

Congress Report 2005

The 137th annual Trades Union Congress
12-15 September, Brighton

Contents

	Page
General Council members 2005 – 2006	4
Section one - Congress decisions	7
Part 1	
Resolutions carried.....	8
Part 2	
Motion remitted.....	30
Part 3	
Motion lost.....	31
Part 4	
Motion withdrawn.....	31
General Council statement on the consequences of the terrorist attacks in London	32
 Section two – Verbatim report of Congress proceedings	35
Day 1	
Monday 12 September	36
Day 2	
Tuesday 13 September.....	73
Day 3	
Wednesday 14 September	114
Day 4	
Thursday 15 September	154
 Section three - unions and their delegates	180
Section four - details of past Congresses	192
Section five - General Council 1921 – 2005	195
Index of speakers	200

General Council Members 2005 – 2006

Bob Abberley
UNISON

Lesley Auger
National Union of Teachers

Jonathan Baume
FDA

Sheila Bearcroft
GMB

Mary Bousted
Association of Teachers and Lecturers

Barry Camfield
Transport and General Workers' Union

Marge Carey MBE
Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers

Jane Carolan
UNISON

Gail Cartmail
Amicus

Brian Caton
Prison Officers' Association

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

Sue Ferns
Prospect

Mark Fysh
UNISON

Allan Garley
GMB

Janice Godrich
Public and Commercial Services Union

Anita Halpin
National Union of Journalists

John Hannett
Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers

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

Paul Kenny
GMB

David Lascelles
GMB

Mick Leahy OBE
Community

Paul Mackney
NATFHE – The University and College Lecturers' Union

Leslie Manasseh MBE
Connect

Judy McKnight OBE
napo

Lesley Mercer
Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

Gloria Mills CBE
UNISON

Doug Nicholls
Community and Youth Workers Union

Ged Nichols
Accord

Paul Noon
Prospect

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

Tim Poil
Nationwide Group Staff Union

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

Patricia Stuart
Transport and General Workers Union

Ed Sweeney
Amicus

Mohammed Taj
Transport and General Workers' Union

Paul Talbot
Amicus

Sofi Taylor
UNISON

John Walsh
Amicus

Tony Woodley
Transport and General Workers Union

Brendan Barber *General Secretary*

Section 1

Congress Decisions

Listed below are the decisions taken by the 2005 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

1 Organising

Congress applauds the work of the TUC Organising and Representation Task Force and the success of the TUC Academy and unions' own organising efforts. A new culture requires that the union movement should measure all we do by the impact on winning in the workplace and growing.

Congress calls for a comprehensive programme at all levels as follows:

- i strengthen union-to-union cooperation and the TUC's role in enhancing positive inter-union relations and removing harmful competition;
- ii tighten the rules to ensure that no union in future plays into the hands of an employer by accepting a 'sweetheart deal' – undermining a sister union which is organising or has the members;
- iii ensure unions have the resources to fund real change;
- iv press for improved paid time-off and facilities for union workplace reps;
- v provide improved TUC and union support and training for union workplace reps and officers;
- vi strengthen the key functions which support union organising, including research and campaigning;
- vii explore how unions can use new technology to support organising;
- viii encourage dialogue with sister unions at European and international level on organising strategies and possible joint action;
- ix help change the face of the union movement to better reflect our membership;
- x make a reality of our commitment to organise beyond our current areas of strength; and
- xi ensure public policy assists the organising agenda, in line with the welcome commitment in Labour's workplace manifesto to help unions grow.

Transport and General Workers' Union

The following AMENDMENT was accepted

Add at the end of paragraph 1:

"We must in particular concentrate organising efforts in the private sector, which suffers in comparison to the public sector from significantly lower levels of union membership, organisation and recognition."

Connect

7 Union subscriptions and tax allowances

When an annual subscription is paid to a body that is approved by HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC), a person is able to claim a tax deduction in respect of the payment. Under the current legislation HMRC will approve the fee or contribution where it is paid as a statutory condition of exercising the employment, or where the membership of the "approved body" to

which the annual subscription is paid is relevant to the employment.

Under these rules union subscriptions are generally not allowed as payments "relevant to the employment".

The failure to provide a tax relief for union subscriptions is even more unacceptable when considered against the wide range of membership subscriptions that can be made with full tax relief using the "Gift Aid" scheme.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer has said that "the role of trade unions and the contribution they have made and continue to make is something to be celebrated". Congress believes that the time has come for the Government to take positive action to support trade union membership.

Congress calls on the Government to change the legislation in the 2006 Finance Bill to recognise the fact that union membership is an important feature of a person's working life and should be encouraged by a specific statutory allowance for the annual subscription.

FDA

8 Trade unionists in the classroom

Congress notes that up to two and a half million school children will enter the workforce at some point. Many young people have either little understanding of the role of trade unions or a view of unions that is informed by negative representations, particularly by the media.

Addressing the lack of understanding and the misconceptions is vital not only to the future of the movement but also to secure social justice and to ensure that young people are properly protected at work.

Congress supports the work of the TUC and affiliate unions to raise the profile of trade unions among young people, particularly through its training, support materials and speakers as part of the TUC Trade Unionists in the Classroom project.

Congress urges all affiliates to support this programme and to continue to work with the TUC to develop resources and initiatives to promote trade unionism and employment rights to young people.

National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers

The following AMENDMENT was accepted

Add new paragraph at end:

"Congress therefore agrees that the General Council and Executive Committee will seek to engage the Government in general and the Department for Education and Skills in particular, in pursuit of these objectives, reporting back to Congress 2006."

Communication Workers' Union

17 Disability and employment

Congress notes that since 1997 the levels of employment of disabled people have only marginally increased and, in relation to employment of people with sensory impairments, have actually decreased.

Congress therefore notes that despite considerable and welcome advances on the civil rights agenda, employment prospects of disabled people remain bleak, with little prospect of change.

Congress therefore resolves to encourage all affiliates to raise employment matters to the highest point on the disability agenda, and to defend the jobs of any disabled members under threat. In view of the disadvantages that disabled employees encounter when faced with competitive redundancy selection processes, disabled workers should be retained,

supported and given reasonable adjustments, before being appointed into suitable alternative posts.

Congress calls on the General Council and affiliates to promote in every workplace:

- i disability audits to identify good practice, and necessary improvements to access, retention, reasonable adjustments and other policies and practices;
- ii election of equality reps and statutory recognition so they have training and time to promote equality for all, including disabled workers; and
- iii activists to become Disability Champions.

Congress further identifies that the focus of campaigning must be on the cultural changes necessary to eradicate discrimination and exclusion of disabled people from all aspects of society and particularly the labour market.

Congress calls on the Government to honour its stated commitment to increasing employment rates for disabled people by:

- a) promoting "Access to Work" and increasing available resources;
- b) giving employment tribunals the power to order re-instatement and re-engagement in disability discrimination cases; and
- c) introducing legislation to provide disability leave for those with new or changed impairments.

TUC Disability Conference (exempt from 250 word limit)

The following AMENDMENT was accepted

In sub-paragraph c) insert "paid" between "provide" and "disability".

British Dietetic Association

19 Union diversity fund

Congress asserts that trade unions are in a unique strategic position to push for real progress on diversity in the workplace. Congress believes, however, that such crucial interventions are set back by a lack of resources to bring them into being.

Congress, therefore, urges the General Council to campaign for the establishment, by the Government as soon as possible, of a Union Diversity Fund to which trade unions can apply for funding of projects to bring about positive change within unions and/or the industries they organise.

Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union

32 Public services

Congress welcomes government commitment to extra investment in health, education and childcare but is opposed to policies of privatisation and marketisation for delivery. Measures such as Academy Schools and Independent Treatment Centres are expensive and inefficient and undermine collective provision and fairness. Whilst Congress supports greater efficiency, it strongly rejects the current reviews, which are all too often used to squeeze jobs and working conditions.

Congress demands that where public sector workforce reform is accompanied by new remuneration systems, they must be fully funded and end the gender pay gap.

Clearly the public want first class public services and this Congress must lead such a campaign.

Further, Congress demands that the Directive on Services in the Internal Market being debated in the

European Union is withdrawn, as it will promote further liberalisation and privatisation of public services, attack workers rights throughout Europe and undermine social and environmental standards.

Congress resolves to:

- i lead a campaign for world class public services;
- ii oppose the markets in health, education and criminal justice and the drive towards greater privatisation, under the false pretext of greater choice;
- iii continue our opposition to PFI/PPP and publicise failures;
- iv use the Public Services Forum to promote the workforce-led improvement agenda and support for quality local services; and
- v lead a high profile public campaign on the direct threat to public services from the Services Directive and promote this opposition within the ETUC.

UNISON

The following AMENDMENT was accepted

In paragraph 1, line 9, insert "worsen" before "working".

In paragraph 3, add a new second sentence:

"However, Congress believes that first-class public services for all are under threat from the freedoms and flexibilities now offered to entice private companies to pursue potentially profitable markets in the public services."

Insert new sub-paragraph iii) and re-number the others accordingly:

"iii) highlight the negative impact of privatisation and the threats posed to equality and social justice;"

National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers

The following AMENDMENT was accepted

Insert new paragraph 5:

"Congress also notes the threat to publicly owned Caledonian MacBrayne Clyde and Western Isles ferry services through the imposition of the 1992 EU Maritime Regulations which mean lifeline ferry services must be put out to tender."

Add new sub-paragraph vi):

"vi) oppose the forced tendering of CalMac ferry services and support the STUC campaign."

National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers

33 Civil Service job cuts

Congress congratulates the 200,000 civil and public servants who took national strike action last November against the Government's so-called efficiency agenda of job cuts and privatisation.

Following the action, Congress notes that national machinery was set up, measures to avoid compulsory redundancies were conceded, and planned cuts in sick pay were abandoned.

However, Congress notes that the Government's cuts are clearly worsening public services with the closure of DWP offices, severe problems with tax credits, massive privatisation in the MoD, and other problems in nearly every government department.

Congress calls on the Government to halt the Civil Service cuts programme and to engage with the unions in talks on planned change without redundancies or any deterioration in civil and public servants' terms and conditions.

Congress also calls on the General Council and Executive Committee to offer full support to the Civil Service unions should further national action against the cuts becomes necessary.

Congress further notes that the cuts are leading to an increase in outsourcing and privatisation, including the offshoring of National Savings work and of the Registry of Births, Deaths and Marriages.

Congress calls on the General Council to co-ordinate a campaign against the offshoring of public sector work on the grounds that:

- i it is unacceptable for the UK Government to seek to exploit the inferior pay, terms and conditions of workers abroad who do not enjoy the protection of strong trade unions and employment legislation; and
- ii it increases the risk of a deteriorating service for the public.

Public and Commercial Services Union

The following AMENDMENT was accepted

In paragraph 1, line 2, after "servants" insert "and all those who have campaigned and".

Add at end of paragraph 3, after "department": "and in Non-Departmental Public Bodies."

In paragraph 4, line 3, after "without" insert "compulsory".

In paragraph 6, line 1, after "to" insert: "unacceptable pressures on individual civil servants as well as to".

Prospect

34 Diversity

Congress welcomes the decision of the Public Services Forum to set up a task group on diversity. Through improved collaboration between government, trade unions and public service employers at national level, the aim of the task group is to:

- i adopt a more dynamic approach to workforce diversity;
- ii jointly develop a stronger service delivery and business case for diversity in the public sector;
- iii increase leadership capacity to lead and manage diversity; and
- iv work together to identify best practice and disseminate and promote good practice.

Congress applauds these objectives and welcomes the collaborative approach that has been adopted as being the most effective way to ensure that they are met.

Congress calls upon the Government to ensure that the work of the group is adequately resourced and that a realistic timeframe is agreed. This will help to ensure that the final recommendations will be of lasting and practical use and will have a major impact in increasing understanding of diversity and delivery of good practice at all levels within the public sector.

Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

35 The Supporting People programme - quality assessment framework

In relation to the Supporting People programme, Congress is seriously concerned at changes to target settings, to the quality assessment framework and to the policies of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Congress views these changes as unsound in both principle and practice.

Congress asks the General Council to voice its concern on these issues to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Government and to keep affiliates informed of progress.

Bakers, Food and Allied Workers' Union

36 Post Office

Congress welcomes the commitment in Labour's election manifesto to keep Royal Mail in the public sector.

Congress opposes the attempts of the industry's regulator, Postcomm, fully to liberalise the postal market in advance of the EU timetable, and with no review of the process. Congress also opposes the failure of Postcomm to propose a price control for Royal Mail that will allow for adequate public investment in the industry's services and staff.

Congress calls upon the Government to set aside these decisions in the Government's review of the impact of competition upon Royal Mail under the Postal Services Act 2000.

Congress supports the continuing campaign of the unions in Royal Mail to prevent any partial or full privatisation.

Communication Workers' Union

49 Education, science and research in Europe

Congress believes that a strong, dynamic and effective Europe requires a high-skill, knowledge-driven economy in which education, science and research are fundamental to sustainable, long-term growth and to an enriching of our societies. Congress is concerned that the EU spends a minimal amount on education, science and research in comparison to the rest of the EU budget. Congress is also concerned to note that Europe, the birthplace of higher education, risks seeing its universities overtaken, not just by those in the US but also by those in key developing countries such as China and India as they invest huge sums in their universities.

Congress welcomes the call by the Prime Minister and others for education to be at the heart of Europe.

Congress believes that if the Government is serious that the UK should be at the forefront of the European drive for a knowledge economy it must ensure this is the case through sustained investment in research and development and in our education system as a whole. In this context Congress is deeply concerned that many universities are shutting departments, cutting courses and sacking staff. Instead, Congress believes now is the time to expand and improve higher education and research and condemns those who are doing otherwise.

Congress therefore calls on the General Council to make the case to the Government and its European partners that investment in and support for research, science and education are essential to the future success of Europe.

Association of University Teachers

53 Criminalisation

Congress notes with concern the increasing trend towards the criminalisation of the maritime profession, as exemplified by the European ship-source pollution directive and Spain's continued attempts to take legal proceedings against the master of the tanker Prestige.

Congress calls on the UK Government to support the development of internationally agreed and enforced rules on the fair treatment of seafarers following maritime accidents to prevent individuals from being used as convenient scapegoats.

Congress further notes with concern the continued lack of transparency within the international shipping industry and the widespread use of flags of convenience and 'offshore' brass plate shell companies to mask the identity of vessel owners and operators. Congress calls upon the UK Government to take all necessary actions to increase transparency within the international maritime sector.

National Union of Marine, Aviation and Shipping Transport Officers

54 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 United Road Transport Union's campaign and lobby the Government to seek to have digital tachograph smartcards issued to professional lorry drivers at no cost to LGV drivers.

United Road Transport Union

55 Fire and rescue service emergency response standards in the UK

Congress is gravely concerned that communities in different parts of the UK, who are all equally exposed to the same level of risk from fire and other hazards, are subjected to widely varying emergency response times and standards from different local fire and rescue services - a situation which will only be exacerbated by the regionalisation of emergency fire control centres.

Firefighters and emergency fire control staff are well aware that the emergency response time is a critical factor when they are trying to save lives or property.

The government review of ambulance performance standards also recognised the critical nature of a maximum response time in saving lives. As such the review recommended that the ambulance service in the UK should organise its resources to meet a national emergency response standard.

Accordingly, and in the interests of public and firefighter safety, and to minimise property losses from fires, Congress demands that the Government works in partnership with all stakeholders to reintroduce a national emergency response standard for the fire and rescue service.

This national standard must set both maximum response times and minimum resource requirements.

Fire Brigades' Union

61 Re-nationalisation

Congress recognises now more than ever before the need to secure Britain's indigenous energy reserves. Security of supply is imperative if as a nation we aim to ensure a continued supply of energy without interference of any sort. With this in mind Congress agrees to support and develop the argument for the re-nationalisation of the British deep mine coal industry.

National Union of Mineworkers

64 Diversity in portrayal

Congress recognises that the United Kingdom population is a rich, diverse mix of people with different genders, ages, ethnic origins, disabilities and sexualities.

However, Congress notes that domestic audiovisual product fails to reflect our society, and so neglects to fulfil its potential to foster an understanding within the mix of our communities. Congress welcomes the work being undertaken by the UK Film Council, the Cultural Diversity Network and Broadcasting Cultural

Industries Disability Network, but considers the film and television industries are not doing enough to encourage forward thinking in the creative process or to change casting attitudes to accommodate a greater inclusiveness. Additionally, any qualitative evaluation must provide a detailed analysis within and across these groups to allow a real picture of portrayal to be assessed.

Congress, therefore, calls upon the Government to urge Ofcom and the UK Film Council to ensure the film and television industries take positive steps to address their portrayal of our society by engaging a truly representative spectrum of performers.

Equity

65 Conscience clause

Congress recognises the importance of a media free from commercial and political interference.

Congress notes with concern the prevalence of unbalanced, and often inaccurate, stories particularly about asylum seekers, refugees, Muslims and Roma appearing in the media.

Congress also notes the proven link between racist stories appearing in the media and the subsequent increase of racist attacks and of entrenching myths and stereotypes.

Congress acknowledges the part played by the NUJ in taking the lead in promoting ethical journalism and recognises the role played by the NUJ's Code of Conduct in promoting the fair, accurate and balanced coverage of stories.

Congress welcomes the NUJ's Conscience Clause, part of the union's Code of Conduct, and supports the rights of journalists to refuse to contribute to a story if by doing so they break the Code of Conduct. Congress believes journalists should be protected against disciplinary action should they act in accordance with the code.

Congress calls on newspaper editors, broadcasters, MPs, MSPs and AMs to back the NUJ's Conscience Clause, which, it believes, will enhance public trust at the same time as promoting an informed and accurate debate about these issues, and calls on the TUC and affiliates actively to lobby for such action.

National Union of Journalists

66 Against censorship

Congress notes with concern the events at Birmingham Repertory Theatre in December 2004.

The play "Behzti" written by Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti was the subject of violent protests by some members of the Sikh community, as a result of which all further performances of the play were cancelled.

Congress further notes with concern the orchestrated campaign on behalf of religious groups which led to the British Broadcasting Corporation receiving over 50,000 protests against the proposed broadcasting of "Jerry Springer - The Opera", seeking to suppress the work prior to broadcast.

Congress is disturbed by the inability of the UK Government and the local police service to provide security for legitimate theatrical performances.

It is understandable that Birmingham Repertory Theatre abandoned its production of "Behzti" when faced with physical threats and damage to the theatre premises, and potential danger to audiences of other unconnected productions including a children's Christmas entertainment.

Congress believes that theatres, other media, creators and audiences must all redouble their efforts to combat all forms of censorship, particularly censorship by violence, and while respecting recognised religious groups, Congress deplores attempts at censorship

carried out by representatives of religious organisations.

Congress applauds the BBC for its refusal to cave in to a highly organised campaign intended to force the BBC into an act of self-censorship.

Congress calls on affiliated unions and the General Council to publicise such cases, co-ordinate resistance to censorship and support creators and other workers who may be affected by censorship.

Writers' Guild of Great Britain

67 Broadcasters and entertainment promoters' honesty code

Congress notes that the use of recorded music or high tech digital devices to accompany live performance is becoming increasingly commonplace. In addition, the playback of pre-recorded backing tracks on television programmes such as "Top of the Pops" is wholly inappropriate when they purport to be broadcasting 'live' performances.

Congress understands that, on rare occasions, there may be reasons that make it impractical to use live musicians and backing singers. It also realises that a number of contemporary music genres rely upon pre-recorded samples and the creative use of existing recordings.

Audiences who attend live music events, including rock and pop arena concerts, touring ballet productions, and even the local pantomime, and who are confronted by an artist miming to a tape, with no visible band providing an accompaniment, are being misled and short-changed.

Congress asks the General Council to back the introduction of an 'honesty code' to which all promoters and broadcasters will be asked to sign up. It will simply require that audiences are informed when artists are not performing live or are being accompanied by tape. The code will serve a two-fold purpose: firstly to enable consumers to make an informed decision before they buy a ticket or switch on their TV, and secondly to give due recognition to the value and the thrill of live performance.

Musicians' Union

71 Children in Family Court proceedings

Congress believes that, in accordance with current legislation, the welfare of the child must remain the paramount consideration of the Family Court system. Congress calls on the General Council to resist any proposals to change the law from a 'welfare of children' model to a 'justice for parents' model.

napo

The following AMENDMENT was WITHDRAWN

Add new paragraph at end:

"Congress urges that the model incorporates proper assessment, whereby the voice of the child is fully heard and respected. Congress notes the value of the psychological professions in supporting children to express their view, particularly in the light of their social and emotional well-being."

Association of Educational Psychologists

72 Social responsibility

Congress notes that the Professional Footballers' Association is calling on fellow unions to use their strength of membership and profile to benefit the wider community. As a union it places great importance on ensuring that it uses its profile and position to the best possible end.

Congress notes that the PFA continues to support young people to rebuild their lives by its support of the

Prince's Trust whom it assists not just financially but also in helping young people to gain work placements within the world of football.

PFA members, often against a backdrop of criticism, work many hours for charitable causes. Indeed, every professional contract contains a requirement that players must participate in a minimum of 2/3 hours per week on community projects, et cetera.

Notable charities currently supported by the PFA include Oxfam, Cancer Research, the National Literacy Trust, the Prince's Trust, Tackle Africa, Sports Relief, Football Aid, Oil Aid for the Tsunami Appeal plus many at local level.

Congress believes that a social conscience is vital to the mission statement of every responsible union. Congress calls on all unions to follow the lead of the PFA and consider the best ways in which they might use their powers for the greater good of not just their members but of those less fortunate.

Professional Footballers' Association

73 Women internationally

Congress notes that 2005 brings the review of the UN decade for women, Platform for Action, and of the Millennium Development Goals to eliminate world poverty and promote gender equality, and condemns the continuing poverty of women, the primary victims of violence in the world.

Congress notes with profound concern that although women grow up to 80 per cent of the food in the poorest regions of the world, they are twice as likely to live and die in poverty as men. Seventy per cent of the world's poor are women; their human rights are being violated across the world, including trafficking, attacks on trade unionists, reproductive rights, and public services. Their work, including caring, is undervalued, underpaid, dangerous and stressful. They are under-represented and excluded from political involvement; and war and militarisation breeds new levels of violence towards women and increasing poverty. Half a million women die in pregnancy or childbirth every year, women's rates of HIV infection are overtaking those of men, and two-thirds of the children not enrolled in schools are girls. In welcoming the leadership being shown by the British Government in the drive to mobilise the countries of the European Union and the G8 - hosted by Britain in 2005 - to achieve the Millennium Development Goals by 2015, Congress urges the Government to ensure that aid policies contribute to tackling the underlying causes of gender inequality and the oppression of women in developing countries.

Congress recognises that the eradication of this wretched poverty will only be achieved when the debts that the developed world hold over the developing world are cancelled.

Congress calls on the Government to use some of the aid budget to investigate producing cheaper, generic brands of the recognised HIV/AIDS treatments to be offered to those countries where the AIDS pandemic is raging.

Congress recalls that women trade unionists in Asia, Africa and Latin America have been among the foremost in struggles against oppression and exploitation in many developing countries and urges the Government to include in the British aid programme provision for trade union training as a most cost-effective means of fighting injustice, promoting good governance, and combating poverty.

Congress notes that International Women's Day is a day to raise the awareness of women's contribution to society and to remember the centuries-old courageous struggle by women for the right to participate in society on an equal footing to men.

Congress applauds the TGWU's ongoing campaign to make International Women's Day an additional bank holiday as it is in many other countries and demands that in line with other campaigning activities, we embrace the campaign led by the TGWU and Amicus to ensure its just end.

Congress also notes that the pay gap between men and women has not declined since Labour has been in power and believes that the vigorous campaigning should continue to address this issue.

Congress welcomes the work by the DTI's Women and Equality Unit which has sought to stimulate activities in schools to mark International Women's Day. Congress calls on the General Council to urge the DfES to make a similar commitment to schools on strategies for using International Women's Day to raise awareness of continuing discrimination against women across the world.

Congress calls for the General Council and affiliates to:

- i) support the proposed action from the 2004 TUC Women's Conference;
- ii) use 2005 to build international solidarity, with women central to the TUC international agenda;
- iii) lobby Government for a fair deal for women worldwide: debt cancellation, fair trade, core labour standards, and UN Convention 1325 on women and conflict resolution;
- iv) support the World March of Women; and
- v) campaign for March 8 (IWD) as a public holiday.

TUC Women's Conference (exempt from 250 word limit)

74 Globalisation

Congress agrees that globalisation today is one of the biggest threats to workers' jobs, conditions, health, well-being and prosperity, as global capital runs amok due to the disgraceful activities of multinational and transnational companies. As such, Congress also agrees that the only way to combat such a threat is through coordinated international trade union activity.

Therefore, Congress calls on the TUC through its national and international affiliations to:

- i) ensure that assistance is given to developing nations' trade unions in order that they can flourish and be truly independent;
- ii) campaign in the global arena to raise workplace standards in developing nations;
- iii) campaign in the global arena to raise workplace health and safety standards in developing nations;
- iv) assist national trade unions and other organisations to make links across the globe; and
- v) help raise awareness of the excesses of globalisation.

This will help create a more level playing field and mitigate some of the worst attributes of globalisation.

Bakers, Food and Allied Workers' Union

The following AMENDMENT was accepted

Add at end of sub-paragraph iii): ",incorporating the principle of trade union and worker involvement that UK research has shown is key to such improvement - specifically through the establishment of Health and Safety Commissions to offer expertise and practical resource".

Public and Commercial Services Union

The following AMENDMENT was accepted

At the start of paragraph 2, insert: "Congress believes unions are a source of stability in a globalised world and are central to the success of free and open societies."

At end of sub-paragraph iv), after "globe", insert: "as part of their fight for common employment and democratic standards".

Association of University Teachers

75 EU Constitution

Congress recognises the rejection of the EU Constitution by the peoples of France and the Netherlands. Congress therefore rejects the current proposed EU Constitution.

Congress is concerned that parts of the unratified EU Constitution are being imposed, including the development of an EU diplomatic service and the creation of a Defence Agency to militarise the EU further.

Congress believes that such illegal 'cherry picking' of the discredited EU Constitution cannot continue without a mandate and the ratification process must be brought to an end.

Congress further rejects the increasingly neo-liberal policies emanating from Brussels. Such policies include EU directives that enforce the 'liberalisation' of freight and passenger rail services across the European Union and lifeline ferry services such as Caledonian MacBrayne in Scotland.

Congress also reaffirms its opposition to the planned Directive on Services, which threatens to undermine decent public services, wages, conditions and social protection across the EU and beyond.

Congress rejects a European agenda which is elitist, militarist, corporate and anti-democratic.

Congress therefore resolves to campaign for a European and global workers' agenda which enshrines:

- i) an end to neo-liberal policies and the privatisation of public services;
- ii) the democratic rights of states, democracy and freedom;
- iii) the strengthening of trade union and workers rights; and
- iv) international peace and solidarity, not militarism.

National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers

The following AMENDMENT was LOST

In paragraph 1, line 3, delete "rejects" and insert "accepts that it is timely to reflect on".

In paragraph 2, line 2, delete from "the" to "further" in line 5 and replace with "defence co-operation".

Delete the paragraph 3.

In paragraph 4, line 2, delete "Brussels" and replace with "the Council of Ministers".

In paragraph 6, add after "anti-democratic" at end: "and calls for re-dedication to the values of promoting peace, solidarity and social justice demonstrated in continuing invaluable and irreplaceable EU work for equality, environmental protection, and employee rights".

In paragraph 7 insert new first bullet point (and renumber thereafter):

"i) full employment as the primary goal;"

Community

76 China

Congress notes that sustained rapid increases in economic growth and investment have made China a dominant influence on global economic developments. China has the potential to raise living standards globally and contribute to the defeat of world poverty, but also to aggravate seriously climate change and other environmental problems, increase global

unemployment and lead to a deterioration of working conditions in developing and industrialised countries, particularly in manufacturing.

Congress is convinced that the vast problems of structural transformation would be tackled most effectively, as well as justly, to the benefit of Chinese working people and workers in other countries if they had effective independent trade unions to represent them. Congress calls on the General Council to work with the ICFTU and international trade secretariats in promoting independent trade union development and in exposing violations of trade union and other basic human rights in employment.

Congress recognises that the recent rapid expansion of Chinese exports of textiles and clothing has had a most damaging impact on employment in the sectors in the rest of the world, notably in Bangladesh, and calls on the British Government to intensify cooperation with the Commission and other governments in the European Union to negotiate agreements to minimise the adverse social and economic consequences.

Congress urges the Government and the EU authorities to press China to fulfil its obligations under World Trade Organisation rules by:

- i widening access to exports from EU countries; and
- ii revaluing the Yuan and eliminating the unfair competitive advantage which China presently exploits.

Community

77 Iraq

Congress notes with concern the deteriorating situation in Iraq both in terms of security and social amenities.

Congress regrets the failure of the US and British Governments to set an early date for a speedy withdrawal of all troops from Iraq as called for by the TUC 2004.

Congress asserts that the continued illegal occupation of Iraq is a contributory factor, and not the solution, to the increasing terrorist activities in and outside Iraq.

Congress affirms that those who, in the name of resistance to the occupation, target civilian populations, whether in or outside Iraq, commit criminal acts that do no service to the cause of peace.

Congress welcomes the contact made with Iraqi trade unionists and trade union organisations and calls on the General Council to ensure that in such contacts the question of the speedy departure of the occupying troops is firmly on the agenda and that assistance is given to support trade union education.

Congress believes that the continued presence of British troops in Iraq is morally and legally indefensible. In the absence of an early departure date being agreed with the US administration, Congress calls on the British Government to set its own unilateral date for an early and speedy departure from Iraq.

Community and Youth Workers' Union

The following AMENDMENT was accepted

Add new paragraph at end:

"Congress calls on unions to prioritise solidarity with bone fide Iraqi/Kurdish trade unions, and to support the TUC Iraq Solidarity Committee in promoting:

- i visits to Britain;
- ii twinning;
- iii union education and training;
- iv financial and material support; and
- v a strongly supportive role for women trade unionists."

NATFHE - The University and College Lecturers' Union

The following AMENDMENT was accepted

Add new paragraph at end:

"Congress calls on the British and Iraqi governments and international institutions to:

- i) cancel all debts incurred by Saddam Hussein;
- ii) ensure Iraqi laws and practices embody ILO core conventions including tripartism and workers' rights, equality and religious tolerance; and
- iii) reject privatisation of essential public services and vital resources such as oil."

Fire Brigades' Union

78 The Western Sahara

Congress condemns the recent violence of the Moroccan State against the Saharawi citizens participating in week-long peaceful demonstrations starting 25 May 2005 within the occupied territories of Western Sahara in El Aiun.

This repression highlights the lack of progress by the international community in bringing about an acceptable solution to this 32-year conflict and comes despite numerous European and UN resolutions that support the Saharawis' right to self-determination and the right to a referendum. The lack of compliance by the Moroccan state can only be interpreted as a blatant defiance of human rights.

The plight of the Saharawi people is silent and invisible, despite their cooperation and willingness to come to a peaceful and negotiated settlement. The recent demonstrations only show the desperation and frustration felt by the people of the Western Sahara.

Congress therefore calls upon the General Council to continue supporting the Polisario and for trade unionists and related campaigners to bring about a resolution to the conflict by raising the issues with the UK Government. Congress also calls on the General Council to:

- i call for a meeting with the relevant government department to raise its concerns;
- ii support and help organise a trade union and political delegation to visit the refugee camps and the occupied territories;
- iii publicise the plight of the people of the Western Sahara amongst all affiliates;
- iv actively support the Sandblast Project; and
- v raise the issues amongst the international trade union movement.

Fire Brigades' Union

79 Venezuela

Congress congratulates and supports the Venezuelan Government for its utilisation of the country's wealth and resources for reforms to benefit working people, the poor and the landless.

Congress notes the results of the referendum last August in Venezuela that gave President Hugo Chávez an overwhelming victory and a strengthened democratic mandate.

Congress further notes that these results confirm that there is overwhelming support among working people and the poor for the social programme of the Chávez Government in relation to education, literacy, job training, healthcare, land reform and subsidised food.

However, Congress views with alarm the bellicose statements being made by the US Administration and its allies in Colombia and the oligarchy in Venezuela which pose a real threat to these reforms.

Congress deplores the attempts of the United States Administration to intervene in the internal life of Venezuela and agrees to raise these concerns with the British Government.

Congress agrees to support wider trade union initiatives to highlight the issue of Venezuela within the British labour movement, including the organisation of a trade union delegation to meet and build links with Venezuelan trade unionists.

Furthermore, Congress will build and work with trade union endorsed organisations in the UK working to provide solidarity to Venezuela.

NATFHE - The University and College Lecturers' Union

The following AMENDMENT was accepted

Add at end of paragraph 5: "Congress expresses its solidarity with trade unionists in Venezuela and rejects any outside interference in their affairs."

Association of University Teachers

The following AMENDMENT was accepted

Add new paragraph at end:

"Congress is concerned about the lack of media coverage of events in Venezuela and urges the General Council to establish relations with the Venezuelan National Union of Workers (UNT) to ensure that news of trade union issues, at least, is more widely reported."

Transport Salaried Staffs' Association

The following AMENDMENT was accepted

Add new paragraphs at end:

"Congress notes the independent poll in July that showed over 70percent support for Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez. It also notes the Venezuelan threat to suspend oil exports to the US if attacks on its government continue.

Congress resolves to support the Venezuelan people's efforts to preserve their democratically elected government."

Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen

80 Migrant workers

Congress recognises the important contribution of migrant workers to the UK's economic and cultural development. At the same time, Congress is concerned that many migrant workers often face racism and exploitation in the workplace.

Congress welcomes the initiatives already taken by the TUC in promoting rights for migrant workers, in particular health and safety information jointly produced with the HSE which is available in a number of languages, and the Working in the UK: Your Rights booklet which explains employment rights.

Congress calls on the General Council to continue campaigning for the rights of migrant workers and in particular to make representations to government for:

- i the regulation of agencies to prevent 'regime shopping' and social dumping;
- ii improvements in the Posted Workers Directive to provide real protections for migrant workers and safeguarding of collective agreements; and

- iii a review of current regulations which place procedural restrictions on the employment of migrant workers and asylum seekers.

Congress recognises the valuable role of many organisations in promoting the rights of migrant workers. In particular Congress recognises the valuable contribution of TUC affiliated organisations in representing and organising migrant workers.

Congress notes the creative initiatives taken by affiliates to promote migrant workers rights through training, health and safety and other projects, which are designed to provide assistance to migrant workers.

Congress asks the General Council to determine the best way of promoting current best practice in the representation and organisation of migrant workers to TUC affiliates.

Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians

81 Organising in Europe

Congress recognises that the establishment of trans-national businesses across the EU offers opportunities and challenges. Opportunities for unions to provide a voice to a diverse workforce; challenges to our core responsibilities of representing, negotiating and organising members and potential members.

Congress recognises that a growing number of unions are looking at how they might use this opportunity, but are frustrated by a legislative framework that lags some way behind the flexibility and fleetness of foot shown by business.

Congress agrees, as matter of some urgency, to establish a task group to identify changes in legislation at the national and/or EU level that are required to:

- i enable trade unions within the EU to represent their members collectively and individually in all member states of the EU; and
- ii ensure collective agreements and individual contracts of employment are enforceable across the EU.

Through its membership of the ETUC and drawing on the experience of European works councils, Congress also seeks to establish:

- a) a centre of excellence collating information and developing models of representation for employees of companies with establishments in more than one member state of the EU;
- b) the equivalent of the 'Bridlington Principles' for the organisation and representation of employees in the EU; and
- c) where more than one national union has an interest in a company, a mechanism to assist the unions concerned in agreeing the scope and nature of representation at both the local and EU level.

The British Air Line Pilots' Association

86 Stress and job design

Congress notes with concern the rising tide of work-related stress, which affects all sectors of the workforce.

Congress supports the Health and Safety Executive's (HSE) revised management standards for stress and calls on all affiliates to work with the HSE and employers to agree and implement standards of good management practice for preventing work-related stress. The HSE must be properly resourced to ensure effective enforcement of stress standards and safety representatives trained in risk assessment for stress.

However, Congress recognises that regulation and enforcement actions are the principal reasons why

employers take measures to improve their health and safety practices and procedures. Therefore, Congress calls on the General Council to press for regulations and an Approved Code of Practice on stress, to be backed by a funded programme of HSE enforcement.

Congress also calls on the General Council to seek changes to the RIDDOR reporting system criteria in order that companies have to report absences from work due to stress.

Congress believes that work organisation and job design are critical to workers' health and well-being and calls on the General Council to campaign more widely for:

- i autonomy and control over the pace of work and the working environment; and
- ii an effective voice for workers in the decisions that affect the structure, content and loading of jobs.

Prospect

87 Second-hand smoking in the workplace

Whilst Congress welcomes the proposals contained in the White Paper and forthcoming Bill on public health aimed at ending smoking in the majority of workplaces and enclosed public places, it does not support the proposal to exempt smoking restrictions in pubs, clubs and private members' clubs that do not serve prepared food. A large percentage of performers work in such venues and the proposed exemption will undoubtedly seriously disadvantage them.

Congress believes there can be no good reason to protect most workers but still leave performers, bar staff and others in the leisure and hospitality sector exposed to risk. Many live music venues will be exempted under this proposal and many musicians who have to work in such places will suffer serious health damage in future years as a result. People who work to entertain and serve others deserve better than to choke on other people's poisonous smoke.

Congress therefore urges the General Council to put pressure on the Government to 'sound the trumpet' for clean air, drop the proposed exemptions, follow the Irish and Scottish model, and introduce comprehensive legislation that ends smoking in all workplaces and enclosed public places. This would be the most important advance in workplace health and safety and in public health for many years.

Musicians' Union

The following AMENDMENT was accepted

Add at end of final paragraph: "It would also recognise the fact that the harmful effects of tobacco inhalation are not limited to lung cancer. For example, exposure to other people's tobacco smoke can cause reduced lung function in people with no previous respiratory problems and can be especially dangerous to those with asthma."

Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

88 Fatigue at sea

Congress expresses its extreme concern at the large number of accidents around the UK coast involving ships in collision or running aground as a result of seafarer fatigue. The rate of such incidents indicates that excessive working hours and inadequate crewing levels are presenting a major threat to safety and having adverse effects on the health and welfare of seafarers.

Congress notes the existence of national, European and international regulations covering working hours and rest periods at sea and calls for the UK Government to police and enforce these rules on all UK registered ships and all foreign flag ships in UK waters.

Congress also demands effective international action to prevent unfair competition from different countries permitting ever lower ships' crew levels and urges the UK Government to secure such international measures urgently.

In addition, Congress also urges the UK Government to review the statutory safe manning certificate levels on UK ships, to increase the minimum numbers to allow for the significant extra workloads arising from the new security and other requirements.

National Union of Marine, Aviation and Shipping Transport Officers

89 Trade union organisation

Congress recognises and acknowledges the continuing trend of TUC affiliates to combine, by way of merger and other methods, into new and ever larger units of organisation.

Congress recognises and understands the many reasons why affiliates have chosen in the interests of their respective memberships to become part of larger units. Congress, however, believes that the TUC should itself consider the implications of such mergers upon its own democratic structures and its continuing role as a trade union centre. In particular it should consider the services it is able to provide to those smaller affiliates who have chosen to retain their existing structures and identities.

To this end Congress calls upon the General Council to establish a small, time-limited working party to consider these issues and to report back to Congress with any conclusions at the Congress of 2006. The working party should include representation of some of those unions not otherwise represented on the General Council.

Equity

The following AMENDMENT was accepted

Add final sentence at end: "The working party should actively seek the views of representatives from the national executives of smaller affiliates on the Congress they believe would most add value and how these might be delivered. This active involvement should include convening a seminar for such representatives as part of the time-limited activity."

British Air Line Pilots' Association

The following AMENDMENT was accepted

Add new sentence to end of paragraph 1: "Congress also recognises the valuable job done by smaller affiliates on behalf of specialist groups of workers."

napo

Composite 1 Fairness at work

Congress recalls that 102 years ago, under powers derived from the Taff Vale judgement, railway employers sued the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants for £23,000 for taking industrial action. Congress notes the subsequent 1906 Trades Disputes Act removed trade union liability for damages caused by strike action.

Congress notes that trade union rights have deteriorated since 1906 and unions are again liable for damage caused by strike action. Today National Express and Tyne and Wear Metro are using these laws to threaten the RMT with penalties totalling £500,000 for taking industrial action. Congress reiterates its policy of repealing the anti-trade union laws and on the reintroduction of laws to prevent any trade union from taking industrial action.

Congress calls for the repeal of the anti-union laws and their replacement with a framework of positive rights, in accordance with minimum ILO standards, including:

- i) giving unions the right to organise industrial action, including solidarity action, without the threat of legal proceedings by employers and for workers taking lawful industrial action to be protected from dismissal;
- ii) providing employment rights from day one of employment;
- iii) allowing every worker to be represented individually and collectively by a trade union on any issue;
- iv) extending paid time off for all family-friendly leave provided by statute;
- v) allowing unions to trigger statutory equal pay audits and appoint equality reps;
- vi) allowing unions to choose to conduct workplace ballots;
- vii) strengthening unfair dismissal legislation, ensuring an enforceable right to reinstatement;
- viii) improving time off and facilities for union workplace reps;
- ix) strengthening protection against exploitation and discrimination of migrant, agency, and temporary workers, and women, black workers and those in smaller firms;
- x) ensuring workers receive proper compensation when their employer is declared bankrupt; and
- xi) ensuring pensions, training and equality are included as issues on which collective bargaining must take place when statutory recognition is awarded.

Congress congratulates the General Council for its campaigns around fairness at work and calls for further campaigning around the long hours culture and rights for workers to have greater control over their personal, family and working lives, their working time and when and for how long they work.

Congress welcomes the National Minimum Wage and paid holidays but recognises it must build a long-term campaign, building on the TUC charter Modern Rights for Modern Workplaces and the IER Workers' Charter, to ensure our members are fully aware of the facts and to take the arguments to a wider audience. This should combine a broad range of trade unionists, sympathetic lawyers, academics and politicians into a common cause.

To coincide with the 100th anniversary of the Trades Disputes Act in 2006, Congress agrees to support a campaign for a Trade Union Freedom Bill. This bill should include:

- a) the abolition of restrictive balloting and industrial action notice procedures;
- b) the right to strike and the right to automatic reinstatement for taking lawful industrial action;
- c) the freedom to take solidarity action for workers who are in dispute; and
- d) sectoral forums to establish minimum terms and conditions.

Congress requests the campaign for a Trade Union Freedom Bill be supported by a national march, rally and lobby of Parliament in 2006.

Congress reaffirms its decision 'that affiliates and all independent trade unions should have the right to draw up their own rulebook, free from interference from legislation designed to curtail the efficacy of the fundamental rights of individuals to make and form trade unions'.

Congress notes that the UK Government signed up to the ILO and ECHR, which enshrine that right and also notes that the European Court of Human Rights has already concluded: 'The right to join a union 'for the protection of his interests' cannot be interpreted as

conferring a general right to join a union of one's choice, irrespective of the rules of the union. In the exercise of their rights under Article 11(1) unions must remain free to decide in accordance with union rules questions concerning admission to and expulsion from the union.'

Congress believes that unions do not want to exclude, expel or discipline individuals on grounds of race, gender, sexual orientation, or even political allegiance, nor would they, save that they want to disassociate themselves from racists and fascists and want to reserve the right to discipline those who undermine a union's calls for industrial action.

Congress reaffirms its support to challenges by affiliates to ss64-68A TULR(C)A, for claims for so-called 'unjustifiable discipline', which undermine the right to take industrial action, and ss174-177, which restrict the rights of unions to exclude or expel those with whom they strongly object to associating.

Congress should therefore establish a fund to cover legal challenges, as deemed appropriate by the General Council.

Congress asserts the right of trade unions to be self-governing and calls upon the General Council to review the impact on trade union organisation of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 and subject to its outcome, formulate proposals and campaign for the repeal of the appropriate sections.

Mover: Transport and General Workers' Union

Seconder: National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers

Supporters: Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen

Communication Workers' Union

Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers

National Union of Journalists

Prison Officers' Association

National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers

Composite 2 Employment status

Congress recognises that a significant proportion of the UK workforce are now engaged on freelance and short-term contracts and that in many industries there is widespread use of sham contracts, which include substitution clauses and other devices, which are designed to show a lack of mutuality of obligation between the worker and the employer.

Congress notes that the lack of progress in resolving the uncertainty over employment status is a particular concern in industries such as construction, where mass false self-employment is still a major problem. As a result thousands of workers are denied their employment rights.

Congress recognises that these workers face particular and pressing problems in their employment, including:

- i) a continuing confusion over legal employment status, with some individuals counting as 'employees', some counting as 'workers' and some counting as neither, with severe consequences for employment rights;
- ii) severe job insecurity, which is exploited by some employers to impose inferior terms and conditions and to offload all risk (e.g. public liability insurance, accident insurance) onto workers;
- iii) excessively long hours of work allied to routine contractual waivers of the right to a maximum 48-hour week;
- iv) low hourly rates of pay, sometimes below minimum wage levels, and with the use in sectors such as the media of exploitative 'deferred pay' contracts; and
- v) inferior standards of health and safety, equal opportunities and training provision.

Congress notes the delay in the publication of the Government's response to the consultation document

on employment status. Congress recognises that the denial of employment rights to workers whose employment status is unclear is an important area of unfinished business from the Employment Relations Act 1999.

Congress is also concerned at the continued lack of progress towards the adoption of an EU Temporary Agency Workers Directive. Current legislation can be used to deny agency workers any effective protection where it is not possible to determine the agency worker's employer.

Congress recognises that changes to the law on employment status would contribute positively to the Government's strategy for promoting fairness, flexibility and productivity in the workplace.

Congress welcomes the TUC campaigns that have pressed the case for an extension of employment rights to all workers. Congress strongly urges the TUC General Council to make further representations to the Government on these matters and promote campaigning activities that extend employment rights to all workers.

Congress therefore calls on the General Council to continue to campaign for:

- a) comprehensive employment rights for all workers, including a new and inclusive legal definition of 'worker';
- b) an end to the 48-hour opt-out and to compulsory waiver clauses; and
- c) opposition to the further undermining of workers conditions through the deregulatory draft Directive on Services in the Internal Market.

Mover: Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians

Seconders: Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union

Composite 3 Women and Work Commission

Congress welcomes the interim statement from the Women and Work Commission and looks forward to its final report. It further affirms the need to ensure effective action around the final report, and in line with resolutions 10 and 16 carried at the 2004 Congress agrees to:

- i) promote mandatory equal pay audits to tackle pay discrimination with particular regard to women workers transferred from the public to the private sector, and to underpin them with effective enforcement measures;
- ii) encourage business investors and trade unions to provide input to the Standards Board proposed by the Company Law Review;
- iii) support measures to overcome gender segregation in employment, including tax credits for training to overcome under-representation in job categories;
- iv) press for the extension of the eskills initiative on computer clubs for girls (which encourages IT training for girls in secondary education) in order to address and reverse the decline in the number of women entering the IT profession;
- v) support measures to overcome low pay by childcare providers to ensure a successful extension of child care provision in line with government ambitions; and
- vi) support measures to allow unions to pursue collective actions in cases where there would otherwise be numerous individual claims.

Congress believes that these actions need to be set within the context of a proactive challenge to the continued dominance of male cultural norms that perpetuate women's oppression in the workplace.

Mover: Communication Workers' Union

Seconders: NATFHE - The University and College Lecturers Union

Supporters: Connect

Transport and Salaried Staff Association

Composite 4 Parents, carers and childcare

Congress welcomes the Labour Government's enduring commitment to improving workplace provision for parents and carers in the UK labour market and the ongoing commitment that the Government has shown to childcare, in particular the announcements made in the recent ten-year childcare strategy.

Congress believes the Labour Government's historic third term represents an invaluable opportunity to continue developing and embedding rights for parents and carers. To that end, Congress notes the commitment given at the Warwick Social Policy Forum to review the statutory provision of paid parental leave.

However, the Government's recent Choice and Flexibility consultation focused entirely on maternity leave and the right to request flexible working. The omission of parental leave from the consultation seriously undermines the Government's stated intention of finding ways for fathers to be more involved in their children's lives.

Congress notes that a lack of quality, affordable childcare has a huge impact on family life as well as on people's ability to take paid work. The UK's 24-hour economy means that many people work night shifts or are in jobs that require them to work late or start very early in the morning.

Congress welcomes the recognition in the ten-year childcare strategy that investment in the supply side of childcare is key to overcoming shortages. However, there is still a huge shortage of childcare for those who work 'non-standard' hours. For too long the UK has relied on the private sector to provide the bulk of its childcare, and this has been at the expense of the childcare workforce. Currently childcare workers receive an average wage that is 35 per cent lower than the average hourly wage received by women working part time in the UK. In recognition of the vital contribution that these workers make to society, and in order for the Government's ambitious childcare targets to be met, there needs to be substantial and sustainable investment in the pay and career opportunities for the childcare workforce.

There is also a continuing and urgent need to work with Government to examine how best to promote access to parental leave, particularly amongst men. Congress reaffirms its view that introducing statutory paid and flexible parental leave is the most effective way forward. Congress also believes there is a need for improved flexibility and pay around paternity leave itself.

Congress therefore urges the General Council and all affiliates to:

- i) continue to lobby the UK Government to make provision for paid and more flexible parental leave;
- ii) ensure workers' awareness is raised and access improved to all current and future provision for parents and carers; and
- iii) ensure best practice is shared and promoted amongst all affiliates.

In addition Congress urges the Government to increase investment in the supply side of childcare, and in childcare for those parents who work night shifts and non-standard hours, to ensure that all families have access to the childcare they need.

Mover: Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers

Seconders: British and Irish Orthoptic Society

Composite 5 Opposing racism and fascism

Congress welcomes the TUC campaign in the general election to defend communities from the racially divisive and incendiary politics of the BNP.

Congress deplores attempts by the BNP to exploit the London bombings to stir up racial and religious hatred. Extreme far-right groups such as the BNP, Combat 18 and the National Front are fascist and racist organisations that stand for an all white Britain, the destruction of trade unions and the elimination of basic human rights. Such views and beliefs are incompatible with the ethos and purpose of public services and Congress asserts that those who publicly proclaim their affiliation to such organisations should not be able to work within the public sector.

Congress believes the increase in racial attacks against a background of hostile political party policies on asylum seekers and immigration reflects the need for all democratic bodies to accept the responsibility of tackling racism and that urgent steps are needed to tackle the root causes of the poverty and unemployment that exist in disadvantaged communities and to combat racism in all its forms.

Congress believes that the Employment Act 2004 goes some way towards widening the ability for trade unions to exclude BNP members on grounds of their activities.

However, Congress does not accept that BNP membership is compatible with trade union membership and resolves to campaign for legislation to enable unions to deny membership to those belonging to organisations whose policies or practice are racist and resolves to support union activists who have been subject to intimidation from far right organisations.

Congress supports the vital role of education in building a tolerant, multi-cultural society, and in particular in confronting racism in communities that have a low concentration of minority ethnic learners. Congress welcomes the commitment of the Government to fund work in education establishments to meet the needs of minority ethnic learners and those whose first language is not English and calls on the Government to provide funding mechanisms that enable flexible responses in circumstances of rapid change in the numbers of these learners in any community.

Congress believes there can be no complacency in defeating the far right whenever they stand for election to public office. There should be no BNP representative returned to public office there should be no room for their politics in the UK political establishment.

Congress calls upon the General Council to:

- i) prioritise campaigning against the BNP during 2006 local authority elections and urges affiliates to co-ordinate community campaigns to ensure that far-right candidates are defeated. Congress believes that community-based campaigns work best, as union members, active in their communities, are able to remain in the area and support long-term anti-racist and education initiatives that rebuild the unity required to defeat the BNP;
- ii) co-ordinate the activities of affiliate unions in developing a trade union-led, national and regional fight against the BNP and fascist organisations. Furthermore, the General Council and regional TUC's should establish urgently national and regional task groups, to enable trade union affiliates to co-ordinate their activities;
- iii) press the Government to review its intense pressure on education establishments to achieve excessively narrowly defined targets, which acts as a disincentive for them to focus on tackling racism, and may conflict with their statutory duty to promote good race relations; and

iv) mount a campaign to seek to secure appropriate regulation and legislation in line with the provisions that already apply to service within the police force to apply to those individuals who proclaim their affiliation to extreme far-right organisations.

Mover: Amicus

Seconded: National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers

**Supporters: Association of Teachers and Lecturers
UNISON
GMB**

Composite 6 Amendment to Equality Bill

Congress notes that the current Equality Bill introduced in the House of Lords on 18th May 2005, introduces protection against discrimination in the provision of goods, facilities and services on grounds of religion and belief.

Congress is dismayed that the Bill has not also been used to introduce protection from such discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation. This leaves LGBT people as the only strand, apart from age, without this protection, and leaves the impression that the right to sexual orientation equality has not been established or has lower status.

Congress notes the Government's review of equalities legislation and commitment to its 'modernisation' into a Single Equality Act. However, such harmonised legislation is still some years away.

Congress believes that this is unacceptable and that the current Equality Bill must be amended to include protection from discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation in goods and services.

Congress calls on the Government to introduce such an amendment at the earliest opportunity to ensure legislation is introduced for LGBT people to receive full equal rights analogous to the protection provided within the Sex Discrimination Act and the Race Relations (Amendment) Act.

Congress also resolves that the General Council and affiliated unions should press strongly for an amendment to the Equality Bill to require that appointments to the Board and Committees of the new Commission for Equality and Human Rights must include people with experience as trade unionists.

Congress therefore calls on the General Council and affiliate unions to escalate their lobbying and maintain the maximum pressure for such an amendment.

Mover: TUC Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Conference

Seconded: FDA

Supporter: Nationwide Group Staff Union

Composite 7 Age discrimination

Congress notes the Government's decision to impose a default mandatory retirement age of 65 into the forthcoming regulations to implement EU Age Discrimination laws. The need to avoid workers being coerced into working beyond normal retirement age and the implications for the whole workforce need to be balanced with the right of employees to determine their own retirement age to reflect personal, including financial, circumstances.

Congress notes the current proposals in draft regulations for 'planned' and 'unplanned' retirement for workers above a 'justified' retirement age or aged over 65, are unfair and complicated; and further believes that the 'duty to consider' a request to stay on past retirement will be virtually useless unless employers have to objectively justify their reasons on business grounds, backed up by a Statutory Code of Practice.

Congress calls upon the Government, within retirement age limits if agreed by collective agreement, to:

- i) frame all retirement policy on the basis of maximising genuine employee choice and flexibility;
- ii) include provision in the draft age equality regulations to prohibit employers from removing or downgrading employment benefits because of the implementation of the regulations;
- iii) ensure workers are given at least one year's notice of a 'planned' retirement with statutory provision for collective bargaining arrangements to improve upon this approach;
- iv) provide for at the minimum a levelling up of the redundancy multiplier to one and a half weeks' pay per year of service for all payments and for a significant overall increase in the statutory redundancy payments scheme's generosity, including also an increase in the week's pay limit;
- v) remove provisions in the draft regulations allowing age-related pay for people aged 18-21 earning above the National Minimum Wage youth development rate but below the adult rate; and
- vi) accept that the NMW youth development rate is ageist and enable all workers aged 18-21 to claim the adult rate.

Mover: Association for College Management

Seconders: TGWU

**Supporters: FDA
Community**

Composite 8 Public service pensions

Congress congratulates the public service unions on their campaign to defend public sector pension schemes, and recognises the key role played in this by the threat of co-ordinated industrial action and welcomes the support and co-ordination provided by the TUC to constituent unions to oppose proposed increases in the normal pensions age in public sector schemes. Congress welcomes the Government's recognition of the need for a fresh start to discussions on the reform of public sector schemes and its commitment to genuine negotiations with the trade unions. Congress notes evidence that inequalities in life expectancy are widening, and reiterates its opposition to any compulsory increase in pension ages.

Congress recognises that Governments view on life expectancy of public servants fails to take account of workers who life expectancy is shortened, whilst delivering essential services, due to physical and mental damage. Further, Government should recognise that many of these workers will not survive to their proposed retirement age.

Congress welcomes the Government's subsequent acceptance that all aspects of the proposals will be open to genuine negotiation. Congress welcomes the government initiative to move to formal negotiations on public sector pensions, rather than the previous consultations, which were constrained by the Government's diktat of a normal pension age of 65, and the view that savings had to be made from the review of pensions in the public sector. Congress congratulates the public sector unions on their willingness to take united action against the Government's proposed imposition of a compulsory rise in the pension age to 65.

However, Congress believes that the Government will continue to argue strongly for the pension age to increase. Congress believes that to defend our members' interests it will be necessary to maintain and enhance the public sector campaign alliance and to organise together for maximum pressure should further united industrial action prove necessary.

However, Congress fully supports the TUC's public sector pension principles which set out clearly the way forward for public sector pensions. Congress fully endorses the first principle that it is opposed totally to any compulsory increase in the pension age. For many

workers in the public sector, including health workers such as podiatrists, the physical and mental demands on them at work make it completely unacceptable to increase pensionable age. Congress believes that flexibility, choice and a voluntary approach are the most important elements that should impact on the public sector pension age, along with recognition that pensions are deferred pay and must be maintained on a final salary basis thus enabling an employee to clearly calculate the amount of pension they will receive.

Congress therefore calls on the TUC to continue its high profile campaign on public sector pensions. To that end, Congress calls on the General Council and Executive Committee to:

- i) support and co-ordinate public service unions in their efforts to defend and improve the public sector schemes, including through further industrial action if necessary;
- ii) campaign against any imposed change to pension schemes, specifically increased pension ages;
- iii) coordinate the scheme specific sectoral negotiations, including the circulation of reports from each set of talks;
- iv) propose to unions that they fully consult with each other before reaching agreement in order to counter any 'divide and rule' tactics from the Government;
- v) set up regional and local multi-union campaign groups in alliance with trades councils, the National Pensions Convention and other relevant organisations;
- vi) produce, and distribute to public sector unions for their use, common campaign materials (leaflets, petitions);
- vii) produce publicity to counter the prevailing myth that decent public sector pensions are unaffordable and the myth of the 'crisis' in pension provision;
- viii) oppose any Government attempts to limit the use of the new Inland Revenue flexibilities by public sector pension schemes;
- ix) campaign for employers to be compelled to contribute into a pension for their employees at a level of at least 10 per cent of pay;
- x) campaign for a fairer state pension system, so that no pensioner need depend on means-tested benefits;
- xi) organise a national pensions demonstration; and
- xii) assist unions taking industrial action and support the coordination of that action.

Congress asserts the right of each individual to the dignity and security that come from being able to rely on a decent pension when they need it.

Congress deplores the failure by employers and the state to take their fair share of the responsibility for pension provision. It is unacceptable that so many employers fail to provide their workers with an occupational pension, and that the state pension system leaves so many, particularly women, dependent on means-tested benefits in retirement.

Congress believes the draft regulations on the consultation by employers requirement should be strengthened so that:

- a) no employers are exempted;
- b) there is consultation on all changes to pensions;
- c) consultation involves recognised trade unions; and
- d) consultation is extended so that it is meaningful, with a view to making an agreement.

Congress notes that the Government estimates that less than 50percent of all workers are in private, personal or company pension schemes. This unfortunate situation highlights the need for a state pension linked to earnings and therefore congress reaffirms its policy to campaign for a state pension linked to earnings.

Mover: UNISON

**Seconders: Public and Commercial Services Union
Supporters: Society of Chiropodists and
Podiatrists**

Amicus

National Union of Teachers

Prison Officers' Association

**Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and
Firemen**

British Dietetic Association

Composite 9 Occupational pensions

Congress calls on the Government to meet the long-term retirement savings shortfall through compulsory employer contributions and the strongest possible security for workers' pension savings. Congress further demands that the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister addresses the £29bn deficit in local government pension schemes caused by irresponsible long-term employer underfunding in a moral and equitable way that does not price low-paid local government employees out of the scheme. Any changes to this and any other pension scheme must be negotiated, equality-proofed and encourage maximum membership among those most in need of the retirement income that a good final salary pension scheme can provide.

Congress is deeply concerned that the measures taken by the Government to address the crisis in the pensions industry have failed to address fundamental issues of funding, compulsion and, in particular, taxation. Confidence in pension saving is at an all-time low and Congress welcomes the Government's belated attempts to provide security through the Pension Protection Fund. For those who have already lost out however, the Financial Assistance Scheme (FAS) is a flimsy vessel on which to float workers' hopes of receiving their pensions. It is not enough for the Government to say it will review FAS funding over the next three years.

Diligent savers who have worked for decades remain without any prospect of security for themselves or their families. The only pension consensus that has existed in recent years is that £400m over 20 years to help victims of scheme wind-up and company insolvency would not be remotely sufficient. Congress demands an immediate guarantee that all victims of this pension loss will be compensated by at least the amount already promised to those closest to retirement.

