especially at a time when union resources are stretched. If the Colombian union activists are daily risking life and limb to maintain trade unionism, continued solidarity is the very least they deserve from us.

Congress, all my life as a trade unionist I have done my best to build up trade unionism at home and abroad. I have represented workers in the public and private sectors, in England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and the Republic. It has been my privilege to work with a wonderful set of members over the years, in ASSET, when it had just 36,000 members, on into ASTMS, and then MSF, which put me onto the General Council in 1989. During my 15 years on the General Council I've had excellent support from the officers and staff at the TUC, at national and regional levels. In this year as President, I want particularly to thank Brendan, Frances, Kay and the team for all their work and wise counsel. They serve the movement well.

After 38 years as an official, I am standing down, and I want to thank Amicus for their generous support during my presidential year. I wish my union, plus new colleagues from Unifi and GPMU, and all the members, well for the future.

However, as many of you know all too well, this job just cannot be done without family support and encouragement. I wish to place on record my immense thanks and appreciation to my wife, Kitty, and our four children, for their understanding and love, and for being supportive at all times. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Congress, a day of perfection, with all troubles for working people and wider society resolved is highly unlikely even if we pass a composite motion saying so! So our responsibilities and tasks will continue – to help Britain to achieve its full potential – to secure decent rights and standards for working people at home and abroad. We need to continue building the movement, its membership and strength. So many of the rights already won, such as the minimum wage, stem from unions campaigning. Strong representative unions mean a real, effective voice for working people and their families in the world of work and their communities. That, Congress, is why we are here. That, Congress, is why we will always be here, and that is why we work to make this world a much better place. Colleagues, thank you and have a good Congress. *(Applause)*

#### Vote of Thanks

**The Vice-President:** Thank you, Roger, for that thought-provoking and far-sighted address. I now call on Ed Sweeney, the General Secretary of Unifi, to move the vote of thanks to the President.

**Ed Sweeney (Unifi):** Congress, it is my duty to move a vote of thanks to our President, Roger Lyons. As many of you will know, Roger has had a long and distinguished career in the trade union and labour movement. Throughout that time many have got to know him well and to many he is a clear and trusted ally. But Roger tells me his many talents and qualities constantly. His treatment and sensitivity of others, he tells me, is legendary. This was summed-up perfectly in his approach to myself to give this vote of thanks. It was late on Friday afternoon. Roger called myself and, after the usual pleasantries were exchanged – you know what I mean, Roger telling me that he had just got back from the United States, Roger telling me how much he had enjoyed it, Roger telling me how much he had been out organising for the Democrat campaign to get John Kerry elected but left before it got any worse – asked if I would do the vote of thanks. I, naturally, said yes, I would be delighted and privileged to do it, but before I could develop an overly important sense of my own self-importance, Roger, in his own sensitive way, said, "Oh, by the way, I thought I would let you know, you weren't my first choice". Sensitive to the last.

Roger also told me that he would send me a few biographical notes about himself and his career in an abridged form, you understand, so when the first crate arrived from DHL, I spent the day reading it. It became clear to me, if not to all of you, that Roger is, of course, a mixture of the traits and characteristics of Mother Teresa of Calcutta, Nelson Mandela and Mahatma Ghandi, all dressed up in an Arsenal shirt.

Roger has been a stalwart and defender of the trade union and labour movement all his life. He

carries this with pride, and so he should. Roger started his trade union activity at the tender age of 24 in 1966. He joined ASSET which later became ASTMS. He was based in Liverpool with responsibilities for the north-west of England and north Wales. He had an excellent reputation for labour politics from his university days, so a move into trade unionism seemed a natural stepping-stone. ASTMS and TASS merged in the late 1980s to form MSF and Roger was elected General Secretary of MSF for the first time in 1992. He was re-elected in 1997 and helped steer MSF through some difficult times. In the dark days of the Conservative Government, Roger Lyons could always be relied upon to defend the interests of trade unions, trade unionists, the Labour Party, working people and their families.

As General Secretary of MSF, he was part of the team which steered through the eventual merger of MSF and the AEEU to form Amicus. He is rightly proud of his achievements, whether that was as a full-time officer or as an elected General Secretary. His record in trade unionism and Labour Party activity is as long as it is impressive, but Roger is Roger. No one that I have ever met is neutral about him. He always elicits a response. Everyone has an opinion about him. As someone said to me quite recently, Roger Lyons has been attacked by all shades of opinion, both the left and the right and I suppose they cannot all be wrong. But Roger stands his ground. He has suffered some vitriolic attacks over time. Lesser men and women would have folded, but he did not. He stuck with it, with a stoicism which I found, personally, remarkable. I believe that has been one of his greatest strengths. I know that Kitty, his wife, and the family have stood shoulder to shoulder with him in the face of these attacks.

When it comes to supporting this Labour Government, Roger has always been one of the first in line. Whether you disagreed or agreed with his view, you could never doubt his sincerity or support of this Labour Government and, more recently, for the return of an historic third term Labour Government, something I know we all want to see. Roger is a Labour stalwart, a Labour loyalist. Be in no doubt, comrades, Roger Lyons is proud to carry the description of a Labour loyalist.

I know that Roger has enjoyed and cherished his year as TUC President. He has chaired meetings in his own incomparable fashion with good grace and good humour. Whenever he has been faced with difficult procedural questions asked by some awkward sod on the General Council, he has used all of his skill, training, vast experience and just ignored the point and dealt with the person. Roger, on a personal note, thank you for all the work and support you have given to all of us during your year as President. I know I speak for us all when I wish you well for the future. I know you will have a great Congress week, Roger.

Finally, let me thank you personally for making me your first choice to make this vote of thanks.

**The Vice-President:** Congress, I now invite Lucy Kelly to second the vote of thanks to our President.

**Lucy Kelly (Amicus):** I do not know what remains to be said. I think we should have exchanged speeches very early on. However, it is a great honour for me to second the vote of thanks to Roger, my erstwhile general secretary, and, more importantly, someone who I am proud to call my friend.

What is there left to say about Roger? For me and many others, Roger has a split personality. No, I do not mean he is a schizophrenic, although you could check that out with the Amicus psychology members, but his life and priorities are evenly shared between his wonderful family, who I am privileged to know, the labour movement and, of course, his beloved Arsenal.

Let me begin by painting a picture for you. The year was 1974, the place was Jamestown Road, Camden, and the venue was the ASTMS head office. The significance? It was the first time I met Roger. I was at the beginning of my working life and the man sitting before you was the then national officer, a father of one, with, what might be hard to believe, a full head of hair. By 1992 he had become my follically-challenged general secretary and a father of four, so at least we know he had gone home between electioneering for high office at least three times in two decades! *(Laughter)*

God willing, by the end of the year, he will be a grandfather for the first time.

As we all know, Roger has never been camera-shy. In fact, one wag once said that Roger was the only man he knew who sped around the M25 with his head out of the window in the hope he would be caught on the speeding camera, which is obviously better than no camera at all!

However, there is more to the Roger that I know than the smell of the grease paint and the roar of the press corps. Roger comes from a proud socialist heritage. His father was one of the leaders of the campaign which delivered the first ever Labour Council in Hove, West Sussex. That was an incredible feat in its day, believe me!

Roger decided very early on that socialist politics and trade unionism were going to be the mainstay of his adult life. After completing his education at University College, London, Roger went on to become President of the Students' Union in 1965; something he remains proud of today.

He had a trial for Arsenal. We all know the result of that. However, as a second and very important career, he then became a trainee officer at ASSET nearly 40 years ago. His first general secretary was Clive Jenkins, who influenced so many of us here today. Roger learned from the best and has also tried to emulate the core ASTMS values.

Since ASSET, Roger has taken our union through three highly significant mergers, from ASSET to ASTMS, then to MSF and last year to Amicus, but his core beliefs in gender equality and anti-racism have stayed with him throughout.

There are, of course, hundreds of stories I could tell about this man, many of which cannot be repeated in front of such an innocent audience; so I will tell one of my favourite clean ones. I have worked with Roger on a raft of campaigns from anti-bullying in the early 1990s to fairness at work in the 'noughties'. But, by far, my fondest memory of Roger relates to the campaign we ran on parental leave.

As we all know, this was a big issue for the movement and one that MSF ended up taking as far as Downing Street. But, when we did, Roger and I were

not alone. We decided to borrow the children of many of our MSF colleagues and take them with us. I have never seen Roger so in his element as he led a group of under-5s along Downing Street with him asking the question of them: "What do we want?" and they lisping in response at the top of their voices: "Parental leave" as if they knew what we were talking about, and him again: "And when do we want it?" "Now" they cried with one voice.

For Roger, as for all of us, trade unionism cannot be separated from politics. There is not an election that Roger has not campaigned for the Labour Party and not a door, particularly in Finchley, that he has not leafleted, particularly where his wife, Kitty, has been a councillor for these past 16 years.

I have had the pleasure of working for a tremendous ambassador for our movement, one who continued Jenkins' original mantra to unionise those groups of skilled and professional workers who never thought that collectivism was for them and has helped create Britain's largest private sector union.

I will finish in the vein that I started. I have known Roger all my working life and I was proud to call him my general secretary, but I am more honoured to call him, Kitty and the family, my friends. I hope you join me in wishing them all well for their retirement.

**The Vice-President:** Thank you for that, Lucy, and I am sure, Roger, I am speaking on behalf of the whole of Congress in wishing you a very successful week in the Chair.

#### **Report of the General Purposes Committee**

**The President:** I call Gerry Veart, the Chair of the General Purposes Committee.

**Gerry Veart** (*General Purposes Committee*): I would like to report progress on the final agenda. Composite Motions 1 to 19, as agreed by the General Purposes Committee, are set out in the GPC report and composite booklet that you have all received. Composite Motion No. 20, which has been placed on your seats, was only agreed after the booklet had gone to the printers.

In turning to the printed GPC report, you will see that where the movers on motions have agreed to accept amendments to their motions. On behalf of the GPC, I would like to thank all those unions who have co-operated in reaching agreements on composite motions and amendments.

I can also report that the GPC has approved an emergency motion in the name of Amicus, seconded by the T&G and supported by the GMB on Federal Mogul/Turner and Newall pension scheme. Copies of the motion will be distributed on delegates' seats at the appropriate time and we hope that the motion will be taken in the pensions debate tomorrow morning.

In order to ensure that we complete our business expeditiously, please would you come to the rostrum quickly if you are scheduled to speak. Would delegates who know they will be called to speak please move to the front and be ready to come to the rostrum? Please also respect the time limits on speaking time. Unless reduced, these are five minutes for moving a motion

and three minutes for seconding and supporting a motion.

Finally, whilst we are aiming to encourage maximum participation this week, I would urge that you do not impede the progress of Congress and draw unwelcome attention to yourself by failing to switch off your mobile phone. That completes my report.

**The President:** Congress, I now call on you to formally receive the GPC report. Can we agree? (*Agreed*) Thank you.

#### **Fairness at Work**

**Tony Woodley** (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) moved Composite Motion 1

He said: It is incredible that after seven years of a Labour Government we are still demanding basic rights for workers which are enjoyed by everyone elsewhere right across Europe. It is also incredible that a Labour Foreign Secretary should rush home to a CBI conference to reassure the bosses that Thatcher's laws are not for changing. It is incredible.

Our demands are basic demands for decency and dignity for British working men and women, demands which are not taking us back to the 1970s, as some would have us believe. However, it cannot be right that the law allows employers to fly in scabs to undermine legitimate disputes while we, as trade unions, cannot even offer solidarity support to our own members. It cannot be right. That is why we are concerned with the failure of the Government to repeal all of the anti-trade union laws and the failure to bring Labour law into line with ILO conventions.

I do not have selective amnesia. We have made good progress on many employment issues. Let us not forget that it is 20 years since the Tories victimised for political reasons that great trade union, the NUM. The Tories victimised and decimated the mining communities and told us that the trade unions were the enemies within. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to those men and women who fought to save their pits and their communities. I pay tribute.

The half justice today is not enough. You cannot be satisfied where we have seen workers sacked by text messages, where our pensions are being stolen from us, making employees work long hours for low pay and unequal pay for millions of women still in our country today. I am proud that many of our members are fighting back; at British Airways, as the President has said, at First Bus in Sheffield, in public services with the unions fighting back there and, indeed, in many other places. But whenever you do fight back on the basic issues, we still find the law is against us.

The manifesto commitments agreed at the policy forum are really important steps forward and they have to be honoured; holidays for millions who would not have otherwise had the opportunity; the end to two-tier work forces; and better deals on pensions. All are important. We will stick to our agreements that were made and we expect ministers also to do exactly the same. We are not really bothered who writes the manifesto as long as it does not rewrite the promises that are so crucially important to our movement.

Be clear everyone. Irrespective of Warwick, we need the right to take solidarity action. We do need the right to support each other in struggle and we do need employment rights for everybody in our country from day one, and I do mean from day one.

We need the right to union recognition for those millions of people, many of whom are low, unequally and unfairly paid, being predominantly women in those smaller workplaces. We need the right to take lawful strike action without the fear of getting the sack. We need to ensure that our members' pensions are not at the back of the queue for cash when those companies go bankrupt. These are basic human rights that everyone else in Europe has. We have to continue to campaign until British workers have those same entitlements and protections.

I have heard people say that unions are accountable for what they do, and they are, but what about the reckless bosses who are not accountable at the moment when they murder our members, because that is what it is? We have seen corporate killing legislation promised now in two manifestos. I see our comrade, the Employment Minister, Gerry Sutcliffe, sitting in the gallery, and I say to him: Gerry, we need those commitments honoured. We need laws that ensure that directors are responsible for their actions, or indeed lack of them, and which lead to them being, if necessary, jailed to stop these sorts of preventable and unnecessary deaths happening to working men and women in our country.

It is only when the first boss sees the inside of a jail that we will stop the preventable and unnecessary deaths of working men and women in our country.

Much progress has been made, but on the big issues of the day, there is more to be done, as a united TUC we will not only help to win a third term for Labour, but we demand that they protect and support the people who put them into power, the working people of Britain, and not the CBI. Support the composite.

**Tony Dubbins** (*Graphical Media and Paper Union*) seconding the composite motion said: This Congress in 2004 is different from many of those we have held in previous years. We really are at a watershed. At the Labour Party National Policy Forum a few weeks ago, the affiliated unions agreed on a workplace agenda for the next parliament, and that agenda is completely in line with Congress policies. The issues included the elimination of a two-tier workforce in local government; UK support for the Agency and Temporary Workers' Directive; protection from dismissal from eight weeks to 12 weeks in disputes; bank holidays outside the four-week statutory holiday period; inclusion of the statutory right to bargain on pensions; and an increase in redundancy pay, to name just but a few.

On other issues, reviews have been agreed and the door is open to further progress. On a number of additional issues, although the door may not be wide open, it certainly is ajar for further discussions.

I am certainly not suggesting we have achieved all that we want or that this is the end of the road. It really is the opposite. It is the first step up the ladder. However, there really is only one possible way of climbing that ladder and that is by ensuring that in the general election we have a Labour Government

returned to office. We must not forget too quickly or easily the Tories' record or, indeed, what they would do to us and our members if they got back.

They will get rid of the recognition legislation; they will get rid of the legislation that ensures equal treatment for part-time workers; they will get rid of the protection we have against the two-tier workforce; and we will not be arguing about whether the period for dismissals in dispute should be eight or ten weeks, because any employer would be able to dismiss any worker, no matter how lawful that dispute is. Further, what will happen to the European Social Chapter from which we gained so much over the past few years?

That is just a few of the nasty anti-union policies they will be introducing. I am not pretending we will not consistently have to exert unrelenting pressure on a Labour Government, as Tony Woodley said, to make them deliver, but we cannot afford any splits, we cannot afford divisions and we have to work together in the interests of working people whom we represent.

If we can do that, maybe next year we will be at Congress with a new Labour Government, having taken some very important steps to achieving real fairness at work.

**Peter McLoughlin** (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*) supporting the composite motion said: Congress, I refer to the paragraphs on the second page which highlight sections 64 and 65 of TULR, which confer on members the right not to be unjustifiably disciplined. In effect, they obstruct internal disciplinary reaction against members who fail to act in accordance with union rules and objectives.

A basic right in a free and democratic society is the right to organise. Part of that right must be the right to draw up rules and a constitution free from state interference. Whilst these sections remain on the statute book, unions taking legitimate disciplinary action against members who break those rules are at risk of a complaint to an employment tribunal.

Recently, NASUWT had a barrister, a solicitor, the DGS and a legal officer tied up for days in preparing for an employment tribunal hearing into a complaint of unjustifiable discipline. It collapsed on day one.

The time, cost and effort in defending against such claims, which can be mischievous, diverts resources from the provision of services to members. Section 64 has also been used cynically, as we know, by racist and fascist organisations to undermine trade union equal opportunities policies and secure compensation to fund their vile activities.

No other membership organisations are hidebound in this way. Employer organisations do not have such barriers. There is no parallel interference in the internal affairs of political parties, but for trade unions, which are the most democratic of organisations, not have the same rights to run their own affairs as a golf club is a disgrace.

Section 7 of the Act gives members the option to complain to the Certification Officer. It enables disaffected persons to complain about nearly every aspect of a union's organisation. Recently, NASUWT was involved in four days of gruelling legal argument regarding accuracy of minutes, nomination procedures,



the relationship between the executive and the regions, even farcically whether the term "general secretary" in the rules is a generic term or has to be taken literally.

This residual Tory legislation is a direct interference in trade union democracy. After seven years, UK legislation is still inconsistent with our international obligations. It is still in breach of international labour standards; it is still not complying fully with the Human Rights Act and it is an insult to this movement.

We, therefore, call for an urgent review of the effect and impact on trade union organisations of these sections of the Act with a view to eventual repeal.

**Steve Kemp** (*National Union of Mineworkers*) supporting the composite motion said: Congress, I want to speak about fairness at work, the rights at work, the right to be members of a trade union and the right to organise to work in a safe workplace. Such a bedrock is the base which all of us here this week should believe in.

I agree with Roger and others that have come to this rostrum already this morning. This Government has gone some way to improving rights at work. The minimum wage has benefited some two million workers. Six million part-time employees became entitled to the same rights as full-time employees. Legal entitlement for British workers to paid holidays is, of course, welcomed. Other improvements have been implemented, but still we are faced with a large slice of Tory anti-trade union law and, to be honest with you, it is just not good enough.

Composite 1 asks the Labour Government to conform to UK obligations under the ILO and the European Social Charter. I find it astonishing that the Labour Party that opposed the introduction of Thatcher's employment legislation only states to us now that the vast bulk of it is here to stay.

The nonsense of re-balloting after eight weeks on strike, the refusal to accept a fundamental right for providing employment rights from day one for unfair dismissal and redundancy are simply terrible. In particular, one piece of legislation that has affected the NUM, and I know many colleagues and unions in this hall today who have been affected by it, is in not giving a right to reinstatement where recommended by an employment tribunal in cases of unfair dismissal.

The NUM and unions do not need lectures from government about rights at work. I will tell you a story of what is happening in the coalfields at the current time, especially in Selby. As a result of the pits that have already shut and the four pits going to be closed, 1500 men are or will be out of work. The lads at Selby who want to transfer to Kellingley have been asked to rip up the five-day working agreement, the eight-hour shift arrangement and accept so-called flexible working. Flexible working! It is unbelievable! It is like a stick of rock at Brighton! That is how flexible it is.

Miners have been told at the current time that if they wish to continue employment they have to work compulsory shifts, night shifts and 10-hour shifts at the weekend, with a minimum duration of, like I said, 10 or 12 hour shifts. When the employer can do that and

unions are seen to be helpless, then no wonder we call for trade union rights to be improved because, at the end of the day, those NUM members, some of whom have worked in the industry for 30 years, did not have a right. There is no choice whatsoever, so the employer can come in and give them those terms and conditions.

This movement needs to keep the campaign going to promote additional Labour values based on workers' rights, trade union freedoms, decent jobs and respect. We do that through our own trade union and the TUC. I can think of no better organisation than a united campaign to repeal all anti-trade union laws.

Lastly, I would like to thank all those unions that have supported the NUM, past and present, 20 years on from the dispute. Thanks a lot.

**Maria Exall** (*Communication Workers Union*) supporting the composite motion, said: I am speaking to point seven on the need for an automatic right to reinstatement for employees unfairly dismissed.

This right is important because of the facts. The facts are these. A minuscule 0.03 per cent of unfair dismissal cases in the UK achieved reinstatement. In the interests of fairness, something must be done. What is the point of employment tribunals and all the procedures if the option of getting your job back is not allowed?

The current situation is a licence for employers to pick on people, be they union reps or others, basically, anyone they do not like, knowing that there is no real redress. The right to reinstatement is important to us in the CWU because of our own experience with the Critchley workers sacked for fighting for union recognition, but, more recently, the case of Mick and Tom Docherty.

Tom and Mick were involved in a row after a football match that attracted national press attention. They were subject to no criminal charges as a consequence, yet Royal Mail sacked them anyway. Fellow postal workers in north London took industrial action to support them. The return to work was negotiated on the basis of how an employment tribunal would rule, but it was only after the threat of further industrial action that Tom was reinstated and Mick got a financial settlement.

Two things follow from this case. It took two years to resolve. How much simpler if management had just complied with the employment tribunal in the first place, and that is only fair, surely, for we, as trade unionists, are compelled to comply when we are deemed to be in breach of the law; so why not employers? Secondly, Tom and Mick got justice in the end because of the solidarity from their fellow workers, but most cases are not resolved in this way and the massive injustice continues.

The CWU wholeheartedly supports the Charter of Workers' Rights agreed at the 2001 Congress. If this is to be more than a wish-list, the next Labour Government must bring the UK into line with international law and give us our rights.

As trade unionists, we aim to create respect at work for our members, in fact, for all employees, but our movement itself has to live in a political system

that has no respect for our human rights; the legal right to strike, the right to take solidarity action and the right not to lose your job because of unfair treatment. All these human rights are denied.

How can we promote fairness at work when our rights are held in such contempt? Let us work to make respect at work real. Let us all stand up for the dignity of our movement.

**John McGhee** (*Fire Brigades' Union*): I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of members of the Fire Brigades' Union to thank you and the sisters and brothers you represent for the tremendous support you extended to us during our long and very bitter but, thankfully, now resolved pay dispute.

I would like also to thank Brendan and his staff for their assistance in helping to resolve that dispute. I am sure my own general secretary will have something more to say about that later on in the week.

The solidarity you showed with the fire fighters and emergency fire control staff illustrated the real meaning of the motto 'unity is strength', but we know that solidarity, always essential in winning improvements in pay and conditions, is very often not enough. Forces in governments have always had the law on their side and have used it to drive through their will against that of working people even amid strong and determined opposition.

In recent years in Britain, many of us have looked with some envy at our colleagues in Europe where workers individually and collectively enjoy better employment rights.

A great opportunity has just been missed by this government to right a wrong dating back to Thatcher's anti-union policies and its determined opposition to the inclusion of the Charter of Fundamental Social Rights in the draft European Constitution. That is deeply regrettable.

Despite some improvements since Labour came to power in 1997, UK employment law has short-changed working people in a number of important areas, including those covered by ILO conventions and the European Social Charter.

This Government's often luke-warm commitment to fairness at work was also shown very recently in our pay dispute, when this Labour Government introduced legislation giving itself powers to impose pay and conditions and seize control of the fire engines and fire stations crewed and staffed by our members. Despite our dispute having been resolved, these draconian powers remain on the statute books as a threat to free collective bargaining in the public sector and directly in contravention of the ILO conventions and the European Social Charter.

These powers should, in any country that claims to be democratic, be removed, and that a Labour Government should be resorting to such anti-union measures is frankly a disgrace. It will be next year and the years beyond that we will be coming to this rostrum and saying: "We demand the abolition of Labour's anti-trade union legislation and not just Thatcher's." It is an absolute disgrace.

Sisters and brothers, we must unite, fight for better employment rights and support this motion.

**Joe Marino** (*Bakers, Food and Allied Workers Union*) supporting the composite said: I am speaking, in particular, to that paragraph which talks about insolvency and administration laws and pensions.

I want to tell you a story, and it does not matter what industry is involved. My story will be familiar to everybody. When workers turn up at work at six o'clock in the morning and they are told not to start work or they are taken to the canteen and told: "You, you, you, away you go, your job has gone. You, you, you and you, we will look at later", what rights have we got in order to protect our people in that situation?

As I say to Digby Jones of the CBI, and, to the Government as well: That is the position in Britain today. That is the reality. That is a true story that we faced in Salford just a few weeks ago and one that I know many of you have faced up and down the country.

It is an absolute disgrace that workers are treated in this way. That is why we called for reform of these laws. We are not asking the Government, we are not pleading with the government. I think we have a right to demand of the Government that they protect working people in that situation.

Let me turn to the pension issue, because what really galls is the situation where certain chief executives and employers are paid millions of pounds in pension rights for failure and our people lose their pittance of pensions when they are thrown out of work in this way. If that is not something that is wrong with society today, then we do not know what is.

I think Bob Crow has it right when he says: "We are not in a situation where we plead on these issues. We have to be in a position to demand on those issues." If we are looking forward, as I am sure we all are, to the next Labour Government, these are the kind of issues that we need this Government to work on.

We have a right to say that we demand protection for our people from those who say they are our Government. Our union supports Composite One, and particular reference to these particular issues, and we hope Congress will support that.

**Chris Morley** (*National Union of Journalists*) supporting the composite motion said: I am a first time delegate.

There is so much to put right and so little commitment from those who can do something about it. We have our shopping list to make the workplace fairer and better. When things go wrong, there is one simple remedy which is already available and almost always given the two fingers by the employers.

I want to underline the points raised by the sister from the CWU. I am talking about the right to automatic reinstatement after unfair dismissal. Foreign colleagues express amazement when you tell them that an employment tribunal in this country when making a reinstatement order cannot legally enforce it. It is a

pity that the Prime Minister did not have his speech brought forward today so he could hear this debate.

I would like to look him in the eye and ask why a good trade unionist, an NUJ member, could be allowed to suffer this injustice? Eugenie Verney, pictured here (*holds up copy of magazine*) was a part-time sub-editor and NUJ branch chair at the uniquely union-hostile *Daily Mail*-owned newspaper, the *Aberdeen Evening Express*.

Not to put too fine a point on it, she was shamefully stitched up and made redundant. They advertised for a replacement as she appealed the decision. It was a real no-brainer for the tribunal. Unfair dismissal. They ordered the paper to give her her job back, but, to no one's surprise, it was not forthcoming, despite there being vacancies. She waited six months for a remedy hearing when all the company had to do was sit back and tell the tribunal the employment relationship had 'irretrievably broken down'. The tribunal agreed.

Eugenie walked away with nothing but the loss of earnings and, to add insult to injury, she would have been awarded compensation had the tribunal simply upheld the unfair dismissal claim without a reinstatement order.

Such orders are rare, as you heard. Just eight made last year and six the year before, but when they are given, it seems they are not worth the paper they are written on. In Eugenie's case, her former employer would be the first to howl with outrage if a trade union ignored a court order issued against it; yet they are more than willing to show contempt of the law when it suits them.

Let us nail this nasty little get-out clause and give our members a real chance for justice.

**Tony Donaghey** (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) supporting the composite motion said: Fairness at work. I want particularly to draw attention to the need for action. John Smith promised that Labour would introduce employment rights for British people from day one. It is a tragedy that he did not live to keep that promise. Here we are, seven years into a Labour Government, and still the most repressive anti-trade union laws in Britain are in place: outside international law and outside EU conventions.

Fairness, not favours, we are told, and we hear a lot about fairness. The Government are even going to abolish unfairness to foxes, and quite right too, but it is high time that a Labour Government abolished unfairness to working people.

When RMT members at Stagecoach in Devon were on strike last summer, it was all fine and dandy for the company to bus in scabs from other Stagecoach subsidiaries, but if we had called trade unionists in those self-same subsidiaries to take action in support of our colleagues, we would have been hauled into the courts so fast our feet would not have touched the ground. It seems that solidarity action is fine for the bosses, but not for working people.

We need to repeal all these nasty anti-trade union laws. We need employment rights from day one. We need a charter for workers' rights. We need the automatic right to reinstatement for dismissed workers

who win at employment tribunals. Delivering progress on employment rights remains the litmus test for a Labour Government. This is not a favour. It is fairness. This motion reaffirms our call for an end to all these nasty laws, but it also calls for a campaign.

The General Council should take note that this motion calls on them to organise a national demonstration and a lobby of Parliament as soon as possible.

In his *Morning Star* article the other day, Brendan Barber said that we no longer have to demonstrate against mass unemployment. Maybe so, but we certainly need to demonstrate and lobby to bring an end to a web of legislation designed purely and simply to deny workers the right to take effective collective action.

Let us pass this motion and let us mobilise the movement to demand that a Labour Government brings Britain's laws back in from the cold.

**Brian Caton** (*Prison Officers Association*) supporting the composite motion, said: I support this composite with particular emphasis on paragraph 1, and expressly the concerns of prison officers to the attitude adopted by the current Labour Government to anti-trade union laws in general, but specifically to the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994. The POA would wish to thank the TUC, affiliate unions, and the leadership of the TUC over the past ten years for the support given to the Association in our quest to have trade union rights returned to prison officers in England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland. Those rights were removed from our membership in 1994 by a Tory government intent on destroying the POA as an effective voice in opposition to the immoral act of prison privatisation and the overcrowding of prisons.

At that time we were heartened by the support shown by the Labour Party, in opposition, to our stand against overcrowding and prison privatisation but, more importantly, the opposition to the removal of trade union rights from prison staff. Promises were given to our Congress by all senior members of the Labour opposition and, more importantly, a letter was then sent by the Labour opposition spokesman on home affairs, Tony Blair. This is what it says about our trade union rights: "An incoming Labour Government will want to put this situation right and ensure once again that prison officers are treated in the same way and with the same working rights as other public servants and recognise the status of the Prison Officers' Association as an independent trade union."

That was absolutely the unequivocal intent of the Labour Government on gaining governmental power, and we have sought enactment of that pledge from the Labour Government since it came to office. In 2005, we will seek the removal of section 127 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act that criminalises prison officers for taking any form of action. This is dependent on the signing of a self-shackling agreement that means prison officers should never even contemplate any form of action.

Congress, the POA registered its case with the International Labour Organisation and we will take this United Kingdom government to the European courts to ensure that prison officers are treated no differently than any other public servant in this country, and no differently than our members were treated as a free

and independent trade union prior to 1994. Further, the POA unreservedly supports the repeal of anti-trade union legislation that shackles our unions and attacks the democratic process of union self-determination. I say this to the Labour Government, and to Tony Blair, honour your commitments, stop your worldwide boasting of the restrictive practices against trade unions in the United Kingdom, get your hands off the trade union rule book and allow us to manage our affairs. Please support the composite.

**Christine Howell** (*GMB*) speaking in support of composite motion one, said: Congress, the GMB was appalled by the Government's approach to the review of the Employment Relations Act.

Firstly, it was clear that submissions from the trade unions had been given much less weight than the views of the CBI and the Institute of Directors; but, even more seriously, the review completely ignored the Government's obligations to uphold international law relating to rights for people at work. For the GMB the issue of fairness at work boils down to trust between government and the working citizens of Britain. Other governments in Europe give their citizens a modern and sensible package of rights, including the right to be treated with fairness, respect, and dignity at work. After seven years in power, it is clear that this Labour Government does not trust British citizens enough to let them have the rights to which they are entitled. The end result of this policy is familiar to us all -- British workers, the easiest to sack in Europe despite working the longest hours in Europe, and thousands of migrant workers vulnerable to gang masters, who exploit them ruthlessly and in some cases fatally.

Congress, let me tell you the end result of this New Labour approach: 240 engineering construction workers building the new £800m Wembley Stadium, many of them from the North East, working on a project so important to the Government and the next Olympic bid, sacked not once but twice by different contractors within the space of three weeks: their crime? Asking for their rights under national agreements agreed between management and unions; 240 men across the country, living in digs and asked to work 66 hours a week to build a prestigious new football stadium, have been kicked around the park by their employers. What is really sickening about all this is that the law is on the side of the unscrupulous employers and the law does not protect working people who have been treated disgracefully. That is the result of this Government's policy and it is a policy that must be changed. Congress, please support.

**The President:** Colleagues, I am sure we welcome our sisters and brothers from the Wembley site. Welcome to Congress.

The General Council supports composite motion one.

\* *Composite Motion One was CARRIED*

## Agency Workers

**George Brumwell** (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) moved composite motion two. He said: The growth of labour agencies is phenomenal, it is global, and it is a response and by-product of the privatisation programme that is taking place not only in this country but throughout the world. The agency arrangements in this country provide workers with little or no rights; this is not to mention migrant labour. There are about 800,000 to a million agency workers working in all sectors of the British economy;

there are 120,000 in local government. Agency workers are brought in, inevitably, to undermine the terms and conditions of the stable workforce. They are a vulnerable group of workers. They have no job security and very few rights.

When it comes to the law, if you look at railway maintenance for example, we have members working on railway maintenance for Corillian, employed through an agency called Sky Blue. We had a member there for about 18 months who was then sacked. We found out that he had no right to an employment tribunal so the matter went to the Employment Appeal Tribunal, and the decision from the law courts was that there is no contractual relationship between the employer and the agency. What a sad state of affairs, he is more like a stateless person in today's British workforce.

If we look at migrant workers in this country they are nearly all supplied through labour agencies that act as no more than middle men. On the construction of the Scottish Parliament building we came across migrant labourers, migrant craftsmen, being paid very low rates of pay; it was sheer exploitation. I cannot understand how a £40m contract finished up costing £400m of the taxpayers' money. There needs to be a fuller and further inquiry into that.

We are very suspicious when we find large numbers of Portuguese workers on a construction site. Inevitably, every time we investigate the use of Portuguese workers on a building site there is exploitation and low rates of pay but we manage to get it put right. I am also bound to say that Portuguese workers, to a large extent, were used on the £350m Home Office contract in London. We did not even get access because the French contractors said: "We do not recognise your union." I wonder if they would recognise it if it had been in Attercliffe and they were building the same building in Attercliffe. There are double standards prevailing so far as illegal and migrant labour is concerned. If you are an immigrant working in this country you cannot open a bank account so your wages have to be paid to the agency through a middle-man, and he determines what you get paid and he determines what is deducted from your wages. The exploitation opportunities are there.

The European Union has on the books a European directive for agency workers and if that was applied and introduced in this country it would remove a lot of the abuse that is taking place, but there is an alliance of countries, including Britain, which has effectively blocked that directive. Where is the fairness in that? These are issues I think we need to be aware of. I think the purpose of European directives is to provide a level playing field for everyone competing for work and providing jobs. Unless we get that level playing field, we are always going to get the raw, naked, exploitation of vulnerable workers who have no rights with the agency and no rights with the employer. Colleagues, I move composite two.

**Paddy Lillis** (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*) seconding composite two, said: Colleagues, there are two myths about agency workers, either they are secretaries and admin workers temping in offices, or they are migrant workers trapped in the ugly twilight world of gang masters. There is some truth in both stereotypes and we are all aware of the horrific fate of the Chinese workers in Morecambe Bay earlier this year. But it is also true that the single largest

group of agency workers, around 30 per cent, work in the mainstream manufacturing industries, and the fastest rising group is amongst professionals and managerial workers, up six-fold in the last five years. There are now, colleagues, at least 700,000 agency workers in the United Kingdom. They are not just in the margins, in the dangerous and often illegal world of the gang masters, they are in the mainstream, often working alongside permanent organised workers in the core sectors of the economy. They are in the public as well as the private sector, in health and education, in the building and transport industries, in retail and food manufacturing, meat and poultry processing, and chemicals and pharmaceuticals; it goes on and on. Whatever the sector and whatever the occupation, the same threat is faced by these people. They are often employed quite deliberately on inferior terms and conditions, they rarely have access to sick pay and pensions, they receive little or no training, they are exposed to greater health and safety risks, and have precious little protection on maternity rights.

It is a myth, colleagues, that they are only there to cover peaks and troughs, holidays, and sickness absence. Barely a third of agency workers have worked for their existing employers for less than three months, the vast majority are there for extended periods as an established presence on the pay roll. They are there not just to make good the skeleton levels of permanent staff, drawn in when needed and pushed out when not, employers also often use them to undermine established pay and conditions and drive a cheap labour wedge through the existing workforce. That is why, colleagues, we need to take urgent action with tighter controls on the activities of employment agencies, with improved and extended rights to agency workers, we need a positive and proactive stance from our government, and we need an all-agency workers directive. It is about no more than minimum standards, decent levels of protection, rights for agency workers themselves, and vital safeguards for the mass of other workers whose terms and conditions are increasingly under threat. Please support the composite.

**John Wilkin** (*National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education*) supporting composite two, said: Congress, I want to focus on the part of this composite that calls for agency workers to have equal access to occupational pensions. The largest agency offering lecturers to post-school education found a way of helping employers to avoid their obligations under the laws to protect part-time workers. Some colleges sacked all their directly employed part-time lecturers and then offered them the same work through the agency, but for less pay, no sick pay, no maternity rights, and no pensions. They are supposed to be self-employed but we call it 'bogus' self-employment. The agency used to be called Education Lecturing Services; now it is called Protocol Professionals. Some protocol. Some professionals.

NATFHE pursued the case of one such lecturer right through the European Court. Deborah Allenby was sacked, along with 340 of her part-time colleagues at Accrington & Rossendale College, and then re-employed through the agency to do the same work on a much less favourable contract. NATFHE argued that such workers should be entitled to equal treatment with their directly employed colleagues; this includes access to the teachers' pension scheme from which they are excluded. We have made some progress. Earlier this year the European Court ruled that the exclusion of agency workers from the teachers' pension scheme might discriminate against women.

Congress, the growth of subcontracted self-employed status in the public sector does not just affect teachers. We want equal access to occupational pension schemes regardless of contract status. The Government could put this right, now. This would add real value to agency workers' pay. Let us make this a campaigning issue across the movement.

**Paula Mason** (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) speaking in support of the composite, said: Colleagues, I work for P&O and have worked for P&O for six years as an agency worker and I know people who have worked there for 12 years as agency workers. These agency workers work a week on and a week off, and then every Wednesday they are laid off work, so therefore only work a week. This means that we work with people who are on £19,000-£20,000 a year and we are receiving £10,500 a year; therefore, the employer is getting two for the price of one. This has been happening over a period of 15 years. They have now decided to give us a 2002 contract, so they call it. I call it a 'Mickey Mouse' contract. This Mickey Mouse contract is where they employed 120 of us and then in March of this year they employed another load of agency workers from Portugal that they could abuse. These Portuguese workers now work 1,000 hours more than we do but are on the same rate of pay as us, £12,500. This has been going on for 15 years and it is about time the Government did something for seafarers, and agency workers especially, and also for the younger generation of this country. It is absolutely diabolical.

Please support this composite. Do not just support it, do something about it. I am fed up with it and I am sure the youngsters are fed up with it as well. Thank you for your support.

**Joe Morgan** (*GMB*) speaking in support of composite motion two, said: Congress, what is it that agency workers have done to upset employers and the Government so much that they want to deny them the basic protections that other workers enjoy? The European Union proposal for a Temporary Agency Worker Directive actually came out in March 2002 and yet in September 2004 we are still waiting for it to be agreed. We thought the directive was back on the agenda after July's National Policy Forum where a commitment was made to work with the EU Commission to reach an early agreement, yet at last week's meeting on the issue in Brussels our government simply sat on its hands and no progress was made. Hopes for political agreement in October are also dashed as EU governments will be looking to each other to make the first move, and you can guarantee that nobody will be blinking.

Congress, this is simply not good enough. Our government – our government – has made a commitment and that commitment is going to need movement on their part. Temporary agency workers deserve day one equal treatment on employment rights. The CBI and the DTI are simply wrong to say that this will cost jobs and damage the UK's economic competitiveness and flexibility. Even the CBI's own research shows that most of their employers already provide parity on working conditions. What the directive will do is help to stop the abuse and exploitation of temporary workers, many of them migrant workers of cowboy agencies and gang masters. The tragedy of the Chinese cockle-pickers is, sadly, only one of a catalogue of horror stories. You would think the CBI would welcome seeing the back of illegal and unlicensed operators but, sadly, that does not appear to be the case.

Congress, the GMB welcomes the speedy progress of the gang masters bill to help tackle the exploitation of many of these vulnerable workers in the food and farming industries. However, we need to ensure permanent rights and protections for all temporary workers and improve their employment status. Flexibility can go hand in hand with fairness, employment protection, and respect and dignity for all workers. Temporary workers deserve that as much as any other worker. Progress was promised and we want to see it delivered now. Thank you, colleagues. Please support this composite.

**Judith Griffiths** (*Communication Workers Union*) supporting composite two, said: Agency temporary working has become the norm for more than a million workers, approximately 1.5 million to be precise, and is now a fundamental feature of the UK labour market. The trade union movement was built historically on the basis of organising against casualisation and defending the most vulnerable sections of working people. Agency workers are more likely to be young workers. In 2002, approximately 35 per cent were under the age of 25 and 65 per cent were under the age of 35. Agency workers earn approximately 70 pence for every pound earned by a permanent employee. Clearly, this is a very attractive option as far as the employers are concerned. My daughter is an agency worker. She works in the same job as me but earns half my salary, and has been employed on a temporary basis in the same job for two years. How can that be justified in a major UK company?

Many agency workers feel no necessity to join a union given their temporary status and yet it is precisely this layer of workers that desperately needs the advice and support that a trade union can offer. It is an absolute disgrace that we have a Labour government that, along with other European leaders, is blocking the implementation of a directive that would ensure equal treatment and basic protection for all agency workers, the vast majority of whom only work as temps because they are unable to find long-term permanent jobs.

Let us step up our pressure from this Congress to the Government to introduce the EU directive for agency workers. Let us also step up our campaigning efforts in recruiting and organising these mainly young workers who desperately require our union organisation.

**The President:** The General Council supports composite motion two.

\* *Composite Motion Two was CARRIED*

## Disability Rights and Europe

**Richard Reiser** (*National Union of Teachers*) moved motion 21 on behalf of the Disability Conference. He said: Congress, President, brothers and sisters, this motion comes from the TUC Disability Conference. Earlier this year when a statue of Alison Lapper was unveiled much of the popular press pilloried the idea that we could have a statue of a disabled woman in Trafalgar Square. I am pleased to say that the GLA and the Mayor are going ahead with erecting that statue. It is right that disabled women should be celebrated in our national square. After all, a disabled man has been on the top of that pillar for more than 150 years, although so high up that most people do not even recognise that he is disabled.

Seriously, the 9.6 million disabled adults -- and we still do not know how many disabled children there are in this country, the Government still has not worked it out, but 9.6 million is what they tell us is the number of adults -- deserve full civil rights, but they do not have them at the moment. We have had a piecemeal method of giving people rights in this country for a number of years. Under the Tories there were 13 attempts to bring in comprehensive legislation to give civil rights to disabled people. When New Labour came in on a manifesto commitment to do just that, they quickly did not do it and instead used the existing weak and full-of-holes Disability Discrimination Act actually to bring things forward.

Recently, we have had a new bill, which was scrutinised by a parliamentary committee, to try and strengthen that legislation. Unfortunately, the Government have rejected most of the recommendations that that committee, from both Houses of Parliament, put forward. Why the resistance? It is the same resistance that we have been hearing about this morning in other areas of employment law, "We do not want to make it too difficult for the employers." How is it that in other countries, much poorer than ours -- remember, we are the fourth richest country in the world -- are managing to introduce this legislation?

I have just come back from the Disabled People's International World Summit in Winnipeg, Canada. There we were heartened to hear from many parts of the world with a far lower economic base than us where legislation was actually going forward and campaigning was going on. We as a trade union movement need to support that work. We need to support it across the world. We need also to ensure that the draft European directive, which the European Disability Forum has formulated, is actually brought into legislation. It should have come in during the European Year of Disabled People. What is the point of having a European Year if we do not end up with some legislation at the end of it?

We have the Employment Directive but that only covers employment. It is in fact something that will force this Government -- they would not have done it otherwise -- to lower the employers' threshold from October 2004. So, in a couple of weeks' time one million employers will be brought under the Disability Discrimination Act, and seven million more employees. It would not have happened if the Government had been left to their own legislative agenda; it happened because of the Equal Employment Directive across Europe.

Let no one in this hall say that Europe does not affect us favourably; it does. We have to play a fuller part there and we, as a union movement, have to fight for this directive to be implemented. For instance, in areas like transportation, currently in the UK I am protected when I go to the airport but I am not protected when I get on the plane; they can discriminate against me as much as they want, and they often do. The Directive for Europe will actually cover all carriers and within ten years they will have to implement it.

Why does the Government not sign Protocol 12? It gives equality before the law on any legal issue. Why should we not have it so that equality issues are taken account of when any other rights issue is being looked at? What is the coyness about this? Come on, if we

want human rights legislation, surely we should have it when it comes to the courts and our rights. Of course, we need to campaign in our workplaces. We must applaud Amicus for their Workplace Champions Campaign, which was funded under the European Year, but it is an example that should not just be left to the history books, it is one that we should all take back. We need workplace representatives to organise strongly and negotiate with each employer to get a better deal for disabled workers in the workplace. With the law as it stands at the moment there is no anticipation; an employee arrives and they are told: "Oh, we'll make some adjustments." We have to fight for a situation where all workplaces are decent places for all people, including disabled people. I move the motion. Thank you.

**Janet Seymour Kirk** (*Amicus*) seconding the motion, said: Richard Howitt, MEP, Chair of the European Parliament All Party Disability Intergroup has been fighting for the EU to debate and pass this disability directive all of last year, and is still trying to do so in 2004. It was his hope in 2003, the Year of the Disabled People, that this directive would go through making all the campaigning during 2003 worth its weight. Unfortunately, some countries felt unable to allow this to be passed and have fought and won, at least for the moment, to keep it still a prospective directive. What are they afraid of? Like the last government, and unfortunately this Government too, they believe that this will cost them money and possibly their standing with big businesses, resulting in loss of jobs and therefore the loss of production. We know this is not so.

Disabled people have to fight twice as hard for their jobs but they are less likely to take days off, and they are known to be more diligent in their work. Our members are fully aware of the impact that Europe has on issues that we as unions campaign on, and the difficulty of achieving any progress. I found this out for myself a few years ago. I felt privileged to represent my union on a project with eight other countries in the EU, which later extended to 12. We were attempting to find a basic criterion that all countries could agree on that would bring more disabled people into mainstream employment. As part of these discussions we touched on transport to work and I asked that it be termed as 'accessible transport' in the document. The word 'accessible' was not in most of their languages and it therefore took us nearly an hour to come up with a small sentence that meant the same thing. Some countries are making, and have made, great strides to include disabled people in their workforce -- France and Germany come to mind -- but others still have a great way to go.

What would help those countries now, of course, would be to get a greater majority of companies willing to make themselves accessible. It is unfortunate that due to their reluctance we have to have written within this directive the need for such compliance to be demonstrated on a requirement for future funding and contracts. William Hague (my MP, by the way, unfortunately), when I pointed out to him that he really had not listened to what disabled people had said to him would be better for the country on his six months learning tour before he produced the DDA, replied that we should have persuaded the public of the need to change concerning disability instead of pushing for more legislation. Congress, please support.

**Mark Fysh** (*UNISON*) said: I am Chair of the Disability Conference, and speaking in support of the motion. I welcome the call for the ratification of Protocol 12 but

believe we should get our own house in order. Real political power can only be achieved when a group gains access to status and wealth; this then means that the government of the day has to listen to that group. We, the disabled, have neither acquired status nor wealth, our position in society is given to us, and according to the press yesterday we are the deserving and undeserving poor with benefits cut. Our employment status is large volume, low pay, dead-end jobs, and yet it could be very different.

The DTI, the TUC, and UNISON, in Oxfordshire, are looking at funding a graduate-style entry scheme for disabled managers -- yes, managers -- at £21,000 a year, from scratch and, if successful, will be placed in permanent employment with the practice rolled out across the country. Real access for disabled people, possibly as many as 9 million, will have a huge impact on goods and services in this country - cars, clothes, leisure, white goods, everything this country buys and uses. We could be the life and death of your industry.

I challenge the trade union movement, the Government, and the CBI, to see us not as a handout burden but as part of the economic and social assets of this country. Is it relevant to you? Oh, yes, it is. Remember, you will all become old and disabled. You will demand access to the goods and services that we need now. What price real equality? Support motion 21 and Protocol 12. It is vital to us all. Thank you.

**Gareth Davies** (*Community*): I also represent the Disability Committee. I suppose most of us aspire to a few fairly basic things like freedom, unity, peace, all that sort of thing. However, justice is overarching because, without that, you cannot have them.

I come from the National League of the Blind and Disabled Section of the new union, Community, that came into being on 1 July this year. It was formally launched at the TUC last week. I am its President. God knows how that came about but there we are! I went with the Section Secretary, Joe Mann, to Brussels in March 2000, and we attended the debate on the Anti-Discrimination Directive in the Parliament. This is absolutely pivotal to the whole thing because everything else flows from it, a bit like the Civil Rights Act in the United States.

It seems to me that it points not only to the importance of what we need to do about disability but also to the importance of what we need to do about Europe. Europe is not about straight bananas or what you can call 'ice cream'. That is only the last tormented scream of the demented minds of the media moguls who do not want to be regulated properly. Europe is our future. When we say we want to go forward we need to be looking to a good 'yes' vote in the referendum and we need to be pushing our own agenda in consort with that as well.

Disability is not important in its own right; it is only important because everything else is important. I hope that Congress will put this resolution down between the posts and make it the official policy of the British trade union movement.

**Phil Davies** (*GMB*) supporting Motion 21 said: Since coming to power Labour has had a good record on improving the lives of disabled people. Key reforms under the Disability Discrimination Act are due next month with more to follow. Whilst important and welcome, these reforms still fall short of disabled

people's expectations for equal treatment and opportunity. Disabled people have waited far too long for equality. It is time for full-blown civil rights for all disabled people. That is what the GMB wants; that is what this Congress wants; and that is what disabled people want. That is why ratifying Protocol 12 is so important.

As we know only too well, establishing rights at European level are no guarantee of creating rights at home. A decade ago, under the Priorities Supply Scheme, quality government contracts could be delivered by highly skilled, disabled workers. The Tories unfortunately scrapped that scheme in 1994, arguing that it was in breach of European law. This had a devastating effect on the likes of our members in Remploy. Instead of skilled manufacturing employment, many disabled workers were reduced to low skilled jobs and low status jobs. Since then, the GMB - along with other unions - has campaigned and lobbied in Brussels, and beyond, to reform the European Public Procurement legislation. We want the law changed to ensure that public contracts could be reserved for supported workplaces.

Earlier this year the hard slog paid off: we achieved that crucial reform. Now that seems to have been the easy bit. We did not think then that we would have to do battle with the Treasury's Office of Government Commerce. The OGC has a fixation with free markets. You would be mistaken for thinking it is a hangover from the Thatcher era, but obviously that is another story. These free market ideologists dislike the idea of reserving contracts for disabled workplaces. They dislike social employment, environment or any other kinds of consideration that you can think of. Such things muddy the water. They argue, "Don't buck the market", so in that consultation on transposing the Euro Directive into UK law they tried to strangle the GMB reforms at birth. We cannot allow this to happen. With your help they will not succeed.

**The President:** The General Council supports Motion 21.

\* *Motion 21 was CARRIED*

### Age Discrimination and Equality

**Jonathan Baume (FDA)** moved Composite Motion Six.

He said: It was Marx who said that anyone can get old, all you have to do is live long enough. That was Groucho, not Karl by the way!

People are taking that advice to heart. The average age of the UK population is rising. There are some 19 million people aged 50 and over in the UK, 40 per cent of the population. By 2020 more than half the population will be aged over 50, and there will be 2 million fewer working people under 50 than there are now. By 2040 there will be 15 million people aged over 65.

These changes will have profound effects socially, economically and politically, yet we live in a society that undervalues older workers and the elderly in general, where far too many pensioners are still condemned to a life of poverty and where one in four workers have faced age discrimination.

In 2006 we must implement the EU Directive on equal treatment in employment. For the first time it will be illegal to discriminate on grounds of age. It will

be a momentous change in UK law and a further benefit of our active engagement in Europe. The Government promised draft legislation this summer to allow workers and employers two years in which to prepare. Yet there is an eerie silence. It appears to be because the Government are unwilling to confront employers who seem keen to undermine the legislation before it is even enacted. Put simply, employers want the Government to retain mandatory retirement ages, despite the EU Directive.

What do workers want? Credible surveys suggest that more than three-quarters do not want a fixed retirement age. Our members know that just because they have reached 60, 65 or even 70 it does not mean that overnight they have nothing to contribute to the workplace. By being forced to retire against their will, many workers also suffer financially and they have their rights infringed. Yet older workers already account for almost one-quarter of the UK's annual economic output. If mandatory retirement ages are abolished, up to one million extra older people can be in work contributing £30 billion to the economy each year, saving billions in reduced benefits and generating more tax revenue.

Moreover, CBI pressure to retain retirement ages does not seem to make sense for business itself. Two out of every five workers are employed, particularly in small businesses where there is already no fixed retirement age, and so employers have an access to a wider pool of talent and the experience of older workers. Yes, abolishing retirement ages may create some short-term adjustment challenges for some employers but, in the longer-term, business, society and the wider economy will benefit.

Let me be clear. This is not about the pension age. Retirement age and pension age are different issues, and we will be debating pensions tomorrow morning. I know some unions have genuine fears that any change in retirement age, which is currently normally 65, will allow the government or employers to raise the pension age. My view is the opposite. If we retain mandatory retirement ages in the forthcoming legislation, which will probably end up at 70, there is a real danger that company pension schemes or the state pension age will also be raised to 70. We have to make a judgment. I believe that by abolishing fixed retirement ages we have more chance of protecting the current pension age. The debate is about choice, it is about flexibility and it is about the right of an individual who is fit and able to do the job to stay in the job until they choose to leave, not when the employer uses an arbitrary cut-off to force them to leave.

We should not forget also that age discrimination is not just about older people. It will apply to people of every age, young and old. There will be no upper age limit and no lower age limit after leaving education. There will be no exclusions by the employer's side, nor for senior management. We will all be covered by age discrimination law.

I urge the Government to end the equivocation. No government minister would dream of discriminating against somebody because they were, say, Bengali, or because they were gay or because they were a woman, so why should the Government consider it acceptable to discriminate because someone is 65 or 70?



Anthony Powell, the novelist, said that growing old is like being increasingly penalised for a crime you have not committed. Improved lifestyles, advances in medicine, greater understanding of the science of the body mean that our children -- maybe even our generation -- may no longer face those penalties and we can reduce those penalties in the world of work. Every single one of us in this hall will benefit from this legislation. We will have new rights, new choices, new opportunities. The trade union movement must remain in the vanguard of the campaign to end discrimination against older workers and the elderly. Let us win for older workers the dignity and the respect they deserve.

**Patrick Carragher** (*BACM-TEAM*) seconding Composite Motion Six said: we have waited far too long for advances to be made on the issue of age discrimination, and I think what this motion is about is trying to demonstrate how we can make progress and, at the same time, introduce what I would term progressive flexibility on this issue. Being progressive is an important part of this motion because, as we make advances on this issue of age discrimination, we have to make sure that the approach is voluntary and is going to be even across the piece in terms of the aspirations that union members have.

Reference has already been made to the EU Directive and I have to say that the initial government response on the Directive referred to in the motion was that there should be a harmonisation down in terms of removing age discrimination with redundancy terms within the state redundancy framework. I have to say that that is a bit too indicative of the penny-pinching approach that the Government have in regard to where it sets the balance between the interests of working members of this movement and the interests of business. Surely it cannot be right that when in Ireland they are able to say that they will harmonise up in line with the spirit of the Directive that in the UK, the fourth largest economy in the world, we are able to do no better than simply say, "No, we intend to harmonise down".

One word of warning here. Since this motion was framed we have had a commitment from the Warwick Policy Forum to improvements in state redundancy pay. I would call on the Government to make good that commitment and, in the process of doing that, make sure that when they transpose this Directive they do not harmonise down the aspects dealing with redundancy pay.

**Brendan Barber** (*General Secretary*): The General Council support this composite motion calling for an end to age discrimination at work, but have asked me briefly to explain some of the background to this important issue and to make clear the General Council's position on what is a key issue for working people.

Last year the Government launched a consultation on a European Directive that requires member states to implement new age equality laws. Now the Government are setting up a special consultative group to look specifically at this issue of retirement age. As you know, while in this country we do have a statutory age at which people are entitled to claim a state pension, currently we do not have a statutory retirement age. They are two different things. The TUC and unions have been very clear about our agenda and our aims. First, we want an end to discrimination against workers on grounds of age. We know that too many workers face prejudice, whether it is young

workers excluded from access to pension schemes or older workers denied the chance of training, passed over for promotion purely because an older face does not fit.

Secondly, if we are to clamp down on prejudice and discrimination then all workers, regardless of age, should enjoy employment protection, and we know some employers do not want that.

Thirdly, I want to make absolutely clear that we are determined to protect the pension age, the age at which working people become entitled to claim a state pension. It is enshrined in the state pension scheme and, of course, it is also in hard won union negotiated occupational pension schemes too.

The TUC totally rejects the position put by the CBI that the only way to solve Britain's pensions crisis is to make people work longer and harder for less. We know that the CBI wants the state pension age to increase to 70, and they argue this in the full knowledge that many, many workers would simply not live long enough to claim what is due to them. But work until you drop is not the answer and the TUC, together with the National Pensioners Convention, will continue the campaign to keep the state pension age at 65.

Campaigning for protection against age discrimination and campaigning to keep the state pension age at 65 are complementary not contradictory aims. Greater flexibility on retirement yes, raising the pension age no.

With that explanation, on behalf of the General Council I ask you to support the motion.

\* *Composite Motion Six was CARRIED*

## Energy and environment

**Peter Clements** (*Prospect*) moved Composite Motion 15. He said: The UK energy policy is facing turbulent times. We find ourselves at a point where a number of largely independent factors are coming together to require a complex balancing act if all or any of the government's objectives are to be achieved, for example, the continuity of energy supply or CO2 emissions. The factors include inexorable growth in electricity demand of around one to two per cent each year, a country moving from 65 per cent coal and no gas-fired generation in 1990 to a target of 75 per cent gas-fired generation by 2020. Depletion of UK oil and gas reserves means that we will be importing up to 80 per cent of our gas by 2020, and this from areas of potential political and cultural instability.

The Government rightly focus on support for renewables and energy efficiency and the deregulation of the electricity market. As all of this goes on, so we have to strive to meet our energy policies. For the vast majority of consumers the priority is economic and security of supply, which most would argue is the responsibility of the state and not the market. Yet increased reliance on imported gas brings the prospect of long-term interruptions of supply, whether through technical problems or political instability with being at the end of a long pipeline from Russia to western Europe.

The UK is ill prepared for, and unfamiliar with, such interruptions because, in recent generations, we have always had gas on tap. The UK has around four

per cent of annual gas usage as a storage capacity, which is about two weeks' worth at the current rate of consumption. Whilst we support the further investment of renewables, including wind power, it should be recognised that wind power also brings with it concerns of intermittency.

A further part of the policy conundrum relates to protecting the environment, specifically to CO2 emissions. The move from coal to gas has given the UK an artificially impressive start in this area and the role nuclear power could play to redress the problem cannot be underestimated. Even Professor James Lovelock, guru of the environmental movement, said that nuclear power has a significant part to play in any energy mix.

Yet there is still a long way to go to meet our stretching targets. Indeed, government statistics state that UK CO2 emissions went up not down last year. The aim must be a balanced mix of energy generation, with the inherent security that accompanies diversity. There are roles to be played by carbon free renewables, by clean coal – of which there are significant UK reserves – and by nuclear new build, along with the waste issues that derive from it. This is a challenge not just for our generation but also future generations, and decisions made today may take a generation to be realised. We cannot wait for interruptions of supply to act; we must act now,

**Barry Morris** (*Community*) seconding Composite Motion 15 said: Very soon the European Commission will decide the amount of carbon dioxide big users of energy throughout the European Union will be able to release into the atmosphere free of charge. The EU is fulfilling a responsibility accepted by all 25 EU members to cut greenhouse emissions and give effect to the Kyoto Protocol. Tony Blair has committed us to reducing the amount of gases we put out by one fifth by 2010, more than any other EU country. But we accept that.

The accumulation of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere poses a grave threat to the planet. Already the people of Tuvalu in the Pacific are resigned to leaving their island because of the melting of the polar ice caps when their island will sub-merge. There will be legions of other consequences, mainly unpredictable save that we can be certain that they will cause major disruption and suffering, particularly for the poorest of our world.

Britain will be at a disadvantage compared with all other manufacturing countries outside the EU. None except Japan has ratified Kyoto. None will have to worry about cutting gas emissions. We do not complain about that either. The Government have given their word and we must look after the planet. It is the only world that we have. But in accepting the cuts British manufacturing must not be put at a disadvantage compared to our other EU comrades.

The outlook for British manufacturing is the best for years. In the steel industry alone several companies in Britain plan, over the next two years, to increase production. But steel is a very competitive business and the investment will not happen if the EU scheme makes it relatively more costly to produce in Britain. After all the cuts the manufacturing industry has suffered in recent years we are not going to let victory be snatched from us at this stage.

I ask you to support the motion and support the TUC in keeping manufacturing jobs in Britain.

**Ian Lavery** (*National Union of Mineworkers*) supporting the composite said: It is 20 years since the Tory Government launched the attack on the British mining industry for the sole political purpose of destroying not only the National Union of Mineworkers but the trade union movement as a whole. The sheer stupidity of this vindictive attack has left this country in the perilous position of facing a severe energy famine by the year 2020. The dash for gas has depleted our own indigenous gas reserves and, at the same time, as a nation we have been sterilising the vast coal reserves that we have been blessed with. By 2020 we will be importing energy to the degree of 90 per cent of our requirements, 70 per cent of which will be gas. It will be imported from the most politically unstable countries in the world, like Russia, like Iran, and like Algeria. The gas will be transported through huge pipelines, through many countries, until it gets to the end of the line, here in Britain. That has to be wide open for terrorist sabotage.

Since our own coalfields suffered the terrorist sabotage of Margaret Thatcher, which saw the closure of more than 200 pits and a loss of another 280,000 coal industry jobs, we have become more and more dependent on gas. We now have the obscene spectacle of the most advanced coalfield in the world, the Selby complex in South Yorkshire, closing down because coal owners refuse to invest in its future. This single act has sterilised 80 years' worth of precious coal reserves.

The Kyoto targets agreed by the Government simply mean that emission levels into the atmosphere need to be drastically reduced. We agree with this but it is the way in which we do that. We believe quite clearly that clean coal technology is the answer. It is not new, it is cheap, it is efficient, it is user friendly, and could in many ways close the gap in terms of the energy deficiency that we face. We can as a nation burn coke cleanly and should be investing in that. We have a great opportunity. Oil prices are at an all time high, nuclear power is under close scrutiny. The indigenous gas reserves are at an all time high in terms of prices and increasing. Renewable targets have been set at unachievable levels. World coal prices are at record levels.

We will be here in the future. We will be here to remind those politicians and everyone else of what has been said for generations by the National Union of Mineworkers. We will be there to remind them all. We take little pleasure in saying "We told you so".

**Dougie Rooney** (*Amicus*): First of all, we would like to state that our union completely and totally supports Composite 15. We congratulate the National Union of Mineworkers for their stance and their determination to keep going, even in the face of all the horrendous opposition and the dastardly deeds that have been done to them over decades, but the previous speaker was absolutely right. In the situation we are faced with in this nation, where we have no coherent energy strategy, one is moving from pillar to post and that is no way to run an economy. The result of that is that we are now in a position where we are dependent, as speakers have said, on imported oil and gas, our nuclear capacity needs to be re-strengthened and renewed, and we should not be using gas in order to generate electricity.

There is an important point here. Nuclear generation and gas generation generate electricity at

what is known as base load. That is 80/85 per cent of our electricity. However, we need coal-fired power stations because they provide the other 20 per cent and that 20 per cent has to be flexible. When you or I get up in the morning and switch on the electricity, or come home at night, that creates a peak. That can only be met by flexible generation; coal-fired offers that flexibility. The problem is that the EU regulations that you will have heard about, the Large Combustion Directive and also the Emissions Directive, will seriously compromise the ability of what is left of the coal-fired power stations to meet the flexible demand required in particular during winter months. Therefore, we could be faced with power cuts towards the end of this decade. That is not exaggerating; it is as simple as this. During the winter months, if these power stations -- as they will have to -- reduce their generating hours because of those Directives in order to meet the environmental targets that we have set ourselves, we will be in serious trouble.

Therefore, following what the previous speaker said, and what our amendment, included in this composite, states quite clearly, we need coal-fired, clean coal generation as a matter of absolute urgency. The Government should take an initiative to invest in this. Even though it is public money, we should get a spin off to our manufacturing base and our construction industry in doing that. It is absolutely essential that in the very short term we are able to take an initiative to get clean coal power stations built and start using coal-supplied generation for the flexibility that is required.

**Patrick Carragher (BACM-TEAM)** supporting the composite said: I find it deeply ironic when I try and understand what is happening with energy policy in this country. We have had the dash for gas; we have had the run-down of the coal industry; we have had a market failure where the deregulated market is unable to bring forward from the private sector investment to renew the fleet of generating stations that the country has and the mix between nuclear and coal within that. I find it ironic that when we have that market failure it is not possible to build coal-fired power stations in this country but it is possible to get Export Credit Guarantees from the DTI to build them in India and in other places.

Let me say that coal will continue to be burnt worldwide. As the previous speaker said, it is the only fuel that can provide the flexibility to manage variable loads. Any government would be ill advised to throw away the remaining large resource that the UK has in terms of its coal reserves. I seem to recall that 15 or 20 years ago the UK was at the forefront of research on clean coal technology. OK, we have climate change and that is a challenge but that challenge will have to be met by developing technologies that will capture carbon and burn coal efficiently. We have lost ground on that issue following the privatisation of the British coal industry. If we are going to have a progressive and balanced approach to energy policy into the future we need to commit ourselves through government to demonstration plants for clean coal technology.

If I may, I would just like to echo a point that has been made: if we do not get this issue of variable loads right, make no mistake, the politicians will be having to answer questions when people are sitting round burning candles because of power cuts.

**Helen Rose (UNISON):** UNISON is supporting this composite but with some reservations. Like other

unions, UNISON welcomes the fact that we now have a government that sees the need for an energy policy, unlike the previous Tory Government whose energy policy was not to have one. The Government's White Paper on energy has found broad support for the policy of encouraging renewable sources of energy and energy conservation.

However, UNISON has two reservations about the Government's White Paper. Government policy is still heavily driven by the belief that market forces will be sufficient to ensure that our energy needs are met. In the light of the recent announcements by the major energy suppliers of the forthcoming increases in the price of electricity and gas, by four times the rate of inflation, we can all gauge the exact success of the policy. Let us not forget the impact of these price rises on Britain's four million people in fuel poverty and the 30,000 excess winter deaths it causes every year.

The motion notes this policy also succeeded in turning the UK into a net importer of gas. This is hardly a ringing endorsement of the success of market forces.

UNISON is also not convinced that there is a case for new nuclear stations, either on capacity or environmental grounds. It is true that nuclear stations do not produce the greenhouse gases that are the cause of climate change, but nuclear waste is still a major problem and we are still looking for a solution.

However, despite these reservations UNISON supports the overall position of the motion. Furthermore, we would urge all unions to support a planned energy policy based on the strategic needs of this country for a safe, secure and environmentally sustainable supply of energy rather than the narrow interests of the shareholders and directors of private companies.

**Tom Brennan (GMB):** GMB supports Composite 15 on energy and environmental policy. Energy is the lifeblood of each and every nation. We here in Britain are extremely fortunate in having the enormous supplies of fossil fuel and the ability to design and manufacture world-leading technology. However, we are in danger of squandering this advantage by not having a coherent long-term energy policy. We have suffered through lack of investment in the new generation of nuclear energy and, indeed, other sources including renewables, chip and clean coal technology.

There was for many years a complete absence of any form of energy policy. When the market ruled, planning went out of the window and conservation was not even on the agenda. This artificial market-led approach resulted in an earlier than necessary reduction of the UK coal industry, a squandering of UK national resources, the need for a higher level of imported gas from more volatile sources such as North Africa and the former Soviet Union and, more importantly, a serious skill shortage.

We are left with problems of nuclear generation with British Energy dependent on government financial support. Is it not the time to re-nationalise British Energy? Security of supply both now and in the future means that market place alone cannot determine energy prices and energy policy. The market does not consider the long term, so energy supply and security is far too important to be left solely to market forces.

The lack of a co-ordinated energy policy is directly responsible for the 12.5 per cent hike in energy prices announced by British Gas last month, a price rise caused by no longer having access to North Sea gas and due to the run-down of the UK coal industry and the dash for gas.

Protection of the environment is also a vital part of any balanced energy policy. Conservation of the environment should not be sacrificed for the demands of the market. The energy industry must have effective environmental safeguards, safety controls and enforcement but they also need a highly skilled and well-trained work force of adequate size. We cannot leave safety and environmental protection to chance. The Government must develop a coherent and balanced energy policy for the future. This should include changing the remit of the regulator, OFGEM, to take into consideration strategic issues such as safety, security of supply and Britain's wider long-term energy interests. It should also include an investment in developing the skills of the work force and the commitment to supporting higher levels of research and development. We need a balanced energy and environmental policy that makes the best use of all our resources, expertise and technology.

Please support the motion.

**The President:** The General Council support Composite Motion 15.

\* *Composite Motion 15 was CARRIED*

*Congress adjourned until 2.15 p.m.*

## MONDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

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

**The President:** Many thanks to the group, Lowering the Tone, who have been playing for us this afternoon.

### Congress Awards

**The President:** We start this afternoon with the section in Congress where we honour and recognise the important contribution of lay activists, who are the bedrock of our movement. Last year, for the first time, we introduced three new awards to recognise the different roles that union reps now play in the workplace. Alongside the Women's Gold Badge and the Youth Award, we introduced awards to recognise the specific contributions of Health and Safety reps, Learning Reps and Lay Organisers. It was a move that was widely welcomed, not just as a recognition of the contribution made by some of the outstanding individual award winners but as recognition of the contribution made by thousands of lay reps in work places across the country. This year we have again asked affiliated unions to nominate lay reps. Before we meet our winners, we are going to show a video which will tell you a little bit more about them and their achievements. This video has been sponsored by Browell Smith & Co., solicitors, and I would like to thank them for the support they have given us and hope you enjoy the video. *(Video shown)*

We have seen the video and now it is time to meet our award winners.

### Women's Gold Badge

**The President:** The winner of the Women's Gold Badge is Ann Hills of USDAW. Ann works at Tesco. She was actively involved in helping USDAW to gain recognition in Tesco in 1969. She was one of the first members to join USDAW from Tesco. USDAW now represents more than 100,000 employees in the company. As branch secretary, Ann first fought sex discrimination cases on behalf of USDAW members more than 20 years ago when the climate was very different. Such cases were hard to win. Unfortunately, Ann is out of the country today and her Award will be collected by USDAW President, Marge Carey. *(Applause) presentation of Women's Gold Badge.*

### Congress Award for Youth

**The President:** The recipient of the Congress Award for Youth is Chris Stiles, who is a member of the T&G, who organised a union branch in a poultry factory, which has a workforce comprising 50 per cent migrant workers, made up of Somalians, Goan and Portuguese workers. Chris developed links with the workers, organised volunteers to translate for the union, he gets no time off for his union duties so he does all this in addition to a 48 hour week factory shift. *(Applause) Presentation of Congress Youth Award.*

### Learning Rep Award

**The President:** The Learning Rep Award goes to Mary Locke, a member of UNISON. She is the rep and branch education co-ordinator working at Selly Oak Hospital. She has been the learning rep since March 2003. Mary is a domestic worker in a hospital. Her focus has been on supporting part-time low paid women workers. Mary negotiated a paid time-off agreement for UNISON learning reps but now she has supported new learning reps to get involved in the wider union. Mary Locke. *(Applause) Presentation of Learning Rep Award.*

### Safety Rep Award

**The President:** The Safety Rep Award winner is Elizabeth Corbett, a GMB member and safety rep at Automotive Lighting. Elizabeth has negotiated a bullying and harassment policy, a rehabilitation programme and led several initiatives to improve rest areas in the workplace. She was actively involved in the launch of the GMB's domestic violence pledge card in June 2003 as part of the Daffney Project. *(Applause) Presentation of Safety Rep Award.*

### Organising Award

**The President:** Finally, the Award for Organising goes to Melanie Jenner, a PCS lay organiser in the Home Office. During the past year, Melanie has led a campaign to re-structure and re-vitalise her local branch. During the recent pay dispute, Melanie launched another campaign to recruit new members, which led to some 400 more civil servants joining PCS. As a result of her efforts, the union in the Home Office's Croydon Branch has been re-vitalised, with three active branch committees, 400 new members, a hundred new distributors and the union's training programme for new reps has been re-vamped. Unfortunately, she cannot be with us today but she will collect her award on Wednesday morning. Thank you, Melanie Jenner. *(Applause).*

### Address by General Secretary

**The President:** Delegates, in the past few minutes we have been celebrating the work which has been done day in and day out by lay reps, but to be effective

those reps need the support of their unions and for unions to be effective we need to work together through the TUC, so it is entirely appropriate that after seeing our lay reps at work we should now hear from the person whose job it is to speak on behalf of the whole trade union movement. This is only Brendan's second year as General Secretary and it has certainly not been quiet. It is not just headline disputes like the firefighters, which have kept him busy, but he has also helped quietly to resolve many other problems away from the public spotlight. I know that Brendan argues our case forcefully, both from the corridors of power and from Trafalgar Square. He has a detailed grasp of particular issues and the capacity to see the big picture. I have great pleasure in inviting Brendan Barber to address Congress.

**Brendan Barber** (*General Secretary*): Roger, thank you very much for those words of introduction. It is great to see that so many delegates made sure they got back early for the start of the session this afternoon to make sure that they did not miss my address to Congress. (*Laughter*)

The next general election is almost certainly less than a year away. So our debates this week take on a special significance. We have to formulate detailed policies on a host of matters of crucial importance to working people, but we face a greater challenge, too. That is to think about the big picture, to set out our vision. It is no exaggeration to say that we stand at a defining moment. On the one hand is the American model – deregulation, casual hire and fire, minimal levels of social welfare, long working hours, an economy in which trade unionism is under constant attack from corporate leaderships desperate to deny working people a voice. Vast wealth is generated, for sure, but look how it is divided: obscene wealth for a few sitting alongside desperate poverty for too many. The alternative, for which we have to be the standard bearer, which is a hugely important battle of ideas, is the model which we have developed here in Europe, based on secure welfare states, social partnership, a strong framework of rights, both for citizens and workers. Our case is compelling. The quality of our lives hinges critically on our public services and our welfare state. They are a vital force for social cohesion, the glue that binds our communities together. We know, too, that giving workers a stronger voice at work does not get in the way of economic efficiency. It enhances it, as independent research has demonstrated time and time again. Our way, the union way, is the route to greater prosperity and greater fairness, too. In union workplaces we win fairer pay, with a mark-up of eight per cent over non-union Britain. In union workplaces our people work safer with half the accident rates of non-union Britain. In union workplaces we deliver better training opportunities, a growing gap as our army of learning reps makes an even bigger impact day by day.

So I give the lie to those who dare to question the relevance of unions and the TUC. Perhaps we need to do more to publicise and celebrate our achievements. Of course, there is a huge amount still to be done and the day that we stop being passionate about righting wrongs will be the day that our movement died. Our members want to take pride in the movement that wins for them. That is how we will meet our biggest challenge, which is rebuilding our membership, our organisational strength.

Just think of some of our wins in the course of the last year. Last year we said that we would campaign for decent pensions for all. We have propelled

pensions right to the top of the political agenda. Our campaigning has ensured that no one can now ignore the workers whose final salary schemes have been closed while company directors stuff their own funds with gold; young people denied jobs with pensions, and the women suffering the worst deal of all, many not even eligible for the state retirement pension, that most think is a right. The pensions crisis is deep, for sure, but let us pay tribute to the workers and their unions who, from the depths of despair, facing the loss of their lifetime's pension saving, have led the campaign for fair pensions treatment for workers when firms go bust. Their courageous battle has won the Pensions Protection Fund to ensure that no workers in the future face that catastrophe, and they have won the Compensation Fund, too, for the victims in recent years. Of course, the funding may well not yet be enough so the campaign goes on. But let us thank the thousands of working people who took to the streets with us in London in June in our TUC-led pensions demonstration. That showed ministers and employers that they had to act.

Our campaign for better protection and stronger pension rights should make us all proud to be trade unionists. Last year, too, we said we would put the fight for long working hours right at the forefront of our campaigns, and we have put the spotlight on our long hours culture. In Britain we have the combination of the longest hours and the fewest public holidays in Europe. Countless workers do unpaid overtime effectively working for free until the end of February.

Of course, the statistics do not tell us the full story. They do not tell us about the low paid workers who have to work every last hour just to make ends meet, or the working families where millions of children simply do not see enough of their mothers or fathers. That is why the battle to end the UK's shameful backing of the individual opt-out from the 48-hour week continues. I thought the Government thought that this might be a quick win for them and for the business lobby, but they were wrong. A year later we are still fighting. The European Parliament has said the opt out must go. Let us, perhaps, just pause for a moment to praise those members of the European Parliament who backed us and not the party line which had come from London.

Now the CBI has been forced to discuss how to end abuses that last year they said did not exist. Now, thanks to union campaigning, Labour is pledged to stop employers counting bank holidays against Europe's four-week minimum paid holidays entitlement. Millions of mainly part-time, mainly low-paid, mainly women workers, will benefit. That should make us all proud to be trade unionists.

Last year we pledged to accelerate our learning and skills revolution and help thousands more working people. This year, as we plan for a new Union Academy, our army of learning reps is 8,000 strong and growing fast. I visited new learning centres in the west country, the north-east, the north-west and London and more are on the way. I have met people able to read and write for the first time, people learning new skills and expanding their prospects up to and beyond university level thanks to their unions. They were let down, perhaps, by the education system, let down by the world of work but not let down by our movement. That should make us proud to be trade unionists.

President, I do not have enough time to spell out all of our achievements and victories. Let me mention

just a few – a new minimum wage for 16 and 17 year olds; new information and consultation rights about to be enshrined in law; protection from US-style union busters, about to become law; and soon the law will be changed, too, as Congress demanded, to make it easier for us to expel racists and fascists from our midst. Let us pause for a moment to pay tribute to all those trade unionists who work night and day to ensure that the poison and filth of the BNP was not allowed to make headway in the European and local elections. *(Applause)* I think that work, too, should make us all proud to be trade unionists.

After ceaseless TUC and union campaigning, the end is at last in sight for the disgraceful two-tier workforce in our public services. Last in my list but by no means least, a new law has been won to protect migrant workers against ruthless exploitation by gangmasters. I pay tribute to the T&G and Jim Sheridan MP for all the tremendous work, which went into winning that advance. *(Applause)* What happened in Morecambe Bay on the night of February 5<sup>th</sup> must never be allowed to happen again, but that terrible tragedy shows exactly what does happen in a globalised, de-regulated, casualised, non-unionised economy. It shows why our vision has to prevail.

Every affiliate has their own wins to report. We should pay tribute to the members and the leadership of the Fire Brigades Union. They stuck together, battled on and now, at long last, they have settled their dispute after months of difficult negotiations. I was pleased to be able to have worked with the union to broker a full and final settlement of all outstanding issues. It was just a shame that I had to do it on three separate occasions.

Congress, there is no great secret as to why this has been a year of real advance for our movement. It is because we have worked together. When the FBU asked for support, they got it. When the ASW workers needed support, they got it. When our members fighting the BNP needed supported, they got it. By working together we have achieved the most important advance of the year, and that is the prospect of a new relationship with this Government. Let us be frank. The phrase 'love-hate-relationship' could have been invented to describe how we get along with the Labour Government. Yes, we recognise the achievements. We don't forget the destruction that mass unemployment caused, the damage caused by decades of under-investment in the public services. I have nightmares about just how bad things could be again when I hear speeches from the Opposition attacking basic rights at work and when they label tolerance and opposition to discrimination as political correctness gone mad. I even woke up the other night from a nightmare that John Redwood was back in frontline politics.

Of course, that does not mean that we have not had our differences with the Government, and the second term has seen more than its fair share of disappointments. That is not just because of the deeply controversial and unpopular military action in Iraq.

Congress, let me return to the bigger picture. When I addressed Labour's National Policy Forum earlier this year, I said that what was missing from Labour's second term was any sense of a comprehensive programme for the workplace, to deliver our vision beyond full employment, to quality employment for everyone. We did have a joint

programme in the first term. We made progress together; the Minimum Wage, union recognition, the New Deal and signing up to the Social Chapter. You know the litany well. But we did not secure an agreement for the second term so we have to change that for the third term. That, really, is the significance of the understandings and agreements secured at Warwick through the Labour Party National Policy Forum. I pay tribute to the astute, disciplined and, above all, the united way that Labour affiliates took forward so much of the common policy that we have thrashed out at successive Congresses, using that link to the full at the one time in the political cycle when it has most power. Warwick has given us real sense of a programme on which we can work together with this Government. Of course, there are some big issues, important to us, which remain unfinished business. Much work needs to be done to make some of those commitments into detailed practical policies. Yet I think that the programme put together in Warwick has made us more at ease with each other than for some time. Best of all, it has given us a new sense of common purpose and a confidence that we can make sure progress towards our goals. I am looking forward to the Prime Minister setting out his commitment to those understandings and to the next steps to take them forward.

We will make the greatest progress if we are strongest ourselves. So our priority must be to get the millions back into the union family. Tackling the organising challenge is an ever higher priority for the TUC. We created the Organising Academy; we are tripling the number of courses for activists and officers. We act as a clearinghouse, encouraging unions to share experiences, good and bad, with each other. We try to ensure a one-movement approach, avoiding wasteful inter-union rivalry. Ultimately, of course, it is not the TUC that can recruit new members into our ranks. That is the job of each and every union. It is your decisions in the individual affiliates, your choices, for example, on how you allocate resources, that will make the real difference. Congress, we have got some crucial battles ahead: to win the organising challenge; to win political change; to argue for our union ways; going beyond full employment to quality employment; and we will win if we stay united. Of course, there are many different views in this hall today. Every one of you has your own priorities, but we come together this week because we know that together we are stronger. We are always stronger by far if we stick together; small and medium sized unions as well as big unions; unions that do not affiliate to the Labour Party alongside those that do. We are the voice of Britain at work. Men and women, black and white, young and old. When working people are in need, we do not walk on by.

Congress, President, that is why we are proud to be trade unionists. Thanks for listening. *(Applause)*

**The President:** Thank you very much, indeed, Brendan, for that stirring and thoughtful address which has given us much to reflect on and debate during Congress.

### Strategic Review

**Anita Halpin** (*National Union of Journalists*) speaking to paragraph 1.6 of the General Council Report, said: Paragraph 1.6 of the General Council's Report describes the Strategic Review process. In particular, it talks about how we, as a movement, make an external impact.

I would like to raise two points mentioned in this paragraph. The catch phrase of the Strategic Review

was 'finding the missing millions'. In their response, a number of unions, including my own, argued that we need to be more imaginative, even, dare I say, bolder in making links with other social movements. Those unions which raised the issue stressed that this was a crucial part of making an external impact. While this is referred to quite properly in the annual report, I think Congress should know that, maybe, it does not quite get across the strength of feeling made in a number of contributions in this issue. As I have said, we need to be bolder and we need to seek recruits in non-traditional areas, and not always have dialogue with what might be termed the usual suspects.

Of course we need to develop and build our organising agenda, but that agenda may too often be directed at workplaces where we have members, where we have had members and where we want more members. Of course, we need to make trade unionism attractive to young people. It is a truism to say that the young people are our future, but I think we ignore at our peril the real care and concern that those young people have for their future. That is why so many of them join the millions demonstrating against the Iraqi illegal war.

In believing that a better world is possible, youngsters embrace the principles of the World and European Social Forum, and I am glad that the TUC has come on board with that. The point that my union and others were making during the Strategic Review process was that we must be more prepared to make links with new and different and atypical partners, if I can use that phrase, for once.

President, to my second point. At the end of the same paragraph there is a brief reference to TUC constitutional issues. Those who know me know that I am a bit of a constitutional hack, but I would argue that it is very important to get our own house in order democratically to be attractive to those who want to join us, and who, particularly in the younger generation, are suspicious of institutional bureaucracy. Again, I believe the report does not quite give the flavour of the concerns of my union and others about aspects of transparency, democracy and accountability of the relationship between the General Council and its Executive. It is not the main point I am making now. I think the whole Strategic Review process was very worthwhile. I am just emphasising something here which has not had the stress which I believe it deserved in the report. I thank you for your time.

**The President:** Thank you, Anita. Since we started this afternoon, we have been joined by some of our guests. I want to introduce from the Workers' Bureau at the International Labour Organisation in Geneva, Elizabeth Goodson. From our sister TUC in Japan, RENGO, Suitomo Mauri. I am pleased to be able to report that the two leaders of the two trade union centres in Israel and Palestine are with us now. Welcome to Amir Peretz, the General Secretary of the Histadrut, the Israeli TUC, and Shafer Sae'd, the General Secretary of the Palestinian General Federation of Trade Unions. *(Applause)*

## Union Organising

**Tony Woodley** (*Transport & General Workers' Union*) moved Composite Motion 3. He said: President and comrades, we all know and we have just heard it in Brendan's speech that organising is the key to our future. We say it at every Congress. We agree that without bringing those millions of unorganised millions of men and women into our ranks then trade

unionism as we know it does indeed have a limited future. With our headline union membership now down to just over 6.4 million, that is more true than ever before. Let us accept that there have been some great initiatives. ISTC, now Community, has done a sterling job in growing their union. The TUC's academy for organisers has done a fantastic job and even though my union did not have the brains to join that earlier, it now has. However, what we do need is a culture change throughout the whole of our movement. In our case, the T&G is making, maybe, what is one of the biggest cultural shifts in its history to try and grasp the new opportunities that are out there, millions of opportunities because of the new jobs that Labour has also created. We are refocusing our time, money and effort away from admin and placing it into organising as a whole union. It is not just about recruitment. It is about growing and winning and delivering satisfaction in the workplace, getting our activists active once again. By this time next year we aim to have more than a hundred new full-time organisers on the streets, many young men and women, many from our ethnic communities and backgrounds, on the streets and in our communities, growing trade unionism, fighting back for workers, leaving self-sustainable organisation behind. You have listened to Digby Jones who asked the question: are trade unions relevant today? Let us not dismiss the question. Let us ask ourselves the question in all honesty. Over the past 20 years or so, have we done enough to fight back to campaign and instil a confidence in workers whereby they willingly want to join trade unions. There have been, in my view, notable exceptions, but I believe, in broad terms, the answer is no. The membership density speaks for itself.

A new mood exists amongst workers, indeed, amongst our members. We have to capture the moment and re-connect to the needs and aspirations of working men and women who need our help and support. In some cases, I believe that we have become too remote from our members themselves. If this is a fact what more can the TUC do to lead and give support and help us to grow our movement? The composite before you sets out some of those things that we can do, but, above all, and first of all, we can actually help each other by acting in a much more principled way. Let us stop the poaching of each other's members and agreements. Let's not pick up the invites from the gaffer for that single union deal knowing that another union is already there recruiting. Let's stop doing that. Let's stop behaving badly and let's start behaving in a principled manner. We want a principled trade unionism, not a competitive trade unionism. Indeed, Derek Simpson and myself have tried to lead from the front, along with other colleagues on this, with leads that we have shown. I would sooner see more than one union on a site growing the density of trade unionism than a single union deal delivering neither membership nor employee satisfaction. I want a TUC campaigning even more than in the past to see if we can deliver this. In relation to the great rally on pensions, let us give credit where credit is due. Could we have done it a bit sooner, maybe, but let us give credit with what we have done. Above all, it has to be a TUC supporting those unions which are organising, giving research support and even more training for organisers. That will help us grow.

My vision is a TUC much closer to the daily work and concerns of the affiliates. It does mean that the TUC, like the T&G, must refocus its resources, in my view, on growing and winning and moving away from the à la carte menu of services that it provides. Whilst some of them are useful, quite frankly we can no

longer see these as priorities above organising. We have got to wake up. It is a wake-up call, in my view, that we have to organise or die. I accept that the T&G is slow to wake up.

I finish on this point and I pose one question. What legacy do we leave for those who follow us? It is in our own hands. The choice is ours. Support the composite. Thank you.

**Leslie Manasseh** (*Connect*) in seconding the composite motion, said: I would like to start with some simple if, perhaps, uncomfortable views about our immediate future. Congress, unless we grow in numbers we cannot grow in influence. Unless we put organising at the top of our collective agenda, we will not grow and, unless that means practical changes to the way in which we set priorities and allocate resources, it will not work, because appointing a few dedicated organisers is simply not enough. We have to build organising into everything we do.

There are more than 25 million workers in the economy. Over three-quarters of them are in the private sector. So, if we look at the size and profile of the TUC membership, we can see how big that target is. Unless we make a massive investment in organising we are not going to hit it. Obviously, we must campaign and negotiate on the issues that matter, that touch the lives of the people who we represent. That said, how we use our resources lies at the very heart of the organising challenge. If alongside relevant campaigns we spent time, money and effort on organising, we will reap the benefits. If we do not, we risk bumping along the bottom, organising traditional but shrinking sectors, seeing the age profile of our members steadily rise, leaving vast tracts of the economy unorganised and, perhaps most crucially, being seen very largely as a public sector phenomenon.

This means for many of us re-allocating resources and, perhaps, stopping some of the things that we have taken for granted. For example, Congress, can it be right when resources are so tight to spend millions of pounds every year holding conferences to refine our policies and re-jig our rule books when millions of workers have never been asked to join a trade union? Can it be right to make decisions which simply add to an ever-growing list of priorities when we know having scores of priorities means, in effect, that we have none? Can it be right to maintain structures which do not visibly contribute to growth or renewal? Do we focus on the workplace or our own internal organisation? Are we inward or outward looking? We need honest answers to these questions and we need to think long and hard about what we do and how we do it. The good news is that organising works. The investment is worth it.

My union has grown by more than 20 per cent in the past few years and that is organising white-collar workers in a recession-hit and shrinking part of the private sector, the so-called ICT industries, where trade unionism has a very shallow footprint. We have even gained collective representation for 13,000 managers who were on individual contracts. We do not have a magic wand or a unique formula. That is down to organising. Twenty per cent of our employees are dedicated organisers and every committee has an explicit organising role.

I ask you, Congress, to support this motion, not because you think it is yet another good idea amongst the very many this week, but because it offers a way of

addressing the most serious tasks ahead of us. Thank you.

**Joanna Brown** (*Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists*): My union is speaking in support of the composite and referring you specifically to the fourth paragraph, which is about self-employed workers. Organising is about recruiting workers into unions but it is also about keeping them in when we have got them. If we are to do this successfully we must be relevant to all workers at all stages of their working life. This includes people who are self-employed.

According to the 2001 census three million people in Britain are self-employed. They work in lots of different industries, including construction, sales, catering, finance and health. Are all of these three million in a union? I think we know the answer to that. They are not, although I can tell you that around 4,000 are members of the SCP so we are playing our part in organising this important group of workers. The career patterns of our members, chiropodists and podiatrists, are very flexible. Many of them move between the NHS and the independent sector, so they want different services at different stages of their careers. This is typical of the workforce as a whole, where jobs for life are becoming increasingly rare.

So what sort of services are we talking about? Clearly, self-employed workers do not have a need for collective bargaining but they do have a need for information and advice to help them in their working lives. This could be about pensions, benefits or training opportunities. It could be how to comply with complex legislation, such as the Disability Discrimination Act or the Data Protection Act. It could be about contracts or health and safety. These are precisely the kinds of areas where the TUC has great knowledge and expertise and could act as a resource for unions. The TUC website has sections for agency workers and home workers, encouraging them to join a union, but at the moment the self-employed are the missing three million.

Within this composite there is a request to the General Council to investigate the needs of this group of members with a view to providing additional services, and I hope this issue is not overlooked when the composite is acted on by the General Council.

Please support the self-employed and support the composite.

**Alan Grey** (*Prospect*): My union supports Composite 3 and, in particular, I am speaking to bullet points 9 and 10 on promoting the positive benefits of trade union membership and encouraging students and young people to become members.

Congress, I surprised myself this morning by arriving at the Conference centre early. I will probably shock myself if I do it again this week, but I was extremely interested to see, when waiting for Congress to start, that we were projecting the benefits of trade union membership on the screen behind us. Clearly, trade union members benefit on pay where trade union members on average earn 17 per cent more per hour than non-union members. There are clear benefits other than pay where unionised workplaces have greater access to family friendly policies, where a union presence ensures a fairer workplace with better procedures for handling employment relations issues.



In relation to pensions, it is very rare for there to be a final salary scheme in non-unionised workplaces.

This is the message that we all know, Congress, but it is a message that Prospect believes we have to get across to the 80 per cent of non-members in the private sector and the 40 per cent of non-members in the public sector. Our message has to be particularly targeted at young people and students, because membership density in the working population between the ages of 16 – 24 is only about ten per cent. You do not have to be a genius, Congress, to predict that unless we can successfully recruit and recognise these young people, the positive rules we have recently made will be reversed.

Prospect recognises that the organising challenge for unions is immense. Students and graduates are under-represented at both growing ends of the private sector employment spectrum. Poorly paid insecure work in the service and retail sectors and in the hi-tech areas, where pay may be higher, there is still great insecurity.

Most unions have success stories about recruiting young people. In Prospect we have made great strides in recruiting archaeologists, which is mostly a young professionals occupation. We have to analyse those successes and learn the lessons and use those as the foundation for a major recruitment and organising initiative aimed at young people. I do not believe it is being too dramatic to say that the future of the trade union movement depends upon it. Thank you.

**Kevin Curran (GMB):** While trade unions remain very strong organisations, we should also acknowledge that trade unions are at present failing; strong because the movement represents millions of people at work and is the biggest voluntary membership body in the country, and it sets the standards for every person in employment in the UK; but failing because we are becoming increasingly ghettoised in the public sector and are not recruiting effectively in the private sector services.

British trade unionism has become process-driven; too many of our resources are spent on an endless round of meetings and committees; the same people talking to the same people over and over again while millions of unorganised workers go about their daily business. I am convinced that we will continue to fail and become increasingly marginalised unless we bring about real, lasting and substantive change.

Every part of the movement needs to answer some fundamental questions. How can we better consult, inform and communicate with our activists and members in their workplaces? How do we respond to the steady decline in membership levels? How can we trim bureaucracy and devote more time and resources to frontline recruitment, representation and organisation? How can we increase resources to activists in workplaces to grow our organisations? How do we inspire a new generation of inclusive, effective and confident workplace leaders? How can we become more involved in community initiatives? How do we achieve 100 per cent membership in every workplace where we have a member and, moreover, 100 per cent membership in every workplace that does not yet have any members?

Each part of our movement should take a look at what it currently does in the light of these challenges. The GMB's view is that trade unions have never been

more important or more needed. We must overcome the barriers. We must overcome the challenges that are holding us back. Now is the time to reconnect with people at work. Let us not compete or duplicate. Let us reconnect to our purpose; do what we are good at; organise and protect people at work. Let us be confident and assertive in the process.

Just prior to this Congress, a number of journalists asked me what I expected the Prime Minister to say at this Congress. I said: "What I would love the Prime Minister to say is: 'Join your trade union like I have.'" Tony is in the T&G. He has certainly led by example and the message from Tony should be: "Do what I have done. Join your trade union."

**John Hannett (Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers):** I believe we have some real room for optimism here. In fact, we would not have been having this debate many years ago. Too many of us were thinking it was an automatic right that people would join trade unions hoping that recruitment took care of itself, believing people naturally joined unions and assuming it was a matter of course.

Bearing in mind what has so far been said at Congress, from the point of view of USDAW and the movement, we have some real room for optimism. I think, Brendan, the General Council and the TUC's Organising Academy can take real credit, in fact, for issuing a real wake-up call but, more than that, giving an incentive and a way forward, injecting some real lost vigour into our recruitment and our organising work, putting some real management and steel into the process and, in fact, helping us all to see recruitment and organising for what it really is. It is a skill that needs training, developing and updating. It is about being positive and giving the right message and the right lead.

The TUC Organising Academy has, in fact, been a real catalyst. In my own union, USDAW, we have now managed to move the agenda on and established our own academy, which is in its second year. It consists of key activists who are keen to give the right message and we have had some tremendous dividends so far.

The recruitment and the organising is directed, focused, monitored and evaluated and it is about linking to the campaigns that are important to our members, like our retail violence campaign, an issue that struck a chord with many retail workers. We train our officers and we train our union representatives. We invest in officers to recruit and develop reps and build our infrastructure, and reps, in fact, to take the lead in the workplace.