Congress asks for tax incentives to make pension funding more robust.

Mover: GMB

**Seconders: British Association of Colliery
Management - Technical, Energy and
Administrative Management**

Composite 10 Industrial policy

Congress believes that a successful industrial policy is vital to a successful UK economy, to generate the economic wealth required for investment in high quality public services.

Congress commends the UK Government for delivering economic stability, but believes this masks increasing job insecurity. There is a haemorrhage in skilled jobs, which are all too often replaced by low-paid, low-skilled, insecure work.

Congress believes the UK Government should support the European social model of economic prosperity twinned with social cohesion. UK job insecurity will continue unless the UK develops a level playing field of employment rights, social planning and industrial policy. Britain's labour market flexibility has not improved our productivity.

Congress opposes the Government's negotiating position on revision of the Working Time Directive, and rejects any attempts to pretend that this was endorsed by those trade unions at the Warwick Policy Forum.

Congress calls on the Government, during its EU presidency, to protect the health and safety of British workers by ending the 48-hour opt-out, and respecting European Court judgments that on-call time is working time. Congress urges the Government to practice what it preaches and accept that long hours are a major obstacle to a healthy work/life balance. Furthermore, undermining equal treatment rights for temporary agency workers will not improve productivity, but will open the doors for cowboy employers.

Congress calls for the current EU proposal on services in the internal market to be withdrawn. The quality, safety and integrity of services in Europe are at risk from this blatant attempt to undermine collective bargaining, social and employment rights, and health and safety protections.

Congress notes with dismay that the UK presidency priorities do not include a clear focus on ensuring a high skill, high quality manufacturing future for Britain and Europe. Congress calls on the Government to honour its November 2003 pre-Budget commitment on EU public procurement rules to ensure British manufacturers do not lose out on public contracts, and the Wood Review conclusions about its role in supporting British industry.

Congress believes urgent action must now be taken to ensure the UK's strategic industries are defended. Congress in particular recognises the particular importance of a viable manufacturing base to the wider UK economy. This more proactive industrial policy should include being prepared where appropriate to take a strategic minority public stake in an enterprise.

Congress resolves to campaign for:

- i) a review of business support with a view to having the best support possible;
- ii) a procurement strategy that supports UK jobs and skills, and requires that a proportion of the work is carried out in the UK;
- iii) implementation of EU employment directives in a way that is compatible with the social dimension;
- iv) opposition to the services directive;
- v) a requirement for employers to develop a social plan before declaring redundancies;
- vi) increased statutory redundancy pay;
- vii) legislation to protect negotiated terms and conditions of members when their company is placed into administration; and
- viii) legislation requiring businesses to publish evidence justifying their decision to offshore, with decent terms and conditions, access to trade unions and adherence to ILO core labour standards in the new location.

Congress also notes the Hampton Report which is designed to reduce regulatory inspection and enforcement of industry, including a reduction of 1 million inspections a year by Government regulatory bodies. Congress resolves to campaign against Government plans to implement deregulatory policies which weaken necessary protections for workers and consumers.

Congress believes that public procurement and fiscal incentives could be key levers to raise social, employment and environmental standards in the UK. All publicly funded contracts should, in particular, be used to improve the quality of life at work by encouraging employers to adopt high labour standards. Equal opportunities, health and safety, employer investment in skills and training, employment rights and protection and relations with unions are all legitimate concerns of authorities using public funds to buy goods and services.

Government contracts should stipulate that contractors and sub-contractors engaged in the construction process should not use false self-employed workers

and all workers should be registered through the Construction Skills Certification Scheme. All contracts should be subject to independent auditing to ensure that these conditions are met.

Congress notes the reluctance of the Government to use procurement to support wider social goals and regrets the divergence between the UK and the rest of the European Union on this issue.

Congress believes that fiscal incentives should be used to compensate those employers who invest in high labour standards but have to compete in the market place with those who do not. Congress instructs the General Council to:

- a) continue to lobby and campaign on these issues;
- b) demonstrate how procurement and fiscal policies can be used to advance social goals;
- c) assist unions in the public sector to raise the issue of procurement with public authorities; and
- d) assist unions in the private sector to work with employers on joint campaigns.

Mover: Amicus

Second: GMB

Supporters: Connect

**Transport and General Workers' Union
Union of Construction, Allied Trades and
Technicians
Prospect**

Composite 11 Working time

Congress congratulates the General Council on its high profile campaign to combat the long hours culture in the UK, promote a maximum 48-hour week and remove the opt-out from the Working Time Regulations 1998, which has been so systematically used and abused in the UK.

Congress condemns the UK Working Time Directive opt-out and calls on the Government to tackle the long-hours culture.

Congress is gravely concerned about the UK Government's defence of the opt-out and its reluctance to accept a large and growing body of independent evidence which clearly illustrates:

- i) the widespread abuse of the opt-out by employers;
- ii) the short-sightedness and contradictions within the so-called business case for long hours working;
- iii) the harmful health and safety effects of long-hours working;
- iv) the damaging consequences for productivity, for education and training and for key policies around work/life balance; and
- v) the discriminatory impact on women workers.

The UK Government's decision to block changes to the Working Time Directive which would have abolished the 48-hour week opt-out demonstrates a willful misunderstanding of the effects of excessive working hours on employees, their families and wider society and is a regrettable example of disjointed government policy at a time when more imaginative and flexible arrangements are being encouraged for maternity, paternity, carer and adoption leave.

Congress believes that the UK should take a proactive approach to the issue of work/life balance by providing incentives to employers to provide home-based and distance working, enabled working and other forms of flexibility which will benefit both workers and their employers. This would have economic and environmental benefits.

Congress believes that achieving a sensible work/life balance for all staff - including the Senior Civil Service for whom there exists an endemic culture of long-hours working without financial compensation, mirrored by senior staff in many other sectors - is crucial to ensuring

a diverse workforce and equality of opportunity for all staff to achieve their full potential.

Without concerted action, including by ministers, the position can only get worse with the staffing reductions being experienced across the Civil Service.

As a consequence of government policy:

- a) there is a detrimental effect on those with commitments outside work - most often women - seeking or being successful in securing promotion;
- b) levels of stress are rising because of sustained long-hours working, exacerbated by the challenges of having to lead and manage change; and
- c) government departments are increasingly susceptible to a challenge for breaching Working Time Regulations.

Congress condemns the way the Government has allowed the Working Time Regulations, affecting mobile workers in the area of 'periods of availability', to be used as a means of undermining the safety of both drivers and the public.

The Working Time Regulations were introduced as health and safety legislation. The current interpretation of 'periods of availability' allows employers to claim that, even though a driver may be sat in their vehicle for several hours waiting to be loaded or unloaded, they are not actually 'working' during that time. As a result, some drivers will be expected to work even longer hours, receiving even less rest.

Congress believes it is but a small step from not 'working' for the purposes of the Working Time Regulations, to not working for the purposes of payment. Drivers are already being instructed to register any delay as a 'period of availability'. Is the next step to register this as an unpaid break? The systematic abuse of 'periods of availability' was always inevitable. It will result in even more stress on drivers, who will be asked to work longer hours for the same pay or even less. Congress should mandate the General Council to seek an early review of this excuse for legislation.

Congress supports action to achieve a sensible work/life balance for all, including:

- 1) direct and public lobbying of ministers;
- 2) using the Freedom of Information Act to get details of working hours and recordkeeping in the public sector;
- 3) using legal action under the Working Time Directive and health and safety legislation to ensure reasonable working hours are enforced and adequate records kept of hours worked by staff; and
- 4) campaigning for mandatory audits for all hours worked.

Congress urges the General Council and all affiliates to continue to campaign vigorously on the UK long-hours culture, the 48-hour week and the removal of the opt-out whilst protecting the current length of the reference period and the inclusion of stand-by as working time as defined within the decisions of the European Court of Justice and to:

- A) continue to provide contemporary evidence to the UK Government on the damaging effects of long-hours working;
- B) work closely with the ETUC and all appropriate international trade secretariats to ensure campaigns and lobbies are as effective as possible across the European Union and all its institutions;
- C) intensify its lobbying in the EU to ensure the early removal of the opt-out and the full implementation of a maximum 48-hour week across all of the member states;

D) campaign and negotiate in key UK sectors with employers and their organisations to reduce the incidence of long-hours working;

E) draw up a holistic flexible working policy which will:
- embrace technological developments;
- provide a real alternative to the Government's do-nothing approach; and
- give workers control over their working lives; and

F) make representations to the government to increase the resources to the HSE so that the Working Time Regulations can be properly enforced. HSE inspectors should be able to require employers to demonstrate that they have systems in place to keep working hours within the requirements of the Regulations.

Mover: Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers

Seconders: Connect

**Supporters: United Road Transport Union
FDA**

Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians

Society of Radiographers

Composite 12 The National Health Service

Congress deplores the extension of the use of private sector providers for diagnostic work whilst NHS equipment is not used to its full capacity and stands idle for much of the week.

The Government argued that the development of independent sector treatment centres was necessary to expand capacity and reduce waiting times. There has now been a shift in this policy.

Instead of supplementing NHS activity there is clearly a move to use private health care to undertake core diagnostic and surgical services whilst many MRI scanners remain under-utilised in the NHS. The finance that could be used to deploy them to their full advantage is instead diverted to private companies who make a profit from providing a service to supplement and, increasingly, compete with that provided by the NHS.

Congress calls on the General Council to campaign for the Government to fund NHS services such that all scanning equipment can be utilised to its fullest capacity and to ensure that private sector companies are only used to supplement diagnostic services rather than supplant them for profit.

Congress recognises that there is increasing demand on NHS services resulting in a corresponding increase in levels of sickness and absenteeism among NHS staff due to stress and physical injury. High vacancy levels, particularly among more senior staff, compound this problem.

Congress acknowledges the initiatives introduced by improving working lives in the NHS and believes that this will address the needs of some sections of the workforce. However this does not address levels of support and efficient treatment for employees who suffer physical or psychological injury from working in poor conditions or to unreasonable targets.

Congress believes that improving occupational health facilities, working conditions and safety for all NHS staff must be a priority for all employers.

However, Congress recognises that employees who are incapacitated must wait for specialist help or treatment. This results in the loss of a valuable resource, which in turn creates high demands on other staff.

Congress calls on the General Council to campaign for the Department of Health to introduce a fast-track referral service for NHS staff. This will assist with the reintroduction of their valuable skills and expertise, which is necessary for the maintenance of healthcare in the UK.

Congress also calls for the introduction of better workforce planning in the NHS to ensure that the valuable skills of newly qualified clinical staff are not lost to the NHS through a failure to create sufficient junior posts.

Congress notes that CDNA members work alone in the community, visiting patients in their homes, in areas ranging from isolated rural locations to deprived inner cities. Congress notes that such workers often experience verbal and sometimes physical abuse in the course of their everyday jobs.

They are lone workers yet many of them are not provided with mobile phones by their employer. This is the most basic way Congress would expect responsible employers to keep in touch with vulnerable staff. Congress notes that many community nurses do not feel safe especially when providing the evening service or night duty.

Congress call on the General Council to support a campaign with the NHS, government and general public to highlight the potentially unsafe working conditions these members find themselves in every day, and to demand that financial resources are made available to implement safer systems of working.

Mover: Society of Radiographers

Seconders: Community and District Nursing Association

Supporter: Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

Composite 13 School education

Congress opposes the Government's Academies programme. Congress believes that schools in deprived areas need additional support and resources, and that the Academies programme will fail to provide adequate additional educational support to vulnerable communities.

Congress rejects Government moves to expand the role of the private sector in public services, including through the Building Schools for the Future programme and moves both to introduce private sponsors and increase the use of PFI which can bind schools into restrictive and uncompetitive contracts.

Congress believes that Academies lead to pupil selection and undermine local democracy, equality of opportunity to high quality education and the ability of schools to work together.

Congress believes that Academies represent a threat to staff pay and conditions. Congress believes that staff in Academies should have pay, conditions and pensions in accordance with those in maintained schools and that teachers be subject to GTC registration requirements.

Congress urges the Government to respond to the Select Committee's concerns by returning to local authorities responsibility for establishing new schools.

Congress instructs the General Council to:

i) support the drafting and publication of joint advice, guidance and any necessary action where the existing and future pay, conditions and pensions of members who are employed in the public, private and voluntary sectors are threatened;

ii) plan a strategy involving initially a conference, after which consideration be given to a national demonstration opposing Academies and all aspects of the privatisation of education, to highlight the TUC's opposition to the Academies programme and emphasise the TUC's commitment to proven measures which tackle the impact on social disadvantage and educational achievement;

iii) campaign against selection and for schools to be accountable to the community through their local education authorities;

iv) convene meetings with affiliates and others supportive of a campaign against the establishment of Academies to achieve the aims above;

v) call upon the Government to respond positively to the legitimate and serious concerns about the educational and financial value of academies raised by the House of Commons Select Committee in its March 2005 report and accordingly halt the expansion programme; and

vi) oppose actively any use of government funding for schools where statutory provisions affecting staff are disapplied.

Congress notes that, as a consequence of demographic pressures facing the education service, school rolls are likely to decline significantly over the period of the next ten years. Congress believes that this decline in school rolls should provide an excellent opportunity for significant reductions in class size across all sectors of the education service.

Congress also believes that children learn better and that teaching conditions are enhanced in classes with smaller numbers of pupils. Research indicates that smaller classes are of particular advantage to children in the early years of education. Further, Congress believes that reduced class size plays a significant role in improving learning and attainment, tackling indiscipline, assisting with social inclusion and allowing greater pupil/teacher interaction.

Congress, therefore, calls on the Government to ensure that the necessary resources are available to the appropriate UK and devolved authorities to allow class sizes to be reduced in all publicly funded schools throughout the United Kingdom.

Congress notes the Government's objective of achieving greater autonomy for secondary schools in England, reflected in the current DFES 5-Year Strategy for Children and Learners, but confirms its commitment to the maintenance of a comprehensive state school system dedicated to raising educational standards for all children and, therefore, to avoiding the differentiated educational outcomes associated with 'internal market' theories which promote open competition between schools.

Congress believes that the Government's educational objectives can never be fully achieved when the necessary collaboration between schools is prevented by its obsession with performance-based league tables. Congress therefore calls for the abolition of performance-based school league tables in England, as has happened elsewhere in the UK.

Congress urges the Government, in developing its related New Relationship with Schools initiative, to adopt an evidence-based approach and to appreciate that effective school system leadership and development can only be secured through comprehensive and meaningful consultations, and significant financial investment, in order to ensure consistently high-quality service provision. An 'inspectorial' model of School Improvement Partners will not assist the drive to reduce bureaucratic pressures on the nation's schools.

Congress therefore restates its belief that the state school system, and its workforce, can continue to make progress, given a firm commitment by all interested parties to genuine partnership and dialogue, and to sustained professionalism at all levels of the educational service.

Mover: National Union of Teachers

Seconder: The Educational Institute of Scotland

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

Association of Teachers and Lecturers

Composite 14 Education funding

Congress reaffirms its opposition to the principle of variable top-up fees in higher education (HE). Congress

believes every effort should be made to monitor their impact and ensure:

i) they do not damage our HE system;

ii) students are not deterred from university; and

iii) the additional income is invested in staff as well as students.

Congress notes the 25 per cent of undergraduates who study part-time are not eligible for the financial support available to full-timers. This will undermine the long-term quality and viability of part-time HE. Congress therefore believes the impact of top-up fees on part-time HE needs to be resolved urgently - something the previous government made a commitment to do.

Congress welcomes the 18 per cent increase in spending on HE between 2005 and 2008 and notes that top-up fees will generate an additional £1.4 billion annually for English universities. In April 2004 the HE minister told the Commons 'vice-chancellors tell us that, in general, at least a third of that money will be put back into the salaries and conditions of their staff'. Given the years of decline in salaries and the ongoing disgrace of low pay amongst all university staff, Congress believes this commitment should be honoured.

Congress is concerned that the Government is not making sufficient money available to meet the full range of learning and skills priorities; and is alarmed that further education colleges are now increasing course fees or cutting adult education places as a result of LSC funding priorities.

Congress is dismayed that so many colleges are having to shed jobs in order to meet the financial shortfalls of this funding policy and believes that, in particular, disadvantaged adult learners will suffer as a result.

Congress therefore calls on:

a) the General Council to:

- monitor the impact of top-up fees on student access and on staff;

- press the Government for sufficient additional funding in order to reverse the cuts in adult education provision; and

- campaign with affiliates and likeminded organisations for a long-term commitment from government to a properly funded further education sector that can deliver high quality adult education;

b) universities and colleges to increase their spending on staff and devote at least one third of top-up fee income to this purpose; and

c) the Government to honour its pledge on part-time HE.

Mover: Association of University Teachers

Seconder: Association for College Management

Composite 15 Transport - future of the rail industry

Congress welcomes the 2004 Labour Party Conference decision to return the railways to public ownership. Congress reiterates its support for this policy, but condemns the Government's handling of the South Eastern Trains franchising process and that company's subsequent proposals to reduce ticket office opening times.

Congress reaffirms its support for an integrated transport policy. Congress also notes that the railway industry passenger and freight services under private ownership have been an unmitigated disaster. Congress continues to campaign to reverse that position due to its impact on society as a whole.

Regardless of ownership, Congress remains of the view that safety of railway workers and users is the top priority. Congress therefore condemns the decision to transfer railway safety responsibilities to the Office of

Rail Regulation and the potential conflict this creates that will, amongst other things, weaken public confidence. Congress calls on the Government and the industry to resolve this problem as a matter of urgency and to work together in other areas to improve safety, e.g. to develop and deliver systems that stop trains when there is an obstacle on the line.

Congress notes that, since rail privatisation, the rail network has seen worsening conditions in safety and has seen an increased number of unmanned level crossings, which has led to an unwanted rise in accidents. Congress therefore commits to work with the rail unions by mounting a campaign for additional active safety at level crossings that would ensure that either automatic or driver-operated braking systems are triggered by the cab if obstacles remain on the line.

Congress also welcomes the Crossrail Bill as the first stage in delivering significant improvements needed for travel into and across central London. Congress notes that there is still no indication when Crossrail will be built or who will ultimately operate the service and is concerned about rail freight access. Congress instructs the TUC to press Transport for London and the Department for Transport on these issues and for the service to be publicly owned and accountable.

Congress considers that an increase in HGV maximum weights is not an acceptable way to address the national shortage of drivers and calls on the Government further to encourage the transfer of freight from road to rail.

Congress notes that:

- i) a journey by one average freight train saves 50 HGV lorry journeys;
- ii) road usage is predicted to increase by 40 per cent in the next two decades;
- iii) freight trains produce 90 per cent less carbon dioxide than lorries and their use is shown radically to reduce greenhouse gases, air and noise pollution, congestion, accidents and deaths; and
- iv) the transportation of freight must involve road haulage - therefore the development of rail/road hubs is essential.

Congress further believes that in order to combat the problems stated above a clear commitment should be made to campaign to increase the levels of rail freight on the rail network.

Mover: Transport Salaried Staffs' Association

Seconders: Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen

Composite 16 Energy and climate change

Congress welcomes the priority being given to climate change during the UK's presidencies of the European Union and G8. Concerns on global warming and climate change are growing. Action is urgently needed at the highest levels to meet Kyoto and domestic emissions targets whilst also ensuring security of energy supply.

Recognising the core interest of the trade union movement in future economic prosperity and that moving to a low-carbon economy will directly impact on future employment and skills requirements, Congress calls on Government to work with the TUC on the development and implementation of climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies.

These must include:

- i) a clear long-term policy framework, based on hard-headed analysis of progress made since publication of the 2003 Energy White Paper and safeguarding against the current danger of becoming increasingly dependent on imported gas;
- ii) incentives for investment in all lower-carbon generation technologies, including renewables, nuclear

and clean coal, to ensure early progress in development of new generation capacity;

iii) development of a strategy to deliver a green future for manufacturing;

iv) sector skills agreements which support skills transition and protect individuals whose jobs are adversely affected;

v) increased support for the Government's in-house science capacity to ensure effective monitoring of progress and maximise potential for scientific discovery and innovation; and

vi) clear expectation of employers that they work in partnership with trade unions on this agenda, including through the establishment of a sustainable development fund and rights for environmental representatives.

Congress notes that the last government White Paper on energy deferred some important medium to long term strategic issues to the current parliamentary session. In light of the election these issues are now the subject of further debate and consideration in advance of decisions being taken.

Congress agrees that the Government's broad energy objectives of secure and diverse supplies at competitive cost are the right ones against the backdrop of the need to deal with the environmental issues raised by climate change.

Congress notes that globally most predictions envisage coal use increasing as developing countries establish electricity grids. Congress strongly believes therefore in the development of clean coal technology (CCT) and carbon capture storage (CCS) as an essential response to climate change.

The UK is well placed to develop such technology and the Treasury should introduce appropriate financial instruments to facilitate clean coal technology in the next generation of coal-fired power stations.

Congress notes that indigenous coal currently provides an important bulwark in terms of security of supply and believes that this should be maintained into the future.

Congress seeks to assist the Government in achieving its targets as well as those set out in the Kyoto agreement. Congress calls on the General Council to organise a working group, which would include representatives from the Government, whose remit would be to research, develop and promote the use of clean coal burn technologies in Britain using British deep mined coal.

The General Council are instructed to report to Congress 2006 on progress towards these objectives.

Mover: Prospect

Seconders: National Union of Mineworkers

Supporters: BACM-TEAM

Composite 17 Greening the workplace

Congress acknowledges the valuable work by unions and their representatives in tackling environmental and sustainability issues in employment and at the workplace outlined in the document Greening the Workplace. Congress urges the Government to fulfil urgently its commitment to ensure that the trade union role in achieving environmental objectives is recognised as a standard duty of representatives by revising the ACAS Code of Practice and legislating for environmental representatives. Congress calls on the General Council to back union efforts to negotiate sustainable workplace agreements with employers.

Congress recognises that developing awareness of sustainable development concerns and providing training for skills in promoting sustainability for working people should be integral objectives of public

policy and calls on the Government to ensure that sustainable development skills and training are elements of courses offered to workers.

Congress notes that energy costs to British manufacturing are significantly higher than those of competitors in other EU countries and calls on the Government to act to eliminate this unfair competitive disadvantage and encourage progress by British companies in increasing energy efficiency and reducing carbon dioxide emissions without damage to British manufacturing employment and production.

Congress calls on the Government to intensify work to develop a green manufacturing strategy, recognising the significant employment opportunities emerging in renewable energy, clean coal technology and waste minimisation and other initiatives. To this end the Government should also improve incentives, including tax cuts, to promote green investment.

Congress further acknowledges that recent studies by the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy have shown that dangerous levels of nitrogen dioxide and PM10 pollutants remain in our air. Fresh air is invigorating. It quite literally breathes life into our lungs. However, traffic fumes, industrial pollutants and poisons are causing thousands to suffer needlessly.

Poor air quality can cause wheezing and shortness of breath. Quality of life is reduced and for some a premature death can be the result. Congress notes that every year respiratory physiotherapists treat hundreds of thousands of patients with asthma and emphysema.

An investigation by the CSP in June of this year showed that nitrogen dioxide levels still exceed government targets. Levels of PM10 taken from 61 monitoring points across the UK have not dropped significantly since the beginning of the year.

Congress believes this situation cannot be allowed to continue. The Government should be setting a higher standard for air quality.

Congress calls on the General Council to:

- i) lobby the Government to show a greater commitment to achieving cleaner air;
- ii) encourage all workers to reduce the level of fumes in the air by not using their cars wherever practical, and taking alternative means to get to work; and
- iii) support calls for industry to reduce pollutants - specifically, the car industry should be encouraged to progress ideas such as particulate filters for all diesel fuelled vehicles, and cleaner fuel options.

Mover: Community

Seconders: Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

Composite 18 Defending public broadcasting and UK television production

Congress condemns the decision by the BBC to axe 3,780 jobs in UK public service broadcasting and to privatise BBC services.

Congress further condemns the decision to outsource more programming to the private sector.

Congress applauds the campaign and industrial action organised by the broadcasting unions to defend quality and jobs at the BBC and believes licence fee payers are best served by having a publicly funded, publicly accountable BBC delivering free-to-air high quality news and entertainment to all.

Congress also congratulates the BBC for transporting us back in time by bringing 'Doctor Who' back to our television screens. The popularity of the series demonstrates that there is still an audience for quality family entertainment, and that distinctive UK television productions can still provide a talking point for the nation.

Congress believes that while some imports and so-called 'reality' shows have their place in the schedules,

they cost jobs and reduce opportunities for workers in our television industry. There is no substitute for well-resourced, home-grown drama and comedy material written, performed and produced in the UK.

Congress notes with alarm new threats to the future of public service broadcasting in particular:

- i) the threat to slice up the licence fee and provide public funds to commercial broadcasters;
- ii) the increasingly commercial approach to regulating the BBC;
- iii) further drastic cuts in the minimum requirements for regional non-news programming on ITV taking place against a background of continuing job and studio cuts in the ITV regions - moves encouraged by 'light-touch' regulator Ofcom; and
- iv) the threat to BBC in-house production represented by the Corporation's ill-advised proposals for raising its independent production quota.

Congress resolves to campaign actively:

- a) for the retention of the positive aspects of the Green Paper on the BBC's future in the run-up to the publication of the White Paper - in particular that there should be no 'top-slicing' of the licence fee and that it continues to fund the BBC for a full ten-year period;
- b) for an adequate above-inflation licence fee settlement;
- c) against proposed BBC job cuts and privatisation of services, and in support of the trade unions at the BBC in their continuing fight;
- d) against further cuts to ITV public service broadcasting programming, and in defence of jobs at ITV; and
- e) for the retention of the independent quota at its current level and for a critical examination by the DCMS and Ofcom of the independents' practices on employment training and individual creators' rights.

At a time of damaging cuts throughout the BBC, and massive expansion of the independent TV production sector, Congress further calls on the BBC to maintain a fully staffed, fully funded in-house drama and comedy production capability, and to increase rather than cut its output. In this way jobs and skills can be preserved, and UK television audiences can only benefit.

Mover: National Union of Journalists

Seconders: Writers' Guild of Great Britain

Supporters: Broadcasting, Entertainment Cinematograph and Theatre Union

Composite 19 Criminal justice

Congress applauds the work carried out by Brendan Barber, General Secretary of the TUC, and the support for the justice unions during recent times.

Congress supports the attempts by the current Government to seek a wide consensus on crime, justice, law and order.

Congress recognises that all 'decent, hard working people', whether members of an affiliate union or those awaiting recruitment into unions, have an overwhelming desire to see a fair, decent and civil society.

Congress accepts that it is the voice of the working that is important on all matters of social cohesion and that the TUC, and Congress itself, provides a platform for this voice to be heard. Congress recognises the need for the TUC to lead the way in reforming a decent and civil society.

Congress condemns the current government policy that is seeking to extend contestability and the threat of privatisation across the public services. Congress notes that no evidence has been produced to show that

contestability and the accompanying restructuring of public services to provide for the purchaser/provider split improves performance levels. The introduction of a dangerous purchaser provider model will divert vital resources from frontline services and will inevitably create an increased level of bureaucracy and cost in implementing and monitoring a multitude of contracts.

Congress further notes that contestability, which threatens the continued provision of services in the public sector as well as universal and equal access to services, undermines good industrial relations and partnership working, as well as the public sector ethos and values, all of which are necessary to ensure high levels of performance.

Congress also notes that the National Offender Management Services (NOMS), which brings the prison and probation services under a common umbrella based on the introduction of contestability, threatens the high levels of performance in those services and notes that no business case has been produced to demonstrate how it will contribute to a reduction in re-offending.

Congress recognises and reaffirms its policy that privatisation of prisons and probation is a distraction for the justice agencies, prison and probation management and is used as a threat against staff at a time when prison workers are facing an overwhelming increase in prisoners, most of whom have severe mental and personality disorders. The use of the threat to privatise prisons will distract staff from the task of tackling the needs and the rehabilitation of offenders and preventing re-offending behaviour.

Congress notes with concern the rise in the prison population and the use of anti-social behaviour orders. Congress condemns the planned building programme of 'supersized' prisons. Instead, the Government should promote measures to reduce prison overcrowding, including provision of sufficient levels of investment in the public prison estate and full support for the sentencing guidelines council.

Congress recognises that crime affects all social groups in society, but has the most severe effects on those who are least able to cope as victims of crime - the poor, the old and the socially vulnerable.

Congress fully supports the justice unions in their efforts to work in partnership with government and not-for-profit organisations to tackle re-offending.

Congress further reaffirms its policies:

- i) for the establishment of a Justice Ministry; and
- ii) to use appropriate community based rehabilitation and crime reduction programmes.

Congress also recognises the important role of the new unified Court Service for England and Wales in reducing crime and re-offending. However this is at risk from the unjustified cuts in Civil Service staffing and the dogmatic continuation of out-sourcing under the banner of the so-called 'Efficiency Review'.

Congress calls on the General Council to:

- a) continue its support for the probation and prison service unions to campaign to save their services as public services and to oppose contestability and privatisation;
- b) support the unions in their call for all information of NOMS to be published in line with the spirit as well as the letter of the Freedom of Information Act;
- c) support the lawful acts made by affiliates to resist further privatisation in the criminal justice system, up to and including industrial action; and
- d) agree to have a section of the TUC Agenda and Annual Report identified, that will allow for prominent issues to be discussed relating to the stability and safety of our citizens.

Mover: Prison Officers' Association

Seconder: Napo

Supporter: Public and Commercial Services Union

Composite 20 Learning and skills

Congress supports a sustainable and coherent lifelong learning strategy.

Congress:

- i) welcomes the planned Union Academy and anticipated major expansion of trained union learning reps;
- ii) calls for statutory rights to negotiate on training, paid educational leave, and Workplace Learning Committees tied into learning agreements;
- iii) congratulates the 250 trade union studies tutors for the nine grade one inspections of their centres;
- iv) defends public sector TUC education free to the user;
- v) encourages all affiliates to use the services provided by TUC Education; and
- vi) welcomes the government commitment to expand apprenticeships, but believes additional measures are needed to support collective bargaining and build skills in specialist trades to tackle skills shortages.

Congress is concerned that:

- a) the failure to implement the Tomlinson report could perpetuate second class status for technical and vocational education and deepen racial and gender segregation, with educational opportunities for many narrowed to a vocational pathway or extended workplace training;
- b) the proposed skills academies will be outside the public FE service with private benefactors;
- c) adult education cuts and tuition fees damage opportunities for working class students;
- d) the funding gap of more than 10 per cent between schools and colleges is inequitable for college students and means poorer pay and conditions for college workers;
- e) cuts of £32m are being made to learner support budgets for providers for 2005/6. These funds have been used to support the most disadvantaged learners in our society and include a reduction in funds allocated to childcare for learners; and
- f) UK companies must commit to invest in skills through sector training levies.

Congress calls for:

- 1) guaranteed access to a balanced broad curriculum for all young people, sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of students who might drop out;
- 2) high quality guidance so students can make choices that don't limit future opportunities;
- 3) programmes that draw on academic, vocational and occupational routes, not divided into separate pathways;
- 4) adult learning opportunities to meet actual skills needs and further civic participation and personal fulfilment; and
- 5) a campaign for statutory rights to negotiate on skills.

Congress applauds initiatives by trade unions to promote and support learning for their members. Congress also applauds the 196 Westminster MPs who signed an Early Day Motion calling for a statutory right to a Workplace Learning Committee and recognises the role of devolved parliaments in supporting trade union learning.

Congress commends affiliates for their response to the Union Learning Fund and welcomes the numbers of accredited learning representatives operating within the trade union movement. Congress commends their

efforts on behalf of many employees seeking to improve basic skills, and also on behalf of those seeking advanced professional development. Congress commends the efforts of trade unions to develop and maintain their role in providing essential trade union skills.

Congress notes the barriers to the success of the learning representative. Some employers remain to be convinced of their role; learning representatives are not always provided with time off for their duties despite legislation; and some employers continue to view employee development within the narrow confines of skills training.

Congress believes that the Union Learning Fund and the learning representative initiative have produced many proven benefits for all involved.

Congress, therefore, calls on the General Council to:

- A) continue to develop trade union learning in partnership with affiliates, employers and government;
- B) continue to monitor and publicise the work of union learning representatives and good practice in learning, e.g. the benefits of personal development;
- C) promote the role of statutory Workplace Learning Committees in developing, co-ordinating and monitoring access to learning and working with learning providers linked to the workplace;
- D) work with affiliates to support and develop their own role as providers of learning; and
- E) seek talks with the appropriate government departments, including devolved governments, with a view to increasing funding of trade union learning.

Congress notes the adoption by the European Parliament of the directive for the recognition of professional qualifications. The directive will permit professions to develop their own 'common platforms', which will give professionals the automatic right to practise in other member states.

Congress recognises the value of common platforms in promoting the free movement of professional workers within the EU.

Congress calls on the TUC to support unions that wish to promote the development of a common platform for their members by: providing information and advice on the directive; and providing links to sources of influence and expertise such as the ETUC, Eurocadres and interested MEPs.

Congress also welcomes the growth in UK aviation, but notes that the supply of trained flight crew is struggling to keep pace.

Congress believes that the supply of employees with such professional skills cannot be left to the market alone and that UK plc must get better at predicting future labour needs.

Congress calls for: more sophisticated social dialogue to help predict more accurately the future needs in all sectors of the economy; a review of the support that might be offered, including support through the tax system, to individuals seeking to develop professional skills; and discussion on how ongoing professional development can be better delivered.

Mover: NATFHE - The University and College Lecturers' Union

Seconder: The Educational Institute of Scotland

Supporters: Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists

**The British Air Line Pilots' Association
Amicus**

**Association for College Management
Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers**

Composite 21 School education and inclusion

Congress recognises that parents share the responsibility for ensuring that their children receive an appropriate education, should have a collective voice and should be full partners, with education staff, in the provision of that education.

Congress calls on the appropriate authorities to review arrangements for ensuring appropriate parental involvement in all schools.

Congress recognises that the Every Child Matters (ECM) agenda is vital in protecting vulnerable children; it is also a confirmation of the importance of schools within local communities.

Congress believes that the publication of the Children's Workforce Strategy (CWS) reflects not only opportunities for those working in children services but also significant challenges.

Congress believes that extended and full service school arrangements can only be successful if schools receive sufficient resources for new accommodation and for training and employing sufficient teaching and support staff to take on new responsibilities to support and benefit children's education and to provide quality services for families.

Congress urges the Government and employers to involve fully all affiliates representing members in schools and authority support services in the development of the ECM agenda and CWS, both at local and national level and to make no unnecessary changes to existing national negotiating machinery.

In addition, Congress urges the Government and employers to ensure that when new responsibilities and posts are introduced, all school staff must receive full employment protection and the pay, conditions of service and training necessary to maintain a committed workforce so that everyone benefits, including the pupils whose education is at the heart of the services school staff deliver.

Congress instructs the General Council to press the Government and employers to:

- i) involve fully in consultations and negotiations all TUC affiliates with members in services covered by the ECM and CWS agendas;
- ii) audit and fund fully the cost of its reforms to children services; and
- iii) ensure that all staff receive secure contracts and the pay, conditions and training necessary to reflect the importance of any new posts and responsibilities within education and other children services.

Congress notes the Government's continuing commitment to inclusion but also notes its current emphasis on problems belonging to individual children.

Congress however seeks assurances from Government that every child does matter and that schools will be sufficiently supported and resourced, together with staff development, to make inclusion a meaningful educational experience for all pupils, including those with emotional and behavioural difficulties or special educational needs.

Congress supports the desire for a more inclusive society and recognises the key role of educational establishments to provide fully for the needs of all learners.

Congress recognises that educational establishments must be enabled to provide fully for the learning needs of all.

Congress believes that every learner should be entitled to the provision they need, when they need it.

Congress further believes that a learner's needs must not be compromised by anyone else or be at the expense of another.

Congress urges the Government to agree a Charter on Pupil Behaviour identifying a full range of support and sanctions for staff in schools and protecting the right of all children to learn, and which would require local authorities to establish a full range of pupil behaviour provision.

Congress calls upon the General Council strongly to urge the Government to make these principles a reality.

Mover: National Union of Teachers

Seconders: Association of Educational Psychologists

**Supporters: Association of Teachers and Lecturers
The Educational Institute of Scotland
GMB**

Emergency 1 Gate Gourmet

Congress records its profound anger at the shameful treatment of 667 workers sacked by Gate Gourmet catering at Heathrow on 10 August for objecting to the hiring of temporary staff while permanent staff faced redundancy. Evidence indicates that management engineered this dispute in order to replace existing staff with workers on worse terms and conditions, without due notice or redundancy pay.

Congress applauds the Gate Gourmet workers who continue to fight for their jobs in the face of contemptible attacks on their character, their community and their union.

This case exposes defects in UK law repeatedly condemned under international laws; and calls into question the contracting out of services and the use of agency labour to undercut permanent jobs.

Congress therefore calls upon:

- i) Gate Gourmet management to act in good faith to reach a fair and acceptable settlement to this dispute;
- ii) British Airways not to sign a forward supply contract with Gate Gourmet until a mutually satisfactory agreement is reached with the TGWU and to make preparation for alternative sources of catering services;
- iii) the Government to amend the law: to permit lawful supportive action, simplify balloting procedures, protect strikers from dismissal, and bar the replacement of workers in dispute; and also to seek implementation urgently of the EU temporary agency worker directive; and
- iv) the General Council and affiliates to support members at Gate Gourmet by all legal means, to seek international support, and to unite trade unionists in a campaign for just and ILO-compliant employment law.

Mover: Transport and General Workers' Union

Emergency 2 Rail safety

Congress notes the court decision of 6th September 2005 to clear senior personnel employed by Network Rail and Balfour Beatty of health and safety charges following the Hatfield Rail derailment.

Congress is concerned existing legislation has hindered manslaughter charges being brought in previous rail crashes such as Paddington and Potters Bar.

Congress believes the trial has demonstrated that privatisation has weakened British Rail's safety culture and the Government should rethink its decision to re-privatise South Eastern Trains.

Congress notes a dispute situation now exists between South Eastern Trains and the RMT with regards to the effects of re-privatisation. Congress resolves to support the RMT in that dispute.

Congress further believes however, that the conclusion of the Hatfield trial on 6th September has wider

implications in respect of corporate responsibility. Although both Network Rail and Balfour Beatty were found guilty of safety-related charges and will face punitive fines, the trial has:

- i) highlighted the weakness in the law in respect of corporate responsibility for preventable incidents; and
- ii) underlined the need for urgent action to reform the law in respect of corporate killing.

In the light of the conclusion of the Hatfield trial, Congress requests that the General Council:

- a) examines the implications of the Hatfield trial to strengthen the arguments for an effective Bill on corporate killing; and
- b) lobbies the Government to ensure that adequate parliamentary time is set aside to allow the introduction of a new law on corporate killing to be introduced in this parliamentary session.

Mover: National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers

Emergency 3 Patient-led NHS

Congress notes a survey by the Health Service Journal published on the 25 August showing the expected scale of the re-organisation of England's 303 Primary Care Trusts, leading to the loss of 150 Trusts.

Congress also notes with extreme concern a recent letter, dated 26 August 2005, from John Bacon, Director of DOH, regarding the Government's recent document 'Commissioning a Patient-led NHS'. Bacon describes 'rushing headlong into the design of new delivery units'.

Congress is particularly concerned about the large number of staff, including those working on the frontline, who are extremely anxious about their future and are fearful of the uncontrolled nature of these reforms and the damaging effects of marketisation on patient care.

Congress calls on the General Council to:

- i) lobby urgently for the reintroduction of control mechanisms to ensure the directive authority of the Department of Health;
- ii) press for the NHS Employers' Organisation to enter into urgent discussions with the trade unions with a view to agreeing a national framework for managing the staffing implications of the proposed changes;
- iii) campaign, in coalition with patient groups and other interested organisations, against outsourcing of PCT-provided services and for a reversal of the Government's policy that the role of PCTs in direct service provision should be reduced to a minimum; and
- iv) campaign against marketisation of the NHS.

Congress therefore calls upon the Government to reconsider proposals that would lead to the privatisation of primary care services and take action to address cuts to frontline community staff.

Mover: UNISON

Seconders: Amicus

Emergency 4 BNP and the Race Relations Act

Congress notes the decision of the Court of Appeal on 13th September to consider an appeal from SERCO against the decision of the Employment Appeal Tribunal that the dismissal of a BNP councillor in Bradford was in breach of the Race Relations Act.

The appeal will challenge the decision of the tribunal that dismissing an employee who is a representative of the BNP constitutes less favourable treatment on racial grounds.

Congress is concerned that if the appeal is not successful there will be a number of serious consequences:

- i) fascists will be allowed to pervert the objectives of anti-discrimination law to their own ends;
- ii) it will make employers and unions still more vulnerable to legal cases by the BNP and other far-right organisations;
- iii) it will undermine collective agreements with employers to keep fascists out of the workplace; and
- iv) the decision may also now be applied to actions taken by unions to ensure that members of fascist organisations are expelled or excluded from membership, thereby undermining the improvements to the law in this respect made by the Employment Relations Act 2004.

Congress therefore requests the General Council challenges this perverse decision by:

- a) supporting the appeal against this decision;
- b) urging the CRE to support the appeal; and
- c) lobbying the Government to amend the law if the decision is not overturned.

Mover: Bakers, Food and Allied Workers' Union

Emergency 5 Women in Iraq

Congress notes the draft Iraqi Constitution that was issued on the 23rd August and will now be subject to a national referendum.

Congress expresses its deepest concern over the proposed restrictions on women's civil rights due to the inclusion of provisions for religious codes within the draft Constitution, including Sharia law. Congress condemns the current and continuing rape, kidnapping and murder of women in Iraq for not conforming to religious social codes. Congress is concerned that the proscribed role for women in Iraqi society proposed in the draft Constitution will hinder the development and organisation of Iraqi women trade unionists.

Congress is also concerned that the recent Decree 875 issued by the Iraqi Council of Ministers seeks to overturn previous decisions regarding trade union rights. Congress believes that the issue of trade union freedom is vital for the future of Iraq and particularly for the future of working women.

Therefore Congress calls on the General Council to:

- i) work with all the trade union federations in Iraq including the IFTU, FWCUI, and GUOE and other relevant organisations to defend working women's rights in Iraq;
- ii) campaign within the UK to highlight the issue of the restrictions on women's role in Iraqi society arising from the acceptance of the Constitution;
- iii) work with women's groups in Iraq such as the Organisation for Women's Freedom in Iraq to publicise their concerns; and
- iv) lobby the UK Government about the restrictions on trade union freedom arising from Decree 875.

Mover: Communication Workers' Union

Part 2

Motion remitted

9 Youth Matters - Green Paper on youth policies

Congress welcomes the Government's Green Paper Youth Matters and the central role given to the youth work values of empowerment by involving young people in developing new, more integrated services and increased volunteering in community organisations.

Congress welcomes the proposed additional £40 million capital fund for enhancing youth service facilities and the basis of policy in preventive rather than punitive approaches.

Congress believes the success of the Government's proposals will depend on crucial factors relating to the workforce and resources. Congress therefore calls for:

- i improved statutory provision for the youth service to ensure local authorities and children's and young people's trusts spend government allocations;
- ii a labour market plan to recruit the 4,000 youth workers needed to meet the current targets of the government's policy "Transforming Youth Work";
- iii a new system of regulation, licensing and continuous professional development for all those working with children and young people to be overseen by a general youth and children's workers' council;
- iv consistent application of the relevant, nationally negotiated professional terms and conditions and the development of employment compacts with the voluntary sector prior to grant allocations; and
- v the enhancement of professional specialisms within different disciplines of staff in the field.

Congress calls on the General Council to make representations to government, local government, and the voluntary sector according to these general principles.

Congress notes the opportunities for re-engaging young people in active citizenship and believes that all affiliates must redouble their efforts to involve young people in the trade union movement.

Community and Youth Workers' Union

Part 3

Motion lost

90 Equalities seats on the General Council

Congress notes that, at present, the equalities seats on the General Council, sections D-J, are elected at TUC annual Congress. Congress believes that the equality conferences are the correct electoral constituency for these seats. Congress instructs the TUC Race Relations Committee to liaise with other TUC equality committees in order to progress a reform of TUC procedures, allowing for the election of the seats in sections D-J by the appropriated equality conferences.

TUC Black Workers' Conference (exempt from 250 word limit)

Part 4

Motion withdrawn

52 Terrorism and public transport safety

Congress sends its condolences to all victims and their families and condemns the terrorist atrocities in London on 7 July, and supports law enforcement and other agencies in bringing those responsible to account.

Congress puts on record its gratitude to those emergency service and transport workers who dealt with the aftermath of the outrage magnificently, demonstrating high levels of professionalism, compassion and commitment. The action of these workers ensured that the working life of the capital returned to normality with minimum delay.

Whilst accepting that total security cannot be guaranteed, Congress calls on the Government to undertake a thorough review of the threat of terrorism to public transport safety and implement measures to improve this without delay. In particular, Congress urges the Government to ensure that appropriate training, equipment and back-up is provided for all workers who are likely to have to deal with such incidents in the course of their work. Congress also believes that visible front line staff have a crucial part to play in this and other aspects of public transport safety and demands that this is recognised by the authorities by opposing reductions in staffing levels that put profit before safety. Congress considers that by taking such action the authorities will demonstrate that they are doing everything possible to counter acts of terrorism. Furthermore, this action will demonstrate to public transport workers that their safety is paramount and will also help boost the level of public confidence in public transport during very difficult times.

Transport Salaried Staffs' Association

The following AMENDMENT FELL

Insert new paragraph 3:

"Congress believes a link exists between the terrorist attacks and the Iraq war and British foreign policy. Congress therefore supports the 24 September Stop the War demonstration and calls on the Government to withdraw troops from Iraq by Christmas."

In existing paragraph 3, line 16, after "safety" insert: ",and re-introducing guards and conductors on London underground and bus services".

National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers

The following AMENDMENT FELL

Add at end of final paragraph:

"Congress welcomes the steps taken by the TUC to better co-ordinate the experience of affiliates and calls for this work to be stepped up both within the UK and with sister organisations in the EU."

British Air Line Pilots' Association

Part 5

General Council statement

Congress adopted the following statement:

General Council Statement on the consequences of the terrorist attacks in London

The July 7 attacks on London's transport system were aimed at killing and injuring innocent people, many of them on their way to work. And as the failed attacks two weeks later demonstrate there remains a strong threat of further outrages.

In presenting this statement to Congress the General Council seek to identify the action that the trade union movement now needs to take in response to the new more dangerous situation in which we now live and work.

Trade unionists were among the victims of July 7. Trade unionists were prominent in the widely praised rescue and recovery efforts and we are determined that it will be trade union values of solidarity and unity through diversity that prevail in the new circumstances.

The victims of 7 July came from all parts of the world. They did not have a common race or religion. Many were drawn to London by the prospects of a better life. The bombers killed indiscriminately. Those who died could have been any one of the millions who travel around London every day of the week.

Our first thoughts are therefore with the victims: the bereaved, the injured and especially those who will carry the scars of that Thursday in July long after the headlines have faded. Our thoughts too are with the family and friends of Jean Charles de Menezes, shot dead by police officers on 22 July, another tragic victim in the aftermath of those first explosions.

Secondly, Congress puts on record its gratitude to those emergency service and transport workers who dealt with the aftermath of the outrage magnificently, demonstrating high levels of professionalism, compassion and commitment. The action of these workers ensured that the working life of the capital returned to normality with minimum delay. Many of those who were first on scene following the explosions acted with tremendous presence of mind, great determination and complete selflessness in tending the injured and dealing with the horrific situations that they faced. Some just happened to be there and could equally have been the victims as the rescuers but many were transport workers whose first instincts were to look after the passengers in their care. The part played by the emergency services has been rightly recognised as has that played by many others who had to undertake grim but necessary work over the following days through the local authorities, police and forensic teams. They all deserve great credit.

No amount of training or preparation can prepare for the sort of attacks which occurred on July 7, nevertheless it is clear that many of the preparations that had been made by the transport authorities, emergency services and others helped to ensure that the injured were treated as quickly as possible; that panic did not spread; and that the effects were not as devastating as the bombers intended.

And thirdly, we have been touched by the many messages of solidarity and sympathy which arrived from trade unionists around the world - in particular from those who have also experienced terrible suffering. They reminded us that the people killed and injured on 7 July, as in almost all terrorist attacks, were ordinary workers, bound together by international ties of friendship.

No matter how professional the response to a major disaster, there are always lessons to be learned and it is important that the appropriate lessons are drawn from the London attacks.

Drawing practical lessons from the attacks

Whilst accepting that total security cannot be guaranteed, Congress calls on the Government to undertake a thorough review of the threat of terrorism to public transport safety and implement measures to improve this without delay. In particular, Congress urges the Government to ensure that appropriate training, equipment and back-up is provided for all workers who are likely to have to deal with such incidents in the course of their work. The General Council welcomed the invitation issued to union representatives by Rt Hon Tessa Jowell, a minister charged with important responsibilities in the aftermath of the attacks. The meeting held a few days after the attacks provided a means for unions to have an input into the Government's analysis of the lessons which need to be learned following the attacks and we are continuing to ensure that unions draw on the experience of their members and that the results of our work are fed into the Government's own analysis.

It is clear that working people and their unions have a vital role to play in determining the proper response to the attacks.

At a time when there is increasing pressure on public bodies, as well as private companies, to maximise levels of efficiency and return on investment, management will always be counting the cost of any improvements in worker and passenger safety. Workers who are in the front line, through their day-to-day experience, are able to provide a unique and invaluable insight. They can give their own perspective into what safety measures are necessary; where the threats are at the greatest; and what support is needed in an emergency. It is essential that their experience is drawn on and that they have the opportunity to act collectively and independently through representative trade unions.

In addition to the discussions with government, we therefore welcome the talks that have taken place following July 7 through London Transport, through the individual organisations and companies and at workplace level. These should continue and we are looking to them to achieve the common goal of minimising the risk of further attack, whilst preparing thoroughly for the worst if it happens.

Whilst lessons can be learned and proposals implemented at workplace and organisational level, it is also clear that there are some key principles that apply more generally. In part these are drawn out of our extensive experience of dealing with health and safety in the workplace.

We would identify the following key points:

- Safety and protection measures must be introduced in consultation with the staff and their unions.
- Training for front line staff in coping with emergency situations should be reviewed in light of the increased threat of terrorist attacks and improvements made, in consultation with staff, as necessary.
- Effective communications systems are essential in emergencies, particularly when, as on July 7, multiple attacks are staged with the aim of maximising confusion and panic.

Communication systems should be reviewed and improvements made as necessary.

- There will also be scope for improvements to be made in the equipment available to deal with emergencies and risk assessments need to be undertaken to ensure that adequate funding is available for necessary safety measures.
- Whilst equipment and devices such as CCTV can assist, experience shows that there is no substitute for trained staff at times of emergency and any considerations of staffing numbers need to take this into account.

The July 7 attacks demonstrated clearly what we had all been aware of for some time, namely that there are people who have both the means and determination to attack us at our most vulnerable.

Within all workplaces, particularly those at greatest risk, management should be cooperating with union representatives, including safety representatives, in assessing risks to individual workers, to members of the public and to the organisation itself. Where there are safety representatives and safety committees in place they form a good starting point for this enhanced risk assessment. Where such representative structures do not exist they should be established as the most effective means of providing the appropriate levels of protection.

Congress welcomes the steps taken by the TUC to better co-ordinate the experience of affiliates and calls for this to work to be stepped up both within the UK and with sister organisations in the EU.

Building united communities

In terms of the wider society, it is even more important that the proper balance is achieved between protecting ourselves from threat whilst at the same time ensuring that these measures do not in themselves either threaten us or create a breeding ground for discontent and disengagement from society.

In the first few days after the attacks, there was a genuine sense of solidarity in the face of adversity - exemplified by much of the media coverage and especially by the Trafalgar Square vigil, which we helped organise with the London Mayor, and where the 'London United' message was clear, as was the united opposition both to terrorism and racism.

Nevertheless, whilst those sentiments remain dominant, we cannot ignore the fact that over the past few weeks we have also seen an increase in racial abuse, racial attacks and attacks on property such as mosques. Islamophobia is being fomented by the far right, who, like the bombers themselves, want to deepen divisions in society - to create discord rather than harmony and to set people against each other on the basis of race and religion.

The trade union movement has a proud record of standing up to the far right and working with communities under threat from racists. Over the past few weeks we have sought to build on this work through our local organisations and through the visits that the General Secretary and General Council members have paid to East London, Yorkshire and the Midlands to hear from Muslim and community organisations at first hand. We will continue this work over the coming months, seeking both a deeper understanding of the issues facing communities that have been targeted by the far right and seeking to engage all parts of those communities, most particularly young people.

Other groups and other organisations also have special responsibilities in the changed circumstances following the 7 July attacks.

As was noted above, the media played a powerful role in emphasising the genuine sense of solidarity across different communities following the attacks, but the

media can also play a negative role in simplifying, stereotyping and characterising groups in ways which play into the hands of extremists and undermine that sense of solidarity on which we need to build. As media workers have recognised through their unions, they and their employers need to be particularly conscious of their responsibilities and to act in a responsible way.

Educational institutions also have an especially important part to play in shaping attitudes. Schools and colleges and the education unions have taken these responsibilities seriously and the work which they have begun needs to be built on in creating and building on a sense of communal solidarity opposed both to terrorism and to racism.

As we have seen in many other situations across the world women and women's groups can play a vital role in standing up to men of violence and bridging divides. But in order to do so they need to work together and to develop supportive collective organisations and such organisations themselves require recognition and support across the community.

For its part the trade union movement will be looking for opportunities to work with other groups committed to the goals of countering both terrorism and racism.

Combating discrimination and disadvantage

Members of our ethnic minority communities continue to suffer discrimination and disadvantage. For example, our research shows that people of Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin, who have been the particular target for increased racial attacks, are overall, the poorest and most excluded ethnic groups in Britain and are most likely to live in the most deprived areas and in overcrowded conditions, with the highest rates of unemployment.

A government analysis categorises 69 per cent of people from these groups as 'poor' compared with 20 per cent of the white population and 22 per cent of the country as a whole. As our document *Poverty, exclusion and British people of Pakistani and Bangladeshi Origin* concluded, the London bombs will encourage policy makers to take an interest in the social exclusion of British Muslims, notably those of Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin. But the facts are sufficiently shocking to justify making the poverty and exclusion of British Pakistani and Bangladeshi people a priority regardless of any concerns about security.

The outlines of the action needed on employment are clear enough, and well-understood by the Government: they were set out in the report by the Prime Minister's Strategy Unit on ethnic minority employment. British people of Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin will benefit in terms of work, income and inclusion from:

Measures to improve educational and skills outcomes;

- Reforming employment programmes and services to 'reach out' to Pakistani and Bangladeshi people;
- Introducing the Building on New Deal (BOND) reforms, which will help Jobcentre Plus address needs which will go unmet by a 'one size fits all' approach. (Unfortunately, BOND currently only exists as a number of pilot programmes, and there are fears it may quietly be shelved as the Department for Work and Pensions struggles to make net cuts of 30,000 jobs);
- Support for good employers who want to achieve equal opportunities, and more effective use of public procurement to encourage others; and
- A political lead from senior Ministers. A recent report from the National Employment Panel proposed concrete measures that would make this strategy a reality: the DWP should concentrate resources on the cities where most black and minority ethnic people

live (in the case of people of Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin, this would be London, Birmingham, Manchester and Bradford). Outreach support for people who are not in work or on benefit and have traditionally been excluded from the labour market. And, particularly important for the TUC, the incorporation of race equality into public procurement 'within current legal and policy frameworks.'

Some of this is already happening through the Ethnic Minority Employment Taskforce. And matters are improving - but very slowly. In particular, more needs to be done in the private sector to encourage action on race equality. The TUC's preferred method for achieving this would be the extension of the positive duties of the Race Relations Amendment Act to the private and voluntary sectors. To support this we want the Government to use public procurement as a lever to improve the employment of black workers by explicitly including the promotion of race equality in contract criteria and ensuring that promotion of race equality forms part of the value for money consideration for all government contracts.

Union strategies to build cohesion and deliver equality

Unions are already contributing to this effort in a number of companies, by appointing workplace equality representatives, who provide workers with *independent* and *collective* representation on issues around equality and discrimination. We would like to see this initiative being supported by giving equality representatives statutory rights to represent their members, and the promotion of collective bargaining as a way to develop meaningful action plans to tackle institutional racism and to establish targets, with clear time limits to achieve fair representation of black workers at all levels in the workplace.

As Muslim leaders have also made clear they would welcome union action to broaden public understanding of the diverse faith traditions that make up modern Britain.

Community involvement must also go beyond economics. Declining levels of participation in the political process are a worrying feature of recent times that cut across social, religious and racial boundaries. But levels of participation are lowest in the most deprived communities and amongst young people. Addressing this disengagement is an issue for political parties and all concerned with the strength of our democracy.

Young people are at their most vulnerable to extremist influences, of whatever kind, where support for democratic values is at its weakest. It is healthy for young people to be exposed to a range of ideas and beliefs. The best way for democratic views to prevail is for groups based on democratic values, including trade unions, to involve themselves in communities and promote their own beliefs. Whilst such engagement provides no guarantee that extremism will not attract vulnerable young people it certainly reduces the pool from which the extremists can draw. Unions should look at ways of more actively engaging in such work in the community.

Peace and justice across the world

There are different views on the reasons why over recent years young people, mainly young men, from different countries and different backgrounds have been drawn to an extreme doctrine that leads them to kill themselves and many innocent people with them. What we know for certain is that this has happened across the world with attacks in Kenya, Morocco, Bali, New York and Madrid but especially in the Middle East and now in London.

The failure to make progress in the Middle East Peace Process, and the British presence in Iraq alongside the

United States, have made the UK a more likely target for such a terrorist attack.

Those close to the groups with which the terrorists have associated point to the mistreatment of communities identified as Muslim, in many countries and also to the injustices meted out to the Palestinian people as the reason for their hostility to the West and Western values.

Many of the injustices they point to are in areas where we and the international trade union movement have been active, working with the relevant trade union centres in pressing for progress towards peace in the Middle East and should these injustices be remedied (for example a lasting peace between Palestinians and Israelis and a significant reduction of tensions in Iraq), some of the justifications given for turning to extremism would have less apparent attraction.

Measures to combat terrorism while preserving civil liberties

But whilst work in the community and positive developments in international politics can help reduce the chances of vulnerable young people being drawn to doctrines which praise suicide bombers as martyrs to a greater cause, they will not in themselves tackle the immediate problem of how to identify further potential terrorists and prevent them from carrying out their attacks.

In these circumstances it is right that the Government should look at the measures necessary to minimise the threat. But it doing so it should not underestimate the value of the civil liberties which have been built up over many years in many cases as a result of trade union pressure. These are values which we cherish. They are the hallmark of a free society and once lost are not easily restored. We like others will need to be convinced in each case that the value of any measure is truly proportionate to its effect in making society safer.

As we have already indicated the trade union movement is keen to play its part in making society safer.

In terms of legislation, in recent years we have seen a number of anti-terrorist measures. From the 1970s onwards governments have tried in various ways to counter terrorism through legislative means.

Looking at the legislative options, the first question which needs to be asked is 'are existing powers being implemented effectively?'

The second question is whether new measures can achieve their desired objective. The desire to silence those who advocate terrorism or encourage terrorist acts is understandable and we would not wish to prevent such actions, but the measures need to be tightly drawn and fairly applied.

We are also concerned that measures that do not command widespread support across all the community can be counter productive in increasing the sense of social exclusion that was referred to above.

Measures must also be proportionate and applied even handedly. Outlawing certain Muslim groups whilst allowing groups which threatened violence against Muslims to operate openly would, for instance, be seen as unfair and more likely to alienate the very people who need to be drawn into the mainstream political process.

We will therefore be looking closely and critically at proposed legislation and measuring it by the test of whether it would be effective; command support across the communities; and be seen to be fair and even handed.

adopted 8 September 2005

Section 2

Verbatim report of congress proceedings

The following pages give a full verbatim report of the proceedings of the 137th annual Trades Union Congress, which met in Brighton from Monday 12 September to Thursday 15 September with Jeannie Drake presiding.

Congress decisions are marked with a *

FIRST DAY: MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 12
MORNING SESSION

(Congress assembled at 10.00 a.m.)

The President (Jeannie Drake): Delegates, I call Congress to order. The programme of music this week has been put together by *Music for Youth*, and many thanks to Norton's Hot Eight who have been playing for us this morning. Well done. That was fantastic. Thank you very much, indeed. *(Applause)*

Congress, I have great pleasure in opening this, the TUC's 137th Congress. I warmly welcome all delegates and visitors here to Brighton.

Appointment of tellers and scrutineers

The President: The first formal item of business is to ask Congress to approve the tellers and scrutineers as set out on page 10 of the General Purposes Committee Report booklet. Is that agreed, colleagues? *(Agreed)*

May I remind all delegates to switch off their mobile phones. Normally, I would be encouraging you like mad to use them so my members can stay in employment, but on this occasion can you make sure they are definitely switched off. You should also find on your seats details of the emergency procedures so, please, could you familiarise yourselves with them so should there be an emergency I will give you further instructions. If any delegates require first aid, the first aid station is situated by the food servery in the east bar, the doors of which are to my left, your right.

Welcome to Sororal and Fraternal Delegates

The President: Congress, I now come to the introduction of the sororal and fraternal delegates and visitors who are seated behind me on my right. As you would expect from the British section of an international 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 will be taking part in fringe events and some are here to network, to visit old friends in the British trade union movement and, hopefully, to make new ones. Our international speakers this year include Carlos Rodriguez, the President of the Colombian Workers' Confederation; Guy Ryder, the General Secretary of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, who will join us later in the week, and Elizabeth Bunn, the Secretary/Treasurer of the UAW in the United States and this year's sororal delegate from the AFL-CIO. I will say more about each of them when it is their turn to address you.

We have other international guests on the platform. We have Rasem Abdullah and Abdullah Muhsin of the Iraqi Federation of Trade Unions, and Teopista Mayanja, the General Secretary of the Ugandan Teachers' Union. Some of our international guests are old friends and colleagues making a return visit. Penny Schantz and Jerry Zellhoeffer from the AFL-CIO's European office. John Monks, the General Secretary of the European Trade Union Confederation, and Bill Brett from the International Labour Organisation. There will be a number of other representatives of global union federations and individual union representatives and other foreign visitors here today. You are all most welcome. I hope that the delegates will take the opportunity to meet with them and discuss the issues which bring us together as a global union family.

This year's fraternal delegate from the Trades Union Councils' Conference is Tony Carter. Welcome Tony. Congress, we are expecting many other guests during this week and I will introduce them to you when they arrive.

Obituary

The President: In leading in on Chapter 11 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 list Sir Edward Britton, former general secretary of the National Union Teachers; Lord Chapple, former general secretary of the Electricians' Union and who was president of the 1983 Congress; Peter Dawson, former general secretary of NATFHE; Bob Garland, former general secretary of the AEU foundry section; John Henry, former STUC deputy general secretary; Ina Love, former member of UNISON NEC and the General Council; Bernard Meadows, the sculptor, who designed *The spirit of trade unionism*, which stands outside Congress House; Ron Todd, former general secretary of the Transport & General Workers' Union and former General Council member; Joe Wade, former general secretary of the NGA, and Bob Wright, a former assistant general secretary of the AEU and a former member of the TUC's General Purposes Committee. Since the Report went to press, we have also lost a number of good friends of the trade union movement, in particular Mo Mowlam and Robin Cook, and many of us were deeply saddened by the news of the murder of Thomas, the 15 year old son of our former General Council colleague, Penny Holloway. Tomorrow, we will particularly remember those who died in the London bombings, but at this time I am sure our thoughts are also with those who suffered loss in the major natural disasters of the past year, the tsunami and the hurricane in the southern United States. I ask you to remember all of those who died in man made disasters, through poverty, war and conflict in different parts of the world throughout the past year.

Let us re-commit ourselves to the cause of world peace and let us stand for a minute's silence. *(Congress stood in silent tribute)*

The General Secretary: Congress, I now call upon the President to address Congress.

President's Address

The President: Colleagues, welcome to the 137th annual Trades Union Congress. It's a great opportunity for us to showcase the work we do on behalf of our six and a half million members, to celebrate the values that bind us together and to work out our priorities for the coming year.

This is the time to both look ahead and to reflect. It is now two months since the London bombings since we witnessed the worst in human nature, and, in the most trying of circumstances, the best in human nature. We saw the emergency workers, transport workers, social workers and support workers giving so much, so selflessly, on 7th July and after. What happened in London brought out the best in our movement. We were proud to work with the office of the Mayor of London to organise the vigil in Trafalgar Square one week after the attacks, and we were proud that trade union values – collectivism, solidarity, justice, equality and respect for all – were right at the heart of London's response, values we have been proud to promote in our fight against the bigotry and poison of the far Right.

The core message was simple. London United – one city, one world.

This year, and perhaps more than any other, we have become aware that we do indeed live in one world, a world, with all of its problems and all of its resources, we must share.

That is why my theme for this Congress, as TUC President, is *Make Poverty History*. As Nelson Mandela

said back in February, defeating poverty is the greatest cause of our time. It is not a gesture of charity but an act of justice. Also, as Gordon Brown said at the *Make Poverty History* rally, "Don't let anybody tell you there are no great causes left, don't let anybody tell you that politics doesn't make a difference".

Here and now in 2005, the world's poor effectively have to face a silent tsunami each and every month. For far too long they have drowned in a sea of apathy and neglect. Together we must turn back that tide.

As a movement, all our values, all that we care passionately about, mean that we must be at the forefront of a campaign to make poverty history. The world has never been richer or better placed in terms of medical science, technological innovation, and intellectual capacity to beat poverty. But we need to create the political will and eliminate corruption to deliver debt cancellation, more and better aid and trade justice.

In the past two weeks in New Orleans, we have learned just how fragile the wealth of the developed world is, with Hurricane Katrina revealing the vulnerability of the poor even in the midst of American plenty.

Access to work, underpinned by strong rights, empowers people to lift themselves out of poverty, and that is the message that applies as much in this country as it does overseas. But equally we should never forget that there are always people for whom work is simply not an option. One of the highlights of my spell as President was chairing the TUC conference on poverty, which brought together unemployed workers' centres and other anti-poverty groups, who provide vital support to some of the most vulnerable people in our society.

The launch of our *Peanuts 4 Benefits* campaign was a powerful reminder that living on benefits is not quite the bed of roses the *Daily Mail* says it is, and that not everybody has shared in the UK's economic growth.

The TUC conference on poverty in October will concentrate on Making Poverty History in the UK.

Work and poverty are intimately linked, with workless families much more likely to be poor. Plainly, any government that wants to address poverty must make a serious effort to eliminate worklessness, and whilst there has been some significant success, especially for the most disadvantaged, poverty remains a reality for far too many people and children in one of the richest economies in the world. The point is that unemployment often brings with it its own spiral of decline. It is a major cause of debt, which in turn is a major barrier to work, so the two reinforce each other, forcing families into a trap that affects health, relationships and social life.

Whilst we support the Government's drive to get more people into work, that should not be to the detriment of those who are unable to do so. Nor should a job – any job – be the limit of our horizons. We must aspire to get people from a job into a good job. We must move from high employment to high quality employment.

This year we welcomed Labour's re-election for a historic third term, but we know that mighty challenges remain. Warwick is a starting point, not a conclusion. We need a new agenda for the workplace. That means action across the board – from strong working time protections to better rights for temporary and agency workers to tough measures to combat the gender pay gap.

We welcome Labour's many achievements – the minimum wage, new family friendly entitlements and union recognition rights, but now is not the time to be held back by a poverty of ambition.

As the Prime Minister himself said recently: "Life is still a real struggle for many people and many families in

this country: families trying to cope with balancing work and family life...many families on low incomes who desperately need help and support to increase their living standards."

The UK remains one of the most unequal societies in the developed world. Just 2 per cent of the population now owns one-third of all of the wealth. Now is the time for the Government to engage our movement – to use us, to challenge us – as a partner in delivering social justice.

In an increasingly global economy, there is the real challenge of how to give the narrative to the social model in today's world, so that economic success can go hand in hand with decent employment standards, quality of life and income redistribution to the benefit of all.

We have seen what can be done on learning and skills. More than 100,000 people benefiting from union learning last year alone, a network of 12,000 learning reps – growing all the time – and our new Union Academy just round the corner.

Now is the time for a genuine political partnership on pensions. The TUC has a strong mandate from Congress to fight to protect and improve pensions, to address the disadvantages faced by many women both in terms of state and occupational pensions. We have a responsibility to ensure that any new pension settlement will leave a sustainable inheritance for future generations, for our children and for our young workers.

Politicians simply cannot muddle through the challenges that we face in our pension system. We need a planned approach based on solutions that offer fairness and certainty. We must re-assert the principle that pension provision is a three-way responsibility between the state, employers and workers. But as a movement, if we are to retain and enhance our reputation as campaigners for social justice then we must keep fighting for equality. Because we represent so many millions of workers, we have a unique cultural reference point from which we can contribute so much to the equality agenda.

The economy will thrive if businesses and organisations make full use of the potential of the workforce. This means drawing on the talent of everyone: black people, white people, women, men, straight, lesbian, gay, transgender, disabled and able-bodied, old and young.

The UK has a flourishing multiracial and multicultural society with people from black and minority ethnic communities making up almost 8 per cent of the population, with London boasting a minority ethnic population of 29 per cent.

But the diversity in the population as a whole is not reflected in our employment statistics. Despite hard-won employment legislation secured in the last 30 years, unemployment is higher now for black workers than it was ten years ago. Disabled people are still twice as likely as non-disabled people to be unemployed.

The answer is not simply more legislation on disability. You cannot legislate for attitudes: a massive cultural shift is also needed. Many employers still see the impairment rather than the ability.

For women, low pay is still endemic. There is a lethal cocktail of gender-based job segregation and sex discrimination in our workplaces. Unequal pay is still a dominant feature despite more than 30 years of equal pay law.

The Government have set up the Women and Work Commission to look at this issue and we will hear from the Chair, Margaret Prosser, later today. The encouragement of union equality representatives will make a big contribution to achieving diversity and

forthcoming recommendations from the Commission will be welcomed. This Government more than any other have recognised that diversity comes in many forms, and that we are not fulfilling our productivity potential if we discriminate against sections of society.

But we still have a long way to go. Every union has a responsibility to support action in the workplace to end discrimination, and our capacity to tackle inequality, to fight poverty, to defend pensions and to win for working people ultimately depends on one thing, and that's the collective strength of our Movement. One of the greatest challenges we face is to start growing again. Last year we saw a net increase in membership of 20,000. Yes, a welcome step forward, but it is the missing millions we have to recruit into the trade union family. That means getting to grips with the scale of the task we face, especially in the private sector. That means articulating a vision of work that today's workforce can relate to. In Britain today there are more women trade unionists than men trade unionists and black workers are more likely to join a trade union than white workers. We need to reflect that diversity in our leadership and in our bargaining agendas.

We must shout about our successes a little louder and a little more often, because I am optimistic that we can rise to these challenges. In the past year, what has struck me most about our movement has been the dedication, the decency and the diversity of the people who make up our movement. I saw that when I visited the Scottish TUC, when I addressed the four TUC equality conferences and, most recently, during the celebrations at Tolpuddle. That was a reminder of the richness of our history and the justice of our cause, and also a reminder that the struggle for trade union rights still goes on. Like our comrades in Colombia – the most dangerous place in the world to be a trade unionist – defending their movement from right-wing thuggery. Like our comrades in Iraq – the most dangerous place in the world full stop – trying to establish free trade unions in the face of appalling violence.

Last year 129 of our international brothers and sisters paid the ultimate price for their principles. Across the world, it is often the trade unions who are leading the fight for the rights and freedoms for men and women. As trade unionists – I want to say this collectively for us – there can be no definition of social justice which denies rights and equality to people because of their age, gender, race, religion, disability or sexual orientation.

I was delighted that the Women's Conference decided to submit a motion on 'omen internationally' to Congress this year. The TUC is working with Amnesty International UK in their campaign to end violence against women, which is still so commonplace in so many countries.

In Iraq women face a uncertain future, and they need our support. Their interests must not be neglected in any constitutional settlement. We are watching developments in the debate over the Iraqi constitution closely, and want to assist the trade unions in Iraq and in Kurdistan to fight for women's equality. That is one of the priorities of the TUC's Iraq Solidarity Committee.

So, Congress, this year, for so many reasons, international solidarity matters more than ever. It matters because we live in a world of increasing uncertainty and we live in a world disfigured by poverty and grotesque inequality. But we know a better world, another world, is possible. It's a world with trade unions at its heart and it's a world that we must keep fighting for.

Thank you and have a good conference. *(Applause)*

Vote of Thanks

The General Secretary: I now call on Billy Hayes, the General Secretary of the CWU, to move the vote of thanks for the President's Address.

Billy Hayes (*Communication Workers Union*): Chair and Congress, I am speaking on behalf of the General Council to deliver the vote of thanks to Jeannie Drake, this year's TUC President. Jeannie is also the Deputy General Secretary of the Communication Workers Union. As General Secretary of the CWU and as a fellow General Council member, I am happy to be able to deliver this vote of thanks on behalf of the General Council.

Presiding over the General Council is a big job. All the various competing agendas, in terms of time and in terms of policy and, it has to be said, sometimes in terms of ego, is no easy task. Jeannie has performed that role as President with diplomacy, intelligence and good humour and has ensured today in her speech that our collective voice is heard.

Jeannie has been described as a formidable operator in the male dominated world of trade unions, not just today, when women make up the majority of Britain's trade unionists, but at a time when you did not have to be male and forty to be a trade unionist – incidentally, I am 52 – but it certainly felt like that when I was a young trade unionist. Jeannie's trade union activities span more than 30 years. She was brought up in a Labour voting household. Jeannie first joined NUPE after leaving university. She then saw active service in the CPSA. If you were going to survive the slings and arrows of trade union fortunes, then the CPSA at that time was certainly the place to take up arms against the sea of troubles.

During this time she was also a mother who raised three kids. Jeannie, in her typically under-stated style, described this as 'multi-tasking', bringing up kids, being a trade unionists and dealing with employers. In my language, I think that is simply just hard work. Following the transfer of the CPSA P&T Group in 1985, Jeannie became the Deputy General Secretary of the clerical section of the NCU. In 1995, with the creation of the CWU, Jeannie became Deputy General Secretary and, subsequently, was re-elected twice to that position during a ten-year period. Those of us who have worked closely with Jeannie will testify to her ability; her exceptional negotiating skills, her sharp intellect, her ability to put male dominated officials firmly in their places when needed – I have been at the receiving end of that from time to time – and her determination to manage her work-life balance, both in work and in deed.

Jeannie has also been a strategic thinker on telecoms issues and on the wider movement. She has been instrumental in developing strategies which have increased the union's recognition in the telecoms sector from just one, many years ago, to more than 35 today in what is described by Ben Verwaagen, the chief executive of BT, as "the most fiercely competitive telecommunications market in the world". At the same she has ensured that our structures are responsive to lay members and Jeannie has also been a life-long advocate on equality issues both within the CWU and the wider trade union movement.

Jeannie was one of the first trade unionists to recognise what was happening in the pensions industry and her technical knowledge of pensions few can match. We hope, Jeannie, that the final report from the Pensions Commission, on which she sits, will take account of her expert input and help secure a new settlement on pensions. Aside from her work on the Pensions Commission and the Pensions Protection Fund, Jeannie has other commitments, including being a commissioner for the Equal Opportunities

Commission, a council member of the Open University and an employment appeals tribunal member.

Congress, Jeannie's obvious abilities, her proven track record and sheer hard work and determination demonstrate what an asset she has been to the trade union movement, particularly during this year and what an effective advocate she has been on behalf of working people generally. Jeannie, on a personal note, I would like to thank you for the help and support you have given me as general secretary. I think today, Congress, her speech – I would say this, wouldn't I, because we are from the same union -- was one of the best speeches that I have ever heard in terms of where we should be focusing our future as the trade union movement. Your speech, Jeannie, was absolutely on the mark. It told us where we need to be going and what the issues are.

On behalf of the General Council, I am sure that Congress would like to join me in congratulating Jeannie on your Presidency and what I believe will be a successful week chairing this Congress. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Denise McGuire (Connect): President and Congress, I am delighted and deeply honoured to second the vote of thanks to our TUC President, Jeannie Drake. Billy has mentioned Jeannie's amazing ability to multi-task and her immense capacity to do lots of things very well. Her intellect is razor sharp and it is always a joy to listen to Jeannie on the subject of the boardrooms of the UK, the companies, the white men who inhabit them and just how mediocre they really are.

Jeannie has campaigned on low pay and equal pay from her first days in the union movement. A subject very close to Jeannie's heart was the double-whammy which hit women's pensions – low pay and no pay – whilst bringing up children. When Jeannie was pregnant she used to think by lying on the floor, and when she was heavily pregnant, eight months and three weeks along, in fact, Jeannie was leading in some pay negotiations. During one of the adjournments Jeannie lay down to think, not on the floor this time but on the table in the boardroom. The employers' side returned and they saw Jeannie, thought she was giving birth and, with the great presence of mind that you would expect from senior managers, they ran out of the room. *(Laughter)* They were terrified. They were completely intimidated. So desperate were they to conclude the negotiations and see Jeannie off the premises that they had no choice but to cave in and cough up.

As a negotiator, Jeannie is formidable and she builds excellent relationships with union colleagues. One example of this was in the CPSA Post & Telecoms group merger talks with the Post Office Engineering Union, which Billy mentioned. The merger had hit what you might call a bit of a snag because the POEU conference voted no. The challenge for Jeannie was that the CPSA conference was to take place the next day. Jeannie really did not want her conference to vote no, and she was also facing an executive which, as usual, was split for and against the merger. Jeannie worked tirelessly through the night, talking and listening, proposing and rebutting, waking up her executive members and sending them back to sleep. By 6 o'clock the following morning everything was in place. Jeannie had convinced them all and they all agreed to her plan. They opened the conference and suspended standing orders. Jeannie then explained that their executive was going to 'chat' to the delegates. At the end of this chatting, Jeannie persuaded the conference to close without making a decision. However, because they were altogether they decided to have some fun, and I am told they had the most lavish dinner and disco in the union's history and everyone went home happy. If that is not impressive enough, Congress, you would like to know, I am sure, that the cost of that conference –

the hotel, the lavish buffet, dinner and disco – were all paid for by the other union. *(Laughter)* Being cheeky, now that other unions know about that, Jeannie, maybe they will be making you an offer before the end of the week.

If Jeannie has one fault, and I am not sure that she does because that is what the CWU told me I had to say, it is that Jeannie is not exactly the most punctual person in the world, but Jeannie's reposte to that is, "I may be late but I am always reliable".

On a personal note, I would like to thank Jeannie for her friendship to me and to my union, Connect. We are sister unions in the same industry, and I am proud to call Jeannie a friend and sister. Jeannie has done us proud during her term of office as the TUC President, she is a credit to the union movement and an inspiration to us all. Enjoy your Conference, Jeannie. I second the vote of thanks. *(Applause)*

The President: Thank you very much. I remember lying on the boardroom table when I was eight months pregnant. I had forgotten it temporarily. Thank you very much indeed for those votes of thanks. They were much appreciated.

Report of the General Purposes Committee

The President: Congress, I call upon Annette Mansell-Green, the Chair of the General Purposes Committee, to report to us on the progress of business and other Congress arrangements.

Congress, Annette is the first ever woman Chair of the GPC. *(Applause)* You have shown by your applause that it is an achievement that demands a special mention. Annette's position is a testament to both her own talents and to the continuing advance of women at all levels of the Movement. Many congratulations to Annette, and we look forward to her and the rest of the committee keeping us in order for the rest of the week. Thank you.

Annette Mansell-Green: Good morning, Congress. I am very honoured to hold this position as the first woman chair of the GPC. I believe it is important to say that this is not about myself but it is on behalf of all women trade unionists. *(Applause)*

Congress, I would like to begin by reporting on progress on the Final Agenda. Composite Motions 1 – 20 have been agreed. They are set out in the printed booklet entitled *GPC report and composite motions*, which also include the General Council's statement on the consequences of the terrorist attacks in London. On behalf of the GPC, I would like to thank all those unions which co-operated and worked together to reach agreement on the composite motions.

I can also report that the GPC has agreed Emergency Motion 1 on Gate Gourmet. This will be moved by the TGWU and seconded by the GMB, and it will be taken this morning in the Employment Rights debate. Copies have been distributed on delegates' seats.

The GPC has also agreed a collection for the Gate Gourmet workers which will take place at the end of this morning's sessions at the doors of the hall and at the main exit. Delegates should also note that the TSSA has agreed to the General Council's request to withdraw its Motion 52 in favour of the General Council's statement on the consequences of the terrorist attacks in London, printed at the end of the GPC report.

Delegates should also note that two nominations have now been withdrawn. These are the nominations of Steve Kemp for the GPC and Ian Lavery for section C of the General Council. Both of these withdrawals are noted in the printed final agenda.

May I remind Congress that, in order to complete our business expeditiously, delegates should be ready when

called to speak. Would delegates who know they are scheduled to speak please move to the front and be ready to come to the rostrum quickly. Please also respect the limits on speaking times. These are five minutes for movers, three minutes for seconders and supporters of motions. However, in order to ensure that we complete our business, please come to the rostrum quickly.

Finally, I urge that you do not impede the progress of Congress and draw unwelcome attention to yourself by failing to switch off your mobile phones. Thank you.

The President: Congress, I now invite you formally to receive the GPC's Report. Can we agree? Thank you. *(Agreed)*

Fairness at Work

Barry Camfield (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) moved Composite 1.

He said: Thank you, President. I am proud to be moving Composite 1. I think it would be wrong not to start this speech by welcoming all of our members from Gate Gourmet who are in the audience. *(A standing ovation)*

Congress, much more will be said about Gate Gourmet workers by my General Secretary, Tony Woodley, in the Emergency Motion. I want to deal with the broad issue of employment rights and to start by saying that we are in a new situation today which opens up the possibility of real change for British trade unions, our members and all workers.

Firstly, Tony Blair's term of office as the leader of the Labour Party is coming to an end. He is going. We need a new start under a new leader and the end of New Labour; a new leader who is proud to be a real trade unionist, not just a card holder; a new leader who will make a difference to those Gate Gourmet workers, who will defend them, stand up and speak in favour of them and all workers in struggle; a new leader who is proud of Labour's tradition, its history and its real cause and a new leader who is proud to be a Socialist on the side of workers, the unions, the poor, the majority.

Let us start the debate now about what kind of leadership we want for the Labour Party after Tony Blair departs and ask every candidate where he or she stands on trade union freedom.

Secondly, this could be an absolutely historic Congress for the British trade union movement because today we are about to adopt a truly progressive policy by committing our movement to work and fight for a campaign for our own emancipation, our own freedom and rights as trade unions. We are sending out a message to all those hard-working, under-paid and over-stressed workers of Britain that their trade unions are now ready to battle for trade union freedoms. These freedoms are for a purpose. That purpose is to provide workers and their families with freedom from poverty, long hours, the sack, low pay, pensions robbery, victimization, inequality, injury, ill-health and, yes, death at work, too, through corporate killing.

Composite 1 restates and calls again for the repeal of the anti-trade union laws, but, importantly, it calls for a new Trade Union Freedom Bill next year, which is the centenary of the Trades Disputes Act 1906, which first gave unions their freedom to act, to take strike action and to be protected in doing so, including solidarity action. We want a Trade Union Freedom Bill that will finally right the wrongs and the injustices of that Tory Government all those years ago; informing, educating and mobilising our members in common cause with sympathetic lawyers, academics, progressive politicians -- a real campaign. We call for a huge mobilisation in 2006 to support our Freedom Bill. Critically, we call for the legalisation of solidarity

action. Does the disgraceful treatment of the Gate Gourmet workers not show the justice of that case? *(Applause)*

We call for the abolition of restrictive and bureaucratic balloting and industrial action procedures; the right to have workplace ballots; the right to automatic reinstatement; the right to a strike; the freedom to write our own rule books free from state control; the right to decide on expulsions and admissions to our unions and, yes, fundamentally, the right to expel racists and fascists from our union. *(Applause)*

I want to pay tribute to ASLEF for all its fighting work in this area and to the sisters and brothers in my own union, the T&G, where we have sought and successfully expelled racists and fascists, and to all those unions who are fighting to keep them out of our ranks and our Movement as we say with one voice: "There is no place for you in our movement, no place at all." *(Applause)*

In conclusion, in a world today dominated by capital, global corporations, free trade and the profit ethic, trade unions are the only real defence for working people. Our British trade union movement is waking up. Let us organise to win. There must be no more fear about our rightful freedoms and no more threats about "Support Labour at any cost or you will get the Tories". I remember my mum saying that to me when I was a little kid! We are not children being lectured at by patronizing New Labour apparatchiks elected by no one. *(Applause)*

Comrades, it is time for us to stand up, to forge our future together and to end Britain's repressive anti-union laws. Let today be a new start for working people in Britain, for Gate Gourmet workers and many others. Let us give them back a free trade union Movement.

Bob Crow (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers' Union*) seconded Composite 1.

He said: I have absolute pleasure in seconding the resolution and composite excellently moved by Barry Camfield and the Transport and General Workers' Union. Well, there you have it. We are eight and-a-half years into this Government now. Where are all these laws which the Labour MPs said they were going to repeal when they came to serve in office? Nine lots of anti-trade union legislation were piled on the workers of this country in those dark, miserable days of Thatcher. To the eternal credit of the Labour MPs in Parliament, when they were in opposition they voted against every one of them. Since then they have had majorities of 160, 140 and over 60. Why can't they do the same thing, which they did when they were in opposition, and repeal every single anti-trade union law put on the books? *(Applause)*

Do you remember what Thatcher said? She was going to give the union back to the members. Well, where are the 6 million members who have left this trade union movement since she said it? In 1978, in the last years of the Callaghan Government, 78 per cent of workers were covered by a collective agreement. Today that figure is 35 per cent. Two-thirds of workers now are not covered by a collective agreement. The Gate Gourmet workers, who we proudly saluted a minute ago, and quite rightly so, were told that they were acting illegally by taking unofficial action. What is the difference between unofficial action and official action? The argument should be: was the action they took effective or not? It was effective and we should be proud of what the Gate Gourmet workers did. *(Applause)*

It is harder to go on strike under Labour than it was under the Tories. They say it is about democracy and having a ballot. If you go to a low skilled workforce and you say to the employer: "Dear Guv, in eight days' time we are taking strike action", shall I tell what he

will do? He will phone up an agency and bring in the scabs to do the work. I do not have a lot of time for Winston Churchill, but, thank God, he never deployed those tactics in World War II. Can you imagine him ringing up Hitler and saying, "Dear Adolph, my old mate, in eight days' time we are sending some Lancaster bombers over to bomb you in Dusseldorf; please put your Messerschmitts to one side"? Of course, it is about bringing scabs in to undermine effective trade unionism.

On the railways, we have a strike with one National Express company. What do they do? They bring in managers from other companies, as scabs, to run those services. If it is good enough for them to bring scabs in to undermine our trade union's effective action, it should be right for us not just to take secondary action, which I do not accept, but solidarity action, which is something that this movement and every other trade union movement was built on throughout the length and breadth of Britain. *(Applause and cheers)*

We need to start waking up to the concept of putting pressure on this Government. It is about time we called a national demonstration. We want that national demonstration to say to those new, up and coming leaders of the Labour Party: "You cannot just expect to have our cheque book every four years and we get nothing in return." All of the lobbying groups that go into No. 10 are lobbying for their piece of the action. We should be saying, on behalf of the trade union movement, 100 years after the Taff Vale judgment fined my union £26,000 and the same companies are trying to sue my union for half a million pounds: "In 100 years' time, governments will have come and gone, but this trade union will still be here." They can put us in straitjackets, but workers like those at Gate Gourmet and other groups of workers throughout the world will stand up and fight. Repeat the anti-trade union laws and let us have a march on Parliament to define the freedom of every single worker who operates in Britain! *(Applause)*

The President: That woke us up, did it not?

Employment Status

Alan Ritchie (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) moved Composite Motion 2.

He said: This composite goes to the core values of the trade union movement - the rights of workers. Construction is an industry of extremes. Millions of people work in the industry, but most of the main contractors do not employ a single person who will build the construction projects in the construction industry. On most sites, if you do not sign a waiver on the Working Time Regulations, you do not start work.

With this background, you would not be surprised at the statistics. Every week one or more construction workers are killed on a construction site. Last year, 72 workers were killed for no other reason than they worked in the unregulated construction industry. By the end of this conference, another construction worker will have been killed.

This is what happens when you let market forces rule. We have had flexible labour working for more than 40 years. It means that the industry drives for more profits at the expense of workers' rights. The construction industry is now facing a skills crisis. How can we train craftsmen for the industry when employers do not employ anyone directly? It is no wonder that the industry has an image problem. We are selling a low cost model. That model consists of no respect for workers' rights; the worst health and safety record in the UK industry and inadequate training provisions resulting in an average age for the industry of over 50.

UCATT has known of these problems for a number of years. Contractors make their profits from using so-called flexible labour and the bogus self-employed. Up to 50 percent of the cost of construction output is labour costs, so keeping workers weak and divided is crucial to the employers. It means that workers rarely have a collective voice representing them.

These employers do not want to be tied down with redundancy selection or unfair dismissal claims. They do not want to be bothered with employment rights and contracts of employment. When we challenge sham contracts on site, we get the usual excuse from contractors that there is nothing they can do about the bogus self-employed. We believe something can be done.

In 2002, the Government launched a consultation paper on employment status. UCATT submitted an overwhelming argument to extend employment rights to all workers. It has now been nearly three years since that consultation closed. We are still waiting for a written response from the Government. We believe it is a disgrace to wait three years and still have no response from the Government. Now we have a third term Labour Government, which includes the commitments made at Warwick.

This composite tells the Government that the time is up. We demand employment rights for all workers. By extending employment rights to all workers employers will not be able to dodge their responsibilities; they will not be able to have tax dodges; they will not be able to avoid National Insurance payments and they will not be able to operate the biggest tax fiddle in the UK.

There is a mobile army of tax advisors who suggest contract clauses. However, these clauses bear no relationship to reality. Their sole purpose is to convince a tribunal chairman. All this is done by the employer to avoid giving workers their rights. In so doing, it denies workers the right of dignity and takes away the respect that they deserve.

What type of society are we living in today, in the year 2005, that denies workers the right to sick pay, the right to a pension scheme and the right to holiday pay? I am not talking about a few hundred workers, but hundreds of thousands of workers in construction in the UK. These conditions have been used to drive up the profits for the major contractors.

Finally, I realise that Congress has many important issues to discuss this week, but nothing is more important than workers' employment rights in this country, not only for the workers of today, but for the workers of tomorrow.

Martin Spence (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*) seconded Composite Motion 2.

He said: We have just heard a very eloquent speech about many of the problems faced by workers in the construction and building industry. I want to talk about the problems faced by workers in film and television production. On the face of it, you would think that there could not be two more different industrial sectors. However, the fact that we have similar problems in these two sectors speaks volumes about how widespread these problems of insecure employment, casual employment, freelance employment and bogus self-employment are.

Film and television is seen by many young people as being a very glamorous and sexy industry. It is an industry in which people want to work. That is taken full advantage of by employers. In film and TV production we are now talking about an almost entirely casualised industry. The television programmes you watch at home, the films you watch in the cinema, on DVD, or wherever, are made overwhelming by freelance workers. There are

freelance technicians in the Congress hall today recording our activities. I know that because I have had a chat with some of them.

This is a freelance industry. However glamorous it may look from the outside, it does not feel very glamorous from the inside for many of those freelance workers. These are people with no permanent employer, no permanent workplace, no permanent relationship with their employer and who are moving from contract to contract. A contract may be a day or two, it may be a few weeks or it may, if you are very lucky, be a few months at a time. It is chronic insecurity and chronic unpredictability within your working life. This poses two sorts of problems.

Structurally, those sorts of workers are always in a very weak bargaining position with their employers. The result is a long-hours culture which is absolutely endemic. We have members of our union working in film and television production regularly working 12, 13 or 14 hours a day. Yes, I know that those are illegally long hours, but that is the reality. The pressure on those workers not to speak up, not to complain, not to insist on their rest breaks is enormous, because if you speak up in this industry, you do not just get a bad name with your employer, you do not get another job! You do not get another job because that is what casualisation is about. The 48 hours waiver is absolutely standard. It is written into your contract. Agreeing to the 48 hours waiver is a condition of employment for many thousands of freelance workers in this industry.

There are structural and legal problems because many of these workers are not actually clear what their legal rights are. Sometimes they are employees, sometimes they are workers, but 'worker' is defined in different ways, and sometimes they are self-employed contractors. We are asking in this motion for three things. We are asking for a clear definition of 'worker'; for clear opposition to the 48 hours opt-out, which has been in place for far too long and for continuing opposition to the European Services directive, which simply promises to make these problems even worse.

Andy Reed (*Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*) supported Composite Motion 1.

He said: I am pleased to support Composite Motion 1. The buzz word for our society is 'free'. We are the 'free' world with our 'free' market economies and our 'freedom of expression'. We have freedom coming out of our ears - individually, that is. Once we start being collective, the shutters start coming down and trade union freedoms are way down the list.

We do not have a legal freedom, as we see fit, to take industrial action, to use our money for political purposes, to take solidarity action or to decide on our membership base and our union rulebooks. That is why ASLEF offers its full support to initiatives within the composite. We especially welcome the positive aspects of the composite. It is not enough to condemn the restrictions upon us. We need to map out how we will end them.

The introduction of the Trade Union Freedom Bill could be a massive step in the right direction. It would involve government, people and the unions in an open and honest exchange about the rights, privileges and powers of trade unions. It would demonstrate some of the ludicrous restrictions placed upon us, like the incredible fact that we do not even have the right to decide who we can have as members.

Let me give you an example. A member of my trade union, ASLEF, also happened to be a member of BNP, so we 'invited' him to leave. He refused to do so. We removed him from membership of our trade union. He then took legal advice. Legally, we had to re-admit him to membership. Whilst we were in the process of

that, the individual ran court cases against various members of my trade union. Why on earth should we have in our membership someone whose desires, objectives and world vision are diametrically opposed to our very own objectives?

The BNP on its official website talks about 'the failed multi-cultural experiment'. Trade unions embrace the richness of a multi-cultural society. The BNP talks about 'the threat posed by Islam to our traditions, freedoms and Western democratic values'. Trade unions welcome the contribution that a multi-cultural society brings to our Western democratic values. The BNP calls for the repatriation of immigrants. Trade unions welcome the opportunity to enrich our society's experience. The BNP wants to insist that anyone who has completed National Service must maintain an assault rifle in their home. Trade unions want to see a society whose base is tolerance and understanding, not coercion and force. Yet the law says that we, trade unions, must admit people who pedal this kind of filth in our membership, count them amongst our number and embrace as comrades those committed to destruction of our movement.

That is why we back TUC action; to demand a Trade Union Freedom Bill; to give us back the dignity that comes from self-regulation; to end the constraints that are not imposed on employers and to reassert our self-respect and independence. Thank you, Congress.

Judith Griffiths (*Communication Workers Union*) supported Composite Motion 1.

She said: Congress, the restoration of full trade union rights and the repeal of the anti-union laws is essential if we are to defend our members from the actions of anti-union employers and to build this movement. Gate Gourmet may take centre stage for its vicious treatment of hundreds of workers who refuse to accept pay cuts. However, Gate Gourmet is not alone in its objectives, although most companies use a more subtle approach to undercut decent pay, namely, the hiring of migrant labour agency working, temporary contracts and the segregation of women, black and young workers.

This composite demands the strengthening of protection against discrimination and exploitation of these sections of the workforce for that very reason. As well as demanding legal protection for migrant workers, we must begin a mass campaign to organise migrant labour to protect them from Mafia gangmasters and to ensure they are not used to undermine trade union rates of pay.

The composite seeks to ensure that workers receive proper compensation if an employer is declared bankrupt and seeks to add pensions and training to the collective bargaining agenda where unions gain statutory recognition. At a time when many companies are intent on closing final salary schemes and reducing pension contribution rates, workers need all the help they can get to protect their pensions.

However, as vital as legislation is to provide a legal framework of workers' rights, ultimately, it is left to trade unions to ensure the enforcement of those very rights. The current anti-union laws protect bad employers. We need to step up the campaign and support the call for the lobby and march to demand a Trade Union Freedom Bill.

However, our members on a daily basis take solidarity action in support of their colleagues. In traditional industries, such as the Post Office, workers are often moved from office to office in order to undermine effective action. Of course, outsourcing has further exacerbated the situation in relation to solidarity action.

In this new climate, it will no longer be possible to continue just to demand that the Government unshackle the unions. As Gate Gourmet has vividly

shown, the law is on the bosses' side. Trade unions and trade union rights were won through the struggle of workers against vicious employers, against casualisation and those very same issues have re-emerged today with a vengeance.

We celebrate annually, as a movement, those who lost their lives fighting for what is right. As in the past, if struggle is required to defend workers' rights and regain free trade unions, we should be on board and rise to these challenges. If Labour under whatever leader it has refuses to put the trade unions on an equal footing with employers, those laws will have to be challenged and unions must begin, as some already have, to consider their relationship with that government and with Labour. Thank you, Congress.

Paddy Lillis (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*) supported Composite Motion 1.

He said: Colleagues, we have come some way from 1997 towards a degree of justice and fairness at work and towards a better regulated labour market at or near full employment levels, better for workers and their families and better for the taxpayer. However, we still struggle at one of the last great frontiers, the regulation and management of working time, that is, putting workers at the centre of working time arrangements which promote their needs and not just that of business, be it as part-time workers looking for hours and patterns which suit their commitments or long-hours workers looking for a better quality of life without their living standards suffering. In each case they are trying to combine their private, family and working lives more successfully, not just as parents and carers, but as workers and citizens in their own right, pursuing a changing variety of needs and interests and developing and varying them over the years as their own needs and priorities change.

Through our bargaining activity and a variety of high profile campaigns, we have at last begun to make some headway. We have a degree of regulation around the 48-hour week, though often ransacked by the use and abuse of the opt-out. We have bargained for some time and with some success around term-time working, annualised hours and job sharing, for example. Those are real gains, in many respects, but too often too modest.

The fact is we are battling against a culture of 'presenteeism', the view that a worker's status and value, though not necessarily his or her pay packet, are reflected in the hours he or she puts in, working longer but not smarter -- long hours which are very often the product of poor quality management -- and also a misguided belief amongst our own people sometimes that the more hours we put in, the less leave or holidays we have, the better workers we must be. It is a vicious circle and we need to break it.

As we move forward into the 21st Century, the working time challenge is going to grow. Our success in regulating and bargaining around working time will go a long way to determining our value and success as a movement. The General Council's 'It's About Time' campaign gives us a vehicle to go on campaigning for better regulation from Government -- there is a long way to go on that front -- and help guide and resource our collective bargaining efforts. Please support.

Jeremy Dear (*National Union of Journalists*) said: This week there will be much media speculation about whether our movement backs Gordon or backs Tony. Every speech will be analysed, every motion, every handshake and every round of applause will be scrutinised to see whether at heart we are Blair-ites or Brown-ites. To many millions of our members, it does not matter. It is like asking us to choose between 'Pop Idol' and 'Stars In Their Eyes'. It is the same programme, different presenters, different singer, but the same old tune. Comrades, in this composite, we

are not just asking for a change of DJ, we want them to change the bloody record! (*Applause*)

Let us make it clear. We do not accept that it is a burden on business for workers to have employment rights from day one. We do not accept that casualisation, insecure employment contracts and bogus self-employed status represents the pinnacle of free choice. We do not accept it can be called fairness at work when it is all right for employers to act together to break a strike, but unlawful for our members to act together to show their solidarity in a strike.

The anti-union laws do not deliver fairness. They underpin a low wage and long-hours culture in which union rights are undermined and human rights abused. As Bob Crow said, it is time for those who opposed such injustices in opposition to repeal the laws in government because otherwise millions of our members will rightly ask: "Where is the fairness?" In respect of my members at the *Racing Post*, in the face of an NUJ recognition application, on behalf of 70 per cent of the staff, Trinity Mirror was able under the law to recognise a company union with not one single member. Where is the fairness in that? Add to that the situation at News International, where Rupert Murdoch coughs up quarter of a million pounds to set up his own union, voluntarily recognises it, provides it with offices, legal advice, human resources and, under the legislation, it acts as a block to legitimate, independent trade union recognition applications.

Such action reveals the truth behind the anti-trade union laws. They have nothing to do with democracy, nothing to do with handing unions back to their members and everything to do with seeking to destroy the ability of the unions to act effectively on behalf of our members. It is time they were replaced with a Trade Union Freedom Bill with automatic reinstatement, the right to strike and the right to solidarity. (*Applause*)

If the Government's mantra is choice, in the immortal words of Train Spotting, choose solidarity, choose fairness, choose justice, choose union rights and choose not just to pass this composite, but to begin building for the major campaign, mobilisation and march necessary to deliver that justice for our members. (*Applause*)

Brian Caton (*Prison Officers Association UK*) supported Composite Motions 1 and 2.

He said: I am pleased to be speaking in support of Composite Motions 1 and 2 and with specific reference to the much needed repeal of the Tory-inspired but Labour-maintained anti-trade union laws. One particular and specific piece of anti-trade union law introduced by the Tories and, despite the promises to remove it when coming to power, maintained by the current New Labour Government is the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 and especially Section 127. This anti-trade union law was applied to criminalise prison officers throughout the United Kingdom.

For prison officers in England and Wales, this unfair and disproportionate act has been removed, but for our members in Northern Ireland, it has been retained because they have refused to sign a no disruptive action agreement because of their own circumstances and the constant attacks on themselves and their families.

The POA has such an agreement in place in England, Wales and Scotland, but if we are ever to take any form of disruptive action, it has been made clear that this Government would re-introduce Section 127 to criminalise the acts of prison officers. The POA seeks to avoid disruption in prisons and to the justice system. However, we are not convinced that prison managers or, indeed, the current Government are equally committed to good industrial relations at this time.

We see an ever-increasing prisoner population without an equivalent increase in trained prison officers.

Attacks on our pensions and the ludicrous suggestion to force prison officers to work until the age of 65 are all on the agenda of this Government. There is the continued threat of immoral and dangerous use of privatisation to drive down costs and with it the loss of care and security of prisoners, staff and the general public.

We know that the actions of this Government and the Prison Service will need to be challenged. The POA will challenge those actions. It is unacceptable to have a continuation of these anti-trade union laws, but it is also unacceptable for any worker to be threatened by government to re-introduce Dickensian restrictive legislation. We add the POA's voice to the call to use our history under a 100 year-old Act to establish trade union freedom and liberty today and for this trade union movement in the future. Please support.

Brian Garvey (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*) supporting Composite Motion 1 said: Colleagues, in 1997 the Labour Party came into power ending 18 years of Tory misgovernment. Since then, unfortunately, they have failed to repeal any of the laws that the Tories brought in that limited and paralysed trade unions in certain aspects of their governance. These laws allow unwarranted interference in the self-governance of trade unions. Golf clubs, the Masons, even the Conservative Party have more power over their own governance than do trade unions. Fairness, where is it? This lack of self-governance potentially creates various problems for trade unions. There are those who wish to damage unions, disrupt the organisation, and undermine their very democracy. We are the most democratic organisations in this country. There is no getting away from that fact. These people try to use the current legislation to oppose the democratically agreed policies of trade unions. Attempts to discipline these members can actually result in applications to the certification officer with regard to so-called unjustifiable discipline. We have heard an example of that already.

Colleagues, the NASUWT is currently facing attempts by a small minority, two or three disaffected members, who wish to challenge the internal union processes. They are costing the NASUWT thousands of pounds in legal fees. If we were a small union, this could actually damage and hinder our work with regard to the members, but we can cope with this.

This motion calls for a review by affiliates sharing their experiences, which has not been previously been done to any great extent in this area, to produce a report that would inform and support the TUC's campaign to repeal these laws. Colleagues, I urge you to support this composite motion. Thank you.

Allan Garley (*GMB*) supporting Composite Motion 1 said: The GMB believe that fairness at work demands an effective legal basis for collective bargaining. Trade unions bargain in the shadow of the law. The right to organise and bargain collectively needs to be positively protected by the law. This right was protected to some extent by the legislation passed by the Labour Government between 1974 and 1979. For example, in respect of union recognition most of that legislation was far from perfect but it was repealed by the Tories in the 1980s and 1990s and replaced by a legal framework which strengthened management discretion and weakened collective organisation. Since 1997 we have seen a return to legislation designed to promote good industrial relations but a lot more needs to be done to promote collective bargaining.

In recognition applications, for example, the Central Arbitration Committee is only under a duty to have regard to encouraging and promoting fair and efficient practices and arrangements in the workplace.

Whatever that means it falls far short of a legal duty to promote collective bargaining. Another example, why is there no duty on ACAS to promote collective bargaining? There needs to be.

The introduction of laws positively to protect the right to organise and bargain collectively will protect essential social rights. We all know, colleagues, trade union busting organisations are taking advantage of Britain's employment law in their attempts to remove trade unions from the workplace. We know the tactics they use: they attempt to destabilise, demoralise, and then derecognise. Congress, the balance of forces needs to be changed.

Those people clinging on to the social partnership rhetoric and claptrap need to rethink their way forward. All affiliated unions and the TUC have a vital role in debating, formulating, campaigning, and then delivering a positive legal right to organise and bargain collectively. Thank you.

Bob Oram (*UNISON*) supporting Composite Motion 1 said: I am grateful for the opportunity to speak in the debate. Like all the speakers today, UNISON believes we have the worst employment rights in Europe. It is a disgrace that this continues under the watch of a New Labour government. I want to add our union's voice to all those supporting workers who have suffered because of privatisation or outsourcing and who are taking solidarity action.

Comrades, out in the lobby there is a stand promoting tourism in Southport, Merseyside. I have nothing against Southport, it is a nice place, but I do have a problem with its council. On Saturday, 14th May, six UNISON activists joined a small demonstration against a housing stock transfer being proposed for Sefton. The protestors were outside a shop that the council had rented in the shopping precinct in Sefton protesting against the launch of the campaign to encourage the tenants to vote for the transfer. On the Monday the protestors were suspended from work and today, 16 weeks after the event, two of them, Nigel Flannigan and Paul Summers, are still suspended and face dismissal.

Our union's position has not changed throughout that period. Within days we made it clear that the suspensions were a disproportionate response to what happened, or is alleged to have happened; the council had over-reacted. The suspensions are a political act and an attack on UNISON as a result of our support for the Defend Council Housing campaign, a campaign that spent £17,000 compared to the council's £5.5m, and was still successful in rejecting the privatisation of those council houses. Since May we have made every effort to resolve this dispute but Sefton refuse to move and intend to go ahead with gross misconduct hearings.

The branch has taken three days solidarity action and all 2,000 members have been out on strike; it has been solid and disciplined. The council know that the branch, the Northwest region, and UNISON nationally, believe this to be victimisation and will continue to support its members. This is not a complex dispute, it is very simple to understand: the employer has targeted two trade union activists for their trade union beliefs and intends to sack them. Of course, I would say that, wouldn't I?

I will quickly quote a couple of statements from the police officer who was actually at the demonstration: "I did not see any of the protestors going up to the shop window, staring in, pointing at the staff, making them feel uncomfortable. I did not hear them swear at any members of the official party. No one from the transfer shop made any complaints about anybody shouting at them, at the time, to myself or my colleague who was there. There was no incident that

they were aware of and was recorded in their notebooks." That is from the police.

This is a direct attack on trade unions carrying out legitimate trade union activity. I think it is a disgrace that the council intends to go ahead with their action. I know that everybody in this room is going to do something about this important composite. We must act on it in 2006. I also urge everybody to show support for the two comrades who will be down here this afternoon from Sefton; they are going to lose their jobs for undertaking genuine solidarity action with council tenants. I would urge you to do the same. Thanks very much, comrades.

The President: The General Council supports Composite Motions 1 and 2.

* *Composite Motion 1 was CARRIED*

* *Composite Motion 2 was CARRIED*

The President: I did intend to mention when Bob Crow came up to second Composite 2 that he was nominated Player of the Match when the TUC cricket team finally, after ten years, under the captaincy of Mike Leahy, defeated the might of the British journalist corps. Mick and Brendan keep insisting that it was their two runs that made the difference, but as I was there and as I am genuinely a dispassionate and independent president, I really do think Bob Crow was the Player of the Match, with his 60 not out. Thanks very much.

Gate Gourmet

Tony Woodley (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) moved Emergency Motion 1. He said: Colleagues, I will start at the outset by saying that there is no doubt at all that this is the most important debate we are going to have during this week. It is not just about policy, or indeed just about rhetoric, it is about a fight for justice going on right now for ordinary run-of-the-mill working men and women. These people need our 100percent wholehearted support.

I will ask Congress again to pay tribute to the working men and women who are battling their socks off for their jobs, our people in Gate Gourmet, comrades. (*Applause*) That is what being in a trade union is really about, fighting for people, real people with a real problem, not worrying about mixing with the good or, indeed, the great. Let me say to my members and our comrades in the balcony, not just on behalf of the T&G but on behalf of the whole of the TUC, your fight is our fight and, as you can see, we are all genuinely with you and we are doing our best to help you here.

With this in mind I would just like to take the opportunity to thank Brendan Barber. The amount of time he has put in to try and help us find a resolution has been staggering. Brendan, thank you. I am grateful.

Many of us are used to stories of bad behaviour by big business and, indeed, bad bosses but at Gate Gourmet we have a renegade venture capitalist company, headed up by American union busting bosses, plotting for more than a year to sack low-paid workers, working behind the scenes to provoke a dispute to justify that sacking, secretly recruiting agency labour on still lower rates of pay, and locking out our members in the canteen on the day that they sacked them. They sacked them by megaphone on the orders of a cowboy capitalist from Texas, and I do not mean George Bush.

Comrades, this is truly the unacceptable face of globalisation, a man who insults our intelligence by saying that our members, ordinary working men and

women just like us, are all acting like lunatic troublemakers, 200 militants in a small plant. If it was not so serious, I would say, "Don't make me laugh." It is unbelievable what they will say to justify their unjustifiable actions. Our members are just hard-working, decent men and women, set up, victimised, and sacked, for no good reason other than to cut costs at their expense. It is an absolute disgrace that this can happen in our country today. No decent boss, no worker, no politician, could ever support such bad behaviour in our country.

It is not good enough just to condemn the bad bosses, we have to ask ourselves, how can they get away with such bad behaviour in 21st century Britain? How can they conduct industrial relations on the basis of deceit and, indeed, intimidation? It certainly would not be allowed to happen in any other state in Europe. The anti-trade union laws that all previous speakers have spoken about on the statute book are clearly a green light for greed, a charter for this cowboy capitalist, and a licence for bullying. They should go; not tomorrow, they should go now.

When I mentioned solidarity action all the commentators and, indeed, the politicians who have nothing to say about exploitation, who will not lift a finger to help low-paid Asian workers from mistreatment, were outraged when T&G members at Heathrow Airport walked out in support of our sacked workers; even Lord Rees-Mogg at the time said I should be sacked or sent to prison. If solidarity is a crime, then send us all to jail, your Lordship, because that is what we may have to do to fight back for our rights in this country.

The movement was built on solidarity and we know that is why Thatcher made solidarity unlawful, to make us ineffective. We have to be determined now, comrades, in this movement to move on from the 1990s when our movement was too weak to help colleagues in distress and difficulty. How can it be right that T&G members in Gate Gourmet cannot support their sacked brothers and sisters in struggle whilst at exactly the same time bosses can fly in scabs from any part of Europe with the full backing of the law? How can this be right in Britain today? We do need to redraft those laws, we do need to make solidarity action a basic human right, and we do need to campaign now.

Comrades, we are endeavouring to find a solution to the Gate Gourmet dispute but, be clear, you do not plan action like this to take people back to work just because of an argument. I would like to thank many of you for the support you have already given us but we do need further financial support for our sacked workers, and we do need to make sure that every MP and every part of our country understands what is going on here. It must be understood that in a civilised society this action cannot be allowed to go on. Colleagues, we have to show this government that the time for waffling over employment law is over. We have to stop these outrages happening again and turn round and make those changes. If we make the changes, then that is the response, the only response, that is worthy to obtain justice for our brothers and sisters who I am privileged to represent and who are here with us today from Gate Gourmet. Thank you, comrades.

Paul Kenny (*GMB*) seconding Emergency Motion 1 said: I was not sure, Tony, because of your Liverpool accent whether you said Brendan was seeking support for the 'revolution' or 'resolution' of the dispute! I hope it is the latter. I am honoured and somewhat ashamed, actually, to second Emergency Motion 1: honoured to stand alongside our brothers and sisters in the T&G from Gate Gourmet and ashamed as a movement that, after nearly a decade of a Labour government, working people in this country can still be

treated with such disrespect, be bullied, victimised, and sacked. I apologise that the TUC policy has not been implemented by government. We now see the victims of the failure in the last seven years to repeal anti-trade union rights and laws brought in by Thatcher, the result of inaction by a Labour government.

I know it has become popular to knock the TUC but the General Secretary, Brendan Barber, and the General Council, should be congratulated on their total and firm support in lining up to fight this injustice. There is a battle ahead, make no mistake about that. As long as the TUC is in the forefront of supporting struggle, its unity and its future are secure.

Texas Pacific own Gate Gourmet and for some time our international colleagues in Unite Here and SEIU have been warning us about the North American union busting agenda. David Siegel, the Chairman, accused those hardworking people, those men and women who were employees at Heathrow, of being militants because they wanted a job, militants because they wanted proper pay, militants because they wanted security at work, and that they are disruptive because they wanted and expected respect, dignity, and equality, from their employers. All I can say is that it is a pity there are not a few more million militants in this country right now. Respect, dignity, and equality, which we stand for as a movement, are the values by which you judge a society. That is another reason to thank the Gate Gourmet workers for reminding us of the values we should stand up for.

At election time I am used to seeing Labour politicians holding up pledge cards telling us what they are going to do. I want to show them a pledge card, our pledge card in this movement, our trade union membership card. It pledges that we will support and unite when our members, or the members of this movement, or workers in this country, are under attack. I call on everybody inside the TUC to join together in the struggle to support justice for the Gate Gourmet workers. If the government does not understand, then they should talk to those workers who are being victimised and attacked day in, day out, for seeking to defend their jobs.

Tony (and I mean Blair, not Woodley), never mind about favours for the few, what about fairness for the many? Any dispute, colleagues, and those of you who have been in one know, is hard and lonely. Working people should not have to experience the trauma of dismissal by text, email, or megaphone. The choice is simple for government, it is about decency. We must have the freedom to show solidarity legally and restrict the abuses of employers like Gate Gourmet, Morrisons, Asda, Wal-Mart, and Sefton. The GMB is proud to support the courage of Gate Gourmet workers and ashamed that we have to do so in 2005. We pledge our solidarity in your struggle and the fight for justice. Thank you.

The President: Thank you, Paul. I am conscious that I was very generous with the timing there but I think the spirit of Congress was that Paul should have the opportunity to articulate the view of his members. I call on the General Secretary.

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*) supporting Emergency Motion 1 said: President, Congress, I rise to offer the support of the whole General Council, and I am confident the whole of the trade union movement, to the T&G in their battle for justice for the Gate Gourmet workers so cynically and cruelly sacked by their employers. Since the dispute erupted on August 10th the TUC has been in close and continuous contact with the T&G, backing in any way we could their efforts to get this company to accept that they simply cannot walk away from the sacked workers, and to bring them back into negotiations. Those efforts are continuing.

Over the days and the weeks since the megaphone sackings of August 10th, the dismissed workers have stood together with dignity and determination in the face of outrageous slurs and vilification and it is great to see them with us here today. Along with Tony, I have had the opportunity to meet the workers and their reps. Believe me, their courage is inspiring. Our top priority is, and must remain, winning justice for those workers. Of course, there are wider issues which we expect the government now to address. What this dispute has shown us is the grim fact that our labour law has left these workers absolutely defenceless. That is clearly unacceptable.

I say to the Government, if you share our anger at this outrageous employer behaviour, then sit down and work with us to prevent this ever happening again. The T&G deserve all our support but, even more importantly, the Gate Gourmet workers need all our support. I urge you to carry this emergency motion.

* *Emergency Motion 1 was CARRIED.*

The President: Could I just reiterate, Tony did say in his moving speech that they were appealing for trade union solidarity, including financial solidarity. This is an important fight so there will be a collection for the Gate Gourmet workers as you leave this morning's session of Congress. Could I encourage you to give generously to ensure that their fight is a great success. Thanks very much.

Organising

Jack Dromey (*Transport & General Workers' Union*) moved Motion 1.

He said: We exist for truly the most noble of causes, the freedom of working people in a free society built on solidarity and social justice. Power for working people springs from strong organisation in the workplace, but that power is in decline. Unless we reverse the decline, we will see a world run by rich men and the employers. For all of us there is no choice but to change, refocusing everything we do on organising to win in the workplace. We must not be defensive or complacent. We are all proud of our history, winning real progress for working people, and we survived the Thatcher winter.

In the T&G we are proud of our tradition of being an awkward independent progressive and fighting organisation standing up for our members. We should all be frank, workplace organisation is not what it once was. For the T&G two things are key: First, building with our friends the GMB and Amicus a new union 2.5 million strong. No one here should fear the new union. A strong new union will strengthen all working people; only bad managers or ministers who do not listen to the voice of working people need fear it. Mergers in themselves, however, do not create new members. Second, therefore, organising is key, organising built on the simple truth, that unless you build strong, self-confident, self-sustaining workplace organisation, you do not win in the workplace, you do not grow. Our hard-pressed officers are run ragged servicing a fragmented and declining membership.

We have started by seeking to reorganise the workplaces where we have 800,000 members through our 100 percent Campaign, strengthening workplace organisations and making sure that every worker is in the union. There should be no No-Go areas in future, no more workplaces where we have recognition but only a minority in membership, no more workplaces where the directly employed are organised but temporary, casual, and agency workers are not. All of us face the same task and all of us should learn from one another working together.

Next, we need to organise unorganised workplaces, always applying those organising principles of helping

workers to help themselves. In the T&G we have established the national organising department, which I head, to develop and deliver in partnership with our regions major organising campaigns, from low-cost airlines to logistics we are going for it and growing in expanding areas of the economy. All workers need unions and no workplace is 'unorganisable'. Our message to Michael O'Leary and Ryanair today is, your time will come. In building services, too, we are organising an army of cleaners, most are migrant workers. We welcome them to our shores unlike the brain-dead boot boys of the BNP. These workers suffer, however, from super exploitation; from Canary Wharf to the House of Commons they have had enough. They want a living wage and respect, and they will win it.

Congress, we need a new generation of organisers who believe in old truths. In the T&G we have recruited the first 50 of our organisers, who include experienced shop stewards and convenors. We are also changing the face of the union. One third are women, two of them young Polish organisers. Our building services organising team is black and Latino and we are now joined by our Muslim brother who believes that all good Muslims should be good trade unionists.

Congress, in conclusion, this motion focuses on the future, on the need for solidarity and practical action. Welcoming the work of the Organisation and the Representation Task Group led by our General Secretary, Tony Woodley, we spell out the need for action on the following key five fronts.

First, unions must work together and never allow themselves to be used by employers. To be blunt, we have had sorry experiences of sister unions signing sweetheart deals where we have organised workers into the T&G. We as a movement must act to tighten our own rules, banishing from our ranks disreputable behaviour.

Second, good facilities agreements are essential for good workplace organisation. As unions we need to work together to negotiate better facilities agreements, and the Government should get a move on with its promised review of the law strengthening the rights of shop stewards to enjoy better facilities in the workplace.

Third, capital is global but labour is local. We pride ourselves on international solidarity, and it can make a real difference. The time has come, however, to go one crucial step further. The new union will organise Europe-wide and at the T&G right now we are planning the first international organising campaign working with sister unions committed to the organising agenda. We will target multinationals in the continents and countries where they have the bulk of their work, acting together and moving at the same time.

Fourth, Labour's third term manifesto explicitly stated that a goal of public policy is to help unions grow. We now want to see practical action ranging from simplifying recognition procedures, including better rights of access, to removing the shackles on solidarity.

Fifth, our experience is that high quality research is key to effective organising. The T&G and the TUC together took a pioneering initiative in logistics developing our capacity to undertake qualitative research of workers not in the union and to find out why. We have a choice, we can either make history or we can become history. I, you, we, have not devoted our lives to the cause of working people to become a movement that future generations read about but do not belong to. The TUC must be relevant, working with us to refocus on organising and rebuilding our movement. Decline is not inevitable. We can and will rebuild only if we organise.

Leslie Manasseh (*Connect*) seconding Motion 1 said: In seconding this motion I would like to focus on a key feature of the organising challenge that faces us, that is, the difference, as the President mentioned this morning, between the public and the private sectors. Therein lay some uncomfortable statistics. Of some 6 million public sector workers over 60 percent are in trade unions, but there are getting on for 20 million private sector workers and less than 20 percent of them in trade unions. Recognition is the norm in the public sector but the exception in the private sector. In short, Congress, while trade unions are part of the public sector landscape, we are barely visible in vast tracks of the private sector. In 64 percent of workplaces with more than 10 employees there is not a single trade union member. The situation is set to get worse if we do not correct it. The forecast areas of growth in employment in the private sector are precisely those areas where we are weakest.