Let me just give some evidence to show that there is still a demand to be members of trade unions. Let me just give you one or two figures which demonstrate the case in USDAW terms. We have now recruited 14,000 members more than last year, 21,000 more than the year before and 28,000 more than in 2001.

As the composite rightly points out, this is not just a numbers game. It is about influence and about raising the right issues. In an organised workplace, we can talk to the employers with integrity and authority because we understand the issues. In an organised workplace, an employer can rely on a view being authentic, being rounded and widely supported by the workforce. What it means is we have clout and we have influence.

We are well-used to focusing on work and how and who we recruit. The composite enables us to do that, to work together in a joined-up way and to recruit those many, many members who are not yet in the trade union movement. Please support the composite.

**Kevin Kelly** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supporting the composite motion said: We believe that organising along with campaigning on important membership issues is the key to building a strong, healthy, growing trade union movement. PCS has recently adopted a national organising strategy aimed at PCS becoming an organising union.

We recognise this is more than simply recruitment and a numbers game. A key priority for PCS will be to build and properly sustain a workplace organisation to enable our members to campaign and win at a local level. We are now prioritised and are organising work across the whole union, mapping all areas, identifying our strengths and weaknesses, identifying new areas in government and the private sector where there is currently no union presence and directing our resources towards winning recognition.

PCS has achieved our target of 300,000 members, so we are ahead of schedule. We now have over 316,000 members. In the DWP section alone, we have increased our membership by over 15,000 in the last 12 months. This is because our members in that section stood up and fought on issues such as pay and appraisals, taking strike action in defence of our members' terms and conditions.

Organising young people is critical to our future. PCS has set up a young members' network and appointed an organiser to co-ordinate. We are confident that a strong campaign and structure will soon develop in the next few months.

PCS fully supports this motion, but there are two points we would like to see developed. Firstly, point 5, the Organising Academy. We would like to see a long-term commitment to it from the General Council.

Secondly, point 10, we believe the TUC should give greater profile on youth work in a similar way to that of the STUC's work campaign.

Unions are at their best when they are bold, stand up and represent members. Organising is not an end in itself, but it is a means to increase our chances of winning the crucial campaigns and fight on issues such as jobs, pensions, pay and equality. That is why organising, combined with campaigning work, are crucial to our future successes and delivering real change at the workplace and in wider society.

**Susan Highton** (*UNISON*) supporting the composite motion said: Organising, development and recruiting is the first priority in every union. It is within my union, UNISON. I am pleased that it is on the agenda for the TUC. I am proud to belong to a union. I am proud to belong to an organising union. I am proud to come to this Trades Union Congress on behalf of our members within our union, but I call on others in this conference hall. I want to take that feeling and that belonging to a wider organisation, i.e. the TUC, to my grandchildren and their grandchildren, but unless we carry out what this composite is asking, unfortunately, it may not happen and it may not be possible.

Trade unions are declining, but let us ask ourselves why. After 18 long years of Conservative Government we are all still picking up the aftermath of them attempting to bring down the trade unions. Also, society is changing and we need to change with our members and our potential members.

The composite calls for the General Council to carry out points (i) to (x) and for all the unions to carry out points (a) to (e). I know we all agree, at least I hope we do, but let us not just vote and support. Let us go back and do the work.

I know we all have large agendas and lots of priorities, but let organising be one of the top priorities. I want to see my grandchildren standing on this rostrum talking about organising as a day-to-day part of their activities.

Read this composite. It says a lot, it asks us a lot, and it makes sense. It asks us for a comprehensive review. It asks us for training around organising for the union. It talks about supporting and training reps to take organising work.

This composite is the future of all of us and we want to be powerful and deliver for our members, our members who our grandchildren will be representing. There is a lot more to say, but, unfortunately, my nerves are starting to break now with so many people in the hall as well as our Prime Minister.

\* *Composite Motion 3 was CARRIED.*

#### **Address by the Prime Minister: Rt Hon Tony Blair MP**

**The President:** Tony Blair became Prime Minister on 1<sup>st</sup> May 1997, seven years ago, and this Government has accomplished some major achievements, some of which have been reported here today – the National Minimum Wage, union recognition, devolution for Scotland and Wales, and, in particular, unprecedented levels of economic stability, low unemployment and low inflation. Twelve months ago, this became the longest serving Labour Government in history. That, too, is a great achievement. It is also an opportunity for reflection on the agenda for the third term that we will all be working on and for, an agenda for moving beyond full employment to quality employment.

As the voice of Britain at work, unions have a crucial role to play in working with the Government on that agenda and the issues we both care about – social justice, economic prosperity and a fair society. As we heard in the previous debate we know that we must organise even more new workers to make the union voice stronger, speaking up for Britain's hard working families, working on their behalf with the Government. Tony, we are all delighted to welcome you here today.

**Rt Hon Tony Blair MP** (*Prime Minister and Leader of the Labour Party*): Roger, Congress, as ever, before the TUC speech, I am not short of advice. The difference this year is that I agree with it. Some have told me not to break the agreement at the Warwick Policy Forum in July. Some, notable Brendan, have said it is time to come out in favour of social partnership, not to be embarrassed about it. All have told me not to lose touch with the concerns of the hard-working families it is our and my duty to represent.

So, I come here to praise Warwick, not to bury it; to advocate social partnership, not belittle it, and, above all, to demonstrate that our and my priority is and always will be the lives, living standards and quality of life of Britain's hard-working families, the men and women who play by the rules and expect others to do the same; who worry about the bills and the mortgage and making ends meet; who struggle with the modern burden of work and family life, and who do not ask or expect miracles, just a fair chance to make the most of life for them and their children.

I frankly admit that too many people look at the past few years and see how the political and media agenda has been dominated by nothing but foreign affairs. There are all sorts of explanations I can give. The world agenda since September 11<sup>th</sup> 2001 has been different; different for the leaders that have stood by America since then; different for the leaders that have not, but dominant for both.

I cannot apologise for what I think about the world since September 11<sup>th</sup> or what I have done in the war against this vicious terrorism we face. That would be insincere and dishonest.

But vital though that war is, the daily lives of our citizens here in Britain are not about foreign affairs. It is interest rates, the workplace, taxes and bills, schools and hospitals, crime and anti-social behaviour. Their stage is not the world; it is here on our streets, our towns, villages and cities.

Yet even at the height of the crises of the last three years – since I stood here in this hall on 11 September and spoke about this new form of terrorism our world faces – we have never stopped working on that domestic, bread and butter, real life agenda.

But I acknowledge that it has not seemed like that. I have never been away from those issues that make daily life good or bad for our people. But too many people watching the news every night might think I have. If I can put it like this: even if I have never been away, it is time to show I am back.

The best way of doing that, however, is not words but to prove it by action.

Over the weekend I got out the first speech I ever made to a Labour Party Conference, not as leader but as Employment spokesman back in 1990. I said that a Labour Government would introduce a minimum wage, a legal right to union recognition, sign the Social Chapter, restore trade union rights at GCHQ, improve maternity leave, introduce paid holidays, end blacklisting and remove the power of automatic dismissal for those lawfully on strike.

Congress, we have done every one of those things as a Labour Government. But we only did them by being in Government, not in permanent Opposition.

There is another thing I want to remind you about that period: the name of my opposite number in the Tory Cabinet that gave us mass unemployment, soaring interest rates and the Poll Tax. You may remember him. Mr Michael Howard.

I have told you what I said in 1990. Let me tell you what he said in 1990. He said that the minimum wage would cost one million jobs and that the Social Chapter

would cost another half-million jobs. He was talking nonsense then. He talks nonsense now. If we want to keep our economy strong, we need to keep Mr. Howard in Opposition.

None of this – not the economic strength, not the legislation to correct injustice at work, came through chance, but through choice. The choice you made was not to make demands you knew would not be met, nor to hark back to the past but to understand economic stability had to be the irreducible bedrock of economic opportunity and social progress.

Seven years on, our long-term interest rates are the lowest for 25 years, matching continental levels. Employment has risen steadily without generating inflation. Economic growth is currently the highest in the G8 main industrial countries with 29 quarters of consecutive growth since 1997. The public finances are in good shape. Immense productivity challenges remain, but the foundations of future prosperity are being laid.

The difference that we have made by that choice, and by the action, to the living standards of hard-working families since we came to office is crystal clear. Average monthly mortgage payments are £400 less under this Government than under the Conservatives. Property repossessions, so devastating during the late 1980s, are now at a historic low. Families are far better off with living standards growing by a fifth since 1996/97. The average working family with children is £1,350 a year better off in real terms since we came to office. The poorest fifth are over £3,000 a year better off in real terms.

It is a clear reminder that economic stability is for a purpose – to create a fairer, more prosperous society with decent provision for the least advantaged, and world-class public services for all.

Full employment has transformed regions of the country left behind in the 1980s. Across Britain's cities, city centres and riversides that had become drab, empty at night, are now vibrant. Derelict factories and empty warehouses have been converted into new homes and businesses providing the jobs of the future. Britain is working, its economy now one of the most dynamic and competitive in the world.

As a result, Congress, we are the only major nation in the world that for the last two years and the next two will be increasing public investment in healthcare and education as a percentage of national income. The only one!

Alongside that, as I was hearing this morning from people engaged in combating poverty all over our country, 700,000 children have been lifted out of poverty; almost two million pensioners relieved from acute hardship, and there has been record help for poorer families through extra childcare benefit, tax credits and family support.

So when I hear people saying that we should pursue Labour policies not Tory ones, I say what could be more Labour than record jobs, record investment in the National Health Service and millions of people lifted out of poverty? Yet you do not continue to govern on the basis of your record but on the basis of your vision of the future.

The truth is that despite all of these advances, modern life for many of our people is tough. Yes, there are jobs but they are often insecure. There are still too many people who are sick and disabled who would like to work but do not have the opportunity to do so. The minimum wage may give protection but it is hard to raise a family on it. Years ago, if we talked of pensions, we meant pensioners. Today there is real anxiety amongst those of working age as to how to save for their retirement. More women work than ever before but balancing work and family life is a struggle and equal pay still an aspiration not a reality for millions of women in Britain's workforce.

What is more, even if people are in work, reasonably secure, even if they are comfortably off, the economy they work in is part of a world market that has never seen such revolutionary changes in technology, in consumer tastes and in the scale of competition. China and India today, each with well over one billion people, means that every nation in Europe, including ours, no longer competes only with America and Japan, let alone only with each other.

So how do we, us in Government and you in the trade unions and business, help our people cope with change, survive it and prosper in it?

When I opened recently one of the many new community centres in the former coalfields in the North East, there was a union banner which featured a picture of Peter Lee, who in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century founded the miners' union in the Durham Coalfield. The union was formed to break the virtual serfdom by which the coal owners ruled those that worked for them. The union successfully fought for miners' rights. In time, in Durham alone over 150,000 people employed in the mines, but the union did more than fight for them at the workplace. It founded mutual societies to provide them with help for medical care and pensions. It looked after legal claims and families that were bereaved. The unions stood for solidarity not only at work, but also in life.

No one works in the mines of Durham today. The whole economy of the North East is new. The jobs are new. The way of life is new. Within a few years of the mines closing, Fujitsu, one of the great Japanese hopes of inward investment, had set up its factory in my constituency and closed it again when the microchip market collapsed. The process of change, therefore, is constant.

So the issue for trade unions is the same as for the rest of us: how to adapt to change, to keep principles intact whilst the reality in which those principles exist is being transformed around us?

Once before, many of the trade unions represented here today took a decision to put aside the past in order to equip the Labour Party to govern successfully. Today, I ask you as social partners to do the same, to help the country succeed. To me, this is the significance of what was agreed at Warwick.

There can be no return to the industrial relations framework of the 1970s, no move away from the enterprise and dynamism a modern economy needs. We cannot and will not reverse the programme of change and modernisation that together with record investment is delivering public services combining equity with choice and excellence.

Union members are not just workers. They use the National Health Service. They need good state schools for their children, and they know that the welfare state of 2004, not 1945, has to be one that re-distributes opportunity not merely pays more out in benefit.

These changes, as much as the money, are allowing us to cut dramatically the waiting time for operations; make sure, for example, that no London Borough today has pass rates of under 40 per cent for GCSEs, up from 25 per cent in 1997, and has made long-term youth unemployment literally disappear. This is not selling out; it is paying back, reducing inequality, extending opportunity and giving hope.

Warwick should be seen not as diluting these changes but conditioning them with one very important basic set of principles: good jobs do not come with bad work practices; successful employers do not succeed by abusing their employee, and quality public services do not achieve excellence by undervaluing public servants.

In other words, our belief is that the more we value, invest in, understand and resolve the dilemmas of those that produce the wealth and services of our nation, in the modern world, the more likely we are to have the future we desire.

So what does Warwick mean in practice?

First, let us be clear. For Britain to prosper and thrive in the future, we need a vibrant modern manufacturing sector, just as much as a powerful service sector. Manufacturing in the UK has gone through a difficult time as it has in every developed country in the world. There are real successes in Britain: pharmaceuticals, aerospace, ICT and the biotechnology industry; truly world-class enterprises, of which any country should be proud.

Britain's car industry, once thought to be in terminal decline, has been reinvigorated, gaining a new lease of life.

Nissan in Sunderland is the most productive car plant in Europe, last month producing the millionth Nissan for the UK market. The new mini built at Cowley is a runaway success with half-a-million cars now coming off the production line, and the sector as a whole is now the UK's largest source of manufactured exports.

But there is a huge amount still to do. We will continue to see how investment in technology, the tax system for capital investment, and help for businesses to grow can benefit manufacturing. In every region, each regional development agency is now tasked with working up a strategy to build on the particular strengths of its manufacturing enterprises, helped by the budget from the Department of Trade and Industry.

This Government is now set to make the largest sustained investment in science for a generation - £3 billion a year! Such a commitment means modernised labs, better pay for researchers and new research programmes at the cutting edge of human knowledge.

Let me also make it absolutely clear, that the Government is absolutely determined to protect

research staff facing daily threats of intimidation and violence from animal rights extremists and will bring forward legislation to ensure that this is done.

For manufacturing and the whole economy Warwick signifies that skills, vocational education, once a social cause, are now an economic imperative. Britain will not succeed if over a third of its workforce lacks basic qualifications.

We have started by creating a new framework for skills and are on course to meet our 2007 target to help 1.5 million adults get basic skills and qualifications. We are also working with the TUC on the proposals for a TUC Academy to take the skills agenda even further. Since 1998 we have invested £35 million in the Trade Union Learning Fund, and put union learning reps on a statutory footing. We want to treble these numbers by 2010.

Education Maintenance Allowances have been extended to every 16-19 year old from a low-income background remaining in full-time education. We are extending the offer of free tuition for those without Level 2 qualifications to every worker, and we are now examining whether it is possible to extend financial support to those aged 19-30 years old to get Level 3 qualifications which, along with the other changes, would represent the biggest expansion in access to skills for half a century in this country.

In over a third of the country, we are now piloting employer training schemes, helping employers give time off for their staff to engage in training. We have expanded Modern Apprenticeships already from 70,000 to 200,000 but I can tell you that by the end of 2006 we are now aiming for 300,000 Modern Apprenticeships in Britain today.

Next, because there is today, rightly, far greater interaction between public, private and voluntary sectors to deliver public services, we have agreed a new deal to tackle the two-tier workforce.

In local government, we have already acted to end the 'two-tier' workforce. At Warwick we made the commitment to end it across the public sector and we will fulfil that commitment as a government.

In some workplaces, there is a long hours culture regardless of whether it is productive. We have introduced a right for people to choose not to work more than 48 hours, and an entitlement for the first time to four weeks paid holiday a year. We are committed to ensuring that people are able to exercise a genuine choice about the hours they work.

Let me repeat the commitment we made at Warwick that in a third term, if elected, the Labour Government will extend the paid holiday entitlement, so that the four weeks is always in addition to eight days of public holiday.

Our new family friendly law means that employers are now required to consider seriously requests from parents with children under six – or disabled children under 18 – to work flexibly. Nearly one million parents have taken advantage of the new law, and have applied for a change in working hours. Eight out of ten requests have been met in full.

It is not right that mothers or fathers are refused time off to see their sick child through a hospital operation, the right to time off when a family member is ill.

So we want to build on what has been achieved so far.

We have made a commitment, as you know, to our social partners not to introduce any changes before 2006. But the time is right to start thinking about the next steps in this area. In particular, we will examine how we can extend this right to flexible working to the growing numbers of citizens who have caring responsibilities for the elderly and disabled.

From the spring of next year, employees will have new rights to information and consultation at work, not preventing necessary change at work but ensuring that employees are treated as partners in that change.

We will act to root out abuse at the very bottom of the labour market where working people are most vulnerable. The Government will support Jim Sheridan MP's Private Member's Bill to curb exploitative activities among agricultural gang masters. We will improve protection for migrant workers, strengthening measures against employers who seek to exploit them. It is neither fair for those who are exploited, nor for those firms who do play by the rules when a few rogue employers are able to get away with ignoring the basic law.

You know our concerns on agency workers to maintain the necessary market flexibility. But whilst we must meet those concerns, we will support the EU Directive on Agency Workers.

We will ensure greater safety for front-line workers in retailing, transport and the public services, those who in working to help others face the constant daily threat of violence and anti-social behaviour.

We will publish proposals on corporate manslaughter in the current Parliamentary session, and introduce legislation to ensure that corporations are prosecuted for a serious criminal offence where they show such wilful disregard for their employees that it results in death.

Finally, building on Barbara Castle's Equal Pay Act, Margaret Prosser's Women and Work Commission will enable us to ensure that in our generation we close the gap in pay and opportunity between men and women at the workplace.

This is not an agenda about flying pickets, secondary action or the closed shop. Leave the past to the past. However, it is an agenda that if carried through will radically improve the lives of Britain's hard working and hard-pressed families. Work with us to get these changes. Help us to fashion them in a way that most benefits your members, actual and prospective. Make a reality of the social partnership with sensible forward-looking employers who share the belief that efficiency and fairness go hand in hand.

Trade unions have a past of which they are rightly proud. Today they are also reaching out to the future. In the public services, 'Agenda for Change' in the National Health Service, the 'Schools Workforce

Reform' programme in education, it is true, mean radical change in the way services will operate, but they are changes not just supported but in many cases shaped by constructive trade union participation.

Across the private sector, unions like Amicus at Rolls Royce, Unifi at Royal Bank of Scotland, CWU at Alliance and Leicester have protected or enhanced company pension schemes in imaginative ways to protect their members. The GMB, GPMU and TGWU are now actively involved all over Britain in setting up skills and learning centres with the help of the Government's Modernisation Fund. The shopworkers union is not just increasing members but taking the lead, where the employer is in difficulty in helping the company change, restructure and prosper.

One final area for work: pensions. There is no easy solution. The blunt truth is that the population is ageing; people live longer and yet want, unsurprisingly, the higher living standards they experienced while working, to continue into retirement. We need to get the balance right between what the State, ie the taxpayer, the individual and the employer each contribute; and we need to get the system right to facilitate that contribution. But one thing I can say to you, however, is that the basic state pension and the guarantees against pensioner poverty will always be an essential part of our solution to this issue; and you in the trade unions should be, along with business and industry, part of the partnership to get this issue right.

Those who said unions could never adapt to the challenge of the new economy and its changes are being proved wrong. Of course, wherever there is the possibility of industrial disputes, those capture the headlines. But the true face of modern trade unionism is not to be found in the exception of industrial breakdown, but in the broad rule of social partnership and progress.

We will not go back to the agenda of the past, but there is much for us now to do on the new agenda and to do it together. To people at work, wondering whether membership of a trade union has anything to offer them, I would say: go and see. See what a modern trade union can do; see the breadth of services they provide; see the help in troubled times they can give, and if you want to, as is your democratic right, join. In doing so, join us in building on the record of the past few years to seek new ambitions, new heights to scale, new ways to work, live and prosper.

I go back too that 1990 speech. I said then: "These are the forward-looking priorities we shall establish by our historic decisions today. The British people can now be clear. It is the Tories, not us, who believe that industrial relations is merely industrial warfare, arcane endless legal disputes about strikes and pickets as if the field of employment were merely a field of battle. It is they who are unable to escape the politics of conflict and grasps the potential for partnership. It is they who embrace the agenda of the 1970s and 1980s because they have no answer to the problems of the future. Let them: leave the past to those who live in it. This Party belongs in the future and we can address that future with confidence and hope."

It was true 14 years ago. It remains true now.  
(Applause)

**The President:** On behalf of the Congress, Tony, thank you very much for building on the National

Policy Forum understandings at Warwick, looking towards the third term agenda. I can assure you, on behalf of the TUC and Congress, that we look forward to working with you and the Government in winning that third term and putting the commitments into practice through a third-term Labour Government.

### **Organising and recruiting women at work**

**Debbie Coulter** (GMB) moved Motion 10: She said: Trust me to get graveyard slot after the Prime Minister's speech!

Throughout the course of this week, quite rightly, we will be spending much of our time discussing how to grow the trade union movement. The previous debate focused on the questions of how we can widen our appeal to non-union members, what we can do to attract new recruits and how we can organise workers to ensure that they are protected and represented.

Often the starting point for these debates is that there is a specific group of workers, perhaps a minority group, that particularly need our support or attention. The motion is not about a minority group being discriminated against. This motion is about how we, as a movement, are failing to grasp and missing the opportunity to organise and recruit among a massive workforce, and that massive workforce consists of women.

In 2004 there are more women in employment than ever before. Women now make up 46 per cent of the workforce. That is an awful lot of people whose needs and aspirations are being overlooked by the trade union movement.

It is now time that we got serious about recruiting and organising women at work. It is time that we developed fresh and imaginative strategies that will appeal to the fastest growing section of the workforce.

The GMB is calling upon the TUC to work with all affiliates to develop a comprehensive package of measures that will address the needs of women workers into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. The starting point is to listen to women about what matters to them in the workplace.

We want to see and we need to see the development by the TUC of nothing less than a new deal for working women; a new deal that will enable all unions to campaign, recruit and demonstrate to this huge workforce that the trade union movement is a progressive force for good acting on their behalf.

Central to this package must be the issue of unequal pay. Nearly 35 years after the passing of the Equal Pay Act we are nowhere near ending pay discrimination. We know that less than one in five companies have even examined the difference in male and female pay. If employers do not even bother looking at this issue – they are not even pretending to pay lip service to the notion of equal pay – what chance is there of ever achieving it? It is obvious that compulsion is required.

The EOC is recommending compulsory pay audits and the pressure must be maintained on ministers to put these on the statute book.

A little cautionary note to the Prime Minister: I do not want to see unequal pay ended within a generation. Did he say that? I nearly fell over. It is illegal, it is immoral and it is unjustifiable. We cannot allow our women members to be discriminated against any longer – never mind within a generation.

Protecting pensions is now a major priority for all, but for many women the pensions crisis is nothing new. Less than half of all women workers receive a full state pension on their retirement and urgent reforms, specifically targeted, are needed to decrease the number of women who are guaranteed nothing more in retirement than poverty.

We must act decisively on the important issues as well, like training and skills development, flexible working and better health and safety, which can disproportionately affect women workers.

The dividends to be gained from a concerted effort to recruit women workers are there to be seen. Amongst our public services section, women make up our largest group of members in the GMB, which has 61 per cent women membership. This growth has been achieved by focusing on a bargaining agenda on issues that affect women workers, like school support staff, by asking them and by concentrating negotiations on what they identify as being their needs.

The need for us to demonstrate the relevance and purpose of trade union membership to this significant proportion of the workforce has never been greater. The opportunity before us with more women at work has never been greater. The challenge before the TUC now is to seize that opportunity, to put the issues that matter to women at the centre of the agenda and to make sure that, collectively, we can deliver for women at work.

**Annette Place** (*UNISON*) seconding motion 10, said: Frankly, I have to tell you that I am very pleased to be doing this. I was expecting after the Prime Minister's speech to see more people in the balcony than there are on the floor of Congress but, happily, that has not happened.

This motion is particularly useful for UNISON to be seconding as we have almost one million women members, more than two-thirds of our union, but we do have the potential for so many more. This motion also nicely complements motion 16 in setting a TUC priority agenda for women. Whether you call it a 'new deal' or a 'fair deal' does not really matter, what does matter is achieving these demands, in full, as a matter of urgency.

Tony Blair said that equal pay is an aspiration for millions of women. Why is it an aspiration 35 years after the Equal Pay Act? One of the quickest ways to make this aspiration a reality is, as the previous speaker said, to make the pay audit the statutory duty of all employers. This is about the core business of our trade unions. It is not about flying pickets, or strikes, or closed shops, it is about organising, recruitment, negotiating, and campaigning, but this time it is with a difference. This time it is with an emphasis on women's rights at work and in the community.

In order to achieve these demands we must ensure that women are able to participate fully in all trade union activities and decision-making, and, dare I say,

leadership as well. Our overall equality targets for women can only be achieved through active organisation to break down society and organisational barriers. It is crucial that we open up training and development opportunities for women if we are to narrow the pay gap and provide real development opportunities for women, particularly those in lower grades working part-time who get least access of all.

We know from our experience of providing workplace learning opportunities for women that it does make a difference. The kind of information that we glean from providing our services to women in education should be available to us from all employers and we should be requiring employers to monitor their own performance to make sure that they are addressing the needs of their workforce and their service users. A good example is where the figures for local government training spending tell us that 40 per cent of it goes to those with existing management qualifications while those undertaking vocational qualifications get less than 12 per cent. The gender inequalities are embedded in these figures. That is another aspiration, I think, to make a reality.

Whilst I am up here I will just take the opportunity to promote the fringe meeting on Wednesday lunchtime, which will launch a charter for women. Sisters, brothers, whilst women still earn a lot less than men, face sex discrimination and harassment at work, whilst our members still have to juggle work and home commitments, we have to prioritise this work as set out in the motion. Do not just put up your hand, please make sure that you take these demands forward now.

**The President:** The General Council supports the motion.

\* *Motion 10 was CARRIED.*

### **Organising Black Workers**

**Wilf Sullivan** (*UNISON*) moved Motion 11 on behalf of the TUC Black Workers' Conference. He said: I think the first thing to say about this motion is that it is not just another motion about race. Often, when we talk about issues of race they are seen as minor issues in relation to the trade union movement. This motion is about organising black workers as black workers are a significant part of the workforce in this country. It addresses the vital issue of levels of membership and participation amongst black workers who are working often in the worst parts of the economy. The Prime Minister talked earlier about good employers but we all know there are many bad employers out there, many employers who exploit workers, who have poor health and safety, who maximise their profits by getting what they can out of their workers.

There was a time when black workers in this country proportionately joined trade unions far more than white workers, but that is not the case any more. This is something, I think, that if trade unions are going to survive and if they are going to prosper and grow they really have to address; that is what this motion is about. Currently, we are working in a background where there is still double the unemployment in the black community and in some parts of the black community triple the unemployment than there is with white workers. In an economy that is supposed to be dynamic and where there are job shortages, there are migrant workers being exploited and trafficked. These are all vulnerable workers that we as a trade union movement need to be organising, need to be recruiting, and need to be addressing the problems they face.

Congress, the Stephen Lawrence Task Group, I think, highlighted the problems that black workers face in this country. In some ways it was a wake-up call not only for the Government and society at large but for the trade union movement. I remember the helpline revealing stories about people's experiences that I do not think others actually believed happened any more. It showed that things have not really changed and that black workers, as with other workers, need the trade union movement as much now as they ever did.

However, if we are going to reach out to these workers and bring them into the trade union family, we need to stop seeing race discrimination as an individual issue, as something that when somebody experiences it at work we run off and get them a lawyer. It is a collective issue. If we are going to make real change, then we have to convince people that the only way they can deal with it is deal with it collectively.

I always think that part of the problem in terms of recruiting black workers into the trade union is that we do not make real changes in the workplace. The limit of our ambition seems to be to get somebody compensation after they have been discriminated against. If that is the limit of our ambition, then we cannot expect black workers to come and join the trade union movement. What they need is real change, they need to be able to have a fair opportunity to get jobs, they need to have a fair opportunity to get promotion, and they need to have the same opportunities for training as everybody else.

This motion is talking about strategy for change, it is about how we must have a strategy to organise collectively and bargain on behalf of black workers in the workplace to bring about that change. It recognises that we must start monitoring, setting targets, making sure that we progress, and making sure that it is not just words. Congress, as a race committee we have a vision about what we want to see, that is, that black workers see the trade union movement as a natural home, where black members have their aspirations met and, as a result, there is a high level of membership and participation, where we have strong links with the black community, and that we understand their issues are our issues and our issues are their issues. Unless we do that, Congress, we cannot be talking seriously about tackling the problems of some of the most vulnerable members of the labour force. We need to reach out from behind the workplace door and demonstrate to people that we are worth joining. Unless we demonstrate to people that we can work on their behalf, there is no reason at all why we should believe that those people should come and join us.

The last thing I will say, Congress, is that our view of the labour force has to change. It is not just an all-white labour force any more. We would as a race committee ask you to help us make that vision a reality. Thank you.

**Sybil Dilworth** (*Unifi*) seconding the motion on behalf of the Race Relations Committee, said: President, Congress, this motion was overwhelmingly supported at this year's Black Workers' Conference. It clearly shows and reiterates the points already made by my colleague, that black workers wish to engage in the growth of their respective unions and the TUC in general. In fact, this motion is more vicious than that, it is more than just concentrating on recruitment and

recruiting black workers into the unions. The conference which I had the honour of chairing this year wanted to emphasise the links between the trade union movement and the communities in which we live, communities in which day by day there are things happening.

When I go to work and say something has happened, people say, "Oh, yes?" They are surprised. Why are the people surprised? Why are my colleagues surprised? Because they do not feel the same impacts and do not notice the things that are happening to black workers. Everybody believes that because we are there in the office working along then everything must be the same, but when we walk out of that door there are things that affect us in our communities that nobody else but us know about. The press do not report the issues that are happening. People come home from the services and die and a very very tiny article is put in the press, yet this is somebody who was out there fighting in Iraq, in a war that not necessarily all of us agreed with, doing their duty by the people who are around us and our peers. With that, I would say we have to look at our own communities and work for them.

How can I say I am working for my community? I am only one person but we are a collective grouping and as a collective grouping we must therefore work together to achieve what is best for us. If we do not make it clear as a union that there are things out there that can be achieved directly and indirectly via the union, then it all falls apart, and the membership that you are looking for to support and sustain the trade union movement, and indeed for us to support and sustain ourselves, will crumble away, there will be nothing there. There will be no young people coming forward to join in, there will be no new workers, no matter what age they are, coming forward to join in and take part in a movement that should be there to protect and guide all, and not the chosen few.

I would ask you all to support this motion, and I really think that you all will do so. I would also ask you to examine the TUC Equality Report, look at your own union's record, and look and see what improvements you can actually make. Also, get a copy of the TUC supported *Black and Ethnic Minority Workers Trade Union movement Strategies for Organising, Recruitment, and Inclusion*. Use those tools, make us count, help us to build that effective force that we are looking for so that we may move on and move forward. Please support.

**Mohammad Taj** (*Transport and General Workers Union*) speaking in support of the motion, said: For years we have talked about the need to organise and recruit more black workers. We have talked a good talk on equality but the end result, as we all know, is that the black workers are still badly treated at work. They are in insecure employment, with low pay, long hours, dangerous working conditions, discrimination, and employers turning a blind eye to racist practices. Of course, we have had some success but not nearly enough. The key is not just recruitment but also to organise and, most important, to make sure that we have more black organisers, more black officers, and more black people involved in organising campaigns.

Black and ethnic minority workers are often in so-called difficult to organise workplaces, such as small private businesses where there is no statutory right to trade union recognition, employed as agency or temporary workers. We are not saying it is going to be



easy. It will be a challenge but it is a challenge we must meet as a movement. The challenge is going to take commitment, resources, and moral courage to do the right thing. In the T&G we have seen some success. For example, at Riverstone Spinning in Dewsbury, West Yorkshire, we organised a workforce that was 50 per cent Asian, mostly Punjabi-speaking. We have short meetings at different times to fit around workers' shift patterns. We brought in a Punjabi-speaking steward from another textile workplace to speak to these workers. All our campaign materials were published with Urdu translations. We gained around 200 members and, of course, recognition at the end. We now have trained shop stewards, many of whom are Asian, we now have systems in place to overcome the language barriers, and we have redesigned our training programmes to meet the needs of these workers.

We as a movement need to show black and ethnic minority workers that unions are here to help and support them in their struggles, and we must involve them in everything we do. Congress, please support this motion.

**Sevi Yesidali** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) speaking in support of the motion, said: This is an important motion that PCS fully supports. Even though there has been some progress made within the trade union movement, this is nowhere near enough. You only have to look round this room to see how few we are. In the 21<sup>st</sup> century it is time things changed. Black people are first, second, third generation in the UK. Not only does the trade union movement need to support and encourage black members, we must also give black members every encouragement to participate in that activity, in recruiting and retaining black members, achieving a greater involvement of black members in the democratic processes, addressing the issue of under-representation and improving our structures, supporting the principle of self-organisation, not as a barrier but as a bridge into mainstream activities at all levels of the trade union movement.

Trade unions must be as accountable as employers. The trade unions have to get their own house in order if they want to preach to others. The reality is that black workers often feel that trade unions are not there for them and key to this is the fact that they do not see other black people in trade union roles. We need to ensure that the diversity of the membership is reflected throughout the movement and that institutional racism is eradicated from within all our structures.

**Bev Miller** (*UNISON*) speaking in support of the motion, said: Self-organisation needs to be integral to the pursuit of equality for members who face discrimination purely for being black. Self-organisation encourages black participation and activism within trade unions. UNISON's black workers are able to meet as a self-organised group. I would not be chair of the National Black Members Committee if UNISON had not actively promoted self-organisation. This has enabled black workers to come together to identify their issues and priorities. Self-organisation has undoubtedly ensured that the voice of black members is heard. The existence of self-organisation has been beneficial to many black workers by providing the opportunities to meet to give each other mutual support and encouragement. Without self-organisation many black workers would be isolated and vulnerable to racist practices at work.

UNISON has recently created its own anti-racist strategy, which is a direct response to the Race Relations Act. UNISON cannot hope to recruit, organise, or retain black workers unless we put our own house in order. We cannot criticise employers for ineffective race equality policies or schemes if we do not have an effective race strategy. We cannot hope to make real progress in fighting race discrimination unless we involve black workers collectively in this struggle. Black workers are capable of taking the lead in highlighting and campaigning against racism in the workplace. Monitoring of black workers can help to identify where black workers are and ensure they are given information regarding self-organisation. UNISON's anti-racist strategy will result in detailed action plans with targets that can be measured and that cover all aspects of the union's activity.

This strategy has been devised with the consultation of black members and as a result their voice has been heard and is represented with a UNISON strategy. Black workers in UNISON have gained confidence and strength by being able to organise, meet, and campaign as a self-organised group. The issue of racism is not one which should be dealt with only by black workers but by all workers who recognise that racism is an injustice and unacceptable.

Equality for all needs to be a mainstream priority within unions and black self-organisation within UNISON has clearly helped to raise and address the issue of racism at work; self-organisation is not about separatism, it is about empowerment. Please support the motion and the principle of self-organisation.

**Sam Allen** (*NATFHE- The University and College Lecturers Union*), speaking in support of the motion said: I would like all delegates, please, to take a moment to look around yourself, look around the Congress hall. What do you see? What you see is one of the main reasons why it is not good enough or will not be good enough this afternoon simply to vote for this motion without starting to think about some of the strategy to address the key demands in this motion. There is a business case for all unions to ensure full participation of their members at all levels of the union structure. The trade union movement, our movement, has lost quite a lot of members in the last year, since the last time we met in Congress 2003. I do not have details of the breakdown of the numbers by race or ethnicity but I am sure most of them, or a large percentage of them, are black members and union activists who have simply had enough and cannot cope with the union, or the structure does not address some of their concerns and their feelings.

The motion is calling on both the General Council and all affiliate unions to develop a detailed strategy for organising black workers across the trade union movement and to facilitate more participation of black members in union activity. Comrades, brothers and sisters, it is no good raising up your hand this afternoon, we must all go back to our union to begin to campaign for policies to address the demands of this motion. Tony Woodley, in an earlier composite, said: "Organise or die." I will go further and say, get your black members involved in your union or you will continue to lose them.

**Gargi Bhattacharyya** (*Association of University Teachers*) speaking in support of the motion, said: "People have already said this is a funny kind of motion in lots of ways but instead of us coming and shaking our fists and saying, "Do something for us," it

is much more reflective; it is about things that we might want to do for ourselves. I am really pleased that it is the first motion that comes from Black Workers' Conference as a proper policy motion. Our first motion from Black Workers Conference was for the right to put motions. I think it is a key sign of our development as black trade unionists that we have been able to have that debate and bring it here. We really recognise that all our aspirations rely on our being able to organise and include new generations of black people.

A lot of the debate we have been having has been about trying to remember our histories and traditions from our own communities, about what organising means in a very modest, low key, face-to-face way. I always think that if you cannot speak to one person, one-to-one, and persuade them, you may as well give up on meetings, committees, and conferences because you are not going to be any good to anyone. Let us remember that everyday version of organising, which is about human relations and persuading people about the credibility of the movement. It also concerns some of the things that were spoken of in the earlier debate about organising. I was really pleased to hear from Anita Halpin about the need to make connections with other social movements. We recognise from the Black Workers' Conference that there is a whole new generation of politicised young black people, especially through the anti-war movement, especially through the anti-globalisation movement, but also through community politics, who are not coming to us, who do not recognise that trade unions have a role in those battles for freedom and justice, who really do not know what we do. We need to pool that talent because that is who is going to take us forward to the next step. I also think it is a step forward for us as a Black Workers' Conference because at long last it is not asking for white charity. It is not saying, "Please, please, General Council, do something for me, I am so poor, benighted, I can't do anything for myself." It is saying, "We can do it."

I think we are looking for a model of organising that is not just about recruitment as people say, it is not just about filling our existing structures but about learning again that we can make change. The best gift we have for people is that sense of excitement about what collective impact is. If we cannot remember that making change is possible, we will not persuade other people to join us. Please support the motion.

**Azim Hajee** (*Prospect*) speaking in support of the motion, said: I am pleased to support this motion on behalf of my union, Prospect, but it is a particular privilege to do so along with 241 delegates from 41 unions who voted at this year's 11<sup>th</sup> TUC Black Workers' Conference to submit this motion to the annual Congress.

Congress, the principle of self-organisation is, of course, a fundamental tenet of all trade union activity. It is the very essence of our diverse movement that drawers of water and hewers of wood, that firefighters and nurses, train drivers, doctors, and engineers, should seek to organise themselves to improve the quality of their lives. Yet, Congress, as you know, the notion that black trade union members, black firefighters and nurses, black train drivers and civil servants, should want or need to self-organise was for many years steeped in controversy and misunderstood by our movement.

Congress, it is just over 20 years ago that thousands of local government workers, like myself, in Camden, Hackney, Lambeth, Liverpool, and Birmingham, formed their black workers' groups. Over those 20 years our movement has recognised that the sole activity of these workers, and their colleagues in the Civil Service, among Post Office workers and among journalists, transformed our unions. Black workers brought new ways of organising and new ways of networking, new issues and ideas: the notion that community-based campaigns against the deportation of asylum seekers, for example, was a legitimate concern for trade union branches; the notion that black delegations should visit mining communities to show solidarity and support; the notion that striking miners and firefighters should be welcomed into Notting Hill Carnival, or Guadianas, or mosques; and the notion that racial violence and racial attacks, or racial murders, were legitimate concerns for trade union branches and conferences.

Few of us, Congress, will ever forget the vibrancy of that community or family campaign that brought Neville Lawrence to address our Annual Congress when every delegate on the platform, and on the floor of Congress, wore that orange ribbon for the Stephen Lawrence Family Campaign. The Stephen Lawrence Task Group, however, with the TUC, took the issues raised by the campaign one crucial step further so that its lessons were carefully stitched into the very fabric of our movement and our day-to-day activity. Congress, in the same way this motion from the 11<sup>th</sup> Black Workers' Conference seeks to ensure that the fire, imagination, and new blood, that our conferences engender, and others like it, are then re-focused, re-channelled, and embedded into a detailed strategy for organising black workers and increasing their participation at all levels of our movement.

**Suresh Chawla** (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*) speaking in support of the motion, said: President, Congress, sisters and brothers, as trade union activists and advocates of equality we have a duty to ensure that our unions are reflective of the industries we represent and the nation within which we live. Recruitment and retention of black and minority ethnic members are only two of the issues. What is equally important is that our trade unions reflect our asset of diversity at each and every level, from branch reps and committees, through subdivision and divisional committees, right up to the executive committees on which so many of us here serve. It is not just about our membership but also the staff that we employ to help us run our unions, particularly our national officials and our secretariats. If we are serious about a reflective inclusive trade union movement, we have to be serious in every single area.

Comrades, I urge you to make a proactive stance and effort in your own unions and support this motion.

**Harpal Jandu** (*GMB*) speaking in support of the motion, said: The recent TUC Equality Audit Report identified the major work required to recruit and organise black and ethnic origin workers. Much more effort is needed to create a trade union movement that reflects our contemporary society. For too long lip service has been paid to a strategy to recruit and organise black workers. Now we must all ask ourselves, are we doing enough? There are roughly 600,000 trade union members of ethnic origins but only 8 per cent out of 7.4 million members. Why are we not attracting more members from ethnic communities and, importantly, why do we not have more black

activists? All unions have the responsibility to put their own house in order. We need to conduct a race audit for our membership and implement a strategy of education so that we raise awareness of the issues we face, as the step we must take to improve the situation is quite a sustained commitment.

The report of GMB Congress 2003 highlighted the inherent problem in my own union. The GMB report said it needed to look at discrimination and to begin discrimination enquiries. You need to look at yourself and your own practice. The GMB has taken this advice to heart. We are serious about taking the measures necessary for our organisation to make sure it is fit for purpose and to ensure that we are better equipped to provide protection at work for more black ethnic origin workers. The major recommendations include: the ethnic minority membership to be employed at activist levels with figures published annually, a race equality strategy to meet the minimum requirement set by the Race Relations Act, a national recruitment strategy to include targets for the black and minority ethnic membership that reflects local and regional demographics, and a conservative training programme throughout the union that includes increasing awareness, education, and race equality.

Congress, protection of employment rights is central to our movement. Many black and ethnic workers are among the group most in need of collective protection and representation in the workplace. If we are to grow and improve this movement we must build our membership among the black workers. Now more than ever is the time to educate, the time to organise, and the time to deliver. Please support the motion.

**The President:** The General Council supports the motion.

\* *Motion 11 was CARRIED*

## Manufacturing

**Derek Simpson** (*Amicus*) moved Composite Motion 9. He said: President, colleagues, I have just a slight aside before moving the motion. I moved a similar resolution last year but the President did not realise that I was moving, not seconding, and pinched two minutes off me; maybe I ought to put a bid in to get the two minutes back on this occasion.

Another aside, colleagues: we have obviously heard the Prime Minister speak and he has made a number of points, many of which will impact on a number of issues of interest to colleagues, and certainly on manufacturing. I, like unfortunately many other people, dash outside on these occasions but the spin that has been placed on it is that we were a little bit lukewarm in our reception of the Prime Minister. It was a good speech, we gave a reasonable acknowledgement, but we were not actually leaping in our seats at the contribution. I actually think that that is an unfortunate spin, and I have said so. I actually believe that key to many of our concerns is obviously the return of Labour for a third term.

One of the key things, however, out of the Warwick discussions is to recognise that these are stepping-stones along the way and they are not complete solutions in themselves. I want to highlight just two of the issues that are referred to in the resolution that I believe are actually key, and at the moment still need more attention. First, I do not think that we will ever be able to defend manufacturing jobs

in the UK unless we have a level playing field on legislation with the rest of Europe. I actually believe that, whilst it remains easier, cheaper, more politically expedient to dismiss UK workers, even when they are more productive, even when the companies they work for are profitable, companies will take decisions that reflect badly and the UK worker will come out second-best.

The second issue is one of government procurement, where £109bn has been spent by the UK Government. There is an argument that a very high proportion of that goes to UK companies. Indeed, it may well do but that does not mean to say that the UK companies then produce the goods in the UK. They are as guilty of offshoring as anyone else. It is interesting that in all the campaigns we have run on manufacturing we do not get the same enthusiasm from employers when we argue that government procurement should go to UK companies, meaning produced in the UK. Why? Because they are quite happy to take the jobs abroad if it increases the profit line.

I also make the point that when we look at our rail industry -- and this is an example, I think, that highlights the position best of all, almost to the point of not being able to produce a train in the UK -- we are down to almost the last supplier with the loss of Washwood Heath, yet we are the second largest consumer of rail products in Europe. There is not a German train built outside of Germany, or a French train built outside of France, for example. How is it that they can organise their industry in such a way that they support their own indigenous workers? We should be able to do the same, and should in order to support manufacturing.

We have argued that 10,000 to 12,000 jobs a month have been lost in manufacturing. We said that last year. I checked the statistic before coming up. You know that I do not speak with notes and I do not have piles of statistics. It is as simple as this; if it is anything it is worse than when I said it last year, we have lost more jobs. At that rate we cannot sustain a modern economy without a manufacturing base. So, this is our message: Yes, we want a third Labour term; yes, we will unite behind Labour; yes, we will do everything to get them returned and, yes, they have to start paying some attention to the fact that UK citizens in manufacturing are not second-class. Thank you.

**Tony Burke** (*Graphical, Paper and Media Union*) in seconding the composite, said: The composite draws attention to the tragedy that has been the story of British manufacturing over the last 20-30 years. The composite also draws attention to the remedies that are needed in order to protect and defend what is left of our manufacturing industries in the UK. We fully support everything that Derek has said about the current crisis in manufacturing and the need for a level playing field across the European Union.

We also want to draw attention to the central role that the new Information and Consultation Directive will play in protecting and supporting manufacturing businesses in the UK.

Congress, everybody is aware that manufacturing is shrinking in all industrialised countries. We are also aware that the decline has been much faster and much more devastating in the UK than in other European Union countries. We find it strange that we also happen to be virtually the only country in Europe where workers have no formal information and

consultation rights. The UK remains the only country where employers fail to value and listen to the views and concerns of their employees.

The lack of formal channels to inform and consult workers has played a key role in the continuing low productivity and the lack of skills that has brought about part of this crisis in manufacturing. We believe that the Information and Consultation Directive gives us a unique opportunity to address that deficit. It gives us a chance to build structures that will force employers to inform and consult their workforces about decisions that will affect them and their families. It will also help to address the narrow, short-termism that blights UK manufacturing in this country.

Despite the views of the CBI, and others, let us get it right, our members do care about their companies, they do care about how their companies perform, they care about skills, they care about training and they care about their future. Congress, all the evidence shows that informed and consulted workers are far more productive. It is no coincidence that productivity is much higher in countries such as Germany and France where information and consultation procedures exist, and where companies just cannot be closed down and jobs transported in search of lower wages and higher profits. That is why it is essential that the Government use the opportunity they have to implement the information and consultation legislation in the most comprehensive and robust way possible. Congress, there is only one chance with this legislation; if we get it right, then manufacturing will at least have an opportunity to survive and recover, and can possibly move towards what the Prime Minister described as a vibrant and modern manufacturing sector.

Support the campaign to defend manufacturing in the UK, support manufacturing workers, support our industries, and support the composite.

**Keith Hazlewood (GMB)** speaking in support of the manufacturing composite, said: The DTI review of the Government's manufacturing strategy states that British manufacturing cannot compete in all areas of industry, and nor should we try. What a scandalous statement from a Labour government. Over three-quarters of a million manufacturing jobs have been lost since Labour came into power in 1997. Investment in manufacturing has declined by 26 per cent since the year 2000. Our trade deficit on manufactured goods is expected to be £40bn in 2004. Our Government is at rock-bottom of the European Union state aid league table, providing the lowest amount of funding for industry across the G15. UK workers still receive pitiful low levels of training in comparison to their counterparts in the European Union.

Congress, every year we pass motions calling for the Government to do more to help manufacturing and every year we continue to witness the decline of the sector. The Government must lead the way in championing manufacturing by encouraging better investment from employers, by delivering first-class R&D back-up, by requiring employers to invest in up-skilling their employees, and by providing the right market framework for our industries to succeed.

The GMB believes that by working together, government, employers, and unions, we can develop the new industry forums into specialist industrial clusters, to develop strategies that can deliver a prosperous future for specific industries, such as clothing and textiles, furniture, defence, and for our

members that work in them. In the rapidly growing procurement market, we expect our government to ensure that we have a level playing field for UK plc, a level playing field providing our companies with the training, skills, and expertise necessary to open up European markets and win vital contracts. We also want to see the Government joining with us to demand an ethical dimension to all future procurement contracts, ensuring that in future all contracting authorities are legally obliged to consider social, employment, disability, and environmental issues when awarding contracts.

Congress, we know that British manufacturing can have a brighter future and that our members' jobs rely on competing in tough global markets. We expect our government to lead the way and help our industries instead of raising the white flag at the first opportunity. Colleagues, support our manufacturing industry and support the composite.

**Joe Marino (Bakers, Food and Allied Workers Union)** speaking in support of the composite and specifically to the parts of the composite in relation to low-cost selling, said: May I start by thanking the TUC and the General Council for the work they have done in the past 12 months on this issue. It has been most useful to us and to those unions with members certainly within the food industry. We used to look at the food industry and think it was a protected industry in many ways that did not have to worry about what was happening outside the shores of the UK. That is now no longer the case. Certainly, as the world gets smaller, as communications get quicker, and as transport gets easier, then we are facing all these difficulties that other parts of manufacturing have suffered.

I think also the TUC needs to be congratulated for its manufacturing conference a while ago, which again highlighted why manufacturing is so important. It is also important that we keep this particular campaign going. Whilst we highlight in passing this motion, as we did in our motion last year, the issue of low-cost selling through retailing, it is not only there that it is happening but all sectors of manufacturing are suffering from this same low-cost selling issue, in clothing, and elsewhere, where jobs then are taken abroad because of these issues. It is an absolute disgrace that people are abusing the power they have in the UK, and many of the UK retailers as well, in order to get companies to push down prices by brown envelope audits, and so on, and auction work they already have, never mind the thousands of workers that are as a result thrown out of work. We welcome what the TUC have done on this and it is certainly the way we will take it forward in the future.

The final point I want to make is on the General Council Report where it mentions low-cost selling and talks about the best practical option to make progress on the issue, which is to seek a strengthening of the current code of practice. All right, we will give it a go. We will see if we can make that code of practice work. Some of us have great doubts about that. The code of practice is no good unless it is backed up with real, tough, legislation where we can make this an issue. We will certainly give it a go and try and find a way to take it forward. At the end of the day, it is the food-manufacturing base that we are talking about. I think Tony Blair was talking about people working together; if we can build relationships there and build them together with other people like farmers and the farming industry, and so on, in order to push this forward, then all the more better that we can do that.

I would like, President, if I can, to congratulate the General Council and thank them for what they have done, and hope we can see this movement take it forward to get a fair deal for workers in the food industry. Thank you.

**Peter Booth** (*Transport and General Workers Union*) supporting Composite Motion Nine said: In debates on manufacturing it is always worth just reminding ourselves what manufacturing still represents in our economy today. Three and a half million workers, their families and their communities still rely on manufacturing for their livelihoods and jobs. That represents 60 per cent of our exports, 20 per cent of the country's GDP and indeed 80 per cent of the economy's research and development, a vital part of the economy.

Composite Motion Nine is about the present and the future, it is not about the past; it is about trying to establish modern manufacturing in an increasingly globalised economy where we have to compete with the rest of the world, but we need the support to be able to do so. Composite Nine draws attention to the decline but points the way to a better future for manufacturing. We cannot ignore the fact, as Derek mentioned earlier, that, yes, we are still losing around 10,000 jobs a week. If we look back a little bit just to last week in the Transport & General Workers Union we were notified of two further manufacturing plant closures in Yorkshire: a carpet manufacturing company in the North-east of England going into administration; and Boddingtons, the brewery, a world famous brewery in Manchester, announcing that it intended to close only two years after it had agreed to stay in Manchester to produce local jobs and maintain that brewery and indeed maintain a world class product where it has been produced since 1778. Our union will be supporting those workers to maintain those jobs and to retain that brewery in Manchester. Once again we see that this is an abuse here in the UK where our members should be able to have proper consultation before these decisions are taken and not after they are made by the company behind closed doors.

That is why the information and consultation part of this motion and our campaign is so important. Public procurement is also mentioned in this motion. What we have seen recently is a major contract for battledress for the Ministry of Defence being up for tender, been done by UK companies since the last war, only to see that this £50 million contract is now being taken away from companies in the North-west of England to be taken to the South-east of China. This is public money, public funds, a strategic development for the Ministry of Defence being taken from the UK, along with the jobs of British workers. It is not good enough and we cannot accept that can be a situation. Indeed, we welcome for that reason the change of approach that we have heard about today at Warwick.

There is one key to the future of successful British manufacturing. The Prime Minister quite rightly reminded us of the successful economy and of the massive levels of investment in the public sector. Absolutely right: we need the same level of investment in the private sector, in manufacturing, to have a sustained, successful viable industrial economy.

**Ray Hill** (*Community*) supporting Composite Motion Nine said: I work at Scunthorpe, the largest steel plant in Britain. Yes, we still have a steel industry where we have had increased productivity at double-digit rates

annually for 20 years and more. Steel is an essential component of most manufacturing production and exports, and it is very costly -- about £35 per tonne to import across the Channel. Yet, one of our mills was closed this year with the loss of 100 jobs. The order book went to the main foreign competitor. A combination of governmental neglect, an unsustainable and unstable exchange rate with the Euro and woefully incompetent and greedy mismanagement since 1990 has meant that Britain is bottom of the steel making league in the EU. But we have opportunities now: sterling has lost value against the Euro and incompetent and greedy mismanagement has been turfed out. The Government show signs of recognising the importance of manufacturing to Britain, but Ministers still have a long way to go.

On public procurement, for example, the Corus plant in France produces 95 per cent of the needs of the French rail system, whilst its Workington sister plant has only 65 per cent of the British rail market. The Government say, with much justice, that since 1997 growth here has been faster and more stable than in any of the other large EU economies, and that it has created the conditions for manufacturing investment to succeed. The harsh reality is that the Government still assign a lesser place to manufacturing industry than its counterparts in other EU countries. You see this in a wide range of other economic and foreign policies. We ask that our government really make manufacture the top priority and use the rules as our EU partners do.

Closer government involvement may not succeed. British business people for more than a century have simply refused to invest in Britain, preferring to go far off dubious products abroad. There is plenty of scope for the Government to change their support to encourage manufacture in Britain again.

**The President:** The General Council supports the composite.

\* *Composite Motion Nine was CARRIED*

### 35-hour working week

**Billy Hayes** (*Communication Workers Union*) moved Motion 34. He said: It is most appropriate that we are discussing this late in the day after a very long day in terms of the work we have done.

Congress, the facts of overwork in the UK are clear enough. Full-time workers put in the longest hours in Europe at 43.6 hours a week compared to a European average of 40.3. The situation is getting worse, not better. The average working week increased between 1998 and 2003 by 0.7 hours. Over the same period, the number of people working more than 48 hours has doubled. This is not the 21st century that we were told of in the late 20th century. There was going to be the collapse of work and we were all going to be riding around in hover cars with 2-day and 4-day weeks. This is the 21st century in UK Britain. Overwork may be good for profits; it is bad for workers.

Overwork also allows employers to avoid new investment and avoid real industrial progress. With high levels of investment and a shorter working week German productivity is 27 per cent above UK productivity and the new bargaining agenda for family friendly policies depends upon us ending overwork. The CWU believes the time is right to begin to re-establish the fight for the 35-hour week. George

Brumwell was telling me -- he sits next to me on the Council -- that they had a fight for 35 in 1972, I think it was, and they achieved a 39-hour week, which was a big break through.

We believe that, as a movement, we now need to refocus on this question of a 35-hour week. We believe the time is right. The big advantage of legislation is that it extends the minimum standard across the whole workforce. You have heard some discussion about the impact of the 35-hour week on jobs. Denis MacShane, Minister for Europe, argued in a recent article in *the Guardian* that Germany and France support for the 35-hour week has resulted in high unemployment. Where have we heard that kind of argument before? We heard it many, many years ago in terms of the minimum wage. It is our union's belief that we now need to re-establish the campaign for the 35-hour week, backed up by legislation through Parliament at the most appropriate time.

Let us be clear about this, Congress. There is a growing suggestion in government circles across Europe that the fight for 35 hours is somehow old-fashioned and not in line with the flexible labour market. Be absolutely clear about this: this is something we need to watch and guard against. If we do not, then the idea that having legislation to support the shorter working week is incompatible with a modern and competitive economy. If we can have legislation that enshrines bank holidays being extended, which is obviously welcomed by lots of workers in this country, if we can have legislation that supports a minimum wage, then, yes, we can have legislation that supports working time. We were told it would be impossible, that we cannot have it in our economy, but we look to the experience of France where the French Government quite bravely and quite imaginatively introduced a shorter working week supported by legislation.

There will be those who tell you that really this is now rolling back the whole question of the shorter working week. Even in that debate within France there is no suggestion that it rolls back much beyond what has already been established by legislation. There has been some tinkering with it.

We want to have a campaign so that if you support this motion today that starts a long-term campaign in the same way as we established a campaign on the minimum wage. That is the way we see it if you are prepared to carry this motion today. It is not incompatible with our policy on the Working Time Directive; it complements the policy on the Working Time Directive. Most crucially it holds the government to account, to start to move through the whole question of working time supported by Parliamentary legislation. It is not asking the Government to do something for the CWU that we cannot do for ourselves. You heard today about Alliance & Leicester, how it is an imaginative company. We secured a 35-hour working week there; we have 37 and a half in some of the business units in the Post Office, 36 hours net, and 36 hours in British Telecoms.

In inviting you to support this proposition, may I say that if this trade union movement is to re-establish itself we have to get down to dealing with the long hours and low pay in this economy because shorter hours will make bad employers address the issue of working time if it is supported by legislation.

I commend this proposition to you; I hope Congress will support it. It is not incompatible with the

Working Time Directive. We need to start today to re-establish a campaign for a shorter working week.

**Hazel Harriett-Jones** (*Society of Radiographers*) seconding the motion said: Our organisation represents the 16,000 NHS radiographers. The Government's Agenda for Change proposals require our members to accept an increase in the standard working hours from 35 hours to 37 and a half. To add insult to injury, this is expected of us with no commensurate increase in pay, thus a pay cut in terms of our hourly rates. This clearly contradicts the Department of Health's Improving Working Lives policy and good practice policies of family friendly working.

Radiographers already provide a 24-hour service and take part in waiting list initiatives to achieve government targets. Our contribution is already increasing well above 35 hours in many cases. I myself worked 53 hours last week, along with many of my colleagues across the UK.

Pushing up standard hours will only serve to exacerbate the effects of long hours on our members' health and the welfare and wellbeing of their families. Studies by the Work Foundation show that hours matter: 61 per cent of the British workforce would like to work fewer hours. In the UK we work longer than our European counterparts and have the highest proportion of workers working over 45 hours per week. There is plenty of evidence of long hours exploitation of workers in the UK.

The experience of radiographers and other health professionals facing a working hours increase for no extra pay is another illustration of the cynical willingness and determination of the government to exploit members of smaller unions. It is this cynicism that threatens to fudge the long hours issue. The news that colleagues on the Continent have been put under pressure to increase their working hours, having fought to bring them down to 35, should make us even more determined to end the long hours culture in the UK.

I urge you to condemn long working hours, condemn exploitation and support this motion.

### Working Time

**George Brumwell** (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) moved Composite Motion 20. He said: I would like to remind Congress that the Working Time Directive was a health and safety measure. It was the one Directive the Tories could not veto because it was a health and safety measure. We are sadly disappointed that the Government's application of the Working Time Directive is half-hearted, to say the least.

I want to give you a few of the problems that we face, in our industry. It is all about work-life balance and we have had successes. The biggest job in Europe is Terminal 5, at Heathrow and the client insisted that the Working Time Directive conditions on that site would apply. The contractor was skeptical about it. It was implemented. The working week came down to 48 hours, no loss of pay, and productivity went up. That contractor is now rolling out the conditions of that site throughout the whole of its labour force, 6,000 to 10,000 workers at the end of the day.

The DTi and civil servants within the DTi are claiming that workers do not want the opt-out. Of

course, that is the conclusion they will come to if they talk to the employers. If they talk to the workers' representative they will get a different story.

I want to remind this Congress that the Working Time Directive is not about working hours, it is about the fact that for the first time in this country there was a legal right to paid holidays. If I tell you that six years on we still battle to try and get 20 days paid holidays for workers in my industry it takes a little bit of believing. There are thousands of workers being denied their rights to paid holiday. Anybody who has bought a house recently will know Persimmon Homes, the biggest house builder in the country, a turnover of £1.9 billion, profits of £350 million and the chairman's package is £2.25 million, of which £169,000 is pension. They are sacking our members because they have the temerity to go to Employment Tribunals to establish holiday pay. Mr Prime Minister, where is the choice when you deal with an employer like that? The rub is that if our members exercise their right, a statutory right, in an Employment Tribunal they are shown the door. They can establish their holiday pay but then they are told they have no employment rights to go and claim unfair dismissal. We have one case going to Europe to try and establish our members' rights and I suspect there is another one on its way to Europe to establish rights.

Therefore, far from giving workers the choice, it is really about listening to the needs of workers in this very hectic life style and work-life balance that they have to operate in. My members do a heavy job, it is rigorous, they pay with their lives, they pay with their health and they pay with injuries. They have to travel and work in the worst condition imaginable. They deserve the dignity not to have to scrimp and scrape and crawl for a statutory paid holiday. Whether it is 20 or whether it is 28, six years on if we have not been able to establish that what chance have we got?

I would say to the DTi, and the civil servants within the DTi, start listening to the needs of workers who operate within a climate of fear, because workers do operate in a climate of fear: if you do not shut your mouth you are out. There is another side to this debate about the Working Time Directive and I want to move Composite 20 and hope you fully support it.

**Peter Pendle** (*Association of College Management*): Out of 70 unions at this Congress only three submitted motions on working time. That is three motions out of 140. That is a shame. Whether you work in the public sector or the private sector the long hours culture is a real problem, a key issue facing our members. Whilst I have sympathy with what Billy Hayes says, the issue for ACM members is enforcing the current legislation.

Evidence of the long-hours culture that is thriving in education comes from our own members. Earlier this year, we carried out an extensive survey of ACM members' working conditions. Almost two-thirds of ACM members, many of whom carry heavy teaching workloads, regularly work in excess of the 48-hour maximum week with nearly one in five working more than 60 hours per week. Nine out of ten members say they take work home on a regular basis, and an alarming one in seven members have been diagnosed by their own GP as suffering from work-related stress at some point in the past 12 months. Not a single member who took part in the survey said they worked less than 35 hours in any week.

What about the opt-out? Only four per cent of college managers have opted out of the 48-hour working time regulations according to our survey. They simply feel pressurised into doing whatever it takes to deal with an excessive workload. This means that the further education sector is heavily reliant upon its managers subscribing to the long hours culture and it is paying little regard to the law. The desire to meet unrealistic targets is serving to turn dedicated professionals into stressed out, over worked robots. Meanwhile the colleges that employ them continue to flout the working time regulations with abandon. Of course, managers who are forced to accept the long hours working culture are more likely to expect the same from those colleagues that they manage.

ACM wants its members to have a proper work-life balance and to enjoy good health. The workplace should not make our members ill and it should not destroy their family life. That is why ACM is pleased to be seconding this composite. We want to make it clear that there should be no opt-out from the 48 hour limit and we want you to press government, MPs and employers to develop policies that lead to a genuine reduction in working time. We have launched our own campaign to raise awareness of the problems of excessive hours amongst our own members and we will be seeking agreement with college employers on improvements to our members' work-life balance. Those that do not can expect employment tribunal claims regarding breaching the 48-hour limit. Let us call time on excessive hours. Please support this composite.

**Annette Goss (FDA)**: According to the DTi's current consultation on working time, the government believes strongly that UK competitiveness should not depend on people working long hours, but the Government, as an employer, remains wedded to long-hours working practices. The Government needs to take the lead on this, to take the issues seriously, to explode some of the myths about long-hours working. It is hypocritical to expect other employers to act to reduce long hours if the Government will not deal with it itself.

In 2002 the Secretary of State for Trade and Industry said we needed a new push for working time reform in the public sector, and to tackle the long-hours culture. We are more than two years on now. It is a slow push. The issues remain.

Much is made of this culture of long-hours working. The issues go far beyond a culture. It is the individuals who are working long hours. They work those long hours to get the job done. Frequently it is in reality more than one job. The Government has said that we should work smarter, but that is a contradiction. We are in an advanced technological age that should allow us to work smarter and not longer. If people are doing one job we should not need to work such long hours. Senior civil servants are actually required contractually to work such hours as may be necessary for the efficient performance of their duties. Whilst that might be expected to cover peaks and troughs in workloads, for many there are now only ever peaks. Long hours working seems to have become the norm for all civil servants. The work is, of course, being done for free.

Opt-outs? Well, the Government does not seem to be too concerned about complying with the opt-out provisions. Generally these seem to be ignored. Tony Blair said earlier that people could choose to work less than 48 hours. Actually people are doing whatever it takes to get their jobs done. The heart of the problem

is the sheer volume of work. One member in a recent survey commented "Work load on senior managers is out of control". Nobody cares how much you need to work. Those workloads were set to increase. The Government is now proposing to shed jobs to increase efficiency. Where is that link? Cutting staff numbers? Will that not mean that more people will end up doing more than one job? Fewer people and more work? Does that not lead to increased workloads and inefficiency. Reducing excess hours and achieving work-life balance will not happen until Tony Blair, ministers and senior officials really behave as they preach. Support us.

**Brendan Barber** (*General Secretary*): I wish to indicate the General Council's support for Composite 20, but the General Council has asked me to make a point of reservation on Motion 34.

First, I would like just to say that I think the debate this afternoon has illustrated graphically the realities of the long hours culture that afflict too many workers in Britain today. Indeed, I touched on this issue very strongly in my speech earlier this afternoon. This has been a major, major campaigning issue for the TUC. Our objectives have been to look to make a difference now because there is absolutely no doubt that the Working Time Directive is not being applied properly in our country. Employers are able to side-step the requirements too easily. The individual opt-out in particular has been abused with workers in countless circumstances effectively given no genuine choice about their working time. We want to make a difference now, but also of course to have a longer-term vision for how we want to move forward.

It is really that dimension of Motion 34 that I need to draw your attention to. Most of Motion 34 is very, very strongly supported by the General Council but it does seek to commit us to the objective of putting a 35-hour working week on a statutory basis. The General Council's concern is simply that the principle of a long-term perspective is absolutely right, and gives a sense of ambition to our campaigning, but we will need to do a lot of work to consider exactly how such a statutory limit would work. In France they have had a particular kind of model, averaging working time out over a period with a pretty rigid limit on the amount of overtime. What would be the implications for overtime if we had a new regime based on legal prescription? We need to do that detailed work to consider really how a statutory framework would work, and how it would be enforced.

We are committed to doing that work but we are also committed to keeping up our pressure now for movement from the government to affect the position now. You can be sure that the TUC's 'It's About Time' campaign will be taken forward very vigorously in the coming year.

**Linda Newman** (*Association of University Teachers*) speaking in support of Composite Motion 20 said: In the next few weeks some of your children and thousands like them, 43 per cent of those eligible, will be registering at British universities. Those students, their parents, including many of you, expect them to be taught by inspired and creative teachers who are the leaders in their subject field. I am here to tell you that those teachers and the staff who support them have impossibly heavy work loads and work unacceptably long hours, leading inevitably to stress levels that destroy any creativity and damage health and family relationships. To illustrate, at the University

of Cambridge, no less, the counselling service originally set up to help students has had to be recently extended to cope with the level of calls for help from overstressed university staff.

We in universities welcomed 1.9 million students in 2003, compared to 1.2 million in 1993, without any comparable increase in staff numbers during that time. No wonder that a recent AUT survey revealed that two-thirds of staff reported working more than 45 hours per week, and one-third over 55 hours, and during our vacations too.

But British universities do not only teach. The government, the nation, the industries and organisations in which you work expect university staff to deliver high quality research to boost the economy and support cultural and social life. It is in everyone's interest, in this room and beyond, that university staff have the time to teach and research well. The range of speakers in this debate shows that the long working hours culture damages us all, our health and safety, our own wellbeing and that of those who provide the products and services on which we depend. That is why the AUT is supporting Composite 20.

**Vicky Knight** (*Fire Brigades Union*): The FBU is supporting Motion 34. Britain suffers from some of the longest working hours in Europe. This has resulted in high costs in terms of health, welfare and wellbeing of British workers. It is bad for the economy as the UK lags behind its European neighbours in productivity.

Those who argue against shorter working hours today say the nation cannot afford them. What rubbish. In the nineteenth century we heard the same arguments against banning children from working in our factories. After the Second World War we heard the same arguments against sick pay, and in the 1970s we heard the same arguments against equal pay. In the 1990s there was a huge outcry about the Working Time Directive that provides a statutory right to four weeks annual holiday. The arguments that these advances for working people would irreparably damage the economy and business were also bogus. They were wrong then and they are wrong now. An ever-shorter working week is the hallmark of an advanced economy.

Despite our laggard status in Europe, UK productivity in both the public and the private sector continues to rise and is at an historically high level. In exchange for their higher productivity workers deserve reduced working hours. During our pay negotiations, the FBU put in a claim for a 35-hour week with no reduction in pay. Even our options, which involved anti-social hours and shift allowances, were rejected: hardly modern, hardly advanced and hardly flexible. The Fire Service national employers rejected our claims on the grounds of cost. Quite simply, caring for their employees, the workforce, was too expensive.

We still believe that FBU workers, and in fact all workers, have the right to shorter working hours but the reality today is that our members work 42 hours a week and we believe our members deserve a 35-hour working week with no loss of pay, with no detriment to any remuneration that they quite honestly deserve. This Labour Government have a real chance to make real change. Tony said the best way he could show he was back committed to the domestic agenda, to British working people, was through action. A 35-hour week with no loss of pay should be one action he should take.



Support Motion 34.

\* *Motion 34 was CARRIED.*

\* *Composite Motion 20 was CARRIED*

**Malcolm Sage** (*GMB*) speaking in support of Composite 20 said: Our government appear to be badly confused. On the one hand they are actively promoting a positive work-life balance and improving family friendly work practices, whilst on other hand they are busy locking us into a long hours work culture for another generation. We know we cannot have both. That is why we have consistently told them that long hours is the single most corrosive force against developing a healthy work-life balance, but this is an issue they seem to prefer to remain confused about.

*Congress adjourned for the day*

The Government and the CBI argue that we need more labour market flexibility to be competitive and that is why they want to keep the individual opt-out in the Working Time Directive. British workers have the dubious pleasure of being way ahead at the top of the league for the longest working hours in Europe, yet compare that timetable to Europe's productivity and we are way down. Working long hours does not make us more productive; it makes us tired, stressed, ill, and a health and safety hazard to ourselves and those around us. The only flexibility being tested by working excessive long hours is how far British workers will bend before they break. Frankly, I am not optimistic about the future competitiveness of our economy where it is based on our members being tested to destruction and burned out. Sadly, we are not winning the argument.

An EU proposal revising the Directive on working time is set to come out of the EU Commission in the next week or so and the news is not good: keeping the opt-out, undermining the trade unions bargaining role on reference periods to calculate the 48 hour average and pushing that out to 12 months, undoing the judgment on on-call time. Congress, the long hours culture has to go; the opt-out has to go. But we have a real fight on our hands to get there and we must keep up the pressure.

Please support Composite Motion 20.

**Billy Hayes** (*Communication Workers Union*) exercising his right of reply said: I would like to recognise all the points that Brendan made in terms of the detailed work that needs to be done. Obviously the issues that Brendan raised need to be taken into consideration. However, I will say one thing about the whole question of working time in the UK. One of the reasons why we are in this position on the Working Time Directive is that the UK is the only country in Europe that has never had any statutory rights in respect of the hours worked. If you look across Europe, even before the Working Time Directive was introduced, there were actual legal limits on working time.

One speaker mentioned that we need to be dealing with the here and now. Absolutely, but there is one thing that traditionally we are very bad at as a trade union movement and that is being strategic. This motion is about being strategic and I hope that Congress will support it on that basis.

**The President:** The General Council is supportive of Motion 34 with the comments made by the General Secretary and the General Council is also supportive of Composite Motion 20.

## SECOND DAY: TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14

### MORNING SESSION

*(Congress re-assembled at 9.30 a.m.)*

**The President:** Colleagues, I am sure you would like to join with me in thanking NHS Jazz who have been playing for us this morning. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

May I take this opportunity to remind delegation leaders that the ballot for the General Council and the General Purposes Committee takes place this morning. Ballot papers should be collected from the desk outside the TUC stand situated in the ground floor exhibition area just inside the main front doors of this centre. Papers will only be provided in exchange for the official delegate form. Please note that the ballot closes at 12 noon today.

I now call Gerry Veart, Chair of the Congress's General Purposes Committee, to give a further report on behalf of the GPC.

#### General Purposes Committee Report

**Gerry Veart** (*Chair, General Purposes Committee*): I have two things to report this morning: one, the emergency motion on pensions has been distributed round the hall this morning. The motion will be taken after the pensions composite this morning.

The second point I have to report is that one of the candidates for Section J has withdrawn his nomination. This has been approved by the General Purposes Committee. Accordingly, you will find the name of John Walsh from Amicus scored through on the ballot paper.

That concludes my report.

#### Address by Harold A Schaitberger (AFL-CIO fraternal delegate)

**The President:** In my speech yesterday I mentioned I had just been to the United States where I had the pleasure and privilege of spending some time with the local unions campaigning for Kerry/ Edwards. I saw first-hand how involved the American unions are, and therefore it gives me great pleasure to advise you that this morning as an important item of business we have the fraternal address from the American trade union centre, the AFL-CIO.

I am very pleased to welcome Harold A Schaitberger who is the President of the International Association of Fire Fighters. You will recall that after the terrible events of September 11 many British fire fighters established a special bond of solidarity with their New York counterparts. That is why I want particularly this morning to invite Andy Gilchrist, General Secretary of our Fire Brigades' Union, to say a few words about that unique friendship and to introduce our special guest. Andy, I would like you to introduce Harold.

**Andy Gilchrist** (*Fire Brigades Union*): It is a pleasure, and of course a privilege, on behalf of the General Council to welcome our AFL-CIO delegate here to Congress. Everyone recalls where they were on September 11 2001. Many of us were here in Brighton at the TUC, astonished and horrified at what we were being told was occurring in the United States of America.

A few weeks after that my union asked me to take over a contribution to the fund to support the fire fighters and the families of fire fighters who had so tragically lost their lives in that event. That is when I first met Harold Schaitberger who, for me, is the President of the United States of America Fire Fighters.

It is tough being a trades unionist; we know that. I guess that is the case in America. But to see someone deal, with such integrity and in such a noble way, with the tragedy of losing 343 heroic public servants like that was an inspiration to me. I attended his conference, which he carried with enormous magnanimity. I will say this as well. The respect shown to Harold from all fire fighters across America was warming for us to see.

It is with great pleasure that I give Congress the President of the United States of America Fire Fighters, Harold Schaitberger.

**Harold A Schaitberger** (*General President, International Association of Fire Fighters, AFL-CIO*): Andy, thank you very much for that kind and generous introduction.

President, General Secretary members of the General Council, Congress, sisters and brothers, I bring you warm greetings from the AFL-CIO President, John Sweeney; Secretary-Treasurer Richard Trumka; Executive Vice-President Linda Chavez-Thompson; and our entire Executive Council on this, the 136th Congress of the TUC.

I also bring the good wishes of the 267,000 members of my union, the International Association of Fire Fighters. My Executive joins with me in extending our goodwill and our solidarity to each and every one of you.

I would like to thank you for allowing me to be here today, to take part in this historic 110th exchange of the delegates between our two great labour organisations in a relationship that goes back to 1894. That strong history, our commitment to continuing this partnership, is clearly an example of how important the AFL-CIO -- our affiliates and their members -- feel about working together and their concern and commitment about working with you, the British trades unions and the TUC. The unity, the work that we do together day in day out, every day in support of each other, has continued through good times, tough times, and unique challenges to all of us. My union, the IAFF, knows very well, and has experience first hand -- as was just mentioned by my brother Andy - - the importance of our relationship and the value it brings to those we represent.

I will always remember the outpouring of compassion and support from the entire British trade union movement during that horrific day, and the days and weeks that followed, three years ago just last Saturday, when terror struck on American soil like never before. We are eternally grateful for the assistance of our brothers and sisters in the FBU who sent members to work on Ground Zero, shoulder to shoulder with my members, as well as their generous contribution to our relief fund in our efforts to try take care of the families who lost their loved ones that day - - 343 of my members along with 2,700 innocent civilians murdered at the hands of terrorists.

To my brother Andy Gilchrist, and the FBU, I want to say thank you for your help, your support, in that time of need. We will never forget it. I also want to acknowledge how you inspired my members, my union and my affiliates by the strength and the resolve that you displayed in your efforts to demand a fair contract for your members. You have our admiration for the steadfastness you have shown in representing your members.

Today I would like to talk about three issues, issues that are the focus of this Congress and all of our unions every day. First, there is globalisation and the need to make the world economy work for working families everywhere. Globalisation certainly is not a new trend to any of us. It has been expanding for several decades. It is not new to corporations; it is not new to us in the labour movement as the 110 year history of working together really shows. But globalisation is a widening challenge to trades unions everywhere. It is aided by advances in technology, -- in telecommunications, in the liberalisation of international financial markets and in quicker and more efficient transportation.

Simply stated, on the ground, in the workplaces, in almost every way, globalisation on balance, in my view, has been a disaster for workers and our members. The only way to change that is for us, all global unions, to be working more directly together, to ensure that we do not allow our workers to be pitted against each other in the race to the bottom. We must work together closer than ever before to turn around the trend of global capital and multinational companies that are moving around the world trying to find cheaper and cheaper labour, which has little or no protection. In the United States, this scheme of scouring the globe for every bit of leverage to force manufacturers to compete against each other, to lower pay for workers, to eliminate employer-paid benefits and to increase working hours as the only means for a worker to earn more, all in the name of lower prices, is called the Wal-Mart Economy.

Sam Walton, who founded that company, and his good old boys from Betonville, Arkansas, love to run these television ads that you may or may not see. It has this silly little star that is a happy face bouncing around the TV, lowering prices on products, but what that ridiculous yellow ball really represents is a cruel irony for workers across the globe, one that is turning our country and yours into a society with highly-strung, overworked and under paid citizens.

The predicament that Wal-Mart is putting the world in, one where it sells itself to consumers with its lower prices, while at the same time convincing people and markets that it is good to keep their workers' wages low and their benefits virtually non-existent, is going to be hard to turn around. When you add privatisation -- which you call private finance initiatives, what American business calls outsourcing, and what I call screwing the workforce -- on top of the Wal-Martisation of our economy, the picture gets very bleak. We are now seeing virtually all of our well-paid union manufacturing jobs being exported from our countries at an alarming and growing rate to underdeveloped nations, exploiting their workers for more and more profit. Now we are even seeing service sector jobs and white-collar jobs being outsourced - high-tech, computer, help on line jobs, airline reservation phone centres and even, in the United States, our federal income tax returns are being handled from bases in India.

The numbers projected for the increase in this job exodus over the next decade are staggering. The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund -- dominated by the United States, the United Kingdom and other major industrialised countries -- continue to give support to this model of what it likes to call world development, but this is not development in my opinion. I think it is closer to being destruction. The results are clear: the rich simply get richer, workers are asked to do more for less and poverty is on the increase.

That is why John Sweeney challenged the recent ILO World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalisation, to address these issues in ways that were recommended by the Director General. In his report to the ILO the Director General outlined the goals that we all share: an economic floor to stop the widening gaps between the rich and the poor, extending social security to all workers, promoting living wages, increasing minimum wage levels, reforming income taxes and increasing welfare benefits for low income workers. President Sweeney also endorsed global goals of influencing poverty reduction strategies, underscoring the rights of workers to organise, eliminating labour abuses and improving the quality of employment in small and medium sized enterprises. He pushed for a new multilateral framework on immigration, the establishment of a Global Policy Forum unit to address macro issues, and decent work audits of the World Bank, the IMF and the WTO.

Whilst these are some ideas to fight back, there is no easy answer to the problems created by globalisation. But one of the most obvious solutions is that we -- all of us, each one of our unions, this Congress, our Federation -- need to grow bigger. We need to become stronger and we need to do it through organising, which is the second topic I would like to comment on this morning.

In the United States, our own problems with recruiting new members are well documented. We have gone from representing roughly one-quarter of the workforce in the late 1970s to representing barely one-eighth today. There are many reasons for that decline, like the decimation of our industrial and manufacturing base, which traditionally had high density union membership, but in my opinion the biggest reason for our decline is the erosion and the weakness in our nation's labour laws. Recent studies have shown that there are more than 40 million workers in our country who would join a union tomorrow if they simply had a fair chance to do so, but when they go to sign up or conduct a union election employers in our country -- a number of which are owned by European-based corporations like Saint-Gobain, First Group National Express -- harass our people, intimidate workers, and too often even fire them. In the United States, the sad case is that the price of joining the union is often the loss of your job, your livelihood, placing your family at great risk. There are not many people in our current economy who are willing to risk their jobs and their livelihoods in these times.

A partial answer for us lies in the peaceful legislation we are backing in the United States Congress. It is called the Employee Free Choice Act, which now has more than 200 co-sponsors in the House of Representatives and 30 in our United States Senate. The Act provides for recognition of a union once workers are provided with authorisation cards signed by a majority of those workers. The tactic is commonly

called 'majority verification' or 'card check'. It eliminates long and drawn-out election procedures that provide opportunities for employers to interfere with the workers and bust their drive to unionise.

The Act also prevents employers from stalling the bargaining of first contracts by requiring mandatory arbitration once impasse is reached in those first delicate negotiations. The Act further levels what is now simply an uneven playing field that is heavily tilted towards management by stiffening penalties for employers who violate the Act or other labour laws.

Getting such a piece of legislation through our government, of course, requires a lot of work, and the first step to see the day that this legislation is enacted - and which is my final topic this morning -- is for the American labour movement to get rid of the current President of the United States and get senator John Kerry elected. It is a herculean task, but one which my union and indeed, our entire federation, is working on with a single focus and with unprecedented resources.

I believe that to have impact and gain influence in politics you have to be bold, and you have to be willing to lead. Thirteen months ago when John Kerry was at 9 per cent in the polls, my union made a strong statement in our presidential election process by stepping out for the candidate who the media at that time -- and the talking heads and the alleged political pundits -- said should fold his tent, get out of the race, "You are finished". Well, we stood tall, we did the right thing, because we truly believed in our candidate. I told John early on, when times were very difficult for him, "Win or lose, the fire fighters give you their word and their hand that we will be the last ones standing with you". Now he is standing with us, and he is ready to stand with all of us, and he is going to win.

I can tell you that last fall, during the dark days when things were difficult, we were surprised -- some were surprised, we were not -- when John shot to the forefront. Now he is the Democratic Party nominee. In 52 days we will be electing our 44th President of the United States, John F Kerry, and we will be saying to George W Bush "You are fired". (*Applause*). Every day for the next seven weeks we will make our case for John. We will also be speaking out loudly, and aggressively, about the need to get rid of George Bush this November. We know Bush will never under any circumstances support or sign the Free Choice Act. His administration has America's labour movement in its cross hairs and we believe his policies on taxes and immigration are simply wrong; his positions on trade and global economy have hurt workers.

We believe that his rush to war without a plan to win the peace has hurt our country's standing all over the world. Now we see over 1,000 of our young men and women, who wore the proud uniform of our country, coming home on C130s in flag-draped coffins, and thousands more in veterans hospitals, injured and disabled, trying to learn again to walk without a leg or how to live without arms or hands.

Our country may be the lone superpower left on our planet but we have been a terrible neighbour to too many nations around the globe, and it is time to change that. We will change that by electing a new President. You have probably heard George W Bush's rhetoric about securing our homeland in these times of threats that were unthinkable only a few years ago, but my members -- as well as my sisters and brothers here in FBU -- understand that they are expected by

their citizens to respond to every disaster, natural or man-made, including those that terrorists may cast upon us using weapons of mass destruction. I am tired of George Bush being tall on promises and photo opportunities with his arms around my members, while being so terribly short of providing the equipment, the training and the personnel that my members need to do the job they are expected to do and protect our homeland. Simply put George W has left my members vulnerable in our ability to respond effectively in time in the next attack. There is something very wrong when we are using America's resources to open fire stations in Baghdad when we are closing fire stations down all over the US. It is time for that to stop.

No issue strikes more at the heart of trade unionism than George W Bush's anti-labour, anti-worker actions. He has done everything he can to discourage organising, to encourage union busting by companies, to outsource public service jobs. He has stripped collective bargaining rights from hundreds of thousands of federal workers all in the name of our security, which I say is simply B.S. He has failed to support union rights for millions of state municipal workers who still wait for basic worker rights that private sector workers have enjoyed for seven decades. But we are fighting back because we cannot tolerate any more of a Bush administration, any more than you can tolerate another Tory-controlled government. It is John Kerry that we must elect as the man who stands with the workers in America, with a 20-year record of supporting legislation that helps unionisation and union members. He supports raising the minimum wage. He will make sure that healthcare becomes a right for everyone rather than just a perk for the privileged few. He will ensure that our social security system is funded to provide vital benefits that seniors deserve after decades of service to our nation. He will restore the respect our country once had and heal the wounds that have been inflicted on nations around the world. When he is elected as our next President he will sign the Employee Free Choice Act the second it hits his desk and our union membership will begin to grow.

That is why this year the AFL-CIO is spending \$45 million as a federation, and each of our national unions are adding to that tens of millions more. We are doing that to defeat George W Bush and elect John Kerry. But our real strength is not just money, no more than money is your strength. Our strength in the political process is people, our workers, our members, and our unions are putting thousands of volunteers in the field to maximise the vote from union families. In fact, the night that President Bush gave his acceptance speech to the Republican National Convention we had 15,000 volunteers out that evening visiting over one million union homes.

I know the trade union movement here in Great Britain faces similar challenges in your upcoming elections and in meeting the problems created by privatisation, globalisation and all the other issues that strike at our members. I know that we are together concerned in fighting the pilfering of our pension plans, the loss of pension benefits, which simply allows the lining of the pockets of those corporate executives who are so greedy.

I want you to know how honoured I am to not only be standing here before you today to say we look forward to continuing to work together, but also to make sure that we continue to strengthen the bonds that have been forged in more than 100 years of our shared effort. I guarantee that every union from every nation represented in this Congress has a friend in the

American labour movement, my union and our great federation, and we will be there standing with you as we fight toe to toe with the Wal-Marts of the world, the privatisers and the George W Bushes of this world who are attempting to tear down everything that those that preceded us in this great struggle shed blood to build. Solidarity is not just a word or a phrase; it is the core of what we are together, and the spirit for all of us to embrace to better the life of the members to whom we have given an oath and an obligation to represent their interests -- the members who make all of our economies, our businesses, our governments and our communities around the world actually work.

So to you I say solidarity for ever, thank you for having me today, may God bless you and may God bless our labour movements. Thank you. (*Applause*)

**The President:** On behalf of all of Congress, with much honour, and as a sign of solidarity, not just with the speaker but with the entire American trade union movement in its struggle in the forthcoming election, it gives me great pleasure to present Harold with the gold badge of Congress. (*Presentation of the TUC's Gold Badge of Congress*)

## Pensions and Welfare

**The President:** Some of the delegates have asked me if a former General Secretary of the postal workers union has rejoined the General Council, but they are wrong. No, we are very, very privileged and pleased that the new Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, Alan Johnson, has agreed at very short notice, understandably, to join us here today. He is on the platform. We welcome you now, Alan, and look forward shortly to hearing your address.

## Pensions

**The President:** I now call Composite Motion 7 on Pensions. The General Council supports the composite and I will be calling on Jeannie Drake to explain the General Council's position.

**Lucy Kelly** (*Amicus*) moved Composite Motion 7. She said: I move this composite with a heavy heart. Over the last two years my union has been forced to deal with the tens of thousands of members who, to varying degrees, have seen their savings, retirement plans and future security taken from them. We have seen members' futures dashed through a combination of short-term employer reactions, lack of statutory protection and a continued misguided impression that the voluntary approach to pensions provision will somehow come up with the right result. It will not. It is time the Government realised this.

Given the investment market falls we have seen in the last three years, given the increased costs of improved mortality and given the increased costs needed to run decent occupational pension schemes, I can see no better justification for the introduction of compulsion. The lack of employer commitment to long-term contributions on a voluntary approach, the fact that according to the Association of British Insurers there is a savings gap of £27 billion, and the evidence of poverty line pensioners, support our claim -- a claim that simply states that without a compulsory employer contribution of ten per cent of salaries to employees' second pensions, as well as five per cent contributions by members themselves, we will continue to see the perpetuation of pensioner poverty and the widening gap between rich and poor.

Colleagues, in 1979 those pensioners in the top 25 per cent income bracket had a total average income level of 76 per cent of average earnings. By 2001 this level had risen to 87 per cent. But those in the bottom 25 per cent income bracket -- typically those with no occupational or private pension income, at whom this issue of compulsion is mainly aimed -- had an average income level of 23 per cent of average savings, a level that by 2001 had fallen to 21 per cent. How can we continue to pursue a failed policy of voluntarism when it is clear that a statutory requirement for all employers and employees to make a contribution towards retirement would go a significant way towards eliminating pensioner poverty?

Let us be clear, whilst we will always fight for the maintenance and up-rating of the basic state pension we should not fall into the trap that some employer organisations, notably the CBI, are now laying before us and agree that compulsion can be taken off the agenda if the basic state pension is increased significantly. I say to all those who think that the state pension should be higher, so do I. I say to all of those who think that the earnings link should be restored, so do I. But I say to all of those who think that this will solve the problem of pensioner poverty, I cannot agree. The state pension was designed as the foundation stone of retirement provision in this country, but to say trade union aspirations would be satisfied by a significant raise would be wrong. Simply lifting current and future pensioners just above the poverty line is not enough. We say that that would be a starting point but what we need to be campaigning for is high quality, secure and respectable second pensions for dignity in old age.

Colleagues, for too long we saw employers pay nothing into final salary schemes. We saw them erode surpluses and hide behind the argument that when times got hard they would be there to foot the bills. Well, times are hard and I do not see much coming from employers. What I say to you is, support this motion, lobby and campaign alongside us with government to introduce compulsion. Introduce it now.

**Hugh Lanning** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) seconding the motion said: In seconding Composite 7, I do not want to repeat many of the good points in the motion. I want to focus on three issues: the links between the public and private sectors; explain briefly the specific issues we face in the civil and public services; and, most importantly, discuss how we go forward together.

CBI and employers contrast public and private sector provision, but it is a myth. The average civil service pension is £5,000. Low pay means low pensions. Individuals move, start work in one sector and finish in another. Workers are moved, privatised. Our members in Astra were; their pension fund was raided, then the firm went bust and now 14 years on they are still campaigning for their pensions. The announcement on the two-tier work force was good, although a date would have been handy, but it must include pensions. Without that it would be an empty promise.

In the public sector the Green Paper proposed moving not just the retirement age but also the pension age to 65. This is not about allowing people to work longer because we are living longer. Every year the pension age is put back is a pension contribution saved. It is raiding the pension pot in the same way as any bad private sector employer. Yesterday the Prime

Minister was virtually silent on pensions but he did say good jobs do not come with bad work practices. It is a bad work practice, a fundamental breach of faith to rip up your own employees contracts to make them work longer to get their current pension entitlements. You do not deliver world class public services by announcing you want to get rid of 100,000 civil servants at the same time as you are telling the rest 'Five More Years'. That is why pensions are part of our dispute and one of the issues that we will be balloting on if we do not get satisfactory reassurances.

Public sector pensions are currently on a delicately balanced pack of cards. In the Civil Service we are still waiting for proposals. Many other areas are in discussions -- teachers, the health service, emergency services, local and central government. We are talking to the employers but not enough to each other. It is not enough for pension officers to meet and exchange notes.

We have called for a further day of action but we support the composite and specifically point (x). But we want that point to be real, we must support, co-ordinate and co-operate; we must work together. If we negotiate separate deals in isolation the bottom line will be just that, the lowest common denominator. Our challenge is to protect the public sector pensions as a benchmark for the future.

At our fringe meeting last night, 12 general secretaries -- now dubbed the dirty dozen -- pledged support to the PCS, about which Mark will say more later. I want to repeat one point that Dave Prentis made on pensions, urging that we should learn lessons from the past, pledging support for the PCS. We should stand together, he said, and if that involves industrial action to quote Dave, "so be it". I agree; the PCS agrees. In supporting this motion we must support each other or, as Tony Blair rightly pointed out, most of us will live long enough to regret it.

**Tony Brockman** (*National Union of Teachers*): The National Union of Teachers welcomes this composite. We fully support its call for improved pensions and an improved pensions framework for all workers, and for major improvements in universal state pensions, to end the disgrace of reliance on means-tested benefits. Together with other public sector unions, the National Union of Teachers has been campaigning against the Government's plans to raise the normal pension age for teachers and other public sector workers to 65. We wholeheartedly congratulate the TUC for organising the pensions march and rally on June 19. This composite builds on that. It calls for the General Council to assist and co-ordinate not just campaigning but action by unions and for a National Pensions Day.

Teachers are appalled at the prospect of having to work beyond 60 to avoid a worsened pension. We have secured protection for those aged 50 or over, but for tens of thousands of younger teachers the Government's proposals mean that they and other public sector workers are faced with unilateral changes to their conditions of employment that reduce the pension that they signed up to and have paid for. They did not come into teaching with the expectation of higher salaries; they came into teaching to enhance the life opportunities of children. They did expect though that the Government would honour the pension promises made to them, promises the Government now threatens to break. Tony Blair said yesterday on pensions that there are no easy solutions, so why is his government taking the easiest solution of unilateral

worsening of pensions by imposition. Congress, that is not social partnership; it is precisely the opposite. It is not the partnership he offered yesterday.

Congress, the National Union of Teachers will continue its efforts to protect teachers' pensions and to continue to campaign with the TUC for improved pensions for all workers in both the public and private sectors. We urge this Congress to send a united message to government, that imposed worsening of public sector pensions is not the way forward. Instead it should work with TUC and affiliated unions to secure improved pensions that properly reflect the needs and circumstances of private and public sector workers and also provide a substantial improvement to the state retirement pension. Support the composite.

**David Porter** (*Transport Salaried Staffs Association*): President and Congress, if there is one thing on which everyone with the slightest knowledge on pensions can agree it is that the subject is complicated. Indeed, for many people, it is so dauntingly complex that they put off making any decisions about their pension provision until it is too late. Somehow we have to break into this level of ignorance and ensure that every worker is much better informed and able to make the choice that suits him or her best. The point is that the decisions you make early in your working life will have a huge impact on your later life, especially when you are no longer working and are relying on that pension as your sole source of income. Each employee needs to make their own pension choice, which is most appropriate for their own personal circumstances. Leaflets, advice sheets and booklets are all useful, and the Government have a help line -- Pension Power for You -- which is also of assistance.

An independent evaluation of the help line illustrates the problem. It found that only four per cent of the callers were under 30, and that the service was much less likely to be used by men, ethnic minorities and manual workers. So the TSSA thinks that the best way of helping individual employees is to allow them to talk things over in the workplace with someone who is approachable, is able to give genuinely impartial information and has no financial axe to grind. That is why we are calling for a network of lay pensions representatives to be set up in the workplace. They would have the same status that learning reps and health and safety reps have currently. They will be given training and time off to undertake their duties and their role will be to give information to employees and liaise with the pension scheme trustees. They will be able to cut through all of that appalling pensions jargon, such as AVCs, contracting in/contracting out, SERPS, defined benefits, etc -- of which there is a whole dictionary. They could cut through that and explain things in simple understandable ways. We think this development could make a major contribution to removing the mystique of pensions and ensuring that workers have the information they need. We urge you to support Composite 7.

**Ged Nichols** (*Accord*): Our contribution to Composite 7 was a technical motion, No. 28 on your agenda, which is self-explanatory. I wish to endorse everything that has been said already and I would like to endorse the call for everybody to pay up for pensions. Thank you.

**Paul Keenan** (*Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*) speaking in support of the composite motion, said: Sisters and brothers, I am

going to refer to pensions and in particular state funded pensions. When Labour swept to power in 1997 many trade unions and trade unionists felt that a Labour Government would put right the wrongs and injustices imposed on working people by 18 years of Tory misrule. An obvious example of misrule and abuse of workers was the treatment handed out to pensioners, people who have contributed to the wellbeing of the nation for all of their lives and now they deserve some dignity in their retiring years.