I do not want to underestimate the importance of organising and campaigning in the public sector, nor the real problems our public sector members face but, Congress, that is not where the real organising challenge lies. There is a risk of trade unionism becoming, and perhaps more importantly being seen as, a public sector phenomenon that would make it even harder to organise in the private sector. It must make us think long and hard about our priorities and make sure we speak to the concerns of and on behalf of workers in the private sector. This means, quite simply, we must organise.

As the motion makes clear, there are no easy options here. Organising is hard work. It is about campaigning on the issues that matter. It is about speaking a language of the world of work which chimes with their experience. It is about putting organising near the top of our agenda when it comes to resources rather than near the bottom. It is about remembering that millions of workers have never had any real contact with a trade union and it is our duty to reach out to them. Although organising is hard work, the good news is that it works. It is a real challenge, no doubt, but it is not beyond us and, more importantly, nobody is going to do it for us.

Congress, unless we put growth and renewal in the private sector at the heart of our priorities, we cannot prosper. The sheer arithmetic of non membership is compelling enough but if we need a better reason we only have to look back at the previous debate. Who would speak up for, who would fight for, who would support, who would defend the 670 workers sacked so disgracefully by Gate Gourmet if they were not themselves trade unionists able to organise and act collectively in defence of their rights? Congress, we need more of them. Please support.

Paddy Lillis (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*): I want to express my union's support for the General Council's Report and the motion before Congress today. There can be few of us left nowadays who honestly believe that people will always join because it is in their blood or because their fathers or grandfathers were trades unionists or because of some commitment to the past. Some will but all too many will not, as Jack Dromey just said. We have long since learned the golden organising rule: people will only join us if they see the point here and now. It will not happen by magic. Recruitment has to be planned, managed and monitored. Organising takes resources, skill and training. Committed lay members are always best placed to recruit non-members, not the hard pressed full-time officers running on and off sites, dealing with disciplinaries, grievances and tribunals, and all the other areas of their work. But the local rep, or networks of them, meeting, winning over and signing up new members day in and day out, and then getting them involved, aware and organised and

keeping them in the union, that is the prize and it has been the goal of the TUC's Organising Academy in recent years.

I want to pay tribute on behalf of our union for the groundbreaking work of the Academy staff and for the forward way they have opened up for all of us in this hall today. Following their lead, my union – USDAW – opened our own Academy in 2003. Dozens of lay representatives have now spent six months each on secondment to the union – in fact 54 in the three years – undergoing extensive training, coupled with hands-on practical experience in a wide variety of workplaces, so that we now have a large and growing group of skilled, knowledgeable active and competent lay representatives and organisers and it is really paying dividends.

In the last three years over 20,000 new members have been recruited directly by these 54 people, and well over 500 new shop stewards have been identified and brought on to ensure the sustainability of their workplaces. On top of that, we have a range of agreements with employers to second lay representatives, agreements to stand them down from their usual duties, to resource key organising initiatives, all in addition to the work and resources we dedicate through our full-time people.

It is not easy, and its front end cause is certainly there but so too are the dividends and the vital lessons for the future – dividends and lessons which are grounded in the work of the TUC Organising Academy. We owe them a huge debt of thanks. Please support the motion and the General Council's Report.

Kevin Kelly (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supporting Motion 1, said: Congress, at last year's Congress I spoke about PCS's national organising strategy. Since then, we have been building a stronger healthier PCS. Since then, we have increased the number of our branch organisers from 150 up to 470. We now have over 1,000 learning representatives. We have increased the support for organising. We have trained all our lay organisers, developed with the TUC a strategic training for lead lay organisers, issued regular organising newsletters, we have more full-time organisers, to find, train and support lay activists – all full-time organisers trained by the TUC Organising Academy. We built organising into our trade union education. We have held organising conferences in every part of our regions and on a national basis as well. We have produced more campaigning literature; we have increased the number of activists in our union to around 8,000. We have a growing network of young members with over 50 regional convenors.

Our membership now stands at its highest level ever, 325,000. We believe we are the fastest growing union in the TUC. Congress, an organising union that negotiates hard, backed up by campaigning, mobilising members and the use of industrial action as a last resort has been part of the cornerstone of our success, a cornerstone that has enabled us to win on members' issues. In an ironic way, New Labour has helped us. They have tried to slash our jobs, they have tried to relocate our work, they have tried to attack our pensions and they have tried to refuse to ignore our claim for fair pay. That has angered both members and non-members alike. It has strengthened their resolve to join PCS to get active and to fight back.

Last year, on November 5, when 200,000 of our members stood up for their jobs by taking industrial action, that showed the importance of being well organised. We recruited thousands of new members 1,000 on one day alone. We got members involved not only in industrial action but in the leafleting, the picket line, the petitioning that took place on that day, and that included especially young members. The threatened pensions dispute early this year also

repeated that process and Tony Blair found that he did have a reverse gear after all.

There is still a lot to do. Organising is a long-term strategy. In PCS we have to tackle under representation, election participation, our communications structures and adopting an organising approach in every branch. If the trade union movement is to make a difference for workers then every union has to become an organising one. The TUC can and must make this happen. This motion sets out clearly the work to be done. Support Motion 1 as amended. Together let us build a stronger, growing, healthier trade union movement, one that is campaigning, vibrant and involves members in its campaign, and a union movement that wins on the members' issues of pay, jobs and pensions.

Bernice Waugh (*NATFHE - The University & College Lecturers' Union*) supporting the organising motion and speaking specifically to bullet point (iv), and speaking from personal experience.

I have two daughters; I am very proud of my daughters. One is a shop worker and is a young member of USDAW; one is at university. Like other single parents, and like every person in this room, I have a budget to work to. Like you, I have been involved in the labour movement in my branch for more years than I care to remember. Point iv) calls for improved paid time-off and facilities for workplace reps. This week my employer intends to dock four days' pay from my wages for attending this Congress, an 80 per cent deduction. When we hear government ministers talking about democracy, when we hear the CBI, the Tories, talking about fairness, when we listened last year, quietly, whilst Tony Blair talked of 21st century progress, well isn't there some irony here? Progress, what progress?

Last year, my first year at the TUC, I was very proud, I was paid; this year, a pay cut. Individual trades union members up and down this country are being penalised and victimised, paying out of their pockets and with their time to carry out their duties and their activities, the duties that every modern 21st century employer considers necessary for harmonious and effective industrial relations. Organising, fairness at work, freedom for trade unions, what price Warwick now? Alas poor Warwick!

Support the members; please support this motion.

The President: I wanted to take the opportunity of the first contribution of a speaker from NATFHE to send on behalf of Congress good wishes to Paul Mackney, who is the general secretary, who had a heart attack and is now recovering, which is excellent. But he is still poorly although he keeps using his BlackBerry and Email to make his views known to the TUC! Some people are simply irrepressible, are they not, whatever the odds, but I am sure collectively, on behalf of Congress, you would want me to send him our best wishes for a speedy recovery because he is a character and a half.

Thank you, Bernice, for allowing me to use you as the opportunity to do that.

Paul Talbot (*Amicus*): I shall be brief in relation to supporting Motion 1. If we were to believe some of the media comments in the run-up to this Congress, about the decline of the trade union movement and the membership, you would see this as a question of whether or not we have a future. We have all suffered; we all understand the effect of the last 25 years of neglect in the manufacturing sector, something that has done more to decimate trade union membership than any other single factor.

It is often the case that behind the headlines there are many, many good stories and I just wanted to say that, in relation to our own position, Amicus last year recruited in excess of 70,000 new members. The net

effect, of course, at the end of the day was considerably less than that, for reasons which I am sure we all understand -- reasons which are largely not under our control. But the positive message is that many of these new recruits were first-time trade union members. They came from sectors that, by and large, were considered to be non-traditional for the trade union movement to be involved in. The number of women involved in the union has increased in the course of the last fifteen months, as has the proportion of people from professional and managerial backgrounds as well. Where the results remain disappointing is in relation to our ability to recruit young workers, and in that respect I suspect we are not alone. We also need to address the issue of people from ethnic backgrounds, of whom the proportion inside the union is extremely low.

However, we are tackling some of these issues, or at least we are attempting to tackle some of these issues. Our recent involvement in the Glastonbury Festival, our participation -- along with other unions here in the TUC -- in the Make Poverty History campaign in Edinburgh are all demonstrations of us trying to get the message across that the trade union movement stands for principles, it stands for social justice, it stands for fair employment and it stands for good retirement security.

Where we do strongly agree with the movers of the motion is that a renewed effort must be put in to recruit people who are not currently members of the trade union movement. That is a dedication that requires effort, requires money, requires people, requires time and innovation, not least of which -- in an age of 24/7 news coverage and mobile technologies -- requires good communications systems between the union and the members themselves. It can be done; we can demonstrate it can be done. Indeed, let me just take this opportunity to praise one of the individual members, Jessica Fagan, who is one of the joint winners of the TUC 2005 Organising Award, to show that with the correct attitudes and the correct effort and the support of the organisation on the ground, significant inroads can be made to recruit new members. It is campaigning, it is aspirations, it is using the legislation such as information and consultation, it is building sustainable work forces, and it is helping to train people to help themselves. In brief, where there is work there is a need for a trade union.

The President: The General Council is supporting the motion.

* *Motion 1 was CARRIED*

Union subscriptions and tax allowances

The President: I now call Motion 7, Union subscription and tax allowances. The General Council support the motion.

Martin Fletcher (FDA) moved Motion 7.

He said: I am well qualified to propose this motion as I am one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Taxes. I can say that with confidence because, when I say that at a party, I find people move to another room or sometimes they move off to another party. But today I am speaking to a captive audience. At least, when I wrote that I thought I was!

I fully understand the legislation on income tax. The general principles are quite simple. Tax is paid on a person's earnings after allowable expenses have been deducted, so if a person earns £15,000 but has expenses of £1,000 tax will only be paid on £14,000. However, expenses will only be allowed if they pass various tests that Parliament has laid down. Lots of payments do pass that test and the expense will be allowed, and that is fine. But the rules do not allow for trade union subscriptions to be treated as an allowable

expense for employees. I personally regard my trade union subscription as a necessary and legitimate expense. Indeed, I do not see how I could earn my salary and not pay my union fees, although I understand that a small number of my colleagues do not take the same view. (Pause here for cries of "Shame on them" and if no cries heard remember to reprimand the General Secretary later!)

I accept that the law on this subject is clear. Some years ago I was a member of the AIT, the Association of the Inspectors of Taxes. In 1981 the AIT tried to claim tax relief for a proportion of the union fees based on the amount of union money spent on professional activities as opposed to industrial relations. The Inland Revenue refused the claim and the AIT took the Inland Revenue to a tribunal to fight the case. Despite the fact that there were more senior tax inspectors appearing for the union than there were for the Inland Revenue, the union lost the case. The law did not allow the relief and that was the end of the matter. We continue to feel that while the decision may be right in law it is morally wrong.

I am happy to pay tax on my earnings -- well, I am not actually happy, but you know what I mean -- but what I pay tax on should be the amount that is left after my union fees have been paid. They are a legitimate cost of being in employment. The Inland Revenue guidance on the subject says this: subscriptions to trades unions and other comparable bodies are not deductible even where membership is required by the employer. The expense is not incurred in the performance of the duties nor is it necessarily incurred. But there is then a long list of professional bodies and learned societies where fees and subscriptions can be allowed for tax, and it is a large document over 100 pages long, listing the bodies to which members can make payments with full tax relief. Within the list there are 14 TUC affiliated trades unions, but the vast majority of unions are not included. The National Union of Mineworkers is not included but the Institution of Mining Engineers is. The National Union of Journalists is not included but the Institute of Journalism is. The Musicians Union is not included but the Royal Musical Association is, and so is the International Society for Music Education and the Institute of Music Instrument Technology. The FDA is not included but the National Association for Personal Secretaries is, as is the Institute of Directors. In this debate the FDA is aligned not with the professional unions but alongside the NUM, the NUJ, the TGWU and many others.

A couple of years ago the TUC made representations for a partial relief based on the amount spent by a union on training, but nothing came of this. The FDA is not asking for partial relief and we are not trying to justify relief based on professional work, training or any other single aspect of union life. We are seeking total relief for the whole union subscription based on the fact that union fees should be a basic employee expense and should be recognised as such. It beggars belief that in the third term of a Labour Government this fundamental relief has not been given. How can payments to the Institute of Directors be more worthy of relief than payments to the Fire Brigades Union, UNISON or Prospect? The law as it stands is unworthy of a Labour Government; indeed, it is unworthy of any government but especially unworthy of a Labour Government. The time has come to change it and I ask you to support this motion and support a campaign for change. I move.

Malcolm Cantello (UNISON) seconded Motion 7. He said: supporting and seconding the FDA motion on tax allowances on behalf of UNISON.

Congress, it is almost nine years since my union first approached the Inland Revenue to point out some of the anomalies of the tax allowance system. Our case at the time was that we should have parity with the

organisations such as the Royal College of Nursing around tax relief on subscriptions for nurses and other healthcare professionals. After all, what is the difference between the RCN and us when it comes to offering the same services and opportunities for career development and support? To qualify as an approved body so that members can qualify for a tax rebate we were told that we had to meet the set of criteria set out in the legislation that cover training, education, and professional services. Well, if that is what the revenue want, we said that is what we can give you.

I do not have time to describe our work with other education providers, or the work we have done around the design of courses that link into the knowledge and skills framework which underpins the new Agenda for Change grading system in the NHS, and three minutes is just not long enough to tell you about the skills for life courses we offer that have encouraged tens of thousands of our members back into the education system, or the workplace learning programmes we have running that will provide new career opportunities to our members in sectors like health and social care. We do all this, like other unions, because we want our members to fulfil their potential and because all our work also improves workplace performance. Why else would so many employers be eager to work with us? Even as the Inland Revenue prevaricated over our role in providing training opportunities, employers were quick to appreciate what we had to offer. By 2003 we were working in 345 partnerships with employers to deliver paid courses during work time, so all in all you could say we do even more to qualify for the government's criteria than many existing approved bodies.

At the end of the day this motion is about fairness. We have already called for fairness in the union movement in respect of employment law. We are now calling for fairness in the taxation system. As a movement and as individual affiliates we are providing positive life and career changes as chances to our members, and we are often at the centre of reforming the workplace to make them efficient, effective, sympathetic and fair environments. The government tell us they are serious about life-long learning and creating a skills-based economy. Tomorrow Gordon Brown may even speak about building an industrial relations culture based on unions playing a positive role in partnership. If that is what they want then they must use the tools at their disposal to help us to grow and develop.

Therefore, Congress, I urge you to place pressure on the Government to acknowledge the work that we do and the support we give to our members. We must call on the government to give us a level playing field in the taxation system and offer workers a financial incentive to join a union. Congress, support Motion 7.

* *Motion 7 was CARRIED*

The President: We are running short of time for this morning's session so I am not going to take paragraphs 2.1 to 2.3 of the General Council's Report or the presentation of the 2005 TUC Equality Audit now because I do not want to rush them in the next few minutes, so we will take them either this afternoon or later on in the week.

Congress, I am sure most of you will already know our next guest speaker, Baroness Prosser, who was formerly Deputy General Secretary of the T&G and a long-serving member of the General Council. I know from my own experience she was a positive powerhouse on women's rights issues when she was on the General Council. She was President of the TUC in 1995 to 1996 and last year Margaret was appointed by the Government to chair the Women and Work Commission, which was set up to address the difficult but persistent problem of unequal pay. Margaret is

going to tell us about the important work of the Commission and I am delighted you could get here, Margaret. I invite you to address the Congress.

Address by Baroness Margaret Prosser (Chair of Women and Work Commission)

Baroness Margaret Prosser (*Chair, Women and Work Commission*): Thank you very much, Jeannie. First of all, may I offer you my congratulations on your position of President of the TUC. I hope you have had a good year and I hope you have a very enjoyable week; I am sure you will.

May I also thank the General Council for asking me to address Congress on the work of the Women and Work Commission. I think I will just start by briefly explaining the background to the Commission. Following discussions between the trade union members of the Labour Party Policy Forum and members of the Government on, among other things, the trade unions' request for the introduction of statutory pay reviews, and acutely aware of the looming financial problems posed by equal value claims, particularly in the National Health Service and local government, the Prime Minister decided that there should be a thorough study of the continuing reasons for the gender pay gap. He therefore asked me to chair a commission which would investigate the issues including -- and I quote here from our terms of reference -- "Looking at the case for equal pay reviews to be mandatory and at measures necessary to strengthen equal pay legislation" and to report back to him with recommendations for action. The time frame given was 12 months.

The magnitude of the task did not escape me: 35 years of legislation and a pay gap still wide enough to accommodate the proverbial coach and horses, and we were given 12 months to solve it all! Still, nothing daunted, we set about our task last September. I can advise you that I have now written to the Prime Minister explaining that the sheer volume of work and the complexity of the issues have meant that 12 months has not been long enough. I have proposed a final report date of January 2006.

The Commission is comprised of 14 people with extensive experience of the world of work. The TUC representatives are Kay Carberry, our Assistant General Secretary; Debbie Coulter, Deputy General Secretary of the GMB; Liz Snape from UNISON; and John Hannett, General Secretary of USDAW. We have representatives from the CBI, the public sector, ethnic minority workers, education, training and, of course, the Equal Opportunities Commission. Our style of work has been much like that of the Low Pay Commission. We have received academic research, oral presentations from unions and business and from small innovative projects working, for example, to help women returners. Among those who have made presentations to us have been those with experience of equal pay audits, union equality representatives, computer clubs for girls and Connections, the old careers service. We have been out and about to companies large and small and we have visited the whole of the United Kingdom in an attempt to find out about stumbling blocks as well, of course, as to identify examples of best practice.

So, what does all this tell us? Well, first and foremost it has demonstrated that the problems relating to women in the labour market, which lead to such unequal earnings, are multifaceted and quite complicated. There is no silver bullet answer to what is a multi-layered problem. Processes such as equal pay reviews may well have a part to play but the evidence shows us, for example, that educational choices, lack of available good quality part-time jobs and employment downsizing to fit in with domestic responsibilities impact very adversely on women's position in the

labour market. Job segregation, the undervaluing of women's work, contracting-out under procurement rules, so stiffly written and applied that no account is taken of either good or shoddy equality practices, and managers at local level refusing for seemingly no good reason to implement helpful flexibility arrangements, all contribute to corralling women at the bottom end of the pay scales. We have received some interesting research from the LSE on the impact of moving from full to part-time employment. Even when staying with the same employer, to shift to part-time means that the woman will lose out over time both in salary and status. To move to part-time work with a different employer sees that salary and status reduction immediately.

Many women want to work part-time and the trade union movement has campaigned long and hard for full employment rights for part-timers. But part-time workers are not taken sufficiently seriously by employers and there is a real lack of part-time opportunities at professional or management level. Job segregation within workplaces and workplace organisation generally are both issues over which we have some control in unionised companies. I would urge you all to give this aspect of the problem some serious attention.

I would also recommend that, if you have not done so already, you take a look at the ACAS Employment Relations Matters No. 3, issued this Spring, which sets out the many ways in which unequal pay actually comes about. I am advised by the people on the ACAS stall that they will have plenty of copies of this Employment Relations Sheet by tomorrow.

What other messages do I want to leave with you? Well, firstly let me correct something that was said in the *Guardian Society* article last Wednesday. I have never said that unions are responsible for the pay gap. That view would be patently ludicrous. However, 35 years of legislation and a pay gap of 18 per cent for full-time and 40 per cent for part-time workers does not reflect well on anybody, and we all have a part to play in fixing this.

The Commission has yet to complete its thinking on mandatory pay reviews. We are also still considering issues round the role of equality representatives. We have received evidence on current and serious problems within the legal framework. Any views we have on the Equal Pay Act will be referred to the Discrimination Law Review Group, which is looking at equalities legislation across the piece in preparation for a single equality act. I am impressed by the work being done, as shown in the TUC Equality Audit. I urge those of you who have not yet read it to take a good look because it contains some very good ideas. It demonstrates a shift in emphasis, which is very welcome, but the Commission's work shows there is much still to be done, and I hope that we can work together to deliver a fairer pay deal for all those women who are relying on us.

Finally Chair, may I close by passing my best wishes to my union, the T&G, and particularly to wish them a successful outcome on the campaign for the Gate Gourmet workers. Thank you very much. (*Applause*)

The President: Thank you, Margaret. We are all aware of the enormous importance of the work you are doing and wish you well. I personally want to say it was the recognition of your credentials as a respected campaigner for women's rights that I am absolutely sure led to your appointment as Chair of the Women and Work Commission. Our thanks and good luck to those four TUC colleagues -- Liz Snape, Debbie Coulter, Kay Carberry and John Hannett -- because I think the Commission gives a real opportunity to deal with some of the endemic problems around equal pay. That is a great team that has been charged with dealing with

this and equally it is a great responsibility. Thank you very much indeed, Margaret.

If we could now move to Composite Motion No 3 on the Women and Work Commission, which is being supported by the General Council.

Women and Work Commission

Andrea Snowden (*Communication Workers Union*) moved Composite Motion 3.

She said: The question of equal pay, and specifically how we deliver equal pay, remains central to the union agenda. Despite the passage of the Equal Pay Act over 30 years ago, women still face serious disadvantage in the pay stakes. Latest government figures show how full-time women still earn around 20 per cent less than their male counterparts. Another recent research by paywizard.com put the pay gap even higher at nearly 25 per cent. In recognition of the problem, and in the face of consistent union pressure, the Government -- as you have heard, and as you know, -- set up the Women and Work Commission under Margaret to look at the question of equal pay and the position of women in the labour market.

While we still await the final report -- and that will now be in January as Margaret has just said -- the aim in moving this particular composite is to set out a clear programme of action to tackle the pay gap between the sexes and to support a raft of measures to overcome gender segregation in employment. Although women's participation in the labour market has increased over recent decades, particularly amongst those with school age children women, remain concentrated in lower level, non-manual occupations. Just eight per cent of women work in managerial jobs compared with 18 per cent of men. If we are to avoid debating equal pay in another 30 years' time, we believe the Commission must recommend mandatory pay audits.

Like the EOC, we believe that equal pay reviews are the most appropriate method of ensuring that a pay system delivers equal pay, free from bias. However, while the EOC code of practice recommends employers carry out equal pay reviews, the majority of companies still do not see the need to carry one out. Sixty-eight per cent of employers surveyed by the EOC said they had no plans to carry out a review despite the obvious benefit of doing so, such as reducing the risks of litigation, cutting staff turnover and increasing employee commitment.

As well as mandatory pay audits, the composite also calls for business and unions to provide input into the Standards Board proposed by the Company Law Review to ensure there is a clear commitment to equal pay audits and that unions are involved in that process.

The motion calls for measures to overcome gender segregation at work. Despite girls out-performing boys in education, women are still generally found in lower skilled, lower paid jobs. To combat gender segregation, we need to look at a range of measures, breaking down cultural factors which reinforce gender stereotypes, and that means encouraging both sexes in all occupations, improving the careers advice to young people, so that both sexes are actively encouraged to take up subjects such as physics, mathematics and chemistry; encouraging non traditional jobs for women, especially where there is an acute shortage of skilled workers, and that means encouraging girls to take up careers as plumbers, gas fitters and working in the construction industry; actively engaging with employers to deliver good, family-friendly policies; and encouraging employers to create more opportunities for flexible and part-time work.

We also want to support measures to overcome low pay amongst child care providers. Despite the

Government's assistance to date -- like Sure Start and tax credits -- many families struggle to find good quality childcare and many still rely on family and friends to provide childcare at a low cost. That is why we must continue to push for more assistance for parents, to give them access to good quality early education and flexible and affordable childcare provision. Congress, let us ensure the Women in Work Commission delivers the effective action. We need to tackle equal pay and gender segregation. Please support the composite.

Maire Daley (*NATFHE - The University & College Lecturers' Union*) seconded Composite 3.

She said: In this motion we welcome the Women and Work Commission and we welcome the Government's initiative. As ever, we remain unconvinced of its real value until we see more. More than thirty years after the Sex Discrimination Act was enacted, and even longer since the Equal Pay Act, together with all the recent legislation that we have around equality issues, we have more or less in place quite a sophisticated legal framework to protect women in the workplace, but we know from the mover of the motion that much of this has not been enacted. Much of it has no authority and using the law remains always a limited process for us. In the motion it calls for using class actions rather than individual casework to follow that, and I am sure that will happen.

What I want really to concern Congress about is the final paragraph, which calls for a proactive challenge to the continued dominance of male cultural norms within the workplace. This is a call for a socialist feminist agenda, to further develop an analysis of women's working lives, to expose the fundamental place that patriarchy plays in the maintenance of capitalism. It is a truth that in post-patriarchy there will be no place for capitalism and any call from the Labour Government or anybody else for that matter that we have already reached a point of post-patriarchy is a complete nonsense, clearly grossly exaggerated. Consider this single example from the government's recent agenda: an eight per cent cut in Learning and Skills Council budget results in huge losses of places in adult education. That always has a disproportionate effect on women, and working class women in particular. In my college, for example, one of the first actions was to cut the nursery provision -- a clear case of the Government's agenda saying one thing and doing something else. The Women and Work Commission will mean nothing if the Government do this. For us, just flicking through our annual report, we can see that there is less than one member on every Committee that is named; on the Organising and Representation Task Group 7 out of 26 are women. That is on my count, I could be wrong.

We have to challenge our own approach, and to resist any cuts that may be proposed in our own equality work of the TUC. We have to oppose cuts, for example, in the Women's Conference. Further, we have to have more confidence in the women within this union and the Women's Committee and take their advice on many things, including not having Nestlé here at this Congress.

Conference, we have to support the grass roots initiatives like the Charter for Women and to move towards those things. I second Composite 3.

Denise McGuire (*Connect*) supporting Composite 3 and focusing on gender segregation in employment and the positive impact such as the computer clubs for girls. The first computer programmer was actually a UK woman called Ada Lovelace, but today only 20 per cent of the IT workforce is female and the current gender composition of technical graduates means that this position will worsen. Often when women move into a profession it becomes seen as women's work and the pay levels drop. In IT we saw the reverse: salaries rose

and women seemed to have been excluded through both cultural and structural barriers: for example, an emphasis on technical qualifications instead of aptitude tests and the image of IT as being male and, to be honest, quite dinky. Girls and young women do not think it is cool to do IT, but it is important for us all to realise that IT is an essential part of any career.

The computer clubs for girls was launched by Eskills, the sector skills council for the Telecom and IT industry. The clubs provide compelling fun and educational activities for 10 to 14 - year-old girls, improving their image of IT and improving their IT skills. The girls use IT but on projects that interest them, things such as music and video, design, animation, fashion, dance. The projects are linked to key stages 2 and 3 of the National Curriculum and the engaging fun and the social approach of IT that increases the girls' confidence and their skills levels. By 2008, 150,000 girls and 3,600 schools will have benefited from the scheme. The clubs are effective, with 65 per cent of the girls saying they are more likely to consider a career in technology. In June this year, funding for the clubs was extended to the whole of the UK.

In drawing this initiative to your attention I also want to encourage you to get involved in it. The website is www.cc4g.net; log on and see whether you can start a club in your area. Do join in and make a difference for your daughters. Support the composite.

Jackie Darby (*Transport Salaried Staffs' Association*) supporting Composite 3. She said: Equal pay is fundamental to the work of the Commission. This composite asks for measures to pursue employers who discriminate against their female work force and offers practical means of redress. However, equal pay will not be achievable unless there is transparency. Inequality will thrive where it can be concealed and continuing to privatise public services will make it easy for bad practice to continue out of sight; doors will close on increasing numbers of our sisters. The private sector must be held to account otherwise all this good work, all these good intentions, will fail. We have lived with inequality for far too long. Congress. Please support.

Diana Holland (*Transport & General Workers' Union*): At last year's Congress I said that the Women and Work Commission must not just measure the pay gap but finally close it. One year on our message still has to be 100 per cent clear as set out here and in the fairness at work debate. We need mandatory equal pay audits and union equality representatives, the two areas agreed as priorities at Warwick: mandatory equal pay audits to check equal pay in every workplace and close the pay gap where needed. We already have the right to equal pay but audits help us turn that paper into reality without going to a tribunal time after time. We should also have equality representatives with rights to paid release and facilities, practical support to change our work places and prevent discrimination.

Last year at Warwick, the affiliated trades unions did have enough support across the Labour Party to force through mandatory equal pay audits, but we accepted the case that we needed a thorough examination in the Women and Work Commission of a whole range of issues facing women at work. However, we did not sign up to a strategy of delaying any action and CBI veto.

The TUC first agreed the principle of equal pay in 1888; 117 years later we still have the worst gender pay gap in Europe. It is not too soon to act. In 1944 a proposal on equal pay for women and men teachers nearly brought down Winston Churchill's wartime government. To avoid defeat he established a Royal Commission on equal pay. In Harold Wilson's words, it took minutes and lasted years: 20 years before equal pay was won for teachers and almost 30 years before the Equal Pay Act for all industries. We have waited long enough for equal pay.

In conclusion, you will have heard of the book *Men are from Mars and Women are from Venus*. Yesterday I bought this interesting postcard. It says: "Men are from earth, women are from earth, deal with it." We do not want the Women and Work Commission to be remembered as the Women Still Waiting Commission. We want it to be the Winning for Women Commission and the Winning for our Workplaces Commission.

Conference, I support. Thank you.

* *Composite 3* was CARRIED.

The President: Could I thank you very much, delegates, for your courtesy in giving up a chunk of your lunch time for an important debate and remind you that there are various meetings taking place over the lunch time, listed on pages 11 and 12 of the Congress Guide.

One final appeal: could you dig deep for the Gate Gourmet workers as you leave.

Congress adjourned until 2.15 p.m.

MONDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

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

The President: I would like, again, to thank Norton's Hot Eight who have been playing for us this afternoon. I had a little dance on the platform when not many people were here. I think you are really good. Well done. Excellent. *(Applause)*

Delegates, at the end of this afternoon's session, there will be a collection in support of J-FLAG, an organisation to help lesbian and gay Jamaicans suffering discrimination. The TUC LGBT conference this year heard moving stories as to the extent of the persecution suffered by those in Jamaica on account of their sexuality. So the collection will take place at the doors to the hall and at the main exits. I have to say, having seen the badge, it is very beautiful and artistic. Thank you.

Childcare presentation

The President: Delegates, we start this afternoon by returning to Chapter 2 of the General Council's Report, which is Equal Rights.

Childcare has long been an issue for the trade union movement, as many of you here will know. In our role, we are uniquely positioned to represent both working parents and the childcare workforce. In 1978 Congress supported the General Council's groundbreaking national policy strategy for the under fives, and the Labour Government's ten year strategy, announced in December last year, set out the Government's vision for childcare. I was delighted to see that the Government have adopted almost every one of our 1978 recommendations. As ever, where trade unions lead, others will follow.

Just as an aside, I attended the Gender and Productivity Summit at No. 11 just a few months ago, and I heard Gordon Brown say that Labour politicians had to realise that women's issues were no longer a social policy add-on but a mainstream economic issue, which was, I thought, a very powerful statement and a final reflection of the reality of the economic world in which we live. But there is still much to be done, not least in improving the wages and working conditions of the childcare workforce. Childcare workers need unions no less than trade unionists need childcare. So I am pleased that on our agenda today we have a panel discussion on childcare. On our panel today we have Carol Ball, a childcare worker and union activist, who will talk about childcare workers' needs. I am also very pleased that we have, in a change to the printed programme,

Philippa Thompson, Director of Development at the Organisation for Children. She is an expert on professional childcare issues. We are very grateful for her stepping in at the last minute. We are pleased to have both Carol and Philippa here with us today. Chairing the debate is Yvonne Roberts, a well-known journalist, who has long campaigned for better childcare provision. So, Yvonne, it is over to you.

Yvonne Roberts: Thank you, Jeannie. I cannot tell you how delightful it is to be at Congress and have the "c" world actually debated. I know that lots of "c" words are banded about but very rarely, in my experience, has childcare been so prominent on the agenda.

As Jeannie said, childcare is another word for social justice. It is so vitally important in tackling poverty, the problem of unequal pay, enabling more women to be involved in the labour market, in dealing with occupational segregation and, most important of all, it really makes such a huge difference to the development of children. For many children, childcare is the difference a future and no future. So the trade union movement, in terms of what it can achieve in the childcare workplace, is so desperately important. I think these are two crucial years, really. If the trade union movement can mobilise itself, it can make a truly massive difference.

First of all, we have to explain the situation from the ground up, from the grassroots level. Carol Ball has been a nursery nurse for 24 years and, as many of you will probably know, is very active as a UNISON member in Glasgow. Carol, what changes, if any, have you noticed in the childcare sector in recent years?

Carol Ball: The Government now recognise the importance of providing high quality childcare and have been much more focused on the sector with more money and investment. That raises, quite rightly, the higher expectations of parents and it also raises the expectations of the workforce about what that will mean for them and the changes that will happen. As there has been a great expansion in the childcare sector, the emphasis now is on qualifications, and that is to be welcomed.

However, in the public sector, nursery nurses like me have always been qualified. Now we are finding that our training and development needs are being put on hold while the rest of the sector catches up, and for us that can be quite frustrating. I think we need now to move to an integrated model so that the workforce is able to deliver early years education and childcare across the full range. At the moment, that delivery is quite fragmented, with some nursery nurses working only with three to five year olds, for example, but who are well able and qualified to work with children to the age of eight. I think that is essential, particularly with the introduction of increased school hours.

Yvonne Roberts: What role do you think trade unions can take? What difference do you think that trade unions can make?

Carol Ball: I think that the trade unions can make a huge difference. Childcare workers in all the different settings that they work in do a vital job. Childcare workers, however, earn very little money and they often have poor terms and conditions. This is particularly true of colleagues in the private sector. In the public sector our experience is not perfect but our terms and conditions are better, and that has a lot to do with UNISON's work. For example, last year nursery nurses took industrial action across Scotland against 32 local authority employers to try and improve their pay. They could not have done that without the organisation and support of the trade union movement. Not only in Scotland but also in Brighton

colleagues have won better pay through trade union action.

In Scotland, as a result of that action, I believe that we have been able to influence a national review of early years and the childcare workforce because we have been so active as trade unionists. This concerns not only pay and conditions but our view on how these services should be delivered, what the roles and responsibilities should be and what the qualification levels should be, so that has been a vital piece of work. A nursery nurse has been sitting on that Review which, I think, augers well for the future. So, yes, the trade unions can make a great difference.

Yvonne Roberts: Thank you, Carol. As many of you know, before renaming it For Children, it was Kids Club Network, which has truly been a pioneer in all sorts of areas, particularly in achieving the ideas of extended schools. Philippa, what do you think have been the main achievements in childcare in the past decade?

Philippa Thompson: I think there have been huge achievements in childcare during the past ten years, and plenty of challenges still remain, as Carol has outlined.

The first National Childcare Strategy dating back to 1998 provided us with a vital framework on which to build a genuine childcare infrastructure in this country, really for the first time in the UK. Since we have had this strategy, we have seen investment in key areas of social deprivation and we have been able to address some of the fundamental questions about child development and child based outcomes, which sorely needed to be addressed. Finally, we have been able to address some concerns about barriers to women returning to work and to education, to training and we have involved parents in formal childcare provision, all of which have been successes. We have been able to look at the childcare workforce, too, as well as settings for childcare.

The ten-year strategy announced last December, however, coupled with the establishment of the Children's Workforce Development Council, is a hugely important step forward. That came out of the Government's Every Child Matters Green Paper, plus the extension, as Carol mentioned, into access to childcare through schools, through the Government's extended schools initiative, is really going to take the childcare agenda forward still further.

Yvonne Roberts: What role do you think that trade unions can play given that such a large part of the sector is in voluntary organisations and in the private sector?

Philippa Thompson: I think there are some really key challenges right now for trade unions. The priorities have got to be pay, conditions and a career structure for childcare workers. Without addressing those priorities, I would argue, the Government are just not going to be able to achieve the ambitious targets on childcare which they have set. That, frankly, would be a national disgrace.

There is a lot of evidence from other countries, for instance, for getting these three things right. Proper pay, conditions and career structure can really help to deliver childcare for the majority of children and to their parents when they need it, when they want it and in the form that they need and want it: for instance, based around shift patterns. However, there is still so much left to be done in the area. Real progress is going to present us with some absolutely key challenges. We are at a crossroads. We can either invest now for a first-rate service for both children and for the workforce, or we run the danger of ending up with a fourth-rate service which benefits neither children, parents nor the workforce. There is no doubt that trade unions are going to be absolutely central to us in facing these challenges. We need to see the

childcare workforce in all of the different sectors that are involved – getting organised.

Whilst I appreciate that a lot of childcare workers work in the public sector and they are already in trade unions, the vast majority of people working in childcare either work at home as self-employed childminders, for instance, or they work in small, private or voluntary run settings. These people are not so easy to get to. They are not so easy to reach. They are often young women and, as I understand it, they are probably not women who have had much interaction with the trade union movement in the past and I think they would benefit enormously from the input of trade unions at this point, both in terms of training, development, understanding, organisation and giving them a voice really to put their perspective across, and also allowing them to integrate, as Carol said, into the wider agenda for children's services in the UK.

Yvonne Roberts: How urgent is the need to mobilise the trade union movement in terms of recruiting in the childcare force?

Philippa Thompson: I think recruitment is a key issue and that need is very urgent. At the moment we do not see any training or development investment getting into childcare workers. The vast majority of childcare workers are working outside of children's centres and outside the existing local authority structures, and that situation needs to be addressed and addressed now if we are going to achieve those very ambitious targets that I mentioned earlier.

Yvonne Roberts: I think you can gather from what the two speakers have said that it is really, really, really vital that you start recruiting, organising and mobilising people in the childcare workforce. It seems to me to be an absolutely disgrace that a nursery nurse working with what is our most precious commodity, namely, children, earns less than a shelf stacker in ASDA. That cannot be right. It seems to me remarkable that in an affluent society like we have our poverty rate is 16 percent, compared with Sweden which has a poverty rate of two percent. Part of that poverty level is because people working in the childcare workforce are earning so little. We also have a huge problem with asocial hours. Many people in the workforce cannot get the kind of childcare they need because they are working outside the normal 9-5 routine, and we also have a huge problem with inflexibility in the workplace.

This Government, in the past eight years, have done an enormous amount. They have spent something like £13 billion, but that figure should not blind us to the fact that we actually need treble that amount and, without trade union voices, mobilising, pushing, arguing and recruiting, we are not going to see anything other than a fourth-rate service and that, really, would be disastrous, not just for children, who are obviously very important, but for the well-being of society as a whole.

As Jeannie mentioned, Gordon Brown said that childcare is the new frontier of the welfare state. We really need the trade unions to make sure that it is a fair and just frontier. Thank you very much, and back to you, Jeannie.

The President: Thank you, Carol, Yvonne and Philippa for what was a really interesting introduction to our next debate, which is on parents, carers and childcarers.

Parents, carers and childcare

John Hannett (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*) moved Composite Motion 4.

He said: Congress, it is worth reminding ourselves of the foundations that this Government have already

laid in support of parents and carers at work. They have introduced time off for fathers at the time of the birth of their babies; given adoptive leave of 26 weeks paid leave with the possibility of taking up a full year; the right to request flexible working for parents of young and disabled children; putting parental leave on the map; increasing statutory maternity pay by a staggering 37 percent and extending the period of paid leave from 18 to 26 weeks. They have introduced a commitment to further extend paid maternity leave from six to nine months rising to 12 months before the end of the next Parliament. That is real progress for parents and carers.

However, this composite is not just about justice and fairness for parents and carers, important as that is. It is not just about securing full employment and a fairer deal for the taxpayer, as important as that is, and it is not just about making sure that we, as a society, take care of the youngest, oldest and most vulnerable members of our society, as important as that is. It is about making business fitter, more productive and more competitive. It is also about ensuring that business gets hold of the best people, keeps them and retains them. It is about ensuring that the talent, skills and experience of parents and carers are not lost to the economy. That is why it is important, Congress, that the commitment given at the Warwick National Policy Forum to review parental leave and that the question of pay is pursued remains high upon our agenda.

Parental leave was altogether absent from the Government's recent proposals outlined in their consultation document – 'Choice and Flexibility' – yet it is central to improve the work life balance amongst parents.

As parental leave stands, unpaid and inflexible, the vast majority of parents just cannot access this provision. The Government's own research estimates that the take-up of parent leave at present is only three percent. Without any element of pay, take-up is never going to improve. Yes, both employers and government will need to do the maths: it will cost. If you look beyond the cost, you will see the real benefit. The evidence exists. A recent DTI poll of four thousand job seekers showed that a third would rather work flexibly than get paid an extra £1,000 a year. Three-quarters of all employers who took part in government research confirmed that the introduction of work life balance measures had led to more effective retention of staff and lowered the level of turnover. The Equal Opportunities Commission reports that nine out of ten employers with family friendly working arrangements think that they are cost-effective and more than a third believe that their financial performance outstrips that of their competitors as a result. So it is good for business as well as good for our members.

So far-sighted employers use flexible working to meet their own and, an important part of the equation, their employees needs. It is not just about pay, Congress. Parental leave, as it stands, is inflexible. We live and work in a 24/7 society, and yet the law prevents parents from taking leave in blocks of less than one week. Members like ours often need a more flexible approach in meeting their requirements.

Of course, we will continue to promote the rights of working parents amongst our members and I am proud to say that USDAW's Parents and Carers Campaign is delivering real benefits in the workplace. We will continue to bargain for improvements with the employers both at local and national level but, in the end, the Government also have to rise to the challenge and make the provisions for paid, flexible parental leave by law. Productive workers, stable families and successful businesses increasingly are going to depend on it. I move.

Lesley Anne Baxter (*British and Irish Orthoptic Society*) seconding the composite said: President and Congress, I second Composite Motion 4 with reference to the childcare provision.

Trying to balance work and family life is not an easy task. In these days where parents have to work to pay the bills, flexible parental leave, as our previous speaker said, is essential. However, once back at work childcare becomes essential. Good quality childcare, well paid childcare staff and affordable for those who need it is also essential.

The published figures look good. Provision for childcare has doubled since Labour took office in 1997, but in many areas demand still outstrips supply and parents cannot find childcare that covers the hours they need and, even when they can, the cost is too high to make going back to work outside of normal hours not a reality.

Costs for a nursery place have risen by 5.2 percent during the past year, and the average cost in England is approximately £7,500, and this is just to cover normal working hours. At present childcare is provided in the main by the private sector with staff paid on average up to 35 percent lower than other part-time women workers and it is generally only provided within the normal working week. This means that those of us who want to work an early or a late shift, or those who want to work nights, are unable to take those jobs. That, in turn, puts pressure on our colleagues who have to cover these difficult shifts.

In taking the NHS as an example, improving working lives has involved greater flexibility for staff to manage a career and a family. However, this improvement has been seen by staff without children as a high cost. Flexibility for some means that others are expected to cover difficult hours. A better distribution of childcare provision would allow this sense of disparity to be diminished.

Whilst we welcome the recognition in the 10-year Childcare Strategy: 'Choice for Parents – The Best Start for Children', that investment in childcare is the key to overcoming the shortages, it must be available to cover the UK's 24-hour economy. In this era of so-called choice, clearly, the private sector is mainly interested in providing childcare within normal hours and with a low paid workforce. There must be substantial investment in childcare workers' pay and career opportunities and they must be recognised for the excellent work they do. Childcare must be affordable for those who need it and available to cover our 24 hour society. Please support this composite.

** Composite Motion 4 was CARRIED.*

Women's Equality

Janine Booth (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) speaking on paragraph 2.7 of the General Council's Report, said: Statements made during the General Election campaign and since suggest that women's abortion rights could soon come under attack. One in three women in Britain has an abortion. Every one has her reason. For many it is a difficult choice, but it is her choice. The film 'Vera Drake' reminded us of what happened before 1967 when abortion was still illegal. Women went to back street abortionists and some were injured or killed. In our society there will always be women facing a crisis pregnancy who choose to have an abortion. The choice that society faces is not between abortion and no abortion but between illegal, unsafe abortions and safe, legal ones.

Before 1967 rich women could usually buy their way around the law and pay a doctor to carry out a termination. It was working class women who suffered in the back streets. Recently, leaders of several

religions, including a Catholic Archbishop, the Chief Rabbi and a representative of the Muslim Council of Britain, have called for restrictions on women's abortion rights and, despite the low level of religious observance in this country, politicians of all shades are willing to help them. This is not right and democratic. As a long-standing pro-choice slogan says: "Not the Church, not the State, Women must decide our fate".

We may well see an attempt in Parliament to cut the time limit for legal abortions from the current 24 weeks to 20 weeks. Relatively few abortions are carried out between 20 – 24 weeks but there are several good reasons why a woman might leave having an abortion this late. She may have been obstructed by an anti-abortion doctor, her circumstances might have changed, her partner might have left and/or started to beat and abuse her, a young woman might have been afraid to come forward earlier and an older woman might have mistaken the signs of pregnancy for the menopause.

The pretext for cutting time limits is usually that medical advances have made it possible for foetuses to survive outside of the womb at an earlier stage. These medical advances are welcome and should be used to help premature babies to spare parents the heartbreak of losing the baby they love and want. They should not be used to force women to bear children that they do not want. The best way to reduce the number of late abortions is to reduce unwanted pregnancies and to improve access to earlier abortions. This could be achieved by better sex education, free and effective contraception and the removal of the need for the permission of two doctors for an abortion to be carried out.

Ironically, the religious authorities which attack abortion rights usually also oppose these measures. We have to reject their conservative agenda, defend women's rights and control our own bodies.

I would like to ask the General Council to confirm that the TUC will take the lead in fighting to defend and extend our rights against any attack in Parliament.

The President: Yes, I can confirm that from the Chair.

Address by General Secretary

The President: As you know, our overall theme this week is 'Together Stronger', reflecting the importance of unity in the face of terrorism, poverty and social injustice. Our General Secretary, Brendan Barber, has campaigned tirelessly during the past year for the values of solidarity and fairness, whether in Trafalgar Square, Whitehall, community mosques and temples, in factories and in offices. Brendan has passionately argued the case for trade unionism so, personally, I am proud to invite our General Secretary to reflect on the year behind us and look ahead to the vision we all seek of a fairer society. Brendan, as the General Secretary, I invite you to address Congress.

Brendan Barber (General Secretary): President, Congress, it's been quite a year. The Tories in turmoil, England, perhaps, on their way to winning the Ashes – for those of you who are interested in these matters it is 199 for 7 – the General Council Cricket Team beating the journalists and Everton in Europe, at least for a couple more weeks. That is not a combination that you see that often, but long may it continue.

It has also been a year that has made me more proud than ever to be a trade unionist. Sometimes that has been in my day-to-day work, meeting workers, meeting activists, and sometimes it has been at the big national moments. Just two months ago I spoke from a platform in Trafalgar Square – not that unusual, perhaps, for the TUC General Secretary – but that occasion was different. That was when we said thank you to the capital's emergency and transport workers

who responded with such quiet magnificence when their city was attacked. Tomorrow we will have a proper opportunity to say what a credit they are to the trade union movement. But today let us salute their commitment to the public service ethos – an ethos so casually dismissed by the privatisers, the profiteers and the market testers.

Of course, the message that day in Trafalgar Square was not just one of appreciation. It was also one of solidarity and unity. We came together to say that we would not be divided. Every tube or bus passenger, whatever their colour or creed – people of every religion and people of none – came under attack. That's why we said an attack on one was an attack on all, and why we said no to the racists and no to the politics of hate.

In Trafalgar Square, London came together to sign up to what we as trade unionists have always said: Together we are stronger. Let that message go out again today. Together, stronger in fighting race hatred. Together, strong in struggling for social justice. Together, stronger in striving for opportunity for all. And it was not just after the bombs that we made our stand.

Let us also salute the trade unionists – like those in Ron Todd's old stamping ground in Dagenham – who for years have done so much to cut the ground from under the BNP.

Let us salute the activists who day in, day out strive to build links across their communities, sometimes in the face of vile intimidation from Far Right thugs. And let us salute those who have stood shoulder to shoulder in resisting the politics of hate. That is the message I have taken on your behalf to Muslim Communities in East London, Leeds and Birmingham just in the last two weeks. Together stronger – two words that sum up everything about our movement.

We know unity is what sustains people through the most difficult of times. It's what gives us the strength to cope with great suffering. It mattered here after July 7th, and it matters now across the Atlantic.

It goes without saying -- those affected by the hugely destructive natural disaster in the United States have our solidarity and our support, and I know the American trade union movement has done everything it can to aid the response. But the catastrophe in New Orleans has in the most terrible way shown the consequences of a society where the individual takes precedence over the collective, where massive private affluence coexists with desperate public squalor, where the market reigns supreme. The result is gross inequality between classes, between races, between those who can look after themselves and those who cannot.

But we know there is a better way. In the aftermath of the attacks in London we took great pride not just in the response of our public services but in the philosophy that sustains them. From each according to their ability, to each according to their need. Together stronger. That, of course, is the lifeblood of our movement, and that is something that I have seen time and time again over the past year.

I saw that when I visited the state-of-the-art union learning centres all around the country and discovered how our exciting work on skills is transforming people's lives. At one centre in Watford I met a young mother, out of learning since 16, enjoying new opportunities and a promotion at work – but what gave her most satisfaction of all was her role as a learning rep. She was ambitious, not just for herself but for her colleagues, too.

I saw that when I visited Leeds Prison, where POA reps, delivering a vital service that is so often invisible and under-valued, have negotiated new working arrangements that are making a real difference to

their members' lives and transforming the service they deliver.

Wherever we work, whatever we do, we are all guided by one simple truth. Together stronger. And never have I felt that more powerfully than when I visited the workers at Gate Gourmet. Their experience, as we debated this morning, was a stark reminder about the realities of work in Britain here and now in 2005. Without question, making work better for all is one of the biggest challenges facing the Government. With lots of union help on the ground, Labour secured a historic third term with a clear majority. That's some achievement. But it's one that has to be qualified.

Other than the 1983 disaster, you have to go back to 1935 to find an election where fewer people voted Labour. Nearly 60 Labour MPs now have majorities under 3,000. If Labour is to win again, it must put back its 1997 coalition again. Yes, keeping and winning new voters, but also winning back those who have too often felt taken for granted.

In the second term we had important achievements, but a foreign policy that deeply divided our country. We have seen huge investment in public services, but tempered too often by a preference for private sector solutions.

We won important new rights at work, but heard too much sniping at social Europe. So this time, at the beginning of this third term, we need a new start – a fresh sense of purpose with, at its heart, a clear vision for the workplace.

We can build on the genuine advances that have been made during the past eight years, from the minimum wage to near full employment to the massive expansion of childcare we've just been discussing. Sometimes, perhaps, we do not give the Government enough credit for what they have done. But that does not mean we should not work for more, because so much more is needed.

There is a comfortable Britain – people in decent jobs, fairly paid, with a secure pension. Then there is the other Britain, the Britain where one in five workers earns £280 a week or less; the Britain where work is a struggle and exploitation is rife.

We've heard quite a bit about offshoring in recent months, but let us be clear. Far more people have been hit by outsourcing. There are few companies which have not practised it, companies that we would, by and large, recognise as responsible employers and with whom we could easily do business. But look at who cleans their offices or works in their canteen. They've outsourced the low paid jobs, and they have struck a hard bargain that too often leads to poverty pay, no pension and minimum holidays. Their directors can sign off an annual report that says they are good employers, but two hours later their boardroom is cleaned by people on nothing like a living wage. *(Applause)*

To those bosses who just want to turn a blind eye to this reality, I say simply: you may be able to outsource your business, but you can't outsource your conscience and you can't outsource your reputation either.

To Digby Jones, this is not about competition from China and India. You can't send your building to Beijing to have it cleaned, or order a take away from Mumbai. And outsourcing is not just about the private sector either. That is why we stand solidly behind the House of Commons cleaners who are demanding a living wage. *(Applause)* They are expected to keep the mother of all parliaments functioning – yet expected to get by on little more than £5 an hour in one of Europe's most expensive cities.

So what do the Government need to do? I want them to really work with us to eradicate these crude injustices. They should deliver proper protection for

agency workers, and get the proposed European Directive back on track. They should deliver sensible safeguards on working time, to begin a real crackdown on burned out Britain. They should bring employment law into line with ILO standards, and they should face up to the urgent need for action to reverse the catastrophic slide in our manufacturing capacity.

So my challenge to the Labour Government – our Labour Government – is simple. Work with us to make work better. Never forget: together stronger. To be frank, this represents a major challenge for us too. It is not an exaggeration to say that this is a critical time for our movement. I know how much effort unions have put into recruitment and organisation in the last year, and we have seen some increase in TUC membership. That's a real tribute to the innovation and energy of countless trade unionists around our country. But we are still probably losing as many members as we gain, and with growth in public services slowing in the years ahead, that challenge becomes more acute each year. There is a real sense of urgency about the organising challenge. More of what we are already doing is, of course, much of the answer, but that's not enough. We need to do more – much more – to face outwards, and we need to think hard about our structures and how best to make use of our resources.

Some people tell me that I ought to be worried about the prospect of three of our biggest unions merging. Well, I'm not. I've always wanted to see a more rational union structure and less inter-union competition. The merger could deliver real benefits, and if that is what the members decide, then I wish it well and would want it to be a success in the interest of the whole trade union movement. But I never forget that mergers, in themselves, do not make a single extra member.

In 2001 Ver.di was formed as Germany's largest union with around three million members. Now, four years later, their membership figures have fallen to around 2.5 million. In merger discussions, it can be too easy to get bogged down in the inevitable complexities of constitutions, rules and internal structures, with a risk that the eye gets taken off that crucial growth agenda.

Whatever changes come along in our trade union structures, this TUC – your TUC – must deliver a united trade union voice on all the issues that matter most to working people. And we do that by recognising, indeed celebrating, the diversity that we represent – big unions and small, public sector and private too, niche unions that have unparalleled expertise and insights in the issues facing sometimes crucial parts of our economy, alongside general unions that bring members together from right across the workplaces of Britain, unions that affiliate to the Labour Party alongside others that have chosen a sturdy political independence.

For generations our movement has spoken with one voice, and that is what has sustained us through good times and bad. Together stronger. At every twist and turn, let us remember why we are trade unionists. We are trade unionists because we believe the strong have an obligation to help the weak. We are trade unionists because we do not rest until wrongs are righted, and we are trade unionists because we know we achieve more together than we ever can alone.

Together stronger – for justice, fairness and opportunity. Together stronger – in workplaces and communities across the land. Together stronger, yesterday, today, and most importantly tomorrow, too. Thanks for listening. *(Applause)*

The President: Thank you, Brendan, for those stirring, thoughtful and inspiring words, reinforcing the powerful message of together stronger. Sometimes it is something we can forget when we lose sight of the bigger picture.

Before I move on, just on one lighter note – I hope you do not mind me teasing you, Brendan – you referred in your introduction to the successes of the all male Everton football team and English cricket team, so I thought it was appropriate to mention that the winning TUC cricket team had one outstanding female General Council player, who positively put Rachael Hayhoe-Flint into the shade, namely, our own Alison Shepherd. *(Applause)*

Working Time

John Hannett (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*) moved Composite Motion 11.

He said: Congress, it is time we dealt with the reality and not the fiction. We are told time and time again that people should be free to work for as long as they want. It means more money and a better standard of living, so it is said. We do not have a health and safety problem. It is not an issue of health, and government and trade unions should leave well alone. That is the chorus and we will go on hearing it whenever the 48 hour week and the opt-out hit the headlines. Let us get the facts right. The truth is that working long hours damages workers' health. The Health and Safety Executive in 2002 and the DTI in 2003 both reported that long hours meant an increase in heart disease, stress, mental illness and many other illnesses related to the long hours culture.

Only last month the *British Medical Journal* reported on a major US study which revealed exactly the same thing. The evidence is overwhelming and it keeps coming. Long hours mean workers damage their health.

Congress, we do have a health and safety problem and we need to go on saying so.

Secondly, we are also told that millions of UK workers are content to put in long hours, yet the most recent DTI survey report found that nearly 60percent of long-hour workers would be happy to have their hours pegged at 48. Barely a third had signed an opt-out and a quarter of the remainder were openly pressurised to put the hours in by their employers. Every enquiry reveals a catalogue of intimidation, abuse and sharp practice.

Our own USDAW survey of our white collar membership revealed that about a third of long hours workers had been pressurised to sign an opt-out, and barely a fifth had been explained their rights, and over a quarter had been given the impression that opting-out was a condition of the job. Again, the facts give a lie to the fiction of the contented long hours worker.

Thirdly, and in a sense one of the biggest issues of all, it is said that most long hour workers, it is true, do not even get paid for the total hours they work. About 3.6 million workers work extra hours but only 1.4 million workers actually receive a financial reward. So putting in long hours for money is, to put it mildly, a minority experience. The vast majority – 60percent of long hour workers – slog through the hours and do not even get a financial reward. So much for the myth of the long hours UK worker who is happy to work all the hours the employer wants and is well rewarded for doing so. It is a total fantasy. Long hours often means poor health, abuse and exploitation and precious little else and nothing to show for it.

Then it gets worse. If you happen to be a woman with children, you have little chance of putting the hours in even if you wanted to. Only 15percent of long hours workers and 3percent of skilled manual workers are in fact women. The plain truth is that long hours working discriminates against women.

You can forget, Congress, about the work life balance. Fathers in the UK work the longest hours in Europe. More than a third routinely work more than 48 hours a

week and 80percent of their partners say they suffer for it. Long hours can wreck relationships, divide families and damage children.

It is important that we continue to do more. We have had a travesty of a debate in this country on this issue for too long. The facts have been ignored and the arguments rigged. So, Congress, we are urging the General Council to take the real debate forward to defend living standards and workers' incomes but never at the expense of health and safety, workers' well-being and their family security. Please support.

Adrian Askew (*Connect*) seconded Composite 11.

He said: Congress, for many years we have been trying to get a very simple message across: long working hours are bad for you. That is a very simple business argument that really the Government and the employers have to acknowledge, because how can we ever hope to match the productivity levels of our continental neighbours whilst the UK's workforce stumbles on exhausted from overwork whilst society has to pay the costs of people falling sick because they are unable to cope with the pressures of modern working life? As John Hannett has just said, this is a straightforward health and safety issue.

We are all encouraged to lead healthier lifestyles, but our members are chained to their work and cannot find the time to do things like eat healthily or taking exercise. Despite some good initiatives, such as the right to ask for flexible working, the Government still will not move on the most important question of all – that, of course, is the working time opt-out, which condemns thousands of workers to a dangerous long-hours culture.

We know all the arguments, including the ones that are thrown back at us all the time by the employers. That does not diminish the case that we make. We are told that people want to choose how they manage their working lives. The truth is everyone should have a choice about how they work. That is not the CBI's choice of long hours or low pay. For many workers, new technology offers real opportunities to find a balance. It could be homeworking, video conferencing or picking up emails on the move. There are plenty of ways to work smarter. Some good employers understand this and they will co-operate with the unions to help workers achieve a better work life balance. However, sadly, too many others fail in their responsibilities. They even fail to recognise the business benefit. If more people are able to use the technology that exists, they will have more time to lead a fuller and rounder life. If only employers would realise that, they would have a more productive workforce.

Fewer people, for example, will need to drive to or from work. That means a better environment and safer roads. Remember, almost 100 people are killed or seriously injured every day on Britain's roads. However, we do need to be alert. These new technologies present our members with opportunities, but there has to be a proper level of control and agreements with the unions. There has to be the ability to work when and where you want, which can be liberating, but it must be on work time, not your time.

As unions, we have to continue to put pressure on the Government to ensure that work time is not all the time. That means an end to the UK's opt out of the Working Time Directive. In short, Congress, we can use the technology to work smarter, but we also need to use the "off" switch as well. Congress, please support this composite.

Bob Monks (*United Road Transport Union*) supported Composite 11.

He said: Delegates, the Working Time Regulations were put on the statute books as health and safety

legislation to limit correctly workers to a 48-hour working week. At the beginning of April this year, these regulations began to apply to professional lorry drivers, which my union represents. As a sop to the employers associations, our current government -- and I stop myself here from saying a 'Labour Government' -- introduced into the legislation what is known as 'periods of availability'.

For those of you who would not know what a 'period of availability' is, this is where a driver will turn up and be in a queue of lorries ready to unload. He cannot freely dispose of his time. That is not classed as working time because he is just sat in his lorry and it is classed as a period of availability.

Martin from BECTU, in seconding Composite 2 this morning, spoke of the 12, 13 and 14-hour days that BECTU members are forced to work. You might be surprised to learn that in this country professional lorry drivers can work legally for 15 hours a day. Five months on, we are now witnessing systematic abuse of periods of availability with employers seeking to wring every last minute out of the working day by forcing my members to register their periods of availability for every single minute that is possible.