In 1980 Thatcher abolished the link with earnings and that resulted in a shortfall in the state pension of £30 for the single pensioners and £50 a week for a couple. It took away their income and it took away their dignity, dignity that comes through a decent income, enough to feed yourself and to keep yourself warm in the winter, enough to clothe yourself and to enjoy a few simple pleasures. So why has not Labour restored the link, especially since we have the most successful and buoyant economy for the past 30 years? It is a fact that we are the fourth richest economy in the industrialised world. Gordon Brown, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, says that our nation cannot afford to pay a decent pension to state pensioners. So it is a myth of monumental proportions created by well-paid Labour politicians who should know better.

The National Pensioners' Convention recently published its manifesto. It is a good read because it tells the truth. The full title is: 'Towards Dignity, Security and Fulfilment in Retirement'. That is an apt title. The manifesto clearly illustrates that one in five, some 2 million, pensioners still live in poverty. Less than 12 per cent of women receive the full basic pension in their own right. Millions of pensioners are struggling to meet the rising costs of council tax and utility bills. It does not end there. Pensioners who receive an income from one source or another of just £131 a week pay income tax. It does not seem true, but it is. Over four million households, not pensioners – let us be clear. I am not talking about individual pensioners – have savings of less than £4,000. The problem does not end there. It does not end with the current pensioner poverty.

The Government have a cunning plan to reduce the amount of the nation's wealth, the gross domestic product it spends on the state pension by more than 20 per cent. There can be only one result from this awful decision: a time bomb. The problem of pensions today will be increased sharply for the pensioners of tomorrow. Why, when there are record levels of money in the National Insurance Fund – a massive £30 billion. Not £30 million but £30 billion! – of useable surplus? What is the hidden agenda? Why can't pensioners' money stored in the National Insurance Fund be spent on state pensions? The answer is clear. The political will does not exist. The Government, which we have supported and elected, are putting big business first. That situation can be seen wherever you look.

Let us be clear. The state pension remains the bedrock of the pension system. Support the composite, support the National Pensions Day and support the Pensioners' Manifesto.

**Jack Dromey** (*Transport and General Workers Union*): Congress, friends, brothers and sisters, in modern Britain there is a grotesque contrast between the millions who now fear retirement and the boardroom pensions bonanza, the chief apologist for which is Digby Jones, the man who waters the workers' beer. Our call today is for action to end the pensions crisis,

action in the workplace to say "Hands off our pensions", and action by Government. Ministers have already made some welcome moves; for example, warmth in the cold through the Winter Fuels Allowance, and Warwick promised more, including action to give workers a real say in shaping and running their pension schemes with at least half of trustees member-nominated; action to make pensions a bargaining issue; action to provide TUPE protection to pensions. No worker should ever lose out because they are transferred from one employer to another and action to breakdown those barriers that for too many years have condemned women, carers and the low paid to poverty in retirement.

What we do not want is action to let employers raise the retirement age, being forced to continue working because you cannot secure a decent income at normal retirement age is not a real choice.

Next, we need action to ensure that the Government's proposed Pension Protection Fund and Financial Assistance Scheme are fully funded so that they can protect and compensate every penny to every worker who has lost out. The Government have pledged £400 million and that is a good start, but with at least 65,000 entitled to assistance the £400 million is simply not enough. So industry must also put its hands in its collective pockets and match what the taxpayers have given. Private greed caused the problem. What we now demand is that the guilty face up to their responsibilities to their victims. Workers at companies like Massey Ferguson, Hibernia Foods, Lister Petter, United Engineering Forgings, Mayflower and Turner & Newall, are some of the workers today to whom we pledge our total solidarity.

Workers in those companies thought they had a simple deal: they paid into a pension scheme that would pay them when they retired ensuring security and dignity in retirement. They were wrong and now tens of thousands face hardship and poverty.

Finally, above all, we need action for a new pensions settlement in the third term, built on twin pillars. On the one hand, we need a decent state pension linked to earnings, the goal of that great campaign led for half-a-century by the 90 years young Jack Jones who is in this hall today, and, on the other hand, a mandatory obligation on all employers to provide and contribute towards a decent occupational pension scheme. Then, and only then, will workers be able to look forward to a life after work enjoying security and dignity in retirement. Thank you.

**Mary Turner** (*GMB*) speaking in support of the composite motion, said: Congress, the need for workers' pensions to be protected has never been greater. Digby, that is why trade unions are relevant. The GMB calls upon the Labour Government to take radical action to honour the Party's historical commitment to look after the British people from the cradle to the grave.

Many workers are witnessing the abandonment of their pension schemes by foreign multi-nationals, along with the erosion of benefits by companies, especially Digby's friends. Those who cut the costs to secure public sector contracts must be stopped. Even the most careful savers are seeing their retirement income plummeting. Voluntary agreements have failed. Surprise, surprise! Trade unionists have never got anything voluntarily from employers, only what we have fought for or by a change in the law.

The Labour Party must urgently address the need of workers in retirement. Only decent level contributions from companies compelled to take pensions provision seriously will help to close the £27 billion savings gap. In order to protect workers transferred from the public sector to the private contractors, the GMB says that mandatory admitted body status for local government contracts is essential. The layering of transfers as contracts move from one bidder to another means that there are not just a two-tier workforces but three, four and five. The benefits to be gained from the mandatory admitted body status are not just restricted to the workforce. Some contracting companies already accept that continued provisions through the Local Government Pension Scheme makes good sense and would support a level playing field for their bids based on best practice. Involvement in the public sector pension schemes should be a right for everyone working on public sector contracts. The Government should honour this right by listening and acting upon our demands.

Employers must be compelled to protect the pensions of public service workers whose contracts as transferred mandatory admitted body status is the best way to achieve this result.

The Government's focus on good guidelines is not protecting working people, and it is high time companies were given clear instructions to take pensions seriously; not maybe, not tomorrow, but a new law which says "You will from day one". The GMB believes that clear leadership involves taking bold and imaginative steps to tackle the pensions crisis facing working people. GMB wants the pensions promises to be honoured.

Let me add that local government pensions have got weaker through the continued privatisation of our services. Stop the privatisation and then you will see a growing Local Government Pension Fund.

Colleagues, I have referred to Digby. Let me it clear that I am not referring to Digby, the world's largest cuddly dog. It is the other Digby that I am referring to.

**Pauline Thorne** (*UNISON*) speaking in support of the composite, said: Congress, we hold this debate at a time of unprecedented threat to ordinary people to obtain a decent pension. Never has the threat of insecurity hung over the heads of so many of our members and others across the movement. This is a threat to workers in every sector of the economy. We have many examples of our own members receiving inadequate pensions in the contracted out public services, but we also have more and more examples of the same practices within the public sector. UNISON members working for Birmingham University have seen the closure of their final salary scheme to new members, and now the Government are taking forward proposals to raise the age of receiving an unreduced pension in the NHS and Local Government Scheme. We deplore the fact that many schemes, even those in the public sector, are discriminatory. The Government must address this injustice. We are told that changes are necessary because the cost of the scheme has increased, yet no evidence of this has been produced. We are told that workers still have the choice to retire earlier than 65, if they wish, so long as they take a reduced pension.

Is this the same choice that will reduce the pension of a woman contributing to a local government scheme for 25 years and retiring at 60 on the salary of £15,000 by nearly 30 per cent from £90 a week to £63 per week? What kind of choice is that?

Finally, we are told that our pensions have to be cut back because they have become politically indefensible as a result of the crisis of pensions provision in the private sector. I will tell you what is indefensible, and it is not the modest pensions provided by the public sector scheme. It is the contribution holidays taken by the employers when the Stock Exchange profits were high. We have all witnessed the sickening site of company directors packing their pockets when closing and cutting schemes for ordinary workers. There are two standards - one for the rich and one for the rest of us.

I am glad the Prime Minister took the time in his speech yesterday to highlight pensions but, as he himself said, words are not enough. Alan, you must commit your Government by redirecting the Pensions Commission and its policy focus, instead of asking the question whether compulsion is needed, to how best and how quickly can compulsion be implemented?

**Bob Petty** (*Community*): As Brendan said yesterday, we should take courage from the progress made this year in confronting the pensioners' challenges. We won the Pensions Protection Fund so there will be no more people like our one thousand members in Allied Steel & Wire who lost most of their entitlements because the company went bust. It could not meet its pension commitments to its pensioners. That is some reward for the prudence and thrift of some of them in paying into the scheme for more than 30 years.

In the wake of the ASW case, ministers guaranteed pensions when companies go bust with debts to pension funds. They had to because Community forced the issue by taking up the legal case against them under EC legislation.

However, the Protection Fund will not ease the plight of those thousands of working people and their families whose case brought home to millions the precarious position of pension schemes. After saying that they could not help, the Government did agree to set up the Financial Assistance Fund with £400 million for the ASW people and more than 60,000 others to restore some of their pension losses.

Community welcomes that decision, but £400 million is not nearly enough to stave off the risk of penury to people denied their entitlement by their employer's insolvency. We are pressing ahead with our case against the Government in the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg. We believe that we will win and that we will benefit all victims of employers' improvidence.

We were also the first union to take strike action to keep a defined benefit pension scheme when the employer intended replacing it with the stakeholder scheme. Again, we won. Our members demonstrated that they were prepared to fight hard for their rights. Delegates, I believe the working people generally will show their familiar fight if pressed. We can win in restoring the link between state pensions and pay increases. We can win to end discrimination against women pensioners. We can win in making pensions a transferable benefit. I support this motion.



**Dave Guppy** (*Association of University Teachers*) speaking in support of the composite motion, said: Let me start by scaremongering, and where better to start than with the workers' paper, *The Financial Times*. From Monday's *FT* we learned that US Airways has filed for bankruptcy. This could add \$2.1 billion to the pension fund liabilities of the PBGC, which is the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation. So what, you might say? On our side of the pond we are about to get the new Pension Protection Fund, which is like the PBGC and there are significant worries that it may be overwhelmed by such kinds of claims. It is said of British Airways that BA is a pension fund with an airline attached. We have got the Emergency Motion before us concerning the Turner & Newall workers whose own pensions are now threatened. The moral of all this is be afraid – be very very afraid! That is why it is so good that pensions are moving up the political agenda. As Brendan pointed out in his address, the TUC has and will continue to push on this issue.

However, there are significant obstacles, the not least of which is our own ignorance. Again, from Monday's *FT*, and I quote: "Trustees", that is pension fund trustees, "are heavily reliant on a small number of consultants and have been blinded by science by fund managers telling them to invest in exotic assets". That is quoting David Blake, the director of the Pensions Institute.

All too often we are blinded by the science of the scheme's actuary and the pension rulebook. This leads me to Composite 7 and what I felt was an enormously imaginative, potentially brilliant and overpowering suggestion which came from the TSSA about lay pension reps. That does dovetail very neatly with the Government's wish to raise levels of financial literacy. There are potentially some good synergies there.

Finally, I warmly support the composite and, particularly, those elements which would give the workers more confidence and empower them. Thank you.

**Micky Nicholas** (*Fire Brigades Union*): President and Congress, the Fire Brigades' Union would like to place on record its appreciation for the outstanding contribution and commitment of Rodney Bickerstaffe and Jack Jones, amongst others, in continuing to highlight and expose the scandalous plight of today's pensioners.

We, therefore, welcome the TUC's on-going campaign to shout from the rooftops about the inequality facing today's workforce. With regard to future pension shortfalls, where is the money? Who stole it? Maxwell was not the only robber baron out there.

The composite talks about pension income that bears a decent relationship to pay. How is this for starters? A pension after 7 years, a full pension after 20 years with eight per cent contributions. Needless to say, there are not too many vacancies in the Houses of Parliament for that nice little number. Two fire service members doing the same job of work with different pension arrangements – two tier pensions from our Government, which talks about fairness and equality. Where is the fairness and equality within that particular ethos?

We have heard about compulsory work increased to 65 and voluntary beyond that, no doubt followed by youth unemployment. The maths just do not add up. Let the old retire with what they have earned and

employ the young. That, respectfully, Minister, and proper investment and funding is how pension schemes are funded.

This movement needs to intensify the lobbying of MPs and the pensions industry. We need to continue to mobilise and inform our members – the current workforce – to fight for and fully represent our pensioners and to ensure protection for our children in the future.

In supporting Composite 7, we demand the taking of necessary action because pensions are not only an issue for the future but they are an issue for the here and now.

**The President:** Congress, it now gives me great pleasure to introduce Jeannie Drake to put the General Council's position. Jeannie has led on pensions for the General Council, and we thank you for your work.

**Jeannie Drake** (*General Council*): Pensions have marched their way up the agenda of political domestic policy issues in the UK. That is a reality acknowledged by the Prime Minister in a recent speech and a major focus at the General Council's campaigning this year under the banner 'Pay up for Pensions'.

Pensions are an inter-generational issue. The challenge for us all is to secure a new settlement for pensions that gives a decent standard of living for the pensioners of today and ensures a system that will provide for the pensioners of the future. The General Council have campaigned relentlessly to defend pension benefits in the public and private sectors and to achieve an improved and durable framework of pension provision for all workers. They organised a successful pensions demonstration in June and have argued with the employers accelerating the closure of DB schemes and offering no or inferior money purchase alternatives. There must be an increase in the level of compulsory pension contributions if future pensioners are not to face poverty in old age.

A priority for the General Council in the next year will be to press the Government to extend the level of compulsory contributions that employers must make to workers' pensions. Whilst acknowledging that the Government's first priority has been to increase the income of Britain's poorest pensioners, the General

Council continue to argue that the state pension must be increased and means testing must be reduced as part of a permanent solution to the pensions challenge.

We have pressed the case for an extension of the TUPE regulations to protect pension rights on transfer. We are also focused on getting women a better pensions deal from the state system, the occupational system and, in terms of closing the pay gap, particularly for part-time workers which so directly contributes to the high numbers of women on low incomes in retirement.

The tragedy of pensioners and workers losing their lifetime pension savings when their employers have become insolvent leaving huge deficits in their pension funds has appalled everyone. The Pensions Bill will mean the introduction of the Pension Protection Fund, which will protect members' pensions in the future. Recognition should be given to the Government, actively supported by the TUC, for their determination

to put such a protection in place. It is a major piece of pension protection reform for workers which is much under-stated and which the TUC lobbied for for so long.

Finally, we must also fight for more money for the financial assistance schemes, for those who have already lost their pensions and for whom the formality of an Act of Parliament is too late. We have to fight for them as well as welcoming the protection fund for the future.

Congress, we must ensure that our claim 'Pay up for Pensions' becomes a reality. We support.

\* *Composite Motion 7 was CARRIED.*

#### **Federal Mogul/Turner and Newall**

**The President:** We now come to Emergency Motion 1. In calling Amicus to move it, I am sure Congress would like to welcome the delegation of Federal Mogul workers and their families who are with us today for this debate. (*Applause*)

**Derek Simpson** (*Amicus*) moved Emergency Motion 1:

He said: President and Congress, the issue in front of us typifies the discussion, comments and contributions which have just been made in the last motion. It is reading a little bit like a Hollywood blockbuster: "Produced by Federal Mogul, starring Turner and Newall. A cast of thousands – 20,000 deferred pensioners, 20,000 active pensioners: a complicated plot".

Before I came to the rostrum, I went through the details of what our national and local officials have been dealing with, grappling with the complexities of the scheme. It is unbelievable. Were I to come here and try and describe the detail of it, it would be almost impossible. It is a complicated plot, indeed. We have got some villains in the plot – people who are responsible for the crisis that our colleagues here with us today and around the country are facing. There is one thing missing from this Hollywood blockbuster at the moment, and that is the heroes. Somebody needs to step in and sort out this mess, a mess that we hope that some of the measures that you have just voted for will address, such as the Pension Protection Fund and some of the compensation for colleagues who fall before the watershed, but here is the nightmare scenario. A large number of employees are involved, there is a tremendous financial liability and pension holidays have left the pension funds denuded of assets. This is a crisis that is going to be tremendously difficult to address. We do not know what the answers are. Money cannot be conjured out of mid air. The Government must be concerned about taxpayers' money. We have no confidence that the pension industry can step forward and fill the gap or that the employers can face the responsibility. I also ought to draw to your attention the fact that the crisis is so bad that to pay into the pension fund to anywhere near to compensate it would close the company and force it into liquidation. That is the measure of this crisis.

The resolution before you calls for action, an investigation and for us to look again at those measures that are only partial to solve our existing crisis without this addition, but to look at that to see what can be done to alleviate this tragedy for many many thousands of people.

We will try and get a solution. We will sit down with Alan, who has already agreed, and I hope they tell him that he has agreed, that he will meet a few of the people and hear the personal tragedies and stories. We will sit down with the Government and with your support through this emergency resolution we will carry forward your conviction, embodied in the motion that you have carried and in the motion that I hope you will support.

**Barry Camfield** (*Transport and General Workers Union*) seconding the Emergency Motion, said: I salute the Turner & Newall workers who are in this hall today in their hour of need. My remarks are directed at the Labour Government and those ministers directly responsible for pensions and to all Labour MPs and the Party itself. We are asking you to act now, with urgency, to help the thousands of workers and pensioners at Federal Mogul/Turner and Newall who now face ruin, crisis, a financial disaster for them and their families, to intervene to bring a measure of justice to these British workers so brutally treated. Are we not entitled to expect our Labour Government to act? Was it not founded to stand on the side of hardworking people? If this scheme is wound-up, as Derek has outlined, 2,500 workers now face huge losses directly in their pension entitlements. They will be receiving less than 40 per cent of what they expected and more than 35,000 pensioners and deferred members will be losing out. Where is the incentive for people to save for their retirement? The T&G says it is a lottery as to whether your hard-earned retirement money is taken from you at the stroke of an accountant's pen.

I agree that the Pension Protection Fund is a welcome step forward, and we welcome it, but in reality we think it is woefully inadequate. We reckon that, overall, it would cover something like 53 pence a day. We call on our Government to act now. We know that company directors will get a pension somewhere around 26-times greater than the average worker. Those directors have no fear or insecurity about their retirement. Eighty per cent of them are in a final salary scheme with a contribution of around 20 per cent to their pensions.

The unions have met the DWP and told them of our concerns. Following the decision to close access to the Financial Assistance Scheme and that the scheme might not be eligible for the Pension Protection Fund next year, our people fall between two stools covered by no safety net.

In conclusion, President, with Labour MPs' support the unions have set up an all-party support group to help us in our campaign.

We say to our Prime Minister, to our Secretary of State and to this Labour Government, you must act now, intervene and help us. Do not let Labour's epitaph be: "We had office; we had power; we had a huge majority but we forgot our purpose and our cause". Support the unions, support the pensioners and the workers at Federal Mogul/Turner and Newall. Help us now. We need your help.

**Kevin Curran** (*GMB*): We are one of the unions who have members affected by the crisis at Federal Mogul, and therefore we wholeheartedly support this resolution.

We urge Congress to increase the pressure on government to stop UK pension scheme members being caught up in the financial manoeuvrings of overseas parent companies. The Labour Party first implemented the philosophy of cradle to grave. It cannot and should not stand by and let those citizens remain in the trap, which threatens them with the loss of such a significant proportion of their pensions.

The ups and downs of company survival may be a global issue but the security of pension arrangements is a national issue and it should be addressed by this Government.

The workers and pensioners of Turner and Newall know that their American counterparts are not living under the same cloud as they are. Legislation in the United States provides them with some protection. Similarly, the company's workers in Germany and Italy are not facing 70 per cent losses in their future pensions.

The question has to be asked: what is our Government doing to protect our workers? Funding for the Financial Assistance Scheme is already pitifully low on the basis of 60,000 potential claimants. The additional 20,000 victims from Federal Mogul will be in danger of making each individual share little more than an insult.

Our brothers and sisters who have come to this Congress from Federal Mogul are looking at as little as £335 per year from the scheme. With additional claims, this sum could be reduced to £250 per year. However, the workers of Federal Mogul do not even know if their Government is going to regard them as eligible.

The idiosyncracies of insolvency law mean that workers could be left out in the cold, unable to access either the Assistance Scheme or, indeed, the Pensions Protection Fund. We will continue to make every effort to ensure that the pensions promised to these workers are honoured. The Government must be pressured to play their part and to assist. Please support the call for the Government to act. Please support the resolution.

\* *Emergency Motion 1 was CARRIED.*

**The President:** As the emergency motion was carried unanimously, that is a message to take back to the rest of the workforce.

#### **Address by The Rt Hon Alan Johnson MP**

**The President:** I am sure that Congress will be aware that Andrew Smith, who was due to take part in a panel discussion on pensions, has now left the Cabinet. We would like to take this opportunity to extend our thanks to Andrew. It has been a pleasure working with him. He will be missed for his steadfast work on behalf of some of the most vulnerable and needy in our society. None the less, we are very pleased to invite to Congress Andrew's successor, an old friend who is no stranger to our proceedings, Alan Johnson. Of course, Alan is no stranger to Congress. He last addressed us in 1966 – sorry 1996 – in his previous guise as General Secretary of the CWU – a more radical version of Billy Hayes – because on that occasion he had the rare distinction of moving a motion at Congress on union rights that was opposed by the General Council and

which Congress defeated. As they say, seven years is a long time in politics.

Alan has kindly stepped in at very short notice, but in line with his earlier career in rock and roll, he has decided to manage without the backing group in the form of the panel, which had been planned, and instead Alan has agreed to perform solo. We are very pleased that Alan has taken the opportunity of speaking at the TUC Congress today immediately on taking office to make his first major speech on pensions. It is a great pleasure to welcome you back as our guest. This time you have the chance to speak after Congress has voted.

**Rt Hon Alan Johnson MP** (*Secretary of State for Work and Pensions*): President and Congress, it is a great pleasure to be back here for the first time since England won the World Cup. Thank you, Roger.

One of the first things I did on becoming Secretary of State last Wednesday evening was to ask the General Council if they would allow me to make my first speech as Secretary of State for Work and Pensions among fellow trade unionists here at the Trades Union Congress. My responsibility is for work and pensions broadly. I think it is fair to say that during my 17 years as a TUC delegate the emphasis was on work. Now it has, rightly, switched to pensions.

A combination of circumstances has propelled this issue up the political agenda. There was a certain complacency in the 1990s. It was not just the over-dependency on a booming stock market. It was the fact that Inland Revenue rules encouraged a short-term approach and nobody was seriously facing up to the enormous changes that had affected society since the creation of the Welfare State.

The average person now spends more time in education, fewer years at work and far longer, over twice as many years, in retirement as they did 50 years ago. We ought to celebrate that success. It is a great advance for our society, but we also need to deal with its consequences.

Be in no doubt, Congress, that the biggest, real and deep-seated crisis we faced when we came to power, and Jeannie referred to it and so have others in the debate, was pensioner poverty. The state pension had increased only once in real terms in 18 years. Its value had declined dramatically. The poorest pensioners were generally the oldest pensioners, most of them women who had been adults when the welfare state was created and who had incomplete contribution records.

Two things were certain. The first was that they suffered a mean existence on as little as £69 a week. The second was that they could not wait years for a solution. We were right to make these two million pensioners our priority.

Under the Tories many of them faced the stark choice of eating or heating. Now winter fuel payments of £200 and £300 for those over 80 mean a tax-free payment to all households on top of the basic state pension.

The Minimum Income Guarantee provided a stop gap but its replacement, the Pension Credit, means no single pensioner need live on less than £105 a week

and no couple on less than £160 a week. For the first time, pensioners are rewarded for having saved, rather than seeing their savings taken off their benefits.

In less than a year, three million of our poorest pensioners are being paid Pension Credit with an average of £1,000 arrears being paid as a tax free lump sum. What is more, Pension Credit is accessible – one free phone call and it is sorted for five years. If pensioners cannot call, the Pension Service will make a home visit.

The Pension Service is dedicated to helping pensioners access their entitlements in their local communities. It is a personalised service, which has also led to the take up of Attendance Allowance, Carers Allowance, Council Tax Benefit and Housing Benefit increasing dramatically.

As a result of this Government's reforms since 1997 we will, this year, spend an extra £10 billion on pensioners. That is over £7 billion more than if the basic state pension had simply been linked to earnings.

We are targeting this extra money at the poorest pensioners. Almost half of it is going to the poorest third of pensioners, who, compared with the 1997 system, are better off in real terms after adjustments for the cost of living by, on average, £1,750 a year. That is 1.8 million pensioners lifted out of poverty.

Under the Tories, carers, the long-term disabled and those with incomplete contributions, who I have already mentioned, lost out on building up rights to the state pension. In the main, these are women. We have addressed this injustice by creating the State Second Pension. You do not hear much about it in the media. It provides a second pension which is up to twice as good as its predecessor, the State Earnings Related Pension Scheme. It is benefiting some 20 million carers, disabled people and lower income earners. These are the people who did not benefit much from SERPS including five million long-term disabled people and carers.

Congress, these are crucial issues. The agreement we reached at the National Policy Forum in Warwick included an important statement of what more we need to do to tackle poverty and increase confidence in pensions. We will honour that agreement.

The Pensions Bill already contains measures which the TUC has skilfully championed for many years. The groundbreaking Pension Protection Fund will mean that, for the first time ever, people in defined benefit pension schemes based in the UK will be protected if their company goes bust and leaves the pension scheme under-funded.

The trade unions have championed the cause of those men and women, who have suffered terribly because of the absence of such protection, and this Government, and my predecessor, Andrew Smith, in particular, who has laid so many important foundations for the future, have listened and acted. Making the Pension Protection Fund a reality will mean bringing real security and peace of mind to more than ten million members of defined benefit schemes.

The Financial Assistance Scheme will bring significant help to people who have lost out already. The details are being finalised in consultation with the TUC and others, but it is a piece of retrospective help

that few people would have thought possible a few years ago.

The Pensions Bill does more to protect the pensions of workers. The new flexible and pro-active Pensions Regulator will further bolster security by tackling the risks to members' benefits whilst enabling well-administered and secured schemes to continue without unnecessary regulatory burdens.

The Pensions Bill will place in law TUPE style protection of pensions for workers affected by company transfer or merger. We are talking about private to private transfers, which were previously left out of any TUPE protection. We have laid regulations to enable trustees to require a solvent employer, who wants to wind up its pension scheme, to buy out members' rights in full. Defending those with decent pensions is at the very heart of what the labour movement is about, but it is only part of the challenge.

Given greater confidence and security to save for retirement, our next challenge is to make people aware of the need to make provisions for their retirement and support them in doing so. Our Informed Choice Programme is focused on giving individuals the information they need to empower them to take control of their retirement planning.

As a result of the spotlight now shining onto this issue today, helped greatly by the TUC and its affiliated trade unions, today's workers, who are tomorrow's pensioners, are worried about the level of income they will have in retirement, and they are concerned that they will either have to save more or work longer. Our approach is to give people greater flexibility to make decisions about when and for how long to work.

Our age discrimination legislation, combined with state pension deferral, will break the cliff-edge between work and retirement and give people greater opportunity and greater rewards for working longer if they wish to do so.

One thing we are already doing, which will be of particular interest given one of this morning's motions in the composite, is to change regulations to allow employees to continue working for the same employer whilst drawing their occupational pension. This part of your Congress policy has already been met in this year's Finance Act.

Flexibility is crucial. To empower people to decide for themselves how long they work is key. This Government will not raise the state pension age. This Government will not force people to work to 70 years of age. However, we have to face up to the problem of many people not saving nearly enough for retirement. That is why we set up the Pension Commission, enhanced by my former Deputy General Secretary, Jeannie Drake, to examine the current pension landscape, to analyse the underlying trends and to consider whether we need to move towards greater compulsion.

I look forward to receiving their first report next month, which will set the scene and make an important contribution to the wider national debate on pension provision. This debate will take place against the background of a wider programme of work that involves Government, employers and the unions. We are committed to go further in our examination of women's pensions, and during the Committee stages of the Pension Bill we committed to producing a specific report on this subject next year. We are working to

increase the involvement that employees have in the running of their schemes.

The Pension Bill includes a measure which will ensure that employees who are active members of a scheme and/or their representatives have the opportunity to feed in their views on proposed changes to their pension arrangements before the employer makes a decision.

We believe in the value of employee involvement. I would like to conclude my remarks, Roger, by saying a word about member nominated trustees, which Jack Dromey and others mentioned in the debate. Everyone agrees that member-nominated trustees are a good idea. They add a different perspective to the trustee board and they allow those boards to have a wider range of skills and experiences to draw upon. If members are involved in the running of their scheme, it can make them feel that they have a real stake in their pension provision. So I can announce today that we have decided to take a power in the Pensions Bill to enable us to ensure that 50 per cent of pension scheme trustees are member nominated.

I suggest, Roger, that it must be some kind of record to have two Congress decisions met within ten minutes of them passing. I think it reflects our common objectives, which are to tackle pensioner poverty and to increase the income levels and quality of life for pensioners both today and in the future; to improve the confidence and security with which people can save for their future retirement; to increase the amount that people save for their retirement and the amount that employers contribute; to help people understand complex pensions issues so that they can make informed choices about working and saving for retirement, and to increase the involvement that employees have in the running of their company pension schemes. These are common objectives. I cannot pretend, Roger, that in my sixth day in office that I have found the pouch of fairy dust that I can sprinkle around to allow me instantly to resolve the challenges we face. However, I do know that my understanding of those challenges has been greatly enhanced by listening to this debate and coming to Brighton today. Thank you for giving me that opportunity and I look forward to working closely with you during the coming weeks and months. *(Applause)*

**The President:** Thank you very much, Alan. Thank you for coming so soon after taking office and thank you for quickly mastering your brief. Thank you for fulfilling two of the promises and, in particular, thank you for listening to our debates this morning, which the delegates most appreciate.

## Public Services

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

He said: Congress, none of us can question Labour's commitment to investing in our public services. We have record investment, with £18 billion going into schools and hospitals in the next three years. That is why it is such a tragedy that this term has been characterised by our differences rather than by the values we hold in common. I make no apology for that. UNISON will continue to oppose market-based reforms that destroy our public services.

Choice? Who could argue with choice? But the real issue for our public services is not choice but capacity. People want good local health services, decent schools, better local transport services and safer

streets. What did they mean by 'choice'? Schools choosing their pupils; flagship hospitals choosing their patients and cream-skimming those that bring in the most cash?

Where is the choice? Where is the choice for the most vulnerable? The elderly patient told she is blocking a bed; the home carer auctioned off to the lowest bidding private company? Where is the choice for the council tenant voting to stay with their council, but told by ministers that a vote against transfer is a vote against having their repairs done? Choice based on markets is the denial of choice for our poorest communities and we will oppose it.

Privatisation is not yesterday's debate. It still wreaks havoc. Look at Jarvis which was responsible for the Potter's Bar disaster and market leaders in PFI battling to survive, and hospital managers turning to the business pages to see if they have a service still left to run.

Ballast, a Dutch company, walking away from Tower Hamlets' PFI school; leaving schools half-finished; bailiffs grabbing everything; a workforce left without a pension; parents sick with worry and when PFI fails, it is communities who pay the price!

How many more failures before they learn; learn that there is a link between the sell-off of care homes to the private sector and last week's report of national haemorrhaging of care home beds? Crisis points reached. Where is the surprise?

As property prices soar, private owners sell off homes, whatever the cost in human misery, and some politicians still denying that there is a link between dirty hospitals and the huge rise in MRSA. Nurses are blamed for not washing their hands. I will tell you who is to blame: those hospitals which in the past 20 years have washed their hands of their cleaning contracts! Sacking cleaners; selling off the rest; treating them like dirt; cutting corners; cutting pay; cleaning staff told they are non-core, not central to the business.

Now, Congress, we have the Gershon Efficiency Review with its £21 billion of so-called efficiency savings in the Civil Service, in the NHS and in local government, putting staff under even greater pressure driving a privatisation agenda.

Of course, we want to see investment in the frontline, efficient procurement, and we will work with the Government to achieve that, but to tackle the so-called back office, softening it up for privatisation, will not wash and we will not wear it.

No frontline worker I know asked for the carnage we are now seeing in the Civil Service. No frontline worker I know asked for outsourcing. We stand shoulder to shoulder with our brothers and sisters in the Civil Service unions.

Better and more efficient public services are part of our agenda, but you do not improve services by threatening job security, cutting pay and conditions, attacking pensions or by deriding office-based staff, making them pawns in a political game.

We must build on our achievements in winning record investment, ending the two-tier workforce,

praising the achievements of public service workers -- a strong united union voice. But, Congress, now is not the time to soften our opposition to privatisation.

**Sandy Fowler** (*Educational Institute of Scotland*) seconding Composite 10 said: I fully endorse the views just expressed by our UNISON colleague. You will not be surprised to discover that I wish to concentrate on the part of the motion which deals with the quality of newly built and refurbished schools delivered through PPP and PFI schemes and talk, if you will forgive me, of the Scottish experience in that direction.

At this point I would not wish to rehearse our principal objection to the use of such schemes, although recent experience in Fife, in the Lothians, would make us question the foolishness of a policy which mortgages the future of the Scottish state to companies whose financial viability and commitment are doubtful, to say the least.

Yes, we do need to campaign for proper, publicly-funded, schemes. However, no matter their shortcomings and our misgivings, public/private partnerships do exist. They are up and running and they are in Scotland a financial option of the Scottish Executive and consequently, of almost all local authorities for future new-build and refurbishment projects.

Yesterday, the Prime Minister referred to the issue of the two-tier workforce. I have to tell you that in Scotland that agreement preceded the one in England and Wales and was signed in November 2002. While the dangers of that two-tier workforce seem to have been reduced, there are still serious concerns about many of those schemes.

EIS recently carried out a national survey of new-build and refurbished schools within Scotland with the help and co-operation of the Royal Incorporation of Architects in Scotland. The clear message of this survey is that teachers are extremely concerned about the quality of new or refurbished schools and the ways in which those schools will affect teaching and learning.

The main concern of teachers and, indeed, of other workers within schools is the complete lack of meaningful consultation or input at the design stage of these new school facilities. Teachers and other employees are continually questioning the value of building schools without asking for the input of the people who will work in them every day.

The survey enforces the message we have been sending out for years, that there must be an appropriate involvement of all stakeholders to develop the brief and contribute at all stages. Teaching and non-teaching staff, pupils and parents need to be able to participate, not merely to be consulted. Our evidence suggests that all too often that so-called consultation was very, very limited.

Sadly, the results of our survey again suggest that such schemes do not provide good value for money to the public purse in the long-term. Too much has already been spent, which is not considered good value for money. If we are to get value for money and to ensure quality education for our young people in the future, then lessons must be learned and stakeholders meaningfully involved in future schemes.

**Andy Gilchrist** (*Fire Brigades Union*) supporting the composite said: Solidarity is a word that is often used within this trade union movement despite the legal straitjacket that we often talk about as well. I want to put on record that in our union we were so proud to see the solidarity that you offered us through two long and very difficult years in our dispute. I want to put on record as well the tremendous support we had from the TUC. I will particularly point to Brendan Barber, the General Secretary. Thank you very much for your support.

If solidarity is about standing together - the defence of public services, indeed the maintenance of public services - we are going to have to stand together again and possibly in a way that we have not had to do for a number of years. That is just to enable the people who work in the public services to continue delivering the magnificent services they do, often in the most incredible and difficult circumstances.

I have no difficulty admitting, indeed praising, the Labour Government for the tremendous commitment and, indeed, investment they have put into specific areas of the public services. I will tell you what, though, it is no good putting increased finance into public services if they are simply creamed off by private contractors through PFI and PPP.

While we are on the subject of things that governments occasionally get wrong, spending plans for public services should not actually include slashing 100,000 decent workers in the Civil Service. As I said last night, we, the Fire Brigades' Union, will stand and respect and support any decisions the Civil Service take in order to defend their jobs and their people's families, which we heard so much about yesterday.

Public services do not need cuts. They do not need criticism. They need more and better trained public servants and that requires investment. In our own Fire Service in this country, we are seeing a service now developed where what you get if you have a fire depends on where you live. I make no apology for calling it 'the fire service by the postcode lottery'.

We also have a system where the regional fire controls, the first people you speak to in the fire service who are the people who give you initial advice before a fire engine reaches the fire, are to be scrapped by this Government. I will tell you this. We have looked at your report, Government, and the figures do not add up. I suggest you get somebody else to look again at that.

So stand with the Civil Service unions and stand with the rest of the public service unions in defending the finest public sector unions in this country.

**Christine Murray** (*AMO-the trade union for magistrates' courts staff*) supporting Composite 10 said: AMO is fundamentally opposed to PFI, to market testing, to Best Value, contestability and any other label that is used to mean privatisation of our public services.

The Magistrates' Court Service has experienced the idiocy of PFI buildings where PFI has shaped how services are delivered, rather than the courts directly identifying needs and priorities and determining the design of buildings and service requirements.

The Magistrates' Court Service has seen spiralling costs of PFI buildings and LIBRA, the computerised case management system for magistrates' courts. As many of you will be aware, in the case of LIBRA, there was eventually only one bidder for the contract, which negated choice and meant that the Government were, in effect, held to ransom and costs trebled from the original bid.

The obsession that this Government have with privatisation is based on fundamentally flawed thinking that everything private is good and everything public is bad. We challenge that distorted thinking and demand to see the evidence upon which these assumptions are based. But, of course, there is no evidence.

The common theme surrounding all PFI contracts is the escalating costs. Inevitably, service delivery is adversely affected, as there is a need to reduce costs to pay for PFI. The grant allocation for the Magistrates' Court Service in 2004/2005 saw an overall increase in budget of 2.5 per cent. Good, you may say, but the LIBRA and PFI charges increased by 111 per cent eating into funding for improved services. The core objective of the criminal justice system of joined-up justice is seriously compromised by PFI as a proliferation of PFI projects increases fragmentation.

As we heard at yesterday's fringe meeting hosted by NAPO, the proposed National Offender Management Service is yet another example of why core services will be privatised and organisations forced to compete against one another.

Shamefully, privatisation is now moving into areas that we never thought possible. The latest threat in the Magistrates Court Service is in relation to enforcement of fines, court security and private sector enforcement agencies; the latter representing a lack of democratic control with powers of forced entry into people's homes, the powers of search and access to primary data. No area is now safe from privatisation.

Good public services do require public sector capital investment. It is fundamentally wrong to seek to profit from the justice system and, in particular, the incarceration of offenders.

**Janice Godrich** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supporting the composite motion said: May I thank those unions that have expressed solidarity in this debate over the serious issues facing Civil Service workers? I know that Mark Serwotka will echo this when he speaks in detail on that specific subject in the next debate.

All unions are entitled to be cynical and forthright in our condemnation of the continued search for privatisation by this Labour Government. It will be recalled, and often has been recalled, at this Congress that we witnessed a series of "U" turns since 1997 when promises by shadow ministers were ditched almost as quickly as their red boxes were opened. It turned out that air was for sale after all and that the onward march of privatisation was unrestrained by a new Labour Government.

Then we get told what works is what matters; an apparent attempt to convince us we should all be pragmatic in our attitudes. However, when we see the reality in the massive PFI projects, such as new hospitals

and which are about mortgaging the future, facing a future generation to pay for this generation's needs, that is a shameful waste of taxpayers' money on interest for borrowing and a shameful case of short-termism aimed at winning votes now but at a high cost 10, 15 or 20 years ahead.

Our experience of privatisation is deeply disturbing, not only in terms of the disruption to our members' careers and future livelihoods and the problems of the two-tier workforce, but we see the handling of private contracts completely out of control. Contracts including important quality and standard requirements are not properly monitored or controlled, penalty clauses for failures are not enforced and also some contracts are placed for more than 10 years, some as long as 20 years, putting the reality of proper control even more in the distance.

We have now identified a further very serious threat. Two weeks after the 1997 general election, New Labour privatised the delivery of the Department for National Savings to Siemens' Business Services, despite pre-election assurances not to do so. In the last few weeks, we have discovered proposals by Siemens to off-shore central government work and transfer about 250 jobs to India whilst at the same time laying off 400 young temporary workers in areas of low employment opportunities, including Glasgow and the north-west.

Siemens has told the Government that the original contract is not financially viable and it needs to reduce costs. It stands to save millions. The only group to benefit from this proposal is Siemens' profits. Siemens need the specific consent of government ministers to off-shore this work. If consent is given, there is a clear, obvious implied threat to many other public sector jobs and existing private contracts.

Off-shoring of public sector work would be a scandal. I urge all unions to support our campaign to prevent this happening and at the same time renew our demands for quality public services delivered by properly paid and resourced public sector workers. Please support.

**Brian Traynor** (*Prison Officers Association UK*): For more than ten years, the Prison Officers' Association, along with our brother and sister unions within the criminal justice system, have been arguing the case against privatisation of prisons. This privatisation has now been extended to the Probation Service and other public sector services that work within the criminal justice system. We remain opposed.

Under the National Offender Management Service, this process will mean the selling off of large areas of our services hidden behind the term 'contestability'. We have never disputed that public sector services should be high-performing and efficient. We would say that if any surplus monies are found -- and it is a big 'if' -- they should be redirected into the services that have been starved of funding for years, such as the NHS, the Fire Brigade or Education, and not into the pockets of the directors or shareholders of private companies.

Earlier this year, I was fortunate to attend a lobby of Parliament organised by our brother and sister unions. It was well-attended and supported by large numbers of MPs. I was heartened to hear speakers from unions such as AMO and NAPO in support of our cause; speakers such as Judy McKnight, Tony Benn and

John McDonnell, pledging to fight this issue all the way.

This is a song the Prison Officers' Association has been singing for a long time. No one should make profit out of the misery that victims of crime suffer. Their suffering should not be a vehicle to line the pockets of fat cat, get-rich companies. The selling off of public services has gone far enough. Prisons are not for profit; neither are probation services. Congress, add your voice to ours. Support the motion.

**Debbie Coulter** (*GMB*) supporting Composite 10 said: Let's not beat about the bush. Choice in public services is a red-herring. Choice is only ever an option for the few, not the majority, especially when choice and diversity too often mean that service quality still depends upon your postcode.

There is no quick fix. The private sector certainly does not have any magical management expertise to offer. Consider PFI schools: some are too hot, some are too cold, some have no natural light, some have no room for a staff room and some do not even have room for the right number of desks and chairs.

It is a scandal that over the past few decades neglect of the nation's school buildings has allowed them to fall into such a state of disrepair. It is a scandal that this is how our children can end up being educated in the 21st century. But it is a tragedy that millions of pounds of taxpayers' money have now been spent just to replace one set of problems with another.

Lack of competence on the part of PFI contractors ought to make the Government and the public authorities wake up. Jarvis is currently going through its PFI death-throws, but it is not the first and it certainly will not be the last. In the chaos and uncertainty, it is the service user and the workforce who suffer.

We, in the GMB, remain clear, that without comprehensive fair wages legislation, contractors and public authorities will keep finding ways to squeeze non-existent efficiency from our members' wages.

Rumours of the death of the two-tier workforce have proved to be premature. The workforce code for local government still has too many loopholes and we do not yet have a road map for how much it will be extended for the rest of the public sector. However, we do have a firm commitment from the Government and we must unite to ensure that the implementation lives up to the hype.

Above all, we must encourage the Government to abandon the quick-fix and focus on sustained investment, investment in direct services, in publicly-owned infrastructure and in publicly employed people. Let us oppose privatisation, keep public services public and support the composite.

\* *Composite Motion 10 was CARRIED.*

## Civil Service

**The President:** Composite Motion 11 is supported by the General Council.

**Mark Serwotka** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) moved Composite Motion 11. He said: I start again by thanking Brendan Barber, the 12 general secretaries and you, the delegates, who packed into the PCS fringe meeting last night to hear our case to campaign against the Government's decimation of Civil Service jobs and services to the public.

May I start by reminding you of three key extracts in the Prime Minister's speech yesterday? He told us that successful employers do not abuse their employees and they do not undervalue public servants. He told us that the time had come for there to be an end to working families having to worry about paying their bills and their mortgages, that they just want a fair chance. He told us to work with him and to talk with him.

Prime Minister, on behalf of the 530,000 people that you employ, our call to you today is to practise what you preach. Why do I say that to the Prime Minister? Think about what his Government are currently doing. 104,500 Civil Service jobs to go; 20 per cent of the work force; 20,000 jobs to be forcibly relocated out of London and the south-east; attacks on Civil Service pensions, forcing people to work five more years when they were promised they could draw their pension at 60 and, even more disgracefully, attacks on people's right to paid sick leave with the Chancellor threatening to withdraw paid sick leave in an attempt to reduce sick absence.

These proposals were announced on national television without any consultation with the workforce or the unions. It is wrong to sack people by text; it is wrong to axe people's jobs on national television because these announcements have nothing to do with more efficient public services. It is party politics at its worst. It is playing politics with people's lives, people's futures and people's families. It is cuts not based on evidence or more efficiency, but cuts for cuts' sake in order to outdo the Tories in a general election.

To make matters worse, the Government now tell us that our members are faceless bureaucrats, that there is a difference between backroom staff who can be cut and frontline staff who deliver key services. Anyone who has worked in public services knows you depend on a dedicated team of professionals behind the scenes to deliver every frontline service.

What are the effects going to be of these cuts? There will be offices closed, compulsory redundancies, more stress at work, lack of promotion prospects, people forced to uproot and move hundreds of miles. The early effects of these cuts are that the Government will close 10 pension centres and shut down 550 benefit processing sites throughout the UK. Services will be decimated. These are services that every single member of the United Kingdom relies on from cradle to grave, because, far from being faceless bureaucrats, what services do our members deliver? Here is a small sample: child benefit; food safety; tax credits; Customs & Excise; education; health; passports; driving licences; driving tests; welfare; New Deal; health and safety; minimum wage; buying a house; crime prevention; criminal justice; transport; security; defence; museums and galleries; equality and pensions.

Which one of these services does not matter? Which one of these services should be cut? We say none of them should be cut. The people of the United Kingdom have a right to have first class public services.



Our members have a right to job security and to be valued for the work that they do.

It is absolutely obvious, if these job cuts take place, there will be mass privatisation of Civil Service work because somebody has to do the work. It inevitably means there will be even more privatisation on top of the privatisation the Government have already carried out.

We have a warning to the Government. It is this. Look at the example of British Airways. British Airways cut staff to the bone, allegedly to be more efficient. The result this year was chaos at our airports while people had to queue up and wait because there were not enough staff.

Having a delay in your flight to New York is one thing, but not being able to access vital public services the pensioners, the sick, the disabled and the vulnerable depend on is absolutely another. That is why our union, as a last resort, is balloting for national strike action on November 5. It is a last resort because we want to talk, not go on strike, but when you have a dialogue with the deaf, there comes a time when you have to stand up and be counted.

We want to talk to the Government about more efficiency, persuade them to stop wasting millions of pounds on private sector consultants and millions of pounds on failed privatisation. That is why if we do not get the reassurances about no redundancies, about no staffing levels being cut without negotiation, no attacks on pensions and no attacks on sick leave, that action will take place if our members vote 'yes' in a ballot.

All history tells us that with attacks of this size we will not win this campaign without solidarity from our brothers and sisters in the trade union movement. We appeal for solidarity today, we appeal for solidarity in the weeks to come, because when we march together and take action together, we are stronger. Further, we appeal to all unions who have problems of similar issues like pensions and job cuts to talk to us to see if we can co-ordinate our campaign and co-ordinate industrial action, if necessary.

Britain's civil servants are essential. Britain's civil servants provide key services from the cradle to the grave. Support us in this composite today. Support us in the weeks ahead. Tell the Government that we are fed up with them knowing the cost of everything and the value of nothing. Stop attacking your public servants. Praise them, support them, value the work they do and stop this disgraceful butchery of public service jobs. Work with us and we are confident we can win this campaign because every one of your members depends on the services that we provide. Thank you.

**Paul Noon** (*Prospect*) seconding the composite said: I want to add the particular perspective of professional and specialist staff in the civil and public services represented by my union. I also want to set out briefly the positive case on what the Government should do now, not just what they have done badly. That has been pretty plain for all to see.

The Government argue that the size of the Civil Service has increased since Labour was elected. The reality is that professionals working for government

are down in number by more than a third over the past 10 years. Physicists, chemists, engineers, electronic experts, veterinary staff, environmentalists and other important specialisms have all suffered. This has reduced the Government's ability to respond to the demands of an increasingly knowledge-based society. There is now a knowledge gap at the heart of the government machine in the UK with the Civil Service dangerously short of technical and scientific expertise.

The Government are at risk of being ambushed by new scientific problems by GMOs, BSE, foot and mouth and MMR. Cuts in professional and specialist staff have led to a dumbing down of government with a loss of in-house expertise. The single biggest feature of this has been privatisation. The current administration has privatised air traffic control, defence research, medical advice on disability benefits, engineering support to the navy and horticultural research. It plans to sell off the Forensic Science Service and the Silsoe Research Institute -- world leaders in crime detection techniques and agricultural engineering, respectively. We say this must stop.

What should the Government do now? First of all, talk to us. Sit down with us to determine how to deliver effective and official public services, which meet the needs of citizens whilst respecting the rights of government employees. We want improved service delivery. Arbitrary cuts on the basis of crude head counts to outdo the Tories and the Liberal Democrats are no basis for sensible government. It was only in the year 2000 that the Civil Service unions signed a partnership agreement with the Government, which committed the Government, amongst other things, to manage positively the process of change and avoiding compulsory redundancies. We want them to stick to it.

Next, the process of change needs to be properly and coherently managed. There should be no need for either compulsory redundancies or compulsory transfers. It may not surprise you to know there are many civil servants who would quite like to get an exit visa from the Civil Service, given the state of morale at the moment. With proper redundancy terms, that might happen. It has to be managed effectively on a service-wide and voluntary basis.

Next, we want to see an early agreement in moving to a fair, coherent pay system across the Civil Service that might produce interchange in redeployment rather than the present chaotic and hugely resource-intensive system that prevents movement. The process of pretend delegation with no negotiation on treasury remits to departments and agencies is demotivating and has been the root cause of strikes and pay protests of our members and the Health & Safety Executive and many other areas.

Finally, all measures to implement the Government's efficiency agenda should be equality-proofed. The Government should practise for their own staff what they preach for others. These steps could form the basis of a positive agenda if ministers -- there are new ministers who want to do this -- actually want to follow this path. The view of *Prospect*, the view of professionals and specialists in the Civil Service, is that this is the only sensible way to proceed.

**Lorimer MacKenzie** (*FDA*): It is a great shame that the Civil Service unions have to come to Congress to ask you to pass a motion of this sort. Governments throughout the years have urged the UK workforce to

aspire to be as good as the competition, to be the best in Europe, to be the best in the world. They have been willing to look at all sorts of examples to import working practices, no matter how inappropriate, to help deliver more efficiency; yet when they already have one of the best, if not the best, Civil Service organisations in the world, is their reaction to praise it or to invest in it? No. They decide to cut it and cut it without the evidence that cuts are necessary.

As civil servants, we are told that when we develop policies for ministers, we should make sure that our work is evidence-based. We are told that we must always consult our key stakeholders. That is very sensible; an approach with which we, the FDA, wholeheartedly agree. What we object to here is that the Government, when looking at their own staff, have done neither.

We have had the Gershon Report on efficiency. There is no evidence in that process that the cuts are anything other than a crude numbers exercise; the result not of spit sensible analysis but of political expediency. Not only did the Government ignore the need for evidence, but they also failed dismally to discuss this with us, the unions, surely its most major and key stakeholders. It is a classic case of the Government saying: 'Do as I say, not as I do.'

We have no difficulty with the idea that efficiency can be improved. All of us here want the most efficient delivery of public services, but cuts are not the same as efficiency. The workload, which ministers will expect us to shoulder, will not reduce.

We are told that we are in a knowledge economy. Delivery in the modern world is dependent on knowledge, skills and experience. In the Civil Service, the Government have a huge well of knowledge, skills and experience; perfect, you would have thought, for the current environment. However, the Government's approach risks throwing much of this away. When it has been thrown away, when the targets for cuts have been met, when they realise they have lost the knowledge, the skills and the experience, by then it is going to be far too late to fix.

For such a large and risky project, you would have expected a good co-ordinated strategy. You would expect a well-planned approach with clear outcomes and benefits, but we have none of this. There is no strategy. There is merely a series of individual departmental processes. There is no commitment even to ensure that the programmes will be such to equality audit. Not only are the cuts ill-conceived, but they will be implemented without any attempt or assurance at fairness.

The FDA wants to talk to the Government. We want to negotiate. We want to engage in partnership, as the Government wish. However, at a time when we are endeavouring to be positive, when we are endeavouring to be constructive, we are faced with the unedifying spectacle of the Government and the other major political parties behaving like schoolboys engaged in a pissing contest to see who can cut most Civil Service jobs. We support the composite.

**Rosie Eagleson** (*AMO-the trade union for magistrates' courts staff*) supporting Composite 11 said: July 12, 2004 was a grim day for our public services; grim for the people who work in them and grim for the people who use them. The Chancellor's

announcement amounted to a redundancy notice by Parliamentary proclamation. He struck fear and uncertainty into the lives of hundreds of thousands of public servants. We were shocked to hear Tory and Labour politicians vying with each other, outbidding each other, desperate to prove that each could slash ever more jobs.

We want a Labour Government vying to promote good employment practices, competing to create and sustain decent public sector jobs and making quality services a reality. Caricatured and belittled by politicians of all parties, it is a sad fact that civil servants are seen as an easy target.

These job cuts appeared from the blue, are arbitrary and unexpected. Many of our members and their families contrast the unwillingness of the Chancellor and the Prime Minister to maintain these public services with the seemingly bottomless pit of money available to finance a deeply unpopular war.

The Government like to talk about achieving these cuts through greater efficiency. The announcement by the DCA, the department responsible for running the courts, consisted of vague, meaningless statements about unspecified savings, mostly in an agency which has yet to come into being, resulting in 1100 job cuts. Fear and uncertainty pervade because no one knows where the axe will fall.

We cannot afford to create yet another under-funded agency at the heart of our justice system. Job cuts of this scale are inevitably service cuts. There is no arbitrary distinction between frontline services and so-called backroom activities.

Getting a case into a courtroom relies on a whole range of back office staff and support. The Gershon Report was charged with releasing backroom resources and enhancing frontline services, but the Government specifically excluded any examination of the impact of PFI on service delivery, in our view, by far the most significant diversion of resources away from frontline services.

We cannot underestimate the impact on civil servants and potential recruitment to the Civil Service. Recruitment and retention are already a problem. Low pay and a tax on pensions are now compounded by a lack of job security. Our members work in difficult jobs. They deserve praise and affirmation, not denigration. These cuts are a betrayal of civil servants and of the public.

Yesterday, the Prime Minister said successful employers do not succeed by abusing their employees. Quality public services do not achieve excellence by under-valuing public servants. His words ring hollow unless these cuts are reversed.

**Dave Ward** (*Communication Workers Union*) said: The CWU is supporting this composite in total solidarity with PCS, who face similar problems to our own. May I remind Congress that this Labour Government's decision to axe 100,000 jobs in the Civil Service comes hard on the heels of their decision to put in place a so-called renewal plan for the Post Office based on axing 30,000 jobs. At the time we knew the Post Office had financial difficulties, albeit in our opinion they were deliberately over-exaggerated. As a union we also recognise that there was a need for change in the

postal industry but because the ethos of this Government has shifted away from improving public services to improving the commercial bottom line, we ended up with a renewal plan that was 100 per cent focused on profit and nought per cent focused on service.

Where has the Government's balance-sheet mentality taken Royal Mail? In three years we have moved from an over-exaggerated financial crisis to what amounts now to a real crisis in customer confidence with the service we provide to the public. Who takes the brunt of the criticism? You have guessed it, our people on the front line, ordinary postal workers having to deal with the public's complaints on a daily basis.

What has happened to the real culprits? They just move on. There is no accountability or responsibility for them, they simply switch their focus to the next round of public sector job cuts. Like PCS, and from our own bitter experience, we reject the flawed logic which says that you can cut your way to an improved service. The Government must be made to understand that you cannot have a quality public service on the cheap.

Congress, this motion also talks about the need to challenge the growing casualisation of our public services. Let me explain how our members see the problem of casualisation. In Royal Mail they see casuals brought in on a daily basis. They know they have not been properly vetted, they know they have not been trained, and they know they do not have a uniform. They are just sent out with a map pointing them to the start of a delivery. Imagine the damage this does to the image of the industry and the people who work in it. It undermines the status of the job, it undermines the trust and integrity that the public expect from those who deliver their public services. I am not blaming casual workers, it is not their fault. We must now convince the Government to act against the casualisation of public services. It is not just the amount of jobs but the quality of those jobs and the need to invest in the public sector's greatest asset, the people who work in it.

So, strengthened by our own experience, we call on all other unions to support PCS in publicising the effects of plain job cuts on the delivery of frontline services, to back their planned day of protest, and to raise these issues with the Public Services Forum and government. I would also ask the General Council to have a real serious think about the strategy that you are going to have to put in place to carry out the terms of this motion. All of us know, the whole of the movement is facing very serious challenges and perhaps now more than ever we need to feel again how solidarity can be a positive experience for the workers we represent.

**Steve Sinnott** (*National Union of Teachers*) speaking in support of the composite, said: I am pleased to support the civil servants in their campaign to defend services and to protect jobs. The NUT knows how false the separation is between the back room and front line. We know and value the contribution of civil servants to implement those things that are securing and improving our schools and, indeed, our education service. We know, too, how damaging will be some of the cuts that are proposed.

There is within the Department for Education and Skills the Family and Vulnerable Children's Unit. That

unit assists schools and local education authorities dealing with vulnerable children, it deals and assists in implementing an equalities agenda, and it deals and assists in support for ethnic minority children. The cuts that are proposed are savage. Almost one in three jobs will be taken from that particular unit. We will oppose any cuts in the services to local authorities and to schools. Composite 11 recognises that the proposals for cuts in Civil Service jobs are also an attack on the whole of the public sector. Therefore, the need for unity across the public sector and across all public sector unions is essential.

This composite calls for the establishment of a group to assess the impact of the so-called efficiency review and, indeed, of workforce reform. Different unions will have different experiences of public sector reform. The NUT will wish to play a very full part in the work of that group. The NUT will wish to tackle within the group the positives and the negatives of workforce reform. For us, we will certainly wish to emphasise our experiences – our experiences – of the negative impact of workforce reform.

In doing this, Congress, we will not wish in any way to question the trade unionism of any one. We will wish to work closely with colleagues in defending the whole of the public sector, in defending and giving full support to our colleagues in the Civil Service. Support composite 11.

**Carole Maleham** (*UNISON*) speaking in support of the composite, said: Congress, the plans for reform in the Civil Service by cutting is a very bold move, but let us be clear, the message from UNISON is even bolder: you can do it but not in our name and not with our support. The recent Gershon Report promised more money for school support staff, healthcare assistants, and police support staff but we do not think it should come from cutting 100,000 jobs in the Civil Service. We value all the staff team equally, from cleaners to chief executives, from Wakefield to Whitehall. I doubt we will see the money, anyway, because Gordon Brown has more tricks in that Budget than Paul Daniels. There are tough efficiency targets to meet that will mean even more cuts.

Congress, we in UNISON stand alongside our Civil Service colleagues but not just because the Government plan to attack their jobs and the service that they provide, but because of the attack on our members as well. We want to warn the Government that cuts in jobs mean worse services. What we want is the Labour Government committed to delivering the best public services possible, a government that realises that they must invest in the public sector workers. Where we think the Government is prepared to invest we have been prepared to work with them. We have signed agreements that will reform public services, but we have signed and will only sign for reforms recognising that all public servants have an equally important part to play in delivering the services.

All public servants, whether they are civil servants, local government officers, from schools, police, transport, and healthcare service, the Government has to remember that in order to deliver good services you need backroom support; to provide a first-class service you need a team. You also need money and we need plenty of money to do this. Where there are good agreements and well-funded, they tend to work; where they are not, they are undermined. We warn this government, your sums do not add up, your cuts have an effect on every service, and your reforms

cannot be done on the cheap if you want to do them properly.

Congress, UNISON stands shoulder to shoulder with our Civil Service colleagues. Support this composite motion.

**Gerard Dempsey** (*Graphical, Paper and Media Union*) speaking in support of the composite, said: The GPMU shares the outrage at the news of the massive loss of 104,000 jobs to be inflicted on the Civil Service by the Government. It is a scandal. It is not just an attack on our civil servants and the PCS trade union, the cuts will have a direct effect on the well-being of all our members, on those working, on the unemployed, on the disabled, and retired members. It is a further attack on our public services. It will impact on all our communities and ordinary people. It will hit the most vulnerable hardest, such as the people who have to rely on benefits or need support.

The Civil Service is being treated as a political football with Labour and the Conservatives engaged in a grotesque game of who can cut the most jobs. Cuts on this scale will have a massive impact on the Government's ability to deliver core services, such as getting people back into work, the New Deal, the Sure Start programme, and winter fuel payments to our elderly and retired. We are talking about real people and real lives.

Tony, Civil Servants have mortgages and families and do jobs that matter, such as making sure students in further education obtain financial support. Congress, let us not fall for the lies, the myths, and the spin. The workers affected are not people in pinstripes and bowler hats, but in fact some of them are the lowest paid, struggling on wages well below the Low Pay Unit's decency threshold. Undermining morale and pay does not send out the right signal from any employer; it is an own goal. Congress, let us get it right, there is no division between manufacturing and our public, social, and civil services, we rely on each other and we are united. Let us campaign together.

Finally, Congress, I find it ironic and really galling that at a time when we rightly condemn these rogue bosses who sack staff by text and email, we get a Labour Government and a Labour Chancellor sacking 104,000 workers publicly on the television in a spending review statement. Is that insensitive, or what?

Congress, let us send a clear message today, support this motion and support the PCS.

**Jeremy Dear** (*National Union of Journalists*) speaking in support of the composite, said: I come not to praise Civil Service job cuts but to bury them. Comrades, there are times when myths repeated enough, exaggerated enough, take hold, that it is workers asking for too much money which fuels inflation, and that it is waste and bureaucracy which is at the heart of the deficiencies in our public services. It is also a myth that there is an army of Whitehall pen-pushers under-employed with no role in the delivering of quality public services.

Of course, it has traditionally been the right wing and sections of the media who peddle such stereotypes but with the Chancellor's announcement of the savage cuts in Civil Service jobs this Government has shamelessly embraced that red-tape mantra, demonising civil servants in the process. Incidentally,

what example does it set employers with the introduction of the information and consultation regulations for the Chancellor to sack 100,000 workers live on TV? Of course, we are asked to support the idea that such job cuts will only affect backroom staff and free up resources for front line services. Have we not been here before? It is the same old refrain for those who seek political cover for cutting services and axing jobs. Delivering quality public services relies on both front line and support staff; without the necessary back-up services delivery inevitably suffers. We are talking about job centre and benefits staff, customs staff, pensions staff, immigration officers, coastguards, air traffic control staff, librarians, prison and court workers, and many more, the very public services so many of our members rely on; it is not about luxuries but an essential part of the fabric of our society.

The result of such job cuts means all our members and their families will receive a poorer service at a greater distance from their homes and communities. I echo Mark's rallying call, if we are to defeat such cuts, and we must, solidarity is vital between backroom and front line staff, between civil servants and the public, between public sector and private sector unions. Each of us must be ready to do all we can to mobilise our members, to lobby, to march, to demonstrate, and where necessary to act in defence of quality public services.

**Gary Doolan** (*GMB*) speaking in support of the composite, said: Congress, critics of the GMB Keep Public Services Public Campaign have told us we are out of touch with the public mood but I am sure you agree that the six millions trade unionists and their families represent a pretty good cross-section of this British public. We know that the public want, expect, and deserve, first-class public services; second-best is no longer good enough. GMB members say the Government must listen. We are all service users and many of us are public servants too. We say it is the Government that is out of touch with what the people want from the public services. We know that so-called efficiency savings do not result in quality improvements but in second and often third-rate services.

The GMB commends this Government on its record investment programme and the jobs it has created, and we agree that raising public service standards is at the heart of today's debate. This will be the key ground on which the next election will be fought and won. Congress, here we must draw a line. The GMB will vehemently oppose any move to cull any civil or public servants for cheap electoral gain. We reject the Dutch auction offered by the main parties. We reject the lack of consultation and notifications of redundancies via parliamentary speeches. We reject any simplistic distinction between front line services and backroom staff. Civil and public services will only become first-class when this government treats us all as equal stakeholders.

The GMB says: stop threatening civil and public servants with P45s, consult with and involve civil and public servants in improving the services that they deliver, engage the workforce in developing sensible proposals that will not only discriminate against and damage people but also their communities.

Congress, together we can, and will, defend Civil Service and public service jobs. Let us have a co-ordinated campaign involving all public sector unions; we know that these cuts are wrong. The GMB

applauds our colleagues in the PCS delegation for the support and solidarity they displayed for our sacked members in this hall yesterday. We call for concerted joint opposition, the defence of quality jobs, and quality civil and public services. Please support this composite.

**The President:** The General Council supports the composite.

\* *Composite Motion 11 was CARRIED*

## Public Services

**Pam Baldwin** (*UNISON*) speaking to paragraph 5.9, said: UNISON has long campaigned for better pay within the public sector and as a result of strike action in July 2002 by 850,000 local government workers the Local Government Pay Commission was set up. UNISON welcomed the Commission's report, published in October 2003, for offering a unique and overdue opportunity to overhaul thoroughly the treatment of local government staff. The Commission recommended that all councils should carry out equal pay audits and pay and grading reviews to a specified timetable. You may well ask what did this involve. An equal pay review involves comparing the pay of women and men doing equal work, investigating the cause of any gender pay gaps, and closing any gaps that cannot satisfactorily be explained on grounds other than sex. This is long overdue amongst local government workers.

Key recommendations of the report are that above-inflation pay increases are justified on equality grounds, all local authorities should undertake to carry out equal pay audits, the NJC should investigate issues of pay awards for particular groups such as term-time workers and part-time workers, London weighting needs to be reviewed, the single status agreement and NJC job evaluation schemes are to be fit for purpose to ensure proper job evaluation and ranking of jobs and, most importantly, that the trade unions should undertake joint working with employers at all levels to deliver on single status equal pay and other equality issues; last but not least, that central government finance should be made available for initiatives to help close the gender pay gap.

President, Congress, UNISON welcomes the Local Government Pay Commission's Report, in particular their rejection of regional pay bargaining and the support for the national agreement. UNISON commends this section of the report to Congress.

## Fire Services dispute

**Ruth Winters** (*Fire Brigades Union*) speaking to paragraph 5.12, said: I know we have already had delegates up here thanking the TUC but I would really like from the bottom of our hearts to thank the TUC, and Brendan, for the role they played in resolving our dispute.

The one reason we are getting up under this paragraph is not to go over it all again but as a matter of accuracy. The matter of accuracy concerns the meeting that was held on 2<sup>nd</sup> August which fell apart with no agreement, and where the national employers, Labour and Conservative, working together scuppered that agreement. This paragraph actually states that at that meeting the employers' only objection was to the 'stand down' agreement. Normally, we would not speak to a paragraph but there has been so much misinformation put out about our dispute that I think this needs to be put on record.

The employers objected to the 'stand down' agreement and they also refused to pay us the second half of our pay, which was the 4.2 per cent, and they would not give us any decision on that. I think that has to go in there as well; it has to be recorded. Brendan said it was a shame that it took them three times to resolve the dispute. It was a bit like a groundhog day, I have to say, but I think the whole point of ground hog day is that you are supposed to learn from your mistakes and that is something the employers never did.

I will also take this one opportunity to say that I did listen very carefully to Tony Blair yesterday. He actually talked all the time about 'social partnership' but there will only be social partnership, and it will only be effective, when they stop causing situations where strike action is something that has to be taken. Our second ballot was only going to be a 'yes' vote because we were having to ballot to get what we had agreed, not for anything else. Until this government stops actually causing the problem in the first place, interfering in industrial disputes, then we will not get any further.

Once again thanks to the TUC, and could we please have it recorded that that matter of accuracy needs to be sorted. Thank you.

## Address by Shaher Sae'd

**The President:** We now move, Congress, to receive an international visitor. Last year I was privileged to lead a General Council delegation to Palestine and Israel. On the West Bank we saw many really depressing things: the wall being built around Palestinian villages, the desperate poverty, the unemployment caused by travel restrictions, and the devastated compound where we met President Arafat. One meeting we had with the Palestinian Minister of Labour was disrupted because Shaher Sae'd, the General Secretary of the Palestinian General Federation of Trade Unions, had been stopped from leaving Nablus by a roadblock. We had to get the ILO to intervene and secure his passage to join us at the ministry.

A TUC delegation met Shaher and his colleagues in both Nablus and Ramallah and we invited him to Congress. We understand that it has been difficult for him to get here, but he is here today and it is my great pleasure to welcome one of the brightest lights in the Middle East. Shaher Sae'd, I invite you to address Congress.

**Shaher Sae'd** (*General Secretary, Palestinian General Federation of Trade Unions*): Dear brother President, General Secretary, brothers and sisters, it is a great honour for me to be with you attending your conference and taking this opportunity to express the greetings of the PGFTU, Palestine General Federation of Trade Unions, to your organisation, which is enriched by experience that is reflected in your independence and freedom.

Sisters and brothers, this is the second time that I have had this opportunity to address your Congress. At the time I last spoke to you, we had a huge hope that peace and security would be won by my country, and other countries in crisis as well, but unfortunately no one could put an end to the backward escalation in the economic, political and security situation in Palestine which is getting worse and worse in view of the policies of the Sharon Government.

There are still over 480,000 workers out of 850,000 in the labour force in Palestine without jobs and living in great poverty. All cities, villages and refugee camps are cut off; movement is forbidden after 7 o'clock in the evening until 7 the next morning. These cities and villages are no more than big open prisons. The Israeli Army and settlers continue their terrifying attacks on the Palestinians, killing and injuring thousands of our people, including our children. The Israeli Army continues its invasions into the cities, villages, and camps, day and night, arresting, killing, uprooting olive and palm and other fruit trees, and demolishing houses, roads and workplaces. Life has become as horrible as hell.

The daily suffering of our people on the checkpoints barriers cannot be described in ordinary terms. Hundreds of fixed and mobile checkpoints cut off the roads of the West Bank and Gaza and paralyse people's plans and spirits. It is a regime which violates all international conventions and human rights legislation.

It is an impossible issue for the Palestinian workers to start their day normally, going to jobs to earn a living, although this is a normal human demand. Thousands of our workers who try to get to their jobs, universities, schools, or even social events, have been arrested.

The discrimination and separation wall has made the situation even worse, physically separating families, preventing people from farming their land, and taking over a third of the Palestinian land and water resources.

Sisters and brothers, you will have certainly read, in the report of the TUC delegation to Palestine, headed by the President of the TUC and the General Secretary, the objective conditions, the difficulties and obstacles which Palestinian people face daily. Despite this suffering, I am pleased to tell you that we succeeded in conducting our Constitutional Congress in May. It approved several key historical resolutions, among which was to support all actions to establish an independent and democratic Palestinian State with East Jerusalem as its capital, which has been occupied since 4<sup>th</sup> June 1967, side by side with an Israeli state, both living together in security as good neighbours.

On behalf of the PGFTU and myself, I would like to confirm that peace and stability cannot be achieved in the region unless the Palestinian people achieve their rights, freedom and independence, according to all relevant UN resolutions, in particular resolution 242 and 338. The settlements must be removed. I repeat, the settlements must be removed. The killing of innocent civilians everywhere must end. These actions must be strongly condemned. There can be no peace with the land confiscation. Products made or grown in settlements must be boycotted by all means to force the settlers to leave Palestinian lands.

We support a just and comprehensive peace that recognises the rights of all people, whoever and wherever they are. We look forward, hoping and wishing to achieve social protections and to create jobs for our workers and improve our labour movement's rights and freedoms.

The PGFTU strongly support the ILO Fund for Palestinian Employment and Social Protection. We urge all governments to contribute to it.

I thank you again hoping that your Congress will succeed in achieving more rights and more progress for your workers and for your people. Thank you.

**The President:** Thank you very much, Shaher, and we send the greetings of Congress to you and all of your members in all of the sections.

### **Future of Health and Public Policy**

**Lesley Mercer** (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*) moved Composite Motion 12. She said: It is somewhat humbling to follow our previous speaker.

I want to start moving composite 12 by linking it with the previous conference motion. Certainly, we do not want to see extra funding for the NHS at the expense of vital civil service jobs. We in the NHS, like in education, realise that it is a contribution of all workers, support workers, admin workers, as well as clinical workers, that makes the NHS what it is, a fantastic national asset which belongs to all of us here. It is something that we believe is worth celebrating and cherishing for the care it gives. It certainly does not deserve the denigration that it gets constantly from some quarters. I suppose it is always true that one bad news story will make for much more exciting copy than 12 examples of plain good service. The truth is that there is a lot more good news out there than bad.

It is true that it is taking time for the extra money going into the NHS actually to start to show tangible differences, but the reality is, comrades, that it does take time to train up more professionals, it does take time to develop new working practices, and it has taken time to negotiate a better system for paying NHS workers, which we believe will stand the test of time. Improvements are now starting to come on stream and for those of us who believe in our National Health Service, free at the point of need and irrespective of the ability to pay, the future for the NHS is a good one.

My union is especially pleased to see that health promotion and the better management of long-term health conditions are starting to move up the political agenda. Both these areas are crucial to the Government's vision, which we share in the CSP, of moving the NHS away from just being an emergency service for the sick to a service that positively supports quality of life. The members I represent can make a big contribution in all these areas, from cutting down waiting lists through to preventing hospital admissions in the first place.

There are many examples of where the NHS is truly moving in the right direction but, clearly, we are not completely there yet. To some extent healthcare, like other parts of the public services, is still a lottery, depending on where you live or depending on what your needs are. A manual worker in this country will still live on average seven-and-a-half years less than a professional worker. Within the NHS itself workloads are too high, staffing shortages still persist, and the partnership approach to change is yet to be fully embedded into our culture.

I am afraid the launch of the NHS plan this June is a case in point. Whilst the plan contains a lot that we in the CSP agree with, we also have some concerns and questions that we believe would have been far better addressed and discussed before the plan was launched rather than afterwards. We are unsure, for example, how the theory of patient choice is going to be

translated into a practical reality. We seriously question the proposed scale of private sector involvement in the future. We strongly disagree with a statement in the plan that pay linked to performance will create stronger incentives for service.

It is in order to address these kinds of concerns that we call in this composite motion for a stronger role for the Public services Forum. The CSP was one of the unions that actually first supported the idea of a Public Services Forum but its credibility does rest on the extent to which it can deliver genuine dialogue. We also call on the TUC itself to support affiliates by providing quality research, in particular on the choice agenda, so that we can start to unpick from the spin (which is undoubtedly there) what the real issues are for the users of public services, including health, and how they are going to impact on the users and our members.

Congress, just winding up, there are two ways to look at the NHS. One way is to dismiss it as a concept past its sell-by date, which is an idea that has credence in some quarters. The other way is to recognise it for its achievements and positively engage to spread these achievements further. Not surprisingly, the CSP believes strongly in the latter approach. Please support the motion.

**Ann Pollard** (*Society of Radiographers*) seconding the composite, said: The greatest problems we face within the NHS are targets imposed on us by government but not followed with the relevant revenue and staff resources to implement them. As healthcare professionals we believe in early diagnosis and treatment. Targets that are introduced without any dialogue can lead to the reduction in the level of services elsewhere in the NHS. Why is it that people most able to give good advice to government on service issues, such as practising radiographers, are never asked.

The Government has recently introduced a scheme into the NHS to reduce the number of patients awaiting an MRI scan. There are issues that question if this policy can work. Firstly, the Government has contracted this out to the private sector to implement and, more importantly, the desperation to provide a quick-fix solution has missed the point about capacity that already exists to do this work within the NHS. Over recent years extra funding and government spending initiatives provided excellent MRI facilities in most parts of the country but in many cases there has been no funding provided to run these scanners.

Within my own trust, we had to reduce the use of our scanner to just three days a week.

The result of this private provision initiative is the scandalous situation, I believe, that public money is being spent on a privately provided service in trusts where NHS equipment is actually mothballed. Radiographers are being employed by the private company to operate their MRI scanners. Where are the extra radiographers going to be recruited from if not from vital services? This then leaves gaps in a profession that is already experiencing a severe recruitment retention problem leading to non-delivery of services for patients elsewhere due to this lack of staff.

NHS staff and the Society of Radiographers are committed to improve the service to all patients. Why,

oh, why, does this Government find it so hard to talk to us about implementing and introducing change? Though I congratulate them on some of their improvements within, I would implore dialogue be undertaken with NHS trade unions when developing policy.

Congress, please accept this motion so that my patients can receive the service that they have paid for. Thank you.

**Jonathan Baume** (*FDA*) speaking in support of the composite, said: I despair at times about politicians. We have a critical debate to undertake on the future of public services yet it has been reduced in the Civil Service to bowler hats versus the front line as politicians bid against each other to cut civil service jobs, and in the NHS it is bureaucrats versus nurses and doctors. It is an insult to the electorate.

In reality, the NHS is undertaking the biggest single public sector reform programme in the world. Who are these bureaucrats? The FDA represents senior managers. We know that many senior managers actually have clinical backgrounds. Birmingham Children's Hospital, Great Ormond Street, Guys and St Thomas's, their chief executives are all doctors. Many primary care trust chief executives have come from nursing backgrounds. Hospitals are introducing modern matrons, all nurses, who are key clinical leaders with management roles. Look at the advances in new technology in healthcare, the human genome project, the use of robotics, the massive investment in information technology. They have tremendous significance for clinical research and practice. Busy front line clinical staff have many talents but not necessarily in managing rapid change.

For the NHS to work – and whether we like it or not the structures are those that the politicians have set – we need quality management. Moreover, in the UK 6 per cent of healthcare spending goes on overall management costs compared to an average across the EU of 9 per cent and about 14 per cent in the United States. So, we have a false debate. The FDA wants an NHS that empowers and recognises everybody's contribution. We should put far more value on the ancillary staff, porters, kitchen staff, laundry workers, without whom no hospital could operate. Let us not only focus the healthcare debates on nurses and doctors, crucial though they are. They could not do their job without other professionals, the physiotherapists, the radiographers, speech therapists, and others.

Instead of rhetoric about bureaucrats, we should welcome development and support to enable all of these people to enter into management roles, if that is how they want to develop their careers. Let us utilise everyone's talent and end this myth of the bureaucrat. The FDA supports the composite.

**Christine Wilde** (*UNISON*) speaking in support of the composite, said: I have been a health service worker for over 30 years. The Government is putting historic levels of investment into the NHS. To a large extent this investment is paying off; patients are getting quicker and better treatment and death rates from killer conditions, such as heart disease, are substantially down. All too often the Government's additional investment into the NHS has been undermined by an approach to reform which fails to listen to staff or to recognise that in order to improve the NHS there must be investment into its principal asset, its people.

Back in June, the Government published its five-year improvement plan for the NHS. It contained an extension of the popular expert patients initiative to cover the whole of England by 2008. It stressed a renewed emphasis on health promotion and public health but it was published without any prior consultation with staff or trade unions. The Public Services Forum was given no opportunity to have input into its contents. Staff in the NHS were not asked what they saw as problems or what they believed were the next steps for delivering improvement in the NHS. The Government apparently did not see the logic in consulting people in the know, working the system, dealing with the public, assessing their needs; far better to be advised by experts in long-distance knowledge of the NHS.

Had they been asked, staff may well have been able to offer some useful advice to the Government. They may have had some tips on how to eradicate MRSA, pointing out, for example, that where contractors are allowed to reduce the number of cleaners below what is needed standards will inevitably suffer, and on calling for a return to the in-house team system. I was discussing this very item with a fellow trade unionist at Tolpuddle, who was in full agreement. They may have called for more stringent protection for whistle-blowers so that staff are empowered to speak out when there is bad practice. We are not blind to what is wrong or unfair, incompetent management, but we need to speak to provide for our families. They might have talked about the pressures of constant structural changes in the NHS, almost one major reorganisation a year since 1982, and they might have pleaded for a period of stability to allow them to focus on the job of patient care in the front line. We have been through more reorganisations than government reshuffles, and there lies a success story that gives us confidence.

I believe most of all the message that would have to emerge would be, the NHS needs investment in its principal asset, its staff: it means treating staff fairly, it means seeing the potential of staff and working with them to develop it. The reality is that no one is more committed to the NHS and patient care than the staff working in it. Well done to the Government for all the good things it has done in the NHS so far but there is a need for further improvement. The Government needs to do more work together with staff by both listening to us and investing in us. Thank you.

**The President:** The General Council are in favour of Composite 12.

\* *Composite Motion 12 was CARRIED.*

*(Congress adjourned to 2.15 p.m.)*

## TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

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

**The President:** I call Congress to order. Many thanks once again to NKS Jazz who have been playing for us this afternoon. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

## Presentation of Equality Awards

**The President:** We now come to the presentation of the first ever TUC Equality Awards. The trade union movement can be proud of its long record in promoting equality and combatting discrimination. It is now six years since Neville Lawrence received a

standing ovation from Congress in recognition of his campaign for justice for his murdered son. In the intervening period we have taken a close look at our structures and recognised what needs to be done to ensure that our unions promote equality both in theory and in practice. Last year we had our first ever equality audit in which we took a critical look at ourselves. This year we recognise the positive work being done by unions through the first of what will become biennial equality awards.

I now invite the Deputy General Secretary to present the awards.

**Frances O'Grady** (*Deputy General Secretary*): It gives me great personal pleasure to present these awards, a personal pleasure because these awards prove that organising is at the heart of equality, and that equality must lie at the heart of organising. The awards recognise the groundbreaking work of unions to promote equality in the workplace and in the wider community.

Unlike other TUC awards, the equality award is to unions as organisations, not to an individual. That is because we recognise that while individuals play a vital role the big challenge is for unions to work collectively for change. These awards show us that unions are tackling equality with imagination, creativity and determination. They are using the organisational strength of working people to challenge discrimination, prejudice and inequality.

But unions are also meeting the need of members in new ways. Each of the winning entries demonstrated the real recruitment and organising potential of equality campaigns, because workers want to see unions win real change, real improvement, in their working lives and real changes in their communities. One of today's winners increased its proportion of black members by nearly 40 per cent in the months following its campaign. We need more campaigns like this. They work for the members, they work for the union and they make a real difference.

The awards are in two categories, one for unions over 100,000 members, and one for our smaller affiliates. The award recognises that unions are working to promote equality for union representatives, for members and for workers, including challenging workplace cultures that exclude and discriminate. Several of the entries showed how unions helped put new laws on disability into practice. Amicus's Champions at Work project has trained 94 disability champions, and the T&G has carried out 115 workplace disability audits. Other unions, like the NUT, looked at ways to deliver equality across the board, across the union. But this year, the first year, by far the greatest number of entries covered race issues.

Turning to the awards, the first award is for unions with fewer than 100,000 members. The winning project was carried out with imagination and flair. The union provided practical and much needed career advice and support for its black and ethnic minority members. It organised 530 individual meetings for members with key top executives -- black workers trying to get a break in a highly competitive world to smash what you might call a white ceiling -- who have now, as a result of the union's work, landed new and better job contracts. It has led to a recruitment surge amongst black professionals in that union, a 37 per cent increase in black members joining the union and two new black NEC members.



BECTU's 'Move On Up' project has come up with the sorts of results that really demonstrate the organising potential of good equality initiatives. I am delighted to invite BECTU's General Secretary, Roger Bolton, Janice Turner from the BECTU press office, who worked so hard on the project, and new NEC member Suresh Chawla to collect the awards on behalf of BECTU. Please welcome them. *(Applause)*

*Presentation of the Award*

**Roger Bolton** (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*): I am delighted to accept this award on behalf of BECTU. The 'Move On Up' initiatives that we launched in partnership with industry partners made a real difference, got black members jobs in the industry in a way that would not have been possible without this initiative. I am very grateful to the TUC. Thank you very much.

**Frances O'Grady** (*Deputy General Secretary*): This year the judges decided to highly commend an entry from one of our smaller specialist affiliates that shows great promise and initiative. Following the success of the 'Let's Kick Racism out of Football' campaign, the Professional Footballers' Association is tackling the bias against retired black footballers who are not moving into the coaching and management levels of football. A player coach liaison officer has been appointed and the union is introducing a new mentoring scheme. The PFA want to make sure that black talent is seen at all levels of football and not just on the pitch.

The PFA members who are here today to collect the award were pioneers on the pitch, and are now helping their union to take this project forward. I invite the Professional Footballers' Association's Chief Executive, Gordon Taylor, to come and collect the award, along with ex- England players Cyrille Regis, Luther Blissett and Paul Davis, also the wonderful Bobby Barnes and the brilliant PFA Equality Officer Simone Pound. *Presentation of the Award*

**Gordon Taylor** (*Professional Footballers Association*): Thank you very much, Frances. It is a real pleasure to be here and to have our initiative recognised by our colleagues in the TUC. I would expect nothing less.

It is ten years now since we began our 'Kick It Out' campaign and it has been really encouraging to see the way that other initiatives have developed throughout Europe, and indeed in the TUC with the "Respect" campaign.

You see the quality in front of you with such great black players as Cyrille Regis, who you will know, particularly for West Brom and England; Luther Blissett who performed so admirably for Watford and then in Italy and England as well; and then Paul Davis of Arsenal and England. We must not forget my colleagues with the PFA. We have Pete Smith, who is back on his home territory where he used to play so well for Brighton; Bobby Barnes, formerly of West Ham United who you will know; and last but not least a young lady who has taken over so well from my deputy, Brendan Batson, as our Equality Executive Officer, Simone Pound.

The point I wanted to make is that we have such great players who are fully qualified as coaches. Our initiative is about their being recognised by those most important of all, employers, and seeing how much better things will be when they adopt an equalities policy. They should recognise the talent that is there, showing itself now, integrated so well on our football

pitches but which need also to be given a chance on the touchline as managers and coaches and in the offices as administrators and in the boardrooms as directors.

Thank you very much indeed.

**Frances O'Grady** (*Deputy General Secretary*): That has made my day!

Now to the award for unions with over 100,000 members: the winning union in this category has carried out an ambitious project that reflects its size, its organisational capacity but I would say it also reflects the level of its ambition. It has taken on the challenge of the BNP at the local level, and challenged the far right in the workplace. It has put its money where its mouth is, but it has also done the hard work of organising with activists in parts of the country where racism is a real threat to black people, working with anti-racist campaigners as well as -- and here is a hint -- council workers. Every member living in a ward where the BNP was standing in this year's council elections was sent a direct mail union leaflet. Advertisements were placed in national newspapers to warn voters in the European elections of the dangers of the BNP.

Changing workplace culture by promoting equality and community cohesion is a central part of the union training programme that this union put on. The training stresses the contribution of black and migrant workers to the public services and the essential role they play. I know that the union's General Secretary has been personally committed to steering this campaign, and together with his national Executive Committee in my view has shown true leadership. The project has exactly the balance of grass roots involvement and commitment from the top that is necessary, essential, for success.

Please can General Secretary Dave Prentis, activist from the north-west Rena Wood and UNISON's Race Equality Officer and mover of the Black Workers motion on organising, Wilf Sullivan, collect the TUC Equality Award on behalf of UNISON. *Presentation of the Award*

**Dave Prentis** (*UNISON*): Congress, it is a great honour to receive this award on behalf of the whole of UNISON, a united union totally committed to stopping the BNP in its tracks. But the great surprise of our union was to see the results on the Friday morning last June. The BNP had failed to make the inroads it had boasted about and for that there could be no greater prize.

But we cannot be complacent. They are still moving forward. Much more needs to be done but I am really proud that UNISON has made a difference. To show that we work in partnership I would like one of our activists just to say a few words to you.

**Rena Wood** (*UNISON*): I would like to say thank you for the privilege of accepting this award on behalf of UNISON. I would like you to know that without the commitment of our General Secretary, Dave Prentis, the support of our National Officer Wilf Sullivan, and all the activists who got involved in the campaign, we could not have succeeded.

The most important thing is the fact that we worked alongside all the other trades unions, community groups, multi-faith groups at local, regional

and national level and without all of your support we could not have succeeded but the work goes on. Thank you, colleagues.

**The President:** Congratulations not only to those who won, but to all those who took part. We hope that biennially there will be more and more people participating.

**Address by Amir Peretz, General Secretary, Israeli Histadrut**

**The President:** This morning we heard from Shaher Sa'ed, the General Secretary of the Palestinian Trade Union Federation. I mentioned that I met him when I was leading the TUC delegation to the Middle East last November.

As well as spending time with the Palestinian General Federation on the West Bank the TUC delegation also spent time as a guest of the Israeli TUC, the Histadrut. I am pleased that Amir Peretz, the leader of Histadrut, is also here at Congress. Amir is a leading figure in the Israeli peace movement; he is also fighting off the right wing deregulatory, privatising government of Israel.

The Israeli trade union movement faces the same problems of globalisation that we all face but they do so in an economy that is debilitated by the costs of waging war and isolated from obvious trading partners.

We had previously invited Amir to address this Congress but at that time he was involved in a general strike and he put the general strike first. This year the same clash could have happened as the Histadrut is in very serious dispute with their government. However, I am pleased that they have timed their general strike this time for next Sunday, freeing up Amir to come here today. We are very glad therefore to have him, and I have great pleasure in inviting Amir Peretz, General Secretary of Histadrut, a member of the Israeli Parliament, to address Congress.

**Amir Peretz (*Histadrut- Israel*):** Dear President Lyons, General Secretary Barber, Executive members of the TUC, Congress, brothers and sisters, it is a real pleasure and honour for me to attend the TUC Congress, and I would like to thank you for the kind invitation.

It is especially important now to think again about the implications of capitalism, the place of the human being in the process of globalisation, and how the globalisation of rights not just the globalisation of capital will be realised. It is especially important now that trades unions around the world co-operate among themselves in order to intensify the struggle against the exploitation of workers and child labour.

Let me now turn to the political questions that engage the free world and, above all, the question of terror that threatens the peace of the entire world. The terror of the new millennium is a primitive terror, and therefore it is dangerous. It is possible to find security answers to missiles, tanks and electronic warfare, but it is impossible to fight against the suicide bombers who are live human bombs. Therefore, it is extremely difficult to stop them.

There are many who admire the terrorists and describe them as idealists who are ready to sacrifice

their lives for their beliefs. However, we must not legitimise the killing and murder, especially when we speak about innocent citizens and children. The outrageous act that occurred in the school in Russia clarified for all of us that terror has no boundaries. A week before the murders in Russia there was an outrageous event in Israel when two buses were blown up by suicide bombers, leaving many families without their loved ones.

I was born in Morocco. I came to Israel and I grew up in Israel. During my service as an officer in the Israeli army I was severely wounded and spent two years in hospital. I left hospital in a wheelchair. When I first stood on my feet again I swore to myself that the next war I was going to fight was the war for peace.

I live with my family in the city of Sderot -- the city of peace -- which is on the border of Gaza. My city is attacked daily by Kasam missiles that fall inside the city and in people's backyards. I was the Mayor of Sderot for several years, and since that period I have declared publicly that a Palestinian state is in Israel's interest. I tried to influence Sderot's residents to support peace and co-existence on a daily basis and asked them not to lose hope since those who lose hope for peace enable the murderers to win.

Right now we are sharing a new ray of hope. In my opinion, the Disengagement Plan from the Gaza Strip is the only alternative we have in the present political situation in Israel. At the moment, a right wing government is in power, so we must do everything possible to push this plan forward even if it is not perfect. In my opinion, if the Disengagement Plan is implemented it will be a historical step that will change the Israeli psychology and will provide legitimacy for the cost of the evacuation of the settlements. I would prefer a comprehensive peace plan, but Israel has a right-wing government that is ready for the new plan of Gaza First. I know that many are afraid that Gaza First will become Gaza Last.

However, it is clear to us all that in order to reach a comprehensive peace the agreement must also include solutions to the West Bank. Therefore, despite all our fears we must support the Disengagement Plan in the hope that it will jump-start the peace process. I do not intend to rest until a comprehensive peace is achieved, based on two states for two nations, an Israeli state and a Palestinian state, living in peace side by side.

It has been said before that the worst peace is better than the best war. I believe this to be true; I know this to be true. I can assure you that the Histadrut will continue to be committed to the peace process in general, and to strengthening its relationship with the PGFTU in particular, as well as the solidarity amongst the workers.

Everyone knows that I fully support equal rights for Palestinian workers. However, as long as the acts of terror continue with every new horror, I can do less and less. I call on my friend Shaher Sae'd, head of the Palestinian trades unions, despite the difficult situation that exists between the Israeli Government and the Palestinian authority, to sit together with us and we shall look for workers' groups on both sides to co-operate. I hope that the day will come when we will be able to set up a trade union federation in the Middle East, which will serve as an umbrella for peace and for people-to-people action.

Until that time comes I call on you, my friends from the TUC and my friends from all the trades unions all over the world, to view the peace in the Middle East as an international mission, and to invite groups of workers from both sides to meet in your countries. Only pressure from citizens who want peace will influence the leaders in the Middle East to take courageous steps and to ensure the future of children of all the nations in our region. All over the world, even where there are wars, conflicts, hunger and poverty, no one can stop people dreaming of a better world so we too will continue to struggle for peace and justice for all.

Dear friends, I would like to seize this opportunity and thank you for all the support you have provided us during us with during these hard days and for inviting me to this honourable meeting. (*Applause*)

**The President:** Amir, thank you for that address. The TUC, as confirmed in our delegation to you and to the Palestinian General Federation, stands ready to assist in any exchanges, meetings, training and assistance when the two unions in the region seek mutual assistance. We will be there. Thank you very much for your contribution. I know it is a difficult time for you with the impending dispute and I am sure that Congress will wish you all the best in your dispute with your Thatcherite Government.

### Learning and skills

**Chris Harding** (*Graphical, Paper and Media Union*) moved Composite Motion 18. He said: It is well over a year now since the Government introduced its Skills White Paper and somewhat longer since it gave union learner representatives the right to paid time off to undertake their duties. These initiatives have transformed the lives of many workers who, without these new rights and entitlements, would not have improved their skills levels and ultimately their employability. The Government are now beginning to recognise that unless trades unions are involved as real social partners within the skills and learning agenda, they will be unable to deliver the improvements to productivity and employment that they seek.

However, we still have an awful long way to travel to ensure that the potential benefits can be experienced by all. For far too long workers in this country have had to rely on their employer in order to improve their skills. We all know the majority of employers can be no more trusted with the skills and learning agenda than they can be with other improvements in the workplace. Government estimates suggest that the country loses over £10 billion a year from poor literacy and numeracy rate among adults, but employers and the CBI in particular would rather complain about the cost of sickness levels and red tape than make a real effort to tackle the real issues.

It is very clear that if we wait for employers to offer training to workers to close the productivity gap, increase the country's competitiveness and meet the personal aspirations of every worker in this country, we will be waiting for ever. It is a credit to the Labour Government that more workers have access to training and that the number of union learner representatives is growing all the time. Despite these government initiatives, UK employers remain locked in the 1980s and are stubbornly consistent in their negative approach to the training agenda. We have gone as far as we can with offering employers the choice to train and we have run out of options.

What is now needed is a courageous step, a step change from the Government. Despite the present state of manufacturing and our low levels of productivity, workers still do not have the right to paid time off to undertake training to an NVQ level 2. Workers should not have to rely on their employer to join an employer training-pilot voluntarily to gain this right. The right to paid time off for training should be unconditional. We need to be able to bargain on behalf of our members on the issues of training and learning, something that is essential in any democratic economy, as is bargaining over pay and conditions. We need tough action taken against those employers who refuse to train or engage with trades unions on the skills agenda. The Government need to have the courage to introduce statutory training levies on those factors that fail to improve the skills levels and meet the sector's training needs, whether there is a Sector Skills Council in place or not. The Government need to introduce a statutory obligation for employers to introduce workplace learning committees to ensure that employers work with union learner representatives in every workplace, not just in those workplaces where the employers choose to.

In further education, where the gap between vocational and the so-called academic route is not only distinguished by inadequate provision in colleges but also by the wages and resources for staff, we need greater government support.

This composite calls for a strong government with a clear sense of vision to introduce what are, by European comparisons, modest changes to the way workers gain training and citizens meet their personal aspirations. These changes would not only look after the interests of workers but the long-term interests of the economy and the overall prosperity of our nation. We ask Congress to support the composite motion.

**Paul Mackney** (*NATFHE- the University and College Lecturers' Union*) seconding Composite Motion 18 said: Over the last few weeks the CBI and government ministers have given us helpful advice on how really modern unions should be embracing education and training issues. I do not wish to sound ungrateful but it occurred to me that the TUC has been in the vanguard on these issues since its founding Manchester Congress. The fact is we are still waiting for the Government and the employers to catch up. For example, the demand for a right to paid educational leave has been running as a Congress item for longer than 'The Mousetrap' and it is still not on the Statute Book. It is almost impossible for many workers today to find time to study and juggle caring responsibilities, travel arrangements, work with shift patterns and so on. Although the employee training pilots have clearly shown how enabling people to study in work time transforms the situation, less than 30 per cent of the UK workforce have intermediate skills compared with 50 per cent in France and 66 per cent in Germany. This skills gap will not be closed without an obligation on all employers to contribute to training for the economy's needs rather than for the narrower needs of specific firms.