Congress, this was inevitable. We told the present government so at the time. This legislation is fundamentally flawed. As this composite asks, Congress should mandate the General Council to seek an early review of this miserable excuse for legislation.

Sue Gethin (*FDA*) speaking in support of Composite Motion 11, said:

We all want work life balance. We all strive to achieve it, but how many of us can actually say that we have it? How many of us live in a perpetual cycle of guilt trying to juggle our work, our lives and not have the feeling that we are giving the best of ourselves to either of those? This is an issue that affects us all, regardless of gender.

One of the main reasons for our lack of work life balance is the hours that we have to work to do our jobs. The long hours culture is a huge issue across both industry and the Civil Service. What is the effect of working these long hours? It is increased stress levels and a detrimental effect on our health. In some areas, there is no additional pay. There is no time to spend the money that we have earned or enjoy the benefits that it could bring us. There is no time to take the holidays to which we are entitled. For women who work part-time or who have caring responsibilities for children or elderly relatives, the expectation that you must regularly work beyond your contracted hours is a key barrier to applying for promotion or progression as well as maintaining a senior position in an organisation. Resources are reduced, budgets are constrained and yet still we are expected to deliver without complaint and to continue to sustain ever increasing workloads.

We do it, but at what cost? At what cost is it to ourselves? It is at the expense of our work life balance. We need to achieve a sensible work life balance for all our members in order to ensure a diverse workforce and equality of opportunity for all. Work life balance should be a reality and not an aspiration. The action to seek the redress of this balance is set out in Composite Motion 11. Congress, I urge you to support this motion.

Chris Murphy (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) supported Composite Motion 11.

He said: Long working hours are endemic within the construction industry: Monday to Friday, 7.00 am to 6.00 pm, and quite often Saturday and Sunday working too. The culture has not changed for a number of years and the employers do not want it to change. They want to keep the flexibility that long hours gives them.

It is no wonder that the construction employers have been at the forefront of those lobbying for the retention of the 48-hour opt out. You would think in an industry that accounts for one-third of all work-related deaths that they should consider whether longer hours contribute towards the industry's health and safety problems.

The Working Time Regulations have had a great impact on construction workers. For the first time, hundreds of thousands of building workers have won the right to holiday pay. However, we have had to fight tooth and nail to enforce those statutory rights. Any chairman of a tribunal will tell you, UCATT has been knocking at the door day and night with these arguments.

However, when it comes to working hours enforcement, there is very little of it. That is why we want to strengthen the powers of the Health and Safety Executive to check that the regulations are being enforced. A greater enforcement will help the trade unions press the case for shorter working hours. If they know their regulations are going effectively to be enforced, they will start to look for new ways of organising the workforce. The employers have been concerned about upsetting workers by opting out. Another way of saying this is that they do not want to pay workers a decent rate of pay.

I finish by saying that on Terminal 5 they enforce the 48-hour working week. There is no dissent from the workers mainly because they are treated in a reasonable and fair way and get a good rate of pay for the job. Support this composite. End the tyranny of long working hours. Thank you.

David Wait (*Society of Radiographers*) supported Composite Motion 11.

He said: I want to start by congratulating the TUC on the work it has already done to deal with the UK problem of long working hours. However, there is still a long way to go, as the blocking of the changes to the directive lead by the UK Government show. This block occurred despite the evidence that shows excessive hours to be unproductive, unhealthy and ultimately dangerous. There is a steady stream of research which shows the links between excessive hours, stress, fatigue and an increased risk of injury at work. However, it does not stop there because, despite the fact that this is absolutely a health and safety issue, this issue also affects our families, our friends and our society. This issue is one that we must win.

One hundred and sixty five years ago, an historic figure from New Zealand, and, as it happens, an Englishman, Samuel Parnell, fought and won this battle in New Zealand. He argued that there were 24 hours in a day; eight of these should be for work, eight for sleep and eight for recreation. One hundred and sixty five years later, there are many in the UK who do not have this basic balance.

Of course, the proposed changes to the directive would have removed the opt out from the 48-hour maximum working week. However, trade-offs leading up to these changes would have seen health care workers who are on-call and expected to work at a moment's notice being considered on-call but inactive or not working at all.

The impact of this on radiographers and other workers within the NHS could be a dramatic rise in the actual hours spent at work. This is on top of the additional hours that they will be forced to work under Agenda for Change. Inevitably, this impacts on service delivery with hospitals struggling to find radiographers willing to provide immediate emergency services when they may not be considered working. Congress, for these reasons, I urge you to support this motion. Thank you.

Graham Stevenson (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) supported Composite Motion 11.

He said: Congress, our Government seems fixated on diluting EU directives, and the Road Transport Working Time Directive was certainly no exception. Its scope was narrowed to exclude many professional drivers, and the rules were twisted to make waiting periods classed as rest through this wonderful loophole of 'periods of availability', as explained already by Bob Monks. The T&G, of course, would wish to associate itself with the original URTU motion.

Accompanying a vehicle being transported by boat or train, or waiting at frontiers, or delays due to traffic prohibitions, no matter how many hours you are stuck is all rest, apparently! We say out on the lonely road that the driver is the only person who can truly say if it is working time or not. But that would never do. It would not be flexible work to listen to the workers! But do not wait for the European Commission to come to the rescue. It has embarked upon a wider project to 'liberalise' markets - a race to the bottom by dominant transnational corporations.

'Light touch regulation' means that the enforcement agency, VOSA, has an 'educational' rather than a prosecuting role except, apparently, where there is evidence of persistent offending.

It beggars belief. What next? That breaches of health and safety legislation should only be actionable if it results in real harm? Well, yes, actually, apparently! A chance to reform the long hours and low pay culture in the road transport industry was frittered away in the name of labour flexibility. Without standards, the reasonable employer is undercut by the shifty employer and he, in turn, is undercut by the downright criminal.

The UK is desperately short of professional drivers. Short of shifting the entire population of Warsaw to the UK, the employers and the Government seem to have few answers but the free market. When they can rely on pressurising or importing workers to do 50 or 60 hours a week to secure a living wage, why worry?

The deaths of professional drivers on the road are not recorded as occupational deaths by the Health and Safety Executive. If they were, it would be seen to be the most hazardous job of all. Long driving hours do not only ruin families and health, they kill! The drivers of ministerial limousines are encouraged to take a break every two hours. Well, what is good enough for them ought to be good enough for all professional drivers and the car passengers around them!

The review of the Road Transport Working Time Directive rules is well overdue and we would support the composite and ask comrades to do so and, in so doing, support decency for professional drivers. Thank you, Congress.

Elizabeth Donnelly (*Amicus*) supported Composite Motion 11.

She said: Congress, of 25 nations in Europe, Britain's employees work the longest hours, yet we are not the most productive country. Excessive working hours leads to mistakes. Who amongst us wants to be operated on by a doctor who is too tired to see straight? Who amongst us wants to be flown in an aeroplane by a pilot too tired to fly straight? Who amongst us wants to work so many hours that we are too tired to think straight?

However, the Government are well aware of the problems of the long hours culture and tells us to work smarter, not harder, yet they are not smart enough to remove the opt out of the Working Time Directive. The CBI talks of flexibility, yet what they mean is long hours for the workers and long afternoons on the golf course for the bosses. Flexibility is a two-way street. Those companies that offer genuinely flexible work where employees do not have to work excessive hours reap the benefits in increased productivity and higher staff morale.

Britain is changing. More of our members want to spend time with their families. Young men want a greater part of their children's lives than just popping in to watch them sleep. Young women want more than just a pay packet in support from their husbands and partners.

I know there are those in this hall who will say that overtime is vital for their members' income. I say to you this: Your fight is not with an over-bureaucratic European Union that wants to limit your hours. Your fight is with the tight-fisted employers who do not want to pay an honest day's wage for an honest day's work. (*Applause*)

Congress, before the election, the unions used their influence with the Labour Party to produce the Warwick Agreement; a document that put working people and their families at the centre of Labour's manifesto for the third term. If Labour really wants to help hard-working people, then they must put their money where their mouth is and remove the opt out for the Working Time Directive. Please support the composite. Thank you.

The President: The General Council supports Composite Motion 11.

* *Composite Motion 11 was CARRIED.*

Report of the General Purposes Committee

The President: Comrades, I now call upon Annette Mansell-Green, the Chair of the GPC, to give a further report.

Annette Mansell-Green (*General Purposes Committee*) said: Thank you, President. Good afternoon, Congress. I have some further progress of business to report to you. The GPC has approved a composite of motions 43 to 46 and amendments on school education and inclusion. This composite has been numbered C21 and will be distributed to delegates tomorrow morning.

The GPC has also approved an emergency motion on rail safety in the name of the RMT. This motion will be numbered E2 and will be distributed to delegates as soon as possible. The President will indicate when these motions will be taken.

Finally, a reminder, as the President has already announced, the GPC has authorised a collection on behalf of J-FLAG, the organisation supporting lesbians and gay men in Jamaica. This will take place at the close of conference in the entrances to the hall and the main exit at the end of this session. Thank you.

The President: Can you receive that report? Thank you. (*Agreed*)

Opposing racism and fascism

Steve Davison (*Amicus*) moved Composite Motion 5.

He said: President, Congress, I thought when Brendan gave his speech earlier that he was actually moving our motion. Many of the points that he has made actually deal with the issues involved in this.

The composite itself is very wide-ranging. I am hoping that the supporting union colleagues will pick up their specialities as far as this is concerned. It makes a number of very important points; the first one being that BNP membership and active support for the BNP is incompatible with TU membership. There is no place in our Union, in our Movement, for these people. (*applause*) No if's, no but's, no way! (*applause*)

Secondly, you cannot be a fascist and deliver public services. How can you operate on an equal opportunities contract during the day, go home and have your tea and become a fascist at night? You are either a Fascist or you are not. Therefore, it is about choices. 'Stop being a fascist and you will stay in work.'

If you persist in those activities, we do not want you.' Changes have to take place within the public services and legislation for that is required.

The composite is calling for stronger legislation to oust the BNP members from the unions. ASLEF is dealing with that issue a little later on. The composite represents absolute support for our members, families and colleagues who are attacked, intimidated or threatened in any way shape or form by right wing organisations, including the obnoxious Redwatch website.

Finally, the composite is recognising the vital role of education, as far as the fight against racism and fascism is concerned, and deals with concerns as far as the curriculum is concerned from the teaching unions.

The composite places four demands on the TUC. It demands a prioritisation of community-based campaigning in 2006 as the most effective way of actually dealing with the far right menace. It calls on the TUC to co-ordinate the activities of the affiliates at regional and at national level. It presses for the changes I have indicated, as far as education is concerned, and the securing of the legislation for public sector employment.

Colleagues, these demands all form part of the tool kit of the fight against the far right. The fight against the far right is not a one-off campaign. I am a veteran of the street fighting in the 1970s, as I am sure are many people are in this particular hall. There were some hairy-scary moments in London and in the northern cities at that time. However, we did have the effect of kicking the then National Front off our streets. That has created the basis of building this broad anti-fascist movement in Britain.

However, despite all that work, we have to accept that some of our members vote BNP. Therefore, we have to discover the reasons why. We have to engage our members on these ideas that they have. The reasons are many. However, they are generally rooted in unemployment, poverty and change both at work and within society where change appears to be for the worse. This is particularly true in the northern towns that once prospered and once had skilled quality jobs, but are now reduced to the minimum wage being the maximum wage.

In particular, in the northern towns with that strong allegiance to the Labour Party, as the jobs have disappeared, so has the trust of ordinary people in the politicians. It is in that particular climate where people feel disenfranchised, where people who have traditionally supported their aspirations and their beliefs seem to have abandoned them, that scapegoats are looked for as a reason for the problems. Fear takes root and mythology gains ground, as far as people are concerned.

Dealing with this mythology and dealing with these racist myths is an essential part of our task. However, we have also to discuss what really happens. It is not just perception. There are things that happen in our society which are unacceptable and we have to address those issues as well.

To conclude on what is a big issue here, we need local campaigns run by the unions using traditional trade union methods which unite people and take on the right wing menace. I ask for your support.

Chris Keates (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*) seconded Motion 5.

She said: A recurring theme in the debates today has been the repeal of the anti-trade union laws and the links that have come up constantly between that and trying to tackle racism and Fascism. I make no apologies in this speech for reiterating a number of the really important points that have been made today.

No delegate at this Congress considered the BNP, Combat 18, the National Front or other such far right organisations to be anything other than racist and fascist. However, the ground gained by such groups in the recent general election demonstrates that there are still too many people who remain to be convinced. They remain to be convinced despite the litany of violent offences associated with racist attacks, the setting up of paramilitary groups, the criminal convictions of their leaders for extreme violence, including bombings, desecration of synagogues and mosques, harassment of minority groups and a website dedicated to inciting violence against trade unionists and others who oppose them. The list of their vile activities is endless.

This composite motion asserts that those who publicly proclaim their affiliation to such organisations should not be able to work within the public sector. There will be those who will claim that this is a step too far, that it is an abuse of their human rights. I make no apologies for advocating the removal from public sector work of those who abuse the human rights of others on a daily basis. (*Applause*)

The views and beliefs of those who are active in the far right organisations are completely incompatible with the ethos and purpose of public services. Who would want those who perpetrate or support such pernicious evil nursing the sick, teaching children and caring for the elderly? Unfortunately, there are affiliates who have within their ranks those who subscribe to these views. They seek the cloak of respectability of belonging to a trade union. Steps to remove them from membership result in claims for unjustifiable dismissal and the potential for members' subscriptions to end up in their coffers funding their campaigns of hatred.

I want to add the congratulations of NASUWT to those affiliates who have made a courageous stand against those within their membership who subscribe to these views. NASUWT has been seeking to take action against a member who stood for the BNP in the recent general election. Any affiliate who has pursued such a case will know the frustration of finding that the law is becoming a refuge for these people. They hide behind the Human Rights Act, the Trade Union and Labour Relations Act, the Employment Relations Act and even the Race Relations Act.

Congress, the message of this motion is simple. If the law protects such people in their activities, change the law. Repeal the anti-trade union laws of the Thatcher Government which deny unions the right to be self-governing and allow us to expel from membership those who fail to adhere to our rules and objects. Amend the legislation which enables them to remain in public sector occupations while publicly proclaiming their affiliation to and support for an extremist agenda.

This Congress rightly looks to a Labour Government to act now to strike a blow for social justice and to right these wrongs. (*Applause*)

Mary Bousted (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*) supported Composite Motion 5.

She said: Last year Congress passed ATL's motion to close down the Redwatch site. This site aims to intimidate trade unionists who campaign against racism and fascism. This year, ATL wishes to further the TUC's equalities agenda by focusing attention on the needs of ethnic minority pupils in our schools.

This is a key equalities issue because the proportion of immigrant and ethnic minority children in schools has increased dramatically. In 2004, 17percent of the maintained school population in England was classified as belonging to a minority ethnic group. This general increase in minority ethnic pupils is accompanied also by an increase in the number of pupils for whom

English is an additional language. Since 1997 there has been a 35 percent increase in the numbers of pupils classified as having EAL.

The Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG) is a very important Government policy in the context of raising the achievement of ethnic minority pupils in schools, and ATL wholeheartedly supports it. However, ATL is concerned that many children from ethnic minority groups with additional needs, which can be attributed to complex causes, do not get adequately supported in your schools. This is because the current funding, the current EMAG system, counts each EAL, or minority ethnic pupil, as having the same level of need. Consequently, the funding provided to schools where multiple needs exist is insufficient.

For instance, many schools are only able to provide EAL support for asylum and refugee children, many of whom have several social and psychosocial needs. In some schools, where multiple languages other than English are spoken -- and in the last school I taught at there were 67 first languages other than English spoken -- schools can find it virtually impossible to give targeted support to the whole range of pupils who need it. Where resources are insufficient to meet multiple needs, schools face difficult decisions on where to focus their priorities.

ATL argues, therefore, that the funding support for ethnic minority achievement, EMAG, needs to be reformed to serve its purpose even better. EMAG funding needs to consider pupils who have multiple needs. The system must become more targeted, more strategic and more stable to avoid causing insecurity to school staff who are funded through it. The funding also needs to be more responsive to issues of pupil mobility that particularly affects asylum seekers and refugee children.

In addition, ATL calls upon the Government to provide clearer guidance and support to schools and local education authorities on the implementation of the Race Relations (Amendment) Act. In the long term, the Government should consider the pervasive influence of top down targets. Too often these targets result in much needed extra support being denied to those pupils most in need as teachers are forced to focus on achieving in SATS and GCSEs, rather than the individual needs of pupils.

Tackling ethnic minority under-achievement must be a top priority. ATL recognises that it is a huge challenge. It requires determined team efforts. However, together we can tackle it. So let us do it for our pupils, for our society and for our country.

Margaret Greer (*UNISON*) supported Composite Motion 5.

She said: We are right to be proud, as a trade union Movement, of our fight against the BNP and other far right parties and groups. However, sadly, it is a fight that must continue and one in which we cannot relax. The BNP, in particular, continues to be a threat to our multicultural society with its language of violence and messages of racial hatred. We know that where the BNP has a presence, racist tension increases. There should be no room for their politics in the UK political establishment.

UNISON, alongside our other brother and sister unions and local communities, has always campaigned against the far right and the BNP to prevent them from spreading their hatred on a more significant scale. This campaign has been successful to some extent as the BNP did not win any European Parliament seat nor any London Assembly seat in the June 2004 elections.

However, we are concerned that during the past 13 years the BNP's general election vote has risen dramatically from 7,005 in 1992 to 192,750 in 2005. We know that they will be targeting those

constituencies where they retain their deposit in next year's local elections.

The constant vilification of parts of the UK population by the BNP and others like them only serve to increase division in society and their sort of rhetoric has no place in Britain in 2005. Black and Minority Ethnic Communities – BMEC - have contributed significantly to all aspects of British society and this should be embraced and acknowledged by all. The BNP has always been quick to promote fear and was no less opportunistic following the London bombings of July this year. We deplore the attempts by the BNP to exploit these terrible and very tragic events.

Religious hate crimes, mostly against Muslims, rose six-fold in three weeks after 7th July with 269 hate crimes recorded as opposed to 40 in the same period in 2004, illustrating how dangerous the lies and propaganda of the far right can be.

It will be impossible to stop them from spreading their message of hate and violence if we do not continue to work together with established local community and anti-racist campaign groups to challenge racist and discriminatory actions. We need to campaign continuously, and not just in the run-up to elections, to defeat their hatred. The threat of the BNP and other far right political parties and groups should never be underestimated.

Unfortunately, it still remains necessary to point out that the media-driven frenzy to clamp down with get tough policies on asylum seekers rather than stealing the ground from the far right is actually playing right into their hands. All it does is provide a semblance of legitimacy for the fascists to pedal their politics of fear. The BNP are racist; the propaganda they spread is evil and dangerous and we must not give in to this vermin.

Finally, it must be stated again and again that BNP membership is not compatible with membership of our unions. Courageous and highly commendable actions have been taken by some unions to attempt to deny the BNP a foothold within the movement. We must ensure that all possible support is given to our part in the union movement in doing this. Further legislation is needed to formalise such action to make sure that we exclude fascists from our organisations with confidence. There can be no complacency in defeating the BNP and other far right groups whenever and wherever they raise their heads. Thank you, Congress, for your patience.

Mick Rix (*GMB*) supported Composite Motion 5.

He said: President, Congress, it is right that we should thank the TUC for its work and its continual highlighting of achievements of the unions in pursuing an anti-racist and an anti-fascist agenda since the growth of the fascist BNP a few years ago. I think also it is right that we congratulate the swift response of the TUC in attending and helping organise that event in Trafalgar Square when people came together to mourn the bomb victims and to show that racism was not going to take place in our city as a result of people blaming these people for the atrocities that took place that day. It is right also to thank the unions and the many trade union activists who are turning out day in and day out working alongside anti-fascist groups, working with communities in turning the tide and increasing the fight back against the fascist BNP.

If I may, I would like to thank my own Union for the tremendous work it has been doing. Most notably, recently, in the London region, and especially in Barking and Dagenham, we had more than 30 branch activists from the local branch campaigning every night and at weekends. We turned that seat around and the BNP lost its only seat in the East End of London. It was a fantastic achievement when we at last rid them from London. (*Applause*)

The main thing about that, whilst the BNP have targeted this area, is they see it as the new Burnley of the south. Through the diligence of our activists, other trade unionists and the anti-fascist groups, we have done some great work. However, the main thing about this motion is putting organisation into the fight-back. It is about co-ordination, pooling our resources, pooling our activists and pooling all our efforts to face this terrible scourge of the promoters of hate and hopelessness.

I believe, with the setting up of task groups in the regions, the setting up of a task group of the General Council of national trade unions, where we can actually complement our activities, we will have greater resources to actually defeat these people. Also, it is not just about elections, it is not just about defeating the BNP at elections, it is about promoting positive policies, fighting for positive policies to regenerate our communities, which is causing the scourge of fascism. We need to put that forward.

I would commend supporting Composite Motion 5. It has been an honour and a pleasure to do so, and let us take this forward. John Tyndall died this summer. I do not think many people are going to regret that passing, but by this organising, and co-ordinating, we can ensure that the death of the BNP will not be long too. *(Applause)*

Hector Wesley (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supported Composite Motion 5.

He said: As a black trade unionist, I am proud to be part of a movement which has had a long and distinguished record in fighting racism and fascism. Thankfully, this composite recognises that the battle is far from over. If anything, it is time to redouble our efforts.

PCS believes that being a racist is incompatible with being a public servant. We, therefore, welcome the ban on BNP membership in the prison service. We are campaigning for this ban to be extended to cover the whole Civil Service.

We reject the argument that the BNP are a legitimate political party that public servants are entitled to join. Quite simply, the BNP are thugs. They like to portray themselves as the friend of the working man, concerned about public services, like housing, education and health, but if they really cared about those services, they would value the huge contribution that black people have made in providing them. The truth is as I have stated; the BNP are thugs. It is no surprise that in areas where they get elected there are increases in racist attacks.

PCS supports its activists whenever they face intimidation and racism. Recently, one of our members was threatened with dismissal for gross misconduct. His offence was that he was shown on a TV news report protesting outside Leeds Crown Court where Nick Griffin was appearing on various criminal charges. We supported that member and the disciplinary charges were subsequently dropped.

PCS is appalled at the recent decision of the Employment Appeal Tribunal in the Redfern case. It sets a precedent which means that employers who dismiss staff who are BNP members could potentially face claims of race discrimination from those staff. Congress, we cannot allow our race relations and human rights legislation to be abused in this way.

PCS is fully committed to playing its full part in implementing the terms of this composite. In doing this, we will fully involve our black members as we believe that black workers should be at the forefront of this struggle. I urge Congress to give this composite your wholehearted support. Thank you very much.

Peter Jones (*NATFHE - The University & College Lecturers' Union*) supported Composite Motion 5.

He said: I have just heard someone talking about the new Burnley of the south. I am from the old Burnley of the north! In many ways, standing here and talking to you about this issue, opposing racism and Fascism, is almost like preaching to the converted. Even so, all of us, every one of us in this room, has to remain ever watchful because if we drop our guard, those racists and fascists will use that and exploit it. We need to know that we will be ever watchful and they need to know that too.

They do not, and neither will they ever, applaud the stand that we take as trade unionists to defend workers' jobs and rights, such as those that we have heard about at Gate Gourmet today. However, they will try to drive a wedge between you and me, between worker and worker, between black and white and between brother and sister.

Who are these people? They are the dross from the scum end of the political spectrum. They seek to invade our communities like a virus; they seek to invade our trade unions like parasites and they are not nice people.

Working in Burnley, the BNP capital of Britain, I see these people close up. We have the councillors in our council chambers. These are the very same councillors who are charged with domestic violence for beating up their wives. These are the very same councillors who get their mates to hold down their very own members while they attack them with broken bottles. These are the kinds of people we are talking about; these are the kinds of people who are being elected to councils. Their supporters too are the kind of people who make a night out in Burnley a very, very fearful experience for many of our members.

I have said before in other forums, particularly in my own union, that in the council chambers, on the terraces of the football club, in the pubs and the clubs, I can hear something in the very dark corners and in the recesses. What I can hear is the march of the jackboot and the sound of that march is getting louder and louder for people like myself.

Individually, collectively, as trade unions, we must continue to fight to ensure that we can throw the racists and fascists out of our unions. We should not, we will not, give them a forum; we should not, we will not, let them have a voice; we should not and we will not have them as members in our trade unions. Thank you.

Mohammad Taj (*Transport and General Workers Union*) supporting Composite 5 said: I welcome this composite, in particular I welcome its wide scope and temperate tone. We must be clear, and some of you may be shocked to hear this from me, we cannot demonise everyone who has voted for the BNP. All of those people were misguided, a lot of them are simply stupid, and far too many of them are plain bigots, yet I refuse to see them all as evil. It is our role to work with these people at a community level and bring them back to the world of reason, tolerance, and respectable politics.

With the BNP's leadership and active members we are dealing with a different situation. The BNP is a party that is founded on hate and division. The BNP is a party that promotes hate and division; due to this, BNP activists have no place in public service. You can make an intellectual argument for this, but I will not. I will just ask you to consider a couple of examples. How would you feel about an isolated black pensioner being reliant for medication and food on a care worker who believes that someone with a darker skin is a subhuman? How would you feel about a disturbed and vulnerable Jewish child having to rely on a key worker who denies the holocaust and has a collection of Nazi daggers in his bedroom?

BNP activists can have no place in our movement. Whatever they may say in public the BNP, like all fascist parties, would destroy trade unions. To be committed to the BNP is to be opposed to the very purposes of trade unionism. The BNP is about division, hatred, and tyranny, not about unity, equality, and democracy. We must keep a sense of proportion. The BNP is tiny, ineffective, and full of splits. It is not a tiger about to devour us. The BNP is a nasty, poisonous insect of a party. We do not like nasty, poisonous insects in our country so it is time we put on our big trade union boots and crushed them for ever. Delegates, I commend this composite to you.

Colin Moses (*Prison Officers Association UK*)

supporting Composite 5 said: I have spoken on this subject at Congress on many occasions. I find it actually sad that we are here again today discussing this subject, but we must. Do not forget where we are now. 'Islamophobia' rages, but stoked by whom? It is stoked by mainstream newspapers, not members of the BNP. Members of the BNP use the events that took place on 7th July as reasons for their terrible actions. They are wrong.

Could I just ask you to think on this? You will pick up newspapers in the days and weeks ahead which will be full of the sentencing policies in this country. How many BNP members, wearing their BNP badges, carrying their BNP leaflets, are stopped and searched? Whilst the BNP is allowed to behave as it does without challenge, people will live in fear. We supposedly have a war on terrorism. Congress, racism is terrorism; we must have a war on racism.

We will not stop the BNP by words alone. Support this composite, but this composite will not stop the BNP, it will not stop the racists in our society. We can stop them with real deterrents. If you racially abuse, if you racially attack, then you should be sentenced to prison. This is from a man who leads a union that in the days ahead will talk about reducing our prison population. If you check on the 77,000 people we have in prison and find out how many of them are in prison for racist attacks, it is a very, very small minority.

What is happening to the racists who go to court? What is happening to those who perpetrate the fear on our streets? Are they being supported by Mr Howard and his Conservative Party? Do not forget Mr Howard's views during the election on gypsies. He could be a member of the BNP. As I said earlier, we will not stop fascism with talk but we will stop it with action, we will stop it by standing together, and we will stop it by saying there is no place in our society for racism. Racist attacks should be dealt with severely, not by just saying we can convert racists; we cannot convert those who perpetrate racist attacks and create fear on our streets. Please support this composite.

Chris Tapper (*Communication Workers Union*)

supporting Composite 5 said: It has been mentioned previously that the next eight months are going to be the most important eight months that we will have in fighting fascism, in particular with the local government elections. Between then and now what we do as a trade union movement, together with other people, will be vital. The BNP will be expecting to make gains. In the last general election they quadrupled their votes. It was absolutely disgusting but, as previous speakers have said, some people were misled by these horrible, disgusting people.

The CWU believe there is only one way of dealing with Fascism, that is, via unity. Unity is the message put out by Brendan Barber, 'Together Stronger'. Unity is the way we can deal with this. Unity has become the theme of a lot of organisations and bodies over the past number of years. We have united against the war. We have united against poverty. We have united against racism, and we must continue to unite together with all organisations.

The organisation, Unite Against Fascism, has played a crucial part in getting together all religious and trade union organisations and NGOs, in fighting racism. The CWU believe that it is important to continue this as one body with the UAF playing a vital role. I am proud to say that my union has been involved with the UAF in organising events, organising to get rid of the BNP. We have done this in several forums. We have done this at our own conference, and our youth committee organised a social, mixing politics together, to get the message across. The youth committee is getting the message out to all of our younger members. The problem is that we have to make sure this message is clear to everybody.

Finally, Congress, I will leave you with one name. Somebody mentioned earlier the death of Stephen Lawrence 10 years ago. I am going to mention another person who has been murdered by fascists, Anthony Walker, the young student in Liverpool. Remember that name, Congress, Anthony Walker. What did he do to deserve to be murdered by these people? He did nothing. He deserves for us to go out and campaign to ensure this does not happen again. The first place you should do this, Congress, is in Leeds on November 2nd. Nick Griffin will be there in front of a court. Go there and rally. Go there and demand that this man is put in prison, just as the previous POA member has stated.

With that, Congress, I wholeheartedly support this composite.

Val Salmon (*Fire Brigades Union*) supporting

Composite 5 said: In Hampshire we had a fire-fighter that used his position of trust in his community to stand for election as a BNP candidate. Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service are quoted as being a beacon for equality and justice with their core value statement; they sat by and did nothing. When one of the Fire Brigade Union members complained, as a result he and his family were bullied and harassed by this individual, with his name and personal details appearing on the BNP website. Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service did nothing. Unfortunately, the BNP candidate was not a member of ours, otherwise we would have expelled him; that is our policy and we will see anybody in court over it.

Gloucester Fire and Rescue Service almost got it right but they have belatedly watered down their policy regarding membership of the BNP being incompatible with working in the Fire and Rescue Service to it only being incompatible if they are active in the BNP. After the Police Chief Officers Organisation made it clear they will not employ members of the BNP, we lobbied their counterparts in the Fire and Rescue Service for the same commitment. The silence is deafening. The BNP have targeted FBU officials who have campaigned against them delivering their programme of filth and hatred. Regardless, we will continue to fight them wherever they crawl from under their rocks. There is no room in the FBU for the BNP members, active or not, and we demand that our employers and the Government move against them, too. Support the composite.

* *Composite Motion 5 was CARRIED.*

Race Equality

Jeremy Dear (*National Union of Journalists*) speaking to paragraph 2.8 of the General Council Report said: I welcome the motion we passed last year on Redwatch and the progress that was made immediately following it, the letter that went from the TUC to the Government asking them to take action against Redwatch. There was then the delegation meeting that was organised where a number of unions who were involved in the motion, along with Frances O'Grady, went to see the Home Secretary to ask what action the department was taking. At that meeting,

we were told that they would consider what appropriate action could be taken to close down the Redwatch website. It seems that since then there has been a deafening silence. I wonder if we could have some progress update. I also wonder what extra pressure we can bring to bear on the Government to get the Redwatch site closed down before more trade unionists have to face the attacks from the fascists.

The President: Could I invite Gloria Mills to comment for the General Council, having had absolutely no notice. Thank you very much. Gloria.

Gloria Mills (General Council): The General Council has been actively pursuing what more can be done to close down the Redwatch website. As indicated in the General Council Report, in March this year, and as Jeremy has said, the Deputy General Secretary led a delegation of a number of unions, including the NUJ, to see the Home Secretary on this issue. This was a constructive meeting. We made known the strong views of the TUC and the unions on Redwatch and other fascist websites known. We followed up the meeting by supplying a dossier of evidence collected from our TUC affiliates showing how Redwatch is organised to intimidate trade unions and trade unionists. We recognised that the Home Secretary has a particularly full agenda to address at present. However, following our meeting with him we wrote again to urge that the prosecution of the individuals running the website be prioritised. We stressed the urgent need for a government response, especially given the imminent local elections in Spring 2006. It is vital that campaigning against far right parties should not be hampered by intimidatory websites.

Congress, I want to thank the NUJ for their intervention but I also want to say that you may rest assured we will continue to press this issue until we get the Redwatch website closed down, and we will continue to follow this up with the Home Secretary. Thank you.

Amendment to Equality Bill

The President: The General Council support Composite Motion 6.

Alan Jarman (UNISON) moved Composite Motion 6, on behalf of the LGBT Members Conference. He said: Congress, we all recognise the need for laws, they are a vital tool in helping to build and maintain a just, equal, and fair society. The laws that we have in relation to combating discrimination, however, make a mockery of the concept of equality. Take for example, a lesbian, and we will call her Marigold, who lives in Bromley and applies for a job at a hotel. She cannot be legally discriminated against on the grounds of her sexual orientation yet that same hotel can refuse her and her partner a room for the evening on the grounds of their sexual orientation. How can this be right or legal?

For members of the transgender community, the Sex Discrimination Act was extended in 1999 to make clear that discrimination on the grounds of gender reassignment is sex discrimination but only in employment and vocational training. This, we believe, highlights the need to ensure that all legislation that deals with discrimination and equality is given equal weight, as well as gravitas, and fully enforced by the law. The Government this spring launched a review of equalities legislation which may eventually lead to a single equality bill. In the meantime, the equality bill that is the subject of this motion is to be debated in the House of Commons in the next few weeks. This will seek to create a new commission for equality and human rights.

Congress, consider that this bill will introduce protection against discrimination in the areas of goods, facilities, and services only on the grounds of religion

and belief but for some reason not on the grounds of sexual orientation. Why is it that this government believes that there is a hierarchy to discrimination? The TUC LGBT Committee has already made the point that it would have been appropriate to ensure that this anomaly is covered in the current equality bill to send out the message that all forms of discrimination are not tolerated in our society.

Congress, from December 2005, lesbians and gay men all over the UK will have the right to register their same sex partnership, which I am sure we all welcome, but some local authorities, for example, Bromley in London, and Lisburn in Northern Ireland, have already come out – do excuse my turn of phrase – and said that they will bar some couples from even having ceremonies on council property. Comrades, hoteliers or restaurant managers who hold bigoted or contrary views will be allowed to discriminate against those couples who merely wish to celebrate the formalising of their relationship in law. This, Congress, we believe is nothing short of a travesty.

As a result of lobbying by the trade union movement, the matter of this anomaly was raised at House of Commons committee level leading to the Government agreeing to look into this over the course of the summer. To look into what, Congress? They say they are looking into technical problems but we would ask, are there any technical problems in outlawing bigotry? Congress, although we may not wish it so the summer is almost over and now we are asking all of you, and the General Council, to question the government as to what they have found in this review, in this 'looking at'. We can only hope that there are some concrete answers and proposals. Congress, this must be done speedily to ensure that questions are raised when the bill comes back before the House of Commons this autumn.

The TUC LGBT Conference believes that there is no reason to delay further an amendment to the current equality bill. Be in no doubt that we must ensure that all of you today lobby for an amendment to this bill. It may be, as the Government has already acknowledged, that a future equality bill can provide the protection that we are seeking. Congress, we do not want to and why should we have to wait for more crumbs falling from the table of government.

Congress, at the beginning of my speech I told you about Marigold from Bromley and her partner who may suffer discrimination. We all represent workers who are LGBT and those workers also partake and participate in our society. We must ensure that when they celebrate their civil partnership in December we did something to make certain their day is special, even in Bromley.

Jonathan Baume (FDA) seconding Composite Motion 6 said: I am proud to second this motion but also disappointed that this motion has to be on the agenda. We all welcomed the introduction two years ago of the regulations outlawing discrimination at work on the grounds of sexual orientation. The Government were congratulated for implementing what has been landmark legislation but there have been no plaudits whatsoever for their clumsy and confused handling of the current equality bill. The bill itself has a number of positive features. I am sure we all recognise the value of the changes that will make it illegal to discriminate in providing goods and services on the grounds of religion and belief. Why on earth should it be illegal to refuse a hotel room to someone who is a Muslim or a Sikh but perfectly legal to refuse that same hotel room to someone who is gay or a transsexual?

The FDA was proud to support UNISON's emergency motion at the LGBT Conference in July. However, that motion in focusing on sexual orientation but not on gender identity potentially suggested that we were opposed to discrimination on the grounds of sexual

orientation but would be content for such discrimination to transsexuals or transvestites. That was not, of course, UNISON's intention and I am glad that they have accepted the amendment. What we do now need is a concerted campaign to confront the government's refusal to tackle the deficiencies that Alan has just set out. Frankly, the Government's explanations of why it is refusing so far to do so veer between the bizarre and the insulting. There has been an argument that it is too complex. That is, frankly, nonsense. I do not think we believe that and I cannot imagine that seriously the government does either. It should not actually be for the other political parties to come forward with that amendment. The Government itself has made a series of commitments over the years to offer full protection to the lesbian and gay community and it is the government who should act.

Tolerance and respect in Britain have travelled great distances since the 1960s but there unquestionably remains a strong element of active homophobia or at the very least discreet contempt. The Government's equivocation and evasion on this issue simply helps to reinforce that. As a trade union movement we have a duty to continue to challenge homophobia wherever it is manifested. I should add that that includes its prevalence amongst the faith and religious communities. We have said that we give full support to the religious communities, that we respect their beliefs and their right to live free from discrimination, but I think equally we can turn to them and say that we expect their respect for the lesbian and gay community to live equally free from discrimination. Whether it is some Muslims, Christian Evangelicals, Orthodox Jews, Rastafarians, it does not matter what your religion says, if your religion is telling you that gays are evil or that gays should be murdered, then frankly your religion has got it wrong and we should not hesitate to send that message, and neither should the government. Get off the fence and act. Support the motion. Support the lobbying, whether at national or constituency level. Thank you.

Tim Poil (*Nationwide Group Staff Union*) supporting Composite Motion 6 said: I am pleased to be supporting this composite. As you have already heard from both Alan and Jonathan, it is essential that this equality bill is amended to include provisions in relation to sexual orientation. I would like to focus in particular on paragraph 6 of this composite in relation to the make-up of the board and committees of the commission. The challenges that the board, committees, and the commission will face in fulfilling the duties outlined in this Act will be immense, but they must face these challenges if the expectations of so many of our society who continue to face prejudice and discrimination in their daily lives are to be met. They must meet these challenges head on and they must do so quickly and effectively.

It is important, therefore, that the commission can call upon the resources of people who have real experience in tackling issues of equality, people who understand how destructive and divisive prejudice and discrimination can be, people who have experience of working within communities and promoting the value of diversity and of shared respect for equality and human rights. These people are trade unionists and it is vital that our experience is represented within this commission from the outset. We have the experience of tackling these issues as we work with and support our members. The contribution that trade unionists can make to the commission, the board, and its committees, is clear. The only way to guarantee that our experience as trade unionists is utilised to the full, the representation on the board and committees that will look at the activities, the provisions, the services, must therefore ensure that the bill enshrines trade unionists as a full part of this new body. I therefore

call upon Congress to support the composite. Thank you.

* *Composite Motion 6 was CARRIED*

Disability and employment

The President: I now call Motion 17, Disability and employment. The General Council support the motion.

Richard Reiser (*National Union of Teachers*) moved Motion 17. He said: I am pleased to move this motion on behalf of the TUC Disability Conference. This was a prioritised motion because, not surprisingly, we are still in the same position that we have been when we have come to this rostrum before. This is not down to our colleagues here, it is down to the employers, it is down to everybody, really, that we have the same position on unemployment and lack of employment for disabled people of working age that we have had for a very long time, that is, 50 percent of us are not working. If that was a fact for non disabled people, it would be top of our agenda but because it is disabled people - and in our society there is something called disablism, which is a form of oppression which thinks of people differently because they have an impairment of one sort or another - we have to challenge and change our own practices, as well as putting pressure on government to change in order to end this shameful situation.

It is not about compulsion, it is about creating real jobs and security for people in work who acquire impairments, as well as recruiting disabled people. I suppose it is not strange that our society is riven with very strange ideas. If you have been at the cinema any time in the last few years you will have seen some very strange ideas; it may be the remaking of Marvel comics, Batman, or the X-Men, Dare Devil, all of which have disabled superheroes or villains in them. The message that is coming out from this is that we are just not ordinary, we are not the same as everybody else.

Of course, we are all of us, including all the non disabled people, non disabled people waiting to become disabled. The reality of life is that by the time we reach 80, 80 percent of us will be disabled people, so get used to it; it is just that some of us have to live our lives with it all the time. Should that preclude us from actually having access to work, being trained, and getting higher qualifications? No.

In order to challenge this we are putting forward a strategy that each and every union has to take this much more seriously. We have been taking it more seriously. This excellent report, the TUC Equality Audit, points to the increase in unions taking up disability issues: 98 percent of membership is covered by you here, 73 percent of unions reporting say they are taking up disability issues, and 52 percent say they are taking forward negotiations, and negotiations are what we need. We need, for instance, to distinguish between sick leave and sickness monitoring, and disability leave, and leave which it is necessary to take because of an impairment should not count in sickness monitoring schemes. That is a simple thing for everybody to negotiate but it is not the reality in many workplaces, therefore disabled people are segregated in these systems and discriminated against.

One of the ways to deal with this will be actually to have an audit in every workplace. The Transport & General Workers Union led the way, according to this audit, in that in the Year of the Disabled, 2003, they initiated 115 audits in workplaces all over the country. We need audits in every workplace to see how accessible it is, and not just in terms of ramps, lifts, and loops. Do not forget, only one in 13 disabled people are wheelchair users; the vast majority of us are not visible.

I was at a fringe meeting at lunchtime on HIV-AIDS which has gone off as a major issue. We must remember that people with HIV and AIDS are disabled people and they have the same rights to employment as everybody else. Many many people with mental health issues are excluded from our system of employment for no good reason; with simple adjustments people could actually carry out a useful job. Many employees who are disabled are a benefit, as the Small Employers Federation have stated. If you want to check it out, look at the Disability Rights Commission website.

Really, we should not be relying on the Disability Rights Commission to make this fight, it is our fight actually to improve the employment position for disabled people across the country. Therefore, we need more access to work for money, we need to have the right to be reinstated if we win discrimination tribunals, and we also need to introduce legislation which will give new leave arrangements. As for ourselves, we need equality reps in every workplace, and we need training.

The last thing we need to gear up is by no means the least, the law is changing and for the good, for all public sector bodies, including private companies that carry out public functions, from December 2006 will have to have an equality plan which will be robust and monitored. We can play a key role in developing that but we have to start now with the training all of our reps and challenging our employers to get these schemes under way.

Donna Duncan (*British Dietetic Association*) seconding Motion 17 said: I work in the health service as a dietician and this brings me in contact with colleagues with disability every day who have been supported through Access to Work. Legislation has opened up the world of work for people with disability, or for some people. To illustrate this I am going to tell you Paul's story.

I want you to imagine on a sunny beach in Portugal, you are Paul, aged 40, setting off for a swim. Imagine the waves are so strong they bowl you over. Imagine being flown back to the spinal injuries unit in the UK after an emergency operation. Imagine recovery is slow but you regain some independence. Imagine your employer making changes to enable you to return to work part-time in a role where you can use the knowledge and skills you gained over 27 years in the job.

The support Paul received has been made possible because of the changes in the Disability Discrimination Act but even so the information he was provided on his rights under the Act were minimal. His accident was in September last year. Until this July it was uncertain if his employment would be terminated or he would have to be pensioned off when his sick pay ran out. This brought worries about financial insecurity on top of the physical changes he had experienced. Paul was supported by his trade union to make the necessary adjustments to help him return to work. His employers already knew how to support disabled workers and knew the benefits if they could use, not lose, the knowledge, skills, and experience, of their staff. They were able to see Paul's ability and not his disability.

Paul's story demonstrates the key role of trade unions, working together we can make it possible for all categories of employees to return to employment, not just those who work in areas with strong traditions of supporting disabled workers. Finally, imagine Paul's employer granting paid disability leave to enable him to achieve the maximum physical recovery he can achieve. Imagine the difference this would make to Paul's contribution and productivity at work. Imagine the impact on his dignity, financial independence, and ability to support his wife and daughter.

The TUC on behalf of us all are best placed to champion the appropriate use of disability leave in the place of sick leave where there are substantial long-term effects on an individual's abilities. You can now stop using your imagination. We urge Congress to raise the employment issues at the top of the disability agenda. In addition, we ask Congress to seek the introduction of legislation to provide paid disability leave for all those with new or changed impairments. Please support.

Lynne Chambelain (*NATFHE – the University & College Lecturers' Union*) supporting Motion 17 said: I teach visually impaired people at the RNIB College in Redhill. We train or retrain people for work on a range of courses, including information technology and administration, which is the one I do. Many students who have attended the college are victims of sheer discrimination in the workplace due to their sight difficulties. Some may have been to employment tribunals seemingly winning the cases, only to find they have been completely stitched up by the bosses who have not offered reasonable adjustments, or they have even downgraded the posts without compensation. This is outrageous.

Any one of the students that I teach, whose ages range from something like 18 to over 60, would be an absolute asset in the workplace. It is the sight that has gone and, as tragic as that is, it is not the intellect, not the IQ, and so on. With access technology they are as able, if not more able, than non disabled people to work and produce equally first-class results. The problem with Access to Work is that it is too inflexible, it can take months to get the right equipment into place for somebody, by which time the job is in jeopardy. Recently, a student of mine was offered two jobs over three days but was told that he could only have one assessment for one job. That would not happen to an able-bodied person.

I want to link this up with pensions. Part of the introduction to the TUC solving the pensions crisis states, "We believe that increasing the employment rate amongst the working age population has to be a key part of the solution." Absolutely, yes. We say the working age population should include people with disabilities. We need to ensure these workers are part of the solution, as has been said by the first speaker, bearing in mind that once we are over 50 many of us will have a disability, over 70 percent of people in the UK between the ages of 18 and 65 may have one, and so on, four out of five workers may develop a disability once they are over a certain age.

I know we do not have a lot of time but I need to mention the case of one woman who is supported by NATFHE and UNISON, and some other unions. This woman is called Violet Pethiyagoda, she is registered blind, and an asylum seeker. She fled from Sri Lanka a few years ago. Violet is an excellent IT worker. She speaks five languages and, like other people I have just mentioned, will be an absolute asset in the workplace. This Government wants to send her back to Sri Lanka to certain persecution instead of allowing her to work here. Her sin in Sri Lanka, she is Sinhalese, is that she married a Tamil. Her brother and husband were murdered by the Tamil Tigers. Violet and other people who are registered blind, are disabled, or are asylum seekers, would be a real boon to this economy.

Congress, we must pressurise the Government and tight-fisted bosses to provide full and meaningful employment for disabled people. Thank you.

Gordon Rowntree (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supporting Motion 17 said: It is quite correct when the motion says that the employment prospects of disabled people remain bleak. It is therefore no surprise that when a disabled person finds his or her job under threat it is going to affect them more than an able-bodied person.

This can be demonstrated by a recent sad case that occurred in the Inland Revenue and was subsequently the subject of a successful employment tribunal hearing brought by PCS. One of our members, a man named Nigel Osborne-Clark, a married man with a young family who was profoundly deaf from birth, started work in the Revenue in January 2003. He had been performing fully up to standard and was a popular member of his team but in October of that year he was summoned to see his manager over an alleged incident of computer misuse. His crime was actually accessing his wife's file. Although he admitted to this, he was unaware that it was a gross misconduct charge under the department's computer misuse policy.

He became extremely distressed when he found out about it. He took the next day off on the sick and was feeling really really depressed from there. The Inland Revenue supposedly has a strong diversity in equal opportunity policy yet the human resources department did not take responsibility for ensuring that appropriate arrangements were made, and the area disability officer did not make contact with Nigel or his manager. He had filled in an Access to Work application and indicated that he would need a British Sign Language interpreter for meetings or reviews. In the response from the Access to Work they indicated as well that he would need interpreter support for team meetings, job reviews, training courses, etc.

Because his manager did not get any support he was not aware that this was an automatic right so it was only agreed that the interpreter would attend formal training courses and job reviews. Because the disciplinary procedure takes time Nigel was left in a state of uncertainty about his future for months. Tragically, last February Nigel hung himself. The tribunal said his distress was connected with his deafness because he was married with a child, he had another child on the way, and his family were dependent on his earnings, and his disability meant that the number of jobs available to him was limited. The tribunal found that the Inland Revenue breached the 1995 DDA by failing to ensure that Nigel was given a BSL interpreter for an induction process relating to the organisation's policy on computer issues. They were ordered to pay £15,000, plus interest and damages.

Thankfully, tragedies like this do not generally happen too often but in the present climate with job cuts, particularly in areas like the public services, an increase in this type of incident is only too likely. I am sure Congress is appalled as much by this event as PCS, and we are going to continue to support others to raise awareness and to ensure that dignity and fairness in the workplace is upheld. We call on Congress wholeheartedly to support this motion.

The President: The General Council supports the motion.

* *Motion 17 was CARRIED*

Disability

Pam Tinsley (*Amicus*) speaking to paragraph 2.10 said: I am a Congress virgin; please bear with me.

I want to know what Congress is going to do under this paragraph to secure the needs of people within the Remploy factories. We want to work. Recent government policy has delivered a lot of improvements with 50 per cent of disabled people working, but a lot of them are working in jobs that are totally unsuitable for them. They are working where they are not protected. They are not working in the factories that were set up to protect people with disabilities. Having a job, being able to work, having adjustments made

for you -- as has been said by other speakers -- is terribly important. I work for Remploy, which is meant to be a caring organisation. Five years ago our Remploy management gave out something called Remploy 21 and promised that the workforce would never fall below 6,000. There are 5,100 in the factories. If you ask Remploy they say "No, we have 6,000 people working", but these include outsourced workers, people who are not working in a protected environment. Please, will Congress help to protect these people? Will they help to keep Remploy factories open for people who cannot hope to work in outside industry?

Rehana Azam (*GMB*) speaking to paragraph 2.10 of the General Report said: I am speaking in support of paragraph 2.10 of the General Council Report.

GMB welcomes the disability section of this report. We thank the General Council for its continued support for our members working in Remploy. We are pleased that this report backs the GMB campaign to achieve the higher level of disabled factory-based employees to which Remploy had agreed. GMB will continue to apply pressure until those agreed levels are reached. No doubt you have already seen our committed Remploy activists. They are calling on your support to preserve the viability of the Remploy factory network, so please continue to show your support.

I would now like to turn to the last section of this paragraph, which mentions the report on improving life chances of disabled people. Overall, that report is to be welcomed as a major step forward, but let me spell out a warning for, hidden away in that weighty report, is a single innocuous but potentially damaging recommendation. Recommendation 7.13 proposes withdrawing funding from programmes that are deemed not to integrate disabled people into mainstream employment. Instead, funding will be directed to programmes that progress disabled people towards open employment. Progression can mean different things to different people, so how that recommendation is implemented is critical. That is why trades unions must be involved in these discussions.

Let us take a reality check. Ninety per cent of employers regard blind or partially sighted people as either difficult or impossible to employ. Small surprise then that three out of four people with visual impairment are not in work. It is paternalistic to suggest that disabled workers must always be progressed into open employment. Are disabled people to be denied a choice in where they work? Where their supported workplace is not at fault for failing to progress, it must not be penalised. The problem really lies with mainstream employers who refuse to shed out-dated prejudices. Nearly a decade after the DDA became law disabled people are still denied real employment opportunities that are available to their non-disabled counterparts. The GMB calls for some joined-up government thinking to create quality jobs for disabled people. For example, why create a public sector disability equality duty if the public procurement regulations do not require public bodies to reserve contracts for supported workplaces?

Thank you.

The President: I call Mark Fysh to respond for the General Council.

Mark Fysh (*General Council*): Let us make this perfectly clear: the TUC's position is that you will be supported in your employment in Remploy and other areas. What we want to see is proper, well-paid jobs, the end to the glass ceiling, the end to second class citizenships, no more second-class jobs, and we will fight for that and get that. I hope that situation is perfectly clear.

I would want to make one further point and it was made earlier. All of you at some time will become

disabled, so this is not a side issue, this is not an add-on, this is real and it will affect you, so help us to help you.

Thank you.

Age Discrimination

The President: I call Composite 7 on age discrimination. The General Council support the composite motion and I will be calling the Deputy General Secretary, Frances O'Grady, during the debate to explain the General Council's position.

Peter Pendle (*Association for College Management*) moved Composite Motion 7.

He said: ACM welcomes the fact that finally we are going to make age discrimination unlawful. This is long overdue and will benefit people of all ages. However, although we are happy with the principles of outlawing age discrimination, we are very concerned about some of the practices. In particular, we believe the draft regulations are too technical and too employer-focused. A key difference between the draft regulations and most other areas in employment law is that employers can justify direct age discrimination in order to avoid liability and, as the composite motion clearly shows, there are a number of specific issues with which we have concerns. None is more important than the retirement age.

It may seem strange that we are saying that workers should be able to work longer in life. Of course, everyone should have the right to retire at or before the normal retirement age with a proper pension, but more and more people want to work on. People are living longer, professional workers no longer work for the same corporation for all their working lives. Gap years and career breaks are becoming more and more common. People choose to start families later in life, or have second families. Forty-year mortgages are common and, even now, some people just cannot afford to retire because their pensions have been stolen.

So what do the regulations say? They introduce a national default retirement age of 65 and the concepts of planned and unplanned retirements. They will also make retirement a fair reason for dismissal, at the same time removing the 65-year age limit for claiming unfair dismissal. Retirement before age 65 will only be lawful if it can be justified, and working on after 65 will be allowed. That sounds simple enough. The problems can be seen in the small print. What is supposed to be a flexible approach to retirement age is really only flexible if you are an employer. There is too little in the regulations for the workers.

Firstly, an employer will still be able to force someone to retire simply by giving six months' notice. In the regulations they call this planned retirement, although the upper age limit for redundancy payments is also being abolished. The key concern here is that employers will use the new fair reason of a retirement dismissal to avoid making future redundancy payments. A worker can challenge whether it was a genuine retirement dismissal but they will need to submit a grievance and then perhaps follow the tribunal route. In their consultation document the Government say there will be a heavy burden of proof needed to show that the dismissal was not a genuine retirement. Many employers will use this to sack their oldest workers, save some money and get away with it.

Secondly, we have what is known as the duty to consider. This is to be about choice: the choice to consider working after the default or employers' justified retirement age. It is a procedure enabling workers to make a request to remain employed. According to the consultation document, it is modelled on the existing right to request flexible working but

that is where the similarity ends. The employer has a duty to consider but has absolutely no obligation to do this in any meaningful way. The employer can say 'no' without even explaining why, and there is nothing the worker can do. Clearly, there needs to be some further duty on the employer to justify properly a 'no' decision.

Thirdly, we have the default retirement age itself. It is currently set at 65, but the government were originally looking at a default retirement age of 70. Unless there is a radical change of thinking, we would not be at all surprised if the default retirement age were raised. It certainly is not going to come down. Then there will be extra pressure on occupational pension schemes to raise their own retirement ages.

Colleagues, the way that the age regulations affect retirement is very complex and, although well intended, they have some serious shortcomings. We fear a very big increase in employment tribunal applications. I have concentrated on the retirement age, just one aspect of these regulations. The speakers who follow will deal with other points. Please support the composite.

Barry Camfield (*Transport & General Workers' Union*) seconded Composite 7 on Age Discrimination but coming at it from quite a different angle. Unions must fight for the right to retire with dignity, a decent pension and retirement while we are still young enough to enjoy it. We have to be very careful not to send the wrong message about individual choice in retirement. Employers and government want a larger and more flexible labour force. They talk of individual choice; they do not talk about collective bargaining. This composite calls for retirement policy to be framed within retirement age limits that are agreed by collective bargaining.

The composite also recognises the need to avoid workers being coerced into working beyond their normal retirement age and recognises the implications for the whole workforce. We demand collective and not individual solutions: the right to retire with dignity, a decent pension and, as I said, while we are still young enough. Otherwise, it is the thin end of the wedge. Once they have softened us up and people are working past 65 in large numbers, it will be much easier for them to defer payments on pensions, give us the choice to work until we drop or being forced out through sickness to live the rest of our days in poverty.

We have made many of the same arguments about the Working Time Directive here today. We do not want individuals working themselves to death under the guise of choice. We hear a lot about the ageing population, but it does not mean we can all work longer. On average, a male professional -- and you have to listen to who is speaking today -- lives to 79, an unskilled worker to only 71. For unskilled women workers life expectancy actually decreases. Overall, nearly one in three men will die before they are 70, one in five before they are 65. Also, we are living longer in poor health: nine years of ill health for the average male.

So where is this clamour for working past 65 coming from? Only 5 per cent of the population want to, according to a survey by the Employers Forum On Age; three-quarters want to retire by 60. Half of the respondents said a fixed retirement age lets people retire with dignity, and a similar number said they were worried that if there were not a fixed age they would be forced to carry on working. We do not accept that the answer to unequal pay for women is for women to work longer. People should retire by 65 or younger.

Be very careful not to allow retirement ages to go up and read this resolution very carefully. On the basis of our amendments to it we second.

Jonathan Baume (*FDA*) supporting the motion said: The forthcoming age discrimination legislation will be among the most important employment laws for many years, and crucially it affects every member, however young, however old. Much of the argument and debate has, as Barry has just explained, focused on the implications for retirement, but in practice there will be an impact at all stages of people's working lives. We will need to systematically re-negotiate the considerable swathe of personnel practices and staff handbooks. Any agreement, any working condition, that might have directly or indirectly a bearing on the age of the worker will be up for review. The time is quite short. The Government had promised that the regulations would be ready by October 2004. In fact, we have only just seen the drafts, currently out for consultation, and responses are due by 17 October. Therefore, the final regulations will be unlikely to be published until the beginning of next year so we will have nine months, not two years' notice.

The reason for the delay, the key reason, has been this argument over whether or not to have a default fixed retirement age or no national retirement age at all. The Government, under heavy pressure from the CBI, opted for a fixed age of 65 supported by some -- though not all -- unions. It is important to emphasise that the arguments we have had about retirement age are, in my view, tactical; they are not about principles. The FDA, the transport workers, other unions, share a common aim, to maintain a state pension age of 65 and allow workers dignity in old age. We have had differences -- and Barry has just explained them -- about how best to achieve this, but we do have agreement about our goal.

I am sure that there will be clear agreement as well on the issue of redundancy payments. There is a real fear that employers will use these regulations to level down conditions where there is an age criteria, not level up, and we quite clearly want to see a levelling up. The statutory redundancy payment scheme is important for very many workers. Whilst most FDA members are covered by more advantageous arrangements in public sector schemes, some of our members actually have to rely on the statutory redundancy scheme. At the moment in calculating payments as a multiplier with age bands the government propose starting to level this up between half-a-week and a week and a half to one week but have not reached a final decision. They have emphasised that any changes must be "cost neutral" and that means some workers will get higher payments and others lower payments if the government's proposals stand.

Every union must respond by 17 October. Argue for a levelling up of the redundancy payments agreement, argue for an increased generosity in the weekly payment and get in early to ensure that national and local negotiations maximise the benefits to all of our members of these new regulations.

Tracy Clarke (*Community*) speaking in support of Composite 7 said: The motion deals with a form of discrimination that can hurt all of us whatever age we are. I want to focus on the impact of the discrimination on young people, which is built into the national minimum wage regulations and could be made even worse by the new employment equality regulations that will come into effect next year. We are asking Congress to affirm that paying people in the 18 to 22 year age band less than other workers on the national minimum wage is unjust and divisive. People working together doing the same work are being paid different rates. No one ever forgets an injustice and the regulations presently can turn young people off from the world of work permanently. Therefore, we start off by saying that all working people over the age of 18 should be entitled to earn at least adult minimum wage.

Far from righting the wrongs in the national minimum wage, the draft equality regulations would make them even more unjust. The present rules do allow unions to negotiate with employers so that people are paid the full adult rate from the age of 21. Under the new proposals employers will lose the possibility to see that the adult rate applies to 21 year olds. Those responsible employers who now pay the adult minimum rate from the age of 21 would be acting in breach of the age regulations if they continued to do that. To comply, an employer would either have to abandon the idea of paying the adult rate at 21, and either pay it to all workers at the age of 18 or to all workers from the age of 22. Delegates, we know which option they will choose.

I am glad that this Congress enables Community to expose this serious flaw in the proposed regulations and I urge all delegate to add their voices to that of the Low Pay Commission and call for a full adult rate to be paid from their 21st birthday as a first step to ending all age discrimination.

Frances O'Grady (*Deputy General Secretary*): The General Council supports this composite motion and has asked me to explain their position briefly. The Government have now published their final proposals following a consultation on the European Directive that requires Member States to implement new age equality laws. We believe that the Government's proposals fall well short of true equality in a range of crucial areas and we will continue to argue that case.

Firstly, we believe that employers should be explicitly prohibited from using age equality laws as an excuse to strip away pension benefits or other benefits from workers. There must be no levelling down.

Secondly, we believe that the Government must act to protect young workers against discrimination. The youth development rate in the national minimum wage has become a byword for blatant exploitation, and it is time for that to go.

Thirdly, we want action to tackle the disgrace of statutory redundancy payments. We do not want a re-distribution of peanuts. All workers who lose their livelihoods should be entitled to a decent rate, again levelling up not levelling down.

Finally, as you know, the state pension age and the state retirement age are often confused but they are two different things. The Government have decided to introduce a national default retirement age for the first time in this country. In discussions with the Government and the CBI, we argued that there was no need to introduce a new retirement age. The only age that mattered was the state pension age, because that is the age on which most people base their retirement decisions and on which many collective agreements are based. While some people may genuinely want to work beyond the state pension age the majority of those who do so not out of real choice but quite simply because they are poor.

When the Government made clear their determination to introduce a new statutory retirement age, we made our conditions clear. In particular we said we would only accept this if the statutory retirement age was pegged at the state pension age and that we would not brook any attempt to raise that retirement age and then use that to raise the state pension age by the back door.

Congress, let us be clear, yes we are in favour of real choice and real protection in the lead up to retirement, but we will oppose any attempt to force people to work longer and harder for less. So, Congress, in the light of this explanation please support the motion.

* *Composite Motion 7 was CARRIED.*

Age Discrimination

A delegate speaking to paragraph 2.11 said: I think there was an important point made in the last debate about the issue of redundancy being cost neutral. I do not think that unemployment can be cost neutral when the British workers are the cheapest and the easiest to sack and the age discrimination regulations and the way that they are drafted give a green light to employers to use them as an excuse to level down our redundancy packages. The Labour Government made a manifesto commitment to increase redundancy payments as a step to making it less easy and less cheap to sack British workers. I cannot think of any place better to start to deliver this commitment than levelling up the statutory redundancy payments with the age discrimination regulations. It is an ideal opportunity for this Government to demonstrate that the social dimension of Europe will deliver decent job security and equal rights at work. We must work together to convince this Government that in transposing European legislation we would like to see more job security for older workers and not less.

Britain's Olympic Games - London 2012

The President: I now turn to paragraph 4.12 on the 2012 Olympics. Last year Seb Coe told Congress of his vision for London's 2012 Olympics and the importance that he attached to trade union involvement in that project. Seb is not able to be with us today but we are joined by two other members of the team that won the Olympics for London, the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, Tessa Jowell, and the Mayor of London, Ken Livingstone. In a few moments Ken and Tessa will be contributing to this item in discussions with the Congress TV presenter, Steve Levinson, but first of all let me invite the General Secretary to move the General Council's Statement and introduce a video taken from the presentation in Singapore which helped bring the Games to London.

Brendan Barber (General Secretary): Thank you very much, Jeannie, and let me join you in welcoming Tessa and Ken and congratulating them on the crucial parts that they both played in winning the Games for London for the first time since 1948.

My job is very briefly to move the General Council's statement. The Games are a huge economic project. They will mean jobs -- jobs in construction, in manufacturing, in transport, in entertainment, in the service sector. They will give an enormous boost to the economy of East London but with the benefits stretching far beyond the venues with new jobs and growth potentially right across the country. Our task is to make sure that these are quality jobs, with high levels of training, best health and safety standards and, of course, union representation too. At the 2000 Games in Sydney, our Australian counterparts showed what can be done.

But none of this is going to happen of its own accord. As a country we have something of a mixed record on major projects. We know the problems with the Wembley Stadium project. We are determined that this should be a project that we get right. To do that we need to ensure that unions are central to the organisation, involved right at the heart in determining the procurement process. We need to press our employers too to look at the opportunity the Games are going to present to bid for contracts, to plan ahead, ensuring that the manufacturing jobs also come to this country on the basis of the best bids. We need to press the training bodies, including the Learning and Skills Councils, to ensure that we have the skilled workers who will be needed at every stage of this project. We need to ensure too that we have the best equal opportunities policies, reflecting that diversity of London about which Ken in particular

spoke so eloquently in Singapore. So we need to work together, and I have already invited the construction unions to come together to discuss how we can make sure that we put the most into this project and, equally importantly, how we ensure that we get the most out.

The Games, of course, will take place in a part of East London famous for the birth of new unionism in the 1880s. It was the area where the dockers made their voice heard, where the gas workers got together for the first time, the birthplace of many of the unions represented here today. It can also now be a place for us to give a real new boost to trade unionism. The Olympics are a massive global event, with world-wide implications for unions too. We have already played a prominent part in the Play Fair at the Olympics campaign, pressing for fair treatment for those involved in the production of sportswear world-wide, and we will build on that campaign too in the run-up to the Olympics over the next seven years.

I hope that the Games will inspire and challenge unions, just as they inspire and challenge young athletes around the world. Inspiration was the theme of the London 2012 bid. So, before we hear from Tessa and Ken, let us now just see a short part of that bid, in a video suitably titled 'Inspiration'.

(The video was shown)

The President: Thank you very much, Brendan. That is some video.

I now hand you over to Congress TV presenter, Steve Levinson, who will be putting some of the issues raised by Brendan to Tessa Jowell and Ken Livingstone, so over to you, Steve.

Steve Levinson: Great video. If they ever had an Olympics for propaganda that is going to get the gold.

Ken Livingstone: We could get them working on the next election campaign!

Steve Levinson: I would like to pick up one of the points that Brendan made here, which was that obviously these Olympics are going to produce jobs, hopefully lots of jobs, but it is the quality of jobs that people are interested in. Maybe the first question for both of you, but to Tessa first, is how do we ensure that these are quality jobs?

Tessa Jowell: First of all, we are absolutely determined that they will be quality jobs. We estimate that something like 7,000 jobs will be created in the course of the development of the Olympic site and the infrastructure, with the prospect of about 12,000 permanent jobs servicing the site and the legacy afterwards. We have gone on and on about the importance of legacy in relation to these Games. We know that the construction industry, for instance, in London is heavily under-skilled. The scale of construction investment in the Olympics creates the possibility of altering the training strength and the capacity of the construction sector. So training is a prerequisite for jobs being good jobs, but that is a principle that all of us who have been involved in developing the bid, those of us who are now taking forward, will support unequivocally.

Steve Levinson: Ken, obviously it is a good idea but how do we put it into practice?

Ken Livingstone: We have drawn up an initial statement of principles about the things we want built into all the contracts, not just environmental sustainability but recognition of trades unions, acceptance of a minimum wage and in London they effectively recalculate you need to spend about, pay about, £6,70 an hour to achieve what we call a living wage. We are fighting against many of the backward employers who are paying their cleaning staff well below that. This will be something that ratchets up over the next seven years.

I have been pleasantly surprised to discover -- because you can look at me and realise I have not spent much of my life in the company of the international sporting community -- that none of them wants an Olympics on the cheap, they want an Olympics they are proud of; they do not want a series of horrible exposes about someone doing clothing or footwear manufacture exploiting sweatshop conditions, and I think we will establish a new set of yardsticks by which all Olympics are to be judged on this.

Steve Levinson: Are we going to formalise this in any way? If you look at the Sydney experience, there were very, very strong agreements written down and adhered to? Are we going to formalise it?

Tessa Jowell: I know when Seb was here last year he talked about the Sydney framework, but if you look at the procurement principles that we published last week and which are out for consultation -- and you should all take some time to take part in that consultation -- you will see the kind of principles that defined the Sydney agreement and then within that, when the tenders are let, principally by the Olympic Delivery Authority, you will see (as Ken has said) the principles of employee representation, fair and ethical employment standards, a London living wage and so forth, written into the criteria that will apply in tendering for the Games.

I just underline this point that bidding for the Olympics for London is intended to transform our country, and so everything we do is with an eye to the legacy that it creates, way beyond the point at which the Games close in August 2012.

Ken Livingstone: We are working now on these details and until Parliament passes the Bill that creates these authorities next year the good news for the trade union movement is that the contracts are all let by the London Development Agency, which is under my direction, and Transport for London, and we are drafting contracts now that I think will set new standards for ensuring local recruitment, and also all the basic things that the trade union Movement has been fighting for so we will get the organisation into working that way before the new structures are set up. We have the Government on board and the British Olympic Association. Nobody wants a Games that will be an embarrassment in terms of exploiting the workforce in Britain or internationally.

Steve Levinson: There are two important bodies involved here, a development agency and an Organising Committee. The Sydney experience again was that there should be union representation on those bodies. How far are you along that road?

Tessa Jowell: In relation to the Olympic Delivery Authority, which is the body that will deliver all the infrastructure, I certainly hope that when we appoint the board for the Olympic Delivery Authority we will have trade union representation on that. It will be very important to provide guidance on contracting and good employment practice, and in relation to the LOGOC, which Seb chairs, I know that he will also want to work closely with the trade union movement in the development of the work of the LOGOC.

Steve Levinson: May I raise one more issue, which is skills. Obviously in London there are loads of projects going on. There is the Wembley Stadium project, there is Cross Rail possibly, there is Terminal 5, there is already a shortage of skilled people, skilled engineers. How much drain will these projects be putting on our skill base?

Ken Livingstone: The London Development Agency is already working with the Learning and Skills Councils recognising -- we have known for years, with or without the Olympics, all the big transport projects we are pushing -- that we have to up-skill our workforce. I am in negotiations with the Government at the

moment about extending the powers of the Mayor. One of the areas we are looking at is bringing the Learning and Skills Council under the Mayor so that they can be integrated with the London Development Agency so that there is just one body for London.

Tessa Jowell: To go back to your first question, which is about both skills and quality jobs, because quality jobs are jobs for which people have the opportunity, we look at the legacy potential at the Olympics in East London. The unemployment rate now is more than twice the national average; the unemployment rate among young Bangladeshi men in East London is 40 per cent. It is a fantastic legacy for a Labour Government to see quality jobs and unemployment fall by virtue of the Olympic development.

Steve Levinson: We will leave it there and I will hand back to the President. *(Applause)*

The President: It was a wonderful achievement to win the bid and certainly the trade unions look forward to being part of delivering a great success, so thank you very much indeed and thank you for addressing us today. Thank you. If I could now move to the debate on the General Council's statement and paragraph 4.1 and the GMB have indicated that they wish to speak.

Richard Ascough (GMB) speaking to paragraph 4.1 (4.12) said: I am sure, like me, you were all over the moon, even the non-Londoners amongst you, on the night of 6 July when we knew that we had won the Olympics for London. I believe that we have to thank the work and foresight of the Labour Mayor -- and it is important to say again the Labour Mayor -- of London, Ken Livingstone, the government and the bid team who always thought this was possible. But I am sure you also remember how quickly that euphoria came to an end on 7 July with the four terrible explosions on the tubes and the number 30 bus. I would like to pay a tribute to all those trade union members of the emergency services and Transport for London who worked so hard for all the people of London during that crisis.

To return to the Olympics, obtaining the Olympics is such a wonderful opportunity that we must not squander it. We have the ability to create a great exhibition to the world on how we in the U.K. can stage a world-class event. This gives an unprecedented opportunity to provide investment in the infrastructure and peoples of East London, one of the poorest parts of the UK, and I should like to add at this stage that the GMB are proud to see the Olympics coming to a part of London where our own union was born.

However, it is essential that the trade union movement is involved in this. I welcome the steps the TUC have already taken to ensure this happens. It is also important that the massive construction and infrastructure works are done safely. We heard this morning from UCATT about how many accidents there are, even while we have been here, and how many deaths there will be on building sites. Far too many workers -- both Greek and immigrant -- were sacrificed through injury and death to ensure the Athens Olympics went ahead on time. Safety was compromised time and time again. These large projects will attract workers from many parts of the UK, other EU states and elsewhere. The TUC and trades unions must ensure that the contractors and employers recognise trades unions, pay the proper rate of pay to all workers and do not try and undercut the rate for non-UK workers. GMB warmly supports the work the TUC is doing in this area and we look forward to working together in the trade union Movement to make 2012 a resounding success.

* *The General Council's Statement was ADOPTED*

Congress adjourned for the day.

SECOND DAY: TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13 MORNING SESSION

(Congress re-assembled at 9.30 a.m.)

The President: Before I call Congress to order, could I just say many thanks to Cantabile who have been singing for us this morning. Your voices are really beautiful. Thank you very much indeed. *(Applause)*

If I could now call Congress to order, thank you very much. I hope you had a good evening yesterday, and welcome to today's business of Congress.

Could I first of all 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, which is situated in the ground floor exhibition area just inside the main front doors of the Brighton centre. Ballot papers will only be provided in exchange for the official delegation form so you will need that, and please note that the ballot closes at 12 noon today.

Colleagues, the business that was not taken from yesterday's sessions will be re-scheduled for later this week, and that consists of the Equality Audit presentation, and paragraphs 2.1 to 2.3, Motion 8, Motion 9 and Motion 19 with paragraphs 2.1 to 2.3 of the General Council Report. I will give delegates as much notice as possible of when I intend to take the unfinished business and if at all possible I will attempt to begin taking unfinished business at the end of this morning's session in the order in which it was lost.

If I could now call on Annette Mansell-Green, the Chair of the General Purposes Committee to give a further report.

Report of the General Purposes Committee

Annette Mansell-Green: The General Purposes Committee Report has never attracted so much attention but it is nice to have it!

Congress, the General Purposes Committee have approved one further emergency motion, entitled Patient-led NHS, which will be moved by UNISON and seconded by Amicus. That is numbered E3.

One nomination has also been withdrawn. This was for Roger King who was standing in Section E 'black workers from unions with less than 200,000 members'. His name has been struck from the ballot paper.

In addition, the General Purposes Committee have approved a further collection which is for Make Poverty History. Delegates will recall that the Make Poverty History white wristbands were included in the Congress wallets and therefore we would be grateful if you could make an appropriate donation. Delegates will be interested to know that the PFA have indicated that they will very generously match the amount collected, so please give as much as you can.

The President: I will take Emergency Motion E3 in the debate about the NHS scheduled for this afternoon.

You will have seen that I have been joined on the platform by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gordon Brown. There are a few telltale signs confirming that and Gordon will be addressing us in a few minutes, but he particularly wanted to be here early to join us for the presentation of the Congress Awards, which is our first item of business this morning.

Presentation of Lay Rep Awards

The President: As I am sure you will know, these awards are made in recognition of the vital contribution made by the lay activists who are the bedrock of the trade union movement. For many years

we have had the Women's Gold Badge and the Youth Award, and more recently we have added three other awards that recognise the growing number of different roles that volunteer union reps play in the workplace. We now also have awards in recognition of the work of learning representatives, of health and safety representatives, and -- of crucial importance -- the organising representatives. In the best trade union sense, we do not have individual winners as such but each year we choose outstanding representatives to accept the awards on behalf of all their fellow representatives.

Before we meet this year's representatives we are going to show you a video which will tell you something about them and about their achievements. The video has been sponsored jointly by Browell Smith, solicitors, and BT. I would like to thank them for the support they have given us, and I hope that you enjoy the video.

(The video was then shown)

The President: Now it is time to meet our award winners so I am going to hand over to the General Secretary to introduce them.

Brendan Barber (General Secretary): The winner of the Women's Gold Badge is Lesley Mansell. Lesley has been a union member for 28 years, currently a member of Amicus, and sits on its National Women's Committee and National LGBT Committee. She was a member of the TUC LGBT Committee too. Lesley was instrumental in the creation of the Leicester Women's Centre providing advice and support on a range of employment and health issues. Lesley also set up, and for a number of years ran, a national information help line giving advice on employment issues to lesbians, gay men, bisexual and trans-gender people. *(Applause)*

(Presentation of the Award by the President and Chancellor of the Exchequer)

Brendan Barber (General Secretary): The winner of the Congress Award for Youth is Fiona Smith. She has been the Young Members Officer at the Aberdeen City UNISON Branch for five years and is currently Chair of the UNISON Scotland Young Members Committee. Fiona is a workplace steward and safety rep, and has also been the branch treasurer for the past year. She has also organised recruitment campaigns in the branch, specifically aimed at young workers, and holds one of the two young worker seats on the Scottish TUC General Council. In addition, Fiona has helped to develop a programme of school visits completing on average 15 school visits a year and speaking to around 350 young people about employment rights and the role of trade unions. Fiona, come and receive your Award. *(Applause)*

(Presentation of the Award by the President and Chancellor of the Exchequer)

Brendan Barber (General Secretary): The winner of the Learning Rep Award is Joanne Wallinger. Joanne is a learning rep with the Communication Workers Union, and in that role she successfully negotiated a local agreement for release time to establish a learning centre in her workplace. Given that the majority of Joanne's members work on shift patterns, find it difficult to attend fixed time courses, the flexible approach of the learning centre is something that has really made a difference. Joanne come and receive your award. *(Applause)*

(Presentation of the Award by the President and Chancellor of the Exchequer)

Brendan Barber (General Secretary): The winner of the Health and Safety Health Rep Award, Barry Gapes, is a Safety Rep with the Communication Workers Union -- again! It is no coincidence in Jeannie's Presidency! Outrageous slur! As part of an initiative for the European Health and Safety Week in October 2004, he

developed an information card on the dangers of asbestos. This initiative was done in partnership with the employer, BT. The card was originally planned for 1700 field service engineers in London and East Anglia. Due to demand, it expanded into other parts of the country. Eventually BT produced 39,000 copies of the card and circulated it with its own internal publications. Barry, congratulations. *(Applause)*

(Presentation of the Award by the President and Chancellor of the Exchequer)

Brendan Barber (General Secretary): Finally, the award for Organising goes to two people this year, Jessica Fagan from Amicus and Bob Woods from UNISON. First, Jessica. Jessica is a seconded rep for Amicus at Rolls Royce in Derby. In that capacity Jessica organised a project to reorganise the reps structure within the staff side at Rolls Royce, developing a new network of workplace reps and ensuring that they received the necessary support and training. Jessica also used this project to map the workplace and to build union membership, arranging workplace walkabouts and supporting reps to organise their own strategies. Jessica, come and get your award.

(Applause)

(Presentation of the Award by the President and Chancellor of the Exchequer)

Brendan Barber (General Secretary): Bob Woods is the UNISON Branch Secretary of Barnardo's. In this role he co-ordinated attempts to gain recognition and to establish an effective union presence. The campaign led to a 35 per cent increase in membership and a doubling in the number of activists. A recognition agreement was signed with UNISON in May 2004 after two decades of campaigning. An important part of this was encouraging self-organisation, and with a workforce in which women make up the majority they now also make up 70 per cent of the Branch Executive. Bob, many congratulations. *(Applause)*

(Presentation of the Award by the President and Chancellor of the Exchequer)

The President: Thank you, Brendan. Well they are stars are they not? Makes you feel proud -- a great group of people. *(Applause)*.

Address by Rt Hon Gordon Brown, MP, Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The President: Congress, it is now my pleasure to invite the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gordon Brown, to address Congress. Gordon is on what we trades unionists describe as a split shift today: during the early part of his day he is here in Brighton and the later part of the day he is in New York. It is not the sort of working practice that we want to encourage, but it shows the value that Gordon attaches to being here with us today.

Gordon, as I am sure you will know, we do have our differences with the government from time to time, and some of those differences will be aired later today in the debate on public services and public service jobs. But we certainly recognise that you have been a towering figure in this Government, with a formidable record on economic efficiency, social justice and, last but not least, the cause of combating world poverty. This is the third time that you have joined us at Congress as Chancellor. Gordon, we look forward to hearing your views on how to achieve better working lives for the people we represent and you are very welcome. Thank you.

Rt Hon Gordon Brown, MP: Jeannie, Brendan, General Council members and delegates, let me thank you first of all for your invitation to speak. Let me thank you, Jeannie and Brendan, for your highly praised and respected leadership of the Trades Union Congress, and let me add my congratulations right at

the beginning to Lesley Mansell, Jessie Fagan, Jo Wallinger, Barry Gapes and and Bob Woods, the most important people here today. Let me thank you for the work you do, day in and day out, bargaining for members. You are the everyday heroes of the labour movement who have built this movement, who sustain it and who are its future in the years to come. *(Applause)*

I hope Congress will also allow me to acknowledge the work of men and women who have been good friends of mine, who are retiring from the General Council this year after years of service to this movement: George Brumwell for 12 years general secretary of UCATT; Pat Hawkes from the NUT, and let me thank her also for work as a councillor here in Brighton; and Dave Anderson, former UNISON President, and now let me congratulate him on being elected as the Labour MP for Blaydon. Thank you, all of you, for the work you have done. *(Applause)*

As we thank people today, let us today on this day of celebration for a great English national sporting success congratulate the England cricket team, of whom we are all proud, and let us congratulate London on winning the Olympics for 2012.

Friends, let me just add a personal note. This is a time when we remember also men and women who have served our movement, and in particular this year two Titans who died earlier this year, Ron Todd and Jim Callaghan. Only a month since their unexpected and early deaths I know all of us would want to pay tribute today to two other Titans of our movement, Mo Mowlam and Robin Cook, both of whom died tragically and unexpectedly young, both with such a huge contribution still to make. Mo Mowlam was the People's Minister; she was an inspiration to women everywhere. Let us agree there must now be a fitting memorial to her achievements in Northern Ireland and beyond, and to her work. The passion of Robin Cook's commitment to social justice was and is an inspiration to us all, all of us who are influenced by him and people in every continent of the world. So, inspired by Robin's example, let us affirm -- as he did -- that whenever there is injustice we will seek to eradicate it; whenever there is poverty we will fight a war against it.

Tony Blair and I also want to thank all of you here today for the work you did in helping secure not just the re-election of a Labour Government for the third term, including the election here in Brighton again of three Labour Members of Parliament, but also for your efforts and your achievements in putting right at the centre of the political agenda causes that Tony and I share with you: the cause of full employment; the central importance of manufacturing; the moral and economic case for decent public services, universal and free for all; and, as the Warwick agenda to which we are jointly committed demonstrates, our commitment to fairness to all in the workplace. I am here today to tell you that even in the face of opposition from all other parties in the House of Commons and elsewhere, Tony Blair, I and the Government will as a priority put into place this year and next the legislation that will honour in full the Warwick Agreement. So let me assure you that we will implement our agreement that no one should see their health or safety put recklessly at risk in the workplace, and we have announced legislation outlawing corporate manslaughter. Let me assure you on gangmasters that we will license and regulate employment so that we will protect lives by rooting out dangerous and deadly abuses. Let me also tell you that we are legislating for enhanced rights at work with the eight-week rule extended to 12. I want to thank Brendan Barber and the TUC General Council for making this a priority. On holidays and working hours, as you know, we are moving to add bank holidays to four weeks paid holiday.

Fairness at work means also fairness to the low paid, and it is because of your efforts, the initial commitment of John Smith and then of Tony Blair, that with Labour, Britain now has a minimum wage, one that I am pleased to report will rise this year and rise next year, rising by 40 per cent since it was first introduced. The legal minimum wage, I am pleased to say, is now extended for the first time, thanks to your efforts, to 16/17 year olds in the workforce.

As Britain has historically neglected the importance of childcare, we are now implementing for parents -- as a result of Warwick -- a new national childcare strategy. Women's rights and women's equality have been unacceptably neglected for too long and so we are even now studying the recommendations from Margaret Prosser, the Chair of the Women and Work Commission. Our aim is to end once and for all the gender pay gap in our country.

Friends, having introduced, under Labour, the first winter payment for pensioners of £200, the first free television licences for pensioners, the first pension credit paid to over 2.5 million of our poorest pensioners, the first free local bus travel that is nationwide, we will, as we said at Warwick, and I am pleased that Jack Jones has been with us in our deliberations this week -- and this is the debate we will have when the Pensions Commission of which Jeannie is a member reports -- respond to the Pensions Commission in its investigation into the capacity and limits of the voluntarist system by seeking to make sure that not just some but all workers in our country have security and dignity in their retirement. Let me add because it is morally wrong that when firms go under workers, through no fault of their own, lose their pensions, in partnership with you we have set up and are expanding the new Pension Protection Fund, and for pension funds that have previously gone under, for workers cruelly denied the pensions they were due, we have now set aside £400 million so that money is paid retrospectively to them.

Now friends, most of all on the future of the economy, and this is the central theme I want to discuss with you today. Since 1997 we have been building a Britain that is not only more economically stable than at any time for a generation, but a Britain that is using its stability for a purpose: unemployment, the lowest for 30 years; long-term youth unemployment, once 350,000 in our country under the Tories, now less than 7,000 - less than ten per constituency. Restoring full employment to the centre of economic policy was the first act of the Labour Government, and we are now closer to full employment as a result of our efforts together than at any time for a generation.

I want us never to forget when we talk about jobs that over and over again throughout the Tory years the right wing in our country had the audacity, and they had the arrogance, to lecture us, all of us in the movement, that our objective for full employment was an outdated and distant dream. They told us you could not have low interest rates and high employment. They told us that unemployment was a price worth paying for other people's prosperity. I tell you that I will never forget how, when starting as an MP in 1983, in a constituency with thousands of people unemployed, I met hundreds of coal miners, shipbuilding workers, steelworkers and people in other industries thrown out of jobs at the age of 50, or before, who never expected they would work again. I met young couples who, having lost their jobs, then lost their homes. I met youngsters, once bright eyed and hopeful, under the Tories rejected, discarded, dejected, even before they had had a first pay cheque.

None of us must forget how the experts wrote off three million unemployed, how the commentators fell for the idea that unemployment was inevitable. Let us remember how many lost heart, how they succumbed

to that propaganda that, as manual tasks were mechanised, as digital and computer technology replaced the jobs of skilled workers, we could bury for ever the idea that we could have an economy founded on full employment. I tell you, we the labour and trade union movement, never lost heart. We never fell for this defeatism. We never surrendered our goal of full employment. When we passed resolutions for jobs, when all of us marched for jobs, when we rallied for jobs, when we campaigned for jobs, we were upholding to the world ideals I believe all of us uphold to this day, that mass unemployment is not only unfair but inefficient, and we were sending out an even bigger message -- the philosophy that I was brought up with in a mining and industrial community -- that we do not pass by on the other side, that our mission is to build communities where we look out for each other, where we feel each other's sorrows, where we share each other's pain, and that is the theme that runs like a golden thread through the history of our movement, a belief that injustice should not happen to us, injustice should not happen to anyone, principles that we taught each other through hard times of solidarity, not selfishness, and they are as relevant today as ever.

When people tell us again that the impact of globalisation, the rise of China and Asia, mean that we have to lower our aspirations, when they tell us that as manufacturing becomes global -- as it has -- that we must accept somehow that full employment and good decent paying jobs are a thing of the past, I tell you that in the same way as we met together the challenge of mass unemployment with the New Deal, that in eight years has created two million jobs in this country, we should agree now that as long as we make the right long-term decisions, only if we make the right long-term decisions, can we together meet and master an even greater challenge for our times, the challenge of globalisation.

Let me tell you the scale of the challenge we face. In the last 18 months the doubling of oil prices is just one visible sign of the speed and the scale of global economic change. Asia's manufacturing output is now - - unbelievable but true -- greater than that of Europe. Asia is now consuming 30 per cent of the world's oil and China nearly ten per cent. Once only responsible for ten per cent of manufactured exports, developing countries will soon be responsible for 50 per cent of these manufactured exports. On its own, let us remember China now produces 30 per cent of the world's TVs, 50 per cent of cameras, 70 per cent of photocopiers, 90 per cent of children's toys, perhaps soon 60 per cent of all the world's clothes. At no point since the industrial revolution, friends, has the re-structuring of global economic activity been so dramatic. At no point has there been such a shift in production -- Asia moving from the fringes to the centre of the new world economic order.

At no point in our history has the speed and scale of technological change been so swift and so persuasive. Think back only to 1997 when we came into government. Then there was no digital TV, there were no DVDs, there were no videophones, there was no broadband, there was virtually no texting. Just eight years ago only ten per cent were on the Internet, only ten per cent had mobile phones, and so if in only eight years we can see such dramatic technical change then think of the impact in the next eight years of new technologies on occupations, on industries, on businesses and on jobs.

This is not, as it is sometimes said, a race to the bottom with China and India that will only be met by protecting our home goods, shutting foreign industries out, hoping the world will go away because they aspire -- and I have just returned from Asia and China -- not to race us to the bottom, but to be high skill, high technology economies. China and India are now

turning out more engineers, more computer scientists, more university graduates -- four million in total each year -- than the whole of Europe and America put together. Therefore, the answer for our future will lie not in protectionism but in radically upgrading our skills, science and technology and this is the route to full employment for our times.

Colleagues, there is nothing more important to me in the next few years than preparing and equipping our nation to meet and master these global challenges ahead. I do not disguise from you the scale of the changes, but we -- the British working people -- can, instead of being the victims of globalisation, become its beneficiaries. Throughout our history this labour movement, faced with awesome challenges, huge responsibilities, has succeeded in meeting them to the benefit of working people. Together out of the ruins of war we built the welfare state. Together out of the chaos of private medicine we created the National Health Service. I now want us to work together on a long-term economic reform plan for global success for Britain.

Today I issue an invitation to the TUC, and to trades unions as well as to business, to enter into a discussion with the Treasury and with government in detail on how a more skilled, more adaptable, more enterprising Britain can make the right long-term decisions so that we succeed in the next stage of the global economy and can remain true to our goal of full employment opportunities for all so that, facing these future economic challenges that are greater than in 1945, mastering technological change more dramatic than in any century, we can -- working together in the interests of prosperity for all -- ensure we turn global change from a threat to us into an opportunity and then into a full employment Britain.

Let me tell you, and particularly our manufacturing unions here today, that the global challenge strengthens rather than lessens the case for manufacturing and investment in manufacturing in our regions. As we agreed with you at Warwick, we will give new support to manufacturing, investing in science, technology, transport, infrastructure, new innovations in our regions and in the new manufacturing advisory service. Our Manufacturing Forum, now up and running with full trade union representation, is today -- at your request -- looking at public procurement so that British companies are no longer unfairly denied contracts and markets across key sectors of the European economy, so that British workers and British industry will secure the fairest deal. We will honour our promise that manufacturing should not be seen as a part of the old economy but that together we will build modern manufacturing strength for the future of Britain.

Friends, if China and India are turning out four million graduates a year and more engineers and more computer scientists and more software engineers, then we in Britain, a small country, cannot afford to waste the talents of any child. We cannot afford to write off the potential of any young person. We cannot afford now to discard the abilities of any adult, and it is because the skills of our workforce are now the commanding heights of the economy, it is because the skills of working people are as they should always have been, the most critical means of production, it is because it is increasingly the skills of working people that give every company value and give nations comparative advantage, that new principles must govern education and training in ensuring good, well paying jobs in the future of our country.

Education should no longer be just from 5 to 16. It should start at three and full time educational opportunity should be available to 18. Every teenager should have the right to further education and every adult the guarantee of training and basic skills. Let us

salute in each of our unions today's trade union pioneers of the skills resolution -- 12,000 men and women, one of whom we rewarded today with a certificate, who are trade union learning representatives in the workplace every day bargaining for skills. Let us salute the 100,000 who have come back into learning through the trades union Movement in over 400 learning centres around the country, the two million workers who are engaged in skills for life programmes, the employer training pilots that are moving from the voluntarism that failed in the past and ensuring that for, time off, workers now have money to obtain the new skills they want and need.

I can also tell you today that to support the new Trades Union Academy, proposed by the TUC, Ruth Kelly and Alan Johnson, we will provide over the next two years £4.5 million, part of a total investment of £8 billion in skills in this country. This shows that we will answer the Asia challenge not by becoming resigned to a Britain of low skills and high unemployment but by creating a Britain of new skills and new jobs. I tell you straight, Britain can win in this global economy. We will win because we will not compete on low pay but on high skills. We will win because we will not respond to globalisation by lowering our standards in the workplace, but by raising them. We will win because we will not adjust to global change by protectionism and neglecting investment but by investing more and for the long term. This is nothing less than the economic battle for Britain's future. Upon winning this battle, by focusing rigorously on priorities that matter, we meet the future financing needs of our public services, we will tackle the war on poverty and ensure that the potential for full employment becomes real in the years to come.

I also tell you straight that in the face of that global challenge, from which there is no hiding place, there is no safe haven other than equipping ourselves by investing in the future. If we are to succeed, there must be no return to fiscal irresponsibility, no return to the economic short termism of the inflationary pay deals, no return to the old conflicts and disorders of the past. There can be no retreat from demanding efficiency and value for money as well as equity as we renew our public services and reform them. There is no future for a global trading nation like ours trying to erect protectionist barriers with the rest of the world. Just as we need stability in inflation and stability in interest rates for businesses and homeowners we need stability in our industry policy - stability in industrial relations, stability in our trading relationships with the rest of the world. We will build this stability for a purpose: it is the one sure route to full employment for our generation and to the needs of prosperity not just for some but for all. Every time we will act as a government to tackle the risk to stability and to growth, risks that are already today reducing European growth to one per cent -- much of Europe is now in recession; European unemployment is rising to 20 million -- risks that have now risen from the doubling in oil prices in recent months. But global challenges need global solutions. It is because we understand the problems that are faced by hauliers, by farmers, by motorists, by ordinary consumers right across the country faced with gas and electricity bills at a time of this doubling of oil prices, and because we will never be complacent about these issues, that the first action we must take is to tackle the cause of this problem, ensuring concerted global action is taken to bring down world oil prices and to stabilise all markets for the long term. In the last few days alone I have discussed our plans with more than 30 Finance Ministers and spoken to representatives of all the world's leading economies because, firstly, this is at root an oil problem of demand outstripping supply. OPEC must respond at its meeting on September 19 by raising production to meet rising demand.

Secondly, lack of transparency about the world's reserves and plans for their development undermine stability and cause speculation. The world must call on OPEC and all the oil producing countries to become more open and more transparent in what they do.

Thirdly, from the additional \$300 billion a year in revenue OPEC countries are now enjoying, and the additional \$800 billion available to oil producers, there must be additional new investment in production matched by investment in rising refinery capacity.

Fourthly, the search for alternative sources of energy and greater energy efficiency are urgent not least to tackle climate change. The World Bank should set up a new fund to support developing countries investing in alternative resources and greater energy efficiency.

Fifthly, poor countries and poor people should never be left defenceless against oil and commodity price shocks. The IMF should agree, as a matter of urgency, a new facility for countries hit by these shocks and where there are windfall revenues a special trust fund should be created where oil producers help debt-ridden poor countries to write down their unpayable debts.

At each point in tackling this problem we must have the strength to take the long-term decisions that will get oil prices down. It is by securing economic prosperity, insisting that the benefits go not just to a few but to everyone, that we will achieve another goal -- finance to build world class public services in Britain.

Let me say that, because of our commitment to public services and their renewal, we are -- as promised at Warwick -- extending the local government agreement right across the public service to bring to an end the two-tier work force. Let me here publicly from this rostrum thank -- as I believe you will do later today -- Britain's public servants who, in those anxious hours, facing a terrorist threat on July 7, and in the days and months beyond, rose to the challenge, worked tirelessly, showed bravery, dedication and commitment to tend the wounded, comfort the bereaved, protect the anxious and serve the public first.

Let me take this opportunity to say publicly what is often left unsaid and taken for granted, and thank all our emergency public services. Workers in our hospitals, from the doctors, nurses and nursing auxiliaries to porters, ambulance men and women, cleaners, and catering staff -- men and women who show not only exceptional skill and professionalism but every day also demonstrate extraordinary care, compassion and friendship, which makes us proud of public services in Britain.

Teachers and the teaching assistants, the school dinner ladies and caretakers who at their very best show with their dedication day in and day out that every child and every child's future counts first.

And in our communities, public servants and local government workers pioneering new services from childcare and job help to neighbourhood wardens, carers whose unbelievable compassion and support can transform people's despair into hope, home helps and support staff whose commitment and humanity show that public service can be a calling and not just a career. And proving that with investment and reform, Britain can be a beacon to the world for the highest standard of free universal public services.

For, friends, there is indeed a second reason for winning the challenge here in Britain for universal free public services that are the best in the world, so that not only British people can benefit from these services but that we can offer hope that public services, universal and free of charge, are the way forward for developing countries, too.

For, as we will tell the world at the Special UN Summit that starts tomorrow on making poverty history, it is only by building universal free schooling and ending

charges for pupils, it is only by creating universal healthcare and ending fees and charges for health that the people of Africa and developing countries can even begin to eliminate poverty, disease and ill-health.

In my eight years as Chancellor, I have visited on your behalf some of the poorest parts of Asia and the poorest parts of Africa. I have seen the faces of people crushed by poverty upon whom all the troubles of the world seem to bear down. I have met mothers in Asia who, I knew, that in using every ounce of their own energy to save the lives of their new born infants were about to lose their own lives. I have heard children in Kenya demonstrating and chanting the demand for 'free education' for every pupil instead of charges. I have met women in Mozambique who waved their pay cheques at me demonstrating that no matter how hard they worked they could not afford to pay fees, as they had to, for schooling for their young children. I have met some of the twelve million AIDS orphans in Africa who, having lost both of their parents, face exclusion through having no money from both education and the possibility of health even when some of them have AIDS themselves. I met only a few weeks ago in Tanzania an AIDS victim who could not afford to visit a hospital, who had no money even to visit a doctor, who could not afford to pay for drugs to relieve his pain, and he said to me, "I know I am despised because of AIDS, but are we not all brothers?"

I tell you that for the one hundred and twenty million children who did not go to school today and for the 30,000 children who face avoidable death from disease today, there is not a chance to escape disease, illiteracy and poverty if they are charged for healthcare or if there are fees for education; no hope at all for the poorest communities of the world without free and universal public services that we have championed here from Britain.

Make Poverty History is the theme chosen by your President for this conference this week. Let me thank you, Brendan, for speaking magnificently when we attended the rally in Edinburgh a few months ago to Make Poverty History. Let me thank every trades union in the great traditions of our internationalism for being the driving force in the Make Poverty History coalition, and let me, therefore, congratulate you for your key role in winning for the first time in our history one hundred per cent debt relief for the poorest countries; in exposing agricultural protectionism and in exposing the scandal and waste of the Common Agricultural Policy; in securing a commitment not just to double aid to Africa but that eleven European countries now promise 0.7 per cent of their budgets spent on development aid, and we are demonstrating the truth of the belief on which our movement was founded that as individuals we are not powerless but, acting together across the nations, we have the power to shape history.

But I say to you today, as we look to the future, and recognise not just what we have done together but what we can do in the coming years starting with the UN Special Summit this week, let the new demand from trades unionists, based on our own experience here, from churches and faith groups, from Make Poverty History campaigners from all over Britain and the world, let the new demand be that to truly make poverty history Africa must win the battle we have had to fight in Britain as well. There must be universal and free schooling for every young pupil and there must be healthcare, universal and free, as the beginning of justice for the poorest citizens of the world.

When people say that finance-free universal healthcare and schooling for the world's poor is an impossible dream, let us remind ourselves that two hundred years ago people said that an end to slavery was an impossible dream. One hundred years ago people said that a free National Health Service and free education

for children in Britain was an impossible dream. Just 20 years ago people said that the end to apartheid and Nelson Mandela's release was an impossible dream. Just a year ago people said that one hundred per cent debt relief was an impossible dream.

Our ancestors knew how much easier it was to be unambitious rather than to aim high. It was simpler always to be conservative than to seek change. It was less difficult to take your own share than fight for everyone to have a fair share. It was always more comfortable to see progress as moving up on your own instead of all of us moving up together. It was always less demanding to succumb to vested interests than to take them on. But instead our pioneers held fast to the vision that progress is everyone moving forward together.

And as we look at the challenges ahead – building through global change, full employment, modern manufacturing strength, ending child and pensioner poverty, building the best public services and, yes, the elimination of poverty around the world, let us agree, in the finest traditions of our Movement, that we do not settle for second best but that we reach high; that we never lower our sights but that we strive to make once unrealisable dreams come true, and in the spirit of the highest ideas of our Movement, let us acknowledge the great causes worth fighting for today: a society founded on equality, driven forward by a commitment to justice, dedicated to fairness for all, a Britain worthy of our pioneers and a Britain and a world true to our ideals. Friends, we achieve our ideals best when we work to achieve them together. Thank you. (*Applause*)

The President: Thank you, Gordon, for that moving and challenging speech. You certainly gave us food for thought on the economic challenges we face in today's world and what you yourself called 'the great cause of ending world poverty'. I am sure that Brendan and the TUC would want to accept your invitation to work with the Treasury on the movement's response to those challenges. Thank you very much, and thank you for finding the time to come and address us today.

Learning and Skills

Barry Lovejoy (*NATFHE, The University & College Lecturers' Union*) moved Composite Motion 20.

He said: I am moving Composite 20 on lifelong learning. In moving this motion on lifelong learning, I would like, first of all, to remind ourselves of the position of the Labour Government after two years in office, outlined in its publication *Learning to Succeed*. David Blunkett said: "Lifelong learning can enable people to play a full part in developing their talents, the potential of their family and the capacity of the community in which they live and work. It can and must nurture a love for learning. It also contributes to sustaining a civilised and cohesive society in which people develop as active citizens in which generational disadvantage can be overcome".

I would like to put on record my union's belief, and I am sure that of Congress, that we absolutely share this vision for lifelong learning and, indeed, the vision outlined by Gordon earlier. We acknowledge the injection of funds into the system during the past three or four years, the support for learning reps and the announcement of the Union Academy.

All affiliates to this body, the TUC, generally have taken up the challenge of lifelong learning. Indeed, we have been at the cutting edge of those developments through our work through learning representatives and the wonderful work of trade union education which is reflected in the nine grade 1 assessments of those centres in the past three or four years. Indeed, all our affiliates have continued to provide basic education for our reps but also more in the form of an

extension of educational rights and opportunities for our members because we are committed to that because it is a fundamental move for social justice.

Whilst recognising these advances and applauding our work in this area, we believe, however, that recently the Government have lost their way and, indeed, have actually missed some good opportunities to make some radical reforms around the learning agenda. There remain a large number of barriers to our work and that of other people in producing lifelong learning. Learning reps continue to face the barrier of lack of time and an ambivalent attitude of employers towards providing decent learning opportunities for our members.

So, therefore, this motion calls for statutory rights to negotiate on training to be established, including statutory rights for learning committees and a legal entitlement to paid time off for all our members for education.

We believe that the Government missed a golden opportunity earlier this year to address the pernicious division between academic and technical education. The Government chose to ignore, generally, the view of the Tomlinson Report which advocated one overarching diploma recognising those distinct pathways for giving equal status and esteem for technical education and academic. The problem is that, in terms of meeting the needs of the minority of people who take A levels, it continues that divide and that divide means that technical education and vocational education are treated as second class.

Ruth Kelly has recently described colleges as "the engines of social mobility". We totally agree with that. Further education colleges provide opportunities, mainly to working class people, first and second chance choices and also to black and ethnic minority students. The problem is that those engines need fuel and the major fuel of any public service, and in particular colleges of education, is the people who work in them. My members and members of other trade unions – the support workers – face a situation of continuing low pay and poor working conditions in those colleges. The majority of lectures are still paid up to 10 percent less than their school teacher equivalents. Support workers still continue to have low, poverty wages in some respects in further education.

Further education is still run by an army of part-time employees who have recently been called an army of 'Ragged Trousered Philanthropists'. That is not an indication of their dress sense but an indication of the fact that they are dedicated professionals but working under outrageous conditions for the 21st Century.

The simple fact is that there is not enough money. We call on the Government to make this matter a priority. My union says that if £5 billion can be paid towards the illegal occupation of Iraq, then that money should be spent on extending life chances rather than ending life chances for our people. I move.

Jack Barnett (*Educational Institute of Scotland*) in seconding the composite motion, said: President and colleagues, in seconding, I would like to focus on the issues within the composite related to the Union Learning Fund and learning representatives, and present Congress with a number of reasons why these are worthy of your support. First of all, I speak in recognition of the fact that Union Learning Fund initiatives follow in the long and proud trade union tradition of promoting learning, of supporting the learning needs of members and working in partnership with employers and government, central or devolved, to demonstrate a collective commitment to learning. Secondly, my union commends, as the Chancellor has done this morning, the response of a wide range of affiliates to the opportunities presented by the Union Learning Fund.

In Scotland alone, since the year 2000, at least 23 trade unions, including my own, have accessed the £3.6 million made available through the Scottish Union Learning Fund and have expended their capacity to promote and support learning in the workplace.

Central to all of this has been the development of the role of the union learning reps, more than 1,000 of whom are now active in Scotland, pioneering a diverse range of learning projects. This is not just about helping non-traditional learners access learning, important though that is. This is a life-long learning rights agenda and it applies to all workers.

The message I bring you today is that teachers and lecturers are learners too, and ULR's have an important role to play in supporting their learning, so much so that the EIS aspires to having a union learning rep in every school and FE college in Scotland.

A third reason why Congress should support this motion is because trade union involvement in learning not only allows us to respond to a core need of our members but, in doing so, it can also have a positive impact on the way the union is perceived. It can transform attitudes about what a trade union is and what a trade union does. This gives us an opportunity to reach out to sections of the workforce which traditionally we have found difficult to engage in membership or active participation, like younger workers, women and black and minority ethnic workers.

In my own union, for example, 50 per cent of our learning reps are women, 65 per cent of our learning reps are first-time activists and 60 per cent of our learning reps, who are first time activists, are women. Finally, colleagues, the composite recognises that there are still barriers to overcome and one of the most significant of these is the negative attitude of some employers.

So in supporting this composite today, let us send out a challenge to these employers to meet their legal obligation but, above all, to work in genuine partnership with the trade unions and government to develop the learning potential of their workforce/our members for the benefit of all. Please support.

Joanna Brown (*Society of Chiropractors and Podiatrists*) speaking in support of the composite motion, said:

Congress, I am speaking on the section calling on the TUC to support unions which wish to develop European common platforms. The concept of the common platform arises from the EU Directive on the recognition of professional qualifications. The directive will permit professions to develop common platforms which will give their members the automatic right to practise in other Member States. Common platforms will promote mobility for professionals within the EU whilst, at the same time, providing an assurance for employers and consumers that these people are able to practise to an acceptable standard. It is important to point out that this concept is not about harmonisation of education and training, which would actually be illegal under European law, but rather about establishing a common set of outcomes and competencies.

In case all of this sounds a little elitist, the definition of a profession is interpreted very widely in the EU and may be applied to occupations beyond the traditional professions. We are talking about workers who have some sort of qualification.

So why are we asking the TUC to provide support? Primarily, it is because the initiative for establishing a common platform must come from the professions themselves. The British trade union or professional organisation must work with its counterparts in other European countries and come up with a proposal to

present to the European Parliament. The Parliament will then consult with the national government in deciding whether to adopt the platform. Any of you who have been involved in European matters will realise that this is not very straightforward.

The SCP has just begun to try and establish a platform for podiatry. We have discovered that it is our job to consult with other stakeholders, such as employers and service users, otherwise the Commission is unlikely to accept our application. Also the application must be supported by professional bodies in 20 out of the 25 EU Member States. This will be something of a challenge for us as our profession does not even exist in some of the new Member States where podiatry tends to be carried out by doctors. We have not yet worked out how to get over this hurdle and would benefit from some kind of help. So we are asking the TUC, firstly, to facilitate advice and information for unions which are interested in promoting common platforms for their members and, secondly, to provide links to sources of expertise and influence in Europe, such as the ETUC.

For many workers, despite what we are told, mobility in Europe is still just a theoretical concept. By sharing our knowledge and experience, we will be able to make the single market work for our members. Please support.

Jim McAuslan (*British Air Line Pilots Association*) supported the composite motion.

He said: The British Air Line Pilots Association supports Composite 20 and in particular that part beginning with the need for UK plc to predict and provide for trained professional aircrew. So it was, Conference, that I was uplifted to see the headline on page 101 of the Annual Report and echoed by the Chancellor: 'Employer Training Pilots'. Not so, my friends. Pilots, as in trials; not pilots as in flight crew.

The bleak reality is that employers have, essentially, opted out in the training of flight crew, preferring to leave it to the vagaries of the market. It is so typical of the vagaries of the market that just as UK aviation enjoys some long-awaited growth and the demand for pilots increases, we find that the supply drives up because potential pilots were scared off following the last economic downturn in UK aviation. It is tempting for a trade union to use the market to our advantage and to our existing members' advantage by treating the labour supply tight, stir up a bit of fear about cheap foreign imports on the back of the Helios crash in Greece last month and watch salaries go up as employers struggle to recruit and retain flight crew. But in today's global market this will only result in airlines moving off-shore and basing themselves nearer to the labour supply. Yes, we could extract a short-term salary premium but at the expense of long-term growth on these shores.

UK plc's approach towards training pilots does not help itself. It is assumed that, if you want to become a pilot, you must be a bit of a toff, pursuing glamour and it being nothing more than a gentleman's pastime. The truth is that most of the pilot intake over the past few years has been self-sponsored and it will cost the individual between £70,000 - £100,000 plus VAT. Most will have re-mortgaged their houses or used their redundancy payment or begged or borrowed to raise the money to then go through a lengthy training period to get a job flying, often for nothing as a junior first officer, and for a couple of years, until they get a chance of getting a good job, and that does not always get delivered. It is brutal and it is not the way that a highly skilled workforce will develop on these shores. Yes, we would support the Chancellor's and the Treasury's call to engage in discussion about this situation.

It is not just special pleading, colleagues, or elitism, because without trained aircrew fewer airlines will be

setting up in the UK, fewer airlines mean fewer aircraft, fewer aircraft mean fewer loaders, fewer cabin crew, fewer air traffic controllers and fewer jobs, which is why, Congress, we are calling for a different headline in next year's annual report that employers are training pilots and that UK Plc is supporting the improvement of the UK pilot base. We support the composite.

Tony Burke (*Amicus*) speaking in support of the composite, said: In supporting the composite, I am referring, specifically, to the need for sector training levies. Each year at Congress we argue the case to improve our members' skills and long-term futures, but the fact is that after years of urging, employers to pay for skills, we still have a long way to go to compete with our overseas competitors.

Many UK employers, in their short-sighted approach to business, still look towards cheap, low paid and poorly trained workers. They wonder why we have skill shortages in a number of industries and why productivity is low. Let's just look at three examples. The 2002 Construction Industry Training Board *Skills Foresight Report* claimed an estimated shortfall of 37,000 electricians until 2006, requiring an annual increase of more than 7,000 apprentices. The same study said that there was a shortfall of 30,000 plumbers for the same period, requiring an annual increase of 6,000 apprentices. In printing, research carried out in 2004 found that more than 40 per cent of employers had done no training at all for the previous 12 months.

President, in the commercial printing industry we have got the employers to agree to a voluntary system, which is that 0.5 per cent of company budgets are to be allocated to training. If that does not work, the Government have warned our industry that they will be prepared to introduce a compulsory sector training levy.

Congress, Amicus believes that unions have done much to improve the skills of our members during the past decade, as the Chancellor referred to this morning. The Union Learning Fund has exceeded expectations and our union learning reps are doing a brilliant job in improving access to skills. From our experience, the learning and skills agenda is a wonderful organising tool. However, President, we are still working within a system which allows employers to choose whether they train or not.

The training needs of workers can never be fulfilled whilst employers are allowed to duck this issue and we need firm measures if we are to reverse this terminal decline. That is why we need to keep the pressure on the Government to introduce statutory training levies where it can be demonstrated that employers have failed their industries. In addition, we need the Government to introduce training within the scope of collective bargaining where union recognition provides an obligation to negotiate with workplace reps in relation to training.

We also have to remember that training is not just about improving productivity but it is about our members' future.

Congress, too many employers have been getting away with refusing to train workers for far too long, so I ask you to support the composite. Support investment in our members to win better skills and better learning opportunities, and where employers do not train, let's make them pay. Let us make sure that our members get the opportunities for learning and skills that they deserve.

Peter Pendle (*Association for College Management*) supported Composite Motion 20.

He said: Colleagues, we are pleased to support NATFHE on this composite and we want to refer, briefly, to two specific issues. Firstly, it remains a scandal that a funding gap of more than 10 per cent exists between schools and college students

undertaking the same or similar courses of study. Recent research by the Learning and Skills Development Agency has proved that the gap exists and is damaging students' opportunities. The Government continue to refuse to address the issue. We do not want to have funding for school sixth form students reduced, but we want further education students to get the same.

The result of the funding gap is that pay and conditions of those working in further education suffer, but, perhaps more importantly, the funding gap is discriminatory. Recent research has shown, for instance, that black and minority ethnic 16 – 19 year olds are much more likely to go to further education colleges than to school sixth forms. On average 40 per cent less is spent on their education than their white equivalents. ACM believes that this amounts to both political and institutionalised discrimination, so let us remove the funding gap now.

Secondly, recent funding cuts have been directed at learning support budgets in further education colleges. These funds have, in the past, been used to support the most disadvantaged learners in our society. Especially worrying is the fact that the cuts have included a reduction in the funds for childcare for learners. The Government want to see more people returning to employment but, at the very same time, they encourage the Learning and Skills Council to cut the funds which support them to get the qualifications and skills to do so. Please support the composite for a properly funded further education sector.

Paddy Lillis (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*) in supporting Composite Motion 20, said: Colleagues, lifelong learning has inspired and enthused membership more than any other issue in recent years. My union launched its lifelong learning campaign just six years ago. Since then a staggering 12,000 of our members have returned to some kind of learning. People excluded from any formal education before, now benefit from the basic skills, vocational and personal development training. That is not just of enormous value and benefit to them, but it means the ability to learn through the union adds value to membership. It helps to raise our profile and build our organisation. It is good for attracting people to us and holding them there and that is why we have invested further.

We have now trained more than 500 people to become learning reps. They are carrying out vital work with employers and learning providers to promote education and, of course, offering encouragement and support to our members. They do a fantastic job for our people. That is why we need to go on building around them.

That means workplace learning committees. Learning committees are not just about good intentions but about action; a working mechanism, colleagues, where vital decisions are made about everything from learning providers to financial backing. We have already made some progress. Companies like Tesco, Sainsbury's and Shop Direct have already set up workplace learning committees with us, fundamental to creating a learning culture in the workplace. Enlightened as it is, it is still a voluntary approach, colleagues.

So, like the reps themselves, we need committees on a statutory footing to make real progress. We already have a legal framework for reps to establish health and safety committees. It would be simple and effective to do the same for learning reps and their committees. Nearly 200 Westminster MPs backed that point of view earlier this year. They saw the point and they were right. We need to go on building and workplace learning committees by law are an integral part of it. Thank you.

Frances O'Grady (*Deputy General Secretary*): Thank you. The General Council has asked me, very briefly, to give an explanation with its support for Comp 20 on learning and skills.

The General Council, in particular, welcomes the recognition given in the composite motion to the contribution of unions to progressing this agenda, and in particular our 12,000 union learning representatives nationwide.

The composite motion also welcomes the commitment of the Government to vocational education and training, but it does, quite rightly, raise concerns about the new skills academies, including the concern that they may be created outside of the FE sector and based on an employer-dominated model. However, many unions will want the opportunity to use their influence on the development of these skills academies, especially through union representation on the boards of sector skills councils and in seeking a seat at the table on the governance of these new skills academies so that we ensure that these academies adopt not just an employer dominated model but, instead, an employment led approach and that they are strongly tied into the FE sector. Thank you.

The President: Congress, I do have other speakers who have indicated a wish to speak in this debate, but I am going to move to the vote because I am conscious that I do not want to lose any more business this morning. We are trying to pick up lost business from yesterday. I am going to move to close this debate.

The General Council supports the composite.

* *Composite Motion 20 was CARRIED.*

London bombings – tribute to the emergency workers

The President: At this point on the Agenda, I would like to ask Congress to reflect on the terrorist attacks which took place in London of this year on 7th and 21st July. In a few minutes, I will call the General Secretary to move a statement on behalf of the General Council. However, before that, I think it is appropriate that we pay our respects to those people who died in the attacks and it is also right that we pay tribute to the many transport and emergency workers who played such a vital role in ensuring the safety of the public during those traumatic events. In recognition of their tremendous work in representing both themselves and their fellow workers, I would like to call on stage the following:

George Psaradakis. George is a member of the Transport and General Workers' Union. On 7th July George was driving the number 30 bus on which 14 people died in the explosion in Tavistock Square.

Fanny Takyi-Michais. Fanny is a police community support officer and a PCS rep. Fanny was one of the first people on the scene after the explosion of the bomb on the bus at Tavistock Square, directing people to safety.

Adam Levy. Adam is a biomedical scientist at Great Ormond Street Hospital and an Amicus member. Adam acted as a runner for a surgical team, looking for trolleys and blankets and making sure that people could get through to the switchboard.

David Moore. David has been a London firefighter and an FBU branch official for more than 20 years. David attended the Edgware Road incident on 7th July and helped to rescue passengers from Underground trains.

Richie Hilier. Richie also attended the Edgware Road incident as the driver of the fire engine from Kensington Fire Station. Richie was responsible for checking in and out the emergency workers who went below ground to rescue passengers.

Mark Maybanks. Mark is a member of the Transport and General Workers' Union and was the driver of the number 26 bus on which a rucksack bomb was planted on 21st July. Fortunately, the bomb failed to explode and there were no casualties.

Olanayi Falayi. Olanayi is a station supervisor and a member of the RMT. Ola was one of the first people on the scene at Aldgate where he spent more than an hour underground, getting the injured out of the damaged carriages and walking them along the track to safety.

Mark Belkin. Mark is a UNISON member and a paramedic team leader at Islington Ambulance Station. Mark was called out to treat the injured at the site of the bus explosion in Tavistock Square.

Catherine Mayes. Catherine is a development planner for London Underground and a TSSA member. Catherine helped to arrange protection for the search and rescue teams at Aldgate and worked to get the District Line running back to normal for the following morning.

Robin Mayes. Robin, Catherine's husband, is a station supervisor on London Underground and a TSSA rep. On 7th July, Robin helped to evacuate Liverpool Street Station. He then walked to Aldgate Station where he helped rescue passengers from the exploded train.

Finally, Andrea Shields. Andrea is a paramedic and a UNISON member. On 7th July she was one of the ambulance workers who treated the injured and cared for the dying, first at the site of the bus bombing and then at Russell Square tube station.

Congress, I now ask that you join me in standing for a minute's silent tribute in memory of those who died in the events of 7th and 21st July.

(Congress stood in silent tribute)

Thank you, Congress. *(A standing ovation)*

Let me say to you, the workers, who were able to join us today. We are incredibly proud of you and I know that your unions are incredibly proud of you. Thank you.

(The emergency workers left the platform to a standing ovation)

General Council's Statement on the consequences of the terrorist attacks on London

The President: I now call the General Secretary to move the General Council's Statement on the consequences of the terrorist attacks on London. May I remind Congress that Motion 52 has been withdrawn in favour of the General Council's Statement.

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*): President and Congress, it was right that we began this section by paying our respects to those who died in the London bombings and by paying tribute to the transport and emergency workers who coped so heroically in the aftermath. Whatever other issues arise as a result of the attacks, and there are many of them, nothing can take away from the fact that whenever we consider this issue, our most immediate and most deeply felt thoughts are those of respect for the dead and praise for those whose efforts saved lives and reduced suffering.

The other issues that we now need to consider are covered in detail in the General Council's Statement. It is a long statement, which reflects the range of issues that we, as trade unionists, need to address. Firstly, there is the need to draw practical lessons from the attacks and to ensure that trade unionists are involved in that process. We have made a positive start and the Government and some employers have been to the fore, but more needs to be done such as training, better communications and better use of technology, but most of all the involvement of staff is an essential

element in raising safety standards and in ensuring that we are as prepared as we can be for any future attacks, whatever their form and whenever they may occur.

These are not just issues for those working in the areas of greatest risk – transport and public buildings. Today everyone in every workplace may be vulnerable to some degree, and it is for us and our workplace reps to ensure that management are taking their responsibilities seriously in involving our representatives in their contingency planning.

It was notable that, in the first few days after the bombings, there was a tremendous sense of solidarity to be seen and felt around London. Some unexpected people were using that trade union term 'solidarity'. Communities came together in a way we have rarely seen before. People became more aware of just what a diverse city our capital is. We are, as Ken Livingstone so aptly put it, the world in one city, and we are proud of that.

Unfortunately, that was not a universal feeling. During the past few weeks I have been out visiting some of the communities which are experiencing an insidious backlash. I have been with General Council member Mohammed Taj to visit Beeston, the part of Leeds that found itself in the media spotlight when it became clear that that was where some of the suicide bombers came from. We also went to east London and to the Midlands. We were told what others have confirmed, that since July 7th the number of racist attacks has risen. Alongside that is the daily sense of hostility, abuse, threats and general intimidation in some parts of the country that makes life insufferable for those whose only crime is to look and sound different from their abusers.

During the summer we published a report which demonstrates the scale of the divide that exists within our country. It showed that some racial groups experienced disadvantage way out of proportion to the rest of the population. For instance, almost 7 out of 10 people from the Pakistani or Bangladeshi communities are officially classed as poor compared with just 1 in 5 of the rest of the population. This gross inequality demands action, so we look to the Government, to employers and to other authorities.