Despite the new Facility for Sector Skills Agreements, the skills gap is not going to be sorted out until the business veto on industrial levies or similar arrangements is removed. It was the CBI that persuaded the Government to keep training out of the Information and Consultation Directive. It is rank hypocrisy to suggest that unions are insufficiently committed to training when it is the narrow business

lobby that has been standing in the way of progress. It is high time the key role unions play in committing workers to education and training was recognised by the statutory right to negotiate on these issues on workplace and education training committees.

On Monday the Prime Minister acknowledged the role of learning representatives, backed a union academy and said financial support for 18 to 30 year olds for Level 3 or A level equivalent qualifications is under consideration. These are all good things. But the colleges are still grossly underfunded, with college workers earning seven per cent less than those in schools. These are now subject to an absurd tiered arrangement whereby colleges with the most problems -- usually in the urban areas -- receive less money than the rest. As in other parts of the public service, we want good local college provision, not an artificial choice between first and second-class establishments.

Finally, top up fees: £9,000 for a degree course will saddle most young people with a lifetime of debt. Forget putting money in for pensions; they will not have money for that. This policy shovels votes to the Tories who are now proclaiming, loudly, that they will abolish the fees and, softly that they will cut higher education.

The only good thing about the policy is that it has brought NATFHE and the AUT closer together in saying that education transforms people's lives. We maintain that access to it should be based on the ability to study, not the ability to pay.

**Christine Bond** (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*) supporting Composite Motion 18 said: I want to talk specifically about the Sector Skills Councils.

The councils, a trail blazing idea, need the active participation of unions and the union learning representatives to ensure that the learning provided meets the needs of our members. The union representatives have a pivotal role in the development of the Sector Skills Agreements. Sector Skills Councils need to be employment led, not employer led. To do that we must have union representation on the board. It is important that unions play a strong part.

Training of the workforce must be high on the agenda for all unions because it is a condition of success in the modern world. Training and retaining are requirements our members face everyday. Whether it is improved skills in language, computers, health and safety or the new technology that seems to change daily, members rely on their unions to argue their needs. I find I need training every few years on how to use my mobile phone. Many of you probably need training on how to use an MP3 player. Change is a constant we all face now.

It is important that all workers, whatever their employment status, are covered by the work of the Sector Skills Councils and included in Sector Skill Agreements. A number of motions have highlighted the change in employment patterns. What have been called 'atypical workers' are becoming more the norm than the exception in many industries. We need a strong contribution from unions and union learning representatives on the Sector Skills Councils to ensure that training that is appropriate to our members is given.

Please support the motion and the commitment to training.

**Adrian Askew** (*Connect*): Congress, we have heard a lot this week about Digby Jones and what he has had to say about his future of the world of work, a world in which trade unions are irrelevant, but thanks to a pick and mix employment workers will be able to choose the juiciest jobs with the security of their skills to protect them come what may. I wish I could be so confident, but that would just be complacency because international comparisons consistently show us to be lagging behind our European neighbours. The ill-informed naivety of Jones' speech is surpassed only by its hypocrisy. He called on us, the trade unions, to focus on skills and training as if this would be some novel idea. The facts are that it is the unions that have put thousands of learning reps into the workplace. It is the unions who have worked with the Government to drive the early successes of the Sector Skills Councils, and it is the unions who are pushing the skills developments to be seen as a right for all workers. Further, it is the unions who are working with the first Government since the 1970s to make a real effort to close the skills gap.

So what about the employers? Some recognise that a well-trained workforce is an asset to be valued. Sadly, there are many more who neglect investment in skills who ride on the back of the good employers continuing down in a spiral of decline. This situation cannot continue.

Last year Congress debated globalisation and how we, as a movement, could tackling off-shoring. Whatever your view, improving the skills of the workforce has to be a way forward, a way forward for workers, employers and the UK economy. The point is that the employers and the Government must work with us or face the only real alternative, which is statutory obligation and training levies. Far from being irrelevant, trade unions are already championing the cause of skills and training in the workplace. It is time for the employers to join with us on this because, as Bob Dylan once said, "You'd better start swimming or you'll sink like a stone". Please support Composite 18.

**Peter Pendle** (*Association for College Management*): ACM welcomes recent Government initiatives aimed at lifting the status and quality of vocational education, and encouraging many young people and adults to take up opportunities on vocational courses. In particular, we welcome the Level 2 entitlement established for adults and the revised framework for apprenticeships and the extension of these opportunities to older learners.

Commentators regularly call for an improvement to the status of vocational learning. The academic/vocational divide is widely regretted, but one of the main reasons for the comparatively poor status of vocational education is that much of it has been sub-standard. On the whole, it is not surprising that vocational education has not enjoyed high status. As a nation we have failed to invest in this area of education in the way that we have invested in academic education. Disproportionate resources have been targeted at HE and the academic qualifications that people get. A much smaller resource, an entirely inadequate resource, has been available to vocational education. As a nation, we have often failed to take vocational education as seriously as we should have. Consequently, we have failed those people whose

talents and aspirations would best be developed by vocational programmes.

We welcome the greater investment that this Government have made in this area but much more is needed.

We have witnessed an out-pouring of indignation from the media at HE fees policy which will require those on university courses to contribute to the cost of their education. However, the fact is that until recently, adults on a Level 2 vocational course were liable for the fees for their training, and that fact has generally escaped comment, as has the fact that adults on a Level 3 vocational course still have to fork out for their fees for their training. Do not be fooled by what Tony Blair said yesterday. He did not announce any new money for those people.

In contrast to the indignation around HE fees and grants, when Educational Maintenance Allowances for disadvantaged 16-18 year olds were widely publicised in the early summer, they were criticised as a bribe by the very same newspapers and television programmes which rue the changes to the HE policy. The goal of the Government's Skills Strategy will only be achieved through adequate and effective investment in vocational education. ACM calls on the Government to establish a universal entitlement to free and excellent education up to and including a first full Level 2 entitlement. Creating and delivering that entitlement will take additional and substantial investment in vocational education and training. Such an entitlement would substantially support the development of the skills base necessary for a prosperous economy and would equip individuals with the resources for personal development and growth.

Please support the composite.

**Anne McCormack** (*UNISON*) speaking in support of the composite, said: I am an 11 plus failure but I have a passion for education.

The Government will never meet their targets on skills as long as the FE sector funding is subject to the whims and vagaries of the Learning and Skills Councils who dictate what we teach and where teach it, but without passing legislation to force employers to give paid time off for training. In my college funding for work-based learning has been drastically cut. We have been so successful in our E-to-E programmes in getting disaffected young people into education and training that the LSC is now refusing to pay us because we were too successful.

As an aside, we have been very successful in Government, too. Malcolm Wickes, John Healey and Alan Johnson all visited St. Helen's College as FE Ministers and went on to greater things. Gordon Brown has also been, but time will only tell what his progression route will be.

Why are we successful in delivering work-based training? It is because we pay the training, not the employer. If employers are so reluctant to engage in work course development, when they are the ones saying that they need more skilled workers, then what price is their commitment to workforce development on Sector Skills Councils?

The Government, the TUC and its affiliates must take steps to ensure that SSCs are employment led and not employer dominated. We agree with the call for union SSC members to up-date and consult our relevant unions, but we also want the TUC to maximise support for union Sector Skills Council members to help them carry out their role and actively promote union policies on the skills agenda, not being on the balcony and out of the game.

Indeed, to be frank, the record of employers under a voluntary system has been at best patchy. At worse, their contribution has been non-existent and dictated by self-interest. Without proper safeguards, increased employer involvement in policy and the allocation of funds will simply result in increased public subsidy for the status quo, a system which distributes opportunity unequally favouring those already qualified and on higher rates of pay, neglecting those front-line workers whose working day revolves around face-to-face delivery of essential services, neglecting part-time and shift-workers, a system which has failed hundreds of thousands of our members who have already been let down, a system which is still struggling to come to terms with the shortage of literacy and numeracy skills in our workforce, a system which has met that any mention of the buzz word 'competitiveness' drives us further towards a low skilled, low waged economy, a system which has led the UK to poach skilled people from less developed countries which can ill-afford to lose them.

If Sector Skills Councils and our efforts to support them are going to be effective and make the radical changes we need, we must have statutory rights to paid educational leave, to concentrate the minds of employers on the real issues, to empower our members and negotiators and to stimulate the demand for skills and progression. If we are going to challenge those employers who say they will not or cannot engage, we need the rights to information and consultation missing from the regulations. Our members deserve the right to high quality and training. It benefits our employers and improves their profitability. Employers must pay their part in supporting this agenda and put their money where their mouths are. Please support.

**Marge Carey** (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*) speaking in support of the composite said: Congress, we are ever more ambitious about learning and development at work, not only intensifying our efforts in the continuous struggle on vocational training but thinking and becoming committed to a wider and more ambitious agenda, thinking radically about our members' learning and development needs beyond the workplace and beyond vocational needs, thinking about their genuine and abiding interest in gaining and developing all manner of skills and knowledge, skills and knowledge which are useful and relevant to them, not just their employer.

Statutory rights to learning reps was an absolute massive step forward, guaranteeing us a role and presence in the life-long area of work, beginning at last to see the workplace as a resource for learning and development in general as well as a place of work, building a relationship between worker and employer which is deeper than paid employment alone, and making life-long learning reps real champions of learning throughout workers' lives, so much so that the better employers have seen the point and the benefits, employers working with my union in distribution, food manufacturing, home shopping and retailing.

Our achievements in USDAW include over 450 life-long learning reps now in place and nearly 10,000 USDAW members returning to some form of learning. As a quick aside, I am one of those returning to learning. I am doing PC maintenance, not with a screwdriver, so when my computer freezes I can actually fix it rather than kick it. We also have 30 on-site learning centres in place, and we need to build on that foundation and develop strategically. We need a guaranteed mechanism to bring life-long learning reps and employers together, to anchor and structure that effective relationship in the way the health and safety reps have a statutory role and statutory right to form a committee. We need to develop and embed those rights and structure in our learning and development work. It is vital to encourage and support the excellent work our union learning reps carry out on behalf of their members.

It also makes good business sense for the employers, too, moving forward in a planned, rational and managed way rather than in an ad hoc piecemeal way.

Congress, we are standing on some very fertile ground for ourselves as organised delegates of life-long learning, for decent employers looking to recruit and retain the best and then invest in them, and for the Government to try and build a 21<sup>st</sup> Century workforce adaptable, able to learn and to go on learning. Most importantly, it is for workers themselves needing and deserving to go on learning and developing throughout their lives. Please support.

**Tony Conway** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) speaking in support of the composite, said: President and Conference, PCS members working in the public and private sector have a major interest in the successful delivery of education and skills. Not only do we need to see a major extension in the education and skills provision for all employees, not just the few, but PCS members working in those Government departments – the DFES, Dti and DWP – plus other public sector bodies, such as the Learning and Skills Councils, Sector Skills Councils, regional development agencies along with the Scottish Parliament and Welsh Assembly. PCS members, therefore, Congress, play a direct role in ensuring that this country delivers high quality training and education for people in work, in education, the unemployed and in communities. Without the dedicated support of those civil and public servants, the Government would not be able to deliver its skills strategy, build its better schools, remove the scourge of illiteracy and reach its target of 300,000 apprentices.

There is no doubt that under-investment in schools and colleges, in our FE sector, in workplaces and communities, is reliant on the market. The lack of central government leadership and intervention has got us to where we now are.

From the latest OECD comparisons, the UK is 18<sup>th</sup> in the world as far as the number of adults over 25 with Level 2 skills. Seven million adults have serious skill needs in literacy and numeracy. One in five school leavers leaves school at 16 with less than a Level 2 qualification. These figures, of course, Congress, hide massive inequalities. This inequality persists beyond people's lifetimes, passed from parents to children and within communities. The situation is exacerbated by poverty wages, unemployment and flexible and low-skilled work. It segregates women from men and black from white. To put this situation right, Congress, we need genuine partnerships; public sector trade unions

with employers and government. We need to value those employees.

So what are we faced with? We are faced with a staff cut at the DFES of 30 per cent, which will undermine our aspirations and government targets across all areas of schools, and for those families with children in higher education. The Learning and Skills Council is to lose 800 jobs, with staff forced out and unilateral changes in terms and conditions, with poor wages for trainees. The DTi is to suffer a 20 per cent staff cut in the area of business support, and the DWP is to lose 30,000 jobs, putting more pressure on frontline staff. The very real fear from my union and others is, once again, that after six years of improvement the Government are opting out. We can, will and must succeed. We will press for additional resources, oppose the cuts and fight for better pay, demand statutory rights to time off and develop our learning representatives and the need for compulsory levies. We must succeed. Our children demand us to do it and our communities demand us to do it.

\* *Composite Motion 18 was CARRIED.*

### **The Government's five-year strategy for education**

**Mary Compton** (*National Union of Teachers*) moved Motion 50 as amended. She said: The big idea in this strategy can be summed-up in one word – choice. Choice is important in matters of taste. I might prefer a red jacket to a blue jacket, or beans to sausages. I might even choose when I want to slip out and buy myself a bar of chocolate. There is also democratic choice. I might prefer a new Labour Government to a Tory one, or a New Labour Government to a Tory Government, but when it comes to my children's education, I do not want choice. I want entitlement. I want to know that my children will get a good education at their local school. So is this what is being offered in the five-year plan? Far from it.

The Prime Minister has said that choice is a product of an imperfect world where people are either stuck with a poor service on their doorstep or they exercise their choice and go elsewhere. This simply is not good enough. Choice for some, by definition, means no choice for others. Choice for the articulate, the middle class and, perhaps, even for some of the hardworking families that the Prime Minister is so fond of, but what about choice for the children of parents who do not have the transport, means or motivation to exercise choice? What about children with emotional or behavioural difficulties, or whose parents are too oppressed to care? Are they not, too, entitled to a good education?

There is another great irony at the heart of this document. It denigrates comprehensive education. Now it is no longer referred to as 'bog standard', but as 'the lowest common denominator'. Yet, what does the most thorough investigation of standards ever carried out on education worldwide, the OECD PISA Study, tell us? It tells us that those countries where schools are segregated, like Germany, do badly, whereas those with a fully comprehensive system, like Finland, do best.

The idea of choice is not an original one. Choice, diversity and a new framework for schools! Do you know who invented that title, Congress? - The Tory Government in 1992. They invented grant maintained schools. The school where I teach is going to be one of

them. The parents voted overwhelmingly against it. They wanted to remain part of the LEA and part of the community of schools in our rural area. So what does this five year plan do? It talks about, and I quote, "the complicated and time-consuming process of local decision-making to go grant maintained" and proposes, and I quote again, "to sweep these obstacles away entirely". There is not much democratic choice there, then.

By the way, the document expects that all schools will have a uniform and a house system. Not much choice their, either – Harry Potter schools for everyone.

What is this really all about? The Government say they want joined up services for children and they want all schools to be independent. How does that work? The Government say they want strong public services but this document massively extends the role of private sponsors and private sector involvement. For example, there will be 200 new city academies sponsored by private individuals like Peter Vardy, who for £2 million can get a school which will foist their particular religious or philosophical views. In his case, his view is that Adam and Eve are historical characters. There is growing evidence that sponsors of academies are expecting schools to purchase services from companies that they own. What is more, Congress, these academies have the right to determine their own pay and conditions.

Such a situation not only threatens teachers' livelihoods but will make it even more difficult for desperately underpaid and vital support staff, like learning support assistants, to get the decent national pay scales which they so richly deserve. The two-tier workforce is alive and well and this five-year strategy will make the situation worse.

The Prime Minister likes to praise social partnership. As far as I know, not a single trade union was consulted on the expansion of privately sponsored independent schools. So not much social partnership there!

This motion calls on the TUC to respond with all the relevant affiliates. Then National Union of teachers has a suggestion, and I wish Charles Clarke was in the hall to listen to it. We do not want choice for some but properly funded local schools with manageable class sizes for all children. Please support Motion 50 as amended by the NASUWT.

**Pat Lerew** (*National Association of Schoolmaster Union of Women Teachers*) in seconding the motion said: President and Congress, whilst seconding Motion 50 you will see from your agendas that the primary involvement of the NASUWT in this motion was in the amendment which the proposers have accepted.

The area of false, exaggerated and malicious allegations by pupils against teachers is one which we have been highlighting and campaigning on for years. During this time, there have been nearly 2,000 members of NASUWT alone who have been investigated by the police following allegations of criminal abuse. That works out to an average of 12 per month. Conviction has followed in fewer than four per cent of these cases, but the cost to all of those who were eventually vindicated has been incalculable. For many of them, the judgment came too late to prevent nervous breakdown and the break-up of their family relationships. Most are incapable of walking back into

a classroom and some have even committed suicide. It was the highly publicised suicide of a head teacher last year that brought the head teacher unions alongside most of the other teaching unions to join our postcard campaign to MPs and a petition of 30,000 signatures to the Government for anonymity for teachers faced with such allegations up to a court decision.

We are not attempting to protect those who abuse children. Such people have no place in schools and all allegations must be investigated thoroughly, with those found guilty facing the full consequences of their appalling and damaging actions.

Because we have seen the results of too many elongated and publicised investigations, we welcome the recognition in the five-year strategy of the vulnerability of teachers and other school staff to spurious allegations and the commitment to publish proposals to defend their interests.

We also welcome the Secretary of State's guarantee made since the publication of the five-year strategy that foundation schools will not be able to waive teachers' pay and conditions, nor weaken any existing contractual agreements. Unfortunately, we have no such commitment for city academies where we foresee major problems.

Although there remain issues in the five-year strategy which require a detailed discussion and consideration, we trust that the Government will see that entering into these discussions is the best way forward to improve the educational opportunities of all our young people.

**Rachelle Wilkins** (*GMB*) speaking in support of the motion, said: Congress, at the centre of this generally welcomed five-year strategy is an ill-concealed grenade. Representation and bargaining for school support staff will be blown out of the water by the fast-tracking of foundation status for schools which want it. As long as the majority of support staff are employed by local education authorities and come under the National Joint Council for Local Government Services, the support staff unions at least have a fighting chance of building on the progress we have made in tackling low pay, discrimination and exploitation. We will have a fighting chance of promoting professionalism, career opportunities and recognition for all our members, and a fighting chance of ending the abuse of term-time pay. Let's face it, Congress. The track record of schools on employment practices is not good.

The goodwill of support staff is ruthlessly exploited. Pressure to work overtime is brought to bear but no extra pay comes with it. Multiple short-term contracts are used to secure maximum flexibility. However, through national and local educational authority collective agreements we have been able to ensure that school support staff have some protection and safeguards. Raising standards in our schools relies on a professional well-trained and highly-motivated workforce of both teaching and support staff. *This* strategy does not recognise that. If large numbers of foundation schools get the freedom to rip up collective agreements, this will force us to negotiate with thousands of individual schools and this will take us a long way back down the hard road we have travelled to get official recognition of the crucial contribution made by support staff to raising school standards.

Unless national terms and conditions and pay scales for support staff apply, the prospect of each school being an independent employer will be strongly opposed by the GMB. We call upon you all to join us in rejecting this damaging threat to national pay bargaining.

**Marion Lloyd** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) speaking in support of the motion said: I work in the Department for Education and Skills. PCS members in that department, as part of their responsibilities, regulate and monitor the education standards across our State provision. Like the rest of the Civil Service, we are facing massive job cuts across our department. If this Labour Government are successful in their objectives, who will be left to ensure that consistent standards are in place and give support and advice to LEA schools and teachers?

Yesterday we heard Tony Blair talk about all the money allegedly going into education, health and public services, but you tell me how that squares with a third of civil service workers in the DfES. We all remember Blair's famous catchphrase: 'Education, Education, Education', but for us, it is cuts, cuts, cuts. The Government's five-year strategy is dressed up in fine words about personalisation and choice, opening up services to new and different providers, freedom and independence, but this is merely window-dressing for yet more privatisation, more cuts and the lowering of yet more standards. Even if you believe those words, how can they be delivered when the DfES is being decimated? Who will they turn to do it then? Already it is in the private sector with the Reg Vardy's of this world and other multi-millionaires are free to impose their own values and standards on our education system.

New Labour talks a lot about joined-up government. These attacks are a joined-up attack. The conditions were hard fought for and won by people decades ago. We need a joined-up response to stop privatisation in education, the extension of a two-tier education and what will result ultimately in an attack on our right to defend workers.

What is happening in education and the cuts we face demonstrate clearly that the Government's drive to out-Tory the Tories by butchering the Civil Service in a frenzy of cuts does not only hurt the workers who deliver that service but those who use it. In the case where I work, it is the young people of our country. They are the people who will pay the price. That is why it is important that every union in this hall joins in our campaign to protect not only our jobs and services in education but across the whole of the public sector. Support this motion. Support the civil service workers in our campaign and support our one-day strike on 5<sup>th</sup> November.

\* Motion 50 was CARRIED.

#### **'Every child matters' – children's services**

**Chris Keates** (*National Association of Schoolmaster Union of Women Teachers*) moved Motion 51. She said: The Government's strategy at the heart of the 'Every child matters' process is to protect those children at risk of harm or neglect whilst ensuring better services for all. It is also about tackling the disparities in income and opportunities for young people and their families throughout their lives and few could disagree with these aims.

This motion identifies the range of issues the Government must take into account if this ambitious agenda is to be carried forward successfully. A key component of the success will be funding. Evidence obtained from multi-agency collaborations and partnerships piloted throughout the country are a testament to the cost-intensive nature of reorganising children's services in this way. A move towards the greater integration of services will carry significant financial implications. The proposed changes must not be premised on the basis that they will reduce service costs. The elements of the strategy, such as extended schools, which will provide a range of services on one site, schemes to engage parents, such as accessible universal parenting support and the extension of family learning programmes, ensuring that school buildings are in a fit state to take their place at the heart of the community, the recruitment of training of specialist staff, the introduction of family friendly policies and working practices to enable parents to fulfil their family responsibilities are all essential elements of success. They will not succeed if they are under-funded.

Whilst there is a great deal in 'Every child matters', which is to be welcomed and will command universal support, there are a number of difficult areas that will require careful consideration. The following are some examples: ensuring that schools make an effective contribution to the realisation of the Government's Children's Agenda but are not diverted from their core function; consideration of the appropriate leadership structure for extended schools; support for unaccompanied asylum-seeking children; the unique identifier for each child; the operation of the Common Assessment Framework; the terms on which multi-disciplinary teams are established; the funding strategy including the allocation of resources. All of these require detailed consultation with the unions representing workers in all areas of children's services, including those representing school staff through to the Civil Service unions and, in this context, the question must be posed of how this agenda can be delivered effectively in the context of the proposed massive job losses in the Civil Service.

It is right that the strategy highlights the adverse impact of poverty and low income on progress, achievement and life chances of children and young people. It must be recognised that the proposals will not by themselves overcome the fundamental effects of poverty and deprivation. Whilst a number of the projects identified by the Government will help, what is also needed is an overhaul of the tax and benefits system and specific measures to tackle inequality and to regenerate schools and the neighbourhoods they serve.

The measures of appropriate funding, parental involvement and the strategies to tackle deprivation and inequality are essential components of success. It must be right to seek to address the problems of fragmented provision for children's services.

What is equally essential is the recognition by government of why fragmentation of services, which it seeks to address, exists, and why when a number of agencies are involved with an individual child the result can often be no single agency taking responsibility. This fragmentation has been caused by such policies as privatisation, contracting out, local financial management, deregulation of pay and conditions and performance tables. These policies undermine institutional co-operation, collaboration and information sharing. They have impacted adversely on



the ability of schools, social services and the health sector to recruit and retain the necessary staff as they breed insecurity, leave staff vulnerable to poor management and seriously undermine morale. This situation must be recognised and addressed.

The crucial and determining factor in the successful implementation of this important strategy will be the involvement of trade unions as representing the staff in these services and involvement in genuine social partnership. The trade unions must be seen as part of the solution, not the problem, if we are to provide the high quality services to which children are entitled.

**The President:** Just to tell Congress, you will note that we have been joined by our good friend, Charles Clarke, the Secretary of State for Education and Skills. He will be addressing us later, but I am sure you would like to give him a warm welcome for joining us. *(Applause)*

**Chris Tansley (UNISON)** in seconding the motion, said: UNISON represents members involved in all aspects of the Government's proposals for improving children's services, from support staff in schools to social workers, care staff and health workers. We have said, and I said at Congress last year, that we welcome the Government's proposals for closer working arrangements between all agencies involved in child care, but with many qualifications, some of which are already contained in this motion.

UNISON agrees with the movers of the motion that the emphasis of parental choice in schools is a distraction. Parents already made a choice when they voted out a Tory Government and voted for a government for increased funding to State education to improve all of our schools. It is this policy that the Government should continue with.

Along with the NASUWT, we welcome the chance to join the Government and all our sister unions in getting down to detailed talks on the workforce reform proposals that are set out in the workforce strategy page. We urge Ministers to remember that we already have long-standing bargaining systems for all these groups of workers which we will strongly resist being undermined by any of these changes.

We also urge Ministers to listen to our front-line staff when contemplating another round of organisational change.

One of the key factors that emerged from the Victoria Climbié Inquiry was the organisation and turmoil evident in the agencies concerned, some of which was due to constant re-organisation fatigue.

We also call for increased funding for these wide-ranging changes. We can have the best policies and best procedures in the world, but if the agencies running them continue to be under-funded and under-staffed, they will not be deliverable. We all want these proposals to succeed and not to have to contribute to any more inquiries into the failings of an under-resourced and over-stretched childcare service.

**The President:** Motion 51 is supported by the General Council.

\* *Motion 51 was CARRIED.*

## Education

**Dr Mary Bousted** (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*) moved Composite Motion 13. She said: Congress, the central theme of all the motions contained in this composite is that education is nothing if it is not a human activity. ATL does not need to be convinced that this Government are serious in their purpose and intent towards education. We recognise that since 1997 there has been major and sustained increases, year on year, in education funding. Yet it is undeniable that despite record levels of investment, severe and stubborn problems remain. Most worryingly Britain remains at the bottom of the league table of staying-on rates of post-16 year olds. Last year we were 17<sup>th</sup> out of 23 OECD countries for 17 year olds staying on into full-time education. These figures give rise to a few questions. Why do young people walk away from education? Why do so many young teachers leave before they have completed five years in teaching and why do so many teachers retire early through ill-health and stress.

ATL believes that one of the main causes of dissatisfaction on the part of teachers and one of the causes of alienation from education on the part of young people is the divide that has developed between what should be two intimate related activities – teaching and learning.

I became aware of this divide, this double-think, when I read the Ofsted report into the first year of the literacy strategy in secondary schools. The inspectors stated proudly that standards of teaching had risen as a result of the Strategy, but that there had been no visible improvement in the standard of pupil learning. Think about that statement: standards of teaching have risen but there has been no corresponding rise in the standards of learning. How can that statement make sense? The answer can only lie in a view of teaching that is predicated on performance, on teachers working under the weight of countless directives and a feeling that they have to go through the motions of obeying every instruction contained in the mountainous strategies that have cascaded into their classrooms.

What these strategies under-estimate, I think, is the undeniable fact that if children and young people do not enjoy learning these skills, if they are not interested in and inspired by what they are being taught, if they see little relationship between their school work and their interests and concerns in their lives, then they will reject education as strongly as they feel rejected when they fail to perform in the SATS tests.

A school curriculum which is too narrow and dominated by the ever present spectre of testing and performance tables will not inspire challenge or change children and young people, and it will not motivate teachers and give them an incentive to stay in the profession. We know that, during the course of the next ten years, there will be a desperate need to recruit and retain teachers in the profession.

ATL has commissioned a major report into pupils' views of education. We want to hear what pupils in Year 8 – that is 13 – 14 year olds – thought about their experiences in schools. Here are some of the key issues emerging from our report. Young people want less focus on learning alone in the classroom. They want learning to be enjoyable involving the learner in a supportive environment where relationships with teachers are effective for

learning. Young people want to be trusted more and to be given responsibility for their learning, and they want less stress and fewer tests to interfere with their learning. Listen to their own words on the subject. One pupil said, "I don't think the tests are good because sometimes people crack under the pressure and get nervous". Another said, "I don't see the point of it. There are too many tests and they stress you out".

Congress, there is a strong possibility with the new concept of personalisation at 14-19 and the concept of choice within Tomlinson that things can change. Things must change. The TUC is committed to life-long learning. We must enable young people and children from the start of their schooling to enjoy the learning process and to want to continue with their education.

**Sheena Wardhaugh** (*Educational Institute of Scotland*) in seconding the composite motion, said: While endorsing the points already made, the EIS would wish to concentrate on the demographic changes expected within the next decade and how these provide an excellent opportunity to improve learning and teaching both for youngsters and teachers.

Statistics from the Scottish Executive show that of the total number of full-time equivalent teachers employed in the primary, secondary and special sectors of just over 49,000, 18,500 are over 50. In other words, 38 per cent of the profession will retire in the course of the next decade.

Falling school roles are anticipated in the same period. We must take the opportunity to use these demographic changes to achieve a significant reduction in class size across all sectors. We argue strongly that it is not good enough merely to recruit enough teachers to maintain existing teacher/pupil ratios that call for the necessary levels of teacher recruitment and provision of resources to allow class sizes to be reduced.

The current class size maximum in Scotland across different ages, stages and sectors derive largely from agreements reached in the mid-'70s, although recently there have been some minor improvements and there is also a commitment as part of the Coalition Agreement in the Scottish Parliament to move towards smaller class sizes in Primary 1 and Secondary 1 and 2 in English and maths. However, there are strong arguments that suggest that class size limits that were appropriate in the '70' can no longer be considered appropriate. Reducing class sizes must make a significant contribution to improve learning and attainments.

Although there is definitive research in this area, an example of which is the Tennessee Star Project, it is rather sparse. As part of the 2001 agreement the Scottish Executive is to commission research into 'the relationship between class sizes and attainment'. We await the outcome of the research with interest.

Of course, attainment is not only about exam results, but smaller class sizes allow increased teacher-pupil interaction. Youngsters can be more actively involved in their own learning; teachers can achieve more meaningful assessment and planning with each youngster.

Social inclusion policies cannot be implemented effectively without smaller class sizes, and problems of pupil indiscipline, which can have such a negative effect on learning and teaching, could also be tackled more successfully with fewer youngsters in a class.

In conclusion, class size is a major factor of a teacher's conditions of service and an individual youngster's learning condition. We call on the UK Government and the devolved authorities to ensure adequate funding for increased teacher recruitment and appropriate resourcing to allow class sizes to be reduced.

EIS policy can now be summarised as a maximum of 20 across the board in all classes in the primary and secondary sectors. This policy will be pursued in every forum and in every way possible.

**John Chowcat** (*National Association for Educational Inspectors, Advisers and Consultants*): I am speaking in support of Composite Motion 13 and, in particular, those paragraphs which deal with the issue of teachers' continuing professional development.

It is a great irony that in this area, where there is so much discussion about life-long learning for all and in which there is a debate about the future of schools as professional learning communities, there are classroom teachers at the moment, in the very heart of the education system, who once they are in post do not enjoy reliable systematic and on-going professional updating and development. Provision at the moment, I am afraid to say, is erratic. It depends on local circumstances and it depends on school budgets. Because funding for teachers' CPD is not hypothecated, there are no guarantees of continuing professional development.

However, real progress is now possible. With the MacCrone Agreement in Scotland and with the Teacher Workforce Agreement in England the issue of teachers' CPD, albeit very different agreements in those two cases, has been re-highlighted.

Two years ago the major report for the National Foundation for Educational Research, which looked in detail at 105 different LEAs in England, came to the conclusion that local authorities, and in particular their educational advisory teams, can play very significant roles in supporting, providing and facilitating teachers' CPD. Now, I think, is the time for this process to move forward. There are interesting developments from the DfES. This month, September, sees the start of the DfES learning and teaching framework for primary schools and associated with that is guidance for headteachers on teachers' CPD in particular.

Also this month will see the launch of the pedagogic pack on teacher learning for Key Stage 3. We also have the Teacher Training Agency, the TTA, now offering some very interesting post-graduate professional development opportunities accessible via its website.

We now need time and money to go into whole schoolteachers' CPD programmes, to build on and to balance those particular initiatives now emerging and to have them supported properly by LEAs. A start would be for every school in the country to have a CPD co-ordinator with briefing, training and time allocated to help their staff workforce to develop their learning

so that teachers can learn and move forward together. This is a cause that deserves the support of Congress. Please support Composite 13.

**Brian Harrison-Jennings** (*Association of Educational Psychologists*): My role in supporting Composite 13 is simply to support my colleagues in ATL, the EIS and NAEIAC, and to elaborate slightly upon the contribution of my union to it. All delegates will have heard, I am sure, of the 'Sure Start' initiative. It is the highly successful early education scheme for mainly pre-school children and their parents. It takes the form of bringing new children, their daytime carers, whoever they might be, and a wide variety of educational professionals together in a number of informal settings.

Delegates may be forgiven for knowing less about the 'Keeping it Sure' initiative. This is because it does not exist yet. The Association of Educational Psychologists believes that building on the success of the "Sure Start" scheme and learning the lessons from it, the Government should create a "Keeping it Sure" scheme. Its aims will be to empower parents and other carers to become permanently engaged with the education system.

As children grow older, grow up and progress into the secondary sector of education, a 'Keeping it Sure' scheme would ensure that those parents and others who were such willing and committed participants in the 'Sure Start' scheme will remain committed and participating.

The way forward for our young people is not to criminalise a substantial proportion of them by sticking them on anti-social behaviour orders. It may not work in the short to medium term. It will certainly not work in the long-term. When one half of all children leave school with 10 A stars at GCSE and the other half leave with an ASBO, we will have created a system of educational 'haves' and 'have nots'. That will be a recipe for disaster; rather, we must do something more proactive, more positive and more preventive if we are not to alienate a significant proportion of the population from engagement and full participation in adult society. We believe that a 'Keeping it Sure' scheme, such as the one we envisage, could and must be the way forward. I urge you to support this composite motion.

**Brian Strutton** (*GMB*) supporting Composite 13 said: I am seeking to draw your attention in particular to the penultimate sentence, reference 'whole-school staff'. The demographics of the teaching profession are rightly a cause for concern. However, the debate about skills and training, about class sizes and staffing levels, should not have a narrow teacher-only focus. It must encompass all of those who contribute to teaching and learning in our schools, including the school support staff represented by GMB, UNISON and the T&G.

The Government have presided over a rapid expansion in support staff numbers, and credit where it is due for that, and also in the breadth and depth of their responsibilities. This will continue with extended schools, so it must never be at the expense of teachers; yet schools and local authorities have been shockingly complacent about planning for future recruitment and retention of support staff.

They had assumed there would be a limitless supply of women to take up these low paid jobs

because they are local and because they fit in with looking after school age children. My union has warned for some time that these assumptions cannot be relied upon.

We published a survey just last week showing that admin staff, like the school secretary you will all fondly remember, are working 5 million unpaid hours a year. That is exploitation, plain and simple. It is based on a view that there is a mum's army willing to work for pin money, cheated through the abuse that is term-time pay. That view has to be challenged and it has to change.

Like teachers, the school support workforce is also an ageing one. Young people will not be attracted to roles, such as high level teaching assistant, unless there are career progression pathways for these jobs in their own right and decent pay progression to match.

Falling school rolls is currently a huge threat to the job security of our members working in schools, just as much as it is for teachers because, faced with falling school rolls, the first reaction of a school is to seek to sack the support staff. Falling rolls should be an opportunity for schools to strengthen teacher/pupil ratios and increase the vital support provided by teaching assistants, nursery nurses, technicians and others.

To this end, GMB calls upon Congress to campaign for a funding system that does not penalise pupils in schools with falling rolls; a funding system that enables smaller classes to be staffed with a complementary mix of professional teachers and professional support staff.

Support the composite. I know you will. In taking it forward, please recognise the hidden school professionals, the 260,000 school support staff

\* *Composite Motion 13 was CARRIED.*

## Obesity Epidemic

**Diana Markham** (*British Dietetic Association*) moved Motion 56. She said: The British Dietetic Association believes the continuing obesity epidemic in this country, particularly among children, is a time bomb waiting to engulf the nation's health. Childhood obesity is on the increase. Eight and-a-half per cent of our 6 year-olds and 15 per cent of 15 year-olds are now obese.

Obesity in children results in deterioration in physical health. Obesity-related type-2 diabetes in adolescence is increasing and obese children suffer from low esteem, lack of confidence and negative self-image. The problem of obesity needs to be tackled through both improved food choices, education and increased physical activity.

We call on the General Council to campaign vigorously for measures to be taken to tackle this potentially catastrophic problem. These should include community-based initiatives, which may focus on local food projects to disseminate nutrition messages; promote cooking skills and improve their nutritional status within communities; enable food availability and access to food at reasonable cost to lower income groups and extend nutrition activities within the 'Sure Start' programmes and to continuing the reform of the welfare food scheme.

Food advertising and promotion to children can also be tackled. Labelling on food products needs to enable consumers to easily identify healthier options. Congress welcomes the new legislation that will come into effect at the end of this year.

TV, media and shop advertising should emphasise that healthier foods are tasty and fun to eat. Special offers and larger quantity or portion sizes of unhealthy foods for children should be discouraged, as should the excessive alcohol consumption, like 'happy hours' amongst adolescents. Legislation could be introduced to provide manufacturers' guidance on lowering salt, sugar and saturated fats in their products.

We need to improve nutritional education in schools. Recent Food Standards Agency and OFSTED reports have shown that teachers involved in nutrition education need more knowledge and confidence in teaching their subject. Improvements in school meals are required and foods offered by school caterers need to conform to the balance of good health guidelines.

In 2001, for the first time in 20 years, the Government set minimum nutrition standards for school lunches. The Health Food Policy studies have shown that inadequacies in the diets of children aged 4 to 18 years were highlighted in the National Diet and Nutrition Survey in 2000.

There is also a lack of cooking skills, food safety and hygiene knowledge amongst pupils. All school policies should include continuing professional development on the subject for staff, extra curricula activities for pupils, like cookery clubs and school gardens, participation in initiatives like the National School Fruit Scheme, which will ensure that every child aged 4 to 6 will receive a piece of fruit every school day. Currently, the average consumption of fruit and vegetables is only two portions a day against the recommendation of five portions.

The Food in Schools programme includes promoting the re-introduction of cooking skills for children within the national curriculum and teaching children how to understand food labelling. The National Healthy Schools programme promotes healthy lifestyles to pupils, including healthy eating and physical activity initiatives. There are 10,000 schools that have already achieved Healthy School Standards status.

The Healthy Living blueprint, which was launched last week on 6 September by the Department of Health, sets out to promote good health to young people. It guides schools to help pupils eat sensibly and stay physically active through education in nutrition and health, food and drink choices within schools and physical education.

Finally, consumer choice: consistent and evidence-based messages based on the balance of good health need to be used. A nationally-led campaign engaging all stakeholders should be established. An easily interpreted and understood food labelling system for fat, saturated fat, sugar and salt should enable individuals to make informed choices. Promotions should be used to encourage children to make healthier food choices and healthier choices should be promoted in shops and on menus.

We believe that such initiatives as these described will help reverse the trend of increasing obesity amongst children and young people.

**John Puckrin** (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*) seconding the motion said: I support the accepted amendment. The facts around the rising levels of obesity can no longer be in dispute. You just need to look at our seaside resorts, preferably when the sun is shining and the wind not blowing, and the observer will notice the size and type of donkey is changing. Larger children require larger donkeys!

But ATL is concerned, not only with the physical well-being of our young people, but also their mental well-being. It is a commonly accepted view amongst all those who work in school, from teachers to learning support assistants, from secretarial staff to premises officers that the children's level of concentration and standards of behaviour are lower in the afternoon than in the morning. The accumulation of junk food in young bodies is certainly one factor causing this.

Charles Clarke will readily admit that you are what you eat and drink. He provides an excellent example of the health-giving properties of red wine. Only last week he said: "Good health and the effective learning go hand-in-hand. Schools are well-placed to lead by examples." Indeed, they are.

ATL welcomes the government scheme to provide daily fresh fruit to the foundation and key stage 1 pupils. We just wish it was extended upwards. We also welcome the recent recognition that nutritional standards in school meals need revision, but the now privatised school meals service provides only part of a pupil's intake during school hours. In all too many secondary schools, it is the vending machine that provides part, and in some cases the bulk, of pupils' food and drink.

There are calls for the Department of Health to reduce sugar levels, yet the most popular drinks sold from these machines are sweet and fizzy and with many associated 'e' numbers. There are also calls to reduce salt and fat intake, yet the most popular snack that is fed by these machines is a packet of crisps.

So why do schools allow these machines of convenience? Simply put, profit. A school can make enough money to purchase at least one extra member of staff, plus on costs, from allowing vending machines on their premises. That is why ATL is linking its warning concerning the effects of excessive junk food on behaviour and learning with a call for sufficient funding to at least maintain current staffing levels and ensure the continuing rise in standards.

Congress, for the sake of all our children, support Motion 56.

**Ginny Klein** (*Amicus*) speaking in support of the motion said: I am a health visitor. Delegates, forget the pensions crisis. If this generation of children continues with today's average diet, very few will survive to their 50th birthday. Childhood obesity and its consequences is fast becoming a major public health issue. Dangerous eating habits begin in infancy. Breast feeding rates remain low in some areas for multi-factorial reasons, even though it is known to protect against future heart disease.

Health visitors and their nursery nurse colleagues are often the first contact when infants' diets are discussed in their early days. Active encouragement is given to use fresh home-cooked foods, but this is against the heavy marketing and promotion of proprietary baby foods, tempting and clever labelling that illustrates healthy-looking foods.

Children are faced on all fronts by the intensive marketing strategy of high fat and sugary foods in supermarkets and on TV. Fast-food outlets and take-aways are now on almost every corner and offer cheap food. They are no longer seen as a treat but an every day option. Vending machines in schools, and often too in council-owned leisure centres, also offer unhealthy foods. What sort of message does this give?

I welcome 'Sure Start' programmes that are tasked with helping to improve the health and well-being of under-5s in deprived areas. Some of the programmes run 'cook and eat' courses that are aimed at teaching young mothers the skills that would seem to have been lost somewhere along the way. However, there are still many deprived areas outside these 'Sure Start' boundaries that do not have access to this work. We should bring back cooking skills into the national curriculum. Of course we should. I also applaud initiatives such as 'Five a day' and free fruit in schools.

Yes, there is a case for extending the 'Sure Start' approach to nutrition education. This could be done by existing teams of health visitors and nursery nurses. Unfortunately, staffing levels in some areas remain dangerously low. Lack of investment in recent Tory years has caused a recruitment gap yet to be breached. There just are not the health visitors out there.

The supermarkets and food manufacturers rake in their millions while selling cheap and unhealthy food to those who have little idea of what a healthy diet is. Good nutrition and eating habits come from early education and trust in those delivering the message. The expectations that food comes cheap and that home cooking is difficult must be changed.

The impending crisis in public health can be avoided. Let us stop sending mixed messages to young families. Let us start using health visitors to change eating habits and let us look forward to a healthier future. Support this motion.

**Andrew Merriman** (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*) speaking in support of Motion 56 said: This is my first time at Congress. Child obesity should be a major concern for us all. I believe that if we fail to act now, it is going to become a huge problem in the future.

I am only 24 years of age, but when I was a child you came home from school, you called on your friends and you played out. You played bulldogs, whippie and football until your mum called you in for tea. I was active. I played many sports and I enjoyed it. However, now, as I am sure any of you who have teenagers will know, when children get home from school, they sit at their computers on the internet chatting to their friends. Then they sit at their play stations. They then sit and have their tea. They then continue to sit whilst watching *Neighbours*, *Hollyoaks*, *East Enders*, *Emmerdale*, *Friends* -- the list goes on. Children do not play out any more. They text each other on their mobiles. They do not go and call on their friends and see them. They get driven round by their parents.

I think we have to act now. I am fearful that this culture of sedentary lifestyles in children is going to become 'cool' and the phrase, 'I can't be bothered' is going to be the coolest thing to say. I think we have to get children more active. We are not going to just look at diet. We have to look at activity. We have to get children more interested in sport. We have to prevent our children's futures being plagued by heart disease and illness. This is not just an issue for education and health. It is an issue for us all.

**Nigel Baker** (*National Union of Teachers*): We do not just have an obesity crisis; we have something much worse. We have a nutrition crisis. As if heading towards 20 to 25 per cent of the population being obese was not bad enough, we also need to confront the massive nutritional deficits for an even bigger percentage of the population, most particularly our children and young people.

Alongside our increasing calorific intake, there has been a parallel decline in intake of essential nutrients, minerals and fats. It is worth being clear about the word 'essential' because this is what the right quantity and balance of fats, vitamins and minerals is -- essential.

I give one example. Our most important organ, the brain, is 60 per cent fat. It is not 60 per cent saturated fat. If it was, there would not be a problem. It is 60 per cent, omega 6 and omega 3 fat. The most important one, omega 3, is found almost exclusively in oily fish and certain seeds. How many of us regularly eat oily fish and seeds? Much more importantly, how many of our children do? Very few children and young people eat a good nutritional diet. Maybe a third have a barely adequate one. Such is the scale of the crisis in 2004 that the majority of children and teenagers in Britain are seriously deficient in nutrients. It is not just the overweight ones. These nutrients are the oil that makes our body mechanisms work. Unfortunately, millions of children are running on very low grade oil indeed and many with hardly any oil at all.

There are a number of solutions to this crisis, but time only allows me to focus on one of them. Undoubtedly, the most important one is regulating the marketing in all its forms of junk food aimed at children. Let us not mince our words. What Coca-Cola and Pepsi, Walkers and Cadbury's, McDonald's and Burger King produce and relentlessly market at our children have almost no nutritional value whatsoever, but they are 'cool' or they are sugary sweet, or they are the product of choice of superstars or they have that nice little Disney tie-in. For every £1 spent promoting healthy food, like Tommy Tomato and Annie Apple, well over £1,000 is spent selling junk. These companies are not going voluntarily to stop marketing their products.

When American primary children were shown pictures of Ronald McDonald and President Bush, more of them recognised Ronald McDonald, or was it just that they were not sure who was the biggest clown? That is a different issue.

Seriously and briefly, how can we help? We could start by supporting the Children's Food Bill. As an Early Day Motion, this Bill, sponsored by Sustain and Debra Shipley, calls for all the things in the BDA's excellent motion. It is already backed by 170 MPs and 120 organisations, including NUT, UNISON and BDA. Every union here should support it.

Let me give you one more thing to ponder on. Who gave McDonald's, Coca-Cola and the rest the right to market to our children?

**Mary Turner (GMB)** supporting Motion 56 said: This is a campaign I have led for the last 20 years and will continue to lead that campaign until access to free school meals with a high nutritional standards is the right for all children.

It is nice to see Charles Clarke on the platform. I have to be fair. He is the first Minister who has actually taken an active role and interest in the nutritional standards of our children in school meals. I thank you for that, Charles. We have a long way to go, but there we are.

Childhood obesity has tripled in the past 20 years. We are heading for an obesity time bomb with our children's future threatened by diabetes, cancer and heart disease. This, in turn, will put more pressure on the overburdened NHS. So we welcome the Government's recent 'Healthy Living' blueprint for schools, which aims to develop a whole school approach to health and well-being.

At last, there will be over £1 million invested in improving the nutritional standards of school meals, encouraging schools to provide a healthy meal service and not a packed lunch, which seems to be, Charles, the trend. In my own borough and in Essex, schools can opt out of the School Meal Collective Agreement. There is a tendency now to go for a packed lunch when children, especially in some poor boroughs, like the London Borough of Brent, need a hot meal, not a packed lunch.

We need to improve training and support for school and catering staff. We need to steer our children away from a junk food initiative lifestyle. Good nutritional food is vital to raise achievement and improve pupil behaviour. We need to make sure that their guidelines are fully implemented to give all of our children, wherever their school is, the same opportunity to eat more healthily.

It is ironic that school meals were first introduced in 1904 following a Parliamentary report into malnutrition. One hundred years later, government intervention is needed again to ensure that school meals are healthy and nutritious. We need to get away from the process of pre-cooked, warmed-up food. We need to introduce cooking skills and awareness about diet and nutrition. We need to find new ways to promote a take-up of healthy options instead of high fat, high salt and high sugar snacks and, of course, high profits for some of the contractors that work in these schools. We need to continue the fight for a properly funded, universal free school meals service with good quality nutritional food for all.

The food industry has to play its part too. They need to reduce the amount of salt and sugar in foods. They need to improve their labelling and stop targeting unhealthy food advertising to children. In short, they need to exercise a greater degree of social responsibility.

Obesity amongst children cannot be tackled through diet alone. The calories burnt are as important as the calories consumed. Yes, we want healthy eating nutrition, but we also need healthy and

safe play. This has to be encouraged and enabled. That is why the GMB says 'stop the sales of our school playing fields'. We need more parks and green spaces and employment of enough park-keepers to ensure safe play and enough supervisors to ensure safe environments.

For the future of our children and grandchildren, please support the motion. President, could I say, if you look back in your archives, 15 years ago I stood on this platform and I said exactly then what has now materialised. Very sad. So let us be serious. Let us get on. Free school meals for all.

\* *Motion 56 was CARRIED.*

### **Learning and skills – union learning reps**

**The President:** Delegates, before inviting Charles Clarke to address Congress, we have a short video on learning and skills which features the important work of union learning reps. (*video shown*).

**The President:** That was an excellent video, which really does bring out the role of union learning reps.

It is now my pleasure to introduce Charles to address Congress. He has had a long relationship with the trade union movement, going back to his days of working with Neil Kinnock. Now, as Secretary of State for Education and Skills he is, of course, the driving force behind the skills agenda and the champion of union involvement in the Skills Alliance. It is about the skills agenda that Charles will be speaking today.

After his speech, he has bravely agreed, or perhaps one should say will be 'happy', to take a few questions. So whilst he is addressing Congress, if you think of some questions, we can try them on him after his speech. Charles, it is my great pleasure to invite you to address Congress.

**The Rt Hon Charles Clarke MP** (*Secretary of State for Education and Skills*): Let me begin by congratulating the makers of that video, congratulating you on your own presidency and your personal commitment to this subject during your presidency, and to thank Congress for the invitation to be here this afternoon.

I want to start by taking this opportunity to congratulate all those in the TUC, in the individual unions within the TUC and the union learning representatives up and down the country for the tremendous and inspirational work that you are doing, which we have just seen evidenced in this document.

The Union Learning Fund is now in its seventh year and has supported more than 450 projects from more than 50 different unions working in almost 3,000 workplaces. The projects have ranged from tackling basic skills needs to continuing professional development. In one year alone, the most recent year, 2003/4, we had the following outstanding results: over 60,000 people back into learning, over 190 new learning centres opened and over 250 learning agreements with different employers.

One of the fund's greatest strengths is the success of union learning representatives. As you all know, the main function of union learning representatives is to

advise union members about their individual training and development needs.

There were relatively few union learning reps six years ago, but since the introduction of the Union Learning Fund thousands of new reps have been trained and there are now more than 7,500 active union learning representatives across the country.

Following a consultation, we legislated in 2003 to give union learning representatives the same rights to paid time off for training and for carrying out their duties as those enjoyed by shop stewards and other union representatives at workplaces where a union is recognised for collective bargaining purposes.

We believe that with these statutory rights, those 7,500 active union learning reps across the country can be dramatically increased so that by 2010 we can help as many as 250,000 workers a year with their training and development needs.

As Secretary of State for Education and Skills, the events I do with learning representatives are literally the most inspirational. As I say, we had a touch of it in that video. But if you make a presentation to people who left school at 14, 15 or 16 feeling a failure, feeling they simply could not achieve in life beyond a certain level, having been introduced back by a trade union colleague to see their own possibilities, to get a qualification and to move forward, and to move forward, their pride and sense of achievement at that particular moment is, as I say, the most inspirational thing that I personally do.

They represent, Roger, millions of people up and down the country who have been in the past sold short by the education and training system of this country. I am talking about those five, six or seven million people without basic skills who ought to have had those basic skills but, because of failings in our education system, did not have them. That is why we give such a priority in the Government – I know the movement supports us in this – to that slogan, which was the subject of the composite earlier this afternoon, that every child matters and that every child must have the opportunity to develop their own education, their own skills in primary school, at secondary school, then through apprenticeships, through life and all the way through.

The thing which has most encouraged me in the recent month has been that in the education results that were published in the month of August, it was the schools and areas of the country which had actually done worse in recent years which were making the biggest leaps forward, giving opportunities to communities which simply had not existed in that way before.

The reason why we all celebrate this development is that we all know that educational capacity is the key to success in life. That has been a goal of the trade union and labour movement since its very foundation. Roger, it is in that spirit that I very much welcome the TUC's plans for a union academy, which I strongly support and which you have published today, which is yet another commitment of this Congress to developing that work in a variety of different ways.

That will be a major contribution to the work that we have to do to tackle the massive skills deficit in the country. The Government and this trade union

movement share a vision of a learning society where everyone has the opportunity to go as far as their efforts and talents will take them, regardless of ethnicity, disability, gender and social class. There must be no glass ceilings for anybody in this country and education is the way to ensure that we smash through them.

That is the reason why we introduced the National Skills Strategy just over a year ago in July 2003, which together with our Skills for Life initiative to tackle adult basic skills needs is intended to enable us to tackle the skills deficit and to develop a workforce fit for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The central aim of that strategy is to ensure that every individual has the skills they need to be both personally fulfilled and employed at the level that they wish to be and, by that route, to ensure that employers, public and private, have the right skills to support the success of their businesses, enterprises and organisations.

However, the core of the strategy is effective partnership between government, trade unions, employers and individuals, all recognising the key roles they have to play and focusing efforts and resources on the skills that are needed to equip everybody for modern life.

There has been good progress over the past 12 months. The trade union contribution has been absolutely crucial, but my number one message this afternoon is to seek even more support and commitment from the trade union movement to these ambitions and the powerful contribution that has already been made.

At a strategic level, you are already very directly involved with other partner organisations to develop the national strategy in this area. I want to thank particularly Brendan and Frances for the work that they are doing to make that happen in a very committed and direct way.

However, much more than the strategic level nationally, trade unions up and down the country have a key role in developing and delivering in every workplace and every community. You are helping to take forward work across a wide range of activities, including the employer training pilots; the implementation of Level 2 entitlement, where everybody is able to get the Level 2 qualification that they need; the new arrangements for modern apprenticeships and pre-apprenticeships; the development of regional skills partnerships and the development of sector skills councils and sector skills agreements.

As I said earlier, your unions, your members and your learning representatives have been particularly effective in helping to implement the Skills for Life Initiative. As was said on the video, it is your learning representatives who have the particular quality and ability to reach out to engage those hard-to-reach learners which so many agencies simply have not succeeded in doing.

This is an area where we have exceeded our targets. We have set ourselves a target by July 2003 of 470,000 adults achieving a literacy or numeracy qualification by going through this process. Instead of

that 470,000, we actually got 520,000. Our target for this July was 750,000. I can tell the Congress today that we have gone past that figure for July 2004 and over-achieved our targets yet again.

As to the situation in the future, where we have a target in 2007 of 1.5 million and in 2010 of 2.4 million, we believe that that will be achieved as well. So we can by our work make a difference. That is the key point I think that needs to be driven home as strongly as possible.

I conclude by referring to the Sector Skills Councils and the Sector Skills Agreements, because the fact is that we need to work much harder than we have been able to doing the past to bring together the world of work and the world of education to overcome many of the barriers that exist in these areas. The Sector Skills Councils and Sector Skills Agreements are crucial to that and your role within those partnerships and agreements is absolutely central. Of the 25 Skills Councils that will be in place, 19 are already there and four have developed Sector Skills Agreements.

I am very keen indeed that every trade union makes active contributions to those sector skills councils. I know the TUC – and I commend you for it, Brendan – has been working hard with other colleague unions in the Skills to Business Network to really make sure that happens often against employers and in circumstances where progress is very difficult indeed. Making that happen is tough and problematic.

However, if we are going to hit better pre-apprenticeships, 14 to 16, to expand the number of modern apprenticeships, 16-plus, foundation degrees and a better relationship right across the range, we need the full and maximum engagement. We need to get agreements that will bite in particular sectors to drive those skills forward.

I was delighted yesterday to agree to a joint request from unions and employers in the film industry to set up a new industrial training board and to put their existing voluntary levy onto a formal statutory footing, which is a great achievement and takes that whole training area forward very significantly indeed.

This agreement has widespread support from both employers and employees who see it as a positive step forward for the sector. It is an example of co-operation and commitment to secure industry investment in the skills of the workforce. But I have to acknowledge here, as many in this room have represented to me, that we need to go further because there are many employers who are not ready to commit in the way that the film employers have been ready to do.

So I want to confirm the agreement we made at Warwick at the end of July, that where this does not happen on a voluntary basis, in a way that we need to see it, we are absolutely committed to doing what we have to do to ensure that employers make the commitment they need to take forward. We will do that on the basis that has been agreed.

Congress, as I have said, education and skills are the agenda of the future. In a rapidly changing world, economically, technologically and socially, we must equip people and organisations to deal with and control that process of change. You are often dealing

with the adverse consequences of those changes, for example, in the International Labour Organisation, and education and education and skills are the key, in my opinion, to dealing with it.

That commitment is not at odds with the historic traditions of this movement. On the contrary, it is absolutely in line with the commitment of this movement to develop education and training at all levels. That is why we have to work together. Working together to get a strong offer of skills for every individual in the country throughout life is a plus for the individual, it is a plus for the trade union, it is a plus for the employer and the workplace and it is a plus for the country and the economy overall.

I look forward to working with you and continuing to put even greater efforts into making this happen, bringing it about and transforming the prospects of every working individual in this country. Thank you for the chance of being here today.

**The President:** As I mentioned, Charles has agreed to take two or three questions at a time.

**Pauline Thorne (UNISON):** Minister, President, Congress, I have a question about skills. The Prime Minister announced yesterday a guaranteed right to Level 3 qualifications for people aged 18-30. You may be surprised to learn that many trade unionists are over 30. I know this is hard to believe looking round this hall! UNISON is the largest education trade union with over 300,000 members working in education, and we have around one million women. These women members are concerned that you are restricting it to the age of 30 and that that will have a disproportionate impact on women workers as many have to take time off to look after their children and return to work in their 30s and 40s. Is there a reason for restricting it to under-30s, and does the Secretary of State plan to extend it to other people? Thank you.

**Steve Sinnott (National Union of Teachers):** Secretary of State, every single delegate and every trade union here is committed to an equality agenda on skills, and indeed in schools, but we have a significant number of challenges. Secretary of State, how do you intend to improve the post-16 staying on rate for particular minority ethnic groups, such as African Caribbean boys? How do you intend to improve the number of young people in these groups attending teacher training programmes and universities?

**Sam Allen (NATFHE- the University and College Lecturers' Union):** President, Congress, Secretary of State, we welcome your statement which clearly says you can make a difference in providing proper and good quality education for all our youngsters. However, that can only be achieved with proper and adequate funding of all sectors of education. Therefore, NATFHE's question to the Secretary of State is: when can we expect parity of funding for 16-19 between schools, sixth form, and further education colleges? At the moment, there is no parity. Thank you.

**Charles Clarke:** Those are three interesting questions. First, Pauline's question: could I by the way congratulate UNISON on the work they have been doing. I had an afternoon with colleagues in UNISON who were working in this area and they have really done excellent work on this in very many ways.



What the Prime Minister was saying was that we have our top commitment to provide full funding for everybody to get up to a Level 2 qualification and we are ready further to provide the resource to go to a Level 3 qualification where that is necessary and where money is the block to making that go. I am ready to look at whether 30, which I agree is an arbitrary age, is the right one and to see where that can go. I think that is a perfectly fair question to ask, Pauline, particularly when you make your point about women generally.

The key issue for Level 3 qualifications is how are we going to get more resource into that right across the range. We are ready to put resource in but also – and I will come to this in a second – we need employers to put resource in as well.

On Steve's point, firstly, congratulations on your election as General Secretary of the NUT; as always I look forward to a fruitful and constructive relationship. Your question was about the post-16 staying on rate and to ensure that we could really make progress in this area.

I think the absolute key here, the number one point, is the reforms to the 14-19 curriculum, which are currently being considered and will be published as proposals by Mike Tomlinson in the next three to four weeks. We need to get, as I have said earlier, a far stronger relationship between the place of work and the place of study. I think there are very very many young people who get particularly de-motivated towards the end of their period up to 16 and who need to be much more engaged and excited in education than they actually are; they turn away, which leads to a whole series of negative consequences that are very serious.

My number one solution to your question is a reform to the curriculum from 14 upwards, giving more realistic choices for young people over that period, and really trying to make progress to encourage people to stay on. In all the educational indicators, Roger, we do very well at 10 and 11, very well at 15, very well in universities; worse in comparison with other countries is the staying on rate at 16. I believe the way to attack that is by changing the curriculum for those people.

On Sam's point, we are moving, we have made some movement towards funding parity and we are committed through our five-year programme of spending review to make more progress. But I do want to make a hard funding point here, which is a very real one. If we are talking, as we should be, of a massive expansion of education opportunities across the range that we try to achieve in this area and if we know, as we do, that at best we are getting 3-4 per cent a year increase in state money that is going to come into education over that period, which in itself has its own funding pressures to deal with, including that, Sam, which you raised, the question is, can we get money from elsewhere to make this expansion go farther, or do we have to accept the state funding limit, which there is? I argue that we need to be prepared to get more money in than we currently have. That is why I highlight the employers' contribution particularly to this approach to see if we can get more money in these areas to take it forward. I hope that deals with the points that have been raised.

**The President:** Congress, I have four people waiting to ask questions here. I intend to take these four and then we will move on.

**Geoff Page** (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*): The question for the Minister surrounds the statutory rights for workplace learning reps. USDAW, along with the TUC, welcomes the new statutory rights for learning reps but we would like to know what the Minister's view is on statutory workplace learning committees. The better employers work voluntarily with learning committees and are doing a good job but there are some employers who will not even pay them lip service. Should we not have statutory committees for workplace learning reps, just like the statutory health and safety committees?

In closing, could I say that it was great to see at the fringe meeting this lunchtime on Learning Skills and Apprentices. It was absolutely packed, with standing room only. On behalf of USDAW I would like to thank Frances for the work she is doing in this field. Thank you.

**Gillian Lewis** (*Unifi*): Unifi welcomes the increasing emphasis on quality jobs and believes there is a need for resources in the workplace for quality learning backed by real employer commitment. Learning agreements are increasingly the way forward to empower Britain's workforce access to developmental skills. There is an opportunity for the Government to drive forward this agenda by providing financial incentives for unions and employers to develop learning agreements that deliver real and tangible benefits for workers. Could the Secretary of State give his view on this idea?

**Bernard Rutter** (*Graphical, Paper and Media Union*): Secretary of State, as you will know, the TUC has commissioned a feasibility study examining the possibility of a new union learning institution which will have the potential to offer life-long learning opportunities to all workers wherever they work. To complement this, has the Government given any consideration to workers having a legal entitlement to a skills audit? This entitlement could take the form of a one-off self-testing online questionnaire, a session with an adviser, or both. The aim of this exercise will be to encourage workers to re-enter some form of education and training and it could be delivered by Learndirect with help from union learning reps. The GPMU believes that making this an actual entitlement would help convey the message that this is something worthwhile which workers should seek to take up. Such an entitlement could be a central element of the new union academy and I believe would help to engage workers in learning and training. Thank you.

**Janet Seymour Kirk** (*Amicus*) said: I am speaking on behalf of governors with a disability. Out of the 76 recommendations to the Government from the Scrutiny Committee looking into the draft Disability Bill, one of those recommendations not accepted is to allow governors to be covered by the DDA, yet councillors were accepted so why weren't we? There are few governors and each county finds it more difficult each year to fill those public appointments. Why are you making it more difficult for disabled people actually to be involved?

**Charles Clarke, MP:** There are four points. First, Geoff from USDAW: I am absolutely delighted that we do have the statutory rights for union learning representatives that we have talked about and on which we legislated last year. I think that will make a major impact. I am slightly more sceptical about the potential role of learning committees and the way that has been put forward. I am not convinced that a single

form of organisation in every workplace, and so on, is the right way to proceed. I am, however, open-minded on this and ready to see what are the experiences of development of the union learning reps in the areas that we have.

I accept the central point that you are making, which lay behind the question, Geoff, which is, that there needs to be proper organisation in each workplace to deal with the particular issue. I think we should just see how the current situation develops for a little bit before seeing how we go. This is a matter that I am absolutely ready to keep on discussing with the TUC because I know the concerns that have been expressed in Congress about this.

Gillian's point from Unifi: I am absolutely ready to look at financial incentives to encourage the participation that you describe. In fact, in your sector the Financial Sector Skills Council was launched by Paul Boateng and myself just about a week or so ago, covering 1.1 million employees and 5.1 per cent of the economy, which will have an enormous impact on how we operate. I have specifically encouraged, and did in my speech on that occasion, work in the way that we are talking about. So, yes, we can look to financial support in the way that you suggest.

Bernard's point from GPMU: as Bernard knows, and as other colleagues in GPMU know also, the situation with the printing employers is their unwillingness to make the kind of commitment that is necessary, something which I well understand from conversations, and that is why there are two areas where I think we need to make progress: First, in developing a centre of vocational excellence where we can work with the union, and the GPMU has made very positive proposals, which we are discussing at the moment, about how we can really get a major step forward in that area; second, as Bernard suggests, developing the skills audit through the union academy or by other means. Again the question of whether a legal entitlement is the right way to go I think needs to wait just a little bit but the development of the skills audit is certainly right.

On Janet's point about the disability directive and the question of colleges, I am absolutely ready to look again at that point. There was a very substantial debate that went on before we reached the position we did right across government on that, but I am prepared to look at it again.

Roger, may I say that I have appreciated the chance to have the discussion with Congress this afternoon and I really do look forward to a very strong, positive, working relationship over the coming year.

**The President:** Congress, may I say that that address, and the questions and answers, is just a small reflection of the very close working relationship that the TUC enjoys with the Department for Education and Skills, particularly on skills and lifelong learning. We are now working so well together and the benefits are coming through seriously at workplace level as the video shows, and, as each of your unions is increasingly recognising, this is because of your contribution to the work. I think this close working with the Department is a model for how we need to develop in some other areas, too.

Charles, on behalf of the TUC, thank you for coming, thank you for the work, and thank you to all your colleagues in the Department.

## Inequality and Discrimination in Higher Education

**Steve Wharton** (*Association of University Teachers*) moved Motion 57. He said: We all know that higher education institutions, or HEIs, play a vital role in the nation, not only through their preparation of graduates for the world at work but through a more general contribution to civil society. While at HEIs students learn not just the subjects they are studying but also other qualities such as the importance of an understanding and an appreciation of tolerance, and the need for equality within society as a whole, principles to which all of us here are committed.

So, it may come as a surprise to learn that, despite this and despite a more general national legal framework of equality in terms of gender, race, disability, and equality, discrimination and unequal treatment are rife in higher education institutions. While this motion is specific to the issue of the research assessment exercise, we know that discrimination and inequality affect all workers in higher education institutions and we support and work in solidarity with our sister unions in the sector to end those inequalities.

Turning to the issue of the gender pay gap, average hourly earnings for women working fulltime in higher education are 18 per cent lower and those for part-time women are 40 per cent lower compared with men. While we are talking about part-time staff, 48 per cent of women work part time in HEI compared with 38 per cent of men. The higher up the academic and related career ladder you go the fewer women you find; only 17 per cent of vice chancellors are women. Vice chancellors nowadays like to have themselves called CEOs and they often have special non-elected committees to determine their salaries, but at the same time they refuse to accept the principle of a pay audit that would start to tackle issues such as the gender pay gap.

It is not only in terms of gender that we see inequality in higher education. Only 18 per cent of lower grade lecturers and 11 per cent of professors in the so-called old universities are from ethnic minorities. While the number of disabled staff in higher education has doubled in the last ten years, that still means only 1.5 per cent of university staff.

I mentioned the research assessment exercise earlier and it features in the motion. The RAE, as it is known, is a kind of academic research pop idol or X factor. Every five to eight years academics have to produce their best research and put it forward to panels which grade that research, and that grading is then used as a means of distributing funding as part of support for universities. As you would expect, higher education institutions play games with that funding to maximise the score, they leave out staff they think would lower the score and surprise, surprise, if you are a female academic you have a far higher chance of being left out of the research assessment exercise, yet another form of gender inequality in higher education.

Although I have mentioned higher education institutions here, AUT fully accepts NATFHE's amendment as enhancing the requirement on the heads of all institutions in further and higher education to face up to their responsibilities in fighting inequality in the profession. President, Congress, the time has come to put an end to inequality and unequal treatment in the sector. The time has come for those in charge of institutions to stop paying lip service to the equality issue and instead to take concrete steps to

tackle the gender pay gap, face up to their responsibilities, and end RAE and other discrimination in higher education.

**Sam Allen** (*NATFHE – The University and College Lecturers Union*) seconding the motion, said: We in NATFHE welcome our sister union accepting this amendment to motion 57. In moving and seconding the motion, and the amendment, I am going to concentrate on the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000, and the slow and in some cases lack of implementation in both further and higher education.

The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 put the onus on public bodies. The Act insists that public sector bodies must have a positive duty to promote good race relations. It requires all public employers to publish an annual report examining how many members of staff are employed, at which level, who receives training, and what has been done to ensure that black workers are promoted in at least similar proportions to their white counterparts.

On paper the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 is one of the strongest anti-racist laws anywhere in Europe. However, a survey commissioned by the Department for Trade and Industry in summer 2003 shows that over half the colleges and universities were unable to identify a single outcome to show that they are making progress towards the implementation of the Act. Ninety per cent of colleges and 95 per cent of universities recorded that they had a race policy in place, the majority said they had produced race equality schemes and were monitoring the impact of their policies. Yet when we look at the details of the institutional practices it soon becomes clear that very few employers had begun even to address the minimum duty set out in the law; just 40 per cent of colleges and 37 per cent of universities recorded that they were monitoring staff data, and only one-third in each sector recorded that they had even begun to analyse the data, and of this 37 per cent not one has published their findings.

Congress, comrades, it is very important that we as a movement must continue to maintain a determined campaign to make sure the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 is properly implemented by employers in both the private and public sector. I move support for the motion as amended. Thank you very much.

**Dave Jones** (*Amicus*) speaking in support of the motion, said: I am the higher education rep and this is my first Congress. I fully agree with my two previous colleagues on the situation within higher education. My position in higher education, as a job, is technician. Just to give you a little colour of what higher education is like, I will give you a technician's perspective. Higher education is a bizarre place to work in. Earlier we heard the pensions debacle being likened to a Hollywood blockbuster but where we work is more like the Hammer House of Horrors, the black and white versions.

Professors are living their dream, and quite rightly so. The rest of us who work there are just trying to earn a living. In some institutes professors are called staff and the rest of us are called non-staff. Some professors become management and management is done through councils and senates. For those of you not familiar with the intricacies of the higher education system, I will try and give you an example. If you could picture a tudor hall full of professors, that is

a council; professors who are all geniuses in their fields but, unfortunately, are halfwits in management.

For example, we have evidence of this management trying to undertake equal pay audits and at the end of the day they said: "Look, everybody is okay." Then you step back and look at the job structure. Who holds those top spots in the job structure? Those crusty old men in that tudor hall, no women, no black people or other ethnic minorities, no gay, lesbian, or transgender people, no disabled people, and no non-staff. That is the way they want to keep it. Yes, let us have a full equal pay audit but we need accountability.

Certainly this management will generate policies on any given subject that you care to confront them with and post it on their website so that they can look clean to the outside world, but to non staff the reality is quite a different story. We have had too many instances of being left behind. A retired union colleague told me that when he used to negotiate with these people he had to drag them kicking and screaming into the '70s. I did not realise that he meant the 1870s.

Congress, please support this motion because we want to drag them screaming into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Thank you.

**The President:** Motion 57 is supported by the General Council.

\* *Motion 57 was CARRIED*

### **Racism and the 'Redwatch' Site**

**Chris Wilson** (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*) moved Composite Motion 5. He said: ATL welcomes the helpful amendments from our colleagues in UNISON and the NUT, which now form part of this composite.

Congress, the continued existence and operation of the Redwatch internet sites is an affront to democracy, to all those who value diversity, tolerance and political pluralism. The issues here are straightforward. The Redwatch records the names, the addresses, and when it can the faces of trade union activists involved in anti-racist or anti-fascist activity. Its motivation is to intimidate, its calling is to coerce, to silence community, religious, political, and trade union leaders by implicit threats.

Congress, the breadth of these sites, for there is now more than one, is truly shocking. Read the ATL briefing on this available from the ATL stall. At least one activist from each of 34 affiliated trade unions here represented and most general secretaries are identified, as well as the activists, as well as many ordinary lay reps whose only crime is to resist racism, whose only fault is to defend their members' interests. Leading TUC officials are named, as well as councillors and MPs from across the political spectrum. Trade unionists, members and officials from ACM to Amicus, from Connect to CWU, from GMB to NATFHE, from Unifi to UNISON, are but some receiving Redwatch's unwelcome attention. This leaves out the non-affiliates, the Labour Party, the Liberal Democrats and even Conservative activists, the faith groups, and the community groups.

Congress, ATL is making no party political point. We are not affiliated to any political party. Our membership is broad. But regardless of any or no political affiliation, we stand united on this, no one has the right to silence by threats peacefully held beliefs. No one has the right to intimidate trade unionists. No fire-bombing of any teacher's car will ever be acceptable. ATL, the education union, will stand shoulder to shoulder with all those who are listed; with any who are targeted; and should we now find that we, too, join them, then, Congress, we are in good company. This resolution calls upon the Home Secretary, and other relevant authorities, to close immediately all such sites. It calls upon TUC affiliates to support actively any in our movement who risk harm to person or property as a result of being named by Redwatch. It calls upon the General Council to offer urgent advice to all affiliates.

ATL hopes that the General Council are taking notice for the movement has been slow to respond on this question. The watchers have grown confident. Away from the light they have prospered. The number of sites has grown. The list of names, of our names, has lengthened. The details, the contacts, and the photos increase, and the links from Redwatch to Combat 18 go unchallenged. Who was it said, "For the bad to succeed the good must only do nothing"? Congress, after we pass this composite, the General Council must act, they must not allow this composite to gather dust. It must not accept the 'Well, we're sympathetic but it can't be done' attitude from the Government. We know that bringing order to the Internet is difficult but, Congress, Redwatch is an ongoing injustice and, as Martin Luther King observed, "There is nothing more tragic in the world than to know right and not to do it."

Congress, let us now do right, support the composite, and close Redwatch.

**Rena Wood** (*UNISON*) seconding the composite, said: I want to draw your attention to composite 5, at page 14 in your booklet. Point one has been covered but it is important that the General Council also talks to business; it is not in business's interest to employ anybody that has any links with the BNP. So, what this motion is saying is not just talk to government but talk to everybody that the TUC General Council has links with.

It is important that we protect our members; we actually have a duty to protect them. Congress, *Searchlight* was in your pack and if you have not had an opportunity to read it, please read it. It gives very detailed information of successful campaigns around the country. If your branch is not affiliated, please do affiliate. The information, assistance, and solidarity is in *Searchlight*.

Looking at number three, we have to continue our campaign. Why do we have to continue our campaign? Yesterday, Roger Lyons told us, Congress, that in Lancashire the BNP won nearly 1 million votes. Yes, we beat them at the ballot box, we beat them because we campaigned, we had a strategic approach working alongside all trade unions, community groups, and faith groups, as I said earlier when accepting the award, but the point is we have to convince people to get out to the ballot box. We have to argue and tell them why the BNP is a threat. The evidence is there. The fact is that ordinary people in that one million voters are not traditionally racist but they bought the argument. We have to start with our own trade union

members. I do not believe for one minute every one of our members understands the threat of the BNP. We have to have a very comprehensive education package and programme, that is very clear, and in terms of challenging government, Congress, we started this job last year when we passed composite 5, 'Opposing BNP and Racism' and putting a submission to the Government's employment review.

I want to say that in our union we had a joint anti-racist, anti-fascist working group between the North West Region and Yorkshire & Humberside, and we worked alongside community groups. We cannot do this without bringing other people on board. It is important to explain to them that it is a trade union issue, that the BNP do not want women in the workplace, the BNP do not want black people in this country, and we as black people are not a number who have to be controlled, we are allies, we are workers like everybody else. That is the message we have to get out there, not just in our workplaces but in every facet of our lives from our faith groups, in our schools, absolutely everywhere. It is coffee break chat time, put the leaflets out, affiliate, and actively – actively – support this composite. Thank you.

**Roger King** (*National Union of Teachers*) in support of the motion said: I am pleased to hear from the Secretary of State for Education that he is going to start speaking to us again.

President, Congress, our amendment seeks to strengthen and broaden the scope of the original motion. You will be aware that the far right organisations have been seeking to infiltrate trade unions, both in order to achieve legitimacy and in an attempt to seek damages when they are expelled. If the expulsion of a member by a trade union is found to be unlawful, the minimum compensation the union has to pay is £5,900.

We believe it is essential that we have legislation in place in order to deny membership to or expel individuals who belong to racist and fascist organisations. They have no place in the trade union movement, their principles and activities are incompatible with ours. We welcome the Government's inclusion of a clause within the scope of the Employment Relations Bill, which will allow trade unions to expel or deny membership to individuals who belong to far right organisations. The bill, now awaiting royal assent, will remove the provision of the minimum compensation award. We would like to pay tribute to the TUC on the work they have done on the Employment Relations Bill and urge the TUC now to start an awareness raising campaign on new aspects of the legislation to ensure that it is used to maximum effect.

We must not allow a small number of individuals to use the name of our movement to give legitimacy to the far right extremism or as a way of gaining resources to promote their racist message. Our members' subscriptions should not be tied up in fighting court cases because some idiot cannot understand that their extreme right-wing views are incompatible with trade union objectives; nor, worst still, because a loophole allows this scum to exploit the law to gain compensation to continue peddling their message of evil. It is vital we get this right.

The second part of our amendment relates to education and the crucial role it plays in combating racism and prejudice. It focuses on the threat posed by the far right to the multi-cultural and anti-racist ethos

of schools and colleges. The education policy of the BNP in their election manifesto said that they will stop the introduction and teaching of Asian languages to classes containing any native British children, and where foreign pupils have not achieved a satisfactory standard of English they should be taught separately rather than being allowed to drag down the standards and hold back native English speakers. What tosh!

Tackling racism requires genuine partnership between all the key players in education, the trade movement, and government. Promoting anti-racism in schools, workplaces, and communities, is crucial. We know racism often stems from ignorance and fear and we need to educate everyone, particularly young people, about the consequences of supporting the far right. In moving this amendment we seek to broaden the scope of the motion and wholeheartedly agree with the content of the original ATL motion and the UNISON amendment. Please support.

**The President:** The amendment has been included in Composite 5.

**Jane Aitchison** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) speaking in support of the composite motion, said: Congress, Redwatch, and similar sites, are terrifying for white trade unionists because in turning the nazi spotlight on us they give us a taster of what it is like for our black colleagues every single day. PCS, and its predecessor unions, have a long history of organising against fascism, stretching back to the Hither Green dispute, an all-out strike mounted to remove a BNP organiser from Hither Green Social Security Office, in South London, to today when, like many of our sister unions, we are seeking to reach agreement with management that organised fascists should not be employed in the Civil Service.

I work in Leeds and I live in Bradford, which will give you an insight into why I am up here today. In the late 1990s, Combat 18 were making serious inroads in Leeds. Leeds TUC, along with Anti-Fascist Action and several other political organisations, organised one of the biggest ever May Day demos that Leeds has ever seen against the Nazis, and it really turned things around in Leeds. Throughout that period, TUC delegates faced massive intimidation. The secretary of Leeds TUC had his windows put through, not once but twice. A teacher in Leeds TUC had her car fire-bombed. I never walked home by the same route twice but it did not stop Combat 18 from finding out where I lived and from mounting a very frightening overnight vigil outside my house.

Redwatch is the fascists new hi-tech intimidation tool but the violence they threaten and the violence they employ is of the old-fashioned bloody variety. Redwatch even has pictures of the children of anti-racist activists on their site taken on anti-racist rallies and demos. As a mother of a three-year old, who I take everywhere and who is already a veteran of picket lines and rallies, I do worry that her picture might end up on one of these sites, but I would rather run that risk than have to face trying to explain to her that fear prevented me from taking action against these scum.

Congress, we need to combat these creatures collectively. The Government have to act to shut these sites down. It is not that difficult. We might have hoped the Prime Minister would have announced their closure here yesterday. If these websites threatened big business they would have been shut down already. The Redwatch slogan is, 'The only solution is white

revolution.' Division is the fascist weakness. Unity is our strength. United we will defeat them. Congress, support the composite.

**Sue Rogers** (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*) supporting the composite, said: The BNP are seeking a presence everywhere; they stand outside the schools leafleting, they stand for local, national, and European elections, they stand for a place in governing bodies. In this way they seek to control our society, our future, our very lives. We know what they stand for. They stand for racism, fascism, intimidation, and bullying tactics; that is what they really stand for. Their website seeks to name and identify schools where they say there is a BNP presence, whether it is a presence through pupils or through staff.

No one can ignore the fact that in the recent local and European elections there were in fact over 20 BNP candidates who were teachers. NASUWT's policies declare that racist beliefs are incompatible with membership so imagine our sense of horror when one of these teachers actually used our name to declare and identify himself as our member. Now we have to explore both our own rules and the legal implications of how to deal with him which will avoid a financial claim that could then bolster BNP funds. We wait eagerly to see the removal of the Tory legislation that prevents unions controlling their own membership rules. For schools the BNP presents a danger where, dressed in smart suits with an external aura of respectability, they try to obtain a place on governing bodies; thereby they hope to control and to influence schools, whether through the appointment of staff, the disciplining of staff and pupils, or in foundation schools even more dangerously through some attempts to control directly the curriculum that is offered.

Our recent campaign against the BNP in the local and European elections brought resignations from some of our members. What we have to do is work together with our sister unions to make sure that those members then do not go and try and seek a home in another teacher trade union; they are the sort of membership which really none of us want. Together we can fight the BNP. This is the only way to block the racists and the fascists, and to make sure that education plays its role forward-looking, progressive, and not in any way linked with or supporting such organisations.

**Amarjite Singh** (*Communication Workers Union*) speaking in support of composite 5, said: Congress, the CWU, with other unions and organisations, have vigorously campaigned to keep the BNP out of local and mainstream politics with some success, such as the London Assembly and the European Parliament. However, as Brendan Barber, TUC General Secretary, said yesterday at the anti-racism fringe meeting, one BNP councillor is too many, never mind 20 or so. There is no time to be complacent and we need more than ever to be proactive to expose the BNP.

The CWU has played an active role fighting the racists and fascists. Billy Hayes, our General Secretary, is treasurer of the Unite Against Fascism. With other CWU activists we have at every opportunity raised the issue of the importance of keeping the BNP out. Nationally, the unions forced an agreement with the Royal Mail that if any post-person's conscience did not allow them to deliver the racist filth, they did not have to. At the delivery office where I am a representative, the majority of my members do not deliver the filth. I

am proud of them. We have also been infiltrated by the BNP, not because they want to represent our members or that they love the unions but for financial gain and gain only. Now our General Secretary, Senior Deputy General Secretary, DGS Postal, and DGS Telecoms, have found themselves on the Redwatch website with their photographs and personal details portrayed.

Congress, when we get into dialogue with the new legislation to expel racists and fascists the legislation must be watertight and not wishy-washy. Since last March David Blunkett has had the dossier/study that shows MPs, unions, and other organisations, have objected to the site. How long does it take to shut down their site? It is vile. We say this is not good enough and demand it is closed down now.

Congress, I will leave you with a quote: "For evil to triumph, all that is necessary is that good people do nothing." So when there is an anti-racist rally or demo, or elections, think of the quote.

**Jeremy Dear** (*National Union of Journalists*) speaking in support of the composite, said: Colleagues, if you thought that the Hutton Report was a whitewash you should see the BNP's website report of its laughable national demonstration they organised outside my union's headquarters in February. I thank Unite Against Fascism, and all those unions who came to support us on that day. The BNP demonstration was allegedly about the media's failure to report the death of Gavin Hopley at the hands of a group of Asian youths. Of course it was a failure, that is, unless of course you count the eight BBC reports, the dozens of newspaper reports, the coverage in Asian News that said he was beaten up by a gang of Asian men, all of which also reported the conviction of eight men for the assault. Of course, the BNP do not mention this because their demonstration was not about media failure but a calculated attempt to silence opposition and to intimidate those who expose the BNP and the far right for the thugs they really are.

Nor does the BNP mention its threats against journalists. Their bulletin asks their members to collate information on journalists who expose the party, like those who exposed the BNP in the recent BNP documentary. As a result, threats have been posted on websites run by neo-Nazi groups, and on Redwatch. In one chilling message they say of one of our members: "He will go quiet when he realises his family is more important than his politics." Another says: "We need to find this reporter fast. If we can scare this [bleep] off we might get an easier time instead of being made to look like a bunch of muppets. We are good but we can't perform miracles." Visitors to the Redwatch website are told: "Remember places, traitors' faces, they'll all pay for their crimes." A new email network linked to Redwatch carries the following threat: "Redwatch has accumulated many names, addresses, and pictures of the targets, many of whom have had nothing done to them. Now's the time to start a proper campaign of violence and intimidation."

As one of those people who is targeted, as one of those who has also been visited at my home, of course I am scared but I, like others targeted, will not be silenced. Be in no doubt, Redwatch and the like target not just individuals but the very values that we stand for, justice, equality, freedom of association, workers' rights, solidarity and unity between black and white workers. It is time for the Government to act and close

down Redwatch but also time for us to take our fight for our values and our message into our workplaces, our communities, and our unions, to combat this racist poison. We have no place for racists or fascists in our communities, our workplaces, or our unions.

**The President:** As the last speaker on this composite I want to call Peter Jones, NATFHE, who is from Burnley where there are six BNP councillors.

**Peter Jones** (*NATFHE – the University and College Lecturers' Union*) speaking in support of the composite, said: Thank you, President. Congress, comrades, I am a member of NATFHE and, more pertinently, the secretary of our branch in Burnley, where for some people fear now stalks the streets, where for some the town centres, the terraces of the football club, the pubs and clubs, are no-go areas, and where for many the six BNP councillors make us the fascist centre, the fascist capital, of Great Britain.

I want to tell you a little story about what happened in the council chamber just a fortnight ago. An unholy alliance led by the Liberal Democrats, including the Tories and the BNP, forced through the Borough Council a motion that demanded that the executive of that council is shared amongst every party within the council. The Liberal Democrats were wanting to sit down and rule the council with the BNP, the LibDems, the Tories, and the BNP running a council, a more unholy alliance I could not imagine. This, comrades, is the reality of having fascists in the council chamber. This is what we are facing. To its credit the Labour Group decided it would have nothing to do with this. I, as a person who is not in the Labour Party, applaud those councillors for standing down and going into opposition, and I think we should do the same.

Turning to the issues of composite 5, I do not need to ask you to support it; I know you are going to. There are many of you out there, myself, our General Secretary, loads of others of you, who are on that site, we have seen ourselves there, other people have seen us there. They say, "This is Peter Jones, this is where he works, this is where he lives. You know what he looks like now." I could, I suppose put on a wig and put on a moustache, things like that, but that is not going to work, is it?

Let us be sure about it. These people, the BNP and their fellow travellers, come from the scum end of the political spectrum. They are Nazis. We cannot make any mistake about it, these people are Nazis and because they are Nazis we need to shut down sites like Redwatch now, and because they are Nazis we need to be brave enough in our unions to say to every one that we find in our unions, "We are going to throw you out and we do not care about the consequences." We should defy the law, if necessary; let us get rid of every BNP member in every one of our unions. Thank you, comrades.

**The President:** Composite Motion 5 is supported by the General Council.

\* *Composite Motion 5 was CARRIED*

### Diversity in the Workplace

**Bobby Barnes** (*Professional Footballers Association*) moved Motion 19. He said: I have already been up here once this afternoon and it was with great pride I was able to stand here alongside Gordon Taylor and accept

an award on behalf of the PFA for the work that we have actually done in creating diversity within the workplace and, in the broader issue, in the world of football. It would have been unthinkable 20 years ago that anybody from the world of football could have stood here in front of the TUC even to have the temerity to discuss such an issue. Going back to the 1970s and 1980s, football grounds were not very pleasant places to be. I think almost unanimously they were the province of groups of young men, a lot of them with far right sympathies, who gathered on a Saturday afternoon and those black players who were fortunate enough to make through were subjected to organised campaigns which really related to sheer race hatred. I myself was fortunate enough to be a professional footballer in that time, playing for West Ham, and there were certain football grounds around the country where you absolutely knew you would be subjected to a torrent of abuse.

Things have moved on tremendously since then, particularly on the field of play. If you were to look at the England football team at present, if you were to look at most football teams around the country, there is a very high mixture of players of all races and creeds, not just black but from all over Europe. Football on the playing field has very much become integrated and diverse. It would be easy to be complacent and say, "Job done", but there is still a fair way to go. We looked at the demographics of our membership and we established that there are approximately 25 per cent of footballers of ethnic minorities currently playing in the Football League and the Premier League but how many managers are there? How many directors of football clubs are there? How many chief executives? How many administrators? You could count them on one hand. So, although great strides have been made, there is still a long way to go.

The PFA, along with other governing bodies, has worked hard with organisations such as Kick Racism out of Football – and I acknowledge the T-shirt of the gentleman who spoke before – and Show Racism the Red Card. The football industry is currently booming but if you look back to those days of the 1970s and the 1980s, the crowds were down and, as I said, the grounds were not very nice places to be. If you look at an average Premiership ground, at Nationwide – sorry, Coca Cola – at the moment they are inclusive welcoming places, where families, women, and people of all ethnicities come along and watch games. That is a testimony to the way that football has worked to clean up its act, to move with the times, and to reflect the diversity of our country here today.

Just going away from football for a moment and looking at the Olympics a couple of weeks ago and the performance of the young boxer, Amir Khan, if you look at how well he actually performed on behalf of Britain, it was fantastic. But not only was Amir's performance in the ring fantastic, I think it was so encouraging to look around the stadium and to see his family, in particular his father proudly supporting his son and wearing his Union flag waistcoat. I think it just shows how far sport has come when we are able to reach this state of affairs. I think it is congratulations to Amir Khan for his efforts during the Olympic Games.

There is much work to be done. We are not complacent. We continue to strive. As we mentioned earlier in terms of our coaching initiative, we have set up a group which seeks to address the anomaly in terms of representation on the coaching and management side of things; that is an objective we will continue to pursue. We will continue to engage with

the governing bodies across football to encourage, to press, to coerce, so that football in all of its spheres can reflect the demographics of this country and reflect the diversity, which can only be of benefit to all. Please support the motion.

**Patricia Auty** (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*) speaking in support of the motion, said: We are proud to second this motion from the Professional Footballers Association, as we can see how much they have achieved, not only because of the historic links between our two unions but also personally and professionally. The personal link is that my brother in his youth played for Drumcondra and Ards in Ireland, probably one of the first black players. It was useful having a physiotherapist in the family. The professional link is because the CSP believes passionately, as I do, in the principles of equality and diversity, whether it is in the world of sport, industry, trade unions, or public services.

In one respect, Congress, I am a typical physiotherapist, being a woman. However, in another, I am sadly far less typical. Yes, you have probably guessed it, and can see; less than 5 per cent of physiotherapists are from an ethnic minority, and I am one of that small number. This has to change if my profession, along with other health professionals, is to serve properly the UK's diverse population and its health needs, which is why we welcome and pledge to work with the Government on its latest initiatives to attract people from ethnic minorities as well as those from the economically disadvantaged. We also see a role for the TUC in vigorously and publicly supporting such initiatives as those in sport and health, and urging other sectors to follow this lead. Boosting diversity amongst student entrants is only one part of the issue; graduating with debts of £12,000 is another. The CSP is lobbying the Government to introduce a student loan repayment scheme to write off loans for those who commit to working for the NHS for five years. We think and hope such a scheme would encourage greater diversity among all health professionals, as well as having a positive image and retention factor.

Congress, we call upon you not only for support for these tangible initiatives to boost diversity in the workplace but to support diversity in career progression as well. Let us move from paper policies to positive action and implementation. Please support our motion and amendment. Thank you.

**Tim Lucas** (*National Union of Teachers*) speaking in support of the motion, said: We support motion 19 with what we believe is an important reservation. Congress, we support the motion before you wholeheartedly and we congratulate the PFA on their Equalities Award made today. However, the motion refers to the people's gain, everyone's gain, for a lead in addressing all inequalities. We are concerned that there is no explicit mention of sex orientation and the other new equalities issues in the list that follows. Anyone who regularly attends football matches cannot but be aware of the homophobic abuse of players and others from the terraces, which is all too common at some grounds. It is an issue that we believe needs to be addressed alongside the Kick Racism out of Football campaign which the NUT sponsors alongside other affiliates. What happens both on and off the pitch has an enormous influence on our young people so perhaps I could suggest it would be useful for the PFA to meet with the TUC LGBT Committee to see if we can do some joint work.

Congress, support the motion and let us also take on the additional work of kicking homophobia out of football. Thank you.

\* *Motion 19 was CARRIED*

### Scrutineers Report

**Lesley Mansell**, Chair of Scrutineers, presented the Scrutineers Report, as follows.

### GENERAL COUNCIL

#### SECTION A

*Unions with more than 200,000 members*

UNISON (*six members*)

Dave Anderson Dave Prentis

Alison Shepherd Liz Snape

Keith Sonnet Sofi Taylor

Amicus (*four members*)

Lucy Kelly Doug Rooney

Derek Simpson Paul Talbot

Transport and General Workers' Union (*four members*)

Barry Camfield Jimmy Kelly

Patricia Stuart Tony Woodley

GMB (*three members*)

Sheila Bearcroft Kevin Curran

Paul Kenny

Communication Workers' Union (*two members*)

Jeannie Drake Billy Hayes

National Association of Schoolmasters

Union of Women Teachers (*two members*)

Chris Keates Sue Rogers

National Union of Teachers (*two members*)

Pat Hawkes Steve Sinnott

Public and Commercial Services Union (*two members*)

Janice Godrich Mark Serwotka

Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers  
(*two members*)

Marge Carey John Hannett

#### SECTION B

*Unions with between 100,000 and 200,000*

*Members*

Association of Teachers and Lecturers Mary Bousted

Graphical, Paper and Media Union Tony Dubbins

Prospect Paul Noon

Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians  
George Brumwell

Unifi Ed Sweeney

#### SECTION C

*Unions with fewer than 100,000 members*

*Eleven to be elected*

Andy Gilchrist (FBU) 585,000\*

Judy McKnight (NAPO) 554,000\*

Jeremy Dear (NUJ) 553,000\*

Paul Mackney (NATFHE) 552,000\*

Brian Orrell (NUMAST) 495,000\*

Jonathan Baume (FDA) 492,000\*

Brian Caton (POA) 486,000\*

Bob Crow (RMT) 430,000\*

Gerry Doherty (TSSA) 428,000\*

Michael Leahy (Community) 409,000\*

Ged Nichols (Accord) 382,000\*

Doug Nicholls (CYWU) 323,000

Joe Marino (BFAWU) 264,000

Ian Lavery (NUM) 220,000

Robert Monks (URTU) 59,000

#### SECTION D

*Women from unions with fewer than  
200,000 members*

*Four to be elected (no contest)*

Anita Halpin (NUJ)

Sally Hunt (AUT)

Lesley Mercer (CSP)

Jenny Thurston (Prospect)

#### SECTION E

*Member representing black workers from unions with  
more than 200,000 members*

Mohammed Taj (TGWU) 4,471,000 \*

Roger King (NUT) 240,000

#### SECTION F

*Member representing black workers from unions  
with fewer than 200,000 members*

Leslie Manasseh (Connect) (no contest)

#### SECTION G

*Member representing black women*

Gloria Mills (UNISON) (no contest)

#### SECTION H

*Member representing trade unionists with disabilities*

Mark Fysh (UNISON) 5,329,000 \*

Tony Sneddon (CWU) 739,000

#### SECTION I

*Member representing lesbian, gay, bisexual and  
transgender trade unionists*

David Lascelles (GMB) 5,303,000 \*

Maria Exall (CWU) 765,000

#### SECTION J

*Member under 27 years of age*

Matthew McGregor (TGWU) 4,676,000 \*

Alan Totten (CWU) 1,277,000



**GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE**

*(five to be elected)*

Tony Cooper (TGWU)	5,999,000 *
Linda McCulloch (Amicus)	5,978,000 *
Annette Place (UNISON)	5,826,000 *
Phil Davies (GMB)	5,562,000 *
Peter Hall (RMT)	4,912,000 *
Steve Kemp (NUM)	1,747,000

\* - elected members in contested ballots.

*Congress adjourned at 5.45pm.*

**THIRD DAY: WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15<sup>TH</sup>**

**MORNING SESSION**

*(Congress reassembled at 9.30 a.m.)*

**The President:** Good morning. First of all, many thanks to the musicians who have been playing for us. Thank you very much.

Before we start I would like to mention the procedure on the General Council's Statement to Congress on Europe, which is being circulated. When we come to the debate on Europe, I will call the General Council Statement first, moved by Kevin Curran on behalf of the General Council, then I will call the mover and seconder of Composite 17, which incorporates the NUM amendment, but all other amendments have been withdrawn. I will then give a right of reply to the mover of Composite 17, and then to Kevin Curran as mover of the General Council's Statement. I will then take the vote on the General Council's Statement, followed by the vote on Composite 17. The Statement is being circulated and if anyone does not have a copy later on this morning, ask one of the staff.

Secondly, on speakers, although we have not yet had to consider reducing the length of speeches, we may have to do that. We are falling a little behind so I would ask people not to repeat arguments that have already been made by previous speakers; if necessary, formally second. I may not necessarily be able to take all the speakers who want to speak on every motion. Please, let us all show a degree of discipline on this and we will get through the business.

It is a great pleasure now, colleagues, to invite a speaker, sororal delegate for the Labour Party. I did suggest that as she has already spoken to us twice we should take that off her time, but I will not be unkind because I love Mary Turner. It is not so much a visiting speaker as an address by one of our own in a different guise. Mary is President of the GMB, been a delegate to Congress for many years, and after one speech to Congress provoked a former president to award her the 'Best Dressed Delegate' award for her slogan-bearing T-shirt, and the phrase that was coined, 'You know when you've been Turner'd'.

Mary, you are very very warmly welcome, and I am delighted to be able to ask you to give the sororal address for the Labour Party.

**Sororal Address by delegate from the Labour Party:**

**Mary Turner** *(Sororal delegate from the Labour Party):* Thank you, President. I notice that every time I come up here we have to talk about clocks and putting times back, but I am honoured, extremely honoured, to give the sororal address on behalf of the Labour Party. As Chair of the Party's NEC I have the pleasure of keeping some pretty big egos in their place but I have to say that I am more nervous this morning about giving this speech than telling John Prescott to shut up. There we are, that is life.

Colleagues, I am honoured. I am the first woman ever in my union's history to be nominated to the NEC; that shows you how far the trade union movement and my own union has come. I was the proudest girl last year when I was nominated by the Party to be the chair. I really always thought that by the time it was my turn they would change the rules, but here I am,

the school dinner lady, on the NEC of the Party. That just shows we can make it. To get that honour the same day as Jack Jones and Michael Foot were honoured, believe you me, made me feel extremely humble.

I am a trade unionist, I am a school dinner lady, and in my own history, yes, I fed and led the 'March for Jobs' when they marched from Liverpool to London. Yes, my dinner ladies, as lowly paid as they were, gave up their week's wages to make sure that those good people were looked after well. We marched and we marched to find employment.

Congress, throughout our shared history we have made some great progress for working people and working productively together under a third-term Labour Government I believe we can deliver so much more. That is what I want to talk to you about this morning, our ambitions for Britain and our ambitions for British people at work, and in their communities.

First, I think it is important to step back and think about what we have achieved since 1997. Let us reflect on some huge gains working people have made, and you have made, under Labour: the minimum wage, the New Deal, the four weeks paid holiday, new rights for trade unions and the right for every worker to be represented at work. Labour is delivering for working people beyond their workplace. Our record investment in public services is delivering results in health, education, transport, and the fight against crime that working people, as taxpayers, can be proud of. I salute all public service workers, whatever job they do, and I am proud to be one.

We have heard a lot about Warwick, and rightly so. What took place was a discussion involving all parts of the Party working together. I congratulate all the trade union leaders here for that weekend and, in particular, I would like to pay tribute to Tony Dubbins. Tony led a great weekend and I was very proud. There were MPs, MEPs, councillors, CLP delegates, and trade unionists present. I am sure the 'Warwick Deal', as it has now been billed, will appear in future in our history books for some time. I was one of the negotiators there and what took place was not a secret discussion in a smoke-filled room, as some would have you believe, but instead a genuine dialogue between ministers, the Party, and the unions, on building the workplace of the future. No Tory minister ever came to talk to us when they were in power, of that you can be assured. We have now agreed a positive agenda for the third-term giving unions a significant agenda on which to work with government and employers.

As someone who represents members, my commitment is absolute in delivering the Warwick pledges. Our agreement includes a commission on women in work (not before time), chaired by our comrade Margaret Prosser, to take a systematic look at the factors shaping continuing gender pay gaps and women's opportunities at work; an extension of the entitlement to four weeks paid holiday by making eight bank holidays a right in addition to the four weeks; eradicating the two-tier workforce across the public sector and, as many of you know here, that is my goal, I gave you that promise and I will keep going until we do make sure that all the little I's are dotted and the T's are crossed; comprehensive corporate manslaughter legislation; and for manufacturing a review of business support and a commitment to work for a level playing field in procurement.

I know that not all our aspirations, or yours, have been fulfilled but we will continue as we always do as one family to work to meet them. We need to work together, colleagues, because if we do not the consequences are dire. If we look back 20 years ago this year to the miners, to the rape and pillage, the devastation, that Margaret Thatcher and Howard did to those communities, it was a vindictive act by a vindictive party that has no place for us any more. I pay tribute to those mining communities and to the good women that led the fight.

That is what Howard wants to take us to; he wants to take us back. That may be Howard's way but it is not our way. Unemployment was 3 million, and I argued those figures were not accurate as women were not allowed to sign on the dole because they never earned enough; millions were on the dole with no hope; and we had the highest number of suicides by men when their homes were repossessed and communities devastated. That was Howard's way. It is not the Labour Party's way. We had the attack on public services, hospitals, and schools. Why? Because Maggie and her cronies always went private. I remember Maggie saying, "There's no such thing as society." We had people like Virginia Bottomley, who thought an intravenous drip was a Tory MP. I can remember those days. That is Howard's way. It is not our way.

Congress, I know what I am talking about. I had to work under the Tory Government. I stood shoulder to shoulder with many of you -- the miners, those at Wapping -- as we fought for our jobs and our industry. Those Tory ministers would not speak to us. That was the Tory way. It is not the Labour Party way. A vote for Howard is a vote to go back to how this country was run in the dark days. I know there is not one person in this hall that wants to go back to those days, where the young people left school and were given their pension at 16.

In a third term, Labour will put particular emphasis on rooting out abuse at the bottom end of the labour market. We will also address people's aspirations. People want satisfying work and the opportunity to participate in the success of their workplace.

Colleagues, today history will be made when hunting will be banned, for which we have waited for so long.

Congress, it was nice to hear Tony telling working people to go out and join a trade union, and that trade unions are relevant. We are relevant, and you are relevant.

In conclusion, there is an issue that I would like to raise. It is now over ten years since the labour movement together helped to achieve free and fair elections in South Africa, and you played a big part in that with the Labour Party. Congress, now Maggie's little soldier is under house arrest in a free democratic society. He will get justice more than his mummy gave to Nelson Mandela and all the other great people who liberated South Africa. I can assure the police that we will not be applying for the right to march, as we did for Nelson Mandela.

Congress, thank you very very much for inviting me and, just to let you know, on my CV I have reached new heights this morning. I have actually at my age reached the height of being on page 3. Isn't it great?

One up, Mary! Colleagues, it is page 3 of the *Morning Star*, and I am very proud of it, too.

Colleagues, I thank you for your invitation and you will never know how proud I am. I am proud of my union and I am proud to work with all of you. Please, please, give us the right for a third term. Never allow the Tories back to do what they did for 20 years because it will take us another 40 years to get back on the road again. Thank you, and good morning.

**The President:** It gives me great pleasure on behalf of Congress to award Mary the Gold Badge of Congress.

*(The presentation was made amidst applause)*

**Mary Turner:** Thank you. Colleagues, in memory of my dad, the first thing he ever told me was: "Join a trade union when you start work." I joined a trade union from the day I left school and I am proud to wear that hat, and I am proud of this. Thank you very much.

### Organising Award

**The President:** Congress, you will recall that on Monday we recognised the immense contribution of activists through the Lay Reps Awards. Unfortunately, Melanie Jenner, the winner of the Organising Award, could not join us then. However, she is here today and it is my great pleasure to present her with the Congress Award for Organising. Melanie Jenner.

*(The presentation was made)*

**The President:** Congress, you will know there are a number of motions that have been scheduled but could not be taken due to lack of time. We will try and take Motions 47, 48, and 49 at the end of this morning's scheduled business. If there is time, I will also then take Composite 16, followed by Motions 70, 72, and 73. It would be immensely helpful, as I said earlier, if people bear in mind the pressure on time when speaking. Also, if anybody is going to speak, they should be here before their speaking time arrives.

Also today we will be having the General Secretary of the Congress of South African Trade Unions, Zwelinzima Vavi, Pedro Ross Leal from the Cuban TUC CTC, and this afternoon we will have Hernando Hernandez, the Colombian Trade Union leader, speaking to us.

### Regional Government

**Clare Williams (UNISON)** speaking to paragraph 10.2 of the General Council's Report said: I just wanted to share quickly under the Regional Dimension part of the Congress Report the work that the Northern TUC did in tackling racism and the anti-fascist campaign that we ran. The Northern TUC was the key body in our region that brought together a coalition under the umbrella of The North East Unites Against the BNP. That brought together every trade union, community groups, Labour Party members, people working with asylum seekers and young people, to form coalitions in every part of our region where the BNP and the National Front were standing. Both parties had targeted the North East region and were thinking they would make great electoral gains. I am very very proud to say that through the trade union movement, and particularly with the work of the Northern TUC, not only did they not win any seats but in some key areas, such as Sunderland, actually the BNP's vote was halved. I think we should congratulate ourselves as a movement on that.

Part of our campaign was a massive Respect festival in Sunderland, which attracted over 13,000, mainly local young people; that was a key event, I think, in making sure people understood, firstly, what the BNP stands for and, secondly, why they should not vote for them. Another key event for us was that at our annual Northern TUC Conference, as the National Front, unfortunately, had been given the right to march around Newcastle, which was an historic event, the Conference voted unanimously to suspend itself and join the protest. I think for me that showed the complete relevance of trade unions joining ordinary people from the community on the streets and actually making a difference. I will always have a lasting memory of Dave Anderson, General Council member, and UNISON's then president, along with Kevin Curran, being chased by the police on horses, and the fascists, which was quite an experience. I do have some photos to make sure I never forget that!

Very importantly, and I will finish with this, what it has done for us in the Northern region is that the TUC is now absolutely relevant to whole layers of new people, and particularly young people, and the unity of the trade unions through the TUC has been absolutely key to our success. People now realise unions are not just about sitting in meetings and talking, we are about action, and we make a difference. I am absolutely proud of the role of my union but also the role of the trade union movement in the North East in making sure we have built lasting coalitions that meant the far right did not win any seats and they certainly will not in the future elections. I hope that as a TUC we will make sure it is an absolute priority for our work. Thanks.

### Protecting People at Work

**The President:** Before I call Composite 19, Congress will be aware that on Monday we were joined by workers from the Wembley Stadium site, who had been shamefully sacked in a dispute that was essentially between contractors: I am very pleased to be able to report that following a great deal of hard work by the unions involved, the GMB and Amicus, a full and final settlement of the dispute has been reached, all the workers have been re-engaged, and they will be on the blue book national agreement. The deal was voted on this morning. Well done.

### Health and Safety

**Kevin Curran (GMB)** moved Composite Motion 19. He said: I am absolutely delighted to be moving composite 19 on health and safety at work. I am delighted because the track record of trade unions on health and safety is something that we have every right to be very proud of. Union safety representatives are the success story of the last three decades, with thousands of active reps trained by their unions and the TUC protecting health and safety in workplaces all over Britain. Independent research proves that workplaces where unions are present are twice as safe as unorganised ones, evidence that shows people join unions specifically because of our record on tackling health and safety, union safety reps reducing risk and protecting people, and delivering for people at work.

So, it is a genuine mystery to me why this fantastic contribution to society goes unrecognised by government. We contribute so significantly and achieve so much success in reducing injury and disease, imagine what we could do if we had more support. Yet the things that we know make a difference, every improvement we suggest or increased right that we ask for is turned down flat: roving safety reps so that we

have the right to represent our members effectively; the right to stop the job; the right to issue provisional improvement notices; and the right to prosecute privately negligent employers on behalf of our members.

Why this reluctance to ensure that we can further increase our contribution to prevention? The answer is that, despite the proven success achieved by unions, our demands are at odds with the deregulatory agenda that this Government seems determined to pursue. Rather than a regime based upon increased rights and more involvement of union reps, vigilance by well-funded, properly resourced, and effective inspectorate, and stronger enforcement of the law, the Government is systematically undermining the health and safety system to reduce so-called burdens on business and, sadly, colleagues, the chair of the Health and Safety Commission seems unable or unwilling to oppose this folly.

The recent Select Committee presented a tremendous opportunity to go to government and demand implementation of its wise and sensible recommendations, to demand the tools, the support, and the resources needed to tackle the failure of employers to protect their workforces, to support a report that recognises that decisive action is necessary if work-related deaths, injuries, and disease, are to be reduced, but the ink was barely dry on the report before the chair, without even consulting the TUC commissioners, declared against improved rights for safety reps. He did that at a press conference called to announce increased deaths at work. How ironic is that?

The Government and the Commission face a simple choice: to pursue to the delight of negligent employers a strategy that will reverse health and safety gains achieved over the last 30 years, a strategy which the Select Committee explicitly rejected and which the unions are firmly opposed to, or they can adopt a radical agenda for improving health and safety at work that will deliver for people at work, an agenda that should be resourced by a work environment fund that every employer must contribute to, an agenda based upon increased inspection, vigilance, and enforcement that enshrines the involvement of unions.

Congress, that is the choice. The Government is at a crossroads on health and safety. Down one road lies deregulation or a system funded by a compulsory levy on employers for support of safety reps, effective inspection, and enforcement of strong laws that will deliver a reduction in deaths, injury and disease. It really is as straightforward as that. It is blindingly obvious which path needs to be followed. We need strong leadership from the HSE to take us down the anti-deregulation path. Deregulation does not reduce workplace risk; deregulation will not prevent deaths and disease; and deregulation cannot deliver for people at work.

**Rob Thomas** (*napo*) seconding composition motion 19, said: Much of the media and employers' representatives in this country love to portray those who campaign on health and safety issues as either whingeing do-gooders or extreme left-wing activists, but over this issue in 2004 that is very far from the truth. Just listen to these quotes on the subject of enforcement rather than encouragement: "The evidence supports the view that it is inspection backed by enforcement that is most effective in motivating duty holders to comply with their responsibilities under health and safety law. We therefore recommend that the HSE should not proceed with a proposal to shift

resources from inspection and enforcement to fund an increase in education, information and advice." Who said that? The Labour-dominated House of Commons Department Select Committee on Work and Pensions, which reported in July of this year. On the subject of stress and occupational health, the academic, Andy Waterstone, an occupational health professor at Stirling University, said: "The HSE does not present itself as a champion for occupational health advances but rather as an apologist for ineffective government." On working temperatures, USDAW, that notoriously militant trade union, in a press statement earlier this year pointed to evidence that anyone working in temperatures above 25°C can start to suffer heat exhaustion, loss of concentration, and consequent loss of productivity. It is a fact that there are more regulations covering the temperatures in which you transport cattle than there are over working conditions for humans. Perhaps we should pretend the Tube trains are cattle trucks.

What kind of action do we need to tackle these problems? First of all, we need enough inspectors to detect breaches of health and safety law, and then we may well see an increase in the incidence of prosecution for criminal acts. Of course, you also need more effective legislation in the area of corporate killing as well. However, it is no good using all stick and no carrot. For some of the less serious breaches of the laws we need a more flexible approach and that is where this motion calls for the promotion of full criminal responsibility and sanctions for those who break the law. Being a union that represents probation officers, we know a bit about the availability of alternative penalties. At the moment, all the court can do is send someone to prison or fine them. We believe it would be much more effective if the courts had other options, such as community punishment or probation orders.

On the rights and functions of safety reps, again the Select Committee has backed the need for major improvements and backed the TUC line. Why is the HSE not backing this as well? On actions to make violence to workers a reportable event, my union tabled a motion to the 2001 Congress which specifically called for racially motivated offences to be recorded. At Congress that came to an abrupt halt because of 9/11 but we need to return to those issues straightaway. Finally, on the opt-out from the Working Time Directive the leadership of the TUC has done a grand job but where is the voice of the HSE on this?

So, this motion is calling for more action; without a big push at every level this will just have been a pious statement. We need a thorough review of the functions of the HSE and I urge all affiliates to ensure that something happens, and happens quickly.

**Eddie Grimes** (*Amicus*) said: I support this composite with specific reference to the amendment including subclause (b) in the composite.

I welcome the Prime Minister's commitment given to this Congress on Monday that legislation will be introduced to create the offence of corporate manslaughter, so why do we need this motion? Firstly, we have heard the same commitment before but this time we want to see it acted upon. The Works and Pensions Select Committee has recommended that the Government publish a bill on corporate killing by 1<sup>st</sup> December this year. Secondly, the facts speak for themselves: 300 to 400 workers die every year in work-

related incidents yet only five companies have ever been convicted for manslaughter. We cannot stand by and continue to see workplace murder take place almost on a daily basis and yet allow those responsible go free.

This motion is not about statistics, it is about people, it is about families, and it is about wrecked lives. Directors and bosses of companies have walked away from these tragedies and washed their hands of them for years. Further delays in promoting the necessary legislation and changes by government will mean that we will share the guilt of future deaths. Management has a responsibility to assess risk, manage health and safety, and make sure that their employees leave their workplaces as they come to it, fit and well. Not until employers see the threat of their necks being on the block will they take their responsibilities seriously.

The fact that employers frequently do not carry out their responsibilities is emphasised in an independent report released by the Centre for Corporate Accountability, today. Amicus fully endorses this position. Copies of this report are available in the Amicus stand today. It gives the shocking statistics that since Labour came to power there have been 2,000 deaths of workers and of which 70 per cent could have been prevented. Despite this horror story, the Government is being asked to consider recommendations from the Health and Safety Commission, and Executive, to move towards a more voluntary approach to safety rather than the enforcement system currently in place.

Congress, we cannot let this legislation remain a promise any longer. We must now demand government action for the sake of our members, workers in general, and their families. Support this composite.

**John Hannett** (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*) speaking in support of the composite, said: Congress, many of us in this hall today in many different trade unions represent workers in the front line, in the public and in the private sector, face-to-face working with customers, clients, claimants and patients, in their millions every single day; in service sectors, which are increasingly open all hours, assessed by customers and fellow citizens who want what they want when they require it on demand. Many of our members move heaven and earth to deliver what I believe is a first-class service but they are doing it in an increasingly hostile and dangerous environment. Violence and abuse from customers plagues our members in the UK, particularly in the retail sector.

In a recent USDAW survey, in one week in the working lives of over 600 shop workers across the retail sector, they reported 887 cases of verbal abuse, extremely demeaning when you are on the receiving end of it repeatedly; 224 threats of violence; 107 actual violent incidents; and 80 cases of sexual harassment and racial abuse. Another survey amongst our union representatives revealed that nearly half of our representatives had seen violent assaults on staff in their stores just in the last year, and many stores had had several attacks; 72 per cent reported that threats of violence were a problem in their particular store and verbal abuse was a daily occurrence in over a third of those stores.

Congress, retail workers do an exceptional job and have the right to be respected, and our retail violence campaign was not only about raising awareness but

bringing to the attention of the consumer that if you want a good service, you have to give respect to the individual providing that service. The levels of violence and abuse have a devastating effect on people's lives. They worry about going to work and three-quarters of our members are worried about being attacked at work and, 87 per cent about being verbally abused.

Congress, that kind of abuse leads to stress and illness, and 38 per cent of our union representatives told us that they suffered ill health due to the fear of violence and abuse. Illness does lead to time off work; 48 per cent of our representatives and members at their store were taking time off as a result of attacks, verbal abuse and violence. Finally, some people even leave their employment because they cannot cope with the ongoing pressure. That is why, Congress, we need a concerted co-ordinated approach to dealing with violence against front line workers, people who do real jobs and should be respected, working with the appropriate authorities, including the police, to resolve crime and disorder in and around our workplaces, working with employers to build a healthy, safe, and stress-free working environment, and supporting our members to organise around issues that really matter to people who do a fantastic job. Please support the composite.

**Chris Baugh** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) speaking in support of the composite, said: As we know, the basis for health and safety law in the UK remains the 1975 legislation and trade unions quickly recognise the need to organise around the important new rights this legislation conferred, and it is still really the case today, but we know from experience, at times bitter, that the broad framework within which health and safety law is regulated has never been enough.

PCS represents staff, front line and the much maligned backroom office workers, employed in the Health and Safety Executive, a public body that fulfils a vital public function but, in our view, has been consistently under-funded, denied the powers of enforcement, and the resources to do the job our members and the public have a right to expect, a position that can only get worse if 104,000 civil servants are eventually declared surplus to requirements. That is why my union has highlighted the call for a properly funded HSE given a wider range of enforcement, in particular, that inspections should force employers to show evidence of workers' involvement and consultation with workers' representatives.

Again, we know that you do not get worker involvement in health and safety, or on any other issue for that matter, without workplace organisation and safety reps. There is a wealth of experience that shows the positive benefits of being a member of a trade union and we know that union membership has a beneficial effect on both injury and illness rates, however scandalously high they remain. This is a powerful weapon in organising the agenda to which PCS, and the Congress itself, were committed on Monday. So, when the Prime Minister commends flexible labour markets, it is worth restating the real meaning for many of our members: a human resource agenda that reduces job control, a battery of work targets, IT systems that mean in an office environment chained to a display screen, and five million workers, a fifth of the UK workforce, suffering high levels of stress.

A Whitehall study of 10,000 civil servants found the familiar story of lack of job control, unattainable targets, conflicting priorities, and poor management, as the major causes of stress at work. But rather than address the underlying causes as part of a media-inspired attack on the so-called 'sick note culture', the Government now threatens for its own employees to reduce sick pay entitlements and compensation for those retired on grounds of ill health. The growing experience of PCS members, we believe shared by many across the public and private sector, compels us to challenge the Government and employer indifference to how modern times makes so many of our members quite literally sick at work. It means fighting to defend the vital public services performed by members in the Health and Safety Executive. It means campaigning against the underlying causes of stress at work, and demonstrating to those we hope to attract into union membership that unions can offer an alternative to the stressful and increasingly unsafe work environments to which millions of UK workers are currently consigned. Congress, please support.

**Suresh Chawla** (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*) speaking in support of Composite 19 said: as I am sure we are all aware, many regulations are flawed with irregularities, inconsistencies and injustices. Regulation 8 of the Safety Representatives Regulations states that it is fine for safety representatives not to be employees of the employer concerned, but only when representing employees from two specific unions, which are Equity and the Musicians Union. Whilst we are very pleased that two of our fellow entertainment unions can appoint roving safety representatives, there is a clear need for the rest of us to be able to follow suit.

Within BECTU, like so many of our unions, more and more of our members are freelances and self-employed, on short-term contracts, in different locations across the nation, resulting in a nomadic occupational lifestyle. We must amend this legislation to ensure that all of our members, in all of our unions, are protected by the right to roving safety representatives.

I urge you to support this composite motion.

**Graeme Henderson** (*Prospect*): Representing inspectors, scientists and other specialists in the Health and Safety Executive.

Prospect calls upon the Government to implement the recommendations of the Work and Pensions Select Committee on the work of the Health and Safety Commission and Executive. The Select Committee identified three main issues: the lack of resources to HSE; the lack of enforcement; and also the lack of support for unions and safety representatives. In particular, the Select Committee made the following key recommendations: first, that in the context of the 2004 Spending Review, the HSE Inspectorate should be recognised as a front-line service and should be protected. The Select Committee endorsed the view that Prospect put to them, both orally and in writing, that the number of inspectors in the HSE's Field Operations Directive should be doubled within six to seven years. It also recommended that substantial additional resources are needed in the next three years, as indeed the seconder from NAPO indicated.

The Select Committee concluded that it is inspection, backed by enforcement, that is most effective in motivating employers to comply with the

law, and it called upon the Executive and the Commission to do away with the proposal to shift resources away from enforcement towards education, information and advice.

It also concluded that in view of the huge job that the Health and Safety Commission recognised as needing to be done in the field of occupational health, it is extremely concerned at the reduction in the HSE's in-house expertise, particularly in the reduction and dumbing down of the numbers of employment medical advisers – 120 twelve years ago, now down to 15 doctors and 27 nurses.

We recognise that we face an uphill struggle to ensure implementation of the report. The Public Expenditure Review announced massive cuts in our sponsoring department, Work and Pensions – up to 30,000 jobs are to go by 2007. In a paper that was presented to the Health and Safety Commission in April, by HSE's Director of Resources, predicated upon a flat cash settlement, she concluded that HSE staff would need to decline from the current 3,800 to either 3,000 or possibly 2,800 by 2007.

Last year, when I moved the composite on health and safety, Prospect challenged the Chancellor to put his money where his mouth is. Gordon, you do not often get a second chance in life but this is your opportunity, and for the sake of millions of workers and their families take it.

**Robert Crow** (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*): We are supporting this composite, with particular reference to the paragraph in relation to the accidents to, or the manslaughter of, four of my members that took place on Valentine's Day this year. A run-away train in Tebay, with no proper brakes whatsoever on that wagon, a lump of chestnut fencing stuffed under the wheel, rolled down the hill, over a mile and a half, full of tons of used steel, rolled over and killed four of my members. The other six were fortunate to get out of it. Really, in all honesty, we do not want a witch-hunt, but when there is agro at Wembley this week they can find copper after copper to investigate what went on up there, so why can they not go down and find out why our members were killed in the railway network? That is the issue to be looked at, and in the rest of the other corporate killings that take place.

Since then, there have been three further incidents. In one of them, the same vehicle was involved, in Motherwell.

To be honest with you, we are fed up with coming here year after year talking about tragedies to people, whether it be in the building industry, the mining industry, the railway industry or anywhere else. We do not want a witch-hunt against anyone, but we want a proper public inquiry to make sure that this never happens again. One company was responsible for the wagon and another company was responsible for the wagon it was attached to, and the fact of the matter is that there were no standards put in place as a result of privatisation of BR.

When these managers walk out year after year, when they go to their places and villas they have in the Costa del Sol, when their companies make millions of pounds out of the railway industry, they get pats on the back. If they are prepared to make millions of pounds out of the railway industry, when they kill our

members they should be banged up in prison and not going back to their villas or wherever they go on the Costa del Sol or anywhere else where they may live.

Also, I would say that the Health and Safety Executive has been absolutely spineless when it comes to this. Hatfield they have dropped. Take one of our members up there, Alan Fenton. The police went round there with a sledgehammer, smashed his door down and took all his particulars out of his house. They did not go round to Corbett's house when he was let off two weeks ago for Hatfield.

By the way, let us make it quite clear, so long as the likes of Digby Jones are out there saying that trades unions need to be relevant, whilst our members are being killed in the trades union movement there is more relevance than ever for the trade union movement to be hard and fast on safety for all workers, wherever they work.

**Ian Lavery** (*National Union of Mineworkers*) supporting Composite 19 said: This composite highlights very clearly many issues relating to the failures of the Health and Safety Commission and, indeed, of the Health and Safety Executive, and chiefly the lack of protection in terms of corporate manslaughter for our members. As trades unions and health and safety representatives, we witness massive problems every day in each and every workplace. Whether it is in the railway industry, whether it is in a shop, on a building site or in an office we experience it every day.

A major concern for the National Union of Mineworkers, among many others, is the lack of legislation in relation to corporate manslaughter. That is where our members are killed as a result of corporate negligence.

As previous speakers have already mentioned, the Government have repeatedly promised to act and have repeatedly failed to do so. The Department of Work and Pensions Select Committee called for the doubling of the number of HSE inspectors, coupled with increased finance for the HSE – quite laudable recommendations, welcome recommendations too. But it is not enough; we must have the power to do something against these employers. If we are doubling the money we must at least increase the service in terms of health and safety. Directors, managers and staff at the very top level must face up to their responsibilities when they cause the death of employees in the workplace. Until legislation is implemented by the Government and the workplace is adequately policed by inspectors, with powers that they are prepared to use, then these greedy, hungry, profit-seeking company directors – as Bob has adequately explained – will continue to kill our members in pursuit of profit.

There have been 100,000 miners killed in the mining industry. In British industry last year, 249 people were killed; thousands have died as a result of occupational illness; and thousands die of industrial diseases such as pneumoconiosis, chronic bronchitis, emphysema and asthma. In excess of 10,000 employees are killed by work every year. That is 29 per day, more than one an hour, and there are very few convictions.

In the trade union movement we have a moral obligation to seek justice for the widows and widowers

and, yes, for those children who lose their beloved parents as a result of corporate negligence. Justice does not only mean a lengthy battle for compensation; it means a fight to ensure that those responsible for the ruination of family life are held accountable for their actions or inactions, as it may be. Yes, the world would be a safer place and, yes, the prisons would be fuller institutions.

**Teresa Mackay** (*Transport and General Workers Union*) speaking in support of Composite 19 said: The Health and Safety Report for 2003/2004 shows that 49 per cent of fatal injuries to workers occurred in construction and agriculture. In construction, 70 workers never came home; for agriculture, forestry and fishing it was 44. For my industry, agriculture, that means almost twelve deaths per one hundred thousand, making it the worst and most dangerous industry in the country.

Of course, the Morecambe Bay incident forms part of those statistics, with the terrible deaths of 21 Chinese cockle pickers. We should also remember that two other workers are thought to have drowned but their bodies have never actually been recovered. We should also remind ourselves that this horrific disaster makes it the worst since Piper Alpha. This, I have to say, was the turning point for the Government's acceptance of the T&G's and Jim Sheridan's Gangmaster Licensing Bill, which received Royal Assent on 8 July. According to DEFRA, there are 3,000 gangmasters in the UK, employing 60,000 workers, but no one really knows. The young Chinese reporter from *The Guardian*, who spoke at the Gangmasters Meeting on Monday, knew of one gangmaster in Norfolk who employed 25,000 workers. This same reporter went under cover for two weeks and experienced the most appalling working conditions.

The Gangmaster Licensing Act has become the legacy of Morecambe Bay but, if it is to work, resources have to be made available. Announcing over 104,000 job losses in the Civil Service does not send out the right signals that proper investment is going to take place. What it does point out -- as the PCS have graphically pointed out -- is that we are dependent on the Civil Service at every level, and that we in the trade union movement must wholeheartedly support whatever action the PCS will take to save those jobs.

Roving safety representatives have also been a major campaigning issue for those of us working in agriculture in the T&G. Six of us have just completed a two-year pilot project sponsored by the HSE to see if roving safety representatives make a difference in this very dangerous industry. Although the results will not be formally announced until the HSE's Agricultural Industry's Advisory Committee meets later this year, all signs seem to indicate that, just like the Workers Safety Advisers Project, it was a resounding success.

One of the major problems that our union has had to face has been the reluctance of the National Farmers Union to allow T&G members on their farms. What this project showed was that none of the farmers, who were all volunteers, had any problems with our visits or objected to our talking to these workers. On the contrary, they were more than willing to participate.

If we are to turn this industry's dreadful record around, which includes massive under-reporting of incidents, the government and the HSE must seriously look at ways in which the roving safety representatives can become a reality. Our project, just like the Workers

Safety Advisers, will surely prove that such schemes make good health and safety sense.

Support the composite.

**Bob Hudson** (*Community*) Supporting the motion on behalf of Community. In May last year David Blunkett confirmed that the Government would introduce the offence of corporate manslaughter, but there is still no progress. On the contrary, we seem to be going backwards. The likelihood of a successful prosecution under the existing law receded completely after the recent Railtrack case. Reportedly, Ministers themselves now fear that they themselves may be charged for the fatal errors employees in the NHS and other public services commit. There is no truth at all in this, and the story just looks like another bit of spin to avoid action.

Since the Home Secretary made that pledge, 235 people have died as a result of injuries at work, and there were more than 150,000 other injuries. There were no convictions of top bosses. In the steel industry we have experienced more than our share of death and crippling accidents. The incidence of serious injuries in our industry is wholly unacceptable, even though top management is committed to reducing the toll, as we are.

About 70 per cent of these deaths and serious injuries at work are generally due to management failures, and the record shows that the larger the company the greater the likelihood that there will be no charge. We need new effective legislation to put top managers in the dock. That would really bring home the priority that health and safety should have.

I urge Congress to adopt the motion and the General Council to press the issue vigorously with the Government to see that they honour their pledges.

**The President:** Composite Motion 19 is supported by the General Council.

\* *Composite Motion 19 was CARRIED*

### Health and safety in commercial aviation

**Jim McAuslan** (*British Airline Pilots Association*) moved Motion 91. He said: I want to tell you about Belinda. Belinda and her husband flew with a major BAE 146 operator. During her time operating as crew she suffered severe medical symptoms on exposure to fumes. Her son was born with a genetic syndrome and she and husband were advised that they had chemical damage to chromosomes.

I want to tell you about Captain Julian Soddy, a physically fit pilot who developed flu-like symptoms and memory loss. A visit to his doctor revealed symptoms similar to those experienced by people exposed to sheep dip. He lost his licence.

I could tell you many other stories from across the world, too many for fume exposure to be explained away as a personal sensitivity. The fact is that engine oils contain organophosphates, neurotoxins, sensitisers and carcinogens. The tin reassuringly warns you that it contains TCP. There is evidence that the ingestion of oil fumes causes a range of complaints from headaches and gastrointestinal problems to heart, lung and neurological disorders. It is looking more and more like it does what it says on the tin. There may be some

short and long-term problems, some result in those affected being ill-health retired. In Belinda's case it was worse.

It does not need to be this way. Other lubricants for engines and auxiliary power units to bleed air systems of aircraft have been known about for 25 years. More recently, the Australian Senate undertook an extensive review making very specific recommendations. These have not been actioned. They gather dust, 'Not my responsibility'. The regulators say it is not a safety issue and that there is no proof of long-term health problems, but they have not been prepared to release all their findings, including some from Porton Down. Manufacturers say it is a maintenance problem; the oil companies say 'It's safe' as long as it does not get into the cabin. For the want of funds, some decent research by eminent scientists goes undone. Everyone says that someone else is responsible. It is massive failure in the duty of care.

So who is to lead? No part of the Chicago Convention, which regulates aviation, requires countries to regulate for health and comfort of passengers. Here in the UK we have the bizarre situation – as you will hear – that in one of the most safety critical environments, aviation, the remit of the HSE does not extend into looking into health. This is not a case of deregulation; it is a case of no regulation.

I recognise from the previous debate that the HSE is itself struggling to deliver on its existing agenda and that more responsibility is probably the last thing that it wants, but if not you then who? In BALPA we are part of a small group of organisations and individuals that are saying that action is needed. We have launched our own campaign and you can find details and watch video clips on our website, BALPA.org. Our aim is not scaremongering; it is to improve reporting by crew of incidents so that we have reliable data and can make the right decisions based on facts.

However, BALPA is but one voice and getting the various groups to put pressure on decision-makers is beyond our resources. That is why we are asking for your support, so that the TUC can take action, because the TUC is at its best when it brings together those working in isolation, best when it acts as a catalyst to challenge inertia and indifference, best when it does not accept at face value the reassuring noises of industry.

Congress, we ask for your support for this motion to help us improve environmental health in aviation to the same standard as aviation safety.

**Dave Reed** (*Transport and General Workers Union*) seconding Motion 91 said: Firstly, as a British Airways worker I would like to thank all delegates and trades unionists for the outstanding support shown to our members in the T&G and our comrades in Amicus and the GMB in our recent British Airways dispute. As our General Secretary says, if we fight back we may not always win; but if we do not fight we will surely lose. We fought back, we won and we thank you.

Secondly, if you had come to this Congress in the 1970s the chances are that few delegates would have flown in a 'plane. Today, many of you here have flown. Air travel is no longer the preserve of the rich; it is for every person. While air travel has grown dramatically, safety is of paramount importance.



Whilst the safety record in aviation is an enviable one, there is no room for complacency. That is why the T&G is seconding this motion, because when it comes to people working and travelling on a plane, moving at 500 miles an hour, at 30,000 feet, the number one most important issue of course is that of health and safety. For example, take the impact of poor quality recycled air in aircraft cabins. Our government must give a lead by commissioning independent research to establish the medical facts and to improve ventilation systems.

We need to end the blurred lines of responsibility that exist between the HSE for our ports and ground workers and the CAA for our people working in the air. We must develop as a matter of urgency ways of working to support and address the problems associated with stress, workload, long hours and fatigue.

We want to reduce the weight limit on each bag to a more reasonable level, and we seek your understanding there. We want our check-in and customer service members to be able to work without fear of verbal and physical assault. We seek your support and understanding on that.

We do not want you to board a 'plane unless the pilot is properly certified. Cabin crew are also vital to safety and security. We call for cabin crew in Europe to be properly certified. I am sure the public would welcome that.

Air travel is essential for our economic future. It has opened up new horizons for travel for ordinary people. It has brought communities together. Passengers deserve to travel in a comfortable, safe and healthy environment and our members deserve the same.

Therefore, let us ensure that this crucial industry remains a safe industry. Support Motion 91.

**The President:** The General Council supports Motion 91.

\* *Motion 91 was CARRIED*

### **Safety and preservation of theatres**

**Barbara White** (*Musicians Union*) moved Motion 92.

She said: It is more than 90 years since the Theatre and Public Halls Act was introduced in 1908. Its principal objective was to exercise control over, and improve, the condition of theatres and licensed halls for the purpose of ensuring the safety and convenience of the public. I must admit that most of the provisions of the Act have been repealed.

You will remember that the 1908 Act concentrated on safety and convenience. What convenience? In countless towns around Britain audiences still sit in uncomfortable seats and spend the interval in queues for the toilet or crushed in a bar. Theatre-going in Victorian and Edwardian times was a very popular pastime, attracting all sections of the population, but the buildings reflected the class structure and social divisions of the period. As only about one-quarter of the audiences entered through the front door and the foyers, bars and toilets were planned with this in mind.

One of the most frequent complaints from the public relate to seats with inadequate leg room. This is not surprising when you realise that the average height of people 100 years ago was four inches less than today.

Once again, we come back to that word 'convenience'. The Theatre Trust's most recent survey states that 65 per cent of theatres would benefit from more women's toilets. From the queues that I have seen, and been involved in, I would say more like 100 per cent.

We must not forget the less able-bodied and wheelchair users. Access presents particular problems, with 48 per cent of theatres having totally inadequate provision for patrons in wheelchairs.

Meanwhile, back at the ranch, performers continue to work in conditions that long ago would have been condemned in most other professions. Dressing rooms and spaces for technical staff often exhibit conditions that would not be tolerated in any other industry. These theatres were simply not designed for the paraphernalia of modern lighting and sound equipment, or for the weight and size of modern scenery, or for today's rigorous standards relating to health and safety. It goes without saying that entertainment unions give safety the green light and danger the red.

What would it cost to make things better? The figure of £250 million would give fairly radical remodelling in those buildings that are least satisfactory. When we think of this figure we must also remember not only the cultural importance of the West End theatre but the fact that it generates ticket sales of £246 million a year. The total direct spending attributed to the West End theatre industry was £700 million, with a further £350 million in indirect spending. This level of economic activity contributed tax revenues to central government of at least £200 million a year.

Without investment the prospects are bleak. Theatre audiences cannot be expected to tolerate indefinitely conditions that reflect theatre-going 100 years ago. In the minds of most people, the National Lottery might seem the most obvious potential for such a programme. Although there is nothing in the regulations to prevent these theatres applying to the National Lottery, applications to Arts Council England have been rebuffed and it is clear that the Council has never regarded commercial theatres as one of its priorities. The present owners of theatres are currently spending around £6 million a year on their theatres, or £150 per seat across the West End theatres as a whole.

The VAT on West End ticket sales recouped by the Treasury now amounts to over £48 million per annum, nearly three times the amount needed annually to refurbish these theatres. We cannot afford, nor do we have the option, to rebuild theatre land. Most subsidised theatres have now been refurbished with money from the National Lottery, creating a marked imbalance between the two sectors. There is now very little alternative other than to look to government to secure a solution.

As an inheritance, theatre land is the envy of the world. Those responsible are determined to play their part to invest in it and to help maximise its potential. We need to act now.

**Graham Lester George** (*The Writers Guild of Great Britain*) supporting Motion 92 said: London's West End theatres are part of its identity. I could say all the usual stuff about culture and heritage, but it is more than that; it is about a city's personality. Paris expresses

itself in the boulevards and in the pavement cafes; Berlin with its dynamism and the old and new vying for attention; Rome with its piazzas, fountains and antiquity around every corner that says "Hey, this is where it all got going". But London is famous all over the world for its theatres. Those theatres are rightly known both for what they house, the best drama and best entertainment productions anywhere, and for their unique interiors that lend that special atmosphere that is West End theatre.

Unfortunately, many of them are crumbling or in danger of crumbling. Often it is not at the front of house where the problem lies; but backstage, cramped and often hazardous spaces strewn with ropes and timber supports, electrical cables and other paraphernalia. It is where all the invisible, magical work is done to create the illusion out front that the actors are in a park, up a mountain or just in an urban living room. But they are not good working conditions back there, although the workers – the carpenters, the electricians, the ASMs, the designers – tolerate the discomfort and inconveniences, and the dangers, because they are doing what they love to do: deliver their magic night after night.

But this is the 21<sup>st</sup> century and we cannot continue to ignore the health and safety problems that beset these venerated and venerable theatres. They are magnets for tens of thousands of visitors from all over the world, bringing millions of pounds to the economy of this country, but so far without access to Lottery cash. They are in danger of becoming unworkable, in danger of subsiding into darkness, thereby depriving the West End of its unique beating heart and those visitors of a reason to come.

I therefore ask you to support Motion 92.

**The President:** The General Council supports the motion.

\* *Motion 92 was CARRIED*

### **Bullying and Harassment**

**Carol Machan** (*British Dietetic Association*) moved Motion 93. She said: Sadly the BDA over the last few years has recognised that bullying and harassment remain at an unacceptably high level within the NHS. As a small organisation we spend a large amount of our trade union resources advising, supporting and representing members who have experienced this serious workplace issue. I am aware, from reading reports and surveys carried out by other unions, that the prevalence of bullying and harassment remains high. We confirmed this as a serious issue by doing our own survey of BDA members this year.

I am not going to describe the meaning of bullying and harassment, as everyone here is aware of the term. I just want to say the BDA have used these terms together to ensure that all possible perceptions of such actions are covered by this motion.

As trades unions, we have been involved in highlighting this issue with employers and campaigning to ensure that the issue is taken seriously. In the NHS there are now policies that we are advised by senior management are taken seriously and that they are there to protect employees. However, the reality of this problem is that it is often ignored and made more difficult to pursue. Even with glossy policies, with a clear approach to this and timescales

for how situations should be managed, individual employees do not get the support of their employer. My own experience confirms this. Supporting members through these bullying and harassment policies is a long and extended process with more hurdles than the Olympics.

I will just quickly describe one situation, which I think demonstrates that the NHS, whose policies say it is committed to eradicating bullying and harassment, clearly avoids doing anything about it. Last April a member working in the NHS came forward to us asking for help after a long period of bullying. This member had been working as a dietician for nine years in two different departments, having never been off sick and always enjoyed working and socialising with colleagues. After having a baby she changed to part-time work in another department. Coming to us about five months after starting this new employment, she had been off sick for almost one month. Worried about this, and about what happened to her at work, she was in despair. On hearing her situation we obviously agreed to support and represent her, and embarked on helping her work through her local policy. The NHS Trust assured me that they took bullying and harassment very seriously and that a thorough investigation would take place.

You might think that I am about to give you an outcome as it is now about 15 months since we started this process. No, having been shouted at, pulled and pushed, ignored in front of others, and singled out by this bully – which, I must tell you, was all witnessed, including a picture of our member placed on a notice board and people being encouraged to use it as a dartboard – we waited eight months even to hear whether the investigation had been completed or not. Now, after one year, we have a statement from the Trust saying "There may be some small element of behaviour which could be construed as harassment but not enough to do anything about it." The BDA are currently seeking legal advice, which again is not easy as you may know.

The legislation is not clear in this area and so we have been advised by our lawyers that results are often unsatisfactory. We come to you for help. Members, employees, should not be bullied at work and employers must take this issue seriously. As a small organisation, we seek General Council's advice and support. We believe the Government must consider and examine ways to extend legal protection for all victims of this endemic problem. Employers must take this issue seriously and, if evidence shows that they have failed to act, they must be forced to do so by adequate protection to victims under law.

It is bad enough having to go to work but what about being in fear of going to work, to be bullied at work, to be bullied in your workplace?

Please support.

**Peter Pendle** (*Association for College Management*): Bullying is not a new issue and it is a shame that two unions representing professionals in the public sector find it necessary to raise this matter today.

In seconding this motion, I wish to draw your attention to the types of problems we are facing in the public sector, and in further education in particular. I will give you an example of the serious effect that bullying can have on an individual and then outline

how the TUC can help us campaign for effective policies to tackle this problem.

Bullying is one of the most common reasons for ACM members to call our Help Line. The inescapable conclusion we must draw from this is that bullying, whatever the non-believers say, is a very serious issue. In further education, you will be relieved to hear that procedures to tackle bullying and deal with complaints are fairly common. Most colleges have bullying and harassment policies for employees. Sadly, though, the good practice often ends on paper.

We too have seen employers fail to accept that there is a problem, fail to use procedures that they have in place and fail to support the victims of workplace bullying. Yet the impact of bullying on an individual is surely reason enough to take every case seriously. Recently we helped a member in his late forties. He had a responsible, challenging job that he performed well. Then the bullying started. It was persistent; it gradually ate away at his confidence and his work suffered. Regular periods of sick leave turned into long-term sick leave. The stress caused by bullying turned into severe depression. So ill was our member that he would not answer the 'phone at home in case it was the college. He rarely went out in case he bumped into someone from work, and if he did he could not go anywhere near the college. Our member was a wreck, his work and working, family and social life destroyed by a bully, aided and abetted by a college employer who ignored all the danger signs.

The college lost a hard-working manager and it also had to pay him one-third of a million pounds in compensation after we lodged a personal injury claim – a small victory for a broken family.

This is a sad example of workplace bullying and it is precisely why we need your support for this motion. Through the TUC we need to press for better legal protection and we need to continue raising awareness of the serious impact that bullying can have on the workplace.

**Ann Robertson** (*Transport and General Workers Union*) speaking in support of Motion 93 said: NHS workers have the right to work without fear. In 2002 violence and aggression accounted for 40 per cent of all reported health and safety incidents in the NHS. The zero tolerance campaign was welcome but, as this motion points out, written procedures are one thing, real change on the ground is another. NHS Trusts are not meeting their targets in reducing violence. This is an urgent problem, not just for NHS workers like me but for patients too. All research shows that violence and aggression leads to staff sickness, resignation and demotivation. Tackling this problem must be central to the Government's plan to rebuild the NHS. The Government must send out a clear message that anyone who is violent towards an NHS worker will be subject to the full force of the law. Employers who do not take this problem seriously must be held to account.

At the National Policy Forum we made progress. The Labour Party made a commitment to encourage the use of Antisocial Behaviour Orders against people who abused public sector workers. However, we cannot afford to wait for a third Labour term; we need action now. Official figures show that hundreds of NHS workers are assaulted very day, and not all incidents are reported. NHS workers care for everyone

else; now we need you to care for us. Please support this motion.

**Pat Dwan** (*UNISON*) speaking in support of Motion 93. I say without fear of contradiction that there are employers out there who should carry a government health warning. Bullying and harassment, I am sorry to say, is not confined to the NHS but can be found in the majority of our workplaces today.

I work for an NHS Trust in Wales where recently, following input from the Royal College of Nursing - dare I say it - UNISON and the British Medical Association, we closed down our cardiac unit for one week and we dealt specifically with issues that are contained within this motion.

Many employers, when faced with bullying and harassment issues, do not know how to handle them; their policies do not go far enough, they are too weak. Their first port of call is to the union rep. They call her or him in and they use them to dig the employer out of the mire. We have, in the NHS, as my colleague just said, a zero tolerance policy on violence to staff. But this policy is mainly used against service users-patients. It does not go far enough. This policy should apply to the bullies and harassers who are actually employed by the NHS. The other procedure that they can use is prosecution, but they very rarely use that.

A clear message should go from here today, not only to NHS Trusts, but to all employers and the Government. My union, UNISON, and all other unions are watching and waiting. We are willing to act on behalf of our members. You need to sit down with us; we will help you rewrite your policies and they will be far more effective.

The protection of our staff is a right. We need it; we need it now. The policies have to be rewritten and rewritten in our favour. Please support Motion 93.

**The President:** The motion is supported by the General Council.

\* *Motion 93 was CARRIED*

### Campaigns

**Owen Coop** (*Graphical, Paper and Media Union*) speaking to paragraph 9.2 said: I would like to refer in particular to the bullet point on migrant workers. The GPMU welcomes the work already undertaken by the General Council concerning the safe working conditions of migrant workers. We would, however, like the TUC to consider broadening their work to encompass the more general issues of agency workers and, more particularly, those relating to health and safety. We, the GPMU, see agency workers increasingly in large printers undertaking magazine and catalogue work. In practice, those agency workers have limited health and safety rights. They often lose out on basic induction training and personal protective equipment. They can unwittingly undermine existing health and safety arrangements for permanent workers. Of course, some employers see agency workers as cheap labour.

We need clear guidance on health and safety to ensure employers and agencies meet their duties towards agency workers. Our experience tells us that agency workers' rights and protection fall down a big hole between the employers and the agencies, even though we, as a union, do what we can. Agency

workers need protecting in relation to health and safety. We therefore call on the General Council to look into this further and to press the TUC representatives on the Health and Safety Commission to keep up the pressure on protecting agency workers and migrant workers.

We ask for the General Council's support in this matter.

**The President:** We will certainly take that into account in our work. Thank you.

**Terry Britton** (*Transport & General Workers Union*) speaking to paragraph 9.2 said: I would like to spend a few moments on paragraph 9.2, particularly in relation to asbestos. I have heard all the speakers this morning and asbestos has not been touched on once. We all know what asbestos is, but few of us know what asbestosis is. That is a related disease from asbestos. It is a nasty disease. It can fester in your body. One fibre can fester in your body and be thirty years before it shows its head. You forget where you got it from. It comes down to one of the related body diseases.

What I would like to say is: why do we have seven lines in the middle of a General Council Report on the biggest single industrial killer that has ever been known? It should be one of the motions that is top of the Agenda. Okay, there is a committee dealing with it but in my own union I intend to push this, and I fully intend it to be on the agenda from the Transport & General Workers Union at the next TUC Congress. It is a nasty disease; it does not want sweeping under the carpet. If you sweep it under the carpet you do so at your own peril. Please do not do that. As I say, it is the biggest industrial killer. Morrish & Co. have a fact sheet on their stand downstairs. I am not on commission for this! The fact sheet tells you some of the signs to look out for.

You might not have worked in an asbestos-related industry; textile workers who I represent have done. We had a case not so long ago where thirty years ago there was a big weaving factory. The roof caved in and a lot of these people now have either died -- we have found out since -- or are dying. We are taking court action against this company. It does not matter what industry you work in. You might have members who have been in contact with asbestos. I would like you to join us the next time the TUC comes here, whichever union you represent, in getting this on the agenda and getting it to the top of the agenda.

**The President:** I can assure you that asbestos and asbestos-related diseases form a central part of the TUC's health and safety work. We liaise with affiliated unions on it and we will continue to.

**Address by Zwelinzima Vavi, General Secretary of COSATU.**

**The President:** Earlier this morning in her address from the Labour Party, Mary Turner referred to the days when Mrs Thatcher supported apartheid and the apartheid oppressive regime in South Africa. She did make a plea that democratic South Africa treats her son fairly in its judicial process currently under way. I am sure that Congress all agrees that he deserves a fair trial and a fair punishment. (*Laughter and applause*)

As one of the early founders of Anti-Apartheid, I remember the trade union campaign which was

founded to oppose Mrs Thatcher's attitude to apartheid. It resulted in a complete and utter victory, a resounding achievement, and this year is the tenth anniversary of the end of apartheid and the creation of a new and democratic South Africa. We should remember that trade unions were central to that tremendous achievement. Trade unions in Britain were in the forefront of the campaign against apartheid, but even more central for the trade unions and the people of South Africa itself. I am immensely and enormously pleased to have Zwelinzima Vavi, the General Secretary of the Congress of South African Trade Unions here today. Comrade Vavi, welcome to Congress. We celebrate your ten years of freedom. The floor is yours.

**Zwelinzima Vavi** (*General Secretary, COSATU*): Do you remember that on the streets of London as part of the world movement in opposition to the Apartheid system and as part of the anti-Apartheid movement we had our most active friends in Great Britain?

President, General Secretary, comrades, delegates and friends to this Congress, democracy brought a huge increase in political power in labour rights and social and economic opportunities for black people, including workers and women. It fundamentally improved conditions for the majority of our people. We saw improvements in pay and conditions for lower level African workers, especially in the first few years of democracy. Blacks and women benefited from laws banning discrimination and improving basic conditions of employment. They also gained much greater access to education and skills development. Workers also benefited from the extension of government services to African communities. As such, the AUC led democratic movement used access to state power to begin to unravel the legality of apartheid. Still the state pursued a contradictory strategy. On the one hand, it provided basic services to the people and changed the apartheid labour market. On the other hand, it relied heavily on conservative macro economic strategies.

The gains listed above have been offset by rising unemployment and the resulting fall in incomes for the poorer households: slow growth and low investment levels. To the extent that the economy has created jobs at all, they have been low-level insecure and very poorly paid jobs. The average income from work declined sharply between 1995 and 2001. Essentially, the first decade of freedom has meant the attainment of political power and not the total control of the state. Whilst the ANC is the leading party in government, the old style bureaucrats, the reactionary consultants and advisers even from the IMF and World Bank have to, an extent, usurped political formulation in critical areas. On its part, the democratic movement has weakened its capacity to formulate and develop policy whilst the tripartite alliance is largely marginalised from policy making. Fundamentally, economic power remains firmly in the hands of white capital centred in mining and finance.

Unless the economy is restructured significantly, it will be very hard to realise the goals of our struggle to build a non-racial, non-sexist and prosperous South Africa. We also noted the process of class formation taking place in our society. Whilst the ruling class remains largely white and centred in mining and finance, we begin to see the emergence of a small black bourgeoisie. The working class has also been restructured with the job losses and expansion in the informal sector. Capital strives for short term gains, and profits have resulted in new forms of insecure and poorly paid low quality jobs.

The overall aim of our political strategy, therefore, in this context is to use the workingclass hegemony of society to counteract the power of capital. To that extent we seek to combine the state and social power in a way that consistently tilts the balance of power in favour of workers and their families. Freedom must bring tangible and real benefits to the poor. The complex changes facing the working class demand a long-term vision to build a strong trade union movement and to assert the working class leadership. The march to our long-term vision demands patience, resilience and bold thinking, foresight and visionary leadership.

COSATU in its recent Congress held in September of last year adopted a medium to long-term vision which is called the 2015 plan. That plan defines priorities. It defines the benchmarks and core strategies for taking forward our initial democratic revolution. The two central pillars of our strategy are to build the working class power and ensure quality jobs. These twin tasks must be linked to reinforce one another. Engagements at the policy level must support organisational development. Our vision is shaped by benchmarks that I am going to mention.

Firstly, the systematic and rigorous implementation of the organisation development programme that will ensure recruitment of workers into trade unions. We aim to reach a membership of four million by 2009, or by the time we go to our tenth Congress, from the current membership of 1.7 million. We are seeking to ensure that we build the trade union unity at least amongst the main centres in the country.

Secondly, I want to defend our political gains and space. In this regard, we want to build a stronger ANC and a stronger SACB. We do not need weaker alliance partners. For each election, we will have a balance sheet based on our vision of what was achieved, what still needs to be done and what have been our setbacks during this period. On that basis, we will develop a framework for what should constitute an electoral platform between the parties that form part of the tripartite alliance. This analysis will then be used to contribute towards development of the election manifesto. We have, in the past, established election teams to mobilise workers and voters during the entire election campaign. We want to continue to mobilise financial resources to implement our election plan, deepening the debates on all major challenges facing the working class and the workers, whilst at the same time playing a major role in delivering membership education and deepening the political consciousness of the working class on the ground. In that context, we are building a pool of cadres with deep organisational, political and ideological depth.

These programmes are designed to ensure that the working class provides a leadership of society within the ANC and key organs of the people's power. We seek to strengthen civil society especially the community-based organisations and ensure stronger involvement of our local structures in local government processes. We want to ensure a stronger role for the working class and black women in the public discourse. We want to ensure that clear measures are in place to reverse the rising unemployment, the poverty and the inequalities in the society. We want to ensure that the workers have a share in the national income. In this context, we want to increase the capacity of the affiliates to influence sectoral and workplace restructuring processes. We want to ensure that there is a stronger development and democratic state that

can ensure growth and a development strategy and ensures redistribution on the larger scale. We want to play our role to see the resurgence of the African trade union movement, because that is absolutely essential in relation to the dynamics that we continue to interact with at the national, continental and global level. We want to see a better co-ordinated and international policy that will contribute to the struggles to build a better world based on the equitable redistribution of resources and closing the growing gap between the rich and poor within and between nations.

In this regard we want to build stronger international trade unions and improve the co-ordination and unity of social movements as well as improve the co-ordination between progressive political parties, progressive governments, the civil society and the trade union movement, which must be strengthened into one solid block in order to demand a change in the global system. Success on this front can only be achieved if we succeed in strengthening the rule of the International Labour Organisation as well as transform the United Nations and its institutions, in particular the WTO, the IMF and the World Bank. We hope that in this path we shall be walking side by side with the TUC in realising all of the dreams that we have. Thank you very much for having us in this Congress. *(Applause)*

**The President:** Thank you very much, Zwelinzima. We wish all the best to the leadership and membership of the Congress of South African Trade Unions.

#### Care of elders

**Tony Kearns** (*Communication Workers Union*) moved Composite Motion 8. He said: I want to explain where composite came from. It was not a matter of the CWU just deciding it would be a nice idea to put forward a motion on the care of elders. The CWU has 22,000 retired members amongst its number, and it has a Retired Members Conference. The majority of this proposition was drawn up by the Retired Members' Advisory Committee of the CWU, placed before a retired members conference and carried, and then placed before the CWU general conference and carried there as union policy. So the issues that this proposition deals with come from those to whom it matters – the retired members.

If you look at the composite motion it talks about campaigns, engaging retired members, direct contact with MPs and of active opposition to the closure of nursing and residential homes. More importantly, it backs the position of the National Pensioners Convention. So why have we put this demand before you and why do we have this need? It is because the treatment of the elderly in this society is nothing short of a disgrace. We kid ourselves if we think we live in a civilised society when we have the levels of pensioner poverty that we do. Two-and-a-half million pensioners need income support. The Government's own figures show that 27 per cent of pensioners in this country live below the poverty line. During the debate yesterday on pensions, we heard about remuneration for pensioners in society, but that is only half the issue. It is a vital starting point, but that is not all that matters. If we want to call ourselves a civilised society, it is an absolute disgrace that last year more than 70,000 elderly people had to sell their homes to provide long-term residential and personal care for themselves. Why is that?

The position in Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales is that some improvements have been made in the funding of personal care in residential homes. But

those people in England needing personal and residential care face means testing. They face bills running into thousands of pounds. Those elderly members who do not meet those criteria find that their money runs out long before the care ends. So we have a situation where people have given their lives to producing the wealth of the fourth richest economy on this planet end their days with a loss of independence, a loss of dignity and a loss of the right of choice, and it happens at the most vulnerable time in their lives.

Means testing degrades and impoverishes the whole of our society. It is a disgrace and it has to end.

The question is how does it end? It ends with the carrying, in a fashion, of Composite Motion 8. It ends by our campaigning vigorously for the full implementation of the Sutherland Report, a Royal Commission that reported in 1999. It had 24 recommendations, the majority of which have been carried into law by the Government but not the issue of long-term residential and personal care for the elderly in society. That needs to be tackled. It encourages retired workers to become active participants in pensioner forums, the very forums that affect their daily lives. We have to press our local MPs to continue opposition to foundation hospitals, which will inevitably lead to the privatisation of the NHS.

The issue of care and nursing is part and parcel of the Government's move away from the model of the NHS, providing public sector orientated health, in favour of the competitive and commercial market.

If you visit the UNISON website there is some excellent material about the campaign against foundation hospitals. I urge everyone to read it. We ask Congress to oppose the closure of nursing and residential homes for the elderly through active campaigns. As I said earlier on, more importantly, we should be publicising the campaigns, rallies and activities organised by the National Pensioners' Convention.

The National Pensioners' Convention are fighting for the provision of all health care and treatment and aids to support day to day living to be provided without delay free of charge. Furthermore, pensioners on discharge from hospital should, where appropriate, be resettled in their own homes with the necessary medical and social care. A number of other points were raised at the National Pensioners' Convention.

This motion is based on the true traditions of this movement. It sets out demands; it identifies targets; it engages with those affected and supports by direct action those groups leading this fight.

We have heard a number of references in the past couple of days to the agreements made in Warwick and the future manifesto of the next Labour Government. However, there is another manifesto to *this* one, which is the Pensioners' Manifesto. It only costs you a pound if you buy it in the stall just outside this hall. It gives a comprehensive way of dealing with the elderly in our society. As we run-up to the general election, *this* document will grow in prominence. There are 11 million elderly in our society. We need to support the NPC in its campaigns and activities around this document, and we need to support long-term personal care for the elderly in our society before we can call ourselves a civilised society.

**Anne Duffy** (*Community and District Nursing Association*): CDNA supports all care of our elderly population. We support and applaud all those who have actually given us our National Health Service that we have come to know today. We continue to campaign against all issues around elder abuse, which we see on our day-to-day travels. We continue to campaign for proper health and social care for all our elders.

Community and district nurses are continually encountering elderly abuse when carrying out their everyday duties. We have identified the fact that our members feel unsupported, in particular around basic medication as a major concern. We support Composite 8.

**Myfanwy Manning** (*UNISON*) speaking in support of the composite motion said: I am speaking specifically to the issue of long-term care and deploring our Government's cynical and contrived separation of personal and nursing care which leads to the means testing that the mover of the composite spoke about.

Colleagues, would any one of you present today say, as our Government do, that people who cannot get out of bed without help, cannot walk, cannot feed themselves and cannot go to the toilet without help are unworthy of state provided care? In the UK we are proud of the equity that underpins our health service. When Tony Blair spoke about first-class public services available to all, he conveniently forgot to add, "except anybody needing long-term care". They are excluded. This is institutionalised discrimination against elderly people. These are attacks on chronic illness in old age and it is an insult to the architects of the welfare state who bequeathed to us a huge programme of reform, which gave us some social justice.

But what sort of social justice is it that forces old people, as you have just heard, to sell their homes, homes they have worked and saved for all of their lives? You really have to be there, colleagues, to know how heartbreaking this all is; to be ill, unable to cope, to need care and then to be stripped of your dignity, your savings and, finally, your home, to know that all hope has gone because even if you get better you have no home to return to. How dare our Government deprive our most vulnerable citizens of the most fundamental of all human rights – the right for their lives to be sustained without having to foot the bill! The Government have crossed the Rubicon on this issue, colleagues, and have created the mother of all health inequalities. UNISON will not stand by and see this happen, and that is why we have set up the Right to Care Campaign, which is a coalition of 17 organisations campaigning for all nursing and personal care to be free across the UK, just as it is in Scotland where, to their immense credit, the Scottish Parliament voted to provide funding for long-term care.

This is an issue that will touch the lives of everyone of you in this room. If it is not yourself it will be someone you love. I want to leave you with one thought, and it is this. If our movement is about anything, it is about caring for people who cannot fight for themselves, who are too vulnerable to fight their corner. That is why we need everybody in this room to join the Right to Care Campaign, to fight for these people and to fight so that we win justice for them.

**The President:** Composite 8 is supported by the General Council.

\* *Composite Motion 8 was CARRIED.*

**Address by Pedro Ross, General Secretary of the CTC Cuba**

**The President:** Congress, this May Day I was in Havana, Cuba, taking part in the International Workers' Day celebrations, which have become a symbol of Cuba during the past 40 years. While I was there I told them what our TUC Congress agreed last year, that we are opposed to US aggression against Cuba, including the economic blockade, and we salute the magnificent international aid that Cuba and the Cuban people give to so many other states, especially in Africa.

While I was in Cuba we were able to discuss a memorandum of understanding between the TUC and the CTC, the Cuban National Trade Union Centre, which was subsequently endorsed by both organisations. Of course, there are some issues about which we have different perspectives with the CTC, but we have extended the hand of friendship to the Cuban Trade Union movement and I am extremely pleased that we have with us here the General Secretary of the Cuban TUC, Pedro Ross, and I now invite Pedro to Congress.

**Pedro Ross** (*Interpreted*): Comrade Roger Lyons, President of the TUC, dear brothers and sisters. On behalf of the Cuban workers, I would like to express my gratitude for the invitation to me to attend this Congress and to convey a brief message of greetings and solidarity.

We are responding to the growing expressions of friendship and solidarity shown by the British workers and trade unions towards my country, a country that for more than forty years has struggled in order to maintain its independence and sovereignty against the most powerful country that has ever existed in the annals of history – the United States of America.

You are all aware of the cruel and inhuman economic blockade; armed aggression; terrorist acts; and biological warfare, that have cost our people much material damage and thousands of human lives.

Dear brothers and sisters, you are also familiar with the fact that despite all of these aggressions and attempts to sway our people by the way of devastating hunger and diseases, we have been able to develop a social masterpiece unparalleled amongst under developed countries, such as our universal system of education, health and social security for all Cubans without exception, massive development of culture and sports, basic nourishment assured for all citizens and access to full employment that enables us today to exhibit unemployment figures that are below the level of three per cent.

The Cuban people believe in solidarity amongst workers of the world. More than 40,000 young people from impoverished Third World countries have completed their university and technical careers in Cuba by way of scholarships completely free of charge. Ten thousand poor youth from Latin America and the Caribbean are being trained as medical doctors in our country and once graduated they will return to their communities of origin to serve. More than 60,000

Cuban doctors have rendered their services in poor nations without receiving a single penny in return. At the very moment that I am speaking, 20,000 medical doctors and dentists are providing solidarity in 64 countries around the world.

Still Cuba is under a threat. The new Bush programme for Cuba has reinforced measures of economic blockade as well as new aggressions against our sovereignty. Millions of dollars have been destined for the development of subversion and counter-revolution in Cuba. Several of these millions have been assigned to create independent trade unions under the scope and protection of the US Interests Section in Havana, acting as stooges and servants of a foreign power. Their aim is to discredit the image of Cuba in the world arena, to regard Cuba as a nation that represses human rights and, therefore, prepares the world opinion and necessary condition for launching direct armed aggression against my country.

Cubans were profoundly convinced of what solidarity really means. We highly appreciate in all its magnitude the solidarity demonstrated by you during these years and especially the active participation of the British trade union movement towards the Cuba Solidarity Campaign, including trade unions such as UNISON and many other organisations in the UK. We also commend and appreciate the resolution of solidarity with Cuba presented by the Community and Youth Workers' Union during last year's Congress, which was unanimously endorsed by all.

We also value as well the courageous attitude of the TUC represented in the recently held ILO Conference in Geneva when understanding that acting against Cuba would only serve the interests of the Bush programme geared towards destroying the Cuban revolution and, thus, implant their domination upon the island. We are confident that the TUC and their affiliated unions will maintain their support for a just cause in order to prevent the giant from the north from having a pretext that would justify a military attack against Cuba.

Dear comrades, the forthcoming British trade union conference of solidarity with Cuba to take place in November is no doubt another example of the increase in support of the British trade union movement towards our cause. All the workers of the world are experiencing today difficult times. The economic policies implemented during the past 20 years have destroyed many of the historic achievements of workers during hundreds of years of hard struggle. Even in the most developed of countries there is sky-rocketing levels of unemployment, job uncertainty and large segments of marginalised people.

In the southern countries, unemployment, hunger and diseases, especially HIV AIDS, threaten to destroy entire nations. New wars of rapacity and conquest are killing thousands of men and women as well as inoffensive children. Yesterday, I recalled the disappearance of the opprobrious regime of apartheid in our system in South Africa. I remember that 30 years ago we were fighting together with our South African brothers in Angola. I was there for four years. The sacrifices in sweat, blood and human lives were not in vain. Colonialism, imperialism and modern slavery were defeated. Nelson Mandela, an icon of freedom and liberty, has said that apartheid would never have been defeated if not for the decisive contribution made by the Cuban people.

Brothers and sisters, Hurricane Ivan, which fortunately did not hit our country, has already gone away, but the hurricane which has lasted for more than 45 years, the infamous and criminal blockade imposed by the United States of America against my country, that permanently harms our elderly, our women, children and our nation as a whole is still in place. This hurricane has not bent the will of the Cuban people. We shall continue to endure with the support of all of you and we are sure that this hurricane will also disappear as apartheid did. All the workers of the world are experiencing today the need for solidarity amongst the workers for the purpose of building a world of peace and social justice for all.

Let us struggle for a better world that, without any doubt, is completely possible. Victory forever. Thank you. (*Applause amidst a standing ovation*)

**The President:** Thank you very much, Pedro. I can give an assurance that the General Council of the TUC will continue the dialogue based on the Memorandum of Understanding in building strong fraternal and sororal relations between our two centres.

#### Equality/human rights commission

**Mary Davis** (*NATFHE, The University and College Lecturers' Union*) moved Motion 12 on behalf of The Women's Conference. She said: This Government are embarking in the biggest change in our equality framework seen in 30 years. They call this a leap forward in the battle against discrimination. What they are proposing to do is to merge the three Equality Commissions together with the new commissions, the so-called "orphan strands", and add human rights to all of this but with no new legislative framework. I wish there was a Minister on the platform. They are never there when you want them. What we want to tell them is that this is at best a leap in the dark but at worse a tremendous leap back, and we must resist it. What is wrong?

What we have now is a mess, but not because the existing commissions are not any good but because the law is a mess. The current law has to be sorted out. It is piecemeal, complex and expensive to access. A basic trade union principle must always be that there must be no worsening of what we have already got. I can tell you, sisters and brothers, *this* is a major worsening. As far as women are concerned we do not want to be a strand in some big diversity melting pot where an unaccountable board can establish hierarchies of oppression in a flavour of the month approach to equality. Women are 50 per cent of the population and of the workforce. We want specific and specialised advice and action backed by stronger laws. I know that I am not speaking only on behalf of the Women's Committee or women in general, because I know that every single equality group is saying exactly the same thing. This Government must listen.

We have all had to submit our response to the White Paper called *Fairness for All – A New Commission for Equality and Human Rights*. The TUC response is that the White Paper will not advance the cause of equality and social justice, and it will not. There is far too much emphasis in this White Paper on the business case. We have to feel terribly sorry for business people who do not understand our complex laws and, as a result, this new Commission for Equality and Human Rights will spend almost all of its time on advising them.

What about the enforcement role? That is downplayed amazingly. We need a separate commission for human rights, anyway, but the point about this proposal is that it absolutely does nothing to resolve the crisis for those suffering discrimination at work. The composition of the Board itself is laughable. There are no guarantees for trade unionists with trade union experience serving on that Board or also with people serving on the equality groups. I think that PCS, which is seconding this motion, will say something about staffing.

I have to let you into this little secret. Jacqui Smith, who is the Deputy Minister for Women and Equality, told us at the Women's Conference, and I quote – I am sure this is absolutely accurate – "The Commission for Equality and Human Rights will need to be realistic about what it can achieve with finite resources given its widened remit over six strands". That really, really encourages us. This encourages us that this great leap forward is going to be something dramatically different in that it is going to be dramatically worse. There are many other things wrong in the composition of this commission. We need not to incorporate human rights. Human rights are important, but let us have a separate commission for them.

What we want is a commission with teeth, with separate sections for each equality strand, properly serviced and functioned. What we want is an equality law with teeth, covering public, private and voluntary sectors. What we want above all is for this commission to have strong enforcement powers and the ability to pursue claims which test the law. That is not what this commission is offering. That is why it is a great leap backwards.

We should end the attempt to put our equality agenda into the comfort zones of white male middle class England. This might suit the Government's electoral strategy but it does not suit our equality agenda. We want more and we deserve more. Every single equality group says the same. This Congress must give that message loud and clear. Apparently, no one at the moment is listening, but I am sure that Brendan you will convey this message very strongly. This matter must be taken up and fought for within your trade union movement. Otherwise we are going backwards rather than forwards.

**Sue Bond** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) in seconding the motion said: I am pleased and proud to second this motion because PCS believes that a single body as proposed is a recipe for failure for all the reasons that Mary has outlined. PCS has a particular interest in these proposals because we represent staff in the three existing equality commissions. Will you be surprised to hear that, despite the Prime Minister's pledge on Monday to consult with stakeholders and work with unions to help fashion change, that PCS has been denied a place on the interim steering group for this body? Clearly, the main recognised trade union that represents the workers who have been delivering equality for more than two decades is the wrong kind of stakeholder.

Our particular concern is the resourcing of this body, because the brutal efficiency savings demanded in Gordon Brown's Budget announcement will apply to the equality commissions, too. Already the Commission for Racial Equality is facing a 13 per cent cut, redundancies and the closure of their office in Leeds. Furthermore, ACAS, the only Government body that



advises on sexual orientation, religion and belief, faces a 15 per cent cut. That is one reality of Gordon Brown's cuts.

The Government are silent on the funding for this new body. Do they see it as a cost-cutting exercise. We not only have to fight for strong enforcement tools to tackle discrimination. We must also fight for the staff and the resources to use them, ring-fenced for each area of discrimination. You cannot achieve equality on the cheap. Investigations and enforcement costs money and you cannot put a price tag on equal rights. Without proper resources, this champion of diversity, as Patricia Hewitt calls it, will come into existence with one hand tied behind its back. Without enough staff the enforcement tools it is given to crack down on discrimination will remain gift wrapped on the shelf unused. It will be a watchdog without teeth, a whisper not a clarion call for equal rights under the law and that doorway to justice for so many of the oppressed, unequal and the vulnerable will stay closed. The Government's bright shiny promise of a fairer, more inclusive Britain will fall broken in bits to the floor with the others. Do not let that happen. Please support this motion.

**Stewart Brown** (*Fire Brigades Union*): My union is speaking in support of Motion 12, submitted from the TUC Women's Conference.

Is it the intention of this Government to continue to introduce legislation that drives us towards equality across the whole of society when, maybe, they think or believe that is what they are doing, but quite clearly from a trade union point of view it is being done incorrectly, and they seem to be getting things done back to front. How else do you explain the bringing together of the three existing commissions and the tag on of human rights? Coupled with new legislation, the proposals before us are absolutely mad, to say the least. So what are the proposals and why are we so concerned about the approach taken?

The legislation introduced last year was the Equality, Employment, Sexual Orientation Regulations, which gave gay men and lesbians protection in the workplace at long last, but, and this is a very big 'but', along with legislation introduced for age and religion, the legislation does not extend to goods and services. Therefore, it is not equal.

The situation is quite simple. We do not have equality now, we have never had it and now we get the chance to make things equal it is not even close. We now have proposals after lengthy consultation, which the Government, obviously, never paid too much attention to have a new single equality commission. That is great news and welcome news, but the catch is that we have equal rights attached. This development is not welcomed, and we foresee many problems with the idea, one of which is the budget for the new Commission, which no doubt will be swallowed up with cases concerning human rights. Therefore, it will dilute the cash required for the six other strands.

We in the Fire Brigades' Union believe that for the Commission to work properly we need to be answering some important and essential points. There is a need to move towards harmonisation and simplification of legislation. As the way it stands today, some strands are more powerful than others, especially in relation to discrimination regarding goods and services.

The new six strands represent particularly discriminated groups, which must work together but also need to be distinctly different to enable them to work with their respective groups and individual problems. The trade union movement demands representation amongst the Commissioners to enable us to feed our knowledge into the Commission and to allow us direct access to our members' needs.

Congress, we are due to go back to our unions and get on the lobby trail to see if we can influence the direction of this equality legislation. The Government have not listened. It is too important an issue that affects the majority of us, as we get older. Remember, age discrimination will affect us all. Please do not give up on the fight that we have in front of us. The single Equality Commission needs to be fully supported, fully funded, fully staffed and fully understood before the removal of the current provisions. This needs not be a quick fix. This needs to be right.

**Lesley Mansell** (*Amicus*): Congress, the White Paper is substantial. It contains 90 pages but the content is flimsy. The Government argues that important benefits are a cost-cutting approach, with single access points, it will tackle discrimination on multiple grounds and an improvement of delivery to public services. All this will come from a single commission. It is all very laudable. The Amicus response shows a number of flaws. We need a level playingfield. The duty to promote is a positive move, but all organisations should be vicariously liable in all strands of equality, not just on race.

This duty is the exception to current legislation, which itself is complex, piecemeal, expensive and mainly harmless. We have an Alice Through the Looking Glass reality on equal pay, which took 34 years of running largely to stay in the same place, yet to discriminate on pay is illegal.

Without a single Act we set a foundation for hierarchical oppression where any gains could be subsumed as lawyers argued away from diversity and towards large sums of compensation. The potential for the weaker regulations is to keep the issue of sexuality, religion and belief invisible. The forces of homophobia are too entrenched to be dealt with in the way suggested, i.e., by producing a few leaflets.

The multiple oppression argument is positive. The White Paper fails to recognise that equalities work is about changes in management. It would be a real agenda for change if we had a single Diversity Act, which encompasses class action. That would make a difference.

As to the Government's argument against a single Commission – I must quote the argument – it would be "a failure to benefit from the economies and scales and synergies arising from a single organisation, including the promotion of good practice on equality and diversity to employers and service providers". So it would not be realised. I think this means a cost-cutting exercise. The Government cannot afford to stop discrimination, like it cannot afford jobs for civil servants. It cannot afford to save manufacturing industry. It cannot afford a National Health Service, but it can afford a war in Iraq.

I urge you to put your collective weight behind the TUC, campaigning to bring in effective legislation to eradicate discrimination to mainstream equality and

diversity for resources and funding to develop a positive mechanism to drive this matter through.

\* *Motion 12 was CARRIED*

### Parents, carers and work/life balance

**John Hannett** (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*) moved Composite Motion 4. He said: I welcome the opportunity to move this composite; a composite that deals with perhaps one of the most important issues confronting millions of working people today, and not just them, but the success of British business and the future of the economy as a whole. I am talking about parents and carers and their working hours.

The facts speak for themselves. Across the UK, there are more than 12 million parents of dependent children. Parents accounted for almost 40 per cent of the entire workforce. There are also at least seven million carers. It is a fact that at some point in our lives we each spend time caring for children or for parents or for relatives or friends. That is the reality. In truth, most of us will probably need someone to care for us in turn.

This agenda, the work/life balance, the family-friendly agenda, is vital for working people and their families. There is no question that the Government have already made some real progress by increasing maternity pay and leave, introducing paternity leave, adoption leave and pay and implementing the right to request flexible working.

However, we also need to press the Government to build on those strong foundations if our members are really going to feel the difference, and our women members in particular. Women members make up nearly half of today's workforce and 58 per cent of women with a child under the age of 5 are in work, rising to 78 per cent of women with children aged between 6 and 13. Despite more and more women entering the world of work, they continue to shoulder the main responsibility for caring.

Last year, my union, USDAW, published the results of a survey. We asked over 7,000 of our activists for their views on what parents and carers really want and need. They told us about the problems they are coping with as parents and carers in the 21st century. Two-thirds of them agreed that their main concern was getting paid time off when the children were ill.

The statutory right to unpaid parental leave does not amount to much for low paid predominantly women workers. It is not just because parents do not know about it; they just cannot afford to take it. Nationally, the take-up is as low as 3 per cent.

This is a vital right that has to get off the paper it is written on and into people's lives for real. It would transform the working and family lives of millions of our people and help to reduce sickness absence levels. It helps businesses manage effectively and it helps employers to recruit and to retain staff. At the same time, to extend maternity pay from 26 weeks to 52 weeks is also important.

We must congratulate the Government on their decision to increase significantly the amount of maternity pay. It is the biggest increase since maternity pay was first introduced in 1948. We also welcome the extension of the period of paid leave from 18 to 26

weeks, but we urge the Government not to lose the momentum here. Opinion polls consistently confirm that women want to take their full 52-week maternity leave entitlement. Such an additional paid maternity leave period would make the situation a reality for women.

The timing could not be better; a general election around the corner and the votes of millions of working parents are up for grabs. A recent poll published in *The Guardian* confirmed that a clear majority of the electorate, 61 per cent in fact, felt that parents of young families spent too much time at work.

We urge the Government to rise to the challenge and reap the benefit of doing so at the ballot box. It is fair, it is right, it is a sound business case and there is huge political capital to be gained. Please support.

**Ruth Jones** (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*) seconding Composite Motion 4 said: We all know that the current parental leave regulations give parents who have worked for their employer for at least a year a legal right to up to 13 weeks unpaid leave within the first five years of their child's life.

The introduction of unpaid parental leave was a useful first step, but after that first step, we now need to go on down the road and build on that step. The next step is paid parental leave. We, in the CSP, call on the TUC to press the Government for delivery on this. How many workers in the unions represented here today can afford to take even one week's unpaid leave, let alone 13? The research shows parents may have urgent reasons for taking parental leave, be it family breakdown, serious illness or injury, but these serious problems will only be exacerbated by the lack of money coming in.

I appreciate Tony Blair and Gordon Brown have young children. It is that good they could benefit from parental leave. I cannot help feeling that the loss of a couple weeks' pay would not jeopardise their family life nearly as much as a family in the South Wales valleys relying on a single, low paid worker's wage.

I enjoyed the story on Monday about a TUC president leading the under 5s dancing down Downing Street lobbying for parental leave. I suggest, Roger, next time after you shout, "What do we want?" you get the children to reply, "Paid parental leave"!

While we are talking about improving basic parental leave rights, what about extending the length of time in which parental leave can be taken? I do not know about you, but I was fortunate in that I did not need time off to deal with my kids when they were little. It is now they are older. Now after-school care and holiday clubs are expensive and difficult to find. It is now my kids are experimenting with climbing trees, rollerblading and skateboarding. It is now at work I get the call from school to say, "Don't worry, Mrs. Jones. Your son is fine. He bounced as he fell, but if you could come along to A&E, you will find him in X-ray." It is now I need parental leave!

Let me briefly touch on the equal pay situation or, should I say, the unequal pay situation. We all know that the gap between male and female earnings remains, but let us think about the individual people involved. For individual women, the consequences of unequal pay are personal poverty, social exclusion,

child poverty, inability to build up adequate pension provision and the inability to invest in personal training and life-long learning.

We know some good companies have voluntarily undertaken pay reviews. That is great, but we all know that most employers would much prefer to ignore the problem. The only way to get them to face up to the issue and overcome the pay gap is by making pay reviews compulsory. The Equal Opportunities Commission task force recommends mandatory pay reviews. Our union agrees. I know you agree; so please show this by supporting the motion.

**Lesley Ann Baxter** (*British Orthoptic Society*) supporting Composite 4 said: If only increasing maternity leave were as simple as celebrating motherhood. Increasing paid maternity leave to 12 months is great news for children and parents. In line with a previous speaker, as our President said on Monday, and as Lucy's story of him with a group of five year-olds demanding parental leave shows, we all believe parents have the right to stay at home with their children.

However, many mothers still have to return to work sooner than they would want because their families need the income. It is no good extending maternity leave provision if mothers cannot take it because they have to pay the mortgage. Fathers also have limited rights and in many cases have very little or inflexible paternity leave.

The Prime Minister said the Government had improved maternity rights, and maternity-leave entitlement is higher in Britain than in most other European countries, but the amount of maternity pay in Britain is amongst the lowest throughout the EU. In Sweden, parents receive 480 days' paid leave that can be shared between both parents before the child is eight years old with one month's paid leave dedicated to each parent.

Parents must be given support to be able to make genuine choices about how to balance work and family responsibilities. We need to increase paternity leave that can be taken in a flexible way. We need to introduce paid parental leave, which is targeted at both mothers and fathers and is in line with the Government's strategy to eradicate child poverty.

More must be done to ensure that the current rates of statutory maternity pay are high enough to mean that women on maternity leave are not earning less than the minimum wage. You know it makes sense. Please support.

**Paul Aburn** (*Unifi*) supporting the composite said: I would like to speak to a particular part of the composite, namely, the upward harmonisation of the parental rights of women and men.

The inequality in carer responsibilities has been identified by the EOC as one of the significant contributors to the pay gap currently sitting at 18 per cent with my own industrial sector, banking, holding the dubious honour of the largest differential at 43 per cent. The finance sector, of course, has a huge percentage of women workers, many of whom are forced to work part-time due to carer responsibilities.

The actual impact of this gap is two-fold. On the one hand, you have the money lost by mothers taking time out for child care duty, missed promotions, lower performance-related wage increases and bonuses, part-time work and the simple fact that maternity pay, as it stands, is of an unacceptably low level.

On the other hand, you have the outdated belief that women should not be promoted beyond a certain level, if at all, because they will, no doubt, need to take time out at some time in the future for child care, the so-called glass ceiling, or is it sticky floor, that is all too prevalent in far too many of our industries. Certainly, whatever you call it, I know that in my own industry women do not just hold up half the sky, they hold up almost all of it.

My sister has just had her first baby. The two weeks of paternity leave are now up. She has told me -- jokingly, I believe -- that she is quite glad her husband is no longer under foot. The truth is that my sister is now having to carry out the larger part of Matthew's upbringing. On the flip side, Kenny has complained that he is not getting as much of a chance as he would like to spend time with his child, especially at this early stage.

Harmonising the parental rights of mothers and fathers is essential if we are to give women and men equal rights. This is a concept that I believe is fundamental to any modern society. More than that, though, it would give out a clear signal to men and to our employers that, not only are fathers able to have the same participation in child care, but this is actually expected of them.

If we manage to achieve that, we will have taken a significant step towards eliminating one of the major contributing factors towards the pay gap. I know that we can afford this, again especially in my own industry where regular obscene profits filter into the pockets of male fat cats and not to the predominantly female workforce that created them.

**Kath Murphy** (*GMB*) supporting the composite said: Thirty-four years, half a lifetime after the Equal Pay Act, the workplace is still unequal and it is getting harder to balance the growing demands of work and family life.

We welcome the Labour Government's commitment to abolishing child poverty and improvements to parental benefits. We congratulate those unions that have successfully negotiated flexible working with employers, but much more is needed, because most of us still have little choice but to keep doing it all, and struggling on in jobs where we can request flexible working but have no right to get it. We can have parental leave but no pay for it.

Too many mothers feel forced to return to work before they are ready because they cannot survive on maternity pay of £102.80 a week. When those mothers are forced back to work, the problems do not go away. We need affordable and accessible child care so that working mothers know their children are safe and secure whilst they are at work.

Work/life balance on the current basis becomes a choice; a choice based on inequality of earnings as long as full-time working women continue to get 82 per

cent of the average male earnings and part-timers 60 per cent.

As for paternity leave, yes, it is welcomed, especially now that fathers play a greater role in child care, but, just like maternity pay, it is simply not enough. It is also inflexible and limited to one or two weeks. A child is for life, not a fortnight.

We, in the GMB, want to see working parents given help to care for their children when they need it most. We need to ensure a decent income for the first six months of a child's life, paid parental leave at the equivalent of a living wage, genuine flexible working so parents can balance work and family life, affordable and accessible child care and it should be compulsory for employers to address the inequalities in pay and for mandatory equal pay reviews.

These are the kinds of measures that will make the notion of work/life balance more than just words, Congress.

**Rose White** (*Graphical, Paper and Media Union*) supporting the composite said: We have achieved a considerable amount of progress with our campaigns for equality legislation. Although this is good news, it has to be seen in the context of the Government's desire for light touch regulations.

This means the effect of this raft of new and improved rights has not been as extensive as we would have wished. The motion goes some ways towards dealing with the flaws in the current system and we are happy to support it.

To make use of existing and future rights, we also need collective strength and organisation. We believe developing equality reps is the way forward. Existing reps may be reluctant to take on even bigger responsibilities and often see equality as a specialist subject. What we need are reps that are committed to equality issues and keen to spend the time it takes to stay up-to-date with new developments.

We need equality reps to ensure the issues are raised and that the profile of equality in the workplace is high. We already have a successful example of this work in the Disability Champions project run by Amicus. Equality reps would have a huge brief and would need training, but between the TUC and individual unions, this could be provided. The most important thing is to ensure they have the standing and facilities to do the job properly and assist their shop stewards in their specialist role. Campaigning to get equality reps the same standing as learning reps is, we believe, essential, especially given the success of learning reps.

Some people's concerns are that this would lead to equality issues being marginalised. Given that we have made little headway on local bargaining agenda to date, surely, it is a risk worth taking. We need our unions committed to developing the role of equality reps and to campaigning for legal rights. We can start the ball rolling by supporting this motion for effective equality legislation. Please support.

\* *Composite Motion 4 was CARRIED*

## Fair Deal for Women

**Jane Carolan** (*UNISON*) moved Motion 16. She said: Reading this week's edition of *Tribune* and the top 10 trade union leaders, I hope I am not the only person in the hall who looked at the name of Rose Boland and thought, who? I then read on and it stirred vague memories of the Dagenham women who took action on equal pay; proud women who took pride in their work; women who took industrial action to secure equal pay and whose efforts led to the Equal Pay Act of 1970. 1970 -- hopefully, there are people in this hall who were not born then!

However, nearly three generations later, in 2004, while we have had 30-odd years of equal pay legislation, we still do not have equal pay. So when Tony Blair talked about eradicating it in another generation, I have to say: "No. We have waited long enough."

To look at the press in this country, you would now think that equal pay battles are about whether female merchant bankers are equivalent to male merchant bankers, but that is not our reality. Our reality is that 40 per cent of women in Britain have an income of less than £100 a week. That is the cost of a dinner in some restaurants in Brighton.

Over a lifetime, a skilled woman will earn a quarter-of-a-million pounds less than a skilled man. The hourly rate for a female full-time worker will be 18 per cent less than her male counterpart. For a part-timer, the gap will be 40 per cent. Where the income gap exists, the pension gap falls. Poor women workers become even poorer women pensioners.

So why do women work part-time? It is because women have to match work around their other vital duties, such as caring for children, caring for elders, caring for those who require care in the community, and it is unpaid, of course. If you look at the figures for who actually does housework, it is predominantly done by women. Women have to look after grown men who cannot look after themselves, including male trade unionists. (*Cheers and applause*)

It might sound as though I am spelling out the obvious, but this movement pays lip service to the women's agenda. If it did not, we would not have waited so long for our most fundamental trade union right - a fair day's pay for a fair day's work.

I am proud that my union under Dave Prentis has made equal pay the central plank of the negotiating agenda. For too long public services in this country have exploited low paid women who perform the vital jobs that keep the services going, whether in the Health Service, where agenda for change is addressing the issue, or in local government.

Our motto, as a trade union, on equal pay has been educate, negotiate and litigate. Litigation, as we all know, is protracted, complicated and expensive. It needs simplifying and it needs speeding up. But while litigation on its own can provide individual claimants with redress, it fails to deal with the underlying unfairness within the pay system. Used strategically, it can provide the stick which encourages negotiations.

However, as a union, we also reject the actions of some unscrupulous hit and run 'no win no fee' lawyers, taking cases to make a hefty profit for themselves,

private firms whose actions are irresponsible and disruptive of good industrial relations.

Our preference is for a negotiated settlement based on objective justification of grading structures through job evaluation, securing settlements that provide compensation for historic discrimination. Within local government, we secured the single status agreement in the NJNC in 1997 and in Scotland in 1999. The fundamental requirement is that all councils audit their grading system to equality proof.

Several years later, progress has been slow. The main reason for the lack of progress is the resource issue. Quite simply, if women are to have equal pay, the employers need to fund it. Too often equal pay cannot be balanced with a need to maintain jobs and services. How often have we heard, "Yes, we will give you equal pay, but we will privatise the service."

Within public services, there needs to be a level playing field for women based on equal pay. The resources to provide it must be given by government. Investment in public services must be based on women's equality.

The Women at Work Commission do not need to commission another forest of research in statistics in women. They need to start with the lives of real women. We need a strategy for real rights for part-timers. We want mandatory equal pay audits. We need real flexibility that is paid and reflects women's lives. We need a pension system that works for women.

The women's agenda cannot be treated as the equivalent of the desirable but not quite essential decking on the patio or balcony; quite nice but not necessary. Frankly, the women's agenda should be the foundation and bedrock of all our work. We want progress. We want it now. Do not just support the motion -- organise.

**Diana Holland** (*Transport and General Workers Union*) seconding Motion 16 said: The press talk of us in terms of 'union barons', the 'awkward squad', the 'big four'. What they have ignored is the 'big 3 million', namely, women trade unionists. Women across our unions are agreed. We need a strong united trade union campaign for a fair deal for women.

Let me remind the movement that the women's agenda has not been completed. Women in Britain are paid a third less than men. That is the largest pay gap in Europe. How long do we have to wait? It was in 1888 -- yes, that is 1888 -- when this Congress first demanded equal pay.

At Warwick, we set up, and agreed to set up, the Women at Work Commission chaired by my predecessor at the T&G, Margaret Prosser. It will look at the pay gap, as has been said, and at mandatory equal pay audits and at the role of union equality reps. We need to ensure that this Commission is not another chance to measure the pay gap, but a final chance to close it.

We know women working night shifts get less pay enhancements than men. We know that term-time workers suffer an unjust pay gap that we must close. We have measured the pay gap in local authorities.

We just need the funding to close it. That is why unions are negotiating change.

This week we have expressed our support for fire fighters, engineers, miners and civil servants. I call on you now to express your solidarity with T&G home-workers at Industrial Rubber Limited in Portsmouth, some earning as little as 73 pence an hour, sacked simply for demanding the minimum wage. Let us support their fight for fairness.

Let me remind you, recent surveys show that 82 per cent of women have experienced sex discrimination at work. That is women here, our mothers, our sisters, our daughters and our granddaughters. It is all of us. If you are a black woman, a disabled woman, a lesbian, a single mother, you face double discrimination.

We all remember the bigoted comments of that UKIP MEP who said, just recently: "A woman's job is to have the man's dinner on the table and to clean behind the fridge." Clean behind the fridge? I know women who make fridges. I also know a few women who would like to drop a fridge on him from a great height! (*Applause and cheers*)

As we have often said, a woman's place is in her union. It is unions that can really make the difference. Women in unions get paid 25 per cent more. If you are suffering discrimination, it is the union that will stand up for you.

My daughter deserves more than women of my generation have had; so does my son. Equality belongs to us all, girls and boys, men and women. A new deal for women. A fair deal for women.

**Rachelle Wilkins** (*GMB*) in support of Motion 16 said: There has been some movement on such things as equal pay, flexible working, access to pensions and the work/life balance. However, we have still not moved far enough. On the issue of equal pay, there are still far too many unscrupulous employers who see women as the cheap option. This has to stop. If women do the same job for the same length of time, then they deserve the same pay.

These bad employers need to be pulled into line by compulsory pay audits. In some areas, we are still having to battle as hard to make progress as our sisters, the suffragettes did, in the 1900s. The wheels of change seem to move very slowly. It is usually women who take part-time work to be able to juggle home life and childcare, giving some employers the excuse for poor training and lack of career development. Why? Do they think that because we only work part-time, we only have half a brain?

We need to insist that the opportunities for good quality training are available for all. Since the legislation on flexible working has entered the arena, the number of women who have been able to access this type of work is still too small. Women need flexible working arrangements in practice, not on paper.

There has also been much debate this week on pensions. The GMB has been at the forefront of making sure that part-time women have access to occupational pension schemes. However, there is still much work to be done in the area, but we are at last winning the battle. Companies are now compensating

our members for not originally allowing them into the schemes.

In supporting this motion, it gives us the chance to demand that gender inequality is addressed by policy and that women finally get the fair deal they deserve. Please support the motion.

**Lorene Fabian** (*Amicus*) supporting the motion said: I also listened to the Prime Minister on Monday. When he started to list reforms that were to take place, I waited with baited breath, especially when he spoke of the gender pay gap. I thought: This is it. We have cracked it. He is going to say that we will have mandatory pay audits. It did not happen, did it?

I represent Amicus on the TUC Women's Committee who have campaigned tirelessly for a fairer deal for women. It is true there have been some improvements in this area, but it is not enough. Many of the points I make may have been made by previous speakers, may be made by subsequent speakers and may have been made at previous congresses. I do not care, because they have to be repeated time and time again until the powers that be listen.

Nineteen per cent is the official figure given as the pay gap, but that is not the whole picture. I am told by one of my sisters in Unifi that the figure in that sector is more like 43 per cent. This is in a sector that makes millions and millions of pounds profit every year. As Bob Crow said earlier, how dare these people say we do not need unions? What a disgrace!

How many reps sitting here in this conference hall have negotiated an equal pay audit? Unfortunately, if you have investigated the possibility, you will have found that with a few exceptions, employers do not do things voluntarily. If this Government is keen to support women in work, then they should practise what they preach and give us a structure that helps the process that would help close the gap.