However, we can do some things ourselves. I know that our solidarity with disadvantaged communities is genuinely appreciated and we need to continue to show that solidarity in the long run and not just when the cameras are there. We can also look to work with others. Our statement mentions three groups, the first of which is the educational institutions, which have a role to play in promoting diversity; the media, which has a duty to avoid stereotyping; and, on a different scale, women's groups and women within the disadvantaged communities who, as other examples have shown, can help to bridge divides and counter extremism in whatever form.

The link between the terrorist attacks in London and the situation in the Middle East and Britain's presence in Iraq has been widely debated. Our view is clear: the threat of terrorism would be reduced if there was genuine progress towards peace in the Middle East and if British forces were not engaged in Iraq. We are working with our international trade union colleagues towards those goals and will continue to do so, not just because it would reduce the threat of terrorism here, but because it is right to do so.

Finally, with the increased threat from terrorism, it is inevitable that the Government should look at measures to minimise that threat. Again, our view is clear. We recognise the need to counter the threat and we welcome effective measures, but we also value our civil liberties. In the case of any new legislation, we would need to be convinced that the value is truly

proportionate to its effect in making society safer. Congress, I commend the General Council's Statement to you. (*Applause*)

Gerry Doherty (*Transport Salaried Staffs' Association*) said: I am pleased to indicate to Congress that we were delighted to withdraw motion 52 and to support the General Council's Statement, indeed, to thank the General Council for its initiative in this respect.

As Brendan said, the length of this statement only serves to indicate the number and the breadth of the issues which this real tragedy has brought to the surface. In the few minutes that I have, I would like to concentrate on one or two of those issues. The 7th July is a date that will be for ever burned in all of our memories, certainly anyone who was around the vicinity of London on that fateful morning. Our headquarters are at Euston Station. I arrived there at about nine o'clock that morning. We had indications that there was something wrong in the Underground. About an hour later we actually heard the bomb explode around the corner in Tavistock Square. At that stage there were uncertain indications that it might be a power surge, or something else, but it was evident quite earlier on that it was a terrorist attack.

Anyone who was around there at that time felt the real surge of sympathy, concern and admiration for the people who were standing on this platform just now for the way in which they reacted that morning. We have lived in the aftermath of it ever since. Anyone again who travels around London looks twice now when someone is carrying a rucksack in the Underground, and that is an unfortunate side effect to this.

However, a week after those events and before the second wave of attacks a fortnight later, we had a meeting with Tessa Jowell, which occurred just before the event in Trafalgar Square. A number of the people who were on the platform this morning were at that meeting. When I listened to the firsthand experience of those individuals, I felt enormous admiration for them in how they carried out their work under those terrible circumstances.

As we all know, the public ethos of public service workers came magnificently to the fore. They were praised in the media on this occasion. As we know, trade union members are vilified. I repeat, they came through magnificently! When I sat down to try to write an effective speech, I found that mere words do not do justice to the admiration that we all feel. However, it was predicted that a terrorist attack was going to happen in London. In fact, it was said that it was inevitable. Despite all that, when it did happen, it was a terrible shock to us all.

Were we prepared for it? Probably not, but I think the services reacted magnificently, as I have already said. However, we have in the future to anticipate that public services and public transport, in particular, are a target for terrorists because they give them such publicity.

So what do we do? Total security is difficult to achieve in a mass transit industry. Put yourself in a place of a worker in London Transport. If you work in a ward in a hospital, if you are a teacher in a school or if you are in a factory, you know that the terrorists are not after you, but London Transport workers think that they are now. We have to give them all the support we can.

Brendan has mentioned about what we do with the Muslim communities. This organisation, the labour movement, has to stand shoulder to shoulder with our sisters and brothers in the Muslim Movement. With a name like "Doherty", I am third generation Irish and I know what happened in the past to the Irish communities. We cannot blame a whole community for the action of a few. Support the General Council Statement and I ask you to do so wholeheartedly.

Ruth Winters (*Fire Brigades Union*) said: I only wish the balcony in the hall was as full as it was when Gordon Brown addressed us earlier!

I come to the rostrum as a tired woman. Some of you know me and, I can assure you, it was nothing to do with the drink last night! I am tired of listening to some people thank us in the way that they do. Gordon, on behalf of the Government, thanked us today. Maybe he should have stayed and damned well listened to us now. They called us 'friends', but friends do not do to each other what this Government are trying at the moment to do to the Fire Service and other public services. (*Applause*)

It is a bit hypocritical and a bit rich when you hear somebody speaking on behalf of the Government who only a couple of years ago called us 'criminally irresponsible' for taking action that it was right to take and, on the other hand, trying to call us 'heroes'. I think that is an absolute disgrace.

We fully support the General Council's Statement and particularly the fact that it calls for action. It calls for action in that this Government should review the situation in terms of what has happened since the London bombings.

We are workers but we are also members of the public. We recognise what happened that day and we recognise the fact that we were not the first on the scene. Underground workers and the public, ordinary workers going to their workplace, were the first on the scene and we went there, as other emergency services did, to help and assist. We also had people affected by it. The sister of one of our delegates was on the bus and miraculously escaped unhurt. We are thankful for that.

I have to say we often hear that we have a listening government. They asked us in the Election to vote for them because they were willing to listen. Well, listen to the advice we give you in the Fire Service and stop ignoring what we ask you and tell you!

We dealt with Lockerbie before. I was on duty at Lockerbie. In the past we have dealt with the Manchester bombings, the floodings in Boscastle, the Northern Ireland bombings and the London bombings. What we will not deal with is the crap that is put in front of us at the moment: Manchester Square Fire Station in London was closed down a week before the London bombings; five fire appliances are disappearing, or on their way to disappearing, and 180 jobs in London have gone. Only the other night in the West Midlands, 20-odd machines came off the run. They had run out of fire engines because of this Government's policy on standards of fire cover. Approximately 900 jobs in emergency fire control rooms are on their way out and this Government are using the excuse that it is to make us better at fighting terrorism.

It is an absolute disgrace and it should be stopped. Government, do not tell us you are going to listen. Act on what we are telling you and stop listening to senior civil servants talking crap! (*Applause*)

We work in a service where equality is actually dropping off the agenda. It is absolutely right that the Statement mentions racism, but that happens to our workers as well, our black members who are in the minority, our women members and our gay and lesbian members. That has to be stopped. I am glad that this Statement mentions the Middle East and the war in Iraq, because we have to live with the consequences and effects of what this Government do. It is about time Tony Blair got his head out of the sand and stopped trying to defend the indefensible position on the war in Iraq. (*Applause*)

Finally, our members would happily forego the praise, the heroism and all the compliments we receive to get back the resources and the respect our profession

deserves, and we are a profession. The Government should not just listen to us but act on what we say. Do not start off a meeting, which we attended two days after the bombings, by thanking us and then try to justify why you are going to get rid of hundreds of our jobs.

The last thing I will say, Chair -- I am sorry, but it is very important -- stop giving us platitudes, Government, and change your attitude. Please support the Statement.

Garry Winder (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supported the General Council's Statement.

He said: PCS stands in sympathy and solidarity with those whose lives were tragically touched by the events in July. Our thoughts go out to those who have lost loved ones or who were injured in those horrific attacks. PCS condemns absolutely such violence against innocent people. We pay tribute to the emergency services, transport and public sector workers, some of whom were PCS members, who responded with great courage and professionalism. In particular, I want to mention our police community support officers who were some of the first on the scene, particularly at the bus bombing, tending the injured until the emergency services arrived. They had to make some very difficult decisions in harrowing circumstances.

It is right that the Government address the security issues and reviews how well we respond to major incidents. However, that does not mean that our long-cherished civil liberties should be eroded because of terrorist threats. The TUC must defend civil liberties, making it clear to Government that erosion is not acceptable to trade unions and the general public. We have already seen how a shoot to kill policy went horribly wrong and how continuing intervention in Iraq creates mistrust and indignation in Muslim communities.

There is an alternative: tackle the inequalities in Britain. If you are a young Asian man, you are twice as likely to be unemployed than if you are white. You are far more likely to live in poor housing, rely on state benefits and be subject to racism and prejudice. Is it any wonder that they can feel disconnected from the wider community? It is this sense of disconnection and this estrangement that provides a fertile recruiting ground for those who preach hatred.

The far right play on the worry and fear that followed the bombings, stirring up more hatred and prejudice. Some of the tabloid press pick up on this with negative stories about immigration and asylum. Immigrants -- 'immigrants' means black and Asian -- are being held responsible for taking our jobs, our welfare, our identity, our corner shops and for the atrocities in July. This view of immigration is a misguided philosophy, a religion peopled by demons rather than saints and martyrs, spurred by fear rather than hope and disintegration rather than integration. The challenge is to break into this cycle of prejudice and hatred. This will not be achieved by ever more Draconian police powers. PCS will be standing shoulder to shoulder with the Muslim Association of Britain on 24th September at the rally for peace and liberty.

The trade union movement will continue to fight racism and race poverty. It will support the improvement of community relations and our members always stand ready to support and protect the public they serve. Thank you.

Barry White (*National Union of Journalists*) said: President, Congress, the NUJ welcomes the General Council Statement about the tragic attacks in London and also the General Secretary's introductory remarks. We would particularly highlight the reference in the report to the role of the media and its powerful role in emphasising solidarity across different communities. The Report also highlights the negative role it can also

play in simplifying, stereotyping and characterising groups in ways which play into the hands of those who are determined to undermine the solidarity we need continually to build.

Take, for instance, the *Daily Express* of 27th July, which told us in the usual measured and objective Express language that the "bombers are all sponging asylum seekers". This showed an amazing foresight, particularly because at the time of writing, the identity of two of the suspected bombers was unknown! Then there was a report in the *Evening Standard*, which carried an article claiming that a Central London Islamic book shop had been selling pamphlets urging Muslims to wage Holy War. The claim was denied by the son of the owner. "We had constant abuse and threats with people threatening to kill us and fire bomb the shop", he told the September edition of the Mayor of London's paper, *The Londoner*.

In addition to increasing racially motivated attacks and fear in those communities, which has already been mentioned, much of this type of coverage was designed to create a groundswell of support for the exceptional powers subsequently demanded by the Prime Minister in his 'let no one be in any doubt the rules of the game are changing' speech of 5th August, which advocated an authoritarian and anti-civil rights agenda much loved by the Murdoch media, *The Express* and the *Daily Mail*. Let us be clear, you do not defend democracy by undermining hard-won democratic rights. It is not only in war reporting that truth is the first casualty.

We know that the press is free from the impartiality regulations which govern broadcasting and this allows them to be as partisan as their owners choose. We need to build our trade union membership within the media industries to give some solidarity and protection to journalists who are prepared to stand by ethical standards of journalism. That is why the TUC campaign for a Trade Union Freedom Bill and the motion on a conscience clause proposed by the NUJ are so important.

The time has come for our movement to give the issues of media reform a much higher priority. Thank you.

Steve Warwick (*UNISON*) supported the General Council Statement.

He said: Congress, as someone who was in London on the day of the terrorist attacks, I want to pay tribute to all of my fellow public service workers who did so much in the aftermath of the bombings to help the public who were caught up in those terrible events. I saw firsthand the work they did and was both proud and glad to see nurses working alongside bus drivers and police alongside tube workers. Whatever we think of the policies since the 7th July, we should be grateful for the help and protection they all offered us on that day.

However, speaking on behalf of my union, UNISON, I would like to clarify our position on three particular areas. First, on the day on which the Home Secretary is having to face some questions on the shooting of Jean Charles de Menezes, I think it is totally wrong to group together his death with the victims of the 7th July bombs. Jean Charles was not killed by a terrorist bomb. (*Applause*) He was killed as a result of a police shoot to kill policy. That is why we expect the Independent Police Complaints Commission to ensure that justice is done and this appalling policy is properly reviewed.

Secondly, a passing reference to Britain's presence in Iraq is an inadequate reflection of the obvious connection between our actions in the Middle East and the terrorist motivation. We must not forget that the biggest threat to freedom and democracy is the terrorist who places no value on innocent lives, but at the same time it is simply wrong not to acknowledge

the part the Iraq invasion has played in stirring up feelings against both our Government and our country.

Thirdly, we must in no way dilute our opposition to attacks on civil liberties. Our civil liberties are at the heart of what we should be fighting to protect. If we are not careful, the knee-jerk reaction to the 7th July will be an attack on the very rights that we want to protect.

Unions have always had a proud tradition of fighting for freedoms because historically and currently in other parts of the world attacks on civil liberties have been used against us. That is why the TUC should be in the front of the queue when it comes to scrutinising, questioning and testing the legal challenges being brought in.

Therefore, with these three qualifications in mind, Congress, I ask you to support the General Council's Statement. Thank you.

Mohammed Taj (*Transport and General Workers Union*) said: President and conference, I intend to address two issues contained within this excellent General Council Statement. First, I deal with extremism. There is much that Government, institutions and the wider community can do, yet, as a Muslim, I say the Muslim community must take the lead in dealing with extremism.

It is insufficient to keep repeating that Islam is a religion of peace. It is insulting to say that suicide bombers were criminals and, therefore, they are not Muslims. It is true they were not criminals. A criminal is someone who steals your car; a criminal is someone who nicks your DVD player. These people were psychopaths, but their madness did not come out of nowhere. There are strands of misogyny, obscurantism, homophobia and anti-semitism that run through Muslim communities. There are elements, tiny but significant, that espouse a toxic mixture of self-pity and aggression. These things help to turn ordinary young men into suicide bombers. It is the duty of every decent humane Muslim to help put our own house in order first.

I will turn to another matter: Tony Blair's proposals to ban some Muslim organisations. I have fundamental disagreements with these organisations, but I cannot agree with banning them. You see, it is quite simple. If an organisation does something which is against the law, arrest those involved. If an organisation incites something which is against the law, put them on trial and let a jury decide. Otherwise, let people speak their mind even if what they say is offensive or just plain barking mad.

We are all protected by two great forces. It is not the army; it is not the police. The two great forces that protect us all are democracy and freedom of speech. It is dangerous to mess with them. Conference, I ask you to support this Statement. Thank you.

Janine Booth (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) said: I work as a station supervisor on the Piccadilly Line on London Underground. I would like to thank Congress and the General Council for your acknowledgment of the work of London Underground and other workers on the 7th and 21st July. However, I also have some bad news for Congress. I have to tell you that, despite the bombings, the near certainty of further attacks, the essential role of staff in saving lives and the reassurance and protection that passengers get from visible staff in stations, despite all of these things, London Underground management is planning to cut staffing levels on our stations.

Chief station staff will soon achieve at last our long-awaited, hard-fought-for 35 hour-week, but the company is trying to pay for this by cutting staffing rather than through public funding.

On the stations where I work and am the union rep, the company plans to cut station supervisors and station assistants. The effect will be reduced safety, worse customer service, increased workload and stress for the remaining staff.

Our message to our employers and to the Government has to be: 'Do not praise us only to attack us.' If Gordon Brown really respects London Underground workers, as he says, then he will reverse the public private partnership and bring London Underground back into public control; he will fund it properly and he will stop these cuts in our staffing levels. (*Applause*)

When I told my workmates I was coming to the TUC Congress, they said to me: "Janine, tell them about what the company is doing to staffing levels on our stations. Tell them that they are trying to cut the staffing and ask them to support our fight." So that is why I have come here. We ask all your unions and the TUC to support the Underground unions' fight against these station staffing cuts.

If the employer presses ahead with this and forces us to take strike action to defend your safety and our working conditions, we hope that we will see you on our picket lines. If that happens, we hope that the media, the Government and the Mayor of London will remember that Underground workers are heroes instead of treating them as villains, which they have done during previous strikes. Thank you.

The President: Thank you. I will now take the vote on the General Council's Statement on the consequences of the terrorist attacks in London.

* *The General Council's Statement was adopted*

School Education

Hilary Bills (*National Union of Teachers*) moved Composite Motion 13.

She said: I am President of the National Union of Teachers. I am proud of the fact that the National Union of Teachers has been leading the way with others in the fight against the introduction of privatised education through the Government's programme of academies.

This is not a comment upon the individual school communities. The National Union of Teachers wants all schools to succeed. Like Estelle Morris, who has been so critical of academies, we believe in standards, not structures.

Academies are about the introduction of a system which breaks down the local community of schools, undermines local democracy and, quite frankly, is the worst way of tackling the effects of deprivation on achievement.

I was recently in Canada trying to explain to some teachers what the academy programme is about because, unfortunately, the privatisation of education is a global trend. I told the listeners that an academy, according to the Government, was a publicly funded, independent school set up to raise standards in disadvantaged areas. The Government want 200 of these academies by 2010 and that faith schools are permitted to give priority of admission to children on the basis of a religious affiliation.

Then I said: "The funding goes like this. The Government give the sponsors £2 million, no strings attached, and then the sponsor has to match the Government with £20 million." The Canadian teachers were absolutely appalled at this arrangement. It was at this point my husband tugged my sleeve and said: "I hate to tell you, hon, it is the other way round. The sponsor puts up £2 million and the Government matches it with £20 million." In recent months that has even gone up to £35 million in some areas.

It beggars belief that this Government intend to roll out a £5 billion programme which takes schools out of local education authority control and the accountability of the local community and puts them into the hands of private sponsors. The ability to raise the £2 million seems to be the sole criterion for sponsoring an academy.

Who are these private sponsors? Sadly, I have to tell you that the evidence so far shows that these sponsors in the main are rich businessmen and faith groups. Have you ever heard of anything for nothing? Well, of course not. They all have their own private agendas. The Christian fundamentalist, Sir Peter Vardy of Reg Vardy Cars, sponsors the academy in Middlesbrough. Children are taught as fact that Darwin's evolution is just one theory and creationism is at least equally valid.

Likewise, the proposed Archbishop Ramsey Academy in Southwark includes in its Sex and Relationship Education Policy: "We need to recognise that some authorities believe that sex education may actually promote sexual experimentation". You have to remember that this is being delivered using money diverted from funds that could be funding locally accountable, democratic communities of schools.

Since 1998, the National Union of Teachers has had a central unit which monitors and advises on the commercialisation and privatisation of education. So what have we found so far? First of all, detrimental changes in staff conditions of service and a huge staff turnover; pupil selection is back; local children cannot attend their local school; parents with cars and who can travel are the ones who are likely to apply for the academy and when disruptive pupils are excluded, other schools have to pick up the cost.

Out of the current 14 academies -- listen to the figures, folks -- eight are achieving in line with neighbouring schools, two are performing below and two have been put into special measures. In other words, OFSTED thinks they are failing schools! It sounds like a pretty good scheme, doesn't it! So I hope you have the message.

So what do we want? The National Union of Teachers is calling on the TUC to plan a campaign involving initially a conference this autumn, after which consideration is to be given to plan a national demonstration opposing academies; a campaign against pupil selection; a fight for schools to be accountable to the community through their local education authorities and, finally, a campaign against the Government's strong arm tactics which force local education authorities into having academies in their areas. We want all children to achieve. We must not let this flawed system get in the way.

Helen Connor (*Educational Institute of Scotland*) seconded Motion 13.

She said: Nine years ago, one of my colleagues, who happens to be in the room today, stood here as an EIS delegate talking about smaller class sizes. No change there, then! However, there has been an enormous change in the last nine years, not least, the Labour Government elected on a platform very much of education, education, education. So why am I standing here now talking again about the need for smaller classes and why is that so crucial to the future of our children's education? I would like to give you four main reasons for that.

Firstly -- and the Chancellor touched on this this morning when he was talking about the need for our education system to adapt and change and the need to challenge technological improvements and technological advance in our society -- a flexible curriculum is crucial to the future of our youngsters. However, we cannot have a flexible curriculum if we are working in classes of 30 and beyond. Why should

education be simply for the academic? In a society that is changing, education must meet those changes.

Secondly, day in and day out we hear of discipline difficulties within our schools. Scotland is no different from anywhere else in that respect. I reiterate, we are not saying that smaller classes would get rid of discipline difficulties, but they very clearly would allow us to focus on the youngsters' needs and, hopefully, remove the blame culture that we live in nowadays when everything is blamed on schools and education. Involving youngsters is crucial and to involve youngsters you must have smaller classes.

Finally, and possibly most importantly, there is the agenda of social inclusion. We are clear that social inclusion does not and should not mean mainstreaming every youngster, but it does mean including many youngsters with special needs. If this concept is to be successful for everybody -- I stress everybody -- then this integration must take place in classes small enough for everyone to benefit.

Colleagues, I could continue, but time does not permit. The key to all of this is resources, both human and financial. We are looking for a commitment from the Government to smaller classes throughout education. Falling rolls gives the Government an ideal opportunity to do this. Maintaining the number of teachers despite falling rolls would not be additional cost. Youngsters are our future. They deserve the best. Support this motion.

John Chowcat (*National Association of Educational Inspectors, Advisers and Consultants*) supported Composite 13.

He said: I am focusing on the practical implications of the Government's introduction of stronger internal market competition within our school system in England and the related New Relationship with Schools Initiative.

Currently, Government ministers' very open encouragement of more academies in our cities and of effectively independent foundation status for secondary and primary schools reflects a much deeper Government push for choice and market-based reforms across the public sector generally. However, the hard evidence from overseas tell us that more competition between local schools can generate very unwelcome consequences.

New Zealand went very heavily for 'parent power' and choice and market forces in its school system some years ago. They completely abolished their equivalent of our local education authorities. They let the market reign. The results include very sharply differentiated educational outcomes for children. The poor white and the Maori children attend the 'sink' schools. The more articulate and the better resourced middle class parents send their children to upmarket schools elsewhere. We have to make absolutely sure that no version of that experience comes to this country.

We need a genuine and a really open debate about this. Julian Le Grand, Professor at the LSE, who is the intellectual guru of internal market theory and public services, became a key Government adviser at Downing Street last year. He is very honest about this project. In a pamphlet published in 2003 by the Policy Network called 'Models of Public Service', he concedes that the evidence for internal markets "has to be treated with some caution" and he concluded at the end of the pamphlet: "It would seem that experimentation in this direction would be desirable". Congress, we are now in that experiment.

The related New Relationship with Schools initiative is all about reducing the role of LEAs in local school improvement. In a Parliamentary answer to an MP's written question on the 6th June, Schools Minister, Jacqui Smith, confirmed that the Government is not going to fully fund the introduction of the new school

improvement partner roles. So that means that LEA finances, already stretched, are going to be further squeezed. We know from the training and the design of the training of the new school improvement partners now coming through that the role looks increasingly like an inspectorial role, a totally unnecessary OFSTED mark II, when what is needed is a highly professional and developmental role that will actually support local schools.

The answer to this is real government investment in this project and meaningful consultation with all the parties concerned. I hope the DfES will listen to that. These are vital issues for the future of our school system. Please support Composite Motion 13.

Kenneth Bell (*UNISON*) said: Conference, academies are just one part of the Government's radical agenda for primary and secondary education; an agenda that is promoted under the guise of investment and choice. It is actually about bringing the market into education, about giving the private sector a key role and about privatisation. The Government's Building Schools for the Future programme is key to achieving this agenda. It is a programme aimed at rebuilding and refurbishing every secondary school throughout the country over the next 10 to 15 years. It is a £40 billion-plus programme that is now going to be extended to the primary sector.

Of course, we welcome the investment, but the conditions attached to the Building Schools for the Future programme are totally unacceptable. BSF is being used to deliver the Government's target of 200 academies. Councils are actually being blackmailed. They are being told: "If you do not adopt academies, you do not get the investment." In the north east of England, Durham, Newcastle, Sunderland and Northumberland councils are going to go for a total of nine academies. All this is directly linked to the Building Schools for the Future programme. Three, at least, of those councils were vehemently opposed to the academies in principle but have succumbed.

However, it is not just about academies. Under the Building Schools for the Future programme, the major funding mechanism is PFI. This means cleaning, caretaking and catering are all threatened with privatisation. As a result of this, in Newcastle alone, 1,000 mainly part-time women workers' jobs are under threat during the next year. Conference, is it not a nonsense for Tony Blair to prioritise school meals and for Gordon Brown to praise public sector workers, cleaners and school meals workers, when thousands of them who currently work in schools are going to be threatened with privatisation under the Building Schools for the Future programme? (*Applause*)

Councils are also expected to establish a local education partnership. This partnership will be 80 percent owned by the private sector. This local education partnership will deliver the Building Schools for the Future programme, but it is also expected to develop and implement education policy. The local education partnerships are a Trojan Horse, which will reduce the role of education authorities in the short-term and, unfortunately, replace them in the long-term.

Building Schools for the Future means academies, PFI schools, privatising cleaning and school meals and the private sector having a key role in education provision. Councils are being forced down this road. In the north east, Ruth Kelly said recently that was not the case. Either she is mistaken at best or she is lying at worst because our experience is councils are told: "You do not get the investment unless you adopt these policies."

In the northern region, under the auspices of the northern region TUC, we have brought together the ATL, NASUWT, NUT, GMB and UNISON, campaigning

against academies, against privatisation of education, publicising the threats of Building Schools for the Future and arguing for an alternative. However, there is an urgency to translate this into a national context. This motion lays the basis. We urge you to support and to move as quickly as we can to defend our children's education. Thank you.

Andy Ballard (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*) said: Industrialists and entrepreneurs who have used their financial strength to bully Labour governments into concessions which help entrench their power now seek to influence and control education, which might otherwise be free to educate and empower working class people to achieve finally a fundamental and irreversible shift in power.

The 'Academies programme' allows unacceptably high profiles for non-elected capitalists to influence the state education system. A much vaunted purpose of academies is to help the most deprived urban communities, but the enormous sums of money thrown at academies would be better spent improving a much wider group of schools instead of being wasted in 50 percent higher start up costs. The iniquitous penalty imposed on local authorities that have declined to accommodate academies is a national disgrace.

Congress, who is it who would impose such a system? None other than our Prime Minister and his unelected Minister of Education, Andrew, now Lord, Adonis. (*Applause*) They ignore the Commons Select Committee which called for a halt in the expansion of the programme because of its profligate use of public funds and failure to deliver significant improvements. They turn a deaf ear to the words of experienced education professionals who urge caution and a halt in expansion until there is proven success. They carry on regardless, for this is part of the Blair legacy.

Adonis makes unsupportable claims about the 'academy effect', but his education credentials are limited and when I hear him talk about schools, I am minded to recall The Bard: "... I had rather hear my dog bark at a crow"!

There is no proven academy effect; there is no benefit from private sector involvement; there is no rapid sustained improvement in GCSE results; there is no requirement for academy teachers to be GTC registered and there is no public accountability.

On the other hand, there is PriceWaterhouse Cooper's spin concocting progress from thin air; there is a reduction in inclusion and a rise in selection; there is a cementing of social division; there is a cynical attempt to portray comprehensive schools as failing despite the best ever results; there is a shift in control of pedagogy, curriculum content and education vision from education professionals to unaccountable businessmen and religious extremists. There is a reduction in democratic control.

Congress, what we face is continued government hostility to highly successful comprehensive state education derided by ministers in favour of an insidious scheme to hand control of state education to the private sector. (*Applause and cheers*)

The President: I think you have a few supporters there, Andy!

Hilary Bills (*National Union of Teachers*) said: In exercising my right of reply, I cannot believe there is anyone in this hall who does not understand the issues in front of us. I did call -- it is in the motion -- for a conference very soon on this very issue. Having heard such wonderful contributions from other unions, I really think that should be taken forward. I ask the TUC to do that with urgency.

* *Composite Motion 13 was CARRIED.*

School education and inclusion

Christine Blower (*National Union of Teachers*) moved Composite Motion 21.

She said: Before I move this composite motion, which is the work, essentially, of the NUT and the AEP, I want to say just a very few words about the AEP General Secretary, Brian Harrison-Jennings, for whom this is his last Congress in that role. Colleagues will know of the work Brian has done and the extent to which he will be missed by colleagues in the education sector.

However, moving to the composite, the Every Child Matters agenda is about improving the lives of all children. It is an inclusive agenda which aspires to outcomes for every single child, which the NUT has long identified as extremely important. They are these: Every child should be safe, healthy, able to enjoy and able to achieve, able to make a positive contribution and should ultimately be able to achieve economic well-being.

No one could disagree with these. The task which faces us is how to achieve them. The NUT supports the Every Child Matters agenda because we see it as a way of achieving genuinely child-centered services and to do this in conjunction with parents and the community at large. However, multi-agency working is, of course, vital to this. It should be about better co-ordination and effective communication, not about engaging in confusing dialogues or any kind of perception of the interchangeability of professionals. Both education and social services must be protected in terms of financial and organisational distinctions.

Therefore, it is a big agenda with the major challenge of co-ordination between care and education services without undermining the role of teachers in both teaching and learning and, very importantly, in the pastoral aspects of a child's school life or, of course, by fudging the proper and legitimate distinction between education and children's social services.

Extended schools are a key feature of the Government's vision and this programme is progressing apace. By 2006, it is expected that there will be at least one extended school in each LEA. However, many schools already see themselves as extended and many do provide additional services and facilities and are very pleased to do so.

The NUT/DfES research commissioned by the National Foundation for Educational Research in 2003 highlighted the need for a bottom up approach to these developments. School communities should be able to identify their needs for services and then call on financial and organisational support from local educational authorities in order to be able to provide them. This must not and simply cannot be allowed to be about existing staff being expected to do more and more and more.

The NUT believes that extended schools can only be successful if, as the composite says, "schools receive sufficient resources for new and appropriate accommodation". I have heard colleagues from support staff unions, for example ask: "Well, if schools are going to be open from 8.00 to 6.00, when is anybody going to be able to clean them?" These considerations are, of course, quite significant and must not be overlooked.

The Government's vision in the children's workforce strategy looks to retaining staff through training and career development. The NUT supports this. However, success depends on employing and training sufficient teaching and support staff and in paying them properly to support and benefit children's education and to provide high quality services, which we would all want for all of our families. This is not a low cost option.

In the NUT's education statement, *Bringing Down The Barriers*, we called for specific funding to support collaboration between schools. We call on the TUC to urge the Government and employers to audit and fully cost the reforms. Seed corn funding and some other short-term funding will not deliver these changes and it certainly will not secure them in the long-term.

As the House of Commons Select Committee noted: "The initial set up of Children's Trust arrangements is likely to be costly and yet minimal funding has been directed to them." I do hope the Chancellor has noted that and is about to remedy it.

As the composite makes clear, we support a more inclusive society. We recognise the key role of education establishments in providing for the needs of all learners. The NUT is committed to campaigning to ensure that all local authorities maintain or re-establish a full provision to address issues arising from children and young people's behaviour.

There is much excellent work being done with children who have social and emotional difficulties. However, as the composite says, every learner should be entitled to the provision they need and when they need it. In short, every child really does matter. Please support

Charles Ward (*Association of Educational Psychologists*) supporting Composite Motion 21 said: Let me first thank the NUT for its kind comments on our retiring General Secretary. The AEP president is pleased to second this motion from the viewpoint of inclusion, the inclusion of parents, the inclusion of children, the inclusion of young people and their families into the hubs of their communities. We welcome the holistic view recommended by the Every Child Matters agenda. We welcome the demands of the Government to put our children at the centre of the services, but we have noticed a sleight of hand in the Government's recent pronouncements. We knew that there would be no new money when the Government started to focus on behaviour. They were implying that if a young person presents difficulties it is okay to remove them: social exclusion, not social inclusion, is what they were saying.

A few weeks ago ministers were extolling the values of special schools. The AEP values the work of special schools but we fear, though, that the Government's praise of these special schools has more to do with removing your children with special needs from their local schools, no doubt to boost the exam tables and results from mainstream schools.

Congress, the AEP does not have an agenda to abolish special schools but it does have an agenda to make them unnecessary. Recent government pronouncements, we believe, are a cynically irresponsible attempt to make individual children at fault for the lack of examination successes. That is patently not the case. The AEP motions that are subsumed in this composite are about showing that the system is failing the children, particularly those with behavioural difficulties and special and additional needs. We seek to remind the Government that social inclusion is about inclusion and participation in our own communities and not being educated away from them. Remember, your child being educated in a different school from your local school not only excludes the child from the local community, it also excludes you the parents.

Congress, the AEP believes that to achieve all this schools need to offer a relevant curriculum to all our children. Resources need to be adequate to allow teachers to meet the needs of all our children. Support for children with special needs and behavioural problems needs to be relevant support to help them achieve. Most important of all, our hardworking school teachers need better training to support and develop these most vulnerable of all our children. If

you think it cannot work, then look at Newham, a fully inclusive education authority and yet according to this week's *Observer* one of the top 20 LEAs. Congress, the AEP requests you to support this motion.

Angie Rutter (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*) supporting Composite Motion 21 said: ATL supports the desire of a more inclusive society but what does inclusion mean? We all know that inclusion should involve all; it should benefit the individual and enhance the community. Inclusion, in its true sense, will promote tolerance and understanding, as well as help us appreciate difference but for many inclusion has become associated with a lack of support, a lack of training, and under-resourcing. Without these resources there is a real risk of inclusion leading to exclusion of other groups of learners. Unless parents are appropriately supported, staff appropriately trained, and schools appropriately resourced, the promotion of a false inclusion agenda can compromise teaching and learning. Real inclusion requires long-term planning, resources, and vision. It cannot be done on the cheap and it should not be tokenistic.

To be sure of what we mean ATL has constructed three simple tests; these help us to have a common understanding of what are often complex and very emotional issues. Our three tests are: firstly, that everyone should be entitled to the provision they need when they need it; secondly, that schools and services are enabled to provide fully for the needs of all learners; finally, that a learner's needs should not be compromised by anyone else or be at the expense of another. These tests recognise the principal needs of understanding, resources, and equality. Inclusion means valuing diversity, understanding difficulties, and recognising and respecting individuals so that all feel they belong. It should not be used as a smokescreen for inactivity. It is crucial that the Government make these three principles a reality and Congress must persuade them to act now. Please support this composite.

Sonia Kordiak (*Educational Institute of Scotland*) supporting Composite Motion 21 said: In Scotland, too, inclusive education remains a challenge for teachers, pupils, and parents. Despite increases in funding from the Scottish Executive there still remains a gap between aspiration and reality. The reality is that inclusive education is expensive but in Scotland money allocated for it centrally can sometimes be spent locally to plug holes in other areas of council spending. If all the necessary resources are not provided in schools, how can our aspiration to meet the needs of all pupils be truly addressed. Sufficient numbers of classroom teachers and support staff are clearly required, and all staff must be offered appropriate staff development. Teachers should not be made to feel they are failing best to support particular pupils' varied additional needs when they have not received training on how to do so.

Partnership with parents is crucial for pupils' learning, especially it could be argued when pupils have emotional and behavioural difficulties or have additional support needs. The pressures today on some parents are such that it can be difficult for them to establish and sustain partnerships with schools. Home-link teachers and EAL teachers are examples of staff who play a vital role in bringing together home and school but too often these services are not adequately staffed.

In Scotland, as my colleague indicated earlier, we acknowledge that the majority of young people will be educated in mainstream schools. Should class sizes be reduced? This would further assist inclusion allowing teachers more time to interact with individual pupils. However, we must accept, too, that for some pupils far more additional support is required and that can only

be found in the form of specialist provision, such as special schools, or units linked to mainstream schools.

Education both north and south of the border must be adequately resourced if it is to counter or compensate for the poverty, deprivation, and social exclusion which still remain in our communities. Education should provide all children with the learning conditions they need to gain all the skills necessary to become active citizens and learners throughout their lives, to enrich not only these lives but our countries. Congress, please support.

Mary Turner (*GMB*) supporting Composite Motion 21 said: Congress, the Government's Children's Workforce Strategy starts with an obvious truth; that truth is, of course, that you have to invest in the workers who look after our children if you want every child to have a decent start in life. It is great that the Government is looking at the Danish early years and childcare model. We are used to the Danes showing us how to do things. That is a sour point with Sven and the England team; things have got worse for them but, hopefully, they do not get worse for us. It will take a huge investment to transform our childcare sector from private nurseries paying the minimum wage into the highly trained, well paid, childcare profession they have in Denmark.

Congress, I would like to continue the Scandinavian theme and deal with a topic that many of you in this hall know is very dear to my heart, the importance of healthy food in schools and nurseries. It is time we stopped divorcing the school meals from education. Feed the child, feed their body and feed their mind that is as valuable a part of the education system as learning. The motion talks about providing for the learning needs of every child, including those with behavioural difficulties.

In Finland some years ago they made the very simple discovery, that if you feed the children well so much else follows, truancy drops, behaviour improves, exclusions decrease, teenagers are in school for lunch, not out on the streets getting into trouble, and children can concentrate for longer and learn more. Feed the body, feed the mind. Every child matters in Finland and every child gets a healthy nutritious lunch, for free. A universal school meals service with carefully planned menus is published each week in the papers so that parents can see what their children will be eating. I have been telling everyone in the Government who will listen about this for years. It is a shame that it took Jamie Oliver and his publicity machine finally to get some action.

Congress, from September school meals and local authorities are getting a bit extra to spend on meals but it is peanuts, and you know what happens if you pay peanuts. I want to see the Government invest in a high-quality, free school food service. Educational achievement would go up and children would no longer be prevented from learning because of poor diet. It would be worth every single penny.

I will close with these words. Yesterday we won the Ashes. Somebody forgot to mention that the women showed the way earlier: the women's cricket team - well done.

Congress, I am now going to end on a sad note and I think it is one that you, parents and grandparents, must go back and remember. At UNISON's fringe meeting yesterday to which I was invited, there was an MP who told us that it is now proven that today's children will die before their parents. We must make sure that today's parents are not receiving the ashes of their children through lack of funding by our government. Thank you.

Chris Tansley (*UNISON*) supporting Composite Motion 21 said: Do not forget where the Government's proposals in Every Child Matters and the Children's

Workforce Strategy actually came from. They came from the Laming Inquiry into the tragic death of Victoria Climbié which found what we in UNISON had been saying for some considerable time, that under-resourced, overworked, child protection work combined with a lack of communication between different agencies would inevitably lead to further tragedies.

UNISON, the union that represents workers in all these agencies, from social workers, social care workers, to health workers, early years workers and school support staff, recognises the need for closer, integrated work in the area of childcare, and said as much to the Laming Inquiry. We also said that structural reform on its own was not good enough; it must be accompanied by resources to make sure that it worked. We must now make sure that closer working arrangements do not lead to deskilling of those workers trained and skilled in particular areas of childcare, child protection, and child development.

We fully support the call in the composite for sufficient resources to fund fully the cost of these reforms, to ensure that properly trained and skilled staff continue to be the lead workers for every vulnerable child. Congress, every child matters but so does every worker in every agency concerned with that child. Congress, please support.

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*): Congress, one of the issues that this motion deals with is the very important issue of children with special educational and additional needs, including behavioural difficulties and their need for appropriate teaching and support. This is a complex area where there is serious professional debate on the most appropriate means of achieving social inclusion. What is clearly agreed is the need for high-quality training and support, including in particular the need for educational psychology resources. The motion reflects the importance of ensuring that educational psychologists are fully included in the discussion and planning on meeting such children's needs.

The General Council wanted me to emphasise that point and on that basis to express our support for the motion.

Christine Blower (*National Union of Teachers*) said in reply: I just want to say that our children are our future. I entirely accept the comments of other colleagues. This is a golden opportunity for us to work together in the public sector to ensure that no child does slip through the cracks and to make sure that we protect and advance the cause of public sector workers in this important area. Thank you.

* *Composite Motion 21 was CARRIED*

Equality Audit

The President: We now turn to Chapter 2 of the General Council Report, Equality Rights, at page 27. Congress, the TUC Equality Audit is one of the most important pieces of work that we do at the TUC. It allows us to examine what we are all doing to promote diversity within our own organisations. You will all have received copies of the 2005 Equality Audit in your packs. I now call on the General Secretary to introduce the TUC's Equality Audit. Brendan, thank you.

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*): President, Congress, it used to be the case that the hall would mysteriously empty when equality motions were debated; some people, and I am sure that none of you are among them, saw equal opportunities as a soft issue best left to those who were not involved in cutting edge negotiations. But, colleagues, make absolutely no mistake about it, there is nothing soft or optional about equality today and nor is it a sectional interest. I do not need to remind anyone in this hall of

the consequences of inequality and a divided society; it can quite literally be a matter of life and death, as we have seen so tragically in New Orleans.

Delegates, our Equality Audit Report is yet more evidence that unions make life better for millions of working people. This Equality Audit gives us valuable information about bargaining in an increasingly important area of working life and employment law. It tells us what we do well and what we could do better.

There have been fundamental shifts in society in the labour market in the last two decades and our bargaining agenda is changing to meet these challenges and changes, but we need to continue to make sure that we are representing the needs of all workers. The last audit that we conducted set a benchmark on union rules, representation, and structures, and in 2007 we will do a comparative exercise to see how far we have achieved our targets against that benchmark.

The 2005 audit surveyed collective agreements, the area highlighted last time. As a result, next month you will be able to access the new electronic TUC 'bargaining for equality' database that will give details of all the agreements listed in the report. It will be a great resource for all negotiators, especially in new areas of employment law like age, religion, and belief. You will be able to see the terms of collective agreements in other sectors and build on the experience of others.

As unions we want to continue to play our part in a genuinely diverse society and in turn we want to be seen as lively, diverse and modern organisations, but to do this we need more local and regional negotiators to promote equality agreements like the ones included in this report. We have seen what an impact union learning reps have had and so we are calling on the Government to build on that success by introducing new statutory equality reps in every workplace.

Colleagues, Congress is the time of the year when we come together to review progress and we should take pride in the headway that we have made on issues that are so important to the daily lives of our members. We certainly have no room for complacency. Our future depends on our ability to organise all workers and really to become a movement proud of its diversity. If you read the special focus on women in the report, you can see that progress has sometimes been patchy.

While there have been some increases in the number of women national and regional officers, some union committees have fewer women members now than a few years ago. The number of women and black branch reps still falls well short of reflecting our membership.

I hope that every union in this hall will use this Equality Audit to help track progress in your own organisations, make sure your negotiators get a copy, use it when you are thinking about your own bargaining agenda and, like some affiliates are already doing, use it to inform an audit process of your own. We have a proud record of representing workers in all walks of life. We have made working life so much better for so many people but this Equality Audit is a real practical tool to help us take that work on to a new level. Congress, I commend this report to you.

Trade unionists in the classroom

The President: We return now to Chapter 1 of the General Council Report, Organising and Rights at Work, and the section on Young People, which is page 22. I now call paragraph 1.19 and Motion 8, Trade Unionists in the Classroom. The General Council support the motion.

Pete McLoughlin (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*) moved Motion 8.

He said: As trade unionists living and working in the 21st century we know that building membership and organising effectively has to be the top priority for the movement. We know that unless we grow in number and meet the organising challenge we cannot grow in influence. We know that unless we reach out and engage with young people we have no long-term future. The reality is that, in spite of the increased focus on and real investment in recruitment and organising, we are still not getting through to enough young people. Many have no clue what trade unions are, even less know what they do, and even less see the relevance of them. If they have a view, it is often the stereotypical negative cloth cap image portrayed by a hostile media. Most are unaware of their basic legal rights as employees. Would any young people at school understand the social justice dimension and that trade unionists are an essential ingredient of a free and democratic society?

These are the daughters and sons of workers who grew up during the Thatcher years of assault on trade unions. They have little or no personal experience, no family heritage of trade unionism. As a result each group of workers that has entered the labour market over the last 20 years has been less and less likely to join a union. As union density continues to decline, the decline is more marked amongst young people. Only 11 percent of workers under the age of 24 are union members. Only 16 percent of working students see unions as a source of advice and help at work. Research shows that once in the labour market individuals tend to remain in or, more importantly for us, out of a union.

We need to do more individually and collaboratively to get the message across. It is not enough to leave it to recruitment drives and campaigns aimed at those who have jobs. We have to do more to encourage and facilitate trade unionism before young people get jobs. This means we have to target schools and colleges. There has been a long tradition of individuals in the movement taking part in school visits, industry days, and similar activities, but it fell into abeyance by and large with the imposition of the national curriculum.

The opportunity has now returned with the introduction of citizenship into the curriculum. This has given us the chance to develop a more strategic approach. The TUC and some affiliates have grasped this opportunity. I know UNISON has helped fund a guide and resource book for teachers. The T&G has produced speaker packs. NASUWT and other teacher unions have activists who teach the subject. The TUC has put on Citizens at Work educational conferences and published a resource pack for 14 to 19 year olds entitled, *A Better Way to Work*. Now there is the Trade Unionists in the Classroom initiative, with panels of speakers made up of young union reps trained and accredited to deliver talks in schools and colleges about rights at work and the importance of trade unions. Using real life experiences of young trade unionists to illustrate some of the issues that young people are learning about in the curriculum makes it real, makes it relevant, and gives it some street 'cred'. The project has enabled a more co-ordinated response to requests from schools.

The NASUWT and some other unions have been working with the TUC to promote this offer. I know I do not need to convince anyone of the importance of tapping into young people but, Congress, we bring this motion to raise the profile of this vital element of organising and to urge all affiliates to get involved in the programme and develop resources and initiatives. We need to fight to keep alive the whole concept of trade unionism in our society. We need to fill the gap

created by the assault sustained on the movement in previous decades. We also need to protect our young people from exploitation. We cannot afford to wait until they enter the labour market. There has to be a corrective to the blinkered, biased, and bloody-minded picture painted by the media and others. A scenario where young people see joining a union as a normal and natural part of working life has to be our goal. This may not be that much of a sexy motion, Congress, but it is a key one.

John Colbett (*Communication Workers Union*) seconding Motion 8 as a trade unionist and as a school governor, said: It is vital for the future of the trade union movement that we raise the profile of trade unions in the national curriculum and make young people aware of the role of trade unions in championing workers' rights and protecting people in employment. We need to counter the negative perceptions of trade unions portrayed in the media and to communicate clearly to young people the positive work done by trade unions and the benefits of joining a trade union.

Equally important, as the motion says, is the need to secure social justice and the TUC's classroom project is central to the achievement of a number of key social policy objectives. One such objective is to tackle discrimination, which includes eliminating the pay gap that exists so starkly between men and women. Challenging stereotypes in the workplace needs to start early so that the offensive, outmoded, and unproductive view of what is men's work disappears from a range of possibilities in the minds of school students.

The TUC has done much valuable work through its trade unionists in the classroom project, for example, setting up panels of young trade union speakers to deliver talks to children about rights at work and the role of trade unions. The Department for Education and Skills is engaged in some of the TUC's work in schools. Most notably (and this supports the issue of tackling gender stereotypes) the DfES has part-funded the Computer Club for Girls project run by the E-Skills Council, with support from the TUC. Currently women represent only one-fifth of the IT workforce and this project aims to redress the balance by making IT more attractive and accessible to women. More specifically on the TUC's Trade Unionists in the Classroom project, the Department for Education and Skills has jointly published a leaflet together with the TUC to encourage trade union members to become school governors, particularly in inner city and disadvantaged areas.

These are valuable initiatives but if we are to maximise the reach and potential of the Trade Unionists in the Classroom project, we need to do more to engage government and the Department for Education and Skills to work with and support the TUC in pursuing the objectives highlighted. We believe that a sense of urgency is now required in pursuing actions to achieve the objectives set out in the motion. The requirement to report back to Congress in 2006 will help propel this project over the coming year and a report due in a year's time will help us assess progress on this very important issue. Please support.

* *Motion 8 was CARRIED.*

Youth Matters – Green Paper on Youth Policies

The President: I do have time to take Motion 9, Youth Matters – green paper on youth policies. Delegates, the General Council is seeking remission of this motion from The Community and Youth Workers' Union so I call the General Secretary to explain the General Council's position. I will then call then call the Community and Youth Workers' Union.

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*): Congress, the General Council met last Thursday to consider its attitude to this motion. It is sympathetic to the majority of points in the motion, for example, the need for 4,000 more youth workers and a proper funding stream for the youth service. These are points which the TUC would reflect in our response to the Green Paper. Nonetheless, the General Council has some reservations on subparagraph (iii). We know, for example, that some affiliates are concerned about another re-organisation of the Connexions service; in addition, subparagraph (iii) of the motion calls for a new system of regulation, licensing, and continuous professional development for all those working with children and young people. This would be overseen by a general youth and children's workers council.

Currently, there are already separate regulatory systems for teachers, social workers, and probation officers. Equally, there are key groups of workers who do not have a regulatory system, such as nursery nurses, play workers, or teaching assistants. This motion effectively calls for them all to come under the same regulatory system, which would mean very substantial changes to some tried and tested arrangements.

So, while the General Council supports much that is in motion 9, we do have some reservations about the third subparagraph and we are proposing to convene a meeting of all the unions with an interest in the issues in subparagraph (iii). In the light of that, we are requesting the CYWU to remit this motion to the General Council.

The President: I call on The Community and Youth Workers' Union and I put it to you, are you prepared to remit the motion?

Doug Nicholls (*The Community and Youth Workers' Union*) moved Motion 9. He said: Yes, President, we are prepared to remit. We are taking a novel approach this year on the basis that we have had a number of motions on youth and community passed unanimously by Congress over the years. There has been not as much action from the General Council as we would have liked but we have some commitments for action in the remission and the statement this year, and we very much hope that the General Council will be able to take those positive points forward on which we are all agreed.

However, we would like to move the motion so that a number of points can be put down on the record. I will do that as briefly as I can.

Of course, our intention in subparagraph (iii) was not to replace any existing arrangements but to highlight the fact to Congress of the massive investment we have seen in our sector. There are tens of thousands of new jobs that have been created but there are no qualifications required, there is no regulation, there is no proper training and service support for the staff involved, often in very vulnerable and sensitive situations with children and young people.

We think that Congress needs to express a very genuine concern for child protection and ensure that these new services that are developing can have public confidence. No one here would want to send their child to a school where there were unqualified teachers. No one here would take medical services where there were unqualified hospital and other medical staff. That is the case for many working-class communities who are expected to entrust children and young people to those without qualification and regulation, and it is dangerous.

We must not let our difference on paragraph (iii) distract us from all the other points on which the General Council and all the unions are united. The heart of the unity is to support the youth service, and

there are three particularly important reasons for that at this time.

Firstly, the youth service is about social and political education. Many youth service organisations have on their official curriculum the promotion of trade unionism and collective action.

Secondly, it is the one public service outside schools which is closest to young people. Young people choose in their hundreds of thousands to be involved in the youth service. For the trade union movement to be seen fighting for that service is helping us to reconnect with the real interests of young people throughout the country. That service is based on many of the same principles that we have as a movement, solidarity with the disadvantaged communities.

Thirdly, youth services outside schools is the only service which treats young people as equal creative citizens and engages them properly. Above all, it is the service which recognises that if you support and encourage young people, social behaviour, academic performance and emotional development improve. It is the only service which is based on the principle of democratic engagement of young people.

Frankly, the General Council's excellent statement on Iraq in that last section of the London Bombings statement, about the need to re-engage young people and bring about community cohesion, will not happen without proper investment in the services which our members support. Young people are not the hoodies, yobs, and hooligans of the gutter press and some politicians who seek continually to demonise the young. It is the youth service that counteracts most of those stereotypes.

Every study that has been done internationally shows that where there are professional youth workers a whole range of things improve for young people, for example, crime rates go down. It is long-term and much more cost effective to invest in prevention rather than punishment and cure, yet still we see jobs are being created with £100m and huge investment into ineffective youth offending schemes, a policy based for young people more on punishment than prevention. It costs £26,000 to keep a young person in a Young Offenders Institute for six months yet the average investment by a local authority in preventative youth services is £72 a year.

The Government does recognise the importance of the youth service to some extent and reinvested last year the sum of £500m, given to local authorities, but because that funding stream is not properly protected they only spent £300m of that on young people. The Government have supported the demand of our union and the National Youth Agency, that we have a ratio of one fulltime nationally qualified youth worker for every 400 young people in the country. To meet that target we need 4,000 more workers in the field, and we hope that is going to be strenuously advocated by the TUC.

This motion gives a key to the need for the movement to re-engage with young people and the dangerously wide gap that exists between the trade union movement and young people can be filled, if we are seen as a movement to start advocating as strongly for this set of services as we do for many others.

* *Motion 9 was REMITTED*

The President: Congress, I wish to remind you there will be another collection outside the main hall, this time for Make Poverty History. In your delegates wallets you will have found a TUC white band, which is designed to be sold for £1 each but we left them with you on trust. I would be grateful if you could make an appropriate donation more than generous enough to cover the cost of the TUC white band. I also think it is worth reminding you that we have a commitment from the Professional Footballers Association that they will

match pound for pound what we raise, so please dig deep; if you put in £5 we get £10, if you put in £10, we get £20, and so forth.

I can also tell you that you managed to collect or donate a phenomenal amount for the Gate Gourmet dispute, the total collected was £2,626.03. I know there are a lot of teachers in the hall but on straightforward arithmetic I think that works out about £4 per delegate, which strikes me as very generous.

Could I also again remind you that there are various meetings taking place this lunchtime and you can find them detailed in page 15 of the *Congress Guide*. Thank you for cooperating so that we could pick up a lot of lost business.

(Congress adjourned until 2.15 p.m.)

TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

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

The President: May I say to Cantabile how wonderful we thought your singing was. Thank you for singing to us. Your voices are positively like velvet. Thank you very much indeed. *(Applause)*

Delegates, in a change to the printed programme in the Congress guide the Skills/Productivity video, which was scheduled for this afternoon, will not now be shown. But before moving on with the programme of business I would like to draw your attention to the best exhibition stand competition. A voting form is included in the *Congress Guide* and should be completed and returned to the TUC Stand No. 18 at the front entrance to the Brighton Centre by close of business on Wednesday afternoon, tomorrow afternoon. You will also find that there is the traditional delegates' questionnaire, which is on your tables. I would be grateful if you could post those in the boxes provided in the hall. Thank you very much.

We start this afternoon's business by introducing the Fraternal Delegate from the Labour Party. This year it is an old friend, the Rt Hon Ian McCartney MP. As many delegates will know, Ian is a long-standing friend of the movement. As Chair of the Labour Party he has the difficult task of bringing together the two wings of the party, the trades unions and the constituencies. Ian does a magnificent job in striving to ensure that the party pulls together and never forgets its roots in the trade union movement.

Ian, you are really warmly welcomed here today. I am delighted to see you and delighted to ask you to address our Congress. Thank you, Ian.

Address by Ian McCartney, Labour Party Fraternal Delegate

Rt Hon Ian McCartney MP *(Fraternal delegate from the Labour Party):* Brothers and sisters, I genuinely stand proud today here on behalf of the Labour Party as its Chair in the year that we won the historical third term Labour Government for the first time in the party's history. I want to echo Gordon's thanks to Brendan and Jeannie and endorse his words to retiring colleagues and the friends we so tragically lost in recent months. I would like to take a brief moment to mention one person in particular, Ian Hepplewhite. He will be known to many of our National Union of Journalist colleagues here today. Ten years ago I got the credit for a successful fat cats campaign, which led to the national minimum wage. Ian was a young Labour Party Press Officer who actually devised the campaign. He was a committed socialist and trades unionist, respected by all in the political lobby. All his family and friends are truly distressed that such a wonderful young man with so much yet to contribute was taken so quickly from us.

I am also proud of what we have achieved in the movement in the last eight years. I have my eyes fixed firmly on what I hope we can achieve together in the next four or five years, and hopefully a term of government after that.

I was also pleased that I came yesterday when I met a number of men and women who were sacked by Gate Gourmet company. I was struck by their quiet dignity, which is so in contrast to the actions of their employer. These are the people we got into politics for; these are the type of vulnerable workers that the Warwick Agreement was designed to help, and we have a responsibility to do our best by them.

We have come a long way in the movement since we met here last year. It gives me particular pleasure to address you at such a proud time in the nation's sporting history. After so many years of disappointment we waited with bated breath all summer long. It was a tough contest but finally the whole nation got the result we had been dreaming of: Scotland 2, Norway 1. (*Laughter*) (*Applause*).

I remember last year's Congress very well. There had been a few headlines running up to the event in the national and local press that I was for the high jump. I ask you, the high jump! Things got so bad that some of my friends thought I should go and look for a new job. Tony Woodley was very supportive. He phoned me up and said "I have set up a job interview on a building site in London." I met the foreman. "Can you make a cup of tea?" I said, "I certainly can." "Can you drive a forklift truck?" "Why? Good grief, how big is this tea pot?"

Colleagues, like many in this room today I have never had much luck with employers. I can remember one particular case. He called me into his office and looked me straight in the eye -- well, actually, he sat down first and looked me straight in the eye. He said "McCartney" -- when they say your surname first you know it is going to be trouble, it is always the same -- "For the first time in my life I am going to mix business with pleasure. You are fired. Don't darken my door again."

There is no pressure, is there. Tony Blair and I have made up since then though!

After eight years as a Minister the civil service get to know you, PCS and FDA members in particular. Apparently it is rumoured that every working day with me is like Christmas Day. They do all the work and some fat guy in a suit gets all the credit. I was watching with trepidation this morning up in the gallery, listening to Gordon Brown. It is always impossible to follow him. He always has that powerful oratory. He weaves into his speech all the things that have brought us into the labour movement and he underpins it by his record as the Iron Chancellor. I can assure you this is not just for show. He takes his reputation for prudence very seriously. Last summer he asked me to go to Kirkcaldy and speak at his constituency party. He invited my wife and I round to his house. We got there, we found they were stripping wallpaper from the living room. I said to him, "Are you decorating, Gordon?" He says, "No, we are moving house."

I have more but I will keep them for another year!

Congress, this is an extraordinary moment for the Labour Party and the trade union movement. In some senses you can say it is the best of times and, if we are not careful, the worst of times. It is the best of times because we won a third term, the Tory Party is still in chaos, we have delivered near full employment in every region in the country, in our kingdom, and trades unions have the opportunity to grow for the first time in decades. Yet it could be the worst of times. The turnout at the election was too low, there is less trust in politics and politicians and, to a lesser extent, trades unions than ever before. All political parties face

declining membership and activists. Trades unions are not growing despite two million extra jobs in the economy.

I want to start today by looking at the positive things we have accomplished, and will continue to accomplish, before moving on to some of the challenges we face. I want to offer my thanks to the trade union movement for the support in ensuring the delivery of a third-term Labour Government. I want to pay tribute to the unprecedented work of the affiliated unions that played such a vital part in a victory in the key marginals, but also to the work of countless individual trades unionists from every union, affiliated or not, working in every constituency to help the Labour Party make history. A majority of 67 in a third term, a majority of 159 over the Tories, an election where Michael Howard won fewer MPs than we did in 1983. A majority of 67 -- people said we actually lost. Well, I tell you what, colleagues, if we had that majority of 67 in 1979, 1983, 1987, 1992 and even in 1997 would any of you not have accepted it? We did win and we deserved to win.

A third term means Labour is starting to break free of the shackles of being the natural party of opposition, debilitated and unable to get things done. Opposition is a breeze for politicians. You get up in the morning, express indignation and anger -- if John Humphrys lets you get a word in -- by lunch time you pass a resolution and at night you go home to bed and put the lights out. What has changed for the worker? Nothing, absolutely nothing. This third time in power means we have the opportunity to build on the steady progress we have made together since 1997. It means millions of working people will benefit from our third term policies. It means the Tories remain in the same leadership crisis they have been in for a decade.

Being in government is hard; it means making all sorts of decisions, many of them very difficult. It is not always that you can square a circle, choices always are difficult, but I would rather be in government than face the barren wasteland of opposition. I would rather have the opportunity to provide leadership than to snuggle up to another generation of opposition. Eight years into government it is time to acknowledge the challenges we face, as a party, as a movement, as a country, meeting the challenge of globalisation, addressing the concerns of Europe's citizens, delivering justice for working people at home and abroad both at the workplace and in the wider communities and societies, meeting the challenges of an ageing society. The Warwick Agreement and our manifesto acknowledged all these challenges and much more besides.

I believe the start of this term is also a time for hope. I joined the Labour Party, the trade union movement, 40 years ago because I was a young optimist. As human beings we can all make mistakes. We all have frailties and we all face difficulties along the way but I still remain an optimist. My grandparents and parents had nothing other than an innate belief in justice and solidarity, an absolute commitment to economic and social justice and a strong belief that each and every generation of working people had the responsibility to each other to work to pass on to the next generation a better world than the one we entered into.

Why should we be optimistic? Why do we need to be optimistic? Because their values were our values, and it is those values that should continue to inspire us as they inspired them. I believe that Labour values offer us a way forward as we address the challenges ahead. Labour values tell us that driving towards full employment is the best way to deliver economic and social justice. Labour values tell us that a well-trained, well-rewarded, respected workforce will be a workforce better equipped to succeed in the global economy. Labour values tell us that injustice and

poverty can and should be addressed through the creation of a modern, enabling welfare state. Labour values tell us we should give working people the choice and excellence in public services, a privilege that only a very few rich have always enjoyed and had. Labour values tell us we must continue on a journey to build a vibrant and secure community. Labour values tell us that an international Britain must be a force for good in the world. Those shared values give us something else, shared responsibilities not just in the best of times, they also sustain us in the worst of times. The Labour Party and trade union movement need to apply their values to the hopes and aspirations of today's communities. The labour and trade union movement need to change so that we look, feel and sound like the communities we seek to serve. The labour and trade union movement need to change so that we reach out to new people who support our values. The labour and the trade union movement need to change so that we can organise and campaign together imaginatively and effectively on the issues that matter to our people.