We need to be able to take class action. This would help those women who work part-time. The casualisation of women only serves to heighten this disgraceful situation. Why, oh why, do we have in the UK, which I am told has a healthy economy, this huge pay gap? There is no sign of it narrowing.

Yesterday's pensioners' debate highlighted the crisis in pensions and poverty in old age. For women, it is far, far worse. You cannot save for your old age if you do not earn enough. You cannot pay into an occupational pension scheme -- that is if you have one -- if you do not earn enough. You can only expect poverty in your old age if you do not earn enough and you do not earn enough in a society with a gender pay gap.

A colleague of mine in the Amicus delegation has asked me to point out to the General Council, when taking on issues that affect workers with disabilities -- that is those disabled people lucky enough to have a job in the first place -- that we must demand of this Government mandatory pay audits because all workers will benefit.

We should campaign on this issue, just as we have campaigned in the past on issues such as apartheid, when we were, quite rightly, outraged by a section of society being denied their rights. The TUC Women's

Conference has highlighted the creeping feminisation of poverty within the UK. Job segregation and the gender pay gap is a big contributor to this situation. Let us get rid of it now, not in 10 years or 20 years.

**Jerry Bartlett** (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*) supporting the motion said: I address the demand included in the final paragraph, that the "Government ensures that initiatives to close the gender pay gap are fully funded, legally enforceable and address past inequalities".

One of the causes of the gender pay gap is the concentration of 60 per cent of women workers into the 10 lowest paid of the 77 occupational groups. There has now developed an additional contributory factor to this concentration. I refer to gender segregation in vocational education and modern apprenticeships.

The Equal Opportunities Commission has conducted a formal investigation. The Commission looked at five sectors, construction, plumbing, engineering, ICT and childcare. These are amongst the most gender segregated occupations in Britain and there has been little change in the past 30 years.

In construction, only one per cent of workers are female. This is replicated in the take-up of modern apprenticeships in the industry. In ICT, 30 per cent of IT operations technicians are female, but only 15 per cent of those in modern apprenticeships are. In engineering, 8 per cent of the workforce and 6 per cent of those in modern apprenticeships are female. In childcare, 97 per cent of modern apprenticeship take-up is female.

What of the gender pay gap in modern apprenticeships? Male-dominated modern apprenticeships pay twice as much as those where the take-up is predominantly female. The gender pay gap extends into vocational training.

What are the statutory agencies doing? The Learning and Skills Council has no targets and does not monitor in this area, despite a statutory duty to promote gender equality. The Equal Opportunities Commission has been openly critical of Connections for appearing to bolster up traditional gender segregation and for not providing full information, particularly about the low rates of pay in stereotyped women's jobs.

The Government target is for 28 per cent of young people to start a modern apprenticeship. The scheme is being extended to 14 year-olds. So these issues must be resolved if real progress is to be made. The initiative must, in the words of the motion, be fully funded, legally enforceable and address past inequalities. Initiatives towards the eradication of occupational gender stereotyping are an essential complement to the ongoing struggle against the undervaluing of work traditionally performed by women and for equal pay.

Please commit to working for a fair deal for women and support Motion 16.

\* *Motion 16 was CARRIED*

## Violence against Women

**Tom Harrison** (*Accord*) moved Motion 17. He said: I represent, along with Unifi, all trade union members within Halifax Bank of Scotland, and we are very proud to tell you that 70 per cent of our members are female.

I would like to start by asking you to imagine a world without violence against women and girls and to hold the thought of the possibilities that that would bring us all, men and women, throughout this plea for action.

Violence against women is a cancer eating away at the core of every society, every country in the world. The work to expose the prevalence of this cancer over the past 25 years has produced increasing evidence of its global magnitude, although it is clear that it is almost universally under-reported. The evidence shows that no political or economic system, culture or world religion is exempt when it comes to allowing and justifying violence against women.

It happens in public and in private, in peace and in war time and it takes many forms; women being killed by their husbands, infanticide, crimes of honour, rape, genital mutilation, sexual violence, prostitution and trafficking are just some of its more horrific manifestations.

This is a global human rights catastrophe. The Council of Europe has stated that domestic violence is the major cause of death and disability to women aged 16 to 44. Furthermore, the World Health Organisation has reported that up to 70 per cent of female murder victims are killed by their male partners.

The home is supposed to be a haven of safety and security, yet for many women and children it is a place of fear. In a survey in 2002, one in three teenage boys thought they may have to use violence in a future relationship. One girl in ten thought that was acceptable.

Is this why in the UK one in every four women will be a victim of domestic violence in her lifetime? Is that woman living next to you? Is that woman working next to you? Is that woman sitting next to you? Is that woman you? Is your union doing something?

At work, our membership is affected by sexual harassment, bullying, attacks on the way to and from work, frontline abuse from customers and, in some of the caring professions, seeing the tragedy of domestic violence, but there being a lack of procedures and resources to deal with it. These issues predominantly affect female workers.

Ten years ago, our Government, our then Tory Government, made commitments in the Beijing Declaration and platform for action to address all aspects of violence against women in the UK. You would have thought that a Labour Government was more likely to deliver on those commitments, but not to date.

In this case, we, in the trade union movement, need to act as the conscience of Government and demand that they develop a national strategy based on Beijing to tackle this cancer in our society. Why should they be interested? Domestic violence alone costs the

UK around £2.6 billion a year -- not a reason I choose, but something this Government may listen to. Furthermore, but tougher still, we must be a major driver in the UK of cultural change with respect to stopping violence and the acceptance of violence against women.

We must educate our membership that this culture is unacceptable and must end. We must ensure that we have policies, rules, procedures and constitutions that ensure violence against women is not tolerated and is tackled. We must offer support and be there for our women members who experience violence.

We must fully engage our male membership for they are the key to cultural change. We must ensure that our members are given procedures and resources to deal with violence against women in all its forms, seeking support and funding from employers and government.

In solidarity, we should support and promote the UN's International Day for the elimination of violence against women held annually on 25 November. May I also ask you to support the Amnesty fringe meeting taking place this lunchtime in the Norfolk Room of the Hilton Metropole Hotel just next door, and the Amnesty International stand in the foyer downstairs?

In closing, I ask you again, imagine a world without violence against women and girls. Use your imagination and unanimously support motion 17.

**Walter Wright** (*Nationwide Group Staff Union*) seconding Motion 17 said: Violence against women is perhaps the most shameful human rights violation and it is also perhaps the most pervasive. It knows no boundaries of geography, culture or wealth. As long as it continues, we cannot claim to be making real progress towards equality, development and peace. Those are the words of Kofi Annan, the UN Secretary General.

In the UK, one in every four women will be a victim of domestic violence in their lifetime. On average, two women a week are killed by a male partner or a former partner. Nearly a half of all female murder victims are killed by a partner or ex-partner. The victims of violence have been, are and, unfortunately, will be our colleagues, our mothers, our sisters, our daughters, our grandchildren our partners. Our neighbours and friends will all be affected too.

One incident of domestic violence is reported to the police every minute. Take a moment to think about that. Since Congress opened at ten o'clock on Monday morning, over 3,000 incidents have been reported in the UK alone. That works out at over half a million a year. Elsewhere in the world, the story is worse. In Europe, domestic violence accounts for more deaths and ill-health in women aged 16 to 44 than cancer or road traffic accidents. In the USA, women are the victims of 85 per cent of all domestic violence. Research has also shown that in Canada and in the USA women suffer from more severe forms of violence.

World-wide, at least one in three women has been beaten, coerced into sex or otherwise abused in their lifetime. Unfortunately, society has failed to recognise the scope and magnitude of what is often a hidden problem or, worse, ignored. We must help our

members and society in general to become aware of the problem and change their views on it.

We demand that the UK Government develops strategies that will redress and reduce the incidents and acceptance of violence in the lives of women world-wide. To live a life free from the threat of violence is a basic human right, but it is a right denied to millions of women across the globe. Now is the time to do something about it.

Please demonstrate that you want to change our society for the better.

**Glenys Morris** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supporting the motion said: Let me make it clear that domestic violence has its roots in inequality, control and power. It affects everyone, regardless of gender or sexual orientation. It is a public health issue on a global scale.

The facts about domestic violence tell a shocking story. We know that much of it remains under cover and undeclared. All too often victims of violence feel they must collude with the conspiracy of silence for fear of shame and the further loss of dignity and status in their milieu. The truth, of course, is that the real shame is not on the victims, but on the perpetrators. We must speak out and campaign against domestic violence in our own employment situation, in our own country and across the globe.

For example, in March this year, after lobbying and campaigning by my own union, PCS, and other unions, the Cabinet Office published guidance for the Civil Service about introducing policies on domestic violence. These policies include the provision of safe working environments, ensuring that abused workers are not adversely affected by sick absence procedures or performance appraisals, agreeing time off or variations in hours worked.

However, there is much more that government should do, particularly as governments become the enablers in the same conspiracy of silence by allowing attitudes and laws to prevail which tolerate and normalise violence against women. Why is this so, when we have a government that is prepared to intervene in almost every other aspect of our daily lives, like telling us who, when and what we can eat, meet, think and drink? But they fight shy of facing up to the most fundamental violation of Human Rights, by failing to adequately legislate, as spelt out in the terms of this motion.

I believe that those who wear the chains know best how to break them. However, on this occasion, sisters need the support of governments, of this Labour movement and all its brothers. Please support.

\* *Motion 17 was CARRIED*

*(Congress adjourned until 2.15 p.m.)*

### WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

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

**The President:** Good afternoon. Many thanks to the Highworth Guitar Quartet, who have been playing for us this afternoon. Thank you very much.

Congress, as you will recall, at the beginning of this morning's session I outlined how I hoped to take some of the outstanding business that we had not been able to take earlier in the week. However, we have not been able to complete this so the outstanding business still remains but we will be reviewing the schedule of business to see if there is any scope for taking any outstanding motions at the end of today's session, otherwise all business will be completed tomorrow.

### Migrant Workers Presentation

**The President:** It is with great pleasure we start this afternoon with a presentation on migrant workers. Delegates, we know about the exploitation that so many migrant workers suffer at work but we also know that without their vital contribution many of our public services and other sections of the economy would suffer. We could tell more about the unpaid wages, the unfulfilled promises made by recruiters, the overcrowded housing, the skills used but not paid for, the risk to health and safety, and the intimidation, but it would be better to hear from the migrant workers themselves. So, today we have a panel of migrant workers who will not only be able to talk about the exploitation they have suffered but also about how joining a union can help transform their working lives.

We are lucky to have the opportunity to hear from three workers who have come to Britain and rather than suffer in silence have become active in their unions. They are Janice Caranday of UNISON, who is a nurse, Emmanuel Sillah, of T&G, who is a cleaner in Canary Wharf, and Katicia Giordani Bendo, of the GMB, who is a restaurant worker. These colleagues will be interviewed by Felicity Lawrence, who is consumer editor of *The Guardian*. Her recently published book, *Not on the Label*, documented many examples of the abuses faced by migrant workers in the food industry. You may also have read a piece on migrant workers in this year's Congress Guide. Felicity, Congress, I am sure, is looking forward to your interview with your guests; over to you.

**Felicity Lawrence** (*Consumer Affairs Correspondent for The Guardian*): Thank you very much. I have been lucky enough to listen to the stories of Katicia, Emmanuel, and Janice, earlier and they make extraordinary telling. They are extraordinary stories and yet from my experience of interviewing these are the reality, the very ordinary experiences for migrants who come here. They are fascinating stories of how the union has helped them, and also how they have contributed enormously to unions in return.

Katicia, let us start with you. You are from Brazil and you came here and originally in very typical experience worked as a chambermaid for a large hotel, where you worked extremely long hours, no overtime pay, and no sick pay. You went on to a better company and you now work for the Pizza Express Group. Tell us a little bit about what happened and your experience there, because it did not all go well, did it?

**Katicia Giordani Bendo:** I was almost six years in Pizza Express. I had a kind of horrible manager. I had a few problems because I did work in a shift of 18 hours for the big part of Pizza Express.

**Felicity Lawrence:** That is 18 hours non-stop?



**Katicia Giordani Bendo:** That is 18 hours non-stop and the director was passing by and telling us that we were going to get nice service, extra money on the side, carry on working, and we are all happy. Two weeks after not having seen any money I went to my general manager to complain about it. I said, "Sorry, but you remember the service charge you promised to us." He said the typical answer: "If you are not happy, the door is open for you." Since that happened to me I felt, "What a small thing I am. I have to do something because there is not only me but lots of other friends and colleagues who are in the same position." So, I started be a little bit annoying around, always look after friends, and the manager decided to do something about it, so the assistant manager put in a grievance against me on a sexual harassment case.

**Felicity Lawrence:** They turned it against you. You were complaining and demanding the money they had promised, and they turned it against you.

**Katicia Giordani Bendo:** Yes. Afterwards I was, like, 20 weeks suspended then. I went to the union. My mum gave me an application form and it was fantastic. I do not just get help from them, my job back, my money back, but help for my colleagues and support. I am an activist now and I feel proud of it to be what I am. It is a very good experience to come from a country that is poor and to come here, especially to come to a TUC Congress and say that there are people who can support you. The main thing is, do we know that there is support? Do foreign people know that there is a union out there? They think many times that the unions were only for British people, which they are not. This is what we have to show them, that we are here, and if they need our help we will help them because together we are stronger.

**Felicity Lawrence:** Emmanuel, you are from Sierra Leone and you came here and were granted asylum having suffered like so many of your countrymen terrible experiences in the war. When you found work it was with a contract cleaning company and, as with many of the cleaning jobs in this country, they have been privatised and outsourced. It was one of the largest, was it not, in one of our largest office complexes in Canary Wharf? Describe to me a little the conditions there and how you were made to feel as a worker.

**Emmanuel Sillah:** When I started working with a very big company known as ISS Morgan Stanley, it was a very big surprise to me because, firstly, when I came into this country based on my past experience I tried to help myself, to improve my state, to have a better life, and then to take away the bad memory from me I decided to work. Indirectly, I now discover that we are not in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, we are in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, but slavery is still in existence indirectly in my place of work. The way they treat staff, those who are working, they are not important, cleaners are not human beings, they see them as ghost workers.

**Felicity Lawrence:** You were treated without dignity but also one worker was required to do the work of many people, as I understand it, and when people were sick, as often happens when they are working night shifts, you had no sick pay. Tell me a little bit about some of the things that happened in terms of what you were asked to do.

**Emmanuel Sillah:** There are great differences which happen in the place of work in terms of asking new staff -- a new worker who has not been given a

feasibility study about what the jobs look like, how it needs to be done, what procedure you need to take before carrying out your job -- asking the cleaner to clean 15 toilets at a go, which makes the job more difficult, more frustrating, and then at the end they now start victimising, harassing, using some abusive language without recognising that they are dealing with people with dignity, people that have families of their own and have been respected, they are putting them down as if they are nothing, not to be respected in this society.

**Felicity Lawrence:** You said you always lived in fear of security, that you were never sure when you were going to lose your job. Then you discovered that you could join a union. Tell me a little bit about what happened with the union.

**Emmanuel Sillah:** First of all, before the union came into existence people were living with fear and harassment, victimising them at their place of work, asking them to do things that they do not want to do, that is, they have no choice in doing the type of job they need to do and that it is their own responsibility or duty to carry out that job. At a point when they were asking staff to clean 15 toilets, the job was too much for him or her to carry out without any assistance, so then they just insulted the staff at that point and started searching, checking them, making them to feel different, that they are not equal with other staff in the place of work.

**Felicity Lawrence:** They were searching you, assuming that ----

**Emmanuel Sillah:** If anything goes wrong in the place of work, the first thought is that it is the cleaners, the cleaners are the ones who are doing the bad things, stealing and all that, even though it may be the contractor or the staff members in the place of business who are doing it.

**Felicity Lawrence:** Katicia described earlier to me that she had not known that the union was there, at first she did not know what to do, and then she discovered she could join the union. How did you find out about the union?

**Emmanuel Sillah:** First of all, two individual members of staff when they felt tired of being harassed at the place of work, and they could not speak out, they said, "There is a form." They brought the form in. They introduced it to everybody to join the union, but one thing was they could not follow it up. Then I had to call my senses back to who I was before I had experienced a lot of slavery and a lot of pain in life. So immediately I asked them for the form and I took the form home, I thought about the form, and that the union is about unity.

The union is two things that I am going to describe, that I want to give a description about. If you look at this bunch of papers, the union is just like this bunch of paper. When you hold it, you try to tear it but it is not easy. You can see I am squeezing but I am not able to tear it. It is not easy. That is unity. That is what is called union, with togetherness we stand and with togetherness we become stronger. Then when you want to act individually, literally this single leaflet, if I hold it up, it is easy for me to tear. You can see there is no need for me to squeeze it; it is already torn. I told the entire staff at work, "This is what union is about. If we act together and we ask this organisation

to come in and act for us, then the fear will be out of your life. With the trade union you will have a fair deal and respect in the place of work."

**Felicity Lawrence:** That is a wonderful example of how, having suffered fear in your previous life, you come to find there is no dignity here, and you rediscover it through help with colleagues, and through the union. As I understand it, in Canary Wharf there is now a big campaign of recruitment and conditions are improving.

Janice, you are one of the nurses that we hear so much that we desperately need to fulfil our skills shortages, qualified in the Philippines. You were recruited there and came here thinking that you could take the extra qualifications needed to get the British qualification to work in a hospital, but that was not quite how it worked out, was it? Tell us what happened to you.

**Janice Caranday:** I came here in June 2000 and we know that we are going to work in a nursing home. We are hoping that we are going to have a registration within a 3-6 months adaptation period, but it did not work that way. We ended up doing manual tasks, doing the cooking, hovering the floor, and doing the laundry.

**Felicity Lawrence:** And long hours?

**Janice Caranday:** Long hours as well, 48 hours a week, and we would start at 7 o'clock in the morning and finish at 8 o'clock at night.

**Felicity Lawrence:** Describe a little your living conditions because they were very classically awful.

**Janice Caranday:** Yes, we came here, the ten of us, and we lived in one house, a four-bedroomed house, so we ended up having two or three people in one room.

**Felicity Lawrence:** How much did you get paid at the end of the month?

**Janice Caranday:** In our contract before we came in here it was stated that the air fare will be free but they have deducted it within the first six months. Can you imagine living with just £286 in your pocket for a month; how could you live as such?

**Felicity Lawrence:** This is after a 13-hour day, as you have told us.

**Janice Caranday:** Yes.

**Felicity Lawrence:** At one point they asked to take your passports, and this is something that keeps cropping up with people that I interview, that you have no freedom because the agencies try to remove your documents.

**Janice Caranday:** Yes, there was a time that they wanted to confiscate the passport but the group had a meeting. We knew that this is a free world country and we stood firm, we did not want to give our passports to them, so they did not force us to do such.

**Felicity Lawrence:** How did you escape this awful life that you suddenly found yourself trapped in?

**Janice Caranday:** After a year and two months working in the nursing home, after those experiences that we had, after the exploitation, a Filipino aunt of one of my colleagues gave us the leaflets on UNISON and we discussed it and we filled it up. I personally contacted Father Kiro, a Filipino missionary priest, and Eileen Reilly as well. With the help of UNISON we escaped from the nursing home and with the help of UNISON as well I started my freedom here as an overseas worker, and with the help of UNISON as well I found a great job in the NHS, and am presently working in the Epsom and St. Helier NHS Trust.

**Felicity Lawrence:** You are doing a much needed job; well done. Very briefly because we do not have much time left, Katicia, explain to me some of the things that were barriers to you getting help. Did you know about unions before you came here?

**Katicia Giordani Bendo:** No, I did not. Foreign people know what unions mean because they do have unions in their own countries but they do not know that they can use the unions here; they do not know this. So, what I really think would be nice is to have more activists, more migrant people as activists, to pass the message in their own language. I am from Brazil. I will trust a Brazilian person who comes to me, or a person who is speaking my own language, to let me know that there is help here for me, instead of hearing an English person saying it in a way of not understanding, but in a way of trust. That is where is born the trust. Once you have the trust you pass it over and over and over, and then you build the big whole thing. That is when it works.

**Felicity Lawrence:** And when it works for everyone.

**Katicia Giordani Bendo:** For everyone.

**Felicity Lawrence:** Emmanuel, your experience of the union in the workplace was that when you started joining and recruiting others, that actually the company tried to set up something separate and actually ask you to run a separate sort of workers organisation. Is that right?

**Emmanuel Sillah:** Yes, of course. The T&G, in particular, has done a very great thing in my place of work. First of all, immediately I joined the T&G union the one thing I admired in the organisers was that they were very sensitive, that is, to know the right person before they appointed me to be a shop steward. When they came in they just started making changes in terms of, first of all, they granted recognition in the place of work. Then the day after when the company started realising that the union had been sent in, they formed what they called SEG, what they called a staff consultative group to oppose the union. Then they tried to rally me round. They said that they wanted me to be the president, that is the head, to be the head of their committee. They said: "SEG is a voluntary organisation and the committee is set up by the management, and every decision will be by us. They cannot do anything. They cannot help the situation." They were telling me that SEG started in Japan, that there is no union in Japan, and that SEG performs a lot of good rules in Japan; so that is what they wanted to do.

**Felicity Lawrence:** They wanted the model of a workplace where there were no real unions. We do not have time for more but I think these stories are very powerful examples of some of the extraordinary conditions that migrants are facing in this country, and organising them presents challenges; often people are moved from job to job and do not have job security, and there are often language barriers. But in each of these cases extraordinary progress has been made and conditions have been improved. As I say, this is the reality for millions of workers in the UK today. Thank you very much for coming and explaining your stories to us.

**The President:** Thank you, Felicity, and thank you all for coming along to give us the benefit of your experience. Delegates will hear more on this subject tomorrow morning at 8.00 a.m. at the TUC fringe meeting on Organising Migrant Workers, and some of our three contributors here today will be taking part in that as well; details are on the flyers on the chairs. Thanks also to Felicity, who will be signing copies of her book at the bookstall later this afternoon. As you may know, the TUC has also produced a range of publications in migrant workers' own languages, which are also available at the TUC bookstall.

#### **Migrant Workers**

**Angela Roger** (*Association of University Teachers*) moved Motion 79 as amended. She said: What an inspiring start we have had to this afternoon's business; well done, sisters and brothers. Thank you.

I am also going to start on a positive note. Migrant workers are of immense value to the UK. In my sector, particularly, in higher education, they are a success story. In fact, it is hard to imagine how our universities could operate without our international students and staff. In total, nearly a quarter of staff in higher education come from overseas and we are looking more and more to international sources for new recruits to the profession. Overseas students themselves spend over £3bn a year on fees, goods and services.

This motion celebrates the contribution of international students, migrant workers, and refugees; the country would be the poorer without them. One specific example that will be of interest to fans of 'The Thin Blue Line', and 'Queen - the Musical', traces three generations of talent. Victor Ehrenberg, a refugee from Czechoslovakia, was an eminent historian. Lewis Elton, his son, became the first professor of higher education before his retirement. Ben Elton, his grandson, is a well-known comedian and author. This is just one example showing that the UK has a proud tradition of welcoming and nurturing talent from abroad.

Since 1933, CARA (the Council for Assisting Refugee Academics) has helped academic refugees from all over the world, 18 of these have won Nobel prizes, 16 have been knighted, and 120 have been awarded prestigious fellowships. Across the UK as a whole, over 2.5 million workers were born outside the UK and this figure does not include those working here illegally. Many of these are professionals, employers and managers. Across the country in the health service alone nearly a third of doctors and 13 per cent of nurses are migrant workers.

The House of Commons Education Employment Committee got it right when it said: "From fish and

ships to the field of psychoanalysis, from founding of the Labour Party to the mini, the evidence is all around us that the economy, the arts, and sciences, and above all our humanity, have been enriched by those who have sought sanctuary here." But we also have to recognise that UK workers become migrants too when they go abroad to work, so it is vital that their rights are protected both at home and abroad. But, Congress, there are large numbers of migrants working in sectors other than my own where the story is far from a success story -- in cleaning, in food manufacture, agriculture, hospitality, and construction.

Throughout the business of Congress, we have been hearing about the horrendous abuses of migrant workers here in the UK, about the appalling abuses of migrants who are exploited for their labour, and about the obscene trade in human beings by despicable traffickers; these are crimes against their human rights as much as their workers' rights. According to the TUC report, in 2003 fewer than one in four migrant workers has the protection of a union. We need to go out and organise among these workers, to reach out, to provide our support, and recruit them. The TUC has already taken a lead in this work, for example, through its Portuguese workers project, and by producing the leaflet on workers' rights in six languages.

I urge all unions to provide resources for migrant workers, to recruit them in numbers into union membership, to enrich our great movement by adding them to our numbers, and to champion their rights.

**Tom Lannon** (*Union of Construction Allied Trades and Technicians*) seconding the motion, said: Brother President, Congress, trade unions are about providing a voice and representation to workers but it is often the weak and vulnerable who need representation, who are the most difficult to organise. The example of the tragedy of Morecambe Bay underlines this point: Chinese workers were placed in a dangerous environment, working in freezing cold conditions for a pittance, with no regard given to their safety whatsoever. It was clear that something had to be done. I will quote the Scottish bard, Robert Burns, who said: "Man's inhumanity to man would make countless millions the world over mourn."

Jim Sheridan deserves a great deal of credit for steering the Gang Masters Bill through Parliament: an excellent job of work was done. This bill introduces a register of labour suppliers in the agricultural sector and the gathering of shellfish for the first time. I am sure there are other sectors of the economy that should benefit from similar licensing regimes in time. I would like to see the registration of gang masters in the construction industry. At present labour suppliers pray on migrant workers coming into the many ports in this country where we have people standing outside the gates waiting to exploit them as soon as they arrive. These workers are providing the skills industry needs and they deserve the same rights as the other construction workers. Let me say to Digby Jones, if he is listening, if this is not a valid reason for the need to have a trade union organisation, then I do not know what is.

My union, UCATT, is looking at ways to reach out to migrant workers coming into the construction industry. We have already had some success in recruiting and representing East European workers and we are also looking at new schemes we can introduce to help migrant workers with legal representation, but trade unions cannot be everywhere and that is why the

Gang Masters Bill is important. UCATT is at the sharp end of this issue. For example, as a convenor steward in a major construction site in London, I have actually organised these, mainly East European, people coming into the country, have given them minimum standards under a working rule agreement, holiday pay, and continuity of employment, but a registration scheme will never be the only answer. Those importing illegal labour will try and find ways around the law but it does mean that clients and contractors can insist that labour is sourced by registered agencies that comply with UK law. Sheridan's bill was an important landmark in dealing with illegal gang masters. It is time to drive these parasites out of business for ever. Thank you.

**Jack Dromey** (*Transport & General Workers Union*) speaking in support of the motion, said: Two years ago I had an argument with two of our own building industry shop stewards. "Jack," said one, "building sites all over London are brimful with workers from the Balkans and Eastern Europe. You see them standing on Kilburn and Cricklewood corners at 6.00 a.m. on a Monday morning waiting to be picked up by gangsters in white vans to work cash-in-hand at half the rate." The other complained: "Jack, they are difficult to organise and they undermine the rate for the job." I asked: "What corners in Kilburn and Cricklewood are you talking about?" My dad stood on precisely those same corners in 1938 when he came from County Cork to dig roads in London; he, too, was desperate for work; he, too, was exploited by wide-boy gangsters. He fought back and became a pillar of the trade union movement.

Congress, our task is to challenge the country and sometimes those in our own ranks. Our task is not to fear migrant workers but instead to welcome them to our shores. Our task is not to allow migrant workers to be scapegoats for taking jobs or driving down wages and conditions but instead to argue that it is bad bosses who drive down wages and conditions. Our task is not to allow the BNP to exploit the fear of undercutting but instead to end undercutting by organising migrant workers. Our task, therefore, is not to exclude but instead to organise. That is why the T&G took through Parliament the historic Gang Masters Act to end the shameful exploitation of the most vulnerable in our society, exploitation that starts in the boardroom and ends with the terrible death of 23 cockle pickers on Morecombe Sands. I pay tribute to the remarkable coalition of support that we had and to the leadership of Jim Sheridan, who united Parliament in grief post Morecombe leading to welcome action by the Government. That is why we are organising right now the African and South American cleaners at Canary Wharf, the veritable citadel of capitalism. We are determined to end the shameful contrast between fabulous wealth and the forgotten twilight workers who clean the buildings whilst their bosses sip champagne.

I want today to celebrate diversity. I live in Herne Hill, Brixton with its thriving Afro-Caribbean culture and next door is Peckham with the largest African community in Britain. I know of no more decent and hardworking peoples, including Emmanuel. Give me the Peckham African community any day to the brain-dead boot boys of the BNP in Burnley.

Finally, our message today to migrant workers is: You are welcome to our shores in search of a better life. You bring skills and energy to our economy and public services. Migrant workers contribute 10 per cent more in tax than they claim on the public purse. You

enrich our country. You enrich our trade union movement. Let us together organise to win a better life for all, migrant workers and British workers here for generations alike. Support the motion.

**Shirley Rainey** (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*) speaking in support of the motion said: In July 2004, John Hutton, MP, Minister of Health, announced a new strategy to integrate refugee nurses and other health professions into the UK NHS workforce. He noted that it was crucial to ensure that intensive language and communication skills training is available for those who need it.

The CSP welcomes the extra £500,000 funding he announced that would go to support refugees with health professional skills. We recognise that asylum seekers and refugees with health professional qualifications and experience are an untapped resource who could be used to help fill the many vacancies across the health sector, or they would be if the Government in 2002 had not withdrawn the concession which allowed asylum seekers to apply for their work restrictions to be lifted after six months of applying for asylum. Now they can only work when granted refugee or humanitarian status and, of course, it takes at least 18 months for their applications to be processed.

Asylum, as we all know, is one of the most contentious political issues in the UK with the media continuing to report that many arrive on our shores so that they can 'sponge' off our welfare systems, but it is our experience that many are professionals who are keen to offer their skills and contribute to society; also, of course, they want to work as the low incomes they get make it very difficult to support themselves and their families. So it is not surprising that many turn to doing unregulated illegal work and, as we have heard already, the working conditions are often atrocious.

We are asking you, and the TUC, to continue to press for asylum seekers to be granted the right to work legally in the UK. Please support.

**Bahram Mokhtare** (*UNISON*) speaking in support of the motion, said: Congress, the free movement of labour deserves closer attention. It is not about race, culture, or victims, nor is it to do with enriching societies by introducing diversity, it concerns economics and at its root the selling of commodities, literally people in this case.

Whether workers' labour is free, moving, enslaved, or otherwise, it is always a class question. The importation of labour is, in an abusive term, 'free movement of labour' because it is about exploitation. The Chinese cockle pickers, the farmhands, the workers stuffing goods for supermarket chains, are all about employers getting away with paying rates of £1 per hour, or less. The situation has only begun to change in recent years with unions vigorously enforcing the minimum wages as a starting point. The 44,000 overseas doctors, nurses, and health professionals, working in the NHS reflect the refusal of this Government to train and adequately pay the numbers required to fill those jobs from workers of all races already resident in Britain. Meanwhile, health services worldwide are sucked dry, and developing nations are plundered of the skills and resources required to build and staff their own health services. If they want to tackle racism then they should address the unemployment rates among black British youth

running at three times that of white and Asian peer groups by getting that group into work.

We should assist any worker who comes to Britain to join their union, learn English, and understand the history and culture of these islands. The culture is very simple, there are those who exploit and there are those who labour. Unite to defeat the former.

The lies and myths about migrant workers and asylum workers, peddled by the right-wing press and fascist parties, must be countered by trade unions and the Government. We have a responsibility to challenge xenophobia and racism when it occurs. We need to fight, which UNISON has done for a number of years, for all work to be paid well, for all workers.

Finally, UNISON and the British trade union movement must show migrant workers and asylum seekers that we are their friends at work. We must work hard to organise migrant workers and be with them when they need us.

**Ron Waugh (GMB)** speaking in support of Motion 79 said: They would not walk through a picket line -- remember that, Conference -- to mark the extension of the EU. The gutter press went into overdrive. The theme was quite clear: Britain should brace itself for an invasion of unskilled Europeans here to milk our immigration laws. The truth is, of course, that the complete opposite happened and the real facts are very different from what the *Daily Mail* would have its readers believe.

The flood of migrants has failed to materialise. Of those who have come, many are being treated appallingly and are victims of exploitation from criminal gangs and others.

The GMB believes that the TUC has an important role to play in developing support and advice for migrant workers, and also in countering some of the racist and right-wing myths put about. The truth is that migrant workers play a vital role in providing many of the services we all rely on, such as healthcare, hospitality, cleaning, food manufacturing and agriculture. As a movement, we must demand fairness and respect for migrant workers, many of whom are paid scandalously low rates and charged exorbitant levels of rent to live in overcrowded rooms with other workers.

There have been a number of disturbing stories about disgraceful exploitation of migrant workers, including 11-hour working days, seven days a week, workers being sacked for being ill, unauthorised deductions from pay, and pay rates as low as £1 an hour. The lack of legal protection for migrant workers gives gangmasters, rogue employers and employment agencies the ideal opportunity to exploit them.

The GMB has also come across examples of employers seeking to use migrant labour to lower pay rates for an existing work force. In those workplaces, we are fighting back, organising both sets of workers and uniting them to fight for better terms and conditions across the board. We welcome the Gangmaster Licensing Act and the extension of the full protection of the law for workers in those industries. However, we must do more. The TUC and affiliates should take the lead in taking some of the focus away from so-called illegal immigrants and on to the illegal

behaviour of employers and criminal gangs. We must recruit migrant workers into our unions so that we can offer them protection, legal advice and other services.

**The President:** The General Council is in support of Motion 69.

\* *Motion 79, as amended, was CARRIED*

## Refugees and Asylum Seekers

**The President:** I call Motion 80, which the General Council supports.

**Jeremy Dear (National Union of Journalists)** moved Motion 80. He said: Britain is being invaded. Our towns and cities are being flooded. Everywhere you turn you see another one. Pick up any newspaper and the evidence is staring you in the face. There is a flood of myths. We are swamped by lies. We are facing an invasion of stereotypes. Racism sneaks in and bogus facts are everywhere masquerading as the truth. We want to wash the dross down the drain. 'Illegal immigrants, bogus asylum seekers, bootleggers and scum of the earth drug smugglers have targetted our beloved coastline'. 'We are left with a backdraft of a nation's human sewage and no cash to wash it down the drain'. 'Once the German Army had positioned giant guns here to lob shells across the Channel. Yesterday the French sent us asylum seekers'.

Such stories would be bad enough if they were true but they are not. I do not believe the media create racism, but such stories embed stereotypes and myths and help to reinforce racism, giving ammunition to those who would use such bias for their own political ends. Let us smash some myths. We are not being swamped. Most asylum seekers are not bogus; asylum seekers are not mostly criminals; they do not milk the system and live a life of luxury. Britain is not a soft touch; Britain has some of the strictest immigration controls of any European country. It detains asylum seekers for longer with less scrutiny than any other European country.

Above all, do not believe the lie that we cannot afford it. Immigrants contribute £2.5 billion more in taxes than they receive in benefits. A recent Mori poll asked which word the media uses most when referring to asylum seekers and refugees. Sixty-four per cent said "illegal immigrants"; 22 per cent said "bogus". Such terms demonise, dehumanise and create an environment in which attacks on asylum seekers are legitimised, and the abuse of their human rights is seen as a just response. Instead of pandering to this language, instead of reacting to these myths and stereotypes, politicians of all parties should be challenging such racist attitudes. That is why it is shameful to hear David Blunkett attack BBC journalists for exposing racism in the police rather than attacking racist attitudes amongst the police.

In response to this crisis, press regulation has failed. Of the 3,600 complaints last year, the Press Complaints Commission adjudicated on just 0.6 per cent, rejecting every single complaint of discrimination against groups of asylum seekers. Of course, it is no surprise. The Press Complaints Commission is supported and run by the representatives of the very papers fuelling such racism, those like Rupert Murdoch, Richard Desmond or Lord Rothermere who, through creative accounting, starved the NHS, schools and councils of millions of pounds whilst blaming asylum seekers for milking the system.

We should not despair. There is good journalism too that exposes the reality of the issues faced by asylum seekers, which exposes abuses of human rights, that reports growing levels of racial abuse, physical attacks and harassment, that exposes inadequate housing and healthcare -- journalism that highlights the positive contribution in economic, cultural, political and social terms that refugees, asylum seekers and the ethnic minority communities make to the UK. There are those who fight back like our members at the *Express* who have threatened to strike if any member is forced to breach the union's code of conduct.

But in order to support those who stand up for such journalism, rights at work must be strengthened. In particular, journalists must have a right to protection from unfair dismissal for refusing to carry out any assignment that breaches industry codes of practice. To us it may just be a matter of employment rights. To many refugees and asylum seekers it may be a matter of life and death. Please support.

**Andy Ballard** (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*) speaking in support of Motion 80, and in particular to the amendment, said: Refugees and asylum seekers bring their children to this country because it has the reputation of being a good place to live, a safe place to live, where citizens are treated equitably and fairly. The families of refugees and asylum seekers, and especially their children, are often traumatised by their experiences and are vulnerable as a result. As a nation, we must do all we can to alleviate their concerns, reduce their anxieties, make them welcome, make them safe. For most children, school is more than just a place of learning; it is a calm and secure environment, a caring community and what better place for the children of refugees and asylum seekers. For these children, school may be the only place of sanctuary, the only place with structure in an otherwise turbulent and frightening world.

Schools provide so much more than just lessons. Our own children benefit from contact and comradeship with peers from a diversity of backgrounds and thus they quickly learn to accept those from other ethnic origins and those of other religious persuasions, an acceptance that is sustained. But - and, Congress, there is always a but is there not? - This is not cost neutral. Our schools have benefitted from increased funding in recent years, but only enough to offset 18 years of systemic underfunding under the Tories. Schools resources are already stretched paperthin. These schools are extraordinarily willing to open their doors to the children of the world, but they will be asking how will they meet additional need, for example in meeting the needs of pupils who have a language other than English as their mother tongue or in meeting the needs of emotionally fragile children in terms of counselling and support. Clearly, we must require of government that they must facilitate the education of all children of refugees and asylum seekers by providing new additional funding, not passed by means of arcane formulae but directly to local education authorities and schools targetted to where the need arises. The risks of failure to do this are that the most vulnerable children may be alienated and may grow up disengaged and incapable of integration into our society. I urge your support.

\* *Motion 80 was CARRIED*

#### **Aid, trade and unions**

**Paul Gates** (*Community*) moved Motion 81, as amended. He said: The carnage in Beslan in Russia two

week ago was so appalling because innocent children were the targets and we could easily identify them through are own kids. We saw it develop before our eyes, hoping for a peaceful outcome but being completely powerless to do anything about this crime against humanity.

How should we feel then about other crimes against humanity that kill 100 times as many children every day, not from bombs and bullets but from the wretched and lingering impact of hunger and preventable disease? There is nothing unexpected about these 25,000 deaths. The lives are being quenched out in Africa, Asia and Latin America today. Tomorrow another 25,000 will die. There is nothing inevitable about it. Unlike Beslan, there is something we can do to end this misery. We are not individually responsible for these deaths but the World Bank, the WTO and the IMF are major accessories in this crime against humanity and they act in our name. These are international organisations like the United Nations, but the power and influence of the rich member countries is even stronger there than in the UN. They are represented there by politicians, democratically elected and accountable to voters like you and me.

That is why I think Congress should applaud the role our Government have taken at home and in the international organisations to end world poverty. Arguably their greatest achievement since 1997 has been the doubling of the share of national income we devote to development aid, and they have also set 2013 as the target year for raising our aid contribution to the UN goal of 0.7 per cent. It is pressing hard to reform the Common Agricultural Policy that pays a subsidy of £2 a day for every European cow. Three billion people exist on incomes of less than that. They are well on their way to ending the export subsidies that deliberately undermine and starve farmers in developing countries. Gordon Brown is taking the lead in promoting debt forgiveness and the International Finance Facility Initiative that will greatly extend the access poor countries have to credit on reasonable terms.

In this area and in trade generally the rich countries have far to go. The unfair trade rules, policed by the WTO, take an estimated 1.3 billion out of developing countries every day. The world desperately needs fair trade and strong international organisations to ensure that globalisation serves human needs and not the greed and megalomania of the rich. British workers can only benefit from the defeat of world poverty, not just because peace depends on justice and freedom from hunger but also because British manufacturing would gain from the massive markets that would grow in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

There has been a further great advance recently in the Government's approach. Hilary Benn understands that trades unions are partners in development and not obstacles to it. We ask Congress to put to him the case for resources to be used for trade union training in developing countries. This really is a most cost-effective way of promoting development and democratically accountable governments. Look at what unions achieved in South Africa under apartheid. While Nelson Mandela was in prison, the unions gave black people a voice and the muscle to enable them to take on the regime and the system. They did it with much help from the TUC and its affiliates.

It is not just in South Africa that the trade union movement has played a leading role in bringing about

accountable and just government. They did it in Poland and, by extension, throughout central Europe. They did it in Chile and now, in Zimbabwe, it is a former trade union leader who is leading the opposition to an oppressive and tyrannical rule. In Swaziland, the leadership of the movement against the feudal system is the Trade Union National Centre.

I urge you to support the motion and back the international fight against poverty and injustice.

**Amarjite Singh** (*Transport Salaried Staffs' Association*) seconding Motion 81 said: Our amendment to the motion asks you to challenge the General Council to develop a common ethical investment policy. On behalf of TSSA, I make no apologies for placing this challenge before Congress.

Since ethical investment became an issue over 30 years ago, the sad fact is that we have not taken it up as a movement in the way it deserves, and progress has been extremely slow. This is not to deny the excellent work that is currently taking place under the auspices of the TUC, nor indeed the way in which some unions have sought to publicise the reactionary practices of some employers at annual general meetings. But, in our view, we need to broaden our strategy and to intensify our campaign.

Allow me to explain to you the TSSA's approach to ethical investment, as I am proud to say that my union has been investing all its cash on an ethical basis since 1999. Initially our progress was slow but it was only when we began to focus on our general fund, which amounted to several million pounds, rather than our pension fund, that real progress was made.

When we were developing TSSA's own Ethical Investment Charter, which I hope some of you will have seen this afternoon -- if you have not, please see me at the back near the door and you can get one -- we faced the key issue of what we meant by ethical standards. Many people measure ethical standards using different yardsticks. This is certainly true of our members. However, after examining nearly 150 ethical topics we focused on the principles of the ILO. We did this for one simple reason: these principles unite every single member of the union. These ILO principles cover a broad range of freedoms and rights. They include freedom from discrimination, from forced labour, from oppression; they include the right to recognise, to organise, to collective bargaining and equal bargaining, plus elimination of the worst form of child labour.

Now we only invest money in companies that have told us specifically that they comply with the terms of the TSSA's Ethical Investment Charter. Its terms apply to suppliers and sub-contractors too. I am pleased to tell Congress that since our Charter was established all our investments have been 100 per cent compliant.

In the amended motion we are not asking you to support the TSSA Charter specifically. Every union must have a set of ethical principles that suits its own members. We are asking you to give support to the principle of establishing a common approach to ethical investments across our trade union movement.

Please support the amended motion.

**Judy McKnight** (*napo*) supporting Motion 81 said: I would like to highlight the particular issues that were set out in our amendment, which calls on the TUC to produce advice for affiliates on how best we, as trades unions, can promote the principles of fair trade, but also calls on the TUC to press the Fair Trade movement to play their part in upholding and promoting the principles of free trade unionism.

NAPO's last annual conference agreed a motion calling on our union to take up the Fair Trade Campaign and to promote the use of fair trade both in our negotiations with employers, in the services that we purchase and use, as well as producing advice for our members. Bringing this issue to the TUC is not just about us asking the TUC to help us achieve the terms of a conference motion, but it is also about recognising that if this sort of action is going to have any impact it is action that we have to take together as a wider trade union movement and, ideally, as part of the international trade union movement acting in a co-ordinated strategic way.

Congress, we are all increasingly aware that we live in one world and that globalisation affects us all -- as workers, consumers, as citizens. The Fair Trade Campaign is an example of a successful campaign that has secured large-scale and growing support and has a particular resonance with young people. It is a campaign that is based on actions not just by organisations and trades unions but can also involve individuals, using consumer power to influence policies of governments and employers.

A classic example of a very effective campaign that the TUC was involved in earlier this year was the Play Fair at the Olympics campaign. The TUC played an important role in that campaign that ran in over 30 countries, a campaign which used the focus of the Olympics to highlight the need for an industry wide approach to stop the sweat shop conditions still used by many sportswear companies. This motion is effectively asking the TUC to build on the example of that campaign and to help us, as unions, promote fair trade but also to use our collective strength to ensure the Fair Trade movement is promoting trades unionism.

Please support Motion 81.

**Paul Talbot** (*Amicus*) speaking in support of Motion 81 said: It is in debates such as these that we remind ourselves of the international dimension to our movement and the importance we place on global solidarity. Amicus is proud to support the motion and to highlight one aspect of it, namely the role that trade unions can play in this issue.

The hard truth is that millions of our sisters and brothers across the globe live out their lives in poverty, sleep in the streets, exist on inadequate diets, with little or no education, ravaged by drugs and HIV/AIDS -- the young, the elderly, the dispossessed, those who spend their lives in fear and despair and without hope. As the 2004 International Labour Organisation's International Report *Organising for Social Change* shows, for millions of people in this situation the principal route out of poverty is work. We must within the movement help to create opportunities for investment, help with job creation and sustainable livelihoods, as envisaged in the Millennium development goals, in ways that do not affect adversely on people here.

In the process it is essential that we seek reform of the World Trade Organisation and that we include people themselves in decisions that affect their lives. The key to all this is the question of international labour standards, the right to organise and bargain collectively, the right not to be subject to discrimination, the right of no forced labour, and the right for people in developing countries to have their children go to school rather than be forced into work -- in short, the core labour standards of the ILO.

In accepting this conclusion, this motion asks Congress to urge the Government to direct funds for trade union training as part of its international package.

We welcome also the recognition -- for the first time ever -- given to the trade union role in the Department for International Development in the recent publication *Labour Standards and Poverty Reduction*. My own union has taken its initiative in forging bilateral relationships with trade unions in Africa through our *Africa Matters* campaign, a programme of informing at first hand what is happening across Africa. In reply to: term of social justice.

I finish on this note: it has been said that the greatest political challenge of our time is to end mass poverty, to create opportunities, not just for the free and the fortunate but for all. I urge you to support the motion.

**The President:** The General Council supports Motion 81.

\* *Motion 81 one was CARRIED.*

#### Address by Lord Coe – London 2012 Olympic Bid

**The President:** We now come to the presentation on London's Bid for the 2012 Olympics. As you will have seen from the article in the *Congress Guide*, there is more to the Olympics Games than gold medals, although one or two people have their share of gold medals. Being awarded the Games results in thousands of jobs for the winning city -- jobs in construction, transport and the hospitality industry to name but a few. The question that we, as trades unionists will want to ask, is: if London get the 2012 Games will these jobs be quality jobs with union recognition, high safety standards, training and equal opportunities? Can we use the Games to promote fair trade in the countries that produce the equipment and clothing used in the Games. The Sydney Games in 2000 showed what can be achieved with union influence, but it does not just happen; it requires engagement between the trade union movement and the organisers from an early stage.

At his Congress reception earlier this week, the London Mayor, Ken Livingstone, made clear how important he regarded the Games and the importance he places on working with the trades unions. Today we have with us the Chair of the London bid, Seb Coe, but before we hear from him let us hear from some of the people who will be playing the key roles in the London Olympics in eight years' time. (*Video shown*)

**The President:** It is now my pleasure to invite Seb Coe to address Congress.

**Lord Coe:** I have always set myself targets; I suppose it is a by-product of past days. My target today is to get a response to my speech at least as warm as the one you gave the Prime Minister on Monday!

So, let me start by thanking you for the opportunity to speak to you today. I want the whole country to feel involved in our efforts to bring the Olympic Games back to this country. The more support we have the more likely we are to win. I believe that the more people know about the bid, the more they will want us to win. I come today to ask for your support, to explain our strategy, hopefully to enthuse and excite you about what the Games can deliver for jobs and for the economy, for our environment and the sporting ambitions of our young people, and above all perhaps for our confidence and ambition as a country.

Sport has been the passion of my life. I was lucky; I was able to devote much of my life to it, competing at the highest levels. The passion I have for sport is shared by millions. It drives so much of what we are as a nation, what we feel, what we talk about, what we care about. It matters. I know that if we get Games that passion for sport in Britain will ensure that they are a huge and overwhelming success.

As we build our case, I think of the young athletes -- now in their teens maybe -- who have caught that bug for sport, who train hard, who dream one day of being a success at their sport, the young athletes who, like me, watched the Mexico Games on a flickering black and white television set in Sheffield, an experience that changed my life. I want to help bring the Games to London and give those young athletes the chance of changing their lives too, of competing on their own soil in front of the most passionate sports fans anywhere in the world.

The bid is for London, but this is a project for the whole country. Ask anyone who was in Greece recently during the Athens Games. It did not just give the capital a lift, it gave the whole country a lift, a sense of pride and fulfilment at what they were able to achieve -- achievements that produced a lasting change. I know that whatever it takes to deliver the best Games that London can have, London has it. It is twenty years since I competed in the Olympic Games. Since then I have worked as an International Commission member, an Olympic broadcaster, an International Federation member, and now -- as the Chairman of a bidding city -- I feel I have entered the last lap of my own four lap Olympic odyssey.

Our vision is clear and concise. It is to re-unite the world's most vibrant and culturally diverse city and country with the world's largest celebration of sport. In doing so, we can unlock our nation's passion for sport, provide a lasting legacy for our children, release the creativity and diversity of London and the United Kingdom and deliver the best possible conditions for athletes to compete in. The detailed plans we are putting together include a brand new Olympic Park in East London, sited around the transport hub of Stratford. It will include a new athletic stadium, swimming pools, three indoor arenas, a velodrome, a media centre and, of course, an athletes village -- all state of the art and all to be returned to the community after the Games. But we will also use Wimbledon, Lord's, the Dome, Eton Dorney -- our first-class rowing facility just to the west of London -- and the capital's historic beautiful and unique parks that will provide stunning backdrops for all our cultural



events. Our bid is a mix of fantastic new design and internationally familiar venues, and legacy will underpin every new build.

For the residents of east London, an area of inordinately high deprivation, their whole environment will be dramatically improved. A winning bid will deliver the biggest new urban park seen in Europe for the last 200 years. The waterways, canals and wetlands of the Lea Valley will be cleaned, rejuvenated, restored and returned. Over 9,000 new homes will be created from the athletes village within weeks of the Games finishing. Of course, there will be a real and guaranteed sporting legacy for London, with as many as six new major sporting facilities to be used both by local communities and elite and aspiring athletes.

London's Mayor has already committed up to £10 million a year after 2012 to fund this legacy. Nation wide we will see economic and sporting benefits, new jobs in construction and tourism and new facilities to host Olympic training camps and international sporting events. But there are also the unquantifiable benefits of the UK hosting the Games, inspiring our children to achieve, to respect, and to aspire. I was in the West Midlands last week, in Belfast this week. In both those places the sporting community understood fully the impact an Olympic Games and the Kelly Holmes effect has had on the young people they coach and they educate. They also know the even greater impact the seven-year build up to a UK Games can have on those same young people.

London is involved in the most competitive field ever bidding for a Games. Madrid, Moscow, New York and Paris are our opposition. It is an impressive line up and our bid is in good shape, all the stronger because of the Herculean efforts of Team GB and the incredible support and passion of over 20,000 British fans in Athens, neither of which has gone unnoticed by the International Olympic Committee or the great governing bodies of our world sport. They know that a London Games would be played out in front of noisy, knowledgeable and full stadia. The presence of the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State, Tessa Jowell, the Minister for Sport, Richard Caborn, and the Mayor of London, Ken Livingstone, in Athens was vital. Internationally it demonstrated that we have clear political backing, a crucial factor for many IOC members. Domestically the message was just as important.

The five bidding teams also had the opportunity to present their plans to the international media, and although it is still early days in the race I am encouraged by the fact that we were judged by commentators who matter to have come out on top in this rare opportunity to go head-to-head with the other bidding cities.

We are gaining ground at home too. The four London boroughs in east London, home to the Olympic Park, granted outline planning permission only last week. We are ahead of the game and that is where we must remain. We are also just a few days from completing our candidate file, which must be submitted to the IOC by 15 November. This 600-page document outlines our plans in detail, covering venues, transport, security, accommodation, media facilities and, of course, financing. It has been a massive task to put this document together in the space of six months or so, but I am delighted to say that in that too we are ahead of the game.

But that does not stop with the candidate file. Next spring the IOC will send a team of around 20 people to road test our plans. Their evaluation team will also visit our competitors and, a few weeks before the final vote in Singapore next July, they will lay down before us their judgment. Whether or not we are successful is in large part down to the strength of our partnerships -- partnerships between the host city and the IOC, partnerships between central and local government with the business community, with local residents, with environmental groups, employers, employees or the wider Olympic movement. Working together with mutual respect is crucial.

If London is to win the bid and deliver the 2012 Games we need your support; we need your support in developing the strategies for the organisations that will successfully deliver the Games. Our aim must be to draw as much of the workforce from the local community and complement it by local training initiatives run by the London Development Agency and other partners. In setting up the London Organising Committee for the Olympic Games, we will develop a Fair Employment framework, policies to cover issues such as remuneration, terms and conditions, and health and safety. We will implement this ourselves, and take it into account when evaluating tendered and awarding contracts. These should also be our guiding principles for our national sponsorships.

We should never forget that the Olympic Games do not happen without the selfless legion of volunteers. Sydney was a towering example of this, as were the Manchester Commonwealth Games. A London Games would require upwards of 70,000 volunteers. To maximise the opportunities available to them, we would set up a voluntary job programme and local job brokerage schemes so that people can develop transferable skills through voluntary work opportunities.

Working in partnerships with trades unions and developers we can ensure that the infrastructure is delivered on time, on budget and with appropriate levels of investment in skills, training, health and safety all enshrined in common practice. I will also encourage trade union representation on the new Organising Committee and the development of a framework agreement in line with the experience of the Sydney Olympic Games.

When we make our case to the IOC, we must be able to say that we have firm, unequivocal and enthusiastic backing of government. We must also be able to demonstrate that we have the firm backing of trades unions and business. They too will strengthen our case. Tomorrow, in a further expression of political support, I have been invited by the Prime Minister to brief the Cabinet on where we are on the bid to get the whole government fully involved. I will be able to tell them that we are in a strong position. A combination of political and public support, planning permission, a strong technical bid, a fantastic array of venues, sporting success at the Games and the phenomenal support of the British fans there has given us a real sense of momentum. I will also be able to spell out the benefits I believe the Games can bring not just to sports policy but also to trade, tourism, jobs, housing transport and the environment.

No Olympic Games must ever be allowed to simply drift through a city or a country without leaving a lasting impression. For that reason I will set out ways in which we intend to involve the whole of the country in

the planning and staging of those Games. Above all, I will be saying as I say now, that the more the country unites behind the bid, the more the sense of momentum will build.

I left Athens enthused as never before, excited about our prospects, confident about the new case we are putting, convinced we can win. I hope you can help me bring that about. Thank you. (*Applause*)

**The President:** Thank you for that address, Seb. You can be assured that we will be not only watching the progress of the bid, but the TUC has decided to support the bid. We want to see those quality jobs, we want to see them with proper union agreements. We will be engaging closely with London 2012, with the Mayor of London and with the Organising Committee, so good luck from us. You have our support.

I would now like to introduce the Director of the International Labour Organisation Office, who is an honoured guest today, an old friend of ours, a former General Secretary of IPMS, now Prospect, Bill Brett. Welcome. Keep up the good work on hunting out those labour violations.

## Iraq

**Mary Davis** (*NATFHE- The University and College Lecturers Union*) moved Motion 82 as amended. She said: To its credit the TUC opposed the war, and to its credit last year we passed a motion calling for the withdrawal of troops from this country and from the United States. The next step is practical solidarity, and that is what this motion concentrates on. At the same time, however, there should be no mistake whatsoever about our opposition to war and occupation. We do not support Anglo/US imperialism masquerading as a moral crusade to rid the world of tyrants. We want the cost of this war to be counted, both for the Iraqis and for us. How many hospitals and schools could have been built with the appalling waste of money on this continued occupation. We want an end to the abuse and torture of Iraqi prisoners. We want an end to military and economic occupation.

The only sure way of defeating occupation, defeating Ba'athism and the threat of fundamentalism is by strengthening the forces of civil society so brutally crushed for 25 years under Saddam Hussein. Chief amongst these forces are the forces of the working class represented through their trade unions. This is the untold story of Iraq. Since the war the media would have us believe that Iraq has descended into barbarism. Look at today's front-page headline in *The Guardian*. It says 'Iraq, a descent into civil war'. The truth is that despite the devastation of war, the horrors of occupation and the misguided fundamentalist elements -- I cannot call them an opposition if they target Iraqi civilians -- civil society, once so rich in Iraq, is being re-born. Chief amongst them, and most significant amongst the elements of civil society, is the development of the Iraqi trade union movement, in particular the Iraqi Federation of Trade Unions.

Within 17 months hundreds of thousands of workers have been recruited to trades unions in 12 single trade unions in the Iraqi Federation. This is a very enviable rate of recruitment that we would do well to emulate in this country. Amongst those recruits women are a very important factor. They are 35 per cent of the workforce and they are playing a significant role. For example, Hashima Hussein, a woman, is the new President of the Electricity and

Energy Workers' Union -- I think it is a male dominated membership but a woman President.

So why has this happened? Why has there been this success of the Iraqi trades unions? It is because Iraq actually is a highly developed society and has a long history of a strong and powerful labour movement. Just for example, in 1959, on May Day, one million workers marched in Iraq out of a population of 6.5 million. Saddam Hussein, like all fascists, sought to smash the organisations of the working class first and therefore he concentrated on the trades unions. He set up his own stooge corporatist unions, just like Hitler did, but the underground trade union movement was formed, the Workers Democratic Trade Union movement, men and women of great bravery who still organised in Iraq and outside Iraq. This is the backbone of the new trade union federation now existing in Iraq. The federation has no resources. It needs support, not just for its own sake; it is key to ending the occupation and privatisation, and the development of a democratic secular Iraq. Support and solidarity are needed. Individual unions have already done much and the TUC fund is very welcome, but we need greater co-ordination of efforts as contained in the motion, including in particular solidarity between women trades unionists.

We do not need to tell the Iraqi Federation what to do; they know what to do. They have a clear programme but they need the means to do it. Solidarity is not just a word, it is the core of what it means to be a trade unionist. In supporting our sisters and brothers in Iraq we can re-discover what is best in our own movement. They deserve their solidarity and that is the key to building the secular Iraq that will end the awful privation, the dreadful occupation and the devastation that has been wrought on Iraq after years of war and occupational oppression.

Please support this motion. Workers of all countries unite.

**Denis Doody** (*Union of Construction Allied Trades and Technicians*) in seconding the motion said: I am very very disappointed. Four or five minutes ago we heard from Seb Coe speaking about the possibility that we might create jobs as a consequence of the Olympic bid. I hope this movement is not suffering from convenient amnesia because let me tell you what he was part and parcel of. He and his Party destroyed thousands upon thousands of jobs in mining communities the length and breadth of this country. It is an absolute disgrace! It is about time this movement got back to its grassroots and where we emanated from. We should not be inviting people like him and Digby Jones here.

Two years ago this Congress was bitterly divided about Iraq. The majority opposed the conflict without United Nations backing. A minority opposed the war fullstop. As it turned out, the movement was united in opposition to the war, and rightly so. It is important that we are also united today and that we send an unambiguous message to this Government that the forces of occupation, British included, the United States and the coalition, need to be removed from Iraq rapidly. As long as the US and United Kingdom forces are in Iraq there will always be instability and continuing resistance. The occupation prevents the Iraqi people from developing their own society, a society free from Saddam and a society free from foreign occupation. It is for the people of Iraq to

determine their own future and not the coalition of the criminal masquerading as liberators.

The trade union movement in Iraq will play a vital role in the reconstruction of that country. The trade unions are no friend of Saddam Hussein. Under the then Iraqi labour code, in 1987, trade unions were banned in the public sector, which at that particular time formed a major part of the Iraqi economy. Trade unions could not operate independently from the regime. It is hardly surprising that the trade union movement in Iraq is divided politically.

Earlier this year the ICFTU organised a fact-finding mission to Iraq, which included a representative of the TUC. This should give us the confidence that independent trade unions will help to develop Iraq, provided of course they are given the freedom to organise.

Whilst in Iraq the ICFTU found a vibrant grassroots organisation dealing with day to day issues such as non-payment of wages, unemployment and poor management. Whilst trade union organisations are still hampered by the code left behind by the old regime, 17 months after the collapse of the Hussein regime, the '87 labour code still exists.

I have to wind up now. If I had been given a real opportunity without having to make some interventions because of what the ex-Minister for Sport said, I would have got my message across more clearly. The Iraqi trade unions deserve our support. I hope that delegates in this hall do not believe that the new organisation is a stooge to American imperialism. It is not.

**Mitch Tovey** (*Transport Salaried Staffs' Association*) speaking in support of the motion said: We are seeing in Iraq day by day the logical and completely foreseeable results of the US inspired attack backed by Britain and others with the destruction of that nation. This daily barrage and slaughter of Iraqi people continues apace, so much so that we have no absolute idea of how many Iraqis have absolutely died, and certainly Bush and Blair do not seem to care. It appears that the so-called coalition have a very unsectarian approach to the slaughter, be it oil workers, bakers, railway workers or teachers. It does not matter. Be they men, women or children, it does not matter. Any religion, any time and in any way, it doesn't matter. All of this is paid for by public money. Blair and Brown seem to have no trouble in finding the money for munitions that destroy another country's infrastructure. There is much more difficulty in funding building at home. It is cheaper and easier to destroy a hospital in Baghdad than to build one in Britain. Before the war people marched in vast numbers to try and stop the war. School children, including my own daughter, came out on the streets but Blair ignored them. We should not be too surprised if, come the General Election, those people ignored Blair.

An important and increasing aspect is the willingness of the families of those service men and women killed in Iraq to speak out, to demand answers, to make clear their opposition to the war, and I pay tribute to the courage of those relatives for speaking out. They have let the population know the real anguish, agony and tragedy of the reality of war.

The key aspect and reason for the war was, of course, oil. The Bush Government knows full well that a cheap oil supply owned and controlled by American-based multi-nationals need a flexible and cowed workforce. If they are not non-union, then they want passive and controlled unions like some of those around under Saddam Hussein. What it cannot afford is an organised and independent workforce. That is the reality behind the systematic wrecking of the offices in Baghdad of the Iraqi Federation of Trade Unions. It is vital for the Bush regime that the Iraqi people are not allowed to organise, and that is why a small office with a dozen laptops could not be tolerated, and that is why it was ransacked by US forces. We must offer our full and unqualified support to our comrades working in the Iraqi Federation of Trade Unions in this hour of need. Destroying the Trade Union Federation in Iraq would be a great achievement for Bush. He must be stopped and he can be stopped. Support the motion.

**Keith Sonnet** (*UNISON*) speaking in support of Motion 82 as amended, said: Congress, each day we watch with horror the continuing carnage in Iraq. We must remember who is to blame for the chaos – George Bloody Bush and Tony Blair. Just as we know that there will never be peace in the Middle East until Israel stops occupying Gaza and the West Bank, and an independent viable Palestinian State created, so we know that there will never be peace in Iraq until the occupying British and American troops leave. We demand in the motion that our Government take immediate steps to end its occupation of Iraq and to return Iraqi assets back to the Iraqi people. The war was illegal, based upon lies and deceit, and it has spawned continued human rights abuses by occupying forces and now by the so-called interim government headed by a former US intelligence agent.

We have seen the systematic abuse and torture of prisoners in gaols throughout Iraq, just as we know takes place in Guantanamo, personally endorsed, as we learn in the newspapers this week, by Donald Rumsfeld. We have seen the bombing of civilian areas in Faluja and in Najaf, with bodies piling up in the streets. We have seen the harassment of journalists and the closure of *Al Jazeera* in Iraq because they do not want the full horror of the situation in Iraq being reported. Congress, we have no moral right to be in Iraq or to remain there, and we must leave completely. There must be no bases left behind to guard the oil fields.

As Mary Davis said in moving the motion, the motion and amendments are calling for support for the Iraqi trade unions. I was proud that the General Secretary of the Iraqi Federation of Trade Unions was able to address my union conference in June and that a group of Iraqi trade unionists will be coming to UNISON in early November, and other initiatives are planned. It is important for all the unions to develop relationships to assist the emerging Iraqi trade unions. Equally, we must keep the pressure up at home. We cannot simply concentrate, as some people would like, on domestic issues whilst the suffering continues to take place in Iraq and elsewhere in the Middle East. That includes building support for the anti-war movement, including supporting the demonstration called by the European Social Forum supported by the Stop the War Coalition in London on Sunday 17<sup>th</sup> October I hope all unions here will be encouraging their members to attend. Let us stop the occupation and let's stop another Bush-inspired war.

**Stewart Brown** (*Fire Brigades Union*) speaking in support of the motion said: What many of us opposing

the invasion of Iraq feared has come to pass and worse. Iraqis – men, women and children – are paying a terrible price. We heard yesterday of at least another 47 people killed as a result of an explosion in a Baghdad market. In total some 14,000 civilians, men, women and children, have been killed according to some estimates. More than 1,000 American troops and some 70 British troops have been killed. Meanwhile, Britain continues to send working class young men and women to their deaths in Iraq. They are just teenagers with rudimentary training. Many are like 19 year-old Gordon Gentle from Glasgow.

Coalition forces must withdraw from Iraq and Iraqis themselves must choose how they start to deal with regaining normal life with the help of the international agencies, if necessary. We must learn the wider lessons of the war in Iraq. The US and the UK must never again take pre-emptive military action against sovereign nations. The world's hyper-power and its lapdog, Britain, must never again ignore the UN and the rule of international law. We must be immediately moved to reduce, with a view to removing totally, their giant arsenals of weapons of mass destruction. We in Britain and in the trade unions must not forget Iraq.

We have a special responsibility to help ordinary Iraqi people find a way out of their nightmare. We must work with them to build a stable, democratic and prosperous Iraq. In particular, as trade unions, we must support the effort of the IFTU trade union federation to build a strong and democratic trade union movement. We must support them in whatever way we can in achieving their aims. Practical solidarity is crucial.

A delegation from the FBU has visited the country twice in recent months; first, on a fact-finding mission and on the second occasion an FBU official returned with practical help for the country's fire-fighters. He brought some fire-fighting equipment. Iraqi fire-fighters are in the frontline, risking their lives every day in ways in which those British public sector workers, like fire-fighters, would find difficult to image.

Great strides have been made in building trade union structures and building a trade union movement which truly represents workers and is not an instrument of a former or current regime of occupying forces, but much more has to be done. It is time to stop the war. It is time for the UK to withdraw its troops. It is time for respect of international law. It is time for global disarmament led by the US and UK. It is the time to make peace, not war. We must strengthen links with the Iraqi trade unions, visiting the country and providing real practical help. Thank you.

**The President:** Motion 82 is supported by the General Council.

*Motion 82, as amended, was CARRIED.*

## Middle East

**Vicky Knight** (*Fire Brigades Union*) speaking on paragraph 7.9 of the General Council's Report, said: Comrades, more than 7,000 Palestinian prisoners and detainees are currently held in Israeli jails – including elected members of the Palestinian government, like Marwan Barghouti. More than 1,000 are held without charge.

"We live in one big prison", Shaher Sa'ed, General Secretary of the Palestinian General Federation of Trade Unions, said yesterday. Or, maybe, a death camp. The assassinations of the Palestinian leadership, the killing of men, women and children, including those who come to help and bear witness, like, Tom Hurndall, whose mother spoke at the fringe meeting on Palestine yesterday must stop.

Poverty, malnutrition and an economy in total collapse, with 480,000 Palestinians without jobs, and half-a-million Palestinians unable to support themselves or their families, plus 50 percent unemployment.

The wall has been built on occupied territory to consolidate Israel's hold over its expanding colonies, with more than 200 illegally built settlements of 400,000 settlers scattered in the occupied territories, often built on land confiscated from Palestinians, and served by Israeli-only roads and electricity grids, controlling water resources and frustrating any true exercise of Palestinian statehood. The wall violates international law, as the International Court of Justice found in July. Along with 24 other members of the EU, the United Kingdom endorsed the ruling and yet the settlements continue to expand and the Wall still stands. The UK must hold Israel accountable for a failure to abide by international law – on this and a string of other UN articles it continues to ignore.

Sisters and brothers, the fight for Palestinian justice is not about anti-semitism. About a third of Britain's Jews are critical of Israeli actions in the Occupied Territories according to a recent poll.

The peace movement in Israel is growing. The problem is the Israeli Government, the Israeli state, not the Jewish people. Silence about this tragedy from the rest of the world is our biggest problem. We must shout out loud and clear. We must spread the message, we must lobby the Israeli Embassy and we must tell our Government, that justice cannot continue to be denied to the Palestinians.

The efforts of the TUC and affiliated unions, as spelled out in the General Council Report, are commendable in seeking to help promote peace. But things have got considerably worse in Palestine since the last Congress. We must be doing much, much more. The UK Government must come out in support of Palestinians' legitimate demands for justice.

It must break with the United States' slavish support for Sharon. The Israeli Prime Minister is currently under no serious international pressure. It should work to end the EU's preferential trade agreements with Israel. Britain should consider sanctions. They worked with Apartheid in South Africa. They may well help end the Apartheid in the Palestinian territories. We, as trade unionists, must redouble our efforts to end the injustice.

Congress, I urge you and your unions to organise visits to Palestine to see the tragedy for yourselves.

I urge you and your unions to get active, to affiliate and to donate to Trade Unions for Palestine and Palestine Solidarity Campaign.

There was no motion on Palestine on this year's order paper. It is important that we do not forget the Palestinian people.

**The President:** Thank you for that comment on paragraph 7.9. There is, of course, a full report of the TUC delegation that went to Nablus, Ramalla and Israel. We, of course, reported back to the General Council on the problems, many of which were just reported, and assistance and aid is being developed, particularly to the ILO and with the Confederation of Arab Unions. We will do everything we can to ensure that the kind of assistance asked for is given.

In closing that section of the debate, I draw your attention to the TUC Iraq Appeal, information about which was in all the wallets to this Congress. Many of the speakers before in the debate on Iraq did call for practical support and solidarity for the unions, including the Iraqi Federation of Trade Unions. This TUC Iraq Appeal gives our movement the chance to be of help and assistance to rebuilding free and democratic unions in Iraq.

## Colombia

**The President:** In my President's Address on Monday I reported on my visit to Colombia and the fact that it is the most dangerous place in the world for trade unionists. A lot of work has been done in solidarity. Many of the affiliated unions are involved, and Justice for Colombia, which is the organisation the TUC works with closely, has been very active indeed. They have produced a 25-minute film, which is available from the Justice for Colombia stand, but, in advance of the speaker from Colombia, we thought you would like to see an excerpt from the film. After the film has been shown Hernando Hernandez will address Congress, and his speech will be interpreted by Liam Craig-Best, who is the Secretary to Justice for Colombia.

We have another Colombian colleague with us at Congress, Luchio Hernandez, who is President of the Public Service Workers' Union, Sintraemcali, whom we also saw when we were in Colombia in February. The office of Sintraemcali is where a bomb was placed on the same day as our visit.

Last night we heard the terrifying news from the town of Cali that Vanhela Garsonne, who was elected last January as governor of the province of Vali DeCalca, which includes Cali, had been the subject of an assassination attempt. He is a long-standing trade union leader. He was Labour Minister in a previous Government in Colombia and now he is the governor. Although he is extremely heavily guarded, an attempt was made on his life. One of his bodyguards, an active trade unionist, was assassinated. At the moment we believe that Vanhela Garsonne is alive and we are seeking more information and will report to Congress when things are clearer. In the meantime the General Council have sent condolences to the family of the bodyguard. This murderous attack is another example of how dangerous that country is.

At this stage, colleagues, we will show the video.  
(Video shown).

Colleagues, it is now my honour to introduce Hernando Hernandez, the International Secretary and former President of the Colombian Oil Workers Union, who has also been nominated for Colombia's National Peace Prize by the CUT National Confederation. I shall leave Hernando to tell you how his union has struggled

in the face of arrests, detentions and over one hundred murders just in his union in recent years, and about their struggle to save the National Oil Company from privatisation. He comes from a family of union activists. His father, who was also in the Oil Workers' Union, was murdered. His mother and brothers have been arrested. Hernando himself has been the target of numerous assassination attempts. When I was in Colombia in February with the TUC/War on Want/Justice for Colombia delegation, he had just completed 13 months of detention and arrest with no obvious evidence against him. We called a press conference in the Colombian Senate and denounced his illegal detention. It became quite a big issue in Colombia. Within a week Hernando was released together with eleven leaders of the Health Workers' Union. He still faces possible charges of murder, terrorism, kidnapping and anything they want to make-up.

We are very proud that he has been able to come to Brighton to join us as part of our international solidarity with the Colombian people and Colombian trade unions in their struggle. We are delighted to have you here today, Hernando, and I invite you, on behalf of the TUC and Congress to address us this afternoon.

## Address by Hernando Hernandez

**Hernando Hernandez (Interpreted):** In the name of the Colombian workers and in particular the oil workers of Colombia, I would like to bring warm greetings to this Congress. I also thank Brendan, Roger and all delegates at this Congress.

I also give our greetings to the other international visitors and a big thank you to the TUC and Justice for Colombia for inviting me so that I could come and be with you today.

I want to denounce to this Congress and to the world the deterioration of the human rights situation under the policy of democratic security of the Uribe regime is using in Colombia.

Every day the social situation is getting worse under this government's rule. Today unemployment is running at 25 per cent and during the time of this new government we have had 70,000 workers fired. Every day privatisation policies are becoming stronger and growing and hospitals are closing all over the country. There are systematic violations of human rights.

In my trade union federation, the CUT Federation, which has been around for 18 years, up to this date the Colombian government have murdered 4,000 of our members. Since the new President, President Uribe came to power, 137 trade unionists have been shot. This government has also detained and locked up 7,000 social activists and trade union activists. We are all accused of terrorism by the government. I was held under house arrest for 14 months and 14 days accused of terrorism, but in the end the Colombian state found that there was no evidence against me. Threats every day are becoming worse against union activists and the only reason why we are the victims of these attacks is because of our work to oppose things like privatisation. My union, the oil workers' union, was recently involved in a 37 day strike to prevent the privatisation of the state oil company and to keep the oil in the hands of the Colombian people.

As a result, they sacked 248 members of the union involved in the strike, including myself. They are

starting legal processes against many of us. This happened also in Cali where the public sector workers' union, Sintraemcali, held a strike and they were fired from their jobs also. About two weeks ago during a raid in the city of Cali a document was found, that was produced by military intelligence officers, which listed the members of this union and it said that they had to be executed. The document listed, for example, Luchio Hernandez, who is with us today, the head of Sintraemcali. It mentioned the progressive members of Congress, namely, Alexander Lopez and Wilson Borja and many other members of Sintraemcali also. It said that they must all be got rid of – executed. We think that the killing yesterday of the bodyguard of Vanhela Garsonne was the beginning of what the army has called Operation Dragon. That is what the document was entitled.

The Colombian trade union movement demands that the United States, Israel and the United Kingdom stop giving military aid to our government. Those three governments are currently complicit in the violations of human rights in my country.

We need assistance and solidarity with social developments and in our efforts to produce peace with social justice. I was very happy to read the motion proposed by the Fire Brigades' Union and I hope that the entire Congress will support this motion.

While it is very difficult to continue with union work in my country and to be a trade unionist in my country, I can tell you that we will continue struggling and continue fighting. Your help and solidarity strengthens us and makes us able to continue to fight for a free and sovereign Colombia. Thank you.

*(Applause amidst a standing ovation)*

**The President:** Thank you so much for being with us, Hernando. You can take back with you to Colombia the total solidarity of the British trade union movement, all of the affiliates to the TUC and the branches and activists. Once they get this video and hear what is happening, I am sure there will be an outpouring of support and aid to our Colombian sisters and brothers. Thank you.

## Colombia

**The President:** The General Council supports the motion on Colombia.

**Ruth Winters** (*Fire Brigades Union*) moved Motion 83. She said: Let me say what an honour it is to be able to stand on the platform and follow a comrade such as Hernando. Nothing has changed in Colombia and that is why we bring the issue of Colombia before this Congress. It is great to see and hear the full backing of the TUC. The one thing that Hernando never told you in too much detail was about his house arrest. There are two sides to Colombia. There is the public face that the Government wants to portray in Europe, America and the rest of the world, and there is the reality of what is happening. When Hernando was under house arrest and accused of mass murder, terrorism and being a guerilla, at the same time they would let him out from house arrest now and again because he also sat on the Peace Commission. He would go along to the Peace Commission and then be sent back under house arrest. We talk about international solidarity and practical things that can be done. Hernando on one occasion had to go to hospital. When he was in hospital he was under attack all the time, so much so that the international community in Cuba took

Hernando in and looked after him when he needed medical treatment. That is the reality of living in Colombia as a trade unionist.

We met so many people on this trip with the joint delegation of Justice for Colombia and War on Want. I know there are people in this hall, including Roger, who were on the delegation with me. We met so many people that it is difficult to repeat to you all the stories that people told us.

People ask: "What have international issues got to do with us?" Everybody has got branch members who say that. I tell them about the man in this picture. This is a man whose mother I met when I was in Colombia. This is a man who was a community worker. This is a young man who was a volunteer fire-fighter and trade unionist. This is a young dead community worker trade unionist and volunteer fire-fighter. That is the reality of living in Colombia.

The reality of all things we talked about this week, such as trade disputes, strike action and meetings like *this*, result in those attending being charged with rebellion. This hall could have been the most rebellious place ever in Colombia. Just for sitting here and just for getting up and saying what you have to say you would be charged with an offence in Colombia. That is the reality of the situation of living in Colombia.

We even met government ministers in Colombia, the same government ministers who are talking about Plan Dragon. This is the reality of living in Colombia.

The United States of America under George Bush is feeding in hundreds of millions of dollars to support the regime of Uribe. The military aid that our Government gives in our name should be stopped and stopped now.

We met the British Ambassador who knew nothing about military aid. We met Vice-President Santos who knew something about military aid. We met the Minister for Defence who knew a lot more about military aid from the UK but who would not tell us about it because he did not want to give the game away when we were there. This situation has to stop and we can never let the issue of Colombia go away. We visited a women's prison and a men's prison. There is no such thing in Colombia under law as a political prisoner, but they ushered us to the political wing. How that works, I do not understand. We met many people who need our help. We met many people who need our support and we met many people who want you and I to go and see Colombia to see the reality. I would happily go back to Colombia. The only downside to that is that it would be an opportunity missed for another trade unionist to visit. We should encourage, pay and send delegations to Colombia to meet the people. There is no doubt that the stark reality of death and threat on families exists.

Luchio Hernandez, who was mentioned earlier, has to move house every week. He has to change his 'phone number all the time. He and his family cannot live together because of the threats to their lives. Again, nothing has changed in Colombia. There is no doubt about that. We have to stop what is happening in that country. We have to support our brothers and sisters.

The women's movement in Colombia is very strong. The saddest side to that is the fact that the majority of those involved in the movement are widows, who have also lost their sons and fathers yet the Government go out on a limb to make it difficult for them to see any of their relatives who are in prison. They, themselves, are under threat.

In the video you saw some guns. We were standing by them as well. It was the most oppressive atmosphere that I have ever been in in my life. We met a woman trade unionist at the university, and she said to me "It is okay to feel scared here". The strange thing is that I never felt scared in Colombia. I did not feel scared for me or for the delegation because the public face of the Colombian government is such that they would never have let anything happen to us. We were over-guarded to the point of being unbelievable. I said that we experienced a most oppressive atmosphere. I have never lived in a police state, but having lived there for a week I now know what it is like.

I will tell you what I was scared about, and that is that we are not going to do enough to support people like Hernando, Luchio and all the other comrades we met in that country. I am really scared that we do not do enough about that.

You must not forget that the Uribe government is clever. It is a clever government backed by the United States of America. It is about capitalist oppression of a country and it is stepping on brother and sister trade unionists in that country.

Comrades, five minutes to talk on Colombia is not enough. I know there will be other speakers in this debate. Please support Justice for Colombia. Get information from them. Support War on Want and all the other organisations, and support our brothers and sisters in Colombia. We want to see them back again and the same people back again. Thank you.

**Alison Shepherd (UNISON):** I am very pleased to be seconding this motion, which was moved so movingly by Ruth and introduced so eloquently by Roger Lyons, our TUC President. It is absolutely obvious that they have been to Colombia and they have had their lives changed by what they have seen, as I had when I went three years ago.

I am pleased to second this motion to show our continuing commitment to our sister trade unions in Colombia. We have been working with the public service union, Sintraemcali, since 2001. What brought us together was a shared interest in fighting privatisation, sustained by our belief that trade unions do make a difference to the communities that we live and work amongst and represent. The difference, as Ruth has said, is that we in UNISON, or those of us in any trade union in this hall, do not risk death and intimidation, either towards ourselves or our families, from government-authorised paramilitary death squads. That is one reason why I am so pleased to have Luchio and Luis Hernandez from Sintraemcali amongst us, and to meet Hernando who has come over here to a place of relative safety. I am always relieved to have news, but the news we have just heard is not good in terms of so many friends and trade unionists that we work with in that country.

I was very unhappy to hear about the sackings of many of the Sintraemcali executives from the company

that they worked so hard for and fought so hard to keep from privatisation and the vicious struggle that we have followed over here with our solidarity.

As Ruth and Hernando have said, since the current President came to power privatisation has accelerated. Fifty per cent of public utilities have been privatised. Seventy per cent of public hospitals have been privatised and workers rights and wages have been reduced. Colombia is a rich country made poor by international policies. Money is poured into arms from the US and the UK Governments. It does not educate children or help displaced adults fight poverty. It is poured into arms. It is disgraceful.

In the three years since we visited Colombia there has been a groundswell of interest throughout UNISON. The flow of information from Colombia is strong and missing trade unionists lead to a bombardment by faxes, e-mails and callers to the government both here and in Colombia from concerned UNISON members. This is as well as the pressure that we can make as a union directly to ministers and visits to the embassy. An awful lot of us have got to know the Colombian Embassy very well. This situation has been replicated in other unions and I hope we hear some more testimonies.

The motion sets down what we can do. UNISON works with a range of organisations. The motion is very specific. As far as UNISON is concerned, the reasons for our solidarity are simple. As Alexander Lopez, the former President of Sintraemcali, said, "It makes it more difficult for them to kill us". Please support the motion. Trade unionists do not have to die.

**Barbara White (Musicians' Union)** speaking in support of the motion said: I will be very brief. The Musicians' Union wanted to add their voice to their brothers and sisters in Colombia.

It does seem very strange that a government as committed to war on terror as the current British Government may actually be contributing military aid to the most extreme terror the trade union movement faces in the world. Ninety-five per cent of trade union assassinations are the work of paramilitary groups. The British Government have, not surprisingly, kept a tight lid on details of its military assistance. A report in *The Guardian* suggested that the UK is now the second biggest donor of military aid to Colombia.

As a previous speaker said, Colombia is a very rich country. It has resources such as oil, gold and very rich soils, but it is a country that contains fantastic inequalities of wealth. Just one per cent of the population still owns 58 per cent of the land whilst, approximately, eight million Colombians have incomes below a nutritionally defined subsistence level.

Colombia is a young country with 38 per cent of the population under the age of 18. Last year eleven student activists were assassinated, 155 received death threats, 53 were displaced and six were arrested and detained without charge. The Colombian people do not want military aid. They have made that very clear. They need help in alleviating the appalling social problems that Colombia suffers from. I support.

*\* Motion 83 was CARRIED.*

## Trade and Labour Standards

**Nigel Gawthorpe** (*Graphical, Paper and Media Union*) speaking to paragraph 7.6 of the General Council Report on trade and labour standards said: The GPMU supports wholeheartedly the ETI and, indeed, shares the platform with Sir Tony Young, who is the trade union co-ordinator for ETI.

The Play Fair at the Olympics Campaign was an excellent campaign and highly commendable, but there is still work to be done there by persuading sportswear manufacturers to ensure their codes of conduct in their supply chains are not undermined by contract demands.

However, it is not just sportswear manufacturers that need to be targeted. For those of us who go to gigs and buy the merchandise, we can bring pressures to bear on the bands and their managers to ensure that t-shirts are made in unionised companies and that when they are made overseas, they are made by companies that treat their workers fairly, ethically and with dignity.

It is not difficult. By the click of a mouse you can help thousands of workers who desperately need your support. We want to see the General Council continue to support ethical trading. If your union is not affiliated to the ETI, I urge you to ask your union to support the ETI to ensure that we bring an end to exploitation.

## The Americas

**Bob Oram** (*UNISON*): Speaking to paragraph 7.10 said: Last year we unanimously passed a resolution committing us to solidarity with Cuba. We all saw the reaction to the moving and powerful speech made by Pedro Ross Leal this morning. He spoke of the respect and the friendship that our solidarity and internationalism gives to the Cubans as they struggle against unbelievable odds to survive.

We all know the USA in its attempts to destroy the Cuban revolution has used sabotage, assassinations, terrorism, biological warfare and a 43 year-old economic blockade. To us, solidarity is important and when Roger stood in Revolution Square on May Day, the Cubans understood they were not alone.

We are also doing good work with the TUC. On the back of last year's resolution, like Pedro, I would urge everyone to attend the TUC and Cuba Solidarity Campaign conference on 6 November this year.

However, like UNISON and a lot of other delegates here today, we are extremely concerned about the second paragraph in the section of the report on Cuba. The inference that Cuba somehow supports slavery anywhere in the world is nonsense. Are we really saying to our guest, a man who himself, like so many other Cubans, fought for years in Angola and ultimately defeated the South African army, paving the way to end apartheid, that they support slavery? Do we really believe the first country that Mandela visited after his release from jail supports slavery?

These words are an insult to the millions of Cubans who themselves are descended from slaves, and should be removed. Do we honestly believe that Cuba

supports death squads in Colombia? The inference that they do is outrageous.

As for the criticism of Cuba labour laws, let us not fall for Bush-inspired propaganda. I urge you all to read the excellent Institute of Employment Rights booklet on Cuba and labour laws. In 22 states in the USA, the so-called Rights to Work Act denies collective negotiations. Where are the ICTFU demands that the USA provide explanations at the Standing Commission of the ILO against its violations of international conventions?

As part of its unrelenting attacks on Cuba, Bush has recently endorsed a strategy that seeks to use the ILO to condemn so-called labour exploitation in Cuba. He wants to use NGOs, like the ICTFU, to promote independent or exiled trade unionists to finance these people who are, in essence, paid agents of the US Interests Section in Havana.

Let us be absolutely clear. We do not support Bush's agenda for Cuba. As Fidel Castro recently said, Cuba fights on the side of life in the world. The USA fights on the side of death. While the United States bomb indiscriminately civilians all around the world, Cuba saves hundreds of thousands of children, mothers, old and sick people.

Our internationalism and solidarity work with Cuba deserves better than these words in our annual report. I was going to ask for reference back, but I am happy to hear what the General Council will say in response to our concerns.

**Bernard Regan** (*National Union of Teachers*): The National Union of Teachers is proud to support the position of the TUC in defence of Cuba solidarity in opposition to the United States' imposed blockade and for the Hands Off Cuba campaign.

The economic blockade that has been conducted by the United States threatens the educational gains that have been made by Cuba. In Cuba, class sizes for secondary children are 1 to 18, aiming for 1 to 15 and, in the primary sector, 1 to 20. Those are targets that we would be proud of if they were achieved in this country, but they are a long way off.

Cuba has surpassed the United Nations' objectives for education. The United Nations aspires by 2015 that every child will be in a school. At the current period in time, two-thirds of girls are not in schools. Cuba far surpassed these objectives many years ago. However, these and other gains in health, in education and social services continue to be under threat as a result of the economic blockade. That blockade has actually intensified since we made our decision in 2003 that we opposed it.

On May 6, the United States announced eight further major developments in intensifying that blockade which are restricting the right of Cuba to trade freely, are preventing United States citizens from travelling to Cuba and are impinging on the rights of Cuban citizens.

The Torichelli Act, for example, denies food and medicine to be traded with the United States, so that children, for example, in hospitals in Cuba recovering from cancer treatment are unable to get the kind of



palliative treatment that would alleviate the pain they suffer. That is absolutely inhumane.

However, it is more than that. It is not just the economic blockade that has been intensified. In the last few months, President Bush established the Commission for Transition in Cuba. That Commission was under the direction of Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice. It drew on the expertise of various sections within the United States administration and specified what is really a post-invasion plan for Cuba at the core of which is a massive privatisation programme that would attack education and health specifically. That is something that we must be absolutely opposed to.

On November 6, the TUC, together with the Cuba Solidarity Campaign, is organising a trade union conference which will give an opportunity for people to learn about the role of trade unions in Cuba, to learn about the social gains that have been made within Cuba and a massive opportunity for us to develop practical solidarity between the TUC and the CTC.

I hope every union, like mine, will participate and be involved in that programme. We should leave this Congress with the kind of united response that was affirmed last year when we expressed our opposition to the blockade by the United States of America. I think we should echo the words of President Roger Lyons in his response to Pedro Ross's magnificent speech, when he said: "We want to strengthen the fraternal and sororal relations between the TUC and the CTC."

We should leave this Congress with a determined resolution to defy the blockade that is being conducted. We should call for an end of that blockade for the defence of Cuba's sovereignty. Hands off Cuba: solidarity with the Cuban workers.

**Brendan Barber** (*General Secretary*): Congress, may I begin by saying I am happy to accept the point that has been made and accept that the wording in this particular paragraph was clumsy and was open to misinterpretation. We entirely accept that the Cuban Government and trade union movement do not support slavery or death squads in Colombia or anything of that sort.

However, Congress, there are differences of perspective between the TUC and other members of the workers' group in the ILO and the CTC. The report referred to some of those issues and we need to continue to discuss those. However, what today's historic address by Pedro has been about is demonstrated in the growing friendship between the British trade union movement and our Cuban colleagues.

The TUC wants to explore too whether our influence can be used to promote a wider dialogue between the CTC and the wider international trade union family. As part of that, we are organising the conference in November jointly with the Cuba Solidarity Campaign. We have also been stepping up our efforts in opposing without any equivocation the totally unjustified US blockade and aggression against Cuba and pressing our Government for action and for action from the European Union as well.

Congress, I think this has been an exceptional year for our work on Cuba and Pedro's presence here this week, I think, is testimony to that. Let us now take that work forward positively together.

### **Judicial Review on the Sexual Orientation Regulations 2003**

**The President:** We come to Motion 20. General Council support the motion with a reservation.

**Mary Page** (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*) moved Motion 20 on behalf of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Conference. She said: I am a member of the TUC's Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Committee. Last year, we passed a motion calling on the TUC to co-ordinate a legal challenge to the Sexual Orientation Regulations. Thank you to all of you who generously responded to that call.

The unions who took the challenge to the High Court are mentioned in the motion, but many others contributed to the fighting fund. Lesbian and gay trade unionists can be proud of the stance that all our unions are taking. Whilst we did not win on the religious exemption, we can be satisfied that the High Court ruling restricted its interpretation. So were I a teacher in a faith school, I could not now be dismissed because of my sexuality. Congress, this is a victory for common sense and one in the eye for the religious extremists in the Evangelical Alliance.

The challenge to Regulation 25, which allows discrimination in survivor pension rights, was lost too, but the judge was unsure of his own decision and said he fully expected an appeal. An appeal has been lodged, but the legal position remains extremely complex. However, we need to continue to put pressure on the Government because they are wrong; wrong to exclude same sex couples from the right to leave their partner a survivor pension.

I have been with my partner for 25 years, so this is an issue close to my heart. At the end of August, I resigned from full-time work, from full-time teaching, and began to draw my pension. If I die on the way home this evening, she will not receive one penny from the pension fund I have paid into for 32 years. That is not right.

The TUC in the past 12 months has done much to flag up the pension issue. The march and rally in June was one great example. Brendan Barber gave a clear message to London Pride that we will not rest until this injustice is righted. There are moves to amend the Civil Partnership Bill now passing through parliament to give same sex couples the rights married couples enjoy. We need to get our sponsored or supportive MPs to sign up to that early-day motion. Get your MPs to support the amendment when it comes to the Committee stage, but let us keep the pressure on the Government through the legal channels as well. Let us send a clear message to the Government that we will not go away and make sure that I and thousands of others can know their partner will be financially safe after our deaths.

At the LGBT conference in July, I asked the Equalities Minister, Jacqui Smith, if she considered my situation to be fair and she said, "No, but lots of things in life are unfair." Earthquakes and hurricanes are unfair; the bad weather we have had this week is unfair; growing old is unfair, but they are acts of

nature. They cannot be changed, but unfair laws are acts of government and they can and must be changed.

I want to end by going back in history. I think it was exactly 20 years ago, I think perhaps in this very town at a TUC Congress, the general secretary of a major trade union -- it is no longer extant -- when discussing the reasons for Labour's defeat in the 1983 election put the blame on what he said was its "preoccupation with lesbians and other queer folk".

We have come an awful long way together since then, so please support this motion and give us, lesbians, and other queer folk the full rights and equality we deserve!

**Emmet O'Brien** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) seconding Motion 20 said: Like the TUC, PCS has played its part in ensuring pensions has become a key political issue. Equality in pensions has to be a key part of that campaign. PCS is clear that the injustice lesbian and gay members face in pensions is unacceptable. PCS is proud to be party to the legal campaign.

PCS saw the Sexual Orientation Regulations as a major step forward in the fight for equality, but the Government were wrong to include Regulation 25. That allowed discrimination to continue based on marital status.

PCS has reservations about the Civil Partnership Bill as it creates a two-tier system in the UK of recognising relationships, marriage for heterosexuals and civil partnership for same sex couples. However, we will work with our supporting MPs to get that Bill amended around the issues of pensions to ensure equality with married couples.

The trade union movement has been at the forefront of taking equality forward and challenging injustices that are recognised by the LGBT community. The issue of the same sex pension rights is, after all, a number one priority for lesbian and gay members in the trade union movement. Certainly, my own LGBT group, PCS Pride, and PCS, are heavily involved in the campaigning. The work we have done for the lesbian and gay community is also noted.

We have heard yesterday that the Civil Partnership Bill is being delayed because the Right Rev. Ian Paisley wants to explain to parliament that there are no lesbian and gay people in Northern Ireland. It might be interesting to find out how he actually knows that. Let us wait and see. It is notable that there were thousands of people that attended the Belfast Pride march this summer and we were there with the PCS banner. This appears to disprove his theory. Let us wait and see what happens.

We need to keep this issue at the top of the trade union agenda, united in that campaign to win pensions equality for lesbian and gay couples. Let us mobilise the trade union movement in this campaign. Lobby our MPs to support an amendment to the Civil Partnership Bill on pension rights.

**Nick Rowe** (*Accord*) speaking in support of the motion said: I very much welcome the spirit of the motion that calls for solidarity and co-ordination in looking for the best possible opportunity to achieve equality in the field of pensions

My employer is Halifax Bank of Scotland. We have a concept called 'Total Reward', a benefit package jointly agreed and supported between the union and the employer that reflects a number of key elements of remuneration. This year has seen the production of Total Reward statements by the bank sent to all staff members to underpin the context and help colleagues understand and appreciate their benefit package. The pension element forms part of the analysis. Pensions are, after all, deferred pay. We contribute to them as do, in some cases, some of our employers. We should all be treated equally within them.

Some pension schemes recognise same sex partnerships, but most do not. In the pensions debate yesterday, we heard adjectives such as 'outrageous', 'indefensible' and 'socially unjust' to describe the pensions crisis in the UK. These adjectives are just as valid, just as appropriate, to describe the current state of affairs for the provision of equal pension benefits to lesbian and gay workers. We need to find a remedy to end this inequality.

The conference report draws attention to the cross-campaigning around the legal challenge and the proposals contained within the Government Civil Partnership Bill as it is difficult to see Regulation 25 in isolation. However, if the provisions of the Civil Partnership Bill become law, given where it is at present with the potentially wrecking Tory amendment, there will be no retrospection to survivor benefits in occupational schemes.

So where exactly does this leave us? Technically speaking, I believe the description is 'up Pooh Creek without a paddle' with long, continuous serving contributions to pension funds failing to be recognised prior to the introduction of the Bill for survivor benefits. Potentially, we could also see existing schemes that do recognise same-sex partners acting regressively and reverting to restricting benefits.

The President in his opening address said, in reference to the pig with the somewhat surprised look on its face, used in the TUC's pension rally, in its tendency to take off, proof that pigs will fly before employers get to grips with the pensions crisis. Well, may I also add that the securing of equal non-discriminatory pension provision should not be pork pie in the sky for our members.

**Brendan Barber** (*General Secretary*): The General Council strongly supports the thrust of this motion and the demand that it makes for action on this gross injustice, but the General Council has asked me to indicate one point of reservation.

As the motion records, five unions, Amicus, NASUWT, PCS, RMT and UNISON, have pursued a legal challenge to the exemption in the Sexual Orientation Regulations on pension rights for same sex partners. The case is currently listed for a Court of Appeal hearing in December this year.

The motion also acknowledges that the TUC is still pursuing the possibility with the Government of agreeing a favourable amendment on this issue to the Civil Partnership Bill currently completing its passage through the House of Commons. The General Council urges all affiliated unions to support such an amendment.

However, as Congress will recognise, it is, of course, a matter for all of the individual unions concerned to make final decisions on any further legal action and carrying the motion cannot prejudice those decisions. On that basis, I ask you to support the motion.

**The President:** The General Council supports the motion with the reservation.

\* *Motion 20 was CARRIED.*

### Europe General Council Statement

**The President:** The General Council have agreed a statement on Europe and I will be calling Kevin Curran to move the General Council's statement.

**Kevin Curran** (*General Council*) leading in on chapter 6 of the General Council Report said: I am moving the General Council's statement on Europe and giving the General Council's attitude to the composite motion.

The debate over the European constitution is likely to be a long one and the referendum is over a year away, possibly longer. Everyone agrees that we should not adopt a position on the referendum too early. Most people, I think, agree that now would be too early.

That is a pretty simple position. It is a pretty unanimous position. It is the reason that this is an historically short General Council's statement. Going into more detail and expressing a view one way or the other, negative or positive, would only pre-empt the debate, which is not one which could be resolved in the space of a Congress debate, not this year anyway. That is why the General Council's statement takes out of the composite motion and the amendments the bits we can agree on that do not pre-empt the debate, and that keeps the trade union movement's powder dry.

The General Council, therefore, welcome the decision of the movers of the amendment to withdraw and we would very much like the movers of the composite to either remit or withdraw too.

Bob and Steve, we are not going to ask you to do it without addressing Congress. That is clearly your right. I know Congress always enjoys listening to Bob's contributions. We would not want to deprive you of that. However, that is where the General Council's 'nice guy' act ends because I am afraid the General Council will be urging Congress to oppose the composite, if it is not remitted.

We want to unite our position with colleagues, not divide, and the more we say for or against the constitutional treaty at this stage, the more scope for disagreement and disunity there is. We would like you to vote for the General Council's statement. We would like the composite remitted or, if not, then we would, with regret, urge you to vote against it, but at this stage let us not be for or against the constitution.

### Europe

**Bob Crow** (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*): We are asking conference here today to accept the General Council's statement as well as our resolution. It is a shame really that we are debating this resolution, with such consequences, so

late in the day. Year after year, we are putting off a debate that really affects workers' rights, fundamentals, which are what this conference stands for.

Not being personal, I find it hard that Sebastian Coe, as he was known in his former life, can come here, trying to get the Olympic Games in London, when that same bloke sat in Parliament for five years carrying out anti-trade union legislation against you, and now you allow him back here to speak!

Let us make it clear why the RMT is speaking at the rostrum. Some people might say, "Well, you are not really a manufacturing union, Bob, are you?" We are not, but I will tell you what is going on with our members right the way across Europe. It is the liberalisation of the railway network, all the freight to be liberalised by 2006 and all the passenger train services to be liberalised by 2008.

Some people believe, and I believe, that 'liberalisation' means 'free'. It is not 'free'. Liberalisation is privatisation, but they hate the word so much, they will not even use it. It is not free to you. There is not one person in this room, not one of your relatives, not one of the pensioners, who can put his hands in his pocket and buy the railways of Europe. It is going to be given to the billionaires, the big businesses of Europe and multinationals to run the railways in a worse state than they tried to run the British railways at this time.

That is what 'liberalisation' stands for. It stands for the destruction of the shipping industry, the fishing industry and the steel industry. If anyone believes the illusion that this great European Union is going to give you workers' rights, that one morning you are going to wake-up and get it, you are living in cloud-cuckoo land. We want the debate for and against the constitution.

Why should we, as a trade union, want to stop something that is going to give workers better rights? But it's not, is it? You are not going to stop shoes and trainers being made in China as a result of the European Union. The only way you are going to prevent that happening is by getting Chinese workers the same wages as British workers to stop employers moving the manufacture of their shoes and trainers.

The fact is we have been accused of only being concerned about keeping the Queen's head on a £10 note. Let me make it quite clear. I couldn't care less whether the Queen's head or the Queen's backside is on the £10 note. You can pay me in roubles or in shekels -- you can pay me in what you want -- but I will tell you something. You are here this week taking democratic decisions on behalf of your unions to carry those views forward. If you are not going to have an economic policy any more, if you are not going to have a government policy any more and if you are not going to have a policy on the army any more, then you are not a government any more because you cannot control your own destiny.

Whether the Conservatives, Labour or Liberals are in power, you, as independent citizens, can have a say. Who you are going to hand it over to are the likes of Mandleson who has been appointed a European Commissioner. Some of you might say you are going to get workers' rights out of the European Union. Well, you are not, because if you look at the 900-page document, and I do not profess to have read the whole

900-page document, it says it will be left to the domestic legislation whether you have those laws or not. So it is back where you started. The repeal of the anti-trade union laws has not come in and Europe can decide what they want, but you are not going to have the laws that you want unless you repeal them in this country.

The fact of the matter is that we want decent rights. You do not have to tell me about solidarity. You have had the Colombians here this week, you have had the Cubans here this week, Israelis and Palestinians; why does it have to be Europe? Why can't it be the world that we are supposed to look after in the form of unity for the workers?

I ask people not to get fooled that you cannot have debates at conference. That is the reason why people are falling asleep so much this week because there have not been the debates that we should be having year in, year out!

I ask people to have a look at the General Council's statement. It has been extracted from our resolution anyway, so support the General Council's statement. Let us have a proper debate next year and let us not keep on worrying about that general election coming before we take decisions. Let us take decisions in this Trades Union Congress for working people and not start worrying about what political parties are doing. Put the workers' interests first and let us have a proper debate on the European Union Constitution.

**Steve Kemp** (*National Union of Mineworkers*) seconding Composite 17 said: Let me make two things clear at the start of my contribution. Firstly, we also, like Bob's union, do not have a problem with the General Council's statement. Secondly, if this composite had contained any reference to us, as a trade union movement, opposing Britain being in Europe, then we would not have touched, in any way, shape or form, the original motion submitted by the RMT.

That is not to criticise unions like RMT who are sceptical with regard to Europe and, indeed, other unions that are pro-Europe. This is because the NUM, and I would suspect many other trade unions, have not formed a formal position on the proposed constitution for the European Union. I would admit, along with Bob, that I am baffled by the hostility of some colleagues outside this conference to this motion. No doubt, in a few minutes Kevin is going to tell me where I have gone wrong in that, but for the motion itself, it does not seem either to oppose the proposed constitution or, indeed, support it. It calls for this Congress to note that there are genuine concerns about the constitution; that we should welcome the proposal for a referendum; and, in particular, what the NUM supports is that, at long last, after the scaremongering, false views of the right wing media and others, we can now have a genuine and constructive debate on this important issue. I am staggered that we are not going to have that here today.

The composite gives power to the General Council to look at the impact of the proposed constitution. What the hell is wrong with that? I warn Congress that if it is the intention not to have the debate and not to take on the concerns of the people, then we will be seen as the ones who are attempting to stifle discussions on this very question, because there are legitimate concerns by trade union members.

It is a disgrace on such an important issue that once again this issue has been media-led. There has been a frenzy; both sides of the argument, to-ing and fro-ing, while some members of our movement have been left as the proverbial piggy-in-the-middle wondering who to believe.

We are set for the debate, I thought we were, at long last, and in the near future the people of this country will decide. Thirty million householders could be getting a copy of the constitution. We welcome that. The Minister for Europe confirmed from the Despatch Box last week that the constitution is an international treaty and that Britain can withdraw from international treaties. This is one of the many fears that trade unionists have throughout Britain.

I am not suggesting that Minister was telling lies, but I want those questions, questions that are there in the workplaces, to be scrutinised, answered and advice given by the TUC and the General Council. Nothing, surely, can be wrong with that.

**Doug Nicholls** (*Community and Youth Workers Union*): As this debate continues over the coming months, we should expect from the TUC the highest quality objective assessment. We do not want spin. We want accurate, unbiased briefings looking at reality and not the song of the sirens. What the General Council has given us so far is biased, partial and ill-informed.

The General Council Report says that the EU is a full employment economy. This does not explain why unemployment in the Euro zone is double ours at 9 per cent and at one stage, as the Maastricht criteria struck, it was equivalent to the entire populations of Belgium, Denmark and Ireland being out of work.

The General Council Report says that the constitution gives legislation protection to public services. It does not. The terms of convergence for the Euro remain and the legislation they are proposing is, in fact, to open up health and education - the richest prizes - to privatisation.

Often, the significant thing about General Council Reports is what they leave out. There is no mention in the report or the statement of manufacturing. Under the constitution, we would not be able to have an independent national industrial strategy to rebuild domestic energy supply and factories. Even government procurement across the board will have to be subject to even more competition.

However, the General Council is silent on the very biggest issues tied up in the proposed constitution, the economy and government. The General Council should look at economic reality a bit. We are the fourth largest economy in the world, which means that in real terms only 48 per cent of our exported goods and services are traded with the EU. However, if we look at what we produce and buy and sell as a whole, we trade 10 per cent with the EU, 11 per cent with the rest of the world and about 80 per cent within our own domestic economy. As the Chancellor continually warns us, the EU is still the lowest growth area and all eggs in that basket would be fatal.

However, an economy has to be managed and the General Council is not getting to the political heart of the matter. Even the proponents of the new

constitution describe it as 'the capstone of an EU federal state'. In a federal state, a national state loses the basic right of self-government, a right that our predecessors and many of our guests here have split their blood for.

Until now, independent governments in Europe have been relating to each other through various treaties, but the constitution is a new instrument of government with power over them all, described best as the biggest slow motion coup d'état in history. Under an EU constitution, Westminster becomes a subsidiary, an implementor of laws, exclusively initiated by unelected commissioners and subservient to economic policies made by the unelected bankers and invented by the Chicago School monetarists.

We all want a third term of a government we elect and help to direct. An EU constitution would not allow that.

**Tony Dubbins** (*Graphical, Paper and Media Union*): I have been at this rostrum on a number of occasions at TUC conferences arguing very strongly on a pro-European line. That has been our union's position and it remains it. However, let us be clear, this constitution is very difficult and it is a very sensitive thing that we are dealing with now. I am not too far away from what Steve Kemp said, because I understand people's concerns about it. I believe that people need to be assured of what that constitution actually contains.

I have to be honest, I am not sure what the constitution contains at the moment. I am certainly not sure what the implications of the constitution are. I will say something else as well. I do not think our government has helped in this debate very much. I really do not. The kind of line they were taking on fundamental issues, particularly social questions and the Charter of Fundamental Rights, I do not believe has been reassuring to working people in this country.

So I understand what Bob says about workers' concerns. It is right that those workers' concerns should be addressed and it is right that they should be assured. However, they will not be assured by going down this path.

The comments of Jack Straw were most unhelpful for all of us because the gloss that was put on that by the Government, in terms of the social implications and the Charter of Fundamental Rights, has created difficulties, and rightly so, for all.

You heard what Brendan said earlier this week. He pointed out in an article he wrote: "Do not confuse matters." Our anger with the Government's attitude about the Charter of Fundamental Rights should not become opposition to the constitution itself. We need to have a look at that constitution. There are different views on it.

Brian Bercusson, the well-known professor of labour law, who specialises in European issues, takes a very positive view of the Charter and argues the Government do not have the guarantees they sought. On the other hand, Robert Taylor, who is an entirely pro-European journalist, has doubts about the Charter itself and doubts about the implications.

The problem with the resolution is it is pre-emptive and it is Euro-sceptic. I do not think that will help the debate. I do not think anybody who listened to Bob today could have any doubts that Bob's view of this is that we should not be in Europe anyway, and I understand that view.

However, I want the General Council to have a good look at this debate. I want our members to take part in this debate. I do not want debates stifled. I believe that would be the wrong approach. I hope when we have that debate we can have it on the basis of us in the trade union movement treating each other with some dignity, respecting each other's views and not conducting the debate in the way that the *Sun* and the *Daily Mail* do. So I hope you support the General Council's statement and oppose this resolution.

**Fawzi Ibrahim** (*NATFHE – the College and University Lecturers Union*): I am very happy on behalf of my union to have this opportunity to support Composite 17. It is argued that the European Constitution will bring forward workers' rights and improved conditions. Brendan Barber in his address to us on Monday said there are two options, two roads. We have the American model and we have the European model. There is a third way but it is not the Blairite third way, which has been discredited. There is the socialist model where those who produce the wealth in a nation own the wealth they produce. However, the European Constitution does not offer this. What we have is the European model.

Even if this is what we aspire to, and in spite of its inadequacies, why is it we are told we cannot have it unless we sign for a new European Constitution? Why is it we cannot achieve what that European model aspires to through the normal way that we achieve and secure all improvements, namely, by struggles here? Why do we have to sell our soul in order to get an improvement?

There is more to the European model than meets the eye. In fact, it is being used in a similar way to a piece of cheese in a mousetrap. People are not mice. They will see through it and will not bite.

The referendum on the European constitution will be dominated by the issue of our sovereignty, our right to determine our own affairs in this country. The fact that the European constitution will undermine our ability to determine our own affairs is almost indisputable. In fact, if you look at page 72 of the General Council Report, it is stated there the manner in which that constitution will give powers to the EU Commission over and above what we can do in this country.

The question of sovereignty is as non-negotiable as the right to strike for a trade union. It is not a second-hand car that can be traded in. It is non-negotiable. It is important that a country should keep a sovereignty to make its own decisions. It is not up for sale.

**The President:** Does the RMT want to take up its right of reply?

**Bob Crow:** I have one point on Tony's contribution. That is exactly what we wanted, Tony. We actually want to have the merits and demerits of people's views. As I said before, we do not know ourselves

whether it is good for us or not, but we are sceptical about some of the points that we have examined. That is the question we are putting up at this moment in time. At the end of the day, we want a thorough debate throughout the trade union movement on what is going to be the best advantage for British workers as they go in the future to trade.

The General Council Statement, if you look at it, is two paragraphs extracted from the original RMT resolution. All the RMT resolution would do, if you accept the composite with the NUM's position, is basically put the microscope on certain points that the RMT has looked at. That is what it is all about at the end of the day.

We would ask people here today; we do not expect people to make a judgment on a 900-page document by a few people getting up here and making contributions from the rostrum. However, what we would say is let us have this proper debate and put the microscope on the things that affect us.

All I would say at this moment in time is what we have seen for our railway workers throughout the length and breadth of Europe. German railway workers are telling us now they have been privatised, they have lost 50,000 jobs within 18 months. Workers in Italy have witnessed thousands of jobs going as a result of liberalisation. Right across the board, railway workers are having privatisation forced on them all on the basis of a step-by-step process of privatisation, liberalisation and the effect of the constitution.

I would have rather a debate than waking up in two, three or four years, coming to this Congress and we are all sitting here worrying about how many jobs we are losing as a result of it and how workers' rights have not come in.

We have no problem or worry at all about passing the composite. You can pass the composite and you can pass the General Council's statement because *those* two paragraphs have been extracted from the original RMT resolution.

**Kevin Curran** in exercising his right of reply on the General Council statement, said: I told you that you would enjoy Bob's contribution, colleagues. I cannot think of too many of us in the room who can in a debate on the European constitution mention a peer of the realm and the Queen's bum in the same sentence. We obviously respect Bob's views and we respect Steve's views, and we respect the views of everyone in this room, and we respect the views of affiliates, and we recognise they are different, and we recognise the need to have an informed debate, and to take it away from the right-wing press and their reactionary views. There is a balanced debate to be had. It is not about the Queen's anatomy, it is about the future of the people of Europe, and our social agenda. Bob referred to workers' rights, which concerned us all, and he also referred to the fact that Seb Coe was in the House of Commons supporting anti-trade union laws during those wilderness years. I remember during those wilderness years turning to Europe for some succour for the defence of workers' rights, and from that period we obtained new health and safety laws, a period when we had a reactionary government but health and safety laws were needed to look after the interests of British workers.

So, we do need a balanced debate. Steve said he is looking forward to me correcting his view or

correcting his misapprehensions about the case. That is not for me to do, Steve. I am not here to put anybody right, nor is the General Council. We recognise and respect the fact that a number of affiliates here have not come to a position on this issue. We do want the debate, of course we want the debate, but we want an informed debate and it is part of our responsibility to have an informed debate and to take full cognizance of that. Doug was saying that he does not want the General Council to stifle debate and he does not want spin. Again, it is not our intent to stifle any point of view or, indeed, to indulge in spin. The constitutional treaty as it stands is not a perfect document, it never will be, and it will not have all we want to see, but we are going to have the debate, we are going to have a referendum, and affiliates here will no doubt take a full part in it. Tony referred to his position as an affiliate and he understands people's concerns about it, and we share those concerns. Bob is quite right in his right of reply, he wants a thorough debate, we want a thorough debate. I do not think there is any difference of opinion about the need to have a thorough debate about this very very important issue.

I refer you back to the Council's statement where it says, "have the opportunity to consider in depth and assess its impact on key issues such as the rights of working people to decent work, the national democratic right of member states, public services, and equality." Colleagues, I urge you to support the General Council's Statement.

**The President:** Thank you.

\* *The General Council's Statement on Europe was CARRIED*

\* *Composite Motion 17 was LOST*

**The President:** (*Sounds of dissent from the floor*) It is an overwhelming vote, at least 2:1, I can assure you of that; it was not close at all. On that basis, we have completed our business for the day.

(*Congress adjourned at 5.30pm*)

**FOURTH DAY: THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 16**  
**MORNING SESSION**

*(Congress reassembled at 9.30 a.m.)*

**The President:** I would like to thank Team Brass who have been playing for us this morning. It was a delight.

Congress, one of our tellers, Sonia Kordiak from the EIS, is not able to be with us today. Could you, therefore, agree that Ray Hill of Community be a substitute teller? Is that agreed? *(Agreed)*

In view of the outstanding business, I want to reinforce to delegates the importance of staying within the time limits, not repeating points already made and being as brief as possible. If everyone observes this rule, then we need not actually seek the changing of time limits themselves and it may be possible that Congress could be finished by one o'clock, but that will require tremendous self-discipline by everyone concerned.

With regard to unfinished business, I intend to take all the outstanding business this morning after the scheduled business in the following order. After the scheduled business, I will take Motions 74, 75, 76 and 47. On Motion 48, I understand the mover, CDNA, wish to remit. That is acceptable to Congress, I am sure.

Then I will take Motion 49, Composite Motion 16, Motions 70, 72, 73 and 78. After Motion 78, I will call the outstanding paragraphs of the General Council Report on Europe, which are on page 69. Delegates, I inadvertently missed calling paragraph 3.8 on Race Quality on Tuesday. I will be calling that after the Transport debate.

**Transport**

**Bob Crow** (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) moved Composite Motion 14. He said: I ask conference unanimously to support this composite, and also to continue the work that this Congress and the transport unions have done.

The campaign has brought success to all the rail unions. Last October the infrastructure of the mainline railways was brought back into public ownership. Some people say that Network Rail is a company not-for-profit, but one thing for sure is that when they were in private hands, they certainly were for profit. We could not care less, really, what they want to call it, a not-for-profit company. I know this Government does have a problem. It has a bit of a stutter. It will not say the 'N' word, 'nationalisation', so perhaps we should say it here today.

The infrastructure is back. You have heard me criticise the Government on a number of occasions, but I would like to praise the Government for the actions they took in bringing those companies back. The only shame about it is that, while they got rid of the Jarvises and the Balfour Beatty's off the mainline railway, they returned the compliment by privatising London Underground and giving the same work to the Jarvises and Balfour Beatty's.

We welcome the fact that some companies have come back into public ownership, but we want the entire lot back. We do not say it in an arrogant fashion: we do not want crumbs or slices of the bread

when it comes to the railway industry. We want the entire bakery, everything that goes with it, because the railway network can only be run on the basis that everyone operates together.

Some people might think that train drivers are the only people that work on the railway. The fact is before the trains can run, you need someone to open the train station in the morning, you need someone to sell the tickets, you need someone to maintain the railway for the train to run on, you need signal boxes to operate the trains in a safe fashion and you need cleaners. Each part of the rail network complements the other like a patchwork quilt.

If you bring the infrastructure back into public ownership, then why are you not bringing the renewals? On top of that, South-East Trains is now in public ownership. Why is it that when South-East Trains is brought back, the punctuality of the services go up and the actual number of complaints from the passengers go down, yet they are still considering reprivatising it?

Our position is quite clear, that South-East Trains is back, and when the franchises come up for grabs, the keys should be taken off them, just change the overalls and uniforms of the people who work in that company, and bring it all back piece by piece underneath the Strategic Rail Authority. That is the argument.

Someone said, the other day in Parliament, that when Batman was climbing up on the ropes it was someone from the group campaigning for parents' rights. I personally believed it was Richard Branson. The reason I thought he dressed up as Batman to try to get into Buckingham Palace was that he has made so much money from the railway network that the only things he did not have were the Crown Jewels themselves! I thought he might have been trying to get into Buckingham Palace and privatise that as well!

However, the real basis of it all, at the end of the day, is that unless you can control the industry, then you do not run the industry. Therefore, talks at this moment in time that are taking place are on the basis that Virgin's franchise is going to be split up and they are talking about re-putting it out.

Our argument is quite clear. People might argue -- and we need to dispel this untruth -- that compensation has to be paid to these companies if you reprivatise them. The fact is they run it as a franchise. It is no different when you visit to a train station and you see Burger King on the concourse. It is a franchise purely on that basis. So when the franchise is up, you get the keys back and you run it for the people.

We also want the TUC to reaffirm its position on the Race Relations Act, section 9. The position is quite clear. You have heard about globalisation all week, but the fact of the matter is we have no problem whether someone who works on a ship, is black, gay, lesbian or from the Philippines. That is not the issue. It is the system that is wrong, that two workers have to compete against each other for wrong rates of pay. If they work on a British ship, they should be paid British rates of pay and conditions because, if you do not establish that fact, then the bosses get more profits.

I ask you to reaffirm the TUC policy, but also praise everyone here today and our affiliated unions for all

the support you have given the railway workers over the last year.

**Gerry Doherty** (*Transport Salaried Staffs Association*): I am proud and privileged to stand in front of this workers' Parliament and to call for the repeal of the privatisation. John Major's Government moved by stealth when it sold off for buttons some parts of the transport industry. As Alastair Darling said: 'what a dysfunctional way to run a railway'.

As far as privatisation is concerned, what matters is what works. There is one thing we know now. The railway industry does not work in the private sector. It has not delivered. The taxpayers of this country are paying £5 billion per annum to support the industry.

As general secretary of a rail union, of course I welcome public money. Every other country in the world recognises that you do not make money out of your transport industry, in particular your rail industry. It costs money and they support it. Look at France. Look at Germany. Of course, they point to Japan and say, "Well, that is in the private sector." Well, it is. The bullet train is in the private sector, but there is another part of it that requires public subsidy. The current rail subsidy is five times as much as it was under British Rail - £5 billion! I just wish they had paid that type of money when it was actually in public hands, because we would have been an industry and we would have been a service that would have been the envy of the world.

It has not delivered for passengers. I am one myself. I am a commuter. It is a nightmare to travel around the railway industry today. It has not delivered for employees, not because terms and conditions have been attacked, because Bob, ASLEF and I have stood together and we have defended our members. We did have that attack, by the way, in Network Rail. We did stand together and we kept the pension fund open. We will continue. Any other employer within the railway industry that attacks the pension funds will have the same treatment from us.

As you know, we have had Mr Darling's review. What has it done? It shut down the Strategic Rail Authority. It was not strategic and it was not authoritative. It has done nothing else. We are still left with all the train operating companies. We are still left with all the track and rail companies and all of their subcontractors. We are still left with Network Rail. We are still left with ripping off the whole industry and we are still left with the Office of the Rail Regulator.

I know my time has run out and I did take your comment. This is important. We will be back here in two weeks' time. TSSA is taking to the Labour Party a policy position to bring it back into public ownership. Go back into your constituencies, go back to your members and support the TSSA. Let us get it back where it belongs.

**Andy Reed** (*Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*): I am proud to stand and endorse the comments that have just been made by our colleagues from the RMT and TSSA. First of all, I will support the position of TSSA when we come back in two weeks' time to the Labour Party Conference to push forward the agenda for the re-nationalisation of the rail system in this country.

We ask you to support this composite motion today because we say enough is enough. Enough is enough with the substandard safety records within the rail industry, the exploitation of the workers within the rail industry and its associated businesses. We have seen a number of incidents in the rail industry that have cost lives and people are walking away with no blame attached to them. We believe it is through the penny-pinching of those various companies and the profit system that they are operating in that is endangering the country and the travelling public. The fact of the matter is the Government need to know that the reality is that 10 years after the start of privatisation, the railways are in more difficulty now than when they were under British Rail.

If the Government is seriously to undertake a review and seriously undertake a thorough look at the operations, then public ownership must be a major part of that thinking. We are proud of our campaigning record in ASLEF, along with our sister trade unions within the transport sector.

Take Back the Track has been a successful campaign, as has the campaign to drive down hours. It has all been done through the awareness of our members and the endeavours of other people. We would like to place on record our thanks to those people who have taken part in those campaigns and been victimised in the workplace whilst doing so.

On the eve of privatisation, my union, ASLEF, warned the Tory Government that the new structure would be indifferent, bureaucratic and expensive. Today, we stand here to say that it has been proved so. The time has now come to do what the RMT have just said. That is to take the keys back from the privateers when the franchises cease. It will not cost us any money. The money that they are pouring into these various companies can then be redirected into a national rail system for the good of the country, for the good of the commuters and for the good of the workers that are working in that particular industry. Please support the motion and please support us when we get to the Labour Party.

**Paul Maloney** (*National Union of Marine, Aviation and Shipping Transport Officers*) supporting the composite motion said: I am speaking on the last two paragraphs. *Here is the Red Ensign (shows flag)*, the proud symbol of Britain's Merchant Navy; a flag which, at one time, flew from the stern of almost 50 per cent of the ships around the world. How things have changed.

Two decades of Tory rule destroyed Britain's merchant fleet. During that time, the volume of shipping flying the Red Ensign slumped from 50 million tons to 3 million. Even worse, the number of British seafarers was slashed by more than two-thirds. When Labour came to power, with John Prescott at the helm of transport policy, we had high hopes of a new era for British shipping.

The Government are charting a new course. The policy package implemented in 2000 was designed to rebuild our industry and safeguard our seafaring skills. However, four years on, we are now facing the sorry spectacle of our once proud flag joining the sordid ranks of Panama, St. Vincent and Cambodia as a flag of convenience.



Why? Because so far the Government's policies have failed. While they may have delivered more ships, they have failed to deliver more jobs for seafarers. Today, despite the Government's bold words, we have seen a further 1,000 Merchant Navy officer jobs lost in the last two years. We continue to face the sacking of our members and their replacement with lower cost seafarers.

Let us be clear. Our industry is the grandfather of globalised industries. We have had a long tradition of multinational crews, but a global industry needs global rules and global enforcement if it is to avoid lowest common denominator standards and a race to the bottom.

Today we face the very real prospect of the Red Ensign joining and encouraging this race to the bottom. NUMAST believes that the British taxpayer, who now subsidises our industry, would rather see the British flag as a flag of excellence with the best quality, safest ships and the best quality safest seafarers covered and protected by employment law serving on them. So we call on the Government to ensure that if ship owners want to fly the Red Ensign and benefit from tax breaks, then they must have in place plans to train and employ the best quality seafarers. It is time our Government faced up to the problems that our industry faces and recognised that the terms and conditions applied to seafarers serving on UK vessels is a matter for them.

In supporting this motion, I must, however, comment on the final paragraph. NUMAST recognises the argument for the full repeal of section 9 of the Race Relations Act, but we must also ensure that this is replaced with a proper mechanism for safeguarding seafarers' terms and conditions in an international industry. National laws do not always solve international problems.

Britain needs ships and we need seafarers. We need the Government to continue the work started in 2000 so that the Red Ensign becomes a centre of excellence and not a flag of convenience.

**James Undy** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supporting the composite motion said: In welcoming the White Paper as another small step along the agonising path to renationalisation of the railways, In PCS, we want to draw attention to yet another group of our members facing an uncertain and difficult future. That is our members, along with those of the TSSA, who work in the Strategic Rail Authority and who are now concerned about what their future is, whether they are going to end up with Network Rail or with the Department of Transport.

Throughout this week, and we have been very grateful for the support we have received, PCS has sought to highlight the jobs crisis in the Civil Service. We are not going to lose 100,000 jobs because PCS, as you will have gathered, is not rolling over, but we are also not going to lose 100,000 jobs because some of what you are about to see is the kind of statistical trickery that leads to the SRA staff not being civil servants but being public servants, so they do not count against that frightening head count of civil servants that causes such terror in the hearts of politicians.

One of our fears is that more and more 'quasi state' bodies, like the SRA, like OFCOM, like POSTCOM,

will emerge to do jobs that should be done by properly accountable civil servants. You might ask us why that matters, because the type of body may not make a great deal of difference to the way we deliver. I can say, on the basis of my experience of two years working at the strategic rail authority, the kind of body that turned out to be; a body headed by an ex-Virgin accountant whose management philosophy was summarised in the papers as "fit in or F off"; a man who employed Steven Norris, who was at that time challenging Ken Livingstone for the Mayor of London, a post with responsibility for transport, employed him as a consultant to brief him before a Select Committee; a body that covered before the Rail Passenger Committees; supposedly the voice of passengers, a voice that is silent on the central question on who owns and runs the railway; an anti-union culture that saw a reaction amongst senior managers at the SRA to the result of the ASLEF general secretary election that was wholly inappropriate for people who were supposed to be politically neutral, public servants.

In asking for railway workers to run the railway and civil servants to do the policy-making and the regulatory work, we are saying something very simple about the kinds of jobs that we do on your behalf. We are saying that we want public services delivered by people who are on your side. PCS is on your side. It is on the railway unions' side. We ask you to support Composite 14 and support our campaign to defend jobs in the Civil Service.

**Simon Hester** (*Prospect*) supporting the composite motion said: I am supporting the paragraph relating to rail safety regulation. The well-known train disasters of Clapham, Ladbroke Grove and all the rest of them came in the wake of privatisation.

All the resultant public inquiries made many, many recommendations, which are well-documented. One of them, a key one, concerned the Rail Inspectorate, the safety regulator. At the time, the Rail Inspectorate was criticised for being too close to the industry and too reluctant to use enforcement powers.

Lord Cullen's major report endorsed the earlier decision to move the Inspectorate from the Department of Transport and into the Health and Safety Executive. He strongly rejected the argument of the Association of Train Operating Companies. They wanted a regulatory body resembling the Civil Aviation Authority with strong investigative powers but little power to enforce.

Lord Cullen believed that the move to HSE would sharpen up the railway inspectorate by being part of a wider regulatory authority with experience across the whole of industry and by integrating it into the HSE enforcement strategy.

Only three years after that report was published, just three years, Alastair Darling's rail review has reversed the process. The Cullen Inquiry on that particular point is being reversed. The Railway Inspectorate is being moved back into the Department of Transport in the Office of the Rail Regulator. They have buckled to the argument of the Association of Train Operating Companies and against the advice of the Health and Safety Commission.

Why is this a backward step? Firstly, the Office of the Rail Regulator will regulate the financial health of the railway companies as well as the management of

health and safety. There is a massive potential for a conflict of interest, not because of the individual inspectors or even collectively the Inspectorate, but because of the organisational structure that they will be working in. One of the duties of the ORR, for example, would be to ensure the profitability of the companies.

However, this problem is going to be magnified greatly. The Office of the Rail Regulator is going to be the organisation doling out billions of pounds of public subsidies to the rail companies. Where is that money going to go? New trains? New track? Safety measures? Staff training or dividends to shareholders and a Knickerbox on every station?

Here is a quote from Lord Cullen's report in 2001: "If the Safety Regulator is to discharge its function properly and give the public notice that it is doing so, it is essential that it should be independent of the industry and be clearly seen to be independent of it."

There is a bigger picture, which I am not going to have time to finish, but the train operating companies have fronted a big public attack on the HSE using the arguments of the railway industry. For example, the *Daily Telegraph*, in August, called for the Health and Safety Executive to be shut down. The *Daily Mail*, that well-known bastion of liberal values, called Bill Callaghan, the Health and Safety Commission Chair, 'the Health & Safety fascist' -- very rich coming from that paper which had the headline in the 1930s as 'Hooray for the Blackshirts'.

Last year, Gordon Brown said: "Health and safety is a mark of a civilised society". We say to him: "Put your money where your mouth is. Do not cut the jobs and put more enforcement powers into the Railway Inspectorate and the HSE in general."

**Janet Seymour Kirk** (*Amicus*): When you ask disabled people what affects them most, what stops them from being part of the public and an active participating member of society, they say it is inaccessible transport. If it is inaccessible transport that stops them from getting to work, keeps them away from any leisure centres and activities -- even those who are able-bodied are known to refuse or decline an offer of a job due to their being no transport at the time they need it or to the area they need it in -- what is missing out of this motion is not the request but the demand for more accessible transport and at those times needed to get to and from their workplace.

Another recommendation to the Government from the Scrutineers' Committee in looking into the draft Disability Bill that was not accepted was their suggestion of the final date of the running of inaccessible trains to the disabled public. It was recommended to be 2017, not the ridiculous date of 2025. If they did this, the Government would be opening another means of transport to those disabled people who want to work. It is the only type of transport that has no end date applied to it.

So I, on behalf of Amicus, call upon the TUC to support disabled people. Add this item to your campaign on transport by getting the Government to stop dallying and finally make a decision on what the end date will be. The Government wants more disabled people into the workplace, off benefits, they say, yet do not seem to assist us in achieving this. So what do we want? Accessible transport. When do we want it? Now, not in 2025.

**The President:** I have no further speakers listed. The General Councils supports Composite Motion 14.

\* *Composite Motion 14* was CARRIED.

## Maritime Security

**Alan Graveson** (*National Union of Marine, Aviation and Shipping Transport Officers*) moved Motion 61. He said: Fellow workers, three years ago this Congress was abandoned. A great deal has taken place since. The real test of a tolerant and mature society is its response to the difficult challenges it faces. This test has been failed in many parts of the world. Basic rights and freedoms are coming under pressure as a creeping paranoia starts to cripple democratic society.

Transport workers are very much in the frontline fighting on two fronts, facing the risk of death and disablement from unlawful acts and restrictions made by misguided authorities that see them as a potential problem rather than part of the solution. Crews of aircraft on 9/11 were amongst the victims. There is a constant litany of incidents involving trains, planes, ships or buses, with transport workers subject to acts of terror. Major incidents involving the public are widely reported: where workers alone are victims and the motive of the perpetrators is unclear, there is barely passing comment in the media.

We hear a great deal about violence in the workplace. I will tell you what violence is. Over the past decade, there have been more than 2,800 incidents of piracy and armed robbery against merchant ships; more than 2,500 people have been held hostage and at least 330 murdered, limbs severed, seafarers bound and fed to the sharks. That is the swimming variety of sharks.

A major incident involving serious loss of life or catastrophic environmental damage is going to happen. Why? Because this is a government, like many others, that is willing to go to war for business rather than protect and provide the minimum protection to the workers, the seafarers that I represent.

Seafarers are being sent into the frontline armed with little more than a booklet. *This* booklet is what you get from Government. Not much else. That is what you get. What do you get from the ship owners? Yes, a nice coloured one. That is what the two-legged sharks will give you! With crew levels so low and the statutory minimum of 91 hours per week frequently exceeded, these ridiculous suggestions in relation to this booklet are impossible to implement. A major incident is certainly going to happen.

In a number of countries, seafarers are treated like criminals, imprisoned on their ships and denied the opportunity to go ashore. Some ports and terminals have refused access to ships by trade union officials and port chaplains have been denied entry to ships. Seafarers are being victimised twice over, victims of attacks and also victims of ill-thought out responses by officialdom.

Governments, especially those with the resources to do so, must protect shipping, the main artery of world trade; the trade that this island nation depends upon. Ninety per cent by value, ninety-five per cent by volume, comes into this land. So let us stop using seafarers as scapegoats for the shipping industry security shortcomings. Start treating them as the

professionals they are. Let us enjoin in partnership and let us look for a rational, sensible and effective regime.

Congress, we have received little media attention this week. We need debate. We need debate on issues such as this. I ask the General Council here to my left and I ask you to support this motion.

**Graham Fowler** (*British Airline Pilots Association*) seconding Motion 61 said: BALPA fully supports the enhancement of security measures at ports, both sea and air, around the world. We should not overlook the need for robust security measures in the railway industry too, as our colleagues in Madrid know only too well.

Whilst security standards have improved at airports post 9/11, much more needs to be done. If security is to be taken seriously, those employed to undertake it have to be properly trained and remunerated. Too often measures have been introduced by governments, which, far from making transport more secure, undermine it. This can only be avoided if those employed in the industry, seafarers, train and aircrews alike, are fully involved in the development of appropriate security procedures and are kept aware of threat levels and countermeasures around the world.

Please support Motion 61 and help make sea, rail and air travel safer for us all.

**Gordon Rowntree** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supporting the motion said: The motion draws attention to the failure to achieve a compliance with the July deadline for the introduction of new security measures agreed by the International Maritime Organisation. PCS represents those staff in the Transport Security Directorate of the Department of Transport, known as TRANSEC. These are the people who deal with port security.

The whole area of security was under-resourced until the events of 9/11 forced the DfT to re-evaluate the position. However, most of the new posts were allocated to aviation and not to maritime security. PCS, Prospect members and TRANSEC have worked hard to deliver Government and IMO policy, but these members are under extreme measure.

PCS has been telling you this week about the job cuts in the Civil Service, but TRANSEC is so severely under-resourced that it has even been excluded from the Gershon Efficiency Review, which led to the vicious cuts in every other part of the Civil Service. Additional resources and recognition by the government are not only necessary, but essential in order for us to be enabled to meet our UK and international obligations.

Ship security is covered by the Maritime and Coastguard Agency, the MCA, and all UK flag ships have been inspected by MCA's security inspectorate. Together with coastguards, MCA's civil servants have played a major role in maritime safety, security and standards. As is the case for TRANSEC, sufficient funding and resources are needed to assist the MCA in addressing maritime issues and the issues facing MCA staff.

**The President:** The General Council supports the motion.

\* *Motion 61 was CARRIED.*

## Transport

**Robert Monks** (*United Road Transport Union*) moved Motion 62. He said: May I start by taking just a minute to offer heartfelt thanks to all those involved in helping to secure my union's return to the TUC? Particular thanks go to my comrade at the T&G, Tony Woodley, and to the hard work put in by Brendan Barber. As is so often said, it is good to be back.

Ninety-four per cent of all goods are delivered by road. As I look around the Brighton Centre today, whether it be at the stage here, the seats you are sitting on or the lighting, I know it would have been delivered on the back of a truck driven by a professional lorry driver. Drivers of large goods vehicles are the backbone of our country and it is high time their voice was heard. Without them, our economy would grind to a halt.

I am sure all delegates will be able to recall the chaos that was caused when professional petrol tanker drivers did not work for just three days in this country; yet, you may be surprised to learn that the logistics industry in the UK is in deep crisis. There is a vast shortage of professional lorry drivers. Some estimates place the figure as high as 80,000 drivers. With the impending implementation of the Working Time Regulations on mobile workers in transport, this crisis is likely to get worse before it gets better.

Why is there a shortage? The plain truth is that for too long the logistic industry has been abused by too many employers who have done nothing but take and have consistently failed to reinvest in their biggest asset, the driver behind the wheel. Terms and conditions of employment are poor. Experienced men and women have left the industry in droves. Young women and men are choosing not to enter the profession in sufficient numbers. There is a time bomb ticking out there waiting to go off.

To ensure that this exodus stops and the numbers of professional drivers increase will require a monumental commitment of all groups within our industry. My union has been campaigning to ensure that any action that will alleviate this problem is implemented and done so quickly.

In March of this year, the large goods vehicle licence renewal fee was abolished; a positive step in keeping drivers in the industry. Motion 62 seeks to support the General Council to lobby the Government to seek to have the large goods vehicle licence medical examination fees available to professional drivers through the NHS at no cost to the driver.

When a professional lorry driver reaches the age of 45, or the first renewal after their 45th birthday, and thereafter every five years, he or she has to renew their vocational licence. In order to do this, they must pass a medical. In a recent survey of professional drivers undertaken by my union, it was found that doctors charged lorry drivers as much as £120 for such a medical. The BMA advisory figure is £67.50. With approximately half a million vocational licence holders in the UK, this would amount to about £3 million per annum at today's prices.

The abolition of the vocational licence fee was a start. Action by the Government on this motion will continue the good work in ensuring that

encouragement is given to professional drivers to renew their licence and removing yet another obstacle within the industry.

The worth of professional lorry drivers to the UK's economy is incalculable. Their value is so often overlooked. I urge you to support Motion 62 as amended.

**Graham Stevenson** (*Transport and General Workers Union*): I am the national organiser for transport. Every year, some 3,500 people are killed on Britain's roads. It is a case of at least one 9/11 annually. Fatigue at the wheel has now overtaken drink/driving as the cause of road traffic accidents. It is the main factor in 10 per cent of all incidents, yet professional drivers who spend their lives on these dangerous roads are employed in a long hours culture that puts profit before people.

The Government put up signs advising motorists to have a rest every two hours. We wish professional drivers had such a luxury. It is time to change course. It is time to give every professional driver, whatever the type and weight of the vehicle, the full protection of regulations on hours of work and driving time. No fiddling about with stand-by time, waiting time; no tweaking the figures; no clever accounting and no tweaking of the rules. This issue is not about barriers to business. It is about lives.

It is also time to tackle the rising tide of violence suffered by transport workers. Nobody goes to work to be knifed or spat at; nobody deserves to live in fear of a brick thrown through their cab window; nobody likes to hide behind plastic screens for protection. However, that is the situation that the bus and rail workers, cabin crew and check-in staff and many other transport workers find themselves. It is terrorism on wheels.

A Glasgow bus driver was only recently saved from certain death when a knife aimed at his heart stuck in his T&G pocket diary. It is not comical, I assure you, when you are on the receiving end, but I know that the T&G always came through in every set of circumstances.

The fear of assault, the near incidents and the threats all pile on the stress as transport workers try to do their job. Companies are too quick to terminate employment of those on long-term sick when their minds and bodies tell them not to go back to work to be terrorised. Safety and security at work is the most difficult health and safety issue of all because the problems are rooted in the myth that the free market will ultimately resolve all problems.

The violence emerges from our arguments about complex and high fares, late and early running and the decaying fabric of our transport infrastructure. Road, rail, air and even sea rage is not caused by transport workers, nor should they carry the can. Congress, support the motion and the amendment.

\* *Motion 62 was CARRIED.*

#### **TUC Accounts**

**The President:** We turn to Chapter 12, TUC Organisation. Could I draw your attention to appendix 6, page 167 of the General Council's Report, which is

the TUC accounts. Our auditor is present on the platform. Does Congress accept the accounts as set out in the Appendix? (*Agreed*) That completes Chapter 12. Thank you.

#### **Prison Overcrowding**

**The President:** We now return Motion 74, Prison Overcrowding. The General Council support the motion.

**Steve Gillan** (*Prison Officers Association UK*) moved Motion 74. He said: Before I move this motion, Congress, and with a bit of licence from the President, I would like to thank Brendan Barber, who I notice is not on the stage this morning, at the moment, for his assistance in resolving a dispute surrounding prison officers' safety in Northern Ireland. Let me tell you, Congress, that if that dispute had not been resolved then the Prison Officers' Association would have shut down every gaol in Great Britain in order to resolve it. We believed the health and safety of our members was in serious danger at that time, and irrespective of us not having the ability to take industrial action because of the restrictions under the Criminal Justice Public Order Act 1994 we would have broken that law, and we would have criminalized the National Executive Committee. It is about time the Labour Government honoured their pledge given when in opposition to return our full trade union rights; we wait for that to happen as quickly as possible. Please do it soon.

Congress, prisons are again at crisis point. Overcrowded prisons are a recipe for disaster. There are now over 75,000 prisoners in the system. The strain on some institutions is blatantly evident. We are locking up not only the bad, but the sad and the mentally ill, in ever-increasing numbers. At the same time, this Government is continually demanding further budget cuts. They are market-testing the service, privatising parts of it, and we now face the prospect of some of our most modern successful prisons under the guise of contestability being packaged up and handed over to the private companies based here, but predominantly abroad.

Let me remind you of what was said in 1993: "I believe that people who are sentenced by the state to imprisonment should be deprived of their liberty, kept under lock and key by those who are accountable primarily and solely to the state." -- Tony Blair, 1993. "A prison sentence is the most severe form of punishment in this country and it should be the duty of the state to administer it." --Jack Straw, Shadow Home Secretary, 1995.

"It is morally repugnant for private companies to profit out of incarceration." -- Jack Straw, Shadow Home Secretary, 1995.

What was morally repugnant in 1995 is morally repugnant in 2004. The effects of this scurrilous strategy and the continued under-resourcing of the service place our members and the offenders they care for at greater risk. Studies have found that 90 per cent of all prisoners have shown evidence of personality disorder, psychosis, neurosis, alcohol misuse, or drug dependence. This is the indication of the level of difficulty our members have in the care and rehabilitation of offenders and yet the Government expects the service to make efficiency savings through staff cuts. These cuts have consequences: violence against staff is at the highest level. In the last five years, almost 10,000 staff have been assaulted whilst at

work. Over the same period, there have been almost 40,000 incidents; assaults by prisoner on prisoner are higher than ever. In the last five years, over 434 prisoners have taken their own lives in prisons in England and Wales. Only last month we saw the largest ever number of suicides in one month in our prison system, 14 prisoners took their own life. The Howard League for Penal Reform reported last year that the reduction in staff prisoner ratios is making it increasingly difficult for staff to provide the quality of care necessary.

I can tell you now that one of the main fundamental reasons for this is the sustained levels of overcrowding and penny-pinching by the Treasury. We seek the support of Congress to bring an end to a prison system that is now being driven by the market economy to keep the privateer fat cats happy. It is preventable if we have legislation to make overcrowding an unlawful act under European and international law. Please support the motion.

**Judy McKnight** (*napo*) in seconding the motion, said: Congress, prison overcrowding is wrong, immoral, obscene, expensive and actually does not work in protecting the public. There are two points: why does it not work and why is it happening?

Why does it not work? First of all, public protection, real and effective public protection, is not just about locking larger and larger numbers of prisoners away for longer periods of time. It is self-evidently about taking action to try and reduce re-offending. Consider that 80 per cent of prisoners have a reading age of 11, 60-70 per cent of prisoners were using drugs before imprisonment, over 70 per cent suffer from at least two mental disorders, 20 per cent of men and 37 per cent of women prisoners have attempted suicide in the past. The implications of prison overcrowding are self-evident when considering those examples of the causes of offending.

Secondly, why is it happening? It may not be headlines in the tabloid press but actually crime has fallen by 25 per cent over the last five to six years. During that period there has been no increase in the numbers appearing in court. What has happened is that a greater proportion of those who have appeared in court have received gaol sentences as opposed to non-custodial sentences and most of those have received sentences for a longer period of time. Unfortunately, the statistics show a direct link between politicians talking tough and the rise in the prison population. Politicians, we know, of both the Labour Government as well as obviously the Tory Party, cynically court popularity by the tactic of cheap populism with a view to talking tough on law and order. We can expect to see more of this cynical approach in the run-up to the general election.

Congress, help us get the message over to the Government that such cheap populist tactics do not have the support of the TUC. Help us to get the Government to tackle the growing crisis in prison overcrowding, and please support motion 74.

**The President:** The General Council support Motion 74.

\* *Motion 74 was CARRIED.*

## Criminal Sentencing Policy

**Brian Caton** (*Prison Officers Association UK*) moved Motion 75. He said: Crime in our society is identified as one of the major causes of concern for all of our citizens, a major concern that should be, of course, with our members, trade union members, who are also victims of crime. Many of your members will have suffered at the hands of criminals and many will be very very disenchanted about the way in which the offenders were dealt with. So much crime is committed against working-class people. Victorian times with rascals crawling across the rich people's houses to take the jewellery are long gone. Equally, I believe that those Victorian criminals very rarely hurt people. Criminals nowadays do hurt people. When they break into your house, when they mug you on the street, when they attack and rape young children, they hurt not only the victims themselves but their families and society as a whole. We should not hide from the fact that victims of crime want punishment for offenders.

Politicians continue, as you heard from NAPO, with this horse race of who can lead in being the most harsh on crime and being tough on criminals, and sending more and more people to prison. But I would ask you to think on a little bit further than that. A sentence when handed out by the courts should be multi-faceted, it should deal with the actual offenders themselves. Yes, it should punish but it should also look at rehabilitation of the offender and make sure that that offender does not commit a similar or any other crime on release, and certainly should not commit offences whilst in custody or against those trying to help. It should be about rehabilitation and training, and education, and there should be sufficient time to ensure that these behaviours that are so abhorrent are adjusted.

Sentencing should not be an end in itself and it certainly should not end at the prison gate, either when they are going in through it or coming out of it. It should not even start at the prison gate, or on release. Sentencing of criminals certainly fills our prisons to overcrowding but something else it does currently is put huge amounts of money into the pockets of those profiteers that have come to this country because of the lack of civil society and the privatisation of prisons; so, it is in all our interests to insist that we have a good criminal sentencing policy.

We insist as trade unions that we are in the forefront, as professionals, not only to assist government in making sure that their policies are correct, but also to assist society with our professional knowledge. Currently, this is not the case. Government have agreed basically where they want to go but they ignore our views on how we are going to get there. We ask you to support our full involvement if not for our sake as professionals then for the sake of society. If we do not do that, if we do not tap into the knowledge that exists within the criminal justice system, our members and our trade unions, if we do not do that Britain will continue to be seen by observers as the European centre for ineffective penal and criminal policy.

May I finally make clear that our prisons are overcrowded but I say to Bob Crow and to the NUM delegation that we will always find a place for those who are guilty of corporate killing and corporate manslaughter, even if – even if – we have to go against our own policies. Thank you, Congress.

**Rob Thomas** (*napo*) in seconding the motion, said: Building more prisons is popular but raising the extra billions in taxes needed to fund them is unpopular. Nearly everyone agrees that we need more drug treatment centres in our communities, except if it is in their neighbourhood. How do we solve these conundrums? What we need is a government, as has already been pointed out by the POA, that is brave enough to tell the voters that what works best is effective non-custodial penalties rather than what the tabloids tell us is right. If a Labour government is re-elected, then it is going to have to change its tack significantly on both sentencing policies and its attitude to the operation of community-based penalties.

Since New Labour came to power in 1997, it has adopted a justice model based on retribution and punishment. This in turn has led to a record prison population with the UK now having the highest rate of incarceration in the EU. I am sorry that fact is often repeated but it needs to be. Throughout the last eight years the message from ministers on the use of custody has been inconsistent. This has fuelled the view that the Government wishes to see more people in prison; indeed, between 1997 and 2002 New Labour created over 650 new criminal offences. Despite the lessons of the Lawrence Inquiry, the Government has failed to tackle racism and discrimination within the criminal justice system. Young black people are more likely to be remanded in custody for a first offence than their white counterpart yet half are acquitted. Between 1999 and 2002 the gaol population rose by 12 per cent but the number of black people being gaoled rose by 50 per cent. If that is not blatant racism, I do not know what is.

There are now over 4,000 women serving prison sentences in England and Wales. The numbers have doubled in less than a decade. The main reason for this is an increased severity in the courts but there has also been a sharp increase in the number of drug-related convictions. The vast majority of women should not be in prison. They would be better off on community programmes that offer educational skills, mental health support and, if appropriate, one-to-one counselling.

On drug misuse there should be a national debate on whether drug use should or should not be decriminalised. It is essential that the Government begin to approach illegal drug use from the perspective of health and treatment rather than criminal justice and punishment. There is an urgent need for a national programme to promote community penalties. The more information that is available, the more the public traditionally will have confidence. Judges should be encouraged to review cases where community penalties are imposed. Currently they see only the failures yet Home Office data published in March 2003 showed that ex-offenders are less likely to be reconvicted for standard offences within two years if they are on community sentences rather than in custody. Support this motion and be prepared to defend the rehabilitative work done with ex-offenders.

**Rosie Eagleson** (*AMO*) in support of the motion, said: We want to highlight three particular requirements to support this approach. The burgeoning prison population is hugely costly and that effectively diverts resources away from the alternative sentencing options. So, those who sentence, in theory, have a wider range of non-custodial options available to them than ever before. Lack of resources means that sensible alternatives, like drug treatment programmes,

community programmes, intensive supervision programmes, and so on, are rarely available in the right places at the appropriate time actually to be used. We need practical proper resourcing of these alternatives and not a mad dash to build more and more prisons.

Secondly, fines are the most common non-custodial sentences and we need to promote a means-related fines policy. Realistic fines should be imposed which are proportionate to an offender's ability to pay. This does not always happen at the moment and that undermines the credibility and effectiveness of fines as an alternative to prison. The old view was that the fines system was vocally opposed, particularly by the well off, I seem to remember, but the principle was absolutely right and it should be reinstated.

Finally, we must resist any further incursions of the private sector into fines collection. This is a real and immediate threat. The Government is actively reviewing the possibility of further private sector involvement in this work. Private enforcement agencies have an appalling record. Cherry-picking easy work, they charge large fees for the collection of fines which offenders themselves have to pay before their fines are cleared. In the worst-case scenarios, these companies resort to unacceptable collection methods, and they sometimes go bust or disappear with fines money. It is proposed to allow enforcement officers to force entry into premises to search and to restrain. We have some reservations about anybody other than the police having those powers but at least they will be directly managed, there will be a directly managed rigorous code of practice for our members undertaking this work for the protection of the public and the protection of the staff.

Congress, the private sector has no place in this area. We must press for properly resourced, effective, non-custodial sentences operated within the public sector. Please support.

**The President:** The General Council supports Motion 75.

\* *Motion 75 was CARRIED*

### **National Offender Management Service**

**Judy McKnight** (*napo*) moved Motion 76. She said: NOMS has been spun by the Government as being about bringing the probation and prison services closer together but let me explain what NOMS is not. It is not about merging the prison and probation services. It is not about creating a single streamlined employing body with clear governance. NOMS is about bringing prison and probation services under one umbrella, not in order to promote closer working but in order to pit us, along with the voluntary and the private sector, against each other in a competitive framework dubbed 'contestability'. Its purpose is the creation of a purchaser/provider market to ease the path of the private sector in making inroads, and of course profits, into the delivery of justice, and to use the threat of privatisation to attack the terms and conditions of staff.

NOMS was first announced by David Blunkett on January 6<sup>th</sup> when he stood up and announced that the Government was going to act on the implementation of Patrick Carter's report on the correctional services. Without any consultation, he announced that NOMS would come into being on 1<sup>st</sup> June 2004. There were aspects of the Carter report that sounded positive,

including a recognition that something needed to be done about the severity of sentencing. But these concepts have had little to do with the ill thought out ragbag of organisational and structural change still being worked out, seemingly, on the back of an envelope.

In May, the Home Office announced that rushed legislation was to be brought in this autumn so that the probation service, currently organised and employed on the basis of 42 probation areas, was to be dismantled, to split in two, and moved to a regional model, not in order to increase our effectiveness but in order to introduce the purchaser/provider split. These plans had not been properly thought through, did not make sense, and were torn apart by everybody, not just trade unions but probation employers.

NAPO, along with our sister unions in the criminal justice system mounted a big campaign against NOMS as proposed. It included a very successful rally and lobby of parliament and we have also been successful to date in getting 241 MPs to sign an early day motion on NOMS; and certainly again thanks to the TUC for their support in our campaign today.

In July, Paul Goggins, the Home Office minister, announced that the Government would not now go ahead with splitting the probation service as planned and that it would remain organised on the basis of 42 boards for the foreseeable future, but he nevertheless stressed that the Government's plan for introducing contestability into the work of both the probation and prison services remained.

We welcome this announcement as a victory for common sense but we have been increasingly conscious that our victory has only bought us time. The Government remains as ruthlessly committed as ever to extend the principles of contestability to every aspect of our work and the threat is now that a whole probation area is either simply to be handed over to the private sector, or subjected to market testing in the next couple of years.

Our colleagues in the POA know only too well what contestability means and their members understand the harsh realities of the sort of statistics given in a recent parliamentary question to the effect that in April 2003 the average basic salary for prison officers in publicly-run prisons in England and Wales was £23,071, in private prisons £16,077. We have given evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee pointing out that no case has been made for NOMS and there has been no parliamentary debate, no parliamentary scrutiny, no production of a business case, no green paper, it has simply been asserted, announced, and implemented. We are also pointing out that no case has been made to show that contestability will in any way improve effectiveness; no such case can be made.

Colleagues, England and Wales already have a higher proportion of people in private prisons, at 9 per cent, than the United States with 6.5 per cent. It is a depressing fact that more jobs across the public sector have already been privatised under this Government since 1997 than in the previous 18 years of a Tory government.

Colleagues, please support our motion and please prevent the criminal justice system being run by the profit motive. Support motion 76.

**Brian Caton** (*Prison Officers Association UK*) in seconding the motion, said: The National Offender Management Service is a service that seems to have no justification, no jurisdiction, and seems to be again policy on the hoof by a government intent on showing it can be tough on crime but not tough on the causes of crime. Let me tell you, first of all, what NOMS will not tackle and will not resolve. It will not resolve prison overcrowding. It will not bring investment into prisons, into probation, or into the courts. It will not improve security, safety, or the rehabilitation of offenders. It will not in itself do anything other than market-test successful prisons and parts of the probation based on political dogma and the promises given to private companies in America, and given by the NOMS leader, Martin Narey, and this current Home Secretary.

What will happen? Prison populations will rise, more overcrowding, less safety in custody, and more crime, not less. If we get it wrong – if we get it wrong – as professionals, it is you and your families that will suffer from this Government's self-determined failures. It was the TUC, I will remind you, that agreed with the POA, NAPO, and AMO, to seek a joined-up justice system. We did not seek the spin or the photo opportunities of this Home Secretary. We asked for all those with an interest in prisons to tackle this agenda together, in partnership, be they trade unions, officials, government, charities, and non-governmental organisations. This Government chose to launch publicly where we wanted to be but have no real open ideas of how we are going to get there; but privatisation is on the agenda.

I will just read to you what the Home Secretary has said to me: "Although it is the case that the performance improvement plan [and that is something we have done inside the prison service] has an impressive record of success in driving forward change in the public sector prison service it excludes other potential providers from proposing alternatives, thus it does not offer the potential for maximising performance improvement and cost-effective delivery. The principles of market-testing have been long-established as government policy, similarly it is well established that market-testing is not an issue for collective bargaining or disputes procedures." We cannot take industrial action; they took that away and have never given it back, and now we cannot even speak about things that are going to ruin our members' jobs and ruin your criminal justice system and put you and your families at risk.

Colleagues, it is an absolute disgrace for this Government to come forward with such an ill thought out, already failing, process. If you can privatise justice, and I have said it many times here, then you can privatise anything, and if the Government gets away with it, watch out, you will be next. Thank you.

**The President:** The General Council supports motion 76.

\* *Motion 76 was CARRIED*

### **Race Equality**

**Micky Nicholas** (*Fire Brigades Union*) speaking to paragraph 3.8, said: Thank you, President. Under the report, paragraph 3.8, in the little box that has the Black Workers' Conference, we have omitted a speaker that we had at the Black Workers' Conference that I need delegates and officials to be aware of. Her name

was Janet Aulder, and she runs a campaign called Justice for Christopher Aulder. Earlier this year on the BBC there was a programme called Death on Camera, graphically showing us all (those who watched it, certainly) the brutalising and the subsequent death of a young black man while in the custody of the Humberside police. Janet has started the campaign for a public inquiry. She needs absolutely all the help she can get from the trade union movement. I am sure that will be forthcoming and you just need to be aware that campaign literature with offers and requests for support will be with you this side of Christmas. I need you all to be aware of that and to support it in any way you can. Thank you very much.

**The President:** Thank you for drawing that to our attention. It will be reported in the report of this Congress and of course will be part of the business of the TUC during the year. Thank you.

### Opposition to Performance-Related Pay (PRP)

**Richard Evans** (*Society of Radiographers*) moved motion 47 as amended. He said: First of all, I should pay tribute to the work put in on this motion by Sarah Larkins, our member, who unfortunately cannot be here this morning due to the rescheduling of the motion in the agenda.

There is an intention to introduce performance-related pay for public service employees. The NHS is a public service with a massively diverse provision and employing a similarly diverse workforce. The introduction of the concept of equal pay for work of equal value is proving difficult enough to achieve through the current work on Agenda for Change. There are clear deficiencies in the resourcing for this programme but there are very encouraging examples of partnership working taking place resulting in successes in some of the early implementation sites.

Congress, I need to tell you this morning that performance-related pay is not about partnership working, it militates against it. Performance-related pay divides managers and staff by introducing a subjective element to pay determination and it divides staff themselves by introducing inequality and competition. It does not sound ideal. So, what is the evidence to support performance-related pay? I am glad that friends in UNISON have been doing some excellent work in reviewing the research. They have found that schemes are less effective than expected in the public sector. Systems are affected by cash limits making rewards for high performance too small to achieve any motivation for staff. They also comment that because PRP systems are based on appraisals of the individual worker, often by their line manager, bias and personal favouritism can influence the result of the reviews. Instead of motivating workers, performance pay undermines high quality service and challenges effective team working. It encourages a short-term focus and leads staff to believe that rewards depend not on the delivery of a first-class service but on the relationship that you may have with your manager.

My own experiences of a PRP system within the NHS may help to illustrate some of the weaknesses. My colleagues and I knew that 10 per cent of our salary depended on a performance-related bonus. We knew that that would be allocated and decided annually by appraisal. We also knew that it was impossible to achieve a full salary; it was impossible for any of us to reach the full 10 per cent because there was not the money in the budget to do it. Faultless performance

could not actually effectively be appropriately rewarded. We found that the appraisal process became hijacked by this reward factor and little attention was given to any other achievements which fell outside the performance-related framework, and some of the objectives that were set one year related to pay became irrelevant during the year, resulting in a frantic rush at the last minute to try and meet those objectives and be appropriately paid. Our manager did his best to make it work, to make it fair and relevant, but it was not popular with him either. The system was not popular or practical in terms of encouraging good performance.

Congress, the NHS needs motivated staff working in partnership with excellent leaders. Performance-related pay neither motivates nor promotes leadership. Performance pay undermines teamwork and collaboration, and therefore reduces effectiveness and challenges patient care. The NHS does not need it, workers do not want it, and decent managers can produce better results without it. Congress, we should promote partnership working in service delivery and development, we should seek fair, impartial reward for the excellent work of all NHS staff, and we should oppose the implementation of cash-led performance pay systems in the public sector. Please support motion 47.

**Nigel Gates** (*Association of University Teachers*) said: I am speaking in favour of the amended motion and joining with the Society of Radiographers in their opposition to performance-related pay in the public sector. The very essence of higher education is teamwork and collaboration across all staff grades. The courses our members teach and the research they undertake all are based on teamwork. PRP would fundamentally undermine this; it would be bad for institutions, bad for staff, and bad for students.

Congress, I have experienced PRP. In 1992, the University of Hertfordshire, where I work, introduced a PRP scheme for its 800-odd academic and research staff: about 120 received a PRP award and 680 received nothing. PRP was a disaster. It set lecturer against lecturer, researcher against researcher, and teams and relationships were damaged. I am very glad to say that after two years and at the union's request the university scrapped this particular scheme. However, the university is now preparing a new PRP scheme and the unions are very afraid of what will be proposed.

Sadly, Congress, my university is not alone. The University of Nottingham is leading the PRP assault in higher education. Without any proper consultation and in complete contradiction of the national agreement on pay, the University of Nottingham is seeking to impose a particularly ill-conceived PRP system where staff will have to compete against staff, and teams will be undermined. The bureaucratic scheme being proposed is not transparent, it is unfair, it is going to be highly damaging.

Congress, in just four days' time, unless Nottingham returns to negotiations, AUT is going to introduce a national academic boycott. This means academic staff across the world will refuse to undertake any work with Nottingham University. That is how seriously this is viewed and what our members are prepared to do.

Finally, Congress, PRP schemes in the public sector increase inequality and discrimination, they are subjective, and they are divisive. I hope you will all join



with me in sending a message loud and clear to the University of Nottingham, and the other misguided employers, there is no place for performance-related pay in the public sector.

**The President:** The General Council support motion 47.

\* *Motion 47 was CARRIED*

**The President:** Motion 48 has been remitted.

### Decontamination of Surgical Instruments

**Robin Banerjee** (*Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists*) moved Motion 49. He said: Back in 2001 the Government announced the investment of £200m to modernise NHS decontamination and sterilisation facilities. The investment was said at the time to underpin a major overhaul to provide the NHS with the most up-to-date equipment. At present, however, the NHS takes a rather fragmented approach. Given the media coverage, all of us here will be aware of the importance of preventing cross-infection. Processing instruments in the podiatry environment to compulsory standards of washing, disinfection and sterilisation, are fundamental to reducing the risk of cross-infection. It is particularly relevant now because, increasingly, minor surgical procedures are undertaken by podiatrists, who also manage many high-risk patients with anti-biotic resistant wounds, such as those infected with MRSA. Any podiatry instrument once used becomes a potential source of infection to another patient and to anyone handling the instrument. To minimise this risk each must be cleaned and sterilised as soon as possible.

At the Barnsley Primary Care Trust where I work monies were made available following a risk-assessment and cost-evaluation exercise, which stressed the need to ensure instrument traceability. The existing 25-year old sterilisers that the PCT had owned would soon have been only fit for steaming vegetables. The self-service scrubbing and cleaning of instruments by clinicians in and around clinical areas compromised actual treatment time for patients; indeed, such practices themselves were creating potential sources of cross-infection. It made sense for the primary care trust to consider better options. So, in June 2003, our podiatry department joined many other community services operating in the primary care trust in having instruments supplied from a local central sterilising unit. This reduced the risks of contamination to podiatrists, as well as to patients.

By 2007, all our podiatry organisations in the NHS will need to have demonstrated high standards of decontamination set by the EEC Medical Devices Directive. Unfortunately, there are compromised alternatives being considered by NHS boards across the country. They include the cheaper option of providing single-use instruments to clinical staff. The bulk purchasing of such equipment shows no regard at all for individual needs and differences between hand sizes, grip strength, and male/female variations. Given the large volume of patients that podiatrists treat, instruments should be safe not just for the patient but also for the podiatrist. We must not allow our podiatrists to be put in such compromised positions, which would inevitably affect clinical outcomes with possible litigation claims.

Using large quantities of disposable instruments also poses environmental concerns. Where will

potentially infected instruments be disposed of? Landfill? Melting down for re-use? Is there capacity to cope with all this? The initial costs of contracting services to a central sterilising unit are, admittedly, high. This includes inspection, packaging, transportation, storage, let alone the costs of buying, loaning, and maintaining equipment, but without specific funding and not to the detriment of other services, most PTCs would struggle. Investing in protecting both patients and clinicians would help lay a sound foundation for future generations. We must not create a world of excessive waste-producers.

Congress, we must all put our feet down. I ask you to support the motion that adequate funding be provided for central sterilisation, take every opportunity to voice our concerns whether this be through project steering groups, patient and public involvement forums, national patient surveys, or even at council and MPs' surgeries. Thank you.

**Norma Stephenson** (*UNISON*) in seconding the motion, said: Congress, whilst this motion may not be the one that sets this year's Congress alight with stirring rhetoric or heated debate, it is no less an important issue. High standards of decontamination are vital to prevent the spread of disease and to ensure the safety of both patients and staff. I would say that staff who work in the sterile supplies departments are some of the unsung heroes and heroines of the NHS, and that is why UNISON is proud to second this motion and give a voice to their concerns.

It is because clean instruments are so important that UNISON welcomes the new European legislation on decontamination being introduced. We hope that it will lead to higher decontamination standards. We also agree with colleagues in other unions, in the Government, and in the EU, that many existing decontamination facilities are inadequate and that new investment is needed. However, we have serious concerns about the approach the Government is taking in tackling this issue.

A national decontamination strategy was announced last year but this was not the subject of any consultation with trade unions. It is perhaps not a big surprise as it turns out that the major part of the strategy involves the contracting out of services to the private sector. The Government has given an assurance that staff who transfer over will have their terms and conditions protected and that there will be no widespread redundancies. However, this is cold comfort to many of our members as they may not be able to relocate to the sites of the proposed new sterile supply centres. If you were a woman working part-time in Leeds, you may not necessarily be able to move to a new workplace that could be at least 20 miles away.

UNISON believes that the implementation of the decontamination strategy – and I said that after going to bed at 4 o'clock this morning – should be halted until full consultation has taken place with trade unions. So, while we are seeking discussions with the Department of Health, we need you to back this motion and the TUC support in order to press concerns. That is what our members hope for and that is what patients deserve. Congress, please support motion 49.

\* *Motion 49 was CARRIED*

**BBC Charter Renewal and Public Service Broadcasting**

**Tony Lennon** (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*) moved Composite Motion 26. He said: Thank you for being here. We may be towards the end of the agenda but the next few motions cover a subject that is important to all of us, the future of broadcasting in this country and particularly the future of the BBC.

About every ten years the Government take a long hard look at the BBC. They decide what the BBC should be doing, how it should be funded and how it should operate. It is quite right that the Government should do that because the BBC is publicly funded and is owned by you, the public and people who pay the licence fee. To give some credit to the Government, they are going through a very open process of consultation at the moment because, in two years' time, they will have to renew the charter of the BBC, which is effectively the BBC's right to exist.

There have been lot of meetings up and down the country; thousands of individuals have offered their view about what the BBC should be doing; and there are piles of consultation documents big enough to give you a hernia if you try to lift them all at once. Unfortunately, this consultation has given the BBC's competitors and enemies the opportunity to line up and bash the BBC. These are massive media companies: some of them are broadcasters; some of them are publishers. They are saying one simple thing about the BBC: it gets too much money and, worse still, it uses that money to provide services free to the British public, which the media companies think they ought to be charging for so they the media conglomerates can make a profit.

What they are saying to back up this argument is, "We are moving into a multi-channel world of television and the BBC has therefore become irrelevant. There will be umpteen channels that people can choose to watch". They have a point about us moving into the multi-channel age. About half the homes in Britain now have digital television. Within about the next eight or nine years it is possible that all the rest will have to join in and buy digital equipment. But when you look at those who have digital equipment now, the multi-channel homes, four million of them actually are taking a free service called Freeview, which is dominated by public service programmes, many of them made by the BBC. The other six million homes in this country who have digital television, OK they have Sky, they are truly multi-channel and some of them have to pay up to £40 a month for the privilege of watching hundreds of TV channels. If they want to do that, that is fine. Already we have four million homes that say "We do not want to pay" and there are another 12 or 13 million homes out there where people either will not want to or will not be able to afford to pay for the subscription TV that Sky is modelled on.

It is crucially important as we review the existence of the BBC that we commit ourselves to having a properly funded quality broadcaster who is able to bring good television programmes and good radio to the audiences of this country for free, and do it well.

Let me go through the key points in Composite 16 because we need your support to try and keep the BBC going. Firstly, the licence fee, the poll tax of the air waves as it was once called: over the last 20 years people with much bigger brains than many of us have tried to find alternatives for the BBC licence fee and have failed. If you want public broadcasting that is

adequately funded and free at the point of viewing and listening, the licence fee is the only answer. It has to be fair, and so far there has been a concession for households where people are over 75 years of age. There need to be further adjustments for people who genuinely cannot afford to pay, but if you want to fund the BBC properly you have to have the licence fee.

Second key point, top slicing: you remember I said that the BBC's enemies believe it is getting too much money. They have come up with a solution that is very simply to give money to them, the commercial broadcasters. That is no way to provide public service television and we are against the idea that your licence money is creamed off and given to the shareholders of commercial TV companies.

We also want to restrict the amount of independently bought programming on the BBC. At the moment in the way that the Health Service buys in from private hospitals the BBC is forced to buy one in four of its programmes from private providers. We have learned to live with it but we think it has gone far enough. Buy in any more and you start to undermine the basic organisation and its reason for existence.

The final point I want to make on Composite 16 is a call for an end to the creeping privatisation of the BBC. We are currently dealing as a union with the biggest privatisation of the BBC yet: 1,400 people are going to be given over to the company that PCS are having trouble with, Siemens Business Services. The law has prevented them doing anything about it because you cannot go on strike against privatisation.

Those are the key points in this composite. I ask you on behalf of your members, the viewing and listening public, to support the BBC and support Composite 16.

**Lucy Daniel Raby** (*Writers Guild of Great Britain*): Finally getting to speak upon a vitally important issue that concerns all of us, the future of the BBC.

I ask Congress, what is left of it, to consider the following issues. Who, despite recent carping and criticising, still makes the widest and most culturally diverse range of innovative quality programming in the world? The BBC. Why is the Writers Guild supporting this motion? Because we want to carry on contributing to this range. We want to carry on writing challenging, controversial stuff and, like all our industry colleagues, we believe in a free and independent BBC.

So, why is Tony Blair trying to restrict this freedom and independence by siphoning off some of the licence fee to his commercial cronies? Because he would like to shut the BBC up. He was furious when they would not join the Iraq war. He punished them with the Hutton Report, and now he is going in for the kill with the charter review. Who is going to be making the real decisions in this process? Well, I am guessing here but I think it might just be that cosy little oligarchy inside No. 10 with a few handy hints and tips from the likes of Campbell, Mandy, Bert, Berlusconi and that well-known champion of press freedom Rupert Murdoch.

What might they try and do? As my colleague just pointed out, undermine the BBC by stealth with a sneaky top-slicing strategy, which could be the thin end of the wedge. Are we going to let them get away with that? Try no. Do we want to go the same way as America where government and big business control

all the mainstream media? I do not think so. Do we want our public broadcasting system to serve the people or the government? Who do we trust most? It is not really a question, is it? Is the BBC's independence at the heart of our freedom of speech and democracy? You bet it is. But is our BBC safe with a Prime Minister who rigged a public inquiry in order to try and damage it, lied to us and took us to war on false pretences? You tell me. Who deserves the best cultural legacy we can leave them? Our children. Who deserves our support, all of us, during the Charter review process? Michael Grade and Mark Thompson. Who after 80 years is still the best and most respected broadcaster in the world? The BBC. And who is going to join in the fight to keep it that way? All of us, I hope. Let us do it.

Please support this motion and please support our ongoing fight to keep the BBC the way it is.

**Jim Corrigan** (*National Union of Journalists*) supporting Composite 16 said: This composite rightly places the BBC at the heart of public service broadcasting in Britain. In its period of charter review, it is most important that our individual unions and the movement as a whole campaign strongly for a fair settlement for the BBC in a new ten-year charter.

Although many of the great and the good seem to be in favour of charter renewal with the licence fee continuing, there are powerful forces who want to see the BBC down-sized or privatised. As we have heard, the editorial independence of the BBC has been under attack from politicians for the past year for its coverage of the Iraq war and at the time of Hutton. The BBC's editorial independence must be maintained so that it continues to produce news free from commercial and political interference. This helps ensure that balanced news reporting is the standard throughout broadcasting and this makes a vital contribution to our wider democratic process.

We pledge, as the NUJ, to stand together with our sister union, BECTU, in resisting attempts by the BBC management to sell off parts of the corporation. There is no need for this. We believe that the fight to defend public service broadcasting standards is equally important in the independent and commercial sectors. Since the merger of Carlton and Granada, ITV has been cutting its commitments to local news. It is closing studios with the loss of 550 jobs at Meridian TV in the south and at Central TV in the Midlands. Other broadcasters like ITV Wales are also cutting back on local news production. So far the new super regulator Ofcom, which has a brief to be a light touch regulator, has refused to intervene to ensure that these companies keep to these commitments. We urge the General Council to make representations to Ofcom to carry out its responsibilities in regard to ITV.

We urge you all to defend public service broadcasting. Please support this composite.

**Jean Rogers** (*Equity*): Good morning, Congress. I am Vice President of Equity. Are you sitting comfortably? Then I'll begin.

Equity supports this composite and believes it vital that the BBC remains independent of commercial strictures and is funded wholly by the licence fee. Only then can it truly be a public broadcasting service representing all members of our multi-racial society. This diversity should be seen from top to toe of the organisation, as well as in the writing and the casting of programmes, where all age groups too need to be accurately portrayed. Ageism, I believe, is a growing problem for many of our members. To be a performer,

or a presenter, and over 40, means there is a reduction in job opportunities. For actresses these days it is nearer 35. How can this truly represent a society with an ever-ageing population? What message does it send to the young about the potency and value of the middle-aged and the elderly? If you are not young and beautiful you are not fit to be seen, or even worse you do not really exist.

This leads me to the Government's proposed analogue switch-off in 2010 or so with all its cost and technical implications. Many Equity members know how important television can be to the general public. I recall a letter I received from Jack in Blackpool. His wife, Phyllis, had suffered a paralysing stroke. Rather than abandon her, as he saw it, to hospital care he struggled to look after her at home. "She is like a thin tiny baby" he wrote, "and of course cannot hold a conversation with me, but I refuse to believe that she cannot hear or understand. Twice a week we sit in front of the television and watch your programme, and for half an hour we can forget our troubles and breathe the Yorkshire air". What a responsibility, not just for Jack, but for the media and for society too.

Maybe you have a fancy phone or a lap top or most exciting of all a video link, as I do, to keep in touch with my family in New Jersey, but not everyone has either the desire or the financial ability to own such things. For the most vulnerable members of our community -- the old, the handicapped, the bedridden, the very poor, often unfortunately the very same people -- television is their preferred link with society. Congress, the Government must ensure they are not disadvantaged further when the switch-off takes place. Long live a truly independent BBC, and it was a good night last night wasn't it. Please vote for this motion.

**Elizabeth Donnelly** (*Amicus*) supporting Composite 16 said: I would like to extend belated congratulations to the President on his 62nd birthday, which was on Tuesday. Happy birthday, Roger.

The BBC stands as a beacon of excellence, independence and quality programming across the world. How many other British television companies, radio stations or websites can say all of that? The unique way of funding the BBC through the licence fee means that throughout Britain there is a flourishing network of local radio stations and regional television centres. Where I live in the East Midlands company mergers mean that Central Television has closed its Nottingham studios, leaving only a handful of journalists but a lot of job losses. In the same region the BBC has five radio stations and a television centre providing a variety of news, music, current affairs and special interest programmes to over four million people. In the commercial sector our TV comes from Birmingham, over 50 miles away and not in the region. Local radio stations play exactly the same songs in exactly the same order with exactly the same format and only the adverts and the station jingle let you know where you are.

Nationally, with eight TV channels and nine radio stations, the BBC offers quality music and drama, informative discussion, investigative reporting, outstanding sports coverage, services to our minority communities and much, much more. Internationally, the World Service is relied on by millions to improve their English and by many in oppressed countries to tell them the truth that they are denied by their governments. Additionally, the BBC website is a gateway to in-depth information and entertainment and has won awards for its creative output. All of this for £121 a year, less than 34p a day, less than the price of a chocolate bar.

Removing the licence fee would invite in advertising, encourage carpet bagging and ultimately lead to the break-up and sale of this vibrant, thriving and vital institution. Job losses would be rampant. We all know what the alternative is, over £300 a year a sum that is still not enough to banish advertising for a subscription to cable or satellite channels that offer imported programmes of questionable quality, perpetual re-runs of old soaps, a dearth of decent documentaries and sanitised programmes that emulate the partisan media coverage so noticeable when we holiday in the US. Is this what we want because that is what will happen?

The BBC is not in hock to advertisers; the BBC is not in the pockets of the government. It is loved, admired and respected both here in Britain and all over the world. Let us make sure it stays that way. Congress, support the composite.

**Gareth Davies** (*Community*): In supporting this composite I have two things I want to say in relation to it, really, one: community broadcasting. Ofcom conducted a consultation earlier this year that led to an order being laid before Parliament in July and there is now a window of opportunity that closes on 23 November for applicants for community broadcasting licences. This exercise would be conducted on an annual basis with broadcasters expected to start broadcasting within two years of being successful.

The second thing I want to say is that the Telecommunications Act placed an onus on Ofcom to appoint an Elderly and Disabled People's Advisory Committee. This it did on 27 April, and I have to say that in my case it nearly led to me falling through the road down to someone near the Sydney Opera House, I suppose, but we have met on two occasions. I am not the definitive disability experience; I am one perspective of it. I am talking to various organisations and people. Next month I expect to be addressing an AGM of Age Concern in London. But I do think that properly run trades unions are about as most representative as you can get, so I would like as much input as possible to the process.

Somebody once said it is good to talk. It is but please support this composite as well.

**Richard Cook** (*Amicus*): I am not angry, but it might be useful to ask members what does 'handicapped' mean. I am very pleased, by the way, that you included people with disabilities in the motion; I am very grateful for that. But what does 'handicapped' mean? It means cap in hand. We do not like that expression because we are not cap in hand, we are disabled people; we are not handicapped. I just thought it might be a good idea for you to realise that.

**The President:** The point is well taken by both the Congress and the platform and it will be taken into account in future.

Composite Motion 16 is supported by the General Council.

\* *Composite Motion 16 was CARRIED*

## Media ownership

**Graham Lester George** (*Writers Guild of Great Britain*) moved Motion 70. He said: This motion concerns an issue that is fundamental to our democracy and our democracy is being undermined. I ask Congress

to demand that this government reverse recent weak-kneed legislation under the Communications Bill that has surrendered so much of our democracy's protection to foreign powerful media corporations. To own one newspaper is to have power: power to control information, power to influence readers' opinions, power to influence politicians' thinking. To own four major newspapers is to have an awful lot of power, power not just to influence readers' opinions but their voting behavior, power not just to influence politicians' thinking but their decisions and policy-making. This amount of power is a threat to democracy. Rupert Murdoch has this amount of power and a lot more besides with *The Times*, *The Sunday Times*, *The Sun*, *the News of the World* and BSKyB, which unlike the BBC or ITV is unregulated. He also controls a vast swathe of our book publishing industry that he uses ruthlessly to promote his own agenda. Murdoch has been undermining our democracy for years, and this from a man who is not even a citizen of this country. He was born in Australia. Rupert Murdoch was obliged to change nationality precisely because United States law prevented him from owning US media companies unless he became a citizen.

Many of you will remember the vigorous *Sun* campaign against Neil Kinnock in the 1992 elections. On polling day the *Sun's* front page proclaimed "If Neil Kinnock is elected today would the last person to leave Britain turn out the lights". Kinnock was defeated very narrowly and the *Sun's* crowing headline was "It's the Sun wot won it."

Thirteen years earlier when Thatcher got in she wangled it so that Murdoch could buy *The Times* and *The Sunday Times*, something he would have been barred from under the previous Labour Government.

This new American uses his considerable leverage to distort the politics of this country and at the same time has made billions in profits from us, without paying UK tax. Yes, really. Murdoch's politics are undoubtedly very far out to the right. You only have to tune into his American Fox News Channel to see where he is coming from. It is spine chilling and sometimes almost funny to see his anchormen falling over Bush and his gang and in turn spewing bile at anything that smacks of liberality or social good. It is blatant right wing propagandising, delivered under the Orwellian strap line of 'fair and balanced'. I say 'Orwellian', but such a distortion could just as easily have been cooked up by Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's propaganda minister.

Murdoch is also a very pragmatic man and he would not let his political beliefs stand in the way of business. In the early nineties he recognised way ahead of us that Tony Blair was not only a rising star in the Labour Party but that paradoxically he was a true successor to Margaret Thatcher. His American newspapers proclaimed him as such. Murdoch's advisers also identified Blair as being a natural ally to the Christian fundamentalist right, something that Tony's close friendship with prayer buddy George W Bush seems to have borne out. Murdoch started to court him. He and his adviser, Irwin Stelzer met with Blair several times in the nineties and, just as he had with Thatcher in 1979, Murdoch promised Blair his support in the 1997 general election. However, we know that just as Faust had to promise the devil his soul so Blair had to promise Murdoch that he would sweep away the media ownership laws, laws that were there to protect our democracy. Blair kept his word -- to Rupert, that is, not to us -- and cut him a considerable amount of slack in the drafting of the Communications Bill. Luckily thanks to David Puttnam leading a threatened Lords rebellion the clause

allowing Murdoch to get his hands on Channel 5 was amended at the last moment. But it only made it tougher for him, not impossible.

There is no time to relax. Murdoch is a global power, more powerful than Blair is or Thatcher ever was, and he does not give up. Unless we reverse our foreign ownership laws within a few short years we will have the bile of Fox News UK up there with ITN and BBC News.

In the meantime, we have to remember that although Murdoch is not yet able to buy Channel 5, AOL Time Warner can now buy ITV, so can Disney, so can Viacom, but if ITV had the money and the backing it could not make a counter bid for any of those companies because foreign companies are barred by US law from buying American media businesses.

We must act now to protect our media from anti-democratic megalomaniacs like Murdoch and from any other non-EU corporate giants that wants to influence us and our government with its own political agenda. I call on Congress to support this motion.

**Roger Bolton** (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*): You have already heard this morning about the contradictions of the Labour Party in opposition and the Labour Party in power in respect of the Prison Service. The same contradictions apply in our industry. The Labour Party in opposition opposed non-EU ownership of the UK media. The Labour Party in government dismantled the very rules that prevent the non-EU ownership of the British media. That is a disgrace. Just because we deal in our industry with a lot of Micky Mouse employers does not mean we want the Disney Corporation to own ITV.

UK broadcasting affects UK culture and has an impact on the democratic process. It should be owned by European companies, not by foreign companies and not given away to Mr Murdoch.

Colleagues, support the proposition.

**The President:** Motion 70 is supported by the General Council.

\* *Motion 70 was CARRIED*

### Licensing Act

**John Smith** (*Musicians Union*) moved Motion 72. He said: For many years the Musicians Union, with the continuing support of the TUC, has campaigned for the reform of the outdated discriminatory public entertainment licensing regime. We aimed to move away from a system that allowed individual local authority licensing inspectors to impose what were sometimes quite disproportionate licence fees on venues and penalised people for spontaneous dancing and singing. We also wanted the repeal of the outdated exemption for two or less performers, the so-called two in a bar rule.

Early in 2002, the Government announced their intention to reform the entire licensing regime. The aim was to liberalise the system, to allow pubs to extend their opening hours and to impose what the Act now describes as the four aims of licensing. These are the prevention of crime and disorder, public safety,

the prevention of public nuisance and the protection of children from harm -- all very commendable I am sure you will agree. However, the Act that received Royal Assent in July 2002 deals with music and other entertainment in a different way than we imagined it would. Live music will in future be classed as regulated entertainment and it will be a criminal offence to put on live music in a venue that has not asked for that facility to be included in the licence. Rather bizarrely, big screen sports broadcasts sponsored mostly by the gentleman that the previous motion was mainly about are not subject to the licensing regime.

During the Bill's progression through Parliament the Musicians Union lobbied vociferously in order to avoid what we feared might be a serious erosion of our members' ability to work in pubs, clubs and restaurants. We lost the day when it came to the legislation but we are very pleased that the DCMS had appeared to listen to our arguments and set up the Live Music Forum soon after the Act received Royal Assent.

May I, President, at this point pay tribute to Estelle Morris, the Minister for the Arts, who announced yesterday that she is standing down at the end of this Parliament. She has been very useful to the Arts lobby. We are very pleased with the way she has taken on this brief and she will be a serious loss to the Arts lobby and to the Labour Party, I believe. The forum she set up is chaired by The Undertones lead singer, Fergal Sharkey. He has been given the brief to examine the live music scene and, particularly, to monitor the effects of the new Act to ensure it does not diminish the provision of live music.

There is still a lot to do. Licensing authorities are publishing their licensing policies as we speak and the transition period from the old to the new licence regime begins on February 7. Then for a six-month period licensed venues will be able to convert their old licences for a new premises licence for a single fee that will cover the sale of liquor and the provision of entertainment. The licence will then remain valid for the lifetime of the venue as long as the provisions of the Act are not breached. This is a major and welcome departure from the old system. However, if a licensee does not ask for entertainment to be included at the time of conversion an additional fee will have to be paid for variation of the premises' licence, and we fear that a number of smaller venues who previously used the two in a bar exemption will not bother to opt for entertainment in their application for conversion. It is crucial if they want to limit the paper work and save money that they opt for entertainment from the word go, even if they have no plans to present it at the moment.

The Government's commitment to live music is clear but we must spread the word and make sure that the vast majority of licensees convert their licences during the transition period, taking up the entertainment option. That is the only way we can ensure that we keep music live.

**Florence Sparham** (*Equity*) seconding Motion 72 said: Circus and Punch and Judy shows are traditional forms of entertainment that have been performing for over 150 years and are some of the few indigenous forms of entertainment in the UK. Given the Government's desire to demonstrate that the new licensing laws will encourage grass roots culture, Equity feels it is important to address some of the unfairness that will arise for these two forms of art in particular. The

licensing system will require a circus and Punch and Judy to have a licence for every site they perform on. For circus this will mean applying for around 40 to 100 licences. Punch and Judy will have to apply for a smaller number of licences on sites concentrated around a shorter summer period but it will be equally burdensome. Each of these licences will have a separate fee. The government have yet to announce the cost of the licences but it is likely to be around £100 for circus and £10 for Punch and Judy. This is the same system that will apply to fixed buildings such as theatres but will inevitably mean proportionately higher financial burdens on these forms of entertainment as theatres will only have to apply for one licence for the whole year.

Additionally, many circuses will have to deal with the pressures of applying for licences while they are travelling. These problems are exacerbated because both circus and Punch and Judy are weather dependent and may well have to change the performance site at short notice. As the application process for a full premises licence is likely to take 6 to 8 weeks, it may be impossible to find a new venue at short notice if a site is compromised by bad weather or if a local authority declines an application for a licence. Equally, as local authorities will want to inspect the circus prior to granting a licence, and because circuses will be travelling right up to the point where they arrive in an area to perform, there are problems surrounding the practicalities of approving a licence.

One area that we have looked at with the Government is the licensing of public land by local authorities. This would allow circuses and Punch and Judy to request permission from local authorities to use their land. The authority, as the licensee, could then give permission without the lengthy licensing process.

What Equity is arguing for is greater flexibility in the licensing structure. We accept that licensing is necessary for both these art forms but what we want is a system that can be applied to a non-building based travelling art form. Equity supports the successful implementation of the Licensing Act but wishes for some of these specific concerns raised in this motion to be addressed.

**The President:** Motion 72 is supported by General Council.

\* *Motion 72 was CARRIED*

### **Use of union contracts in publicly owned entertainment venues**

**Harry Landis (Equity)** He said: As President of Equity, moving Motion 73, three days late, with a platform practically empty and a lot of people gone home. That is how important we are!

I am an actor. I am very rich. I have an eight-bedroomed house. You can find me in nightclubs any night of the week, surrounded by a bevy of beauties, and the *News of the World* is after my story day and night. If you believe that you will believe anything. That is what they print, rather than printing that there are thousands of performers living on the dole and having a hard time, because that does not sell papers.

The trade union movement suffers from the same thing. When you act for your members, do they say that you are working for better conditions and pay for

them? No. They say you are trying to bring the country to its knees. That is why we are dismayed that some trades unionists take notice of all that rubbish. It helps give credence to the belief that we are happy to do our work for nothing or just expenses.

Let me give you an example. Some time ago I was phoned by a very well respected trades unionist, a great activist and a fine man. He said, "Harry, we are having a party for a truly great man who has done a lot of fine work for the movement. He is moving on; we want to give him a party". I will not tell you the name of that great man but he is married to Harriet Harman. He gave two very good speeches this week, nothing against him, but the other gentleman said to me, "If you can, we would like Belt and Braces", which was a very respected comedy satirical group of the time. He said, "If you can book them for that Saturday it would be wonderful, but do not talk money, I will knock him down".

If I had said to him "Send me a plasterer and I will knock him down, do not talk money", I reckon he would have bloody well knocked me down!

We have mouths to feed and rent and mortgages to pay like everyone else. We are not strolling players who do it for fun, although a lot of people think we do. I think the prejudice starts at the top in the TUC, which is why our motions are put at the end of one day, do not happen, the next day do not happen, and then it happens now at the end of the Conference. Well, I want to tell the General Council that we are as much a part of industry as anyone else, and that the arts play a very important part in this nation.

Recently a play was performed in London's City Hall for nothing: for the good of the cause. People asked the Musicians Union for a free band for an event for the movement. If Congress House asked a plumber to come and fix the hot water for nothing they would get a bloody good answer, wouldn't they?

Brothers and sisters, let me say this to you: if you are in a position to book entertainment for any civic place like civic halls, towns halls, schools, working men's clubs, any event for a trade union, please make sure that they use the Equity contract. It is not exorbitant. It lays down a minimum wage; it lays down certain conditions of work. If you do that for us, you will earn our eternal respect.

**John Smith (Musicians Union)** seconding Motion 73 said: The majority of our members are self-employed, and most of them frequently perform in publicly owned venues, the kind of venue that Harry has just described. These self-employed musicians do not have a statutory right to receive written particulars of employment, unlike employees, so the union provides 18 standard contracts for various types of engagements -- live performance, recordings, even teaching and coaching. We try to ensure that our members always get it in writing, and we have produced a leaflet to that effect to try and encourage them. However, despite all our exhortations often our members cannot prevail upon the people who are hiring them to sign a contract, so the musician has to choose whether to work on the strength of a phone call or to turn down the offer of work altogether. Working without a written contract may be fine as long as the engagement goes off without a hitch but can cause untold difficulties in the event of a dispute. The union then gets involved and, on many occasions, we find that not only are the terms of the engagement vague

but the material terms have never actually been discussed. On some occasions, particularly when the engagement has been arranged by an agent, it is not even clear who has contacted the musician. This has then to be determined by a judge, usually in the Small Claims Court.

Written contracts encourage the parties to consider the agreement and the terms they are signing up to and ensure that all material aspects are covered. Importantly for the union, written contracts make disputes easier to resolve, which is to the benefit of both the artist and the hirer. Therefore, if any of you are involved in hiring performers please use a standard MU or Equity contract and encourage others to do so. That is the only way we can ensure we can provide our freelance members with the protection provided by a union contract.

I am pleased to second this motion.

**The President:** Motion 73 is supported by the General Council.

\* *Motion 73 was CARRIED*

**The President:** It seems to have worked. Harry, the cheque will be in the post.

### Our future in Europe

**Graham Fowler** (*British Airline Pilots Association*) moved Motion 78. He said: As the economic ties between the countries of the European Union continue to grow, and the economic and financial integration between member states increases, it is vital that trades unions across Europe establish new and innovative arrangements that enable the interests of employees to be properly represented. The establishment of European Works Councils, whilst a welcome development, does not fully meet this need as much of the activity undertaken by trades unions, including the recruitment and organisation of workers, falls outside of their term of reference.

Civil aviation, by the very nature of its activity, is at the leading edge of cross-border developments, and a number of UK airlines in which we have members are establishing bases in other member states of the EU. The pilots at those bases are employed on UK contracts and are covered by UK collective agreements, but who is to organise and represent them? Should it be BALPA, the UK pilots association, or one or more of our fellow organisations in the member state or states concerned? Alternatively, should they be represented by an alliance of the relevant pilots associations? If so, how should such an alliance be structured and funded? How should services, including legal representation and benefits, be provided? How are the pilots' interests to be represented to regulators, governments and the institutions of the EU?

As a result of its experience, BALPA believes the importance of developments across national boundaries requires fresh thinking on how we organize. We may need to adopt radical solutions, such as pan-European trade unions.

President, in your opening address to Congress you mentioned the initiative the TUC is taking in co-operation with the ETUC to hold a major Europe-wide organisation conference next year. BALPA welcomes

this initiative and asks Congress to instruct the General Council to undertake research amongst affiliates on the problems being experienced in organising across member states of the EU, and to engage our colleagues in Europe by holding a seminar during the UK presidency of the European Commission.

I ask you to support Motion 78.

**A delegate** (*Amicus*) formally seconded the motion.

**Paul Moloney** (*National Union of Marine, Aviation and Shipping Transport Officers*) supporting Motion 78 said: NUMAST has had to cope with the problems associated with a global industry for decades. Our members, like their colleagues in Europe, are highly trained, skilled workers, often responsible for the lives of many hundreds or, in the case of today's large cruise ships, thousands. Our members work for multinational companies employing workers across the world, yet, despite the skills required to navigate a ship safely, our members' employers often set up internal competition that forces seafarers from one country to compete with those of another country, with the constant pressure to be more cost effective than their counterparts from Europe. In the last three years, we have seen an increase in the internal international pressure to force the cost of employing highly skilled officers down. Cruise companies such as Holland America Line and container companies such as P&O, Nedlloyd and Maersk employ officers from the UK and Europe.

In view of the more beneficial tax incentives in Holland and Denmark, reducing the cost of employing seafarers, NUMAST has had to fight hard to protect our members who are regarded as being more expensive. We cannot influence the way these and many others operate without creating structures to deal with the international nature of these companies. NUMAST has recognised that the only way to protect seafarers from Denmark, Holland, Norway, the UK and elsewhere from continual attacks on terms and conditions is for us to work with our sister unions across Europe.

This motion suggests radical solutions, such as pan-European trades unions. In our industry we can already see the beginnings of this. We now have close ties with our colleagues throughout Europe, and particularly with FWZ in Holland. We are now exploring the possibility of joint pay claims being submitted with the FWZ in those companies that employ Dutch and British officers. We also regularly exchange information so that never again will our two groups of members be forced to compete with each other in companies such as P&O, Nedlloyd and Holland America Line.

NUMAST therefore supports this motion and welcomes the call for research to be undertaken by the TUC. We would be happy to share our experiences so that our movement can be better placed to overcome the challenges set by pan-European businesses. Please support this motion.

**The President:** The General Council support Motion 78.

\* *Motion 78 was CARRIED*

### European Constitutional Treaty

**Tony Richardson** (*Bakers, Food and Allied Workers Union*) speaking to paragraph 6.4 said: Yesterday in the debate on Composite 17 we said a lot about the importance of having a fully informed debate on the

Constitution with all affiliates having the opportunity to contribute. I indicated before the debate that the Bakers Union wished to speak in the debate, but unfortunately we were not called.

When we in the Bakers Union attend the TUC we take our duties very seriously. We do not come here to sit passively on the sidelines; we come here to contribute and we come here to make our members' voices heard. As a lay official, I directly represent hundreds of members in my branch, and thousands of members nationally, when here as a delegate. I hold their views and their interests as paramount.

With that in mind, and demanding our democratic rights, I wish publicly -- without using my detailed speech -- to put on record our position with regard to the EU Constitution debate. My Branch, because of the many concerns highlighted in paragraph 6.4, would have demanded that the TUC take a position and take a vote on the EU Constitution. In the absence of that vote the Bakers, Food and Allied Workers Union nationally, which also has a position of wait and see, supported Motion 77 and Composite 17. We would have spoken strongly in favour of Motion 77 and Composite 17, and after the debate we did vote to support fully the RMT position.

That is all I want to say.

#### **European Social Forum**

**Maureen O'Mara** (*NATFHE- the university and college lecturers' union*) speaking on paragraph 6.7 of the General Council's Report said: I would like to up-date Congress on the European Social Forum.

On behalf of the European Social Forum Committee and as company secretary and treasurer, I would like to thank the TUC and all the trade unions for their current support in the process. The Forum is a partnership between the trade union movement, the NGOs and the wider grass roots social movement where real debate, cultural events and exhibitions will take place attracting people from all over the world. ESF is taking place between 14<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> October in London, and it is the most important civil gathering to take place in 2004, coming as it does just before the G8 in Gleneagles and a possible general election next year. Many trade unions have proposed seminars and workshops to ensure that our voice and our concerns are to be heard loud and clear.

At the World Social Forum in India earlier this year people travelled hundreds of miles carrying their food with them because they could not afford the 50 pence charge a day for food at the event. If these brothers and sisters -- our brothers and sisters -- felt that this gathering was important enough to ensure that their voices were heard, is it any less important for ours to be heard? The Greater London Authority and only three major unions have donated substantial funds to ensure that the event takes place. If we do not receive substantially more money from the trade union movement there is a real danger that the event will have to be downsized. Negotiations are taking place with the ETUC for some funding. Is the TUC prepared to match-fund any monies coming from the ETUC?

We also need to find accommodation for our fellow trade unionists travelling from Europe. We need volunteers. If you can help with anything, please see me or Paul Mackney, our general secretary. I say to all the treasurers, if any are in the hall, I will take your

cheques now. You can register for the event through the website, and if you register before 1<sup>st</sup> October, the charge is £30 but you will get a free travel pass which is normally worth £15, which the GLA and Transport for London are donating.

**Roger Laxton** (*UNISON*): I will be very brief because the last speaker spoke on quite a few of the issues that are important to UNISON. We are one of the unions that have been involved in ESF and we have put quite a lot of resources into it. I would like to thank the General Council for its support and also the Mayor of London, Ken Livingstone, because he has put quite a lot of resources into this event.

For the event to be a success for the trade union movement, please ensure that all of your members come along to ESF. There will be hundreds of different seminars and I am sure that you will find one or two to go to which will be relevant to you. Please support.

#### **Adoption of the General Council Report**

**The President:** Congress, that completes the formal business of this Congress. I call for the General Council's Report to be adopted. (*Agreed*)

#### **Votes of Thanks**

**The President:** I have to make a number of votes of thanks to those who have contributed to the smooth running of Congress. They will be brief because of the time but they are sincere and well meant. I move a vote of thanks to the staff at the Brighton Centre for all they have done to ensure that the Congress has run smoothly, and to the stewards for all their assistance during the week. (*Applause*)

I would like to thank the creché workers and a very special thanks to the team of sign language interpreters. (*Applause*) I would also like to thank the verbatim reporters and the musicians who have worked so hard throughout the week. I am sure that these votes are agreed.

At this stage it is time to say farewell to a number of colleagues on the General Council. Jean Foster of the GMB, who joined the General Council in 1999. Unfortunately, I do not think she is with us today.

Paul Gates joined the General Council last September, having previously served from 2001 -- 2002, and he is now the Deputy General Secretary of the new Community union, and we wish him well in his new job with the union. (*Applause*)

To Linda McCullough of Amicus, who joined the General Council in October, it may be farewell to the General Council but Linda has been elected to the General Purposes Committee, so we will still be seeing her.

To Jane McKay of the Transport and General Workers' Union, who joined us in 2002, and is a well-known and formidable champion of women's rights, thank you.

To Phil Pinder, who is the first representative of young workers, under the new rules on the composition of the General Council. He joined the General Council in 2001 but has now reached the mandatory retirement age of 27. Thank you, Phil.



To Richard Rosser of the Transport Salaried Staffs' Association, who joined the Council in 2000 and who now joins the trade union team in the House of Lords. Thank you, Richard.

We also say farewell to Danny Carrigan of Amicus who served on the General Purposes Committee for the past two years after previous service on the General Council.

We wish them all well in their continuing work for their trade unions and for the trade union movement. *(Applause)*

#### **Award of Congress Gold Badges**

**The President:** We now come to the presentation of the Gold Badges of Congress, which are awarded to those who are retiring after long service either on the General Council or on the General Purposes Committee.

I will start with the General Purposes Committee, and the Chair, my very good friend, Gerry Veart of the GMB, who retires this year after five years service, initially behind the scenes but for the past two years as chair, presenting the GPC Report to Congress. Delegates, the work of the GPC may not receive much attention in public but it is crucial to the efficient running of Congress. Gerry has steered the GPC with great skill and tact. He will certainly be missed. Gerry, I have great pleasure with presenting you with the Gold Badge of Congress. *(Presentation made amidst applause)*

During the course of the year Doug McAvoy of the NUT, who has served on the General Council for 15 years, and he is entitled to the Gold Badge of Congress. Doug was lead spokesperson on local government issues and he enjoyed a high profile as a strong advocate for his union and its members. Doug is not able to be with us today but we will arrange for him to receive the badge and your good wishes. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Peter Landles of the Transport and General Workers' Union, who is one of the few lay members on the General Council, is departing at this Congress after nine years. He, too, receives the Gold Badge of Congress. Peter has brought the authentic voice of the lay activists to the General Council's deliberations. He has also made an outstanding contribution as the lay rep on the General Council cricket team. Peter, I have great pleasure in presenting you with the gold badge of Congress. *(Presentation made amidst applause)*

At this Congress, Sir Bill Connor retires from the General Council after seven years' service, and he, too, receives the gold badge of Congress. Bill has been a tremendous presence in the movement for as long as I can remember, and that goes back to our days in Liverpool together, which is longer ago than we care to remember. He has been a forceful advocate for his union and its members, loyal to the TUC and clear about the importance of ensuring the election of a Labour Government in 1997, its re-election in 2001 and to win a third term. *(Presentation made amidst applause)*

**Sir Bill Connor:** I want to say thank you to all my colleagues on the General Council, to the TUC staff who give a first class service in information and expertise, and, basically, for the comradeship and to be

able to speak to a packed hall like this. Thank you. *(Applause)*

**The President:** We wish all of our colleagues all the best for the future.

#### **Congress President 2005**

**The President:** It is my honour to announce that the next President of the TUC, who takes office from the close of this Congress, is Jeannie Drake. I wish her well. *(Applause)* I have explained to Jeannie that she is responsible for all the ex-President's unpaid bills, and I hope she enjoys her year as President as much as I have. Well done, Jeannie, and good luck.

#### **Vote of Thanks to the President**

**The General Secretary:** I call on the Vice-President to give a vote of thanks to the President.

**The Vice-President (Tony Dubbins):** Congress, it is no easy task to be TUC President. Not only does the President chair the Annual Congress of the TUC, but away from the public eye the President chairs the General Council and also the TUC Executive Committee. At the same time, the President often maintains a leading position in his own union, although in that respect Roger's position has been made considerably easier this week.

You have seen how Roger has steered debates, with tact, humour and skill. The fact that we have been able to complete our business in good time is in no small measure due to Roger's exhortations to delegates to keep their contributions short, be ready to come to the rostrum and not to repeat points already made. That is advice that have taken to heart in preparing this speech.

What we do not see is all the work that goes on behind the scenes to keep Congress running smoothly. Roger's working day does not begin at 9.30 when Congress begins, but at 8.15 with a pre-meeting to finalise the order of the day's business. Few of us are at our best at that time of the morning, but Roger was always there on time, although it has to be said he was not quite looking his normal spruce self, and often urgently seeking quantities of decaffeinated coffee.

Congress, if you think being the Chair of Congress is tricky, you should see the meetings of the General Council and Executive Committee. Trade union leaders are not an easy bunch to keep in some kind of order and Roger has managed all of those meetings with the same skill, tact and humour that you have seen him exercise this week. But there is another side to Roger and that is his passion and commitment to the cause of international trade unionism. Roger really has made a real and substantial contribution to our work with trade union friends in South Africa, Colombia, Cuba and the Middle East.

Roger, we thank you, in particular, for that work. It is not always easy to move on when you have held high office, but I am sure that whatever the future holds for Roger he will bring to it the same enthusiasm, good humour and energy that we have seen this week. Roger, on behalf of all of us at Congress, I thank you for your work during the course of this year and also during the course of this week as TUC President. We wish you well for the future.

On behalf of Congress, can I present the Gold Badge and Bell to the President. *(Presentation made amidst applause)*

**The President:** Thank you very much, Tony; thank you to my colleagues on the General Council and thank you, delegates, for staying behind. It is always nice to check out who is interested in our last set of proceedings. We used to finish Congress on a Friday lunchtime, and we used always to say, "If only we could finish a little earlier, then people would stay to the end". As a result we brought the conclusion time of Congress forward to 4 o'clock today. Then it got a bit dodgy between lunchtime and 4 o'clock, so we thought that if we tried to finish at 1 o'clock, everyone will be here. So thank you, everyone, for being here. *(Laughter)*

Genuinely, thank you to you for making this Congress very easy for me and all the support staff and everyone else who has been working with you. We have completed our business and that is great. I have been congratulated on a number of things this week, but one point I am still trying to puzzle out. Apparently, I am meant to get a message to my parents to congratulate them for having my birthday on the day of the TUC President's Dinner. I cannot work that one out but it certainly went well and I thank all of you who were present on Tuesday for the way it went so smoothly. It was good in that we had a majority of the Cabinet in attendance, so we were able to sort out the manifesto without all the troubles of joint committees, forums and things like that.

I started my career as an official in Liverpool and I made fantastic friends, who I still keep in touch with. I involve myself in many campaigns. Now is not the time to go into detail, but I particularly refer to the campaign in which I met a lot of families in a very sad context, and that was the campaign that we organised after the Piper Alpha disaster. We did get the whole safety regime changed and for health and safety generally by getting risk assessment brought in from the Cullen Report. I hope that the work we did on that occasion has saved many people's lives and limbs in many industries and services, and it is a great memorial to those people whose lives were sacrificed on Piper Alpha. *(Applause)* Those who know me well, know that I have a basic commitment to equalities and equal opportunities, but particularly equal pay as it is something which is under our control. Every agreement we make, if it does not include enforcement of equal pay, whatever the wishes of the employer, makes us a bit culpable about unequal pay. The work we have put in over 12 years through our speech and language therapists, which cost us well over £1 million, led to that final victory when we got many speech therapists ten years' back pay. It amounted to thousands and thousands of pounds. The award of £12 million was an incredible experience. No one believed that we would keep up the funding and no one believed that we would ever win. It was the only budget under the Tory Government which had no cap. The budget to defeat our speech and language therapist members, however many times it had to go to Luxembourg, however many barristers they had to involve, they were under instructions to spend what it took to defeat our speech therapists. We fought with that Government and we beat them. As a result, we got our speech and language therapists fair pay. That was a great victory. *(Applause)*

The third and final memory that I have in these campaigning areas is the campaign that we made on the family friendly agenda and in fighting bullying and

stress at work, because I think they are connected. If people are facing bullying and stress at work, it affects their domestic lives as well. You cannot be nice at home if you are under pressure at work, and that can cause all kinds of secondary problems. I think the bullying campaign that we have been running – the Dignity at Work Campaign – is something I will especially remember. I thank all those who were involved in all of these campaigns, not just in my own union but across the movement.

I have had to stand for two elections as general secretary, as many of you will know, and I won both overwhelmingly. It enabled me to go around the country and to meet members of a union that covers every industry and service. We grew the union from the original 36,000, when I joined in 1966, by merging and organising and eventually to form Amicus. It brought synergy and resources together. That development now enables Amicus to play its full role in the movement, shortly to be joined by Unifi and GPMU.

I am proud to leave more than a million members in the union, which I joined in 1966. It is well situated to grow and I wish all the members well. I have been on the TUC General Council for 15 years. In the past few years we have gone in for some major reviews, and it is as well for people to know because it is not always well understood that we are not a static organisation, which just repeats itself year after year. We reviewed all of our structures a few short years ago. We had 18 major committees of the General Council, which members of the General Council used to sit on day after day after day. When it was proposed that we chopped almost all of these committees, the response was one of shock and horror. It was said that the whole world would come to an end and the whole British labour movement would fall apart. Now most of the committees have been chopped and the world continues to go round and the TUC is all the stronger for it.

In the past year we have reviewed our strategy, particularly with regard to priority for organisation and recruitment, developed on the basis of our experience with the Organising Academy and the affiliates who work in organising. All of this is vitally important and I wish it well as it goes forward.

We have reviewed our working skills and training and life-long learning, and particularly we have looked at the massive growth – the revolution – in workplace learning reps, which is something that I am very proud of, as it changes the face of British trade unionism. A whole new tier of activists comes in, comprising many women and many from the ethnic minorities who are not necessarily the long-standing convenors of the plants. They come forward being the face of trade unionism in workplaces across the land.

As Tony said, I have done my best to strengthen international solidarity. We have put our money where our mouths are, not just by passing resolutions but seeing how our solidarity has been implemented. I believe we have strengthened our credibility with the Government. The quality of TUC evidence makes a powerful impact, and the results of the negotiations leading to Warwick are very important. The implementation of the Warwick Agreement is very important as well. The unity that we have around the Warwick Agreement should be maintained. We do not have the luxury of a house divided, especially in working for a third term.

Our members and the wider public will not respond to a movement that is fueling and fighting amongst itself. It does require a united trade union movement to get our members and families out to the ballot boxes to ensure a third term for this Labour Government. I know there is apathy and cynicism around, and I know that not everybody *here* wants Labour to have a third term, but I strongly urge Congress to beware of any such siren calls, because the Tories and Lib Dems, who are the only serious alternatives, will not subscribe in any way to our agenda. The Liberals want to abolish the DTi as their contribution to manufacturing. Public services jobs will be under an even bigger threat from both of those Parties. The NHS and education would no longer receive the record investment that they get year after year at the moment. The people whom we represent and their families would not thank us if we put them and their lives at risk, and jobs, skills, employment rights, aid to Africa, devolution and many more issues under threat, at risk from reactionary policies.

I am delighted that as I stand down there is a consensus that the movement can make real progress on the back of the Warwick framework. It is not the last word but a big step forward to a third term manifesto, helping unions to prosper and grow in the months and years ahead.

I know I leave the TUC in good hands with a first class team under Jeannie, lead by Brendan, Frances and their colleagues, who are committed to winning the best for Britain's workers and to strengthen solidarity at home and abroad. I thank Amicus in particular for their magnificent support to me during my year as President. I finish with a vote of thanks to my wife, Kitty. Thank you, Kitty. For too many years she has heard me speaking of the work/life balance, but rarely has seen me. Now I have run out of excuses.

So good luck to you all for your continued successes on behalf of our members and families. That is what we are all about. Thank you for giving me the privilege and honour of being President of this great Congress. *(Applause)*

#### Vote of Thanks to the Media

**Brendan Barber** *(General Secretary)*: Thank you, President. It is my pleasure to move the vote of thanks to the media, which is the final item of business on our agenda. I want to begin by offering my congratulations to you, the delegates, for the way in which you have completed Congress with half a day to spare, thus demonstrating our total commitment both to higher productivity and shorter working time. *(Laughter and Applause)*

I ask you to spare a thought for the journalists here, what with Batman at the Palace and fox hunters on the floor of the Commons, it has not been what they call a quiet news week, so they have struggled to make too many headlines out our debates. However much mayhem there has been outside, including the storms and gales, it has been a remarkably united Congress, so no help for the press there. In fact, as I recall it, the closest we came to a voice of dissent in the first couple of days was Ed Sweeney's vote of thanks to the President.

However, we have had some coverage. Our proceedings were the subject of a rigorous intellectual

analysis in that most thoughtful and impartial of daily journals of record, *The Sun*, which referred to, and I quote – this is not a misquote – “to the dimwits of the TUC”. We are making progress. That is mild by their usual standards.

So much for the speeches: what really counted to the press was the level of applause. It is not that we do not trust the press, but in the interests of accuracy, we have undertaken our own scientific measurement of the response to our various speeches during the week.

I can now reveal the results. Third prize went to the PFA's Quality Award winners, Luther Blissett, Cyril Regis and Paul Davis, who had non-speaking parts, as you will recall.

Next came Pedro Ross, our most welcome guest from Cuba, but top of the list was Hernando Hernandez from Colombia.

So the lesson is clear. The way to win over Congress is either to speak Spanish or not to open your mouth at all. *(Laughter and Applause)*

So, amigos, need I say more? *(Laughter)*

Forget politics. What really matters these days is what is happening in the soaps. Of course, we have had our own soap this week. The younger ones amongst you might not remember but in the 1950s everyone was watching the story of an American family in London. It was called *Life with the Lyons*.

That is what we have been enjoying this week. Roger has had a good week in the chair. We celebrated his birthday on Tuesday, and what a birthday party it was at the General Council's annual dinner. Ian McCartney gave an absolutely brilliant speech, which was spoiled only by an excruciating attempt to imitate Marilyn Monroe singing *Happy Birthday, Mr. President*.

Ian was not the only Minister in attendance. About half the Cabinet were there. I did actually suggest that we could have worked out the manifesto there and then.

The other big feature of the week, of course, apart from Roger's birthday, was Warwick. Tony Blair came to praise it, Digby Jones, who was not here and had not been there, wanted to bury it, and us with it – a case of “Alas, poor Warwick” *(Groans and laughter)*

It is getting late in the week. You have to make allowances. I am sure that the agreement made there will be dominating our agenda for a long time to come.

I said in my speech at the start of the week that we have won a lot of victories this year, and we have been piling them up during the week as well. On Monday we passed a motion calling for shorter working time, and according to today *Guardian*, with a story headed “Britain working shorter weeks”, so objective is being delivered already.

Alan Johnson did even better for us. We carried a motion calling for 50 per cent member representation

on pension fund boards, and he was on his feet announcing it ten minutes later.

We have even been able to celebrate one of those most elusive of victories – one at Wembley, for which the unions involve deserve much credit. *(Applause)*

Talking of Wembley, for some reason it reminds me that the incoming General Council has shown a victory for one group, which has long been pressing for equal opportunities, and I refer, of course, to the general secretaries for Everton Group, with John Hannett, Ged Nichols and Steve Sinnott joining our already strong squad.

So we have a lot to be pleased about with our week. We have heard about the importance of our international work from all our guests from overseas, and perhaps, most movingly, when Hernando brought home to us the desperate dangers that workers in Colombia face day in and day out just for doing the simple trade union things that we take for granted.

When I had the privilege of visiting Colombia, it really came home to me how important even simple messages of solidarity can be to people in distress and danger. So let us all send a similar message of solidarity to the people of the Caribbean region, who have been facing the devastation brought by Hurricane Ivan. I know there are many delegates to this Congress with strong family links with that part of the world, and these have been worrying days.

Congress, we have many battles ahead, and solidarity and unity are the strongest weapons in our armoury; solidarity with the Civil Service unions in their battle to protect jobs and vital services. They are going to need all our support in the weeks ahead. *(Applause)* Solidarity with the unions campaigning to defend our manufacturing sector with a new massive threat to jobs at Ford Jaguar looming; and solidarity, above all, in taking trade unionism to the British people so that we grow ever stronger again.

President and Congress, that is enough for me, so in the words of the traditional RAF sign-off, "Roger and out". *(Applause)*

**The President:** Brendan, thank you for that, and also for ensuring that after Ian McCartney's attempt to sing *Happy Birthday, Mr. President*, you were able to supply Marilyn Monroe to sing it in English.

I now call on Daniel Coysh of the Industrial Correspondents Group to reply on behalf of the media. *(Applause)*

**Daniel Coysh** *(Industrial Correspondents Group):* President and Congress, hello trade unionists. It is an honour to address you today at the end of this year's TUC Conference on behalf of the news media and, more specifically, my own paper, the *Morning Star*, the daily paper of the labour movement, now available on line at [Morningstaronline.co.uk](http://Morningstaronline.co.uk). I thought you were wondering about that.

I know you are all anxious to get off home, so do not worry. I will not be keeping you for long, and do not worry that I will not be doing any jokes like Brendan's Warwick gag. I am not very used to public speaking at all. In fact, the last time I addressed a

crowd it was in a living room in Teddington with 20 people in it. It was the South West London *Morning Star* Supporters Group. *(Chuckling)* I did not do too badly that day, as it happened, as I managed to raise £160 for the fighting fund. So looking at you all out *there* now, I reckon we have about two grands worth in the room. If we keep the doors locked, I think we should be fine, so you are not allowed out just yet.

Seriously, standing at this rostrum is quite a nerve wracking experience for me. I was volunteered for this job by my so-called colleagues in the back room while I was in *here* following the education debate. I thought, "Me! Why on earth would Congress want to hear from me waffling on at the end of the day? Am I a worthy speaker for you all?" This really worried me, and then I thought, "The TUC had Digby Jones last year and Sebastian Coe just a couple of days ago, so I am clearly part of this great tradition of ironic speakers", so that is fine. It helps my confidence. I understand Jeffrey Archer is next on the list. He will be appearing next year. Margaret Thatcher had to cancel at the last minute, so the best of luck to him. *(Laughter)* I should not spoil that surprise, so forget I mentioned Jeffrey Archer. The point is that this will not be the most dazzling speech you have ever heard. I fully understand if you do not give me an ovation. Better and more important people than me have failed to get that from you this week. *(Laughter)* I know my place. *(Applause)*

This is the third time that I have actually attended Congress, the first being that somewhat over-shadowed occasion in 2001. Despite being made to feel very small and redundant on that day, sat in the pressroom trying to do reporting there, I have been back every year since for the TUC. I assume this must make me quite a strange person, but I always look forward to the conference and coming here.

The TUC is particularly dear to me. It is a time when something unique happens. The *Morning Star* sells loads of copies, for a start, and we get invited to posh hotels. It truly is a sparkling and unusual event. It makes a real change to the normal modus operandi of my paper. Too many times during my early years in journalism, I was packed off to some rather grim B&Bs in rather grim locations. There is something uniquely unnerving about sitting in Scarborough Spar Centre off-season, feeling this terrible sinking feeling as you understand that you have no idea what the union speaker is actually talking about. Of course, now I am an experienced reporter. I have been in the game now for several years. I have honed my skills. Nowadays, you can read my copy several times before you realise that I have no idea what I am talking about. *(Laughter)* I could not comment about any of my colleagues in that regard, except to point out that they are a very dedicated bunch, fellow NUJ members, obviously. The vast majority of them actually stayed on to report on Congress after Tony Blair had gone home, so well done to them all. The *Star* always stays to the bitter end, as you know. As you can see, I am still here, so I am glad of the company.

I would like to thank the TUC for choosing Brighton again. It spared all of us the white-knuckle experience of Blackpool hotels. That is always a good'un. Let me say that those of us in the press pack all share your trepidation with the news that the Brighton Conference Centre is being redecorated and re-vamped. I am sure the TUC will be thinking very hard over the next 12 months as to an alternative venue with a modicum of comfort, maybe. Perhaps there could be a coffee machine in the pressroom this

time. That might be a good idea. I am beating about the bush.

I have an important job to do today, and that is to offer the thanks of everybody, all my press colleagues, myself, everyone at our paper, to Brendan, Roger, to the top table behind me and, most important of all, to the TUC staff and officers who have been doing the best to facilitate – that is the buzzword now – things for us. They always makes sure that Congress goes as smoothly as possible for us hangers on in the media who are anxious to find out what happens and anxious to write as little as possible. Those copies of speeches are always very useful, indeed.

As a quick aside, I would like to thank *The Morning Star* sellers who got up much earlier than I had to and braved Hurricane Mitch, which seemed to be hitting Brighton seafront during the past couple of days. They did us proud. I want to give a quick shout to UNISON for my luxurious accommodation. I believe it is still Britain's biggest union. So there is no confusion there.

As I have said, this is my third conference. I have always found the press team conference organisers very helpful and knowledgeable. They always work hard to ensure that speeches and motions are available for our perusal as soon as possible. On the rare occasions when they cannot answer a question off the cuff, they get back to us very swiftly. Given how hectic this Congress is, that is no mean feat. I think it is something that should be recognised. They demonstrate courtesy, ability and a terrific commitment, although that does sound like a job reference, doesn't it?

Given the coverage of some papers of trade unionism and the labour movement in general, they must have colossal reserves of patience at times to keep smiling after reading what some people have written the day before. If you want a good example of the type of sacrifices that have to be made for this kind of smooth media operation on the TUC's part, yesterday was a good example. The TUC's favourite Olympian, Seb Coe, had just finished his address, and a few minutes later the plaintive voice of Mike Power could be heard in the press room, saying "Anyone want to interview Sebastian Coe? Anyone? Anyone? Oh, sod it. I am going to bring him in, anyway". (*Laughter*) We salute your dedication, Mike. That is true professionalism. By the way, if any of you are worried about poking fun at Seb twice in a speech, do not worry about it. He is a close personal friend and an old school buddy.

I do not want to keep you from your families for much longer, so I am going to get to the point now. Congress is one of the biggest events in my paper's calendar. That and the Labour Party Conference are the two big ones for us. It is the only place that, for all its flaws and criticisms that can be made, can genuinely call itself the Parliament of the British workers. That is what you are. It is also the place where the labour movement looks back at the industrial events of the year. As Brendan has just said, it has been a very busy and hectic year. There has been industrial strife, walk-outs, in-fighting, union de-recognition, general secretaries on the warpath, and that was just the ASLEF barbecue. (*Laughter*) You are still the workers' Parliament of Britain. You must not forget that.

This year's Congress has been marked by a terrific degree of unity amongst the unions and some very

unified debates. Some have complained that this has led to a debate-free conference. The press has to admit its responsibility for the situation partially as quiet unity, as Brendan said, is not sexy news. Many papers like to interpret passion for controversy or division, whereas it is just people passionately expressing what they believe. There have also been speakers this year who have talked about the importance of a labour movement which does much more than just debate and pass resolutions; that actually gets stuck in. At this year's *Morning Star* rally, Kevin Curran urged unions to pay more attention to servicing their members rather than the institution itself, saying that this is the way to gain membership and recruitment, which is obviously the big issue. He was right. Unions do need to grow if workers are going to avoid this worldwide race to the bottom, the sweatshop agenda, the cost-cutting and globalisation which has been foisted on us.

The best way to make unions grow is to be seen to be taking real action on behalf of working people without folding in the face of the disgracefully one-sided anti-union laws or the inevitable hostility of a press run by a cliqué of multi-millionaires, for the most part. Some people might say that that is lefty idealism, but it can be argued that the unions that have grown the most in recent years have been the ones which are most at risk of being accused of being old fashioned, such as the militant RMT and PCS, whose unflinching action to defend its members' jobs and the essential services that they provide have seen civil servants flocking to join up, because they have seen people making a difference.

A willingness to roll up your sleeves and defy those hostile to trade unionism pays greater dividends than just offering cheap car insurance or a personalised Visa card, and it yields industrial results too, as indeed was mentioned just now, the victory at Wembley is a great example of that, and indeed the BA settlement that was achieved. BA obviously mucked that up by cancelling planes, anyway, so no strike action necessary for that company.

It is true that knee-jerk opposition to anything that management comes out with does not help working people or the union's own position. It just makes people seem as fractious. A one-sided power relationship disguised by the word 'partnership' will not be any good for your members either. It is best when people take everything on its merits.

The union movement is better when it is bold. There is nothing wrong in identifying where your interests lie and then fighting for them. Digby Jones knows that too well. His mill-owner style comments last week illustrate the attitude of the employers to partnership, and, ironically for Digby, demonstrate how relevant the unions are. It was a big of an own goal for Digby there, perhaps. As long as the likes of the CBI exist, the TUC will not only be necessary but vital, as are the unions that comprise it. The beauty of partnership is no kind of partnership. The TUC has to be very vigilant against those sort of people.

Congress, this week's events have shown the country that unions continue to be more than relevant. They continue to be an essential part of our country's fabric and an essential part of the life of working people.

I wish you all the very best in your future campaigning, and on behalf of the rest of the media once again, I thank you all very much. *(Applause)*

**The President:** Thank you very much for that stimulating and entertaining address.

I now declare the 136<sup>th</sup> Congress closed and ask you to join with me in singing Auld Lang Syne.

*Congress joined in singing Auld Lang Syne.*

# 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  
e info@AccordHQ.org  
www.accord-myunion.org  
m 7,558 f17,383 total 24,941  
main trades and industries all staff within HBOS plc,  
including the retail network, Intelligent Finance, HBOS  
Card Services, Halifax Direct, Halifax Estate Agents,  
HBOS Financial Services  
Gen sec Ged Nichols  
Delegates  
Maureen Garlick Tom Harrison  
Marilyn Morris Ged Nichols  
Nick Roe  
male 3 female 2 total 5

### ACM

#### Association for College Management

10 De Montfort Street  
Leicester LE1 7GG  
t 0116 275 5076  
f 0116 255 0548  
e admin@acm.uk.com  
www.acm.uk.com  
m 1,683 f 1,722 total 3,405  
main trades and industries representing managers in  
the learning and skills sector  
Chief exec and gen sec Peter Pendle  
Delegates  
David Green Peter Pendle  
male 2

### AEP

#### Association of Educational Psychologists

26 The Avenue, Durham DH1 4ED  
t 0191 384 9512  
f 0191 386 5287  
e sao@aep.org.uk  
www.aep.org.uk  
m 794 f 2,040 total 2,834  
main trades and industries educational psychologists in  
local educational authorities and other public and  
private organisations (England, Wales & Northern  
Ireland)

Gen sec Brian Harrison-Jennings

Delegates

Brian Harrison-Jennings Morag Ward  
male 1 female 1 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  
f 020 7276 6706  
e afa@afalhr.org.uk  
www.afalhr.org.uk  
m 158 f 474 total 632  
main trades and industries airline cabin crew  
LEC president Kevin P Creighan  
Delegates  
Kevin Creighan Cathy Hampton  
male 1 female 1 total 2

### ALGUS

#### Alliance and Leicester Group Union of Staff

22 Upper King Street, Leicester LE1 6XE  
t 0116 2856585  
f 0116 2854996  
www.algus.org.uk  
m 715 f 2,102 total 2,817  
main trades and industries represents the majority of  
staff working for the Alliance and Leicester plc  
Gen sec Clare Clark  
Delegates  
Debbie Cort Peter Greenwood  
male 1 female 1 total 2

### Amicus

35 King Street  
Covent Garden  
London WC2E 8JG  
t 020 7420 8900  
f 020 7240 4723  
www.amicustheunion.org  
m 776,468 f 158,853 total 935,321  
main trades and industries manufacturing,  
engineering, energy, construction, IT, defence  
aerospace, motor industry, civil aviation, chemicals and  
pharmaceuticals, steel and metals, shipbuilding,  
scientists, technologists, professional and managerial  
staff, electronics and telecommunications, tobacco,  
food and drink, textiles, ceramics, paper, professional  
staff in universities, commercial sales, the voluntary  
sector, banking, insurance, building societies and  
financial institutions, financial services, and the  
National Health Service  
Gen Sec Derek Simpson  
Delegates  
Murray Austin Billy Ayre  
Heather Barnett Les Bayliss

Rob Benjamin Alan Bradshaw  
 Richard Campbell Danny Carrigan  
 Danny Coleman Doug Collins  
 Richard Cook William Craig  
 Peter Currell Antony Czubkowski  
 Steve Davison Elizabeth Donnelly  
 Raymond Duguid Siobhan Endean  
 Ian Evans Lorene Fabian  
 Gill George Cyril Gibbs  
 Martin Gleeson Charlie Gregory  
 Peter Grimes Eddie Grimes  
 Lesley Hammond Phil Hanks  
 Charles Harding John Haswell  
 Mick Hatswell Georgina Hirsch  
 Michael Holmes David Hutchinson  
 Roger Jeary Shirley Johnston  
 Sue Jones David Jones  
 Jacqui Joseph John Joyce  
 Caroline Kavanagh Lucy Kelly  
 John King Ginny Klein  
 Margaret Lawson Jane Lewis  
 David Logan Stephen Managan  
 Lesley Mansell Alan Martin  
 Christian Matheson James McAveety  
 Patrick McCourt Stuart McGhie  
 Danny McLellan Neil Miles  
 Sue Millman James Neill  
 Graham Newbold Patrick Rice  
 Dougie Rooney Daniel Ryan  
 Janet Seymour Kirk Derek Simpson  
 Ray Stewart Barry Stewart  
 Paul Talbot Meurig Thomas  
 Jimmy Thompson Frank Thompson  
 Anne Thomson Derek Torrie  
 John Walsh Andrew Wheatley  
 Phil Willis Claire Wilson  
 Eileen Woods Mark Yates  
 Ken Young  
 male 59 female 20 total 79

#### **AMO**

##### **the trade union for magistrates' courts staff**

1 Fellmongers Path  
 Tower Bridge Road  
 London SE1 3LY  
 t 020 7403 2244 f 020 7403 2274  
 e hq@amo.org.uk  
 www.amo-online.org.uk  
 m 1,942 f 5,415 total 7,357  
 main trades and industries magistrates' courts service in  
 England and Wales  
 Gen sec Rosie Eagleson  
 Delegates  
 Rosie Eagleson Christine Murray  
 female 2

#### **ANGU**

##### **The Abbey National Group Union**

2nd floor, 16/17 High Street  
 Tring, Herts HP23 5AH  
 t 01442 891122  
 f 01442 891133  
 e info@angu.org.uk  
 www.angu.org.uk  
 m 2,261 f 6,613 total 8,874  
 main trades and industries staff employed in the Abbey  
 National  
 Gen sec Linda Rolph  
 Delegates  
 Peter Gruenewald Linda Rolph  
 male 1 female 1 total 2

#### **ASLEF**

##### **Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen**

9 Arkwright Road, London NW3 6AB  
 t 020 7317 8600  
 f 020 7794 6406  
 www.aslef.org.uk  
 total 15,001 (male/female split not available)  
 main trades and industries railways (drivers,  
 operational supervisors and staff)  
 Acting gen sec Keith Norman  
 Delegates  
 Paul Furey Paul Keenan  
 Stan Moran Andy Reed  
 male 4

#### **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  
 www.askatl.org.uk  
 m 29,052 f 79,678 total 108,730  
 main trades and industries teachers, lecturers and  
 teaching support staff in nursery, primary, secondary  
 schools, sixth form and further education colleges  
 Gen sec Dr Mary Bousted  
 Delegates  
 Andy Ballard Sam Bechler  
 Jane Bennett Mary Bousted  
 Shelagh Hirst Gerald Imison  
 Martin Lawes Sharon Liburd  
 Andy Peart Martin Pilkington  
 John Puckrin Angie Rutter  
 Eric Stroud Ralph Surman  
 Brian Waggett Chris Wilson  
 male 11 female 5 total 16

#### **AUT**

##### **Association of University Teachers**

Egmont House, 25-31 Tavistock Place



London WC1H 9UT  
 t 020 7670 9700  
 f 020 7670 9799  
 e hq@aut.org.uk  
 www.aut.org.uk  
 m 29,254 f 17,700 total 46,954  
 main trades and industries academic and related staff  
 in higher education  
 Gen sec Sally Hunt  
 Delegates  
 Gargi Bhattacharyya Nigel Gates  
 Joe Gluza Dave Guppy  
 Sally Hunt Pete Mitchell  
 David Morgan Linda Newman  
 Angela Roger Steve Wharton  
 male 6 female 4 total 10

#### **BACM-TEAM**

##### **British Association of Colliery Management – Technical, Energy and Administrative Management**

17 South Parade, Doncaster DN1 2DR  
 t 01302 815551  
 f 01302 815552  
 e gs@bacmteam.org.uk  
 www.bacmteam.org.uk  
 m 3,388 f 192 total 3,580  
 Gen sec Patrick Carragher  
 Delegates  
 Patrick Carragher Bob Young  
 male 2

#### **BALPA**

##### **British Air Line Pilots Association**

81 New Road, Harlington  
 Hayes, Middlesex UB3 5BG  
 t 020 8476 4000  
 f 020 8476 4077  
 e balpa@balpa.org  
 www.balpa.org.uk  
 m 7,366 f 412 total 7,778  
 main trades and industries airline pilots and flight  
 engineers (commercial)  
 Gen sec Jim McAuslan  
 Delegates  
 Graham Fowler Jim McAuslan  
 male 2

#### **BDA**

##### **British Dietetic Association**

5th Floor, Charles House  
 148/149 Gt Charles Street  
 Birmingham B3 3HT  
 t 0121 200 8010  
 f 0121 200 8081  
 e ir@bda.uk.com  
 www.bda.uk.com  
 m 146 f 4,930 total 5,076

main trades and industries the science of dietetics in  
 the private and public sector

National officer employment relations David Wood  
 Delegates

Diana Markham Carol Mochan  
 female 2

#### **BECTU**

##### **Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union**

373-377 Clapham Road  
 London SW9 9BT  
 t 020 7346 0900  
 info@bectu.org.uk  
 www.bectu.org.uk  
 m 17,604 f 8,588 total 26,192  
 main trades and industries broadcasting, film, video,  
 theatre, cinema and related sectors  
 Gen sec Roger Bolton  
 Delegates  
 Roger Bolton Christine Bond  
 Suresh Chawla Tony Lennon  
 Jane Perry Winston Phillips  
 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  
 bfawuho@aol.com (head office)  
 www.bfawu.org  
 total 25,823 (male/female split not available)  
 main trades and industries food  
 Gen sec Joe Marino  
 Delegates  
 George Atwall Vi Carr  
 Joe Marino Tony Richardson  
 male 3 female 1 total 4

#### **BOS**

##### **British Orthoptic Society**

Tavistock House North  
 Tavistock Square  
 London WC1H 9HX  
 t 020 7387 7992  
 f 020 7383 2584  
 bos@orthoptics.org.uk  
 www.orthoptics.org.uk  
 m 41 f 1,045 total 1,086  
 main trades and industries orthoptists  
 Industrial relations officer Rowena McNamara  
 Delegates  
 Lesley Ann Baxter David Wright  
 male 1 female 1 total 2

## **BSU**

### **Britannia Staff Union**

Court Lodge, Leonard Street  
Leek, Staffordshire ST 13 5JP  
t 01538 399627  
f 01538 371342  
bsu@themail.co.uk  
www.britanniasu.org.uk  
total 2,303 (male/female split not available)  
main trades and industries finance sector union  
representing staff working in Britannia Building Society  
and its group of companies  
Gen sec David O'Dowd  
Delegates  
Chris Hill David O'Dowd  
male 2

## **CATU**

### **Ceramic and Allied Trades Union**

Hillcrest House, Garth Street  
Hanley, Stoke-on-Trent ST1 2AB  
t 01782 272755  
f 01782 284902  
www.catu.org.uk  
m 6,235f 3,738 total 9,973  
main trades and industries the ceramics industry (all  
areas)  
Gen sec Geoff Bagnall  
Delegate  
Geoff Bagnall  
male 1

## **CDNA**

### **Community and District Nursing Association**

Thames Valley University  
18-22 Bond Street  
Ealing, London W5 5AA  
t 020 8231 0180  
f 020 8231 0187  
e cdna@tvu.ac.uk  
www.cdna.tvu.ac.uk  
m 150 f 3,834 total 3,984  
main trades and industries community and district  
nurses  
Chair Rowena Smith  
Delegates  
Jennie Potter Rowena Smith  
female 2

## **Community**

### **The union for life**

Swinton House, 324 Gray's Inn Road  
London WC1X 8DD  
t 020 7239 1200  
f 020 7278 8378  
total 62,1471

e info@community-tu.org

ISTC www.istc-tu.org

KFAT www.kfat.org.uk

m 6,314 f 5,130

male/female split not available 58,615

total 70,059

main trades and industries industries in and around  
steel and metal communities, knitwear, lace, textiles,  
hosiery, dyeing and finishing, footwear, leather,  
gloving, made-up leathersgoods and other apparel

Gen sec Michael Leahy

Delegates

Keren Bender Tracy Clarke  
Gareth Davies Tom Donnelly

Paul Gates Ray Hill

Bob Hudson Michael Leahy

John Lloyd Eddie Lynch

Joe Mann Barry Morris

Ashley Pearce Bob Petty

Mike Satchell

male 13 female 2 total 15

## **Connect**

### **The union for professionals in communications**

30 St George's Road  
Wimbledon SW19 4BD  
t 020 8971 6000  
f 020 8971 6002  
e union@connectuk.org  
www.connectuk.org  
m 15,933 f3,715 total 19,648  
main trades and industries telecommunications,  
information technology and related industries  
Gen sec Adrian Askew  
Delegates  
Adrian Askew Leslie Manasseh  
Denise McGuire  
male 2 female 1 total 3

## **CSMTS**

### **Card Setting Machine Tenters Society**

48 Scar End Lane, Staincliffe  
Dewsbury, West Yorkshire WF13 4NY  
t 01924 400206 f 01924 400206  
total 88 (male/female split not available)  
Gen sec Anthony John Moorhouse

## **CSP**

### **Chartered Society of Physiotherapy**

14 Bedford Row London WC1R 4ED  
t 020 7306 6666  
f 020 7306 6611  
www.csp.org.uk  
m 3,995 f 30,862 total 34,857  
main trades and industries chartered physiotherapists,  
physiotherapy students and assistants  
Director of employment relations and union services  
(ERUS) Richard Griffin

Delegates

Patricia Auty Ruth Jones  
Sarah Lawrence Samantha McIntosh  
Lesley Mercer Andrew Merriman  
Shirley Rainey  
male 3 female 4 total 7

**CWU**

**Communication Workers' Union**

150 The Broadway, Wimbledon  
London SW19 1RX  
t 020 8971 7200  
f 020 8971 7300  
e info@cwu.org  
www.cwu.org  
m 205,790 f 52,906 total 258,696  
main trades and industries posts and  
telecommunications in Post Office, British Telecom,  
Cable and Wireless, Cable TV, National Girobank and  
related industries  
Gen sec Billy Hayes  
Delegates  
Ray Atkinson Norman Cardy  
Tricia Clarke Paul Clays  
Graham Colk John Donnelly  
Jeannie Drake Maria Exall  
Gill Gillett Judith Griffiths  
Billy Hayes Tony Kearns  
Martin Keenan Bobby Kelly  
Jane Loftus Bob McGuire  
Pat O'Hara Ron Rodwell  
Bernard Roome Amarjite Singh  
Tony Sneddon Chris Tapper  
Alan Totten Phil Waker  
Dave Ward  
male 19 female 6 total 25

**CYWU**

**The Community and Youth Workers' Union**

302, The Argent Centre  
60 Frederick Street  
Birmingham B1 3HS  
t 0121 244 3344 f 0121 244 3345  
e kerry@cywu.org.uk  
www.cywu.org.uk  
m 2,127 f 2,673 total 4,800  
main trades and industries youth workers, workers in  
youth theatre, community education, outdoor  
education, play, personal advisers/mentors.  
Gen sec Doug Nicholls  
Delegates  
Jan Cleverly Doug Nicholls  
male 1 female 1 total 2

**DGSU**

**Derbyshire Group Staff Union**

The Mews, Duffield Hall

Derbyshire DE56 1AG

t 01332 844396  
e dsmith@dbssa.co.uk  
m 110 f 366 total 476  
Chair Deidre Smith  
Delegates  
Keith Hurley Deirdre Smith  
male 1 female 1 total 2

**DSA**

**Diageo Staff Association**

Sun Works Cottage  
Park Royal Brewery  
London NW10 7RR  
t/f 020 8978 6069  
Enquiries: elizabeth.jude@diageo.com  
m 340 f 210 total 550  
main trades and industries staff grades in Diageo in the  
UK  
Chair David Orton

**EIS**

**Educational Institute of Scotland**

46 Moray Place, Edinburgh EH3 6BH  
t 0131 225 6244  
f 0131 220 3151  
e enquiries@eis.org.uk  
www.eis.org.uk  
m 13,676 f 40,593 total 54,269  
main trades and industries teachers, lecturers,  
associated educational personnel (Scotland)  
Gen sec Ronald A Smith  
Delegates  
Sandy Fowler Sonia Kordiak  
June McCulloch Ronnie Smith  
Sheena Wardhaugh Ken Wimbor  
male 4 female 2 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  
www.equity.org.uk  
m 17,744 f 17,866 total 35,610  
main trades and industries performance workers in  
theatre, film television, radio and variety  
Gen sec Ian McGarry  
Delegates  
Graham Hamilton Harry Landis  
Ian McGarry Jean Rogers  
Florence Sparham  
male 3 female 2 total 5

## **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  
www.fbu.org.uk  
m 49,389 f 2,348 total 51,737  
main trades and industries local authority fire brigades  
Gen sec Andy Gilchrist  
Delegates  
Stewart Brown Mike Fordham  
Andy Gilchrist Vicky Knight  
John McDonald Micky Nicholas  
Dave Whatton Ruth Winters  
male 6 female 2 total 8

## **FDA**

### **The union of choice for senior managers and professionals in public service**

2 Caxton Street, London SW1H 0QH  
t 020 7343 1111  
f 020 7343 1105  
e head-office@fda.org.uk  
www.fda.org.uk  
m 7,108 f 4,282 total 11,390  
main trades and industries civil service, public bodies and NHS  
Gen sec Jonathan Baume  
Delegates  
Jonathan Baume Annette Goss  
Lorimer Mackenzie  
male 2 female 1 total 3

## **GMB**

### **Britain's general union**

22/24 Worple Road  
London SW19 4DD  
t 020 8947 3131  
f 020 8944 6552  
e Kevin.Curran@gmb.org.uk  
www.gmb.org.uk  
m 358,781 f 241,325 total 600,106  
main trades and industries public services, primarily NHS, local government, care, education; also engineering, construction, shipbuilding, energy, catering, security, civil air transport, aerospace, defence, clothing, textiles, retail, hotel, chemicals, utilities, offshore, AA, food production and distribution  
Gen sec and treasurer Kevin Curran  
Delegates  
Mick Balfour Sheila Bearcroft  
Tom Brennan Marion Cassidy  
Debbie Coulter Kevin Curran  
Phil Davies Harry Donaldson

Gary Doolan Roy Dunnett  
Jean Foster Allan Garley  
Michelle Gordon Keith Hazlewood  
Christine Howell Mary Hutchinson  
Harpal Jandu Paul Kenny  
Barney KettelDavid Lascelles  
Linda Lord Kath Manning  
John McDonnell Joni McDougall  
Don McGregor Joe Morgan  
Jayne Norton Pauline Russell  
Mick Ryan Malcolm Sage  
Brian Strutton Eileen Theaker  
Mary Turner Gerry Veart  
Ron Waugh Rachelle Wilkins  
male 26 female 10 total 36

## **GPMU**

### **Graphical, Paper and Media Union**

Keys House, 63/67 Bromham Road  
Bedford MK40 2AG  
t 01234 351521  
f 01234 270580  
e general@gpmu.org.uk  
www.gpmu.org.uk  
m 84,886 f 17,202 total 102,088  
main trades and industries paper and board making, ink making, graphic design, graphic reproduction, printing, packaging, bookbinding and print finishing. National, regional and local newspapers. Clerical, administration and production workers in all areas of printing, publishing and allied trades, multi-media and information technology  
Gen sec Tony Dubbins  
Delegates  
Wilhelmina Buckley Tony Burke  
Owen Coop Gerard Dempsey  
Tony Dubbins Peter Fitzpatrick  
Nigel Gawthorpe Chris Harding  
Troy Kane Brendan Parkinson  
Bernard Rutter Ted Scott  
Russell Stewart Rose White  
male 12 female 2 total 14

## **GULO**

### **General Union of Loom Overlookers**

9 Wellington Street, St John's  
Blackburn BB1 8AF  
t 01254 51760  
f 01254 51760  
total 265 (male/female split not available)  
main trades and industries weaving manufacture  
Gen sec Don Rishton

## **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 2,495 f 427 total 2,922  
 main trades and industries hospital consultants,  
 associate specialists, SpR grade and staff grade (all  
 employed in the NHS)  
 Gen sec Stephen Campion  
 Delegate  
 John Brawley  
 male 1

## 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 23,525 f 7,758 total 31,283  
 main trades and industries performers engaged in the  
 music profession including music writers and  
 instrumental music teachers  
 Gen sec (media) John F Smith  
 Delegates  
 Ian Bowser Bill Martin  
 John Smith Bill Sweeney  
 Barbara White  
 male 4 female 1 total 5

## NACO

### National Association of Co-operative Officials

6a Clarendon Place, Hyde  
 Cheshire SK14 2QZ  
 t 0161 351 7900  
 f 0161 366 6800  
 m 1,902 f 575 total 2,477  
 main trades and industries retail distribution,  
 insurance, dairy industry, funeral services, motor trades  
 (retail), retail pharmacy, travel industry, agriculture  
 Gen sec Lindsay Ewing

## NACODS

### National Association of Colliery Overmen, Deputies and Shotfirers

37 Church Street, Barnsley S70 2AR  
 t 01226 203743  
 f 01226 295563  
 e natnacods@aol.com  
 total 610(male/female split not available)  
 main trades and industries mining  
 Gen sec Ian Parker  
 Delegate

Rowland Soar  
 male 1

## NAEAC

### National Association of Educational Inspectors, Advisers and Consultants

Woolley Hall, Woolley, Wakefield  
 West Yorkshire WF4 2JR  
 t 01226 383428  
 f 01226 383427  
 e naeiac@gemsoft.co.uk  
 www.naeiac.org  
 m 1,684 f 1,852  
 male/female split not available 2  
 total 3,538  
 Gen Sec John Chowcat LI.B (Hons)  
 Delegates  
 John Chowcat Sue Harrison  
 male 1 female 1 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  
 m 2,692 f 4,566 total 7,258  
 e info@napo.org.uk  
 www.napo.org.uk  
 m 2,782 f 4,947 total 7,729  
 main trades and industries probation officers, including  
 hostel assistant wardens and community service  
 sessional supervisors and family court staff  
 Gen sec Judy McKnight  
 Delegates  
 Judy McKnight Rob Thomas  
 male 1 female 1 total 2

## NASUWT

### National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers

5 King Street, London WC2E 8SD  
 t 020 7420 9670  
 f 020 7420 9679  
 www.teachersunion.org.uk  
 total 223,486 (male/female split not available)  
 main trades and industries education  
 Acting gen sec Chris Keates  
 Delegates  
 Victoria Barlow Jerry Bartlett  
 Terry Bladen Julian Chapman  
 Tim Cox Allan Craig  
 Geraint Davies Kathy Duggan  
 Brian Garvey Mike Grant  
 Mandy Haehner Karen Hopwood  
 Mary Howard Bob Johnson  
 Michael Johnson Susan Kambalu  
 Chris Keates Les Kennedy  
 Roger Kirk Pat Lerew  
 Chris Lines Pete McLoughlin

Mary Page Sue Percival  
John Rimmer Patrick Roach  
Sue Rogers Peter Scott  
Narmi Thiranagama Tracey Twist  
Dave Wilkinson  
male 21 female 10 total 31

#### **NATFHE**

##### **The University & College Lecturers' Union**

27 Britannia Street, London WC1X 9JP  
t 020 7837 3636 f 020 7837 4403  
e hq@natfhe.org.uk  
www.natfhe.org.uk  
m 33,559 f 33,321 total 66,880  
main trades and industries post school education – for  
example from GCSE to post graduate studies -  
representing lecturers in prisons, adult education  
institutions, further education colleges, higher  
education colleges and universities  
Gen sec Paul Mackney  
Delegates  
Sam Allen Maire Daley  
Mary Davis Tina Downes  
Mehdi Husaini Fawzi Ibrahim  
Peter Jones Paul Mackney  
Maureen O'Mara Bernice Waugh  
John Wilkin  
male 8 female 3 total 11

#### **NGSU**

##### **Nationwide Group Staff Union**

Middleton Farmhouse, 37 Main Road  
Middleton Cheney, Banbury  
Oxfordshire OX17 2QT  
t 01295 710767  
f 01295 712580  
e ngsu@ngsu.org.uk  
www.ngsu.org.uk  
m 3,010 f 8,930 total 11,940  
main trades and industries all staff within the  
Nationwide Building Society Group, including  
Nationwide, Nationwide International Ltd, Nationwide  
Life Ltd, Nationwide Trust Ltd and UCB Home Loans  
Gen sec Tim Poil  
Delegates  
Rob Goldspink Tim Poil  
Walter Wright  
male 3

#### **NUDAGO**

##### **National Union of Domestic Appliances and General Operatives**

7/8 Imperial Buildings (first floor) Corporation Street  
Rotherham, South Yorkshire S60 1PB  
t 01709 382820  
f 01709 382129  
m 1,813 f 198 total 2,011  
e nudago@btclick.com

m 1,673 f 129 total 1,802  
main trades and industries domestic appliance  
industries, engineering, foundries, electronics and  
general workers  
Gen sec Tony McCarthy  
Delegate  
Tony McCarthy  
male 1

#### **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  
www.nuj.org.uk  
m 16,555 f 10,609 total 27,164  
main trades and industries journalists  
Gen sec Jeremy Dear  
Delegates  
Jeff Apter Jim Corrigan  
Jeremy Dear Anita Halpin  
Chris Morley  
male 4 female 1 total 5

#### **NULMW**

##### **National Union of Lock and Metal Workers**

Bellamy House, Wilkes Street  
Willenhall  
West Midlands WV13 2BS  
t 01902 366651  
f 01902 368035  
e nulmw@zoom.co.uk  
m 1,521 f 1,611 total 3,132  
main trades and industries lock and metal  
manufacturing industries  
Gen sec Ray Ward  
Delegates  
Maggie McGee Ray Ward  
male 1 female 1 total 2

#### **NUM**

##### **National Union of Mineworkers**

Miners' Offices, 2 Huddersfield Rd Barnsley, South  
Yorkshire S70 2LS  
t 01226 215555  
f 01226 215561  
m 3,042 f 0 total 3,042  
main trades and industries coal mining  
National Sec Steve Kemp  
Delegates  
Steve Kemp Ian Lavery  
male 2

#### **NUMAST**

### **National Union of Marine, Aviation and Shipping Transport Officers**

Oceanair House, 750/760 High Road  
 London E11 3BB  
 t 020 8989 6677  
 f 020 8530 1015  
 e info@numast.org  
 www.numast.org  
 total 19,258 (male/female split not available)  
 main trades and industries merchant navy and all related areas  
 Gen sec Brian Orrell  
 Delegates  
 Andrew Cowie Peter McEwen  
 Paul Moloney Brian Orrell  
 male 4

### **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 57,119 f 182,677 total 239,796  
 main trades and industries teachers  
 Gen sec Steve Sinnott  
 Delegates  
 Dorothy Amos Lesley Auger  
 Nigel Baker John Bangs  
 Hilary Bills Tony Brockman  
 Mary Compton Emily Evans  
 Barry Fawcett Olive Forsythe  
 Nina Franklin Jerry Glazier  
 Nick Grant Bill Greenshields  
 Lynda Hall Dave Harvey  
 Pat Hawkes Mitch Howard  
 Janey Hulme Max Hyde  
 Arthur Jarman Joan Kennedy  
 Roger King Tim Lucas  
 Judy Moorhouse Robert Phillips  
 Martin Reed Bernard Regan  
 Richard Rieser Hank Roberts  
 Glenys Shepherd Steve Sinnot  
 Maureen Skevington  
 male 22 female 11 total 33

### **PCS**

#### **Public and Commercial Services Union**

160 Falcon Road, London SW11 2LN  
 t 020 7924 2727  
 f 020 7924 1847  
 www.pcs.org.uk  
 m 116,688 f 178,375 total 295,063  
 main trades and industries government departments and agencies, public bodies, private sector information technology and other service companies  
 General secretary Mark Serwotka

### **Delegates**

Jane Aitchison Ian Albert  
 Chris Baugh Roland Biosah  
 Sue Bond Tony Conway  
 Stella Dennis Ian Fitzpatrick  
 Martin John Emily Kelly  
 Kevin Kelly Hugh Lanning  
 Marion Lloyd Mary McCusker  
 Jackie McWilliams Glenys Morris  
 Emmet O'Brien Gordon Rowntree  
 Sian Ruddick Mark Serwotka  
 James Undy Rob Williams  
 Garry Winder Janice Godrich  
 male 14 female 10 total 24

### **PFA**

#### **Professional Footballers' Association**

20 Oxford Court, Bishopsgate  
 Manchester M2 3WQ  
 t 0161 236 0575  
 f 0161 228 7229  
 e info@thepfa.co.uk  
 www.givemefootball.com  
 m 2,485 f 0 total 2,485  
 main trades and industries professional football  
 Chief executive Gordon Taylor, BSc(Econ), Hon DArt, Hon MA  
 Delegates  
 Bobby Barnes Simone Pound  
 male 1 female 1 total 2

### **POA (UK)**

#### **Prison Officers' Association UK**

Cronin House  
 245 Church Street  
 London N9 9HW  
 t 020 8803 0255  
 f 020 8803 1761  
 www.poauk.org.uk  
 total 34,119 (male/female split not available)  
 main trades and industries persons employed in any penal or secure establishment or special hospital as a prison officer, a nursing grade, a non-industrial stores grade and NHS secure forensic staff  
 Gen sec Brian Caton  
 Delegates  
 Brian Caton Andy Darken  
 David Evans Steve Gillan  
 Deanne Hughes Colin Moses  
 Brian Traynor  
 male 6 female 1 total 7

### **Prospect**

Prospect House  
 75-79 York Road  
 London SE1 7AQ  
 t 020 7902 6600  
 f 020 7902 6667

e enquiries@prospect.org.uk

www.prospect.org.uk

m 84,377 f 20,667 total 105,044

main trades and industries engineering, scientific, managerial & professional staff in agriculture, defence, electricity supply, energy, environment, health & safety, heritage, industry, law and order, shipbuilding, transport

Gen sec Paul Noon

Delegates

Katherine Beirne Beryl Brine

Freddie Brown Peter Clements

Clive Davey Catherine Donaldson

Rod Earl Sue Ferns

Alan Grey Azim Hajee

Charles Harvey Graeme Henderson

Peter Henderson Simon Hester

Dai Hudd Helen Kenny

Paul Noon Robbie Ridoutt

David Simpson Jenny Thurston

Jan Usher Neil Walsh

male 18 female 4 total 22

## RMT

### National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers

39 Chalton Street, London NW1 1JD

t 020 7387 4771

f 020 7387 4123

www.rmt.org.uk

m 60,154 f 7,322 total 67,476

main trades and industries railways and shipping, underground, road transport

Gen sec Bob Crow

Delegates

Phillip Boston Graham Buchanan

Paul Cox Robert Crow

Tony Donaghey Jim Gray

Peter Hall Mansur Khan

Paula Mason Mark Russell

Jeffrey Slee Steve Smart

John Whittingham Mark Winchester

male 13 female 1 total 14

## SCP

### Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists

1 Fellmongers Path, Tower Bridge Road

London SE1 3LY

t 020 7234 8620

f 020 7234 8621

e enq@scpod.org

www.scpod.org

m 2,455 f 6,027 total 8,482

Acting chief executive Joanna Brown

Delegates

Robin Banerjee Joanna Brown

male 1 female 1 total 2

## SKISA

### Skipton Staff Association

The Bailey, Harrogate Road Skipton, North Yorkshire BD23 1DN

t 01756 705475

f 01756 705714

e jennifer.tate@skipton.org.uk

total 1276 (male/female split not available)

main trades and industries the unions representing staff employed by the Skipton Building Society

Chair Jennifer A Tate

Delegates

Craig Davey Jennifer Tate

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 7204

www.sor.org

m 2,419 f 14,336 total 16,755

main trades and industries National Health Service

Chief exec officer Richard Evans

Delegates

Richard Evans Hazel Harriett-Jones

Sarah Larkins Ann Pollard

male 1 female 3 total 4

## SWSWU

### Sheffield Wool Shear Workers' Union

17 Galsworthy Road, Sheffield S5 8QX

total 11 (male/female split not available)

Gen sec B Whomersley

## T&G

### Transport and General Workers' Union

Transport House, 128 Theobald's Road

Holborn, London WC1X 8TN

t 020 7611 2500

f 020 7611 2555

e tgwu@tgwu.org.uk

www.tgwu.org.uk

m 647,544 f 169,442 total 816,986

main trades and industries administrative, clerical, technical and supervisory; agriculture; building, construction and civil engineering; chemical, oil and rubber manufacture; civil air transport; docks and waterways; food, drink and tobacco; general workers; passenger services; power and engineering; public services; road transport commercial; textiles; vehicle building and automotive.

Gen sec Tony Woodley

Delegates

Sharif Abbas John Allen

Abu Askira Hilda Ball

John Bees Elaine Blair

Peter Booth Allen Bowler



Pat Breslin Terry Britton  
 Duncan Burnett Barry Camfield  
 Maureen Cann John Chilton  
 Ray Collins Joe Conway  
 Tony Cooper S Cope  
 Collete Cork-Hurst Gerard Coyne  
 Richard Crease Hitesh Dave  
 Jack Dromey Steve Elliott  
 J Elliott Betty Gallacher Frank Gilmour Alison Goodman  
 Davey Gordon Jim Hancock  
 Margaret Henderson Shirley Hewson  
 Brendan Hodgess Frances Hourihane  
 Sharon Hutchinson Joe Irvin  
 Brenda Irvine Jimmy Kelly  
 Rashid Khan Pauline King  
 Bert Lawrie Teresa Mackay  
 Martin Mayer Len McCluskey  
 Eddie McDermott Jackie McDowall  
 Trevor McDowell W McGonigle  
 Sean McGovern Matthew McGregor  
 Paddy McNaught Arlene Minnis  
 Lynette Osment Chris Perrett  
 Mark Plumb Anne Marie Powell  
 Michael Quinn Sean Ramsden  
 Dave Reed Brian Revell  
 Dave Ritchie Ann Robertson  
 Maggie Ryan Willie Scobie  
 June Shepherd John Sheridan  
 Les Sibley Stan Sims  
 Agit Singh Gill Graham Stevenson  
 Pat Stuart Robert Studham  
 Mohammad Taj Monica Walsh Wazim Wardrop  
 Joseph Welch  
 Dave Williams R Williams  
 Tony Woodley  
 male 54 female 25 total 79

## **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  
 www.tssa.org.uk  
 m 21,864 f 9,170 total 31,034  
 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  
 Jackie Darby Gerry Doherty  
 Hilary Hosking David Porter  
 Amarjit Singh Mitch Tovey  
 male 4 female 2 total 6

## **UBAC**

### **Union for Bradford and Bingley Staff and Staff in Associated Companies**

18d Market Place, Malton  
 North Yorkshire YO17 7LX  
 t 01653 697634 f 01653 695222  
 e ubac@btconnect.com  
 m 1,020 f 1,670 total 2,690  
 main trades and industries All staff within the Bradford & Bingley Group and Alltel Mortgage Solutions  
 Gen sec David Matthews  
 Delegates  
 David Matthews Neil Strevens  
 male 2

## **UCAC**

### **Undeb Cenedlaethol Athrawon Cymru**

Pen Roc, Rhodfa'r Môr  
 Aberystwyth SY23 2AZ  
 t 01970 639950  
 f 01970 626765  
 e ucac@athrawon.com  
 m 893 f 3,167 total 4,060  
 main trades and industries education - teachers and lecturers  
 Gen sec Moelwen Gwyndaf  
 Delegate  
 Moelwen Gwyndaf  
 female 1

## **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  
 m 109,583 f 1,303 total 110,886  
 main trades and industries construction and building  
 Gen sec George Brumwell  
 Delegates  
 S Austerberry Roy Bleasdale  
 George Brumwell Charlie Cochrane  
 Denis Doody Michael Farrell  
 Wilf Flynn Terry Harbour  
 Harry Jones John Kemp  
 Tom Lannon T Palfrey  
 W Whalen  
 male 13

## **Unifi**

Sheffield House  
 1b Amity Grove  
 London SW20 0LG

t 020 8946 9151 f 020 8879 7916  
 www.unifi.org.uk  
 m 56,951 f 85,490 total 142,441  
 main trades and industries banking, insurance, building societies and financial institutions  
 Gen sec Ed Sweeney  
 Delegates  
 Anne Abbott Paul Aburn  
 Lindsey Adams Anne Ayres  
 Teresa Baier Sandy Boyle  
 Amrita Cochrane Sophia Cock  
 Mike Cummins Sybil Dilworth  
 Gwyneth Griffiths Margaret Hazell  
 Carwin JamesSheila Kettles  
 Gillian Lewis Patricia Lynch  
 Rory Murphy David Pearce  
 Ian Seddon George Shepherd  
 Stephen Smith Ed Sweeney  
 Paul Tilbrook Agnes Tolmie  
 David Uren Susan Worsley  
 male 12 female 14 total 26

#### **UNISON**

1 Mabledon Place  
 London WC1H 9AJ  
 t 0845 355 0845 f 020 7551 1101  
 text tel 0800 0967 968  
 www.UNISON.org.uk/  
 m 343,983 f 957,017 total 1,301,000  
 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 Dave Anderson  
 Louise Ashworth Angela Bagum  
 Yunus Bakhsh Pam Baldwin  
 Roger Bannister Sarah Barwick  
 Kenneth Bell Jean Boswell  
 Michelle Brankin Pat Buckley  
 Jean Butcher Stephen Caddick  
 Malcolm Cantello Ivy Carlier  
 Jane Carolan Sue Clark  
 Louise Couling Margaret Dunbar  
 Pat Dwan Mary Fitzpatrick  
 Nigel Flanagan Mike Folliard  
 Shirley Ford Mark Fysh  
 Jean Geldart Malcolm Gibbs  
 Dave Godson Emma Goodall  
 Patricia Green Chris Hanrahan  
 Mike Hayes Susan Highton  
 Graeme Horn Alan Jarman  
 Helen Jenner Georgette Johnson  
 Maggie Jones Raj Joye  
 Glenn Kelly Sandra Kennie  
 John Kidd Mike Kirby  
 Roger Laxton Jackie Lewis  
 Tony Luke Angela Lynes

Iris Magill Carole Maleham  
 Kebba Manneh Myfanwy Manning  
 Maggie Martin Jan Matthews  
 Anne McCormack Bev Miller  
 Gloria Mills Bahram Mokhtare  
 Fiona Monkman Iain Montgomery  
 Tracy Morgan Ruth Norman  
 Bob Oram Alun Owen  
 Graham Parkhouse Jim Patterson  
 Annette Place Lynn Poulton  
 Dave Prentis Elizabeth Ring  
 Eric Roberts Gill Robertson  
 Rod Robertson Julie Robertson  
 Jon Rogers Helen Rose  
 Patricia Rowland Jessie Russel  
 Alison Shepherd Eleanor Smith  
 Liz Snape Keith Sonnet  
 Irene Stacey Rosemary Stebbing  
 Norma Stephenson Wilf Sullivan  
 Chris Tansley Sofi Taylor  
 Pauline Thorne Mike Tucker  
 Steve Warwick Christine Wilde  
 Linda Wilkinson Clare Williams  
 Malcolm Wing Rena Wood  
 Doug Wright  
 male 42 female 55 total 97

#### **URTU**

##### **United Road Transport Union**

76 High Lane, Chorlton  
 Manchester M21 9EF  
 t 0800 52 66 39  
 f 0161 861 0976  
 e info@urtu.com  
 www.urtu.com  
 m 15,931 f 315 total 16,246  
 main trades and industries drivers, warehousing, ancillary workers in the logistics and food sectors  
 Gen Sec Robert Monks  
 Delegates  
 Roy Abrahams Trevor Bray  
 Rob Monks Nigel Rogers  
 male 4

#### **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 135,850 f 195,853 total 331,703  
 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

Clifford Bartlam Pat Buttle

Marge Carey MBE Gwen Cherry

Tony Clare Paul Curry

Gavin Dadley Michael Dixon

Pat Fitzgerald Sonia Foster

Alexandra Fraser John Hannett

Peter Hunt Pat Hunter

Dougie JohnstoneShaun Jones

Michelle Kelly Brian Kenny

Paddy Lillis Anne Livingstone

John Mace John McGarry

Frank Murphy Florence Nash

Sally Neale Anne O'Shea

Susan Owen Geoff Page

Bipin Pitrola Brenda Roe

Barbara Wilson Nan Wright

male 19 female 13 total 32

## WGGB

### The Writers' Guild of Great Britain

15 Britannia Street

London WC1X 9JN

t 020 7833 0777

f 020 7833 4777

e admin@writersguild.org.uk

www.writersguild.org.uk

m 1,378 f 764 total 2,142

main trades and industries television, radio, film, books, theatre and multimedia

Gen sec Bernie Corbett

Delegates

Lucy Daniel Raby Graham Lester George

male 2

## YISA

### Yorkshire Independent Staff Association

c/o Yorkshire Building Society,

Yorkshire House, Yorkshire Drive

Rooley Lane, Bradford BD5 8LJ

t 01274 472 453

e kmwatson@ybs.co.uk

m 378 f 1,058 total 1,436

Chair Karen Watson

### Summary

Number of affiliated

unions: 70

membership:

m 3,403,828 f 2,639,009 male/female split not available: 380,857

**total 6,423,694**

# **Section 4**

## **Details of past Congresses**





# Section 5

## members of the general council 1921-2004

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.

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  
Baddeley, W - 1963-72  
Bagnall, GH - 1939-47  
Baird, R - 1987  
Baker, FA- 1976-84  
Bartlett, C - 1948-62  
Basnett, D - 1966-85  
Baty, JG - 1947-54  
Baume, J – 2001-04  
Bearcroft, S - 1997-2004  
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  
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 - 04  
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  
Brumwell, G - 1992-2004  
Buck, LW - 1972-76  
Buckton, RW - 1973-85  
Burke, T - 1993-2002  
Burrows, AW - 1947-48  
Bussey, EW - 1941-46  
Cameron, K - 1981-83, 1991-99  
Camfield, B - 2000 - 2004  
Campbell, J - 1953-57  
Callighan, A - 1945-47  
Cannon, L - 1965-70  
Carey, M – 1998–2004  
Carr, J - 1989-92  
Carrigan, D - 2001  
Carter, J - 1989-92  
Carron, WJ - 1954-67  
Caton, B – 2001-2004  
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

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  
 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 – 2002-04  
 De Gruchy, N - 1989-2002  
 Dhamrait, M - 1995-2000  
 Doherty, G - 2004  
 Donaghy, R - 1987-99  
 Donnett, AM - 1973-75  
 Doughty, GH - 1968-73  
 Douglass, H - 1953-66  
 Drake, JLP - 1990-2004  
 Drain, GA - 1973-82  
 Dubbins, AD - 1984-2004  
 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  
 Farthing, WJ - 1935-43  
 Fawcett, L - 1940-51  
 Fenelon, B - 1998  
 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  
 Fysh, M – 2001- 04  
 Gallie, CN - 1940-46  
 Garland, R - 1983  
 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  
 Gladwin, DO - 1986-89  
 Godrich, J 2003 - 04  
 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- 04  
 Hammond, EA - 1983-87  
 Hancock, F - 1935-57  
 Handley, RC - 1938-39  
 Hanley, P - 1968-69  
 Hannett, J - 2004  
 Harrison, HN - 1937-47  
 Hawkes, P - 1992-2004  
 Hayday, A - 1922-36  
 Hayday, F - 1950-72  
 Hayes, W – 2002-04  
 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 – 2002-04  
 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  
 Keates, C – 2004  
 Kelly, J – 2004  
 Kelly, L - 2004  
 Kenny, P - 2000 - 04  
 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 – 2001-04  
 Lawther, W - 1935-53  
 Leahy, M – 1999-2004  
 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  
 Lyons, CA - 1983-88  
 Lyons, J - 1983-90  
 Lyons, R - 1989-2003  
 Macgougan, J - 1970-78  
 MacKenzie, HU (Lord) - 1987-99  
 Mackney, P – 2002-04  
 Macreadie, J - 1987  
 Maddocks, A - 1977-90  
 Maddocks, WH - 1979-81  
 Manasseh, L – 2001-2004  
 Martin, A - 1960-70  
 McAndrews, A - 1949-54  
 McAvoy, D - 1989-2003  
 McCall, W - 1984-88  
 McCarthy, CP- 1983-84  
 McCulloch, L - 2003  
 McCulloch, 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 - 04	Richards, T - 1925-31
Mercer, L - 2000 - 04	Rix, M – 2001-2002
Mills, G - 1994-2004	Roberts, A (Sir) - 1940-62
Mills, LA - 1983-95	Roberts, A - 1967-71
Moore, JH - 1922-23	Robinson, SA - 1959-69
Morgan, B - 1995	Rogers, S – 2002-04
Morgan, G - 1981-89	Rooney, D – 1998-2004
Morris, W - 1988-2002	Rooney, M - 1990-2002
Morritt, M - 1989-91	Rosser, R - 2000 - 2003
Morton, J - 1975-84, 1987-89	Rown, J - 1921-34
Murnin, H - 1921	Russell, JG - 1982-86
Murray, JG - 1980-82	Sapper, AL - 1970-83
Naesmith, A - 1945-52	Scanlon, H - 1968-77
Nevin, E - 1985-88	Scard, D - 1990-2000
Newman, J - 1990-91	Scargill, A - 1980-82, 1986-87
Newton, JE - 1953-69	Scott, J - 1961
Nichols, G - 2000 – 2002, 2004	Scrivens, EM - 1982-86
Nicholas, HR - 1965-66	Serwotka, M – 2002-04
Nicholson, B - 1983-87	Sexton, J - 1921
Noon, P – 2001-04	Sharp, L - 1957-65
O'Brien, T - 1940-69	Shaw, A - 1929-38
Ogden, JW - 1921-29	Sheldon, J - 1992-97
O'Hagen, J - 1953-66	Shepherd, A - 1995-2004
O'Kane, E - 2003	Sherwood, W - 1934-36
Openshaw, R - 1948-56	Simpson, D – 2002-04
Orrell, B – 1999-2004	Sinnott, S - 2004
Owen, J - 1948-52	Sirs, W - 1975-84
Page, M - 1988-89	Skinner, H - 1921-31
Papworth, AF - 1944-48	Slater, JH - 1974-82
Parry, T - 1968-80	Slater, JW - 1972-73
Patterson, CM - 1963-84	Smillie, R - 1921-36
Paynter, W - 1960	Smith, A - 1921
Peel, JA - 1966-72	Smith, AR - 1979-92
Pemberton, S - 1974-81	Smith, GF - 1959-78
Pickering, R - 1985-96	Smith, H - 1922-24, 1931
Pinder, P – 2001-2003	Smith, LJ - 1980-87
Plant, CTH - 1963-75	Smith, P – 1999-2002
Poole, L - 1957-58	Smith, R - 1957-66
Poulton, EL - 1921-29	Smithies, FA - 1983-89
Prentis, D - 1996-2004	Snape, L – 2001-03
Prime, AM - 1968-76	Sonnet, K – 2001-03
Prosser, M - 1985-95	Spackman, EW- 1945-46
Prudence, J - 1995-99	Spanswick, EAG - 1977-82
Pugh, A - 1921-35	Spence, WR - 1931-41
Purcell, AA - 1921-27	Stanley, BC - 1983-85
Purkiss, B - 1994-99	Squance, WJR - 1936-39
Qualie, M - 1923-25	Steele, NJ - 1983-90
Reamsbottom, BA - 1992-2001	Stevens, L - 1983

Stevenson, RB - 1984-89  
 Stott, W - 1936-39  
 Stuart, P - 2004  
 Swales, AB - 1921-34  
 Sweeney, E - 1996-2004  
 Swindell, B - 1962-65  
 Switzer, B - 1993-97  
 Symons, E - 1989-95  
 Taj, M - 2000 - 04  
 Tanner, J - 1943-53  
 Talbot, P – 1999-2004  
 Tami, M – 1999-2000  
 Tallon, WM - 1957-66  
 Taylor, S –2003 - 04  
 Thomas, JH - 1921, 1925-28  
 Thomas, KR - 1977-81  
 Thomas, P - 1989-91  
 Thomson, GW - 1935-47  
 Thorburn, W - 1990  
 Thorne, W - 1921-33  
 Thorneycroft, 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  
 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  
 Winsett, J - 1986  
 Wolstencroft, F - 1928-48  
 Wood, L - 1979-84  
 Wood, W - 1936-37  
 Woodley, T – 2003 - 04  
 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

### Aburn, Paul

Parents, carers and work/life balance .....139

### Aitchison, Jane

Racism and the 'Redwatch' Site.....117

### Allen, Sam

Learning and Skills .....112

Inequality and Discrimination in Higher

Education .....115

Organising black workers .....65

### Askew, Adrian

learning and skills .....100

### Auty, Patricia

Diversity in the Workplace .....119

## B

### Baker, Nigel

Obesity Epidemic .....109

### Baldwin, Pam

Public services ..... 93

### Ballard, Andy

Refugees and Asylum Seekers .....150

### Banerjee, Robin

Decontamination of Surgical Instruments .....177

### Barber, Brendan

Age Discrimination and Equality ..... 49

Address.. ..53

Working time ..... 72

Judicial Review on the Sexual Orientation

Regulations 2003 .....162

The Americas –Cuba .....161

Vote of thanks to the media..... 187

### Barnes, Bobby

Diversity in the Workplace..... 118

### Bartlett, Jerry

Fair Deal for Women ..... 142

### Baugh, Chris

Health and Safety .....125

### Baume, Jonathan

Age Discrimination and Equality .....48

Future of health and public policy ..... 95

### Baxter, Lesley Ann

Parents, carers and work/life balance ..... 139

### Bendo, Katicia Giordani

Migrant Workers Presentation..... 144

### Bhattacharyya, Gargi

Organising black workers ..... 65

### Blair, Rt Hon Tony

Address .. .. 58

### Bolton, Roger

Equality Awards ..... 97

Media Ownership ..... 181

### Bond, Christine

Learning and skills ..... 100

### Bond, Sue

Equality/human rights commission ..... 136

### Booth, Peter

Manufacturing ..... 69

### Boustead, Dr Mary

Education.. ..... 105

### Brennan, Tom

Energy and environment ..... 51

### Britton, Terry

Safety campaigns ..... 132

### Brockman, Tony

Pensions .. ..... 78

### Brown, Joanna

Union Organising ..... 56

### Brown, Stewart

Equality/human rights commission ..... 137

Iraq ..... .. 155

### Brumwell, George

Agency Workers ..... 44

Working time ..... 70

### Burke, Tony

Manufacturing ..... 67

## C

### Camfield, Barry

Federal Mogul/Turner and Newall ..... 82

### Caranday, Janice

Migrant Workers Presentation ..... 146

<b>Carey, Marge</b>		
Learning and skills .....	101	
<b>Carolan, Jane</b>	Fair Deal for Women .....	140
<b>Carragher, Patrick</b>		
Age Discrimination and Equality .....	49	
Energy and environment .....	51	
<b>Caton, Brian</b>		
Criminal Sentencing Policy .....	173	
Fairness at Work .....	43	
National Offender Management Service .....	175	
<b>Chawla, Suresh</b>		
Health and Safety .....	126	
Organising black workers .....	66	
<b>Chowcat, John</b>		
Education .....	106	
<b>Clarke, Rt Hon Charles</b>		
Learning and Skills .....	110	
<b>Clements, Peter</b>		
Energy and environment .....	49	
<b>Coe, Lord</b>		
London 2012 Olympic Bid .....	152	
<b>Compton, Mary</b>		
The Government's five-year strategy for education .....	102	
<b>Connor, Sir Bill</b>		
Gold badge .....	185	
<b>Conway, Tony</b>		
Learning and skills .....	102	
<b>Cook, Richard</b>		
BBC Charter Renewal and Public Service		
Broadcasting .....	180	
<b>Coop, Owen</b>		
Safety campaigns .....	131	
<b>Corrigall, Jim</b>		
BBC Charter Renewal and Public Service		
Broadcasting .....	179	
<b>Coulter, Debbie</b>		
Organising and recruiting women at work .....	62	
Public services .....	88	
<b>Coysh, Daniel</b>		
Reply to vote of thanks to the media .....	188	
<b>Crow, Robert</b>		
Europe .....	163, 165	
Transport .....	167	
Health and Safety .....	126	
<b>Curran, Kevin</b>		
Europe: General Council Statement .....	163, 166	
Federal Mogul/Turner and Newall .....	82	
Health and Safety .....	123	
Union Organising .....	57	
<b>D</b>		
<b>Daniel Raby, Lucy</b>		
BBC Charter Renewal and Public Service		
Broadcasting .....	178	
<b>Davies, Gareth</b>		
BBC Charter Renewal and Public Service		
Broadcasting .....	180	
Disability Rights and Europe .....	47	
<b>Davies, Phil</b>		
Disability Rights and Europe .....	47	
<b>Davis, Mary</b>		
Equality/human rights commission .....	136	
Iraq .....	154	
<b>Dear, Jeremy</b>		
Civil service .....	92	
Racism and the 'Redwatch' Site .....	118	
Refugees and Asylum Seekers .....	149	
<b>Dempsey, Gerard</b>		
Civil service .....	92	
<b>Dilworth, Sybil</b>		
Organising black workers .....	64	
<b>Doherty, Gerry</b>		
Transport .....	168	
<b>Donaghey, Tony</b>		
Fairness at Work .....	43	
<b>Donnelly, Elizabeth</b>		
BBC Charter Renewal and Public Service		
Broadcasting .....	179	
<b>Doody, Denis</b>		
Iraq .....	154	
<b>Doolan, Gary</b>		
Civil service .....	92	
<b>Drake, Jeannie</b>		
Pensions .....	81	

<b>Dromey, Jack</b>		
Migrant Workers .....	148	
Pensions. ..	79	
<b>Dubbins, Tony</b>		
Europe .. ..	165	
Fairness at work .....	40	
Vote of thanks to the President .....	185	
<b>Duffy, Anne</b>		
Care of elders .....	134	
<b>Dwan, Pat</b>		
Bullying and Harassment .....	128	
<b>E</b>		
<b>Eagleson, Rosie</b>		
Civil service .....	90	
Criminal Sentencing Policy .....	174	
<b>Evans, Richard</b>		
Opposition to Performance-Related Pay .....	176	
<b>Exall, Maria</b>		
Fairness at Work .....	41	
<b>F</b>		
<b>Fabian, Loreenne</b>		
Fair Deal for Women .....	142	
<b>Fowler, Graham</b>		
Maritime Security .....	171	
Our future in Europe .....	183	
<b>Fowler, Sandy</b>		
Public services .....	86	
<b>Fysh, Mark</b>		
Disability Rights and Europe .....	47	
<b>G</b>		
<b>Gates, Nigel</b>		
Opposition to Performance-Related Pay .....	176	
<b>Gates, Paul</b>		
Aid, trade and unions .....	150	
<b>Gawthorpe, Nigel</b>		
Trade and Labour Standards .....	160	
<b>George, Graham Lester</b>		
Media Ownership .....	180	
Safety and preservation of theatres .....	129	
<b>Gilchrist, Andy</b>		
Introduction to Harold Schaitberger .....	74	
Public services .....	86	
<b>Gillan, Steve</b>		
Prison Overcrowding .....	172	
<b>Godrich, Janice</b>		
Public services .....	87	
<b>Graveson, Alan</b>		
Maritime Security .....	170	
<b>Grey, Alan</b>		
Union Organising .....	56	
<b>Griffiths, Judith</b>		
Agency Workers .....	46	
<b>Grimes, Eddie</b>		
Health and Safety .....	124	
<b>Gross, Annette</b>		
Working time .....	71	
<b>Guppy, Dave</b>		
Pensions ..	81	
<b>H</b>		
<b>Hajee, Azim</b>		
Organising black workers .....	66	
<b>Halpin, Anita</b>		
Strategic Review .....	54	
<b>Hannett, John</b>		
Health and Safety .....	125	
Parents, carers and work/life balance .....	138	
Union Organising .....	57	
<b>Harding, Chris</b>		
Learning and skills .....	99	
<b>Harriett-Jones, Hazel</b>		
35-hour working week .....	70	
<b>Harrison- Jennings, Brian</b>		
Education ..	107	
<b>Harrison, Tom</b>		
Violence Against Women .....	143	
<b>Hayes, Billy</b>		
35-hour working week .....	69, 73	
<b>Hazlewood, Keith</b>		
Manufacturing .....	68	
<b>Henderson, Graeme</b>		
Health and Safety .....	126	

<b>Hernandez, Hernando</b>			
Colombia address .....	157		
<b>Hester, Simon</b>			
Transport .....	169		
<b>Highton, Susan</b>			
Union Organising .....	58		
<b>Hill, Ray</b>			
Manufacturing .....	69		
<b>Holland, Diana</b>			
Fair Deal for Women .....	141		
<b>Howell, Christine</b>			
Fairness at Work .....	44		
<b>Hudson, Bob</b>			
Health and Safety .....	128		
<b>I</b>			
<b>Ibrahim, Fawzi</b>			
Europe ... ..	165		
<b>J</b>			
<b>Jandu, Harpal</b>			
Organising black workers .....	66		
<b>Johnson, Rt Hon Alan</b>			
Pensions. ..	83		
<b>Jones, Dave</b>			
Inequality and Discrimination in Higher Education .....	115		
<b>Jones, Peter</b>			
Racism and the 'Redwatch' Site .....	118		
<b>Jones, Ruth</b>			
Parents, carers and work/life balance .....	138		
<b>K</b>			
<b>Kearns, Tony</b>			
Care of elders .....	133		
<b>Keates, Chris</b>			
'Every child matters – childrens' services .....	104		
<b>Keenan, Paul</b>			
Pensions ..	78		
<b>Kelly, Kevin</b>			
Union organising .....	58		
<b>Kelly, Lucy</b>			
Vote of thanks to the President .....	38		
<b>Pensions</b> ..	77		
<b>Kemp, Steve</b>			
Europe ... ..	164		
Fairness at Work .....	41		
<b>King, Roger</b>			
Racism and the 'Redwatch' Site .....	116		
<b>Klein, Ginny</b>			
Obesity Epidemic .....	108		
<b>Knight, Vicky</b>			
Middle East .....	156		
Working time .....	72		
<b>L</b>			
<b>Landis, Harry</b>			
Use of union contracts in publicly owned entertainment venues .....	182		
<b>Lanning, Hugh</b>			
Pensions ..	77		
<b>Lannon, Tom</b>			
Migrant Workers .....	147		
<b>Lavery, Ian</b>			
Energy and environment .....	50		
Health and Safety .....	127		
<b>Lawrence, Felicity</b>			
Migrant Workers Presentation .....	144		
<b>Laxton, Roger</b>			
European Social Forum .....	184		
<b>Lennon, Tony</b>			
BBC Charter Renewal and Public Service Broadcasting .....	178		
<b>Lerew, Pat</b>			
The Government's five-year strategy for education ..	103		
<b>Lewis, Gillian</b>			
Learning and Skills .....	113		
<b>Lillis, Paddy</b>			
Agency Workers .....	44		
<b>Lloyd, Marion</b>			
The Government's five-year strategy for education .....	104		
<b>Lucas, Tim</b>			
Diversity in the Workplace .....	119		

**Lyons, Roger**

Adoption of the General Council Report .....	184
Votes of thanks .....	184
Gold badges .....	185
Congress President 2005 .....	185
Reply to vote of thanks .....	186
Close of Congress .....	190
Congress Awards .....	52
Organising Award .....	123
President's address .....	35
TUC Accounts .....	172

**M****Machan, Carol**

Bullying and Harassment .....	130
-------------------------------	-----

**Mackay, Teresa**

Health and Safety .....	127
-------------------------	-----

**MacKenzie, Lorimer**

Civil service .....	89
---------------------	----

**Mackney, Paul**

Learning and skills .....	99
---------------------------	----

**Maleham, Carole**

Civil service .....	91
---------------------	----

**Maloney, Paul**

Transport .....	168
-----------------	-----

**Manasseh, Leslie**

Union Organising .....	56
------------------------	----

**Manning, Myfanwy**

Care of elders .....	134
----------------------	-----

**Mansell, Lesley**

Equality/human rights commission .....	137
Scrutineers Report .....	120

**Marino, Joe**

Fairness at Work .....	42
Manufacturing .....	68

**Markham, Diana**

Obesity Epidemic .....	107
------------------------	-----

**Mason, Paula**

Agency Workers .....	45
----------------------	----

**McAuslan, Jim**

Health and Safety in Commercial Aviation .....	128
--	-----

**McCormack, Anne**

Learning and skills .....	101
---------------------------	-----

**McGhee, John**

Fairness at Work .....	42
------------------------	----

**McKnight, Judy**

Aid, trade and unions .....	151
Prison Overcrowding .....	173
National Offender Management Service .....	174

**McLoughlin, Peter**

Fairness at Work .....	40
------------------------	----

**Mercer, Lesley**

Future of health and public policy .....	94
--	----

**Merriman, Andrew**

Obesity Epidemic .....	109
------------------------	-----

**Miller, Bev**

Organising black workers .....	65
--------------------------------	----

**Mokhtare, Bahram**

Migrant Workers .....	148
-----------------------	-----

**Moloney, Paul**

Our future in Europe .....	183
----------------------------	-----

**Monks, Robert**

Transport .....	171
-----------------	-----

**Morgan, Joe**

Agency Workers .....	45
----------------------	----

**Morley, Chris**

Fairness at Work .....	42
------------------------	----

**Morris, Barry**

Energy and environment .....	50
------------------------------	----

**Morris, Glenys**

Violence Against Women .....	144
------------------------------	-----

**Murphy, Kath**

Parents, carers and work/life balance .....	139
---	-----

**Murray, Christine**

Public services .....	86
-----------------------	----

**N****Newman, Linda**

Working time .....	72
--------------------	----

**Nicholas, Micky**

Race Equality .....	175
Pensions .....	81

**Nicholls, Doug**



Europe .. 164

**Nichols, Ged**

Pensions .. 78

**Noon, Paul**

Civil service..... 89

**O**

**O'Brien, Emmet**

Judicial Review on the Sexual Orientation  
Regulations 2003 ..... 162

**O'Grady, Frances**

Equality Awards..... 96

**O'Mara, Maureen**

European Social Forum .....184

**Oram, Bob** The Americas – Cuba..... 160

**P**

**Page, Geoff**

Learning and Skills..... 113

**Page, Mary**

Judicial Review on the Sexual Orientation  
Regulations 2003 ..... 161

**Pendle, Peter**

Bullying and Harassment ..... 130  
Learning and skills ..... 100  
Working time..... 71

**Peretz, Amir**

Histadrut Israel address .....98

**Petty, Bob**

Pensions .. 80

**Place, Annette**

Organising and recruiting women at work ..... 63

**Pollard, Ann**

Future of health and public policy ..... 95

**Porter, David**

Pensions. .. 78

**Prentis, Dave**

Equality Awards.....97  
Public services .....85

**Puckrin, John**

Obesity Epidemic .....108

**R**

**Rainey, Shirley**

Migrant Workers..... 148

**Reed, Andy**

Transport . 168

**Reed, Dave**

Health and Safety in Commercial Aviation ..... 128

**Regan, Bernard**

The Americas –Cuba..... 160

**Reiser, Richard**

Disability Rights and Europe ..... 46

**Richardson, Tony**

European Constitutional Treaty..... 183

**Robertson, Ann**

Bullying and harassment ..... 131

**Roger, Angela**

Migrant Workers..... 147

**Rogers, Jean**

BBC Charter Renewal and Public Service  
Broadcasting..... 179

**Rogers, Sue**

Racism and the 'Redwatch' Site ..... 117

**Rooney, Dougie**

Energy and environment ..... 50

**Rose, Helen**

Energy and environment..... 51

**Ross, Pedro**

CTC Cuba address ..... 135

**Rowe, Nick**

Judicial review on the sexual orientation  
regulations 2003 ..... 162

**Rowntree, Gordon**

Maritime Security..... 171

**Rutter, Bernard**

Learning and Skills ..... 113

**S**

**Sae'd, Shaher**

PGFTU Palestine address..... 93

**Sage, Malcolm**

Working time ..... 73

**Schaitberger, Harold A**

AFL-CIO address .....74

**Serwotka, Mark**

Civil service .....88

**Seymour Kirk, Janet**

Disability Rights and Europe..... 47

Transport . .....170

Learning and Skills .....113

**Shepherd, Alison**

Colombia . .....159

**Sillah, Emmanuel**

Migrant Workers Presentation ..... 145

**Simpson, Derek**

Manufacturing..... 67

Federal Mogul/Turner and Newall .....82

**Singh, Amarjite**

Aid, trade and unions .....151

Racism and the 'Redwatch' Site..... 117

**Sinnott, Steve**

Civil service .....91

Learning and Skills .....112

**Smith, John**

Licensing Act ..... 181

Use of union contracts in publicly owned  
entertainment venues ..... 182**Sonnet, Keith**

Iraq ..... 155

**Sparham, Florence**

Licensing Act ..... 181

**Stephenson, Norma**

Decontamination of Surgical Instruments .....177

**Stevenson, Graham**

Transport . .....171

**Strutton, Brian**

Education . ..... 107

**Sullivan, Wilf**

Organising black workers ..... 63

**Sweeney, Ed**

Vote of thanks to the President ..... 37

**T****Taj, Mohammad**

Organising black workers ..... 64

**Talbot, Paul**

Aid, trade and unions ..... 151

**Tansley, Chris**

'Every child matters' – children's services ..... 105

**Taylor, Gordon**

Equality Awards ..... 97

**Thomas, Rob**

Criminal Sentencing Policy ..... 174

Health and Safety ..... 124

**Thorne, Pauline**

Learning and Skills ..... 112

Pensions .. ..... 80

**Tovey, Mitch**

Iraq ..... 155

**Traynor, Brian**

Public services ..... 87

**Turner, Mary**

Address from the Labour Party ..... 121

Obesity Epidemic..... 110

Pensions .. ..... 79

**U****Undy, James**

Transport . ..... 169

**V****Vavi, Zwelinzima**

COSATU South Africa address ..... 132

**Veart, Gerry**

Report of General Purposes Committee..... 39, 74

**W****Ward, Dave**

Civil service ..... 90

**Wardhaugh, Sheena**

Education.. ..... 106

**Waugh, Ron**

Migrant Workers ..... 149

**Wharton, Steve**

Inequality and Discrimination in  
Higher Education .....114

**White, Barbara**

Colombia .. ..... 159  
Safety and preservation of theatres..... 129

**White, Rose**

Parents, carers and work/life balance ..... 140

**Wilde, Christine**

Future of health and public policy ..... 95

**Wilkin, John**

Agency Workers.....45

**Wilkins, Rachelle**

Fair Deal for Women ..... 141  
The Government's five-year strategy for  
education .....103

**Williams, Clare**

Regional Government .....123

**Wilson, Chris**

Racism and the 'Redwatch' Site .....115

**Winters, Ruth**

Colombia .. .....158  
Fire services dispute..... 93

**Wood, Rena**

Equality Awards..... 97  
Racism and the 'Redwatch' Site .....116

**Woodley, Tony**

Fairness at Work .....39  
Union Organising ..... 55

**Wright, Walter**

Violence Against Women .....143

**Y****Yesidali, Sevi**

Organising black workers .....65