With the support of the trades unions, Labour will be renewing the way we make policy at our conference here in Brighton later this month. We will also be renewing the way we campaign so that we do look like, feel like and sound like the communities we seek to serve as a political party.

How does Congress want to be remembered at the end of this week? Can the union movement, in the face of national and international change, still inspire people to join a successful growing organisation, a movement that can support the interests of working people and supporting their interests encourage them in the public and the private sector to join a trade union? Labour is committed to modern growing unions; we said so in our manifesto and it is a commitment we intend to keep. I believe it is vital that we see a period of sustained trade union growth reversing a generational decline. In 1979 the TUC had more than 12 million members; today that figure is just over 6.5 million. In those days there were so many collective agreements that unions, employers and the public and the private sector, even my own union the Transport & General Workers Union, at that time opposed a national minimum wage; collective bargaining was the king.

If we are to build a trade union movement for the future we need a strategy for growth. The Government has a role in this. We are committed to implementing the Warwick Agreement in full, but the fundamental challenge is one for trades unions themselves: the fundamental challenge is that 50 per cent of the current work force in Britain have never ever joined a trade union not for one single day or week. This brings a double whammy. TUC research shows us that if a worker has never been a member their children, as they enter the labour market, will probably never join a union either. Already only ten per cent of young workers are in a union. The vast majority of our members are older workers. This gives us a simple message as trades unionists: we need to reach out and grow or we can slowly die out. Left unchallenged the very culture of trades unionism is at risk of fading away. The next four or five years is a window of opportunity for the trade union movement. I hope we can agree that we cannot afford to squander our opportunity by wasting time in barren disagreement and empty rhetoric. I am not saying that we will not disagree, that would be unrealistic. There will be genuine issues where there will be differences of opinion, but that should not stop us moving forward on the basis of shared values, shared objectives and a plethora of agreed policies.

I want union members to know that the unions are working and the Government are working with them and good employers are working with trades unions

too, to make the workplace safer, fairer, and their hours more family friendly. After eight years of a Labour Government we cannot just keep sending out a message that unions are losing out, almost hard done by. Unions need to be seen by millions of people as an effective, successful voice for workers in the workplace. I have had some union members say to me that the Manifesto commitment on bank holidays is meaningless as many union members already have this benefit, and there lies the challenge to us all. The people who will benefit most from this change in the law are the very workers who need trades unions most, the most vulnerable in the most vulnerable patch of the economy. Trades unions need to work with us when we introduce these new rights, to campaign nationally to get these workers into trade union membership and secure their rights and much more for them. In this family of ours there are still some people who think having a Labour Government is a bit of a luxury. There are some who still shout out, claim treachery or cry 'sell out'. These comments are designed to undermine the vast majority of us who want to work together positively in a partnership. They can mask, unfortunately, what can be on occasion legitimate trade union concern.

Just look around the world, name me a government anywhere in the world that invests huge sums of resources into trade union modernisation. I will give you one: this Labour Government. Name another government that invests in trade union learning. I will give you one here: this Labour Government. Name me a government that is committed to improving and increasing employment rights, with over 50 new employment rights in the past eight years. I will give you one: this Labour Government.

It is clear to me that there are more opportunities for union growth than there have been for decades elsewhere in the world. Less than a decade ago, the Australian Labour Party lost office and the right returned to power. What happens when the right returns to power? It is a depressingly predictable story. The right are rewriting Australia's workplace laws, taking away people's most basic rights at work. Firstly, they are abolishing protection against unfair dismissal for all employees in companies with less than 100 staff. Secondly, they are giving support and cover to employers to cut take home pay, reduce employment conditions and workers who refuse can be sacked. Thirdly, they are changing the way the minimum wage is calculated so that it can be set at a lower rate. Fourthly, they are keeping unions out of the workplace and ending the ability for workers to bargain collectively with their employer, and much more besides. As we are here this week, the Australian Labour Party and the TUC in Australia are spending their time and their hard earned resources fighting against these new laws. That is what happens when the right is in power.

That is why it is important here in Brighton this afternoon that we are clear and remember for a moment those long years of opposition. We never want to go back to them. But we should never take power for granted because the responsibility as part of the movement is to ensure that people always see us as being on your side because, if the right ever return, it will be our people who will immediately be suffering. Here in Britain the Tories have been there, they have done it, they have worn the T-shirt. They wrote the textbook -- do this, do this; we will never forget it. The Tories are looking for a new leader. One policy will unite all their candidates. Not every Tory is anti-Europe. They are not all pro-hanging. One or two of them are in favour of banning fox hunting. But one thing unites them all, they are all anti-union to their finger tips. What else do all these candidates for the leadership stand for? All of them opposed every piece of employment legislation introduced by this

government over the last eight years. They all opposed the introduction of the national minimum wage. All of them stood at the last general election pledging to cut investment in public services and cut the wages of low paid agricultural workers, and much more besides.

In the past few days some guns have been trained on Labour Ministers. The Tories have been busily promoting a 'flat tax for fat cats. Let us be clear, the tax stays flat for the fat cat but there is a mountain of a tax increase for Britain's hard-working families to climb. If you hear anyone telling you that the Tories, or Ken Clarke in particular, would be more in touch with working people's aspirations than Labour, help them please to a darkened room, they have obviously got a migraine.

Today's Labour Government holds the presidency of both the G8 and the European Union. Through the presidency and with the strong support of the trade union movement, our government are delivering so much that we can all be proud of -- proud of the terms of aid, debt cancellation, trade justice, and action on HIV/AIDS. There is an anti-malarial programme, which will save 600,000 children's lives a year. A programme to ensure that polio, once a cause of disability and poverty across the whole globe, is now on course to be eradicated by the end of this year. I am sure we are all proud of this because this was down to you, having the courage to campaign for and get a Labour Government elected and re-elected. People who you will never meet, never have a conversation with, have had their lives transformed, many saved, by your actions because it is in the end down to us working together. It is not just the senior politicians but to sustain them in their policies it needs people like you to sustain the commitment. Does anyone seriously think the G8 would have been making decisions of this magnitude without the leadership of Tony Blair and Gordon Brown? That is the difference between being in government and being in opposition.

During the presidency of the European Union, I think it is vital that we help shape our continent around the priorities of its working people. I believe that it is Labour's values that offer a way forward. In the months ahead it is the centre left that must keep Europe moving in a progressive direction; it is the centre left that must take on the big issues such as developing social models for Europe that ensure that social justice and economic growth go hand in hand. Some people argue that the current European social model works in all circumstances, but can someone explain to me why we should support without reservation a model that has left 20 million men and women, many of them trades unionists, on mainland Europe, on the dole? Of course, the Labour Government and the labour movement in Britain do not have all the solutions but across Europe we can learn from each other. Those in the European TUC, those in government and those in opposition, from the centre left and progressive politics, can and should work together, but we can be proud of what we have so far achieved.

Some people say our approach is neo-liberal and Thatcherite. I think that is very offensive. We lived through the Thatcher and Major eras. We were elected to deal with the consequences of them. If we had all been pessimists and oppositionists we would have gone under. But we were better than that. We had values, we rescued them at a Labour Party Conference back in Bournemouth in 1985, we stuck to them, we campaigned on them, and put traditional values in a modern setting. We built a coalition of people to support these values. Our challenge now is to sustain that coalition, bring people back on board both to support us and join us and bring new people to us. We have to do something no party has ever managed in political history: we have to renew ourselves in

government, not go to opposition to manage a change. I am sure if pushed there is only a handful of people in this hall who are not proud of what we have done so far in the last eight years. We in the labour movement need to show the confidence to come up with progressive solutions that build a strong economy, modernise our health and welfare systems, improve security for our children, workers and older people across all communities.

Brothers and sisters, let us understand one thing above all else, if we as the left do not rise to these challenges, difficult as they might be, one thing is certain: the right will not only exploit these issues for their own ends, they will come up with their own solutions. Let us not go there. It is our traditional values of economic and social justice that brought us the Warwick Agreement in 2004 and last year we made significant progress. We remain committed to implementing it in full. The agreement is for the whole Parliament, not just for the first few weeks afterwards. We developed it together, trades unions and the party activists from constituencies, and we should be proud of that.

I have always believed that the Labour Party and the trade union movement can be partners in change, as we apply our values to the 21st century. As an optimist I still do. The prize is great. We can be the generation of labour and trade union activists that breaks the cycle of the 20th century, that saw the Tories as the natural party of government and us as the natural party of opposition. For 100 years or more we in the Labour Party have always been told -- and almost always accepted -- that our Movement did not have the capacity to govern the nation. We are only there as a safety valve, in power for a few years, fall out with each other, then hand power back to the Tories. I do not buy into that. With all the humility I can muster, I do believe we have the intellectual capacity, the values, to run a successful economy and build a successful country fit for all our people.

I believe that because of our experiences in everyday life we have the capacity to tear down the barriers that stand in the way of the life opportunities of so many of our fellow human beings here and around the world. Over the next few years do not let us talk ourselves out of power. Have confidence that every minute of every day of every week that there is a Labour Government an individual or a community will have their life chances transformed for good. We can make this century a time for progressive values -- values of economic and social justice, values of full employment, values of public service, values of a proactive welfare state, tearing down the barriers of poverty and inequality. These are our values. These are our challenges. This is our time. This is our opportunity to do the right thing by the pioneers who went before us, those here and now and those yet to come. Let us go and do it. We are up to it. Good luck and thank you.

(Applause)

The President: Thank you, Ian. You are always welcome at the TUC. I have the great pleasure in presenting you with the gold Badge of Congress.

(The presentation was made)

Ian McCartney: Colleagues, this is a very moving moment actually, to get this. My dad is watching. As members of the T&G will know, he was 71 years a member of his trade union. He is not very well at the moment so he will be looking at the conference. I want to say Dad, this is for you. Thanks. *(Applause)*.

Energy and Climate Change

The President: The General Council support the composite motion.

Paul Noon (*Prospect*) moved Composite Motion 16. He said: Climate change is a fact, not an opinion. Scientists -- including members of my union in the Meteorological Office -- have tracked the rise of global temperatures and monitored its impact. The evidence is there for all to see: heatwaves, drought, extreme weather episodes, all happening with increased regularity and severity. The Government's Chief Scientist, Sir David King, told us recently that there is now more carbon in the world's atmosphere than at any time in the last 55 million years. We have melting ice caps, rising sea levels that threaten the existence of some countries.

The situation will get worse, far worse, unless action is taken now, nationally and internationally, to tackle the causes of global warming, mainly greenhouse gas emissions and particularly CO₂. On this issue the Government have a good record in at least two respects: first, priority has been given to dealing with climate change during the presidencies of the EU and the G8. The continued refusal of the Bush Administration to sign the Kyoto Protocol is shameful and dangerous, and the UK and the international community must push hard for an international framework for dealing with this global issue. Hurricanes happened before Katrina and they will happen again, but it is important that the link between human activity and weather change is understood in the US and elsewhere.

The Chancellor this morning mentioned the measures he is taking on the current energy crisis, and I respect the actions he is taking, but perhaps the answer is not simply to pump more oil but to use energy more efficiently and to move towards sustainability.

The other area in which the Government have a good record is that since 1997 they have involved the trade union movement through the Trade Union Sustainable Development Advisory Committee, a joint body co-chaired by Environment Minister Elliot Morley and through which the Government consults unions on sustainability issues, because this is a trade union issue. Not only does the trade union movement have something to say about the big issues of the day -- and this is one of the biggest -- we are also profoundly concerned about health and safety, and health and safety for our members in the wider community does not end at the workplace. We are also affected because moves to a low carbon economy will have a profound effect on the future employment and skills requirements. There will be opportunities and also problems and we have to deal with both. We also need to insist that employers deal with environmental issues through their trades unions.

This composite calls unequivocally for the creation of a Sustainable Development Fund to help joint activity, and this small investment would reap benefits many times greater than the sums involved.

The composite also covers energy policy integral to dealing with climate change. Here the UK Government are less good. The 2003 Energy Policy White Paper leaves the UK dangerously dependent on imported gas and oil, themselves CO₂ generators. Not only does this raise real dangers for the continuity of supply -- and when the gas runs out in Norway we will be at the end of some very long pipelines from some very dangerous places -- but it will also have some very serious economic and financial implications. Householders and industry have experienced a foretaste of this in the recent hike in gas prices. We need greater diversity of supply and particularly from UK non-CO₂ sources. This means wind power and other renewables and we are in favour of investment in all these areas. It also means a continued place for domestic coal and I am sure the NUM will say more on this in seconding the motion. It also means a continuing role for nuclear power generation, at present contributing more than 20 per

cent to the UK's electricity base load, but with all but one of the UK's nuclear power stations due to close by 2020 a balanced affordable assured and environmentally friendly energy policy is required to continue the nuclear contribution, and this must mean new generation capacity.

As trades unions we are collective organisations and only collective organisations will deal with the question of climate change. All our experience is that if we as trades unions act on these issues we will connect with the new generation of environmentally aware young people entering the workplace. For their sake and for ours we must take action now. Please support the composite. I move.

Steve Kemp (*National Union of Mineworkers*) seconded Composite 16.

He said: It should be clear to delegates attending this Conference that there is an energy crisis as I speak to you today, an energy crisis that in reality has been around now for 20 years. I am proud that the NUM has consistently warned that the day would come when the dash for gas and the butchery of the coal industry would lead us to be paying a very high price for our reliance on gas reserves that have a finite value. Witness then the dreadful announcement last week by British Gas that prices are to go up not 5 per cent, not 10 per cent, but 14 per cent, which you the consumer is going to pay. This is the second massive increase in what consumers have had to bear in the past 12 months and the reasons given echo the warnings given by the NUM, and other unions to be fair, for all most 20 years: one, higher oil prices; two, the relentless dash for gas which has depleted our natural gas reserves. Congress, the proverbial chickens are now coming home to roost to make us pay for the incompetent folly of, first, a vindictive Tory Government and then unbelievably an energy policy perpetuated under New Labour.

The British coal industry could and should have been allowed to contribute like it has done in the past to this nation's energy security. The Kyoto Agreement signed by the present government will be a stern test of Britain's resolve on this subject and one as stated in the motion that will have an effect on future employment and, indeed, skills requirements. Whether the cash rich and very powerful green lobby like it or not, we believe that coal will inevitably be a key player in a future energy mix. While we support clean coal technologies the fact is that the Government are importing coal from just about anywhere: 35 million tonnes of the stuff came into the country alone last year. The 2000 Energy White Paper was a cop out, failing to address the energy needs of this country in a succinct and clear manner, culminating in our reliance on foreign imports, the results of which are now clear for everyone to see.

The NUM believes and understands the need for a balanced integrated energy policy including gas, nuclear, coal and renewables to give Britain a stable energy mix whilst at the same time obviously protecting the environment. Congress, the government need to grasp the nettle on energy and grasp it quick: 35 million tonnes imported, 180 pits in 1984, 8 pits in 2005. Britain's miners and their industry have been closed down. It is now decision time: yes to a greener environment; yes to securing clean air for future generations; and yes for the retention of a coal industry mined by British miners.

Patrick Carragher (*BACM-TEAM*) supporting Composite 16 said: I want to make a couple of brief points. The previous speakers have covered much of the ground that needs to be covered in relation to this motion. When I started out as a young union official back in 1980 the coal industry globally produced 4 billion tons. That figure currently is 5 billion and it is set to grow as the developing economies of China and

India continue to expand. So there is no doubt that coal in global terms will continue to be a major component of the energy mix.

The reason for highlighting this is that if we are going to address the issue of climate change, then we are going to have to do that through clean coal technology and carbon capture. It is the developed countries -- the US, Japan and the UK -- that have the opportunity to capitalise on that and to transfer that technology to the developing countries.

The second point I would like to make is that the last White Paper on energy fudged decisions on new nuclear build and what the role for coal is going to be. Those decisions can no longer be left in the current Parliament; they need to be taken now. If they are not taken the danger is that we will go head long into over-dependence on one fuel, which cannot be good, and there will be a danger that the lights will go out. Why do I make that last point? Coal is the only component in the energy mix that allows the grid to manage the variation in load that occurs at tea time, when Coronation Street comes on, and so forth. It is absolutely essential for there to be a coal component, and within that we need an indigenous component. As the developing countries demand grows the international market for internationally traded coal is going to be tight, and it is therefore essential that the Government take a responsible attitude to the indigenous coal industry. I ask for your support.

Barry Montgomery (GMB) speaking in support of Composite 16 said: Britain has been fortunate in having indigenous supplies of fossil fuels and the ability to design and manufacture world leading technologies. However, we are in danger of squandering this advantage by not having a coherent long-term energy policy. The Government have set targets for the UK which are tougher than those agreed at Kyoto, yet here we are in 2005 already falling behind. Why? There has been insufficient investment in alternative technology, let alone a debate on the new generation of nuclear power.

The Government are still relying on market forces to make these changes, and what have market-led policies resulted in so far? Premature reduction of the UK coal industry, more imported coal, premature depletion of UK natural gas resources, more imported gas from more volatile sources such as the former Soviet Union, and, very important, skill shortages, and government loans to stop British Energy going bankrupt. The UK had a world lead in wind farm technology but left it to the Danes, the Germans and the Spanish to develop it. We had a world lead in tide and wave power but only one pilot plant in the Orkneys. The Portuguese have ordered three full size plants from the UK, but the next orders are not likely to be made in Britain but made in Portugal. We have had the ability to build clean coal plants for many years but do we have one? No. If you want to use solar where is it made? Again, not in the UK but in Germany. We have number of small companies manufacturing microgeneration plants in the UK but when it comes to the price to be paid for any excess generation returned to the grid the government say it is up to the market.

If you want to have a safe, cleaner environment we need an energy policy linked to the needs of the country, the price we pay for it, security of supplies and jobs. Congress, remember energy in the wrong hands can be dangerous. We need long-term manufacturing of equipment in the U.K.

I ask you to support. Thank you.

* *Composite 16 was CARRIED*

Greening the workplace

Michael Walsh (Community) moved Composite Motion 17.

He said: The G8 Summit this year focused on curbing global warming as well as making poverty history. In both areas the British trade union movement is, as usual, on the side of the angels, but we rarely get any credit for this, particularly in respect of environmental issues because we are seen as producers of the harmful emissions, part of the problem rather than the solution.

The work of the Trade Union Sustainable Development Advisory Committee gives a convincing riposte to that view. TUSDAC makes a substantial contribution to finding solutions by developing forward thinking and effective measures to combat this most urgent global challenge – urgent, and the timing of our efforts is crucial.

In the next 25 years about £10 trillion will be invested in meeting global needs for energy, but only a small part of that amazing total will be spent in the UK, which presently accounts for between 2 percent – 3 percent of all global carbon emissions. Through the TUC, we could be a model for trade union involvement internationally in action at the workplace and in the community to promote sustainable development. We could play a crucial and irreplaceable role in helping to steer the investment into clean energy technologies. We could help steer it away from locking into new plant- avoidable global warming emissions for decades to come.

Through TUSDAC the TUC is mobilising constructive union responses to the challenges of climate change, but we could be even more effective. Our motion would press the Government to acknowledge and enhance the trade union role of greening the workplace. It would mean amending the ACAS Code of Practice and recognising workplace environmental representatives, and they would need to be equipped with skills and knowledge to fulfil these key responsibilities, so we need public support for training courses open to working people who are ready to take on a workplace environmental role.

Our engagement is for the common good of our society and our children and grandchildren. But we also have a direct interest in the jobs which may be lost and gained today through the environmental decisions we take. Of course, there are opportunities to create jobs in the renewable technology being created now, and we believe that the Government should advance research and development in these technologies in the context of the national strategy for manufacturing.

Sometimes it seems that the climate change strategy envisages the complete demise of British manufacturing. It seems, even, that senior ministers contemplate this with some equanimity. Hence, the "let them stack cake" remark at a time when the T&G and other unions were trying to save production at MG Rover. But the loss of British manufacturing industry would not help tackle global warming. On the contrary, production lost in Britain would be made up in other countries where the chances are that energy efficiency would be lower and emission rates higher than in the UK. Yet the present British liberalised pricing policy means that British industry pays a minimum of 10 per cent more for gas than all other EU countries. For electricity we also pay top whack along with the Germans, Dutch and Italians. This makes it most difficult for the steel, ceramics, glass and other British industries to compete in the EU, and steel is an infinitely recyclable and an environmentally friendly material. The loss of this industry would weaken our capacity as a nation to combat climate change.

Delegates, carry the motion and keep up a proud TUC record of advancing the common good.

Kim Gainsborough (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*) in seconding the composite motion, said: President and Congress, imagine what it would be like to be unable to breath properly, to cough, wheeze and splutter, to gasp and grab at the air, desperate to get enough into the lungs. It is terrifying. You never know if the breath you are taking will be your last.

Every year respiratory physiotherapists treat many thousands of people with lung disease. These people report that poor air quality worsens their symptoms. As you will know, road transport is a major cause of air pollution. Government targets for safe levels of nitrogen dioxide should be less than 40 micrograms per cubic metre of air. Earlier this year, a study by the CSP found that levels in parts of London were more than twice that level. Even a stroll along the promenade here in Brighton exposes you to higher levels than that deemed safe.

Another pollutant emitted by diesel vehicles are those nasty noxious particles known as PM-10s. These irritate the airways and find their way deep down into the lungs causing breathing difficulties even in healthy people. Studies show that exposure contributed to thousands of deaths and new cases of asthma and bronchitis each year. The World Health Organisation states that there are no safe limits for these particles and yet the CSP study found that high levels of PM-10s exist in areas across the UK. Clean air should be a right, not a privilege.

We at the CSP call on the General Council to lobby the Government to ban high polluting vehicles from our city centres, to force all diesel manufacturers to fit filters to their cars and to make public transport clean, reliable and affordable. As individuals we can lobby our councils to improve facilities for cyclists and campaign in the workplace for cycle allowances and other incentives to discourage car use. So think before jumping into your cars. Even the RAC motoring organisation proposed that people make short journeys by foot. Walking and cycling, for those of us who can, will improve our own health and make a valuable contribution to improving air quality for those whose very lives depend on it. Thank you.

Ivan Monckton (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) in supporting the composite motion, said: I am a member of the Rural and Agricultural Workers' Section of the T&G. The RAAW has been at the vanguard of environmentally sound trade unionism for at least the 30 years that I have been involved.

Let me give you a little bit of history. 245-T has never been officially banned but, in effect, banned because of a campaign led by our trade union. That is Agent Orange for those of you who do not remember, and you used to be able to buy it in practically any shop in the country.

We have promoted pesticide reduction policies; we have promoted organic agriculture; we have been against blanket afforestation with Sitka Spruce and, lately, we were very active in the anti-hunting campaign. At this present moment, we are campaigning for the use of bio-ethanol. So we have a proud history within the T&G and within the agricultural section.

The first part of this motion calls for government action on environmental reps; on ensuring that the skills and training is in place; and on developing awareness. It calls on unions to negotiate sustainable workplace agreements. I can tell you, colleagues, that we need to do a little more than that. If we are not going to be accused of ticking a little box which says we are green or attaching a green flag to our headed notepaper, then we are going to have to do more. Just think of Investors in People. Does the Investors in People flag mean that the firm is a good employer.

We all know damned well that it does not, and we have to make sure that we are truly environmentally-minded and not just carrying a green flag.

What do we need to do? Well, first of all, we need to train our environmental reps. We have some money from whoever, but we need to train our own environmental reps when we get them. We need to do a lot of soul searching, colleagues. For a start, how about an environmental audit of all our individual unions' policies? It sounds pretty easy, but many unions, including my own, would have difficulties in doing that, but those are the sort of issues that we are going to have to take on board.

We need a change of culture and we need to do a lot to develop awareness of our own members. If we can do this, along with the actions that we have asked for from the Government, our members will be working in a healthier and safer environment. What is more, we will be ensuring a future for our great grandchildren. Finally, we will become attractive to young people. Just look around the room. There are not many people under 30 here. When you heard the choir earlier on, ask yourselves how many of those would be natural trade unionists? If we take on board environmental issues and act with integrity, those people who we heard earlier on will be joining our union in the future.

The President: I am going to move to the vote. The General Council supports the composite.

* *Composite Motion 17 was CARRIED.*

Re-nationalisation

Ian Lavery (*National Union of Mineworkers*) moved Motion 61.

He said: If the coal industry is not re-nationalised, there will not be a coal industry in the next 18 months. That is the stark reality of the situation and that is why the NUM has put this motion forward at this TUC Conference. It is not a scare tactic but a fact of life.

The Energy White Paper produced in the winter of 2002 said that coal had a small role to play. It occupied two lines in a very thick document. But how do we best deliver the coal to the nation? There are two options. The first option is that we leave it in the hands of UK Coal, one of the worst employers in the history of mining, or we take it back into public ownership. Since privatisation in 1995, 22 out of 29 collieries have closed. We produced, in 1995, 53 million tonnes of coal. Last year we produced less than 6 million tonnes. We have now, roughly, 3,000 miners left in Britain.

I have to explain to you the role of UK Coal. They are absolutely despicable. They have conned, connived, deceived and lied about their intentions in relation to the coal industry. We attended a meeting not so long ago and they explained, "It is not a coal industry any more, Mr. Lavery. It is a business. Will you stop calling it 'an industry'". They explained that they were not committed to coal but committed to the shareholders, and that was the most important thing for UK Coal.

In the last six months, they have closed one colliery, mothballed two collieries and put one colliery in the Colliery Review Procedure. Last year they closed the Selby complex in Yorkshire, which was the jewel in the crown. It was producing coal at £1.20 per gigajoule. On the spot market at this point in time, it is £2 per gigajoule. It was the crime of the century, but they were allowed to get away with it by the Labour Government.

Last week the Rossington mineworkers, the last pit in the Doncaster coalfield, were notified by UK Coal's six monthly financial statement that their colliery was to close. There were no meetings, no consultations, no texts and no megaphones. Financial statements! They have no affinity with coal but they have an

affinity with land development, and that is exactly what they are doing. They are changing the industry from coal to land. In the Cannock Loft, they have the land which they bought when they bought the collieries in 1995, which is colossal. They have 49,000 acres of prime land. They are getting in excess of £100 million of your money and my money in terms of Coal Industry Aid – CIA. One hundred million! The basic criteria for Coal Industry Aid is to maintain jobs and maintain collieries. They have done exactly the opposite and the Government have not done a thing to stop it. In fact, the role of Malcolm Wicks, the new Energy Minister, has been absolutely atrocious. The NUM wrote to him two months ago and a month ago regarding a meeting to discuss the industry and we have not had a reply since.

However, he has met with the scab union, the UDM, on two occasions. The UDM is not recognised by the Labour Party or by the TUC, yet a Labour Minister is meeting them rather than meeting the NUM. It is an absolute scandal, comrades.

But, at the end of the day, we have to look at the situation facing us. Should any particular form of energy, be it nuclear, gas or coal, be left to the vagaries of the free market? Of course it should not. We need to look at each industry individually. I am a firm supporter of the re-nationalisation of everything that has been privatised, but this motion is in relation to coal.

Comrades, this motion represents common sense for Britain. By the year 2020 we will be a net importer of energy to the tune of 90 per cent, 70 percent of which will be gas from the most unstable of countries. We have the workforce, we have the technology, we have the reserves and we have the ability to burn coal cleanly. Why do we not do it.? Thank you.

Alan Donnelly (*Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers & Firemen*) seconded motion 61.

He said: The future of our country's energy supply and of the deep mine coal industry is in real peril. The destruction of Britain's pits and the ripping up of the mining communities was the most vindictive and political sabotage of modern times. For fifty years historians will be asking themselves, "How the hell did the Tories get away with that?" However, today we have to deal with the potential final elimination of the coal industry.

UK Coal is not just a mining company but a property company. Some of the land on which the surviving deep mines are found is now worth a fortune and provides a big incentive for private owners to asset strip the industry by shutting mines and flogging the land. That explained the closure of Ellington, the last deep mine in the north-east. Publicly we are told that the pit had to be closed because of flooding. In fact, the problems had been solved. Rest assured that if any of Britain's handful of remaining deep pits encountered the slightest problem they will be closed.

Within a few years, if the Government allow to continue to run the industry, all our coalmines will have gone. Conversely, the price of oil is rising rapidly, the supply of gas is not assured and open cast mining will continue to be met with public hostility. If not, we will see a greater amount of imported coal, another source of energy which cannot be guaranteed, which will affect our balance of payments.

Whilst competitor countries are developing their coal fields, we are closing ours down. This is economic madness. On top of that, the death of the remaining pits will cost thousands of jobs in the pit areas and related industries. We really are at a crunch time in mining. We have to put as much pressure on the Government as possible to save our industry and to secure the future of our energy supplies.

Congress, when I arrived in Brighton on Saturday, I walked along the seafront like everybody else and I could not believe where, in this land that we live on, which lies on a bed of coal, and surrounded by water which was once polluted only by fish, it all went wrong. Whilst I was walking along the beach, it came to me where we went wrong. Not all the donkeys are at the seaside.

Tim Davison (*Amicus*) in supporting the motion, said: Let me tell you that I am on the Amicus Energy and Utilities National Sector Committee.

Chair and Congress, the production and consumption of energy is a key issue which must be addressed now. All of us are acutely aware of climate change and the threat that is posed to the environment. The reduction of carbon emissions is essential to prevent global warming and to protect the environment for future generations.

In March of this year Amicus held a conference entitled 'Energy in Crisis'. Amongst the many issues discussed were the consequences of the UK's reliance on imported energy. We already import half our coal supplies and by 2020 we could be dependent on imported energy for three-quarters of our total primary energy needs.

We share concerns that a reliance on imported energy will create a dangerous dependency on energy from less stable parts of the world. An over reliance on foreign imports from one energy source will, inevitably, make the UK industry and consumers hostage to energy price hikes. British Energy recently announced that its gas and electricity prices would rise by 14 percent and other big players, such as PowerGen and EDF, are set to follow suit. For the old, the vulnerable and less well-off fuel poverty will not be made history.

Amicus supports a balanced energy policy that promotes the use of all available energy in the most productive manner possible and to the best economic, social and environmental effect. This should include conventional fossil fuels, coal, oil, gas, renewables and nuclear, all of which we believe are essential components in a balanced energy policy. However, reserves of coal in the UK remain large and contribute significantly to the security, flexibility and diversity of energy supply. With the right level of investment in clean coal technology, there is a long-term future for the UK's deep mine industry.

The development of clean coal technologies and options for carbon capture will contribute towards cutting greenhouse gases and are supported in the Government's White Paper. Restoring the UK's international lead in clean coal technology could help develop a strategically important export industry. We do not envisage a return to the former glory days of the British coal industry. However, investment by the Government in a new generation of coal-fired power stations is essential to secure the security of supply and fuel diversity.

The re-nationalisation of the coal industry requires the investment of public finances. This means putting money back into the mines to ensure that they run efficiently and safely.

We applaud the NUM for the work it has done on raising the issue of energy in the UK. Now is a crucial time for the UK to take stock of the energy crisis and to look to develop its indigenous energy supply.

We call for immediate government action and intervention to re-invest in the coal mining industry. Please support. Thank you.

The President: The General Council is supporting Motion 61.

* *Motion 61 was CARRIED.*

Industrial Policy

Derek Simpson (*Amicus*) moved Composite Motion 10.

He said: Congress, I was very heartened this morning listening to Gordon Brown's contribution. One of the things that I found extremely pleasing was the fact that he affirmed quite clearly that the Warwick proposals that we agreed with the Government and through the Party prior to the election would be honoured and implemented in full. I think that is quite important. I have heard people suggesting that there may be some backsliding on Warwick, and it was heartening to have the Chancellor's confirmation.

However, our concern is that Warwick was only the start of a process. What we need to know is where we stand currently and in what direction we will travel. We are firmly convinced that the absence of full employment protection rights, as applied in the rest of Europe and watered down in the UK, leaves UK workers at greater risk. It is easier, cheaper and politically expedient to dismiss UK workers than it is to dismiss our colleagues in Italy, France, Germany or comparable advanced countries in Europe. That is a situation which sees our jobs disappear at a faster rate than elsewhere.

We keep getting told that we do not want to have the unemployment levels of Germany, without, of course, acknowledging the economic problems of Germany of the reunification process. We keep getting told that manufacturing decline is a worldwide phenomenon but no explanation as to why it declines at twice the rate in the UK than it does in France. I keep telling people about the railway industry. As the second largest user of the rail product, how come we have only one train builder, and we would have lost that if there had not been a campaign from this movement, yet there is not a German train built outside of Germany and there is not a French train built outside of France. Why is it that we cannot organise ourselves to support and protect our industries?

Also in Warwick is the question of procurement. We need to ensure that the Government's immense spending power is utilised to promote, at every possible opportunity, UK employment.

What is important to me in this period when people are speculating about the future of the Government and who might replace the Prime Minister is an indication of the direction. Warwick is where the weathercock sits at the moment. Some of us who were involved in that process know that some of the points were like pulling teeth. Do we now see Warwick as the high water mark, the point beyond which we cannot go in the reform of employment law, or do we see it as a staging post along the way to a full, level and equal playing field with the rest of Europe? I want it to be the latter. I want our members, I want the people of this country, to know that our Labour Government are leaving no stone unturned to do for us what governments in other countries do for their workers. I do not want false protections and I do not want to see other people at risk and cost because of our protectionism, but when we talk about a level playing field I do not mean a level playing field by bringing our conditions down to those of the third world or eastern Europe. I want a level playing field that sees trade unions, trade unionists and workers in those countries brought up to our level. I do not want to see long-term, proper core skilled jobs, for example, being replaced with temporary, part-time agency workers. I do not want those jobs being replaced in such a way that the only way we achieve equal pay in our society is to make sure that men's wages fall to the level at which they reach the level of women's pay. I want to see a situation where – perhaps Congress would look to the back of the hall to the DARA banner – where we protect those jobs. Here is an example of highly

skilled workers, with a massive investment a facility in St. Athan, second to none for the maintenance of aircraft, yet those workers are going to lose their jobs. Those are the jobs that we should be protecting. Those are the jobs that Gordon referred to that we should be developing.

Why were you not on your feet giving the Chancellor a standing ovation for a speech that took every emotional button that you could expect? I'll tell you why, colleagues. It was because his speech was at odds with the reality. We are losing the jobs we need to keep and we are intent on making sure that we do get the advances so that we do not lose the Government we want to keep. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Debbie Coulter (*GMB*) seconded Composite Motion 10.

She said: Congress, the European Union Presidency is a golden opportunity for this Government to champion high skill, high quality manufacturing industries as a focus for job creation. Instead, the Government are on a sales drive to export their flexible labour market policies. I say to any country which finds these salesmen knocking on the door, "Don't be fooled because the job creation record that they are trying to sell you is built on shifting sands". These 'here today, gone tomorrow' jobs condemn a growing section of our labour force to work in poverty and chronic insecurity. I want to tell the Government: don't present us with false choices between economic prosperity or strong employment and social rights. The point is that without these rights the fruits of prosperity fall only to the wealthy few.

The UK is way down the productivity league, yet we are working the longest hours in Europe. The Government are fighting tooth and nail to keep the 48 hour opt-out. It is madness. How can we take seriously their commitments on work life balance and help for working parents when the Government are quite happy for people to work 50 or 60 hours a week to suit employers.

In relation to our temporary and agency workers, once again the Government are among the ringleaders, blocking equal treatment rights which would stop the Gate Gourmets of this world using agency workers as scabs.

These wrecking antics must stop, and I call, instead, upon the Government to use the presidency positively to stamp out once and for all the despicable country of origin principle in the EU services proposal and to embrace public procurement as a means of promoting a strong UK industrial base.

Tell me this: how can it be right that Remploy workers – not the highest paid workers in the land and, yes, Gordon, renowned for their efficiency and value for money – who make the security work wear for the MoD and the chemical warfare suits that our emergency workers now rely on, are having their livelihoods threatened as such critical work is shipped off elsewhere? I hope that you will join with me in expressing support for those workers in their current struggle. (*Applause*)

Congress, in our response to the latest public procurement consultation, the GMB has made a little suggestion to the Government, and it is that since schools, hospital and GPs all have to stand up and be held accountable through league tables, why should not the same apply to any contractor who wants a public contract? Let's have a league table based on contractors' employment standards, their ability to run to budget and to complete on time. Let's put integrity back into how public money is spent, let's give Britain a secure industrial future and let's support Composite 10.

Terry Eden (*Connect*) speaking in support of Composite Motion 10.

He said: I want to focus on public procurement and the role it can play in driving forward social and environmental goals and, in particular, raising labour standards. The money public authorities spend on buying goods and services amounts to £108 billion every year from major capital projects to buying office stationery. Our public money supports private business. It is right that our public money should be used to encourage the private sector to support social goals. It is in the public interest that companies invest in high labour standards and measure which protect the environment. It is in the public interest that companies are good employers, and it is in the public interest that public authorities should go beyond laying down simple technical specifications for goods and services. Contracts should oblige companies to meet social and environmental goals. For example, in the interest of equal opportunity and social cohesion, publicly funded contracts should require companies to be actively committed to race equality. I have chosen this example because, in a Cabinet report, the Government themselves have recommended this course of action.

As we heard yesterday from Ken Livingstone, the LDA is already working hard to ensure that the Olympic contracts set new standards in social justice.

A new European law, which must be implemented by January, enables and encourages the inclusion of social goals in the tendering process. There is support from some sections of the business community; those good employers who invest in high labour standards but have to compete with those who do not.

The Government, however, appear very reluctant to take any practical steps in this direction. All around we hear the sound of dragging feet. Commitment to real progress from the heart of the Government is lukewarm at best. Value for money is defined too narrowly. Complaints about burdens on business are accepted too readily and social goals are abandoned too easily. That is why we must keep up the pressure. Writing social goals into public procurement contracts is not difficult. It is not in conflict with EU policy and it can be done, and unions, both in the public and private sectors, can work together to make sure that good intentions become real commitments. Please support.

Len McCluskey (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) speaking in support of Composite Motion 10, said: It was interesting listening to Gordon this morning, just as we did when he toured the trade union conferences this summer declaring the Government's commitment to manufacturing. Well, they were fine words, but let us just reflect on the position since Labour came to power.

Eight hundred thousand manufacturing jobs have been lost. That is about 20 percent of the manufacturing sector. Manufacturing cannot just be seen as an isolated part of the economy. There are thousands of workers in the services sector whose livelihoods depend on a vibrant manufacturing base. We have just seen the collapse of Rover and the devastating effects and consequences for the community, and although brave efforts were made and the saga is on-going to keep car production at Longbridge, the truth is that the policy options were severely limited. That is why this composite calls for the Government to be prepared to take a public stake in key enterprises. It is about time the Government's thinking got in touch with public thinking. Ninety per cent of British people, according to ICM research commissioned by the T&G, believe the Government should be doing more to support manufacturing. That should come as no surprise when this Government, despite the Chancellor's words, offer 30 percent less support to industry than our European counterparts. In France the level of support is twice that in the UK. In Germany and Italy it is three times

higher. Colleagues, is it little wonder that we continue to decline at an alarming rate?

The T&G welcomes the establishment of the Manufacturing Task Force and will continue to use this as a means to get practical support, not just words and sympathy. At Warwick the Government committed themselves to promote a procurement strategy to safeguard UK jobs and to review best business support, but some people in Government seem to think that a level playing field means stopping other governments from supporting their own industries. That is not a European level playing field; that is a European scorched earth policy.

As Brendan Barber said yesterday in his excellent address to Congress, we do not expect to see a Labour Government – I repeat, a Labour Government – undermining social Europe. Whilst the European Parliament voted to end the 48-hour opt-out from the Working Time Directive, our Government insists on its retention. While the insidious neo-liberal Services Directive has seen opposition all across Europe, our Government, in their presidency, want to help to push it through.

Comrades, I have not come here to bash the Government. I just want them to listen to the millions of ordinary workers who are as frustrated as we are. We do not want to grow the economy through low paid jobs and burger bars or by opening up public services to private capital. We want good quality, high waged jobs which provide decent employment and can fund first class public services. Please support.

Ivan Moldaczuk (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 10.

He said: Chair and Congress, every year 40 per cent of construction output is for public sector work, and one would think that with the Government and other public bodies being both client and paymaster this would make a real difference in the way that workers would be treated on site. Unfortunately, since the 1980s, when the Thatcher Government outlawed contract compliance and scrapped the Fair Wages Resolution, the over-riding determinant in awarding contracts has been price, irrespective of whether this means no direct employment, no training, no pension provision and no minimum safety standards. With much of the work being sub-contracted to the bogus self-employed so as to gain tax advantages and not pay employers' National Insurance contributions.

After eight years in government it is high time that Labour started taking the social dimension of work seriously, and here we welcome the small steps taken by the Scottish Parliament to address this issue.

In 2012 the Olympics come to London with large areas of the capital becoming one giant building site, providing employment for many young people in construction for the first time. It is high time that the Government took a lead. It is time the Government changed their procurement policies by insisting that bogus self-employed labour is not used on public contracts; by insisting that provision for training exists on site and that all workers are processed through the Construction Skill Certification Scheme; by insisting that minimum standards exist regarding health and safety and pensions, and by making sure that those contractors with a bad health and safety record are excluded from tender lists.

Finally, Chair, we have to be crystal clear on the issue of effective auditing and verification, without which the impact of these objectives would be blunted. Support the composite.

Graeme Henderson (*Prospect*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 10.

He said: Congress, the Government are currently consulting on a Better Regulation Bill. This is based upon a report by Philip Hampton, who is the CEO of Sainsbury's that 'highly profitable' company which has gone through so many problems. The report was euphemistically titled report 'Reducing Administrative Burdens: Effective Inspection and Enforcement'. It also drew on a Better Regulation Task Force Report, where the spin doctors worked overtime to come up with the title 'Less is More'.

Together these reports contain proposals which are totally inimical to us as trade unions and a threat to us as consumers. One of the central proposals is to reduce by a third the total number of government regulatory inspections. This is not based upon any risk or cost-benefit analysis, which feature prominently in Hampton's report, and as such he is guilty of the very thing that he decries. Hampton lists the largest regulators by expenditure, which we suspect is, in itself, extremely significant.

Prospect has 8,000 members involved in regulation, in areas as diverse as HSE, the State Veterinary Service, MCA, English Heritage and the Insolvency Service, just to name a few. Our view that inspection is the major reason why companies comply with legislation is based upon clear experience and evidence.

Do Ministers and others have short memories? Who can forget the burning pyres of cows, sheep and other livestock as a result of foot and mouth? Who can forget the smell of roast beef and lamb wafting across our countryside?

A recent outbreak of Newcastle disease, which, by the way, has nothing to do with the failure of the football team to win a major trophy, recently resulted in the mass slaughter of 9,000 pheasants and led to a ban on exports worth £140 million. We, in Prospect, recognise that pheasant may not feature on the dining tables of most trade unionists, but it certainly shows that self-regulation does not work.

Do we forget BSE and the damage which was done not only to the economy but also to the country's reputation? Congress, in the field of health and safety, all the available evidence, including HSE's own independent research, shows that the best motivator of companies to comply is the fear of getting caught. In addition, other research shows that most employers welcome HSE's inspections. This view has recently been endorsed by OSHA, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, in the United States, who believe that inspections lead to higher compliance. This is an extremely welcome statement from George Bush's America, but as a revelation it is probably as revealing as George Bush's inquiry into his own incompetence.

However, there are some things that we would support, such as higher fines for recidivist employers who continually offend, but we reject Hampton's assertion that this will, and I quote, "improve compliance and reduce the number of inspections required". This is completely counter-intuitive. Higher fines will not act as a deterrent unless there is an effective system for inspection, regulation and enforcement. It is essential that the TUC and individual unions campaign against the deregulatory movement which is taking place in this country. Thank you.

Basil Morriss (*Community*) speaking in support of Composite Motion 10, said:

President I am grateful to you for letting me contribute to the urgent plea for the Government to make the survival of British manufacturing the foremost economic objective for Britain. I speak for a union determined to see that the values of solidarity and support are sustained in British communities built around manufacturing. Those communities are under threat from the continual loss of good jobs in

manufacturing which now offers fertile ground for racism and religious fundamentalism.

Those communities have every right to prosper and they deserve more from our Government which have achieved a relatively fast rate of growth but we have paid dearly by losing jobs at an alarming rate with many industries decimated.

Our Government need to take this issue as a priority. We noted Gordon Brown this morning pledging to do so, but it is our third term and strong action is overdue.

The CBI and other employers' organisations, for their part, are obsessed with resisting the further development of a strong framework to guarantee respect for the rights in employment and for working people in the European Union. They, too, are failing in their responsibility to fight the corner for British manufacturing. These failures explain why Britain has low rates of public investment in research and development, and why we should be the ones whose ideological attachment to market forces make our public procurement policies the least helpful to national producers among EU countries.

The Government must act to deliver their Warwick commitments. They must push out the boundaries in promoting manufacturing jobs through public spending. They must drop their insistence of non-intervention where other governments use their powers to the limit to attract and sustain manufacturing in their own countries.

Our textile industries have suffered in an unprecedented way. Interpretation of EU rules on procurement has left workers the poor relations and we have come off far worse than our colleagues in Europe.

We ask you to support the motion. Thank you, President.

The President: The General Council supports the composite.

* *Composite Motion 10 was CARRIED.*

Education Funding

Steve Wharton (*Association of University Teachers*) moved Composite Motion 14.

He said: The regrettable decision last year to introduce variable top-up fees from September 2006 will do little or nothing to reverse the decline in higher education funding. It will reduce rather than increase participation in higher education from lower socio-economic groups. By virtue of its contribution to the United Kingdom, higher education, as with further education and compulsory education, should be funded by and from progressive general taxation. That is how you ensure that those who benefit financially put back what is a right and fair proportion of what they have taken out.

When it comes to contributing to HE and FE, and let us just look at the situation of the staff who work in this area, for more than 20 years salaries in higher education have declined by 40 percent in real terms compared to average earnings, as the Prime Minister himself has acknowledged. Report after report has said that something has to be done to address salaries in the sector, and yet the Government have shirked their responsibilities in this area by pretending that top-up fees will put more money in and solve the funding problems.

Vice chancellors and principals, those who supposedly lead universities and whose own wages are, strangely enough, determined by remuneration committees with settlements which far outstrip anything they ever give their staff, played the Government's game and said they needed variable top-up fees to address the funding crisis in the sector. They even went so far as to

tell Alan Johnson when he was Minister for HE and Life Long Learning that at least one-third of the extra money coming in from variable top-up fees would go towards staff wages. That is what he told Parliament when the bill was going through its various stages. Yet, this year, when we started negotiating with representatives of vice chancellors and principals, they played fast and loose with us, telling us that they could not guarantee any such thing in 2006 when the top-up fees are introduced. "Oh, no", they said, "the pattern of funding for higher education was not clear." They could not necessarily commit to this. There was the whole question of looking generally at enhancing the student experience.

Congress, I ask you, how are you going to enhance a student's experience when he or she is having to work so hard to pay his or her loans and fees that his or her assessment deadlines slip or he or she is taught by overworked and under-paid staff who are not even going to be given the money the vice chancellors said would be coming into the sector? *(Applause)*

President, Congress, the purpose of this composite is to take the VCs and principals head on. It is about making them face up to the promises they made to government in getting them to introduce the iniquitous variable top-up fee regime and the inevitable marketisation of higher education that will follow. We need to make sure that top-up fees are not a disincentive to entering HE. We need to make sure that at least a third of the extra money goes into staff pay packets, as vice chancellors and principals said it would. We need to resist the marketisation of HE that top-up fees will bring with the inevitable impacts on access for those whose inability to pay will conflict with their ability to learn.

As the rest of this composite motion makes clear, our colleagues in the FE sector have similar funding problems without the luxury of the promised top-up income. We should also not forget that 12 percent of HE is now delivered in an FE context. Despite their best efforts, dedication and commitment, how can those already under-funded colleagues hope to deliver when already demoralised staff are asked to do more with less?

Support this composite. Make vice chancellors and principals face up to their responsibilities, ensure that top-up fees and marketisation do not prevent from attending the very people the Government say they are intended to help and ensure that those who work in post compulsory education, FE or HE, get proper pay and recognition for the hard work they do.

Peter Pendle (*Association for College Management*) seconded Composite Motion 14.

He said: ACM is pleased to be seconding this composite motion. We will concentrate our comments on the second part of the motion on further and adult education. Two years ago, this association brought a motion to Congress calling for Level 2 entitlements for adult learners. That motion was carried and we were delighted to see the Government take our collective advice and introduce such an entitlement about a year later.

Adults lacking a Level 2 qualification now have an entitlement to study a Level 2 course free. There are even some modest grants available to the least well-off learners. Furthermore, we are seeing the first shoots of a Level 3 entitlement.

All this represents significant progress in creating better access to learning for many disadvantaged people. However, the resources that have been diverted to support the Level 2 entitlement and other priorities, such as Schools for Life and the National Employer Training pilots, have come at the cost of other areas of adult provision. The situation is further exacerbated by the policy that gives 16 to 19 year-old

provision first call on resources, particularly as we are experiencing a 16 to 19 year-old bulge just now.

The Government consider that there are some areas of adult provision in respect of which it is reasonable to reduce the state subsidy and increase the price to individual learners. We agree that relatively affluent learners merit less support from the public purse. We concur that where cash is limited, the available resources should be targeted on creating the right learning opportunities for people with no or few qualifications who have difficulty in accessing the job market.

However, that has not been the impact of the current funding arrangements. Special needs students, people needing basic skills tuition and the first step courses that bring members of our least integrated communities into education are amongst those who have been hit by the cuts in adult provision. Furthermore, people who want to study an element of a Level 2 course as a step towards a full qualification rather than study a full Level 2 course straight off do not fall within the Level 2 entitlements. Whilst there are positive aspects to the current policy, the negative side is that it has caused colleges to cut a great deal of provision which colleges offer those many learners who most need state supported learning opportunities. Colleges have to turn these people away.

We call on the Government to recognise the funding of adult education, to reconsider the funding of adult education, to increase the resource to support not only L2E, National Employer Training pilots and Schools for Life, but also those other aspects of adult provision that are critically important to social inclusion and cultural integration. Please support the composite motion.

Stuart Herdson (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*) supported Composite Motion 14.

He said: ATL are happy to support Composite Motion 14. We thoroughly support the first half of the composite on top-up fees by AUT. However, I am not going to concentrate on that. We have actually spoken on that before. Congress and the General Council know our views. We will speak on the second half of the composite, which is the original motion by ACM.

Congress, 6 to 7 million adults lack skills either to get a job or to get promoted within this country. That is a shame. Yet the LSC, by focusing on courses, which are for 14 to 19 year-olds, has told colleges to generate more income from fees. We heard today that there are actually people, who are 19 years old, queuing up in colleges like Nottingham and the colleges are turning them away in favour of getting 16 to 18 year-olds.

This has three effects on the colleges: (1) the fees increase and that hits those on low pay or pensions the hardest, so they do not participate; (2) the courses are then cut and (3) jobs are then lost. The first to go are the leisure learning courses, the Ti Chi, flower arranging and yoga. However we might decry these and say it is only leisure but they are a way back into education for some people who are unemployed. More important are the adults' access courses and the basic skills courses. Colleges have used the fees excuse to get a fuller rationalisation of courses and the result is even more job losses. In my own area in Bradford, the college lost over 100 jobs and in Keighley over 50 jobs were lost. Transfer that nationally and you reach the figure of 10,000.

The very people who can deliver the skills are being asked to leave. Is that what Gordon wanted this morning? We are now in the stupid position created by the LSC and the Government between them. If you want skills for the regeneration of depressed areas, Gordon, you need adults to learn new skills; if you want skills for a higher productivity, Gordon, then you

need a workforce to be up-skilled and if you want people to work in better conditions, Gordon, then they need to have higher skills.

These are now being denied to them. Now we have the crazy position of the unemployed not going on training courses because they lose money and they prefer to be unemployed rather than to retrain. We ask the General Council to campaign for a properly funded education sector that can deliver high quality adult education which is of benefit, not just to the individual, but to the country as well. Support the composite motion.

David Jones (*Amicus*) supported Composite Motion 14.

He said: I am from the higher education section. Colleagues, Amicus represents the technical support staff in the universities. We are the invisible workforce that works behind the scenes to provide the service that your children who attend the universities hopefully enjoy and benefit from. I agree totally with the two previous speakers. Both being lecturers, they put it far better than me because that is their job. We have always worked together, both academic and technical support staff, because, essentially, we both need each other. (*Applause*)

Certainly within the universities, there is a moral debate about top-up fees and the technical dilemma or the technicians' dilemma is: "If I do not pay the fees for my kids, does that mean I will not get my pay rise?" This is a situation which the Government and the employers like. However, this issue is about government funding. This morning the Government promised higher education for all. To accomplish that effectively, they have to pay university staff properly. Technicians are paid less than their colleagues in the private sector. This parity must be addressed.

At the Government's request, we undertook with the employers a process to streamline our pay scales and go through a job evaluation scheme to justify our places on those pay scales. That was a rigorous and very painful exercise in every way. Now it is pay-back time.

Conference, whether through top-up fees or not, the Government have a moral obligation to pay us a proven fair wage. The Government also has the moral obligation to carry out an equal pay audit between the public and private sectors, which it promised to do two years ago. Mr Brown, if you want education, education, education, show me the money. Thank you.

The President: Is the AUT happy to waive their right of reply? Thank you very much. I now put Composite Motion 14 to the vote.

* *Composite Motion 14 was CARRIED*

Education, science and research in Europe

Gargi Bhattacharyya (*Association of University Teachers*) moved Motion 49 whilst carrying her baby.

She said: As all of my colleagues said in respect of the last composite, education workers have really had enough of hearing about the values of the knowledge economy. I have brought my kid's toy to show how it sounds to us now. (*Demonstrates*) We have heard that one before! We have been hearing it for eight years. It does not seem to have made much difference to what our working lives are like.

This is a motion about trying to value what higher education brings to all of our lives, not just economically, but in a wider sense than that. We, as a union, and my members, do not really believe that higher education is just about a European heritage. We do not think that it belongs to us alone. We think it is international, that it is about human values and that everyone should benefit from that kind of higher learning. Yes, we think that knowledge and research

are about jobs, but we think it is about so much more than jobs. Of course, research makes a good economy; it makes innovation and we need to build science if we are going to save manufacturing.

However, even more than that, a healthy society needs us to value what human beings can learn, know, remember and keep. That cannot be done on the cheap and it cannot be done according to the market. Come on! Stick with me kid, two more minutes! (*Laughter*)

Universities, although our employers and the Government do not always acknowledge it, really are part of the public sector. My members think of themselves as part of that kind of public service. We have been facing the same kinds of creeping privatisation which many of our colleagues in public service have been experiencing. Top-up are only one aspect of that debate. So now we have to earn our own money to compete against each other. Do not think you are delivering a service. It is about cash.

Part of that has meant that we are losing jobs in the sector, trying to expand the sector but sacking our members at the same time. Some of you will have heard in the press that there have been all kinds of terrible things happening with the shutting of whole academic departments. That is terrible for this country, but it is terrible for people outside this country as well. If we lose subjects like science here, a whole segment of international learning is gone. If you shut down a chemistry department here, there is going to be a big international project that is lost. East Asian studies were shut down in Durham. As a result, you lose that capacity to learn languages and to learn another culture. One of the London institutions is shutting down all its specialist libraries in Asian languages. I missed Gordon's talk this morning about the Asian challenge because I had my own challenge in the bathroom!

However, we are not going to prepare ourselves if we do not keep those skills and expertise in the education system here. Marketisation is just killing our sector, even though we are supposed to be building more access for different kinds of students.

I want to say a couple of things about why I think learning is a wonderful thing, which is the terrible, cheesy thing that all people who work in education secretly believe. We are hearing again and again in this new Imperialism that workers need to be on side, that our way of life is under attack and that we have to be part of this terrible capitalistic world.

I think that one of the things about education and higher education is that it is a set of values that are beyond any nation. We are a highly international sector. We co-operate across national boundaries, and we think the world is better for that kind of learning. For trade unionists, that is really important. It is not about British values. It is about human values. It is not about multi-culturalism here. It is about internationalism everywhere. That is the kind of thing that educators want to keep and maintain.

The market forces that are coming into our sector are trying to make knowledge into one of the things that will make a fast buck, instead of one of the things that will make us wholly human and free eventually. So save my members' jobs, but also think about what kind of society you want to live in because learning and research are about part of what being free will feel like. Thank you.

The President: Thank you, Gargi, and thank you for bringing the youngest ever person to the TUC rostrum! He or she is more than welcome to our family!

Sue Ferns (*Prospect*) seconded Motion 49.

She said: In seconding Motion 49, I want to focus in particular on the case for sustained investment in

research and development, not only in the education system but across the whole of the science base, including the Government's own laboratories and research establishments. These organisations also undertake vital research for the public good and have a key role in training the UK's future scientists.

The motion highlights the financial pressures already being faced by universities, resulting in the closure of departments and courses as well as job cuts. These will be exacerbated as a result of policy decisions currently taking place in another part of government to amalgamate research council institutes into university departments. This has already happened at the universities of Greenwich and Warwick where there is a continuing saga of review, re-organisation and job cuts. In Scotland, discussions are underway to bring the Hannah Research Institute into the university fold. This institute specialises in research relating to breast cancer, diabetes and obesity - work which must not be put in jeopardy.

Government policy is to move to full economic costing for research council funded programmes in universities. Prospect supports this move in principle and we think that it should enhance the sustainability of important areas of research. However, we are concerned that rather than strengthening the science base as a whole, this may in fact turn out to be an exercise of robbing Peter to pay Paul. Although at an early stage of implementation, we have already seen significant job cuts at another research institute, the John Innes Centre, justified by the requirement in 2006 to increase its contribution to university research costs.

We are concerned that such short-term financial imperatives are driving out strategic decision-making and putting the UK's core scientific capability at risk. To give you another example, the Institute for Animal Health - a key player in the fight against the foot and mouth and BSE crises - is facing a loss of over 70 scientific posts. So, with a horrible sense of déjà vu, we are seeing a weakening of scientific capability just as another potential crisis, Avian flu, looms on the horizon.

It seems that the Government are applying the same 'just in time' philosophy to its own science as is applied to stacking supermarket shelves. However, there is no extra supply of scientists waiting in the wings for when the next big problem comes along, because the truth is that R&D cannot be simply turned on and off at will. This leaves us in real doubt as to whether the UK will be able to cope with the next major outbreak of disease.

It is no wonder, then, when Prospect and the AUT jointly surveyed our members earlier this year, that more than three-quarters of them were concerned about short-termism, adequate resources to do their job, loss of respect for their work and failure to renew the skills base. None of these are new problems, but they are becoming increasingly urgent. Please support the motion.

The President: Thank you. I have had no indication of other speakers for the debate, which is probably good, because I suspect Gargi's baby has waived her right of reply anyway in that compelling way they tend to do! No doubt, the AUT is quite happy with that, though. I will put Motion 49 to the vote. The General Council support the motion.

* *Motion 49 was CARRIED*

Public services

Jane Carolan (UNISON) moved Motion 32.

She said: Congress, I am proud to be moving this motion today because I am proud to talk about

efficient public services. I think this motion reflects our values and it is our sense of who we are.

We have heard this week about the need to change the record or to change the DJ. I am not sure that anybody outside this hall will understand that. However, if we talk about our values, our values of collective provision and fairness, people will understand. We need to counterpose that against the buzz words of 'consumerism' and 'choice'.

Congress, I am tired of being told that because I can phone my bank on a 24-hour basis that public services need to change. Change to what? To a lean, mean profit-making machine based in an off-shore call centre? I do not think the NHS can run like that.

However, if you are listening, there is constant talk about public services. My members and my friends talk about public services all the time. They might not talk about them in political terms, but they talk about the schools our children attend and they talk about the last visit to the hospital or their GP. What they are talking about is not choice. They want a local hospital appointment when they need it and they want a local school that is theirs, not owned by a multi-national finance company. Instead, the Government provide a rhetoric of league tables and failure. Whose children are condemned by that? I do not really think there have been many failing schools in Hampstead or Hillhead. Failing schools are condemned, not through education, but because they deal with poverty and deprivation.

However, the next education big initiative, of course, has been city academies. For a down payment of £2 million from a private sponsor, the state will spend £25 million on state of the art facilities. For £2 million, the sponsor takes complete control and ownership; total control over what our children are educated in, even if that is the ideology of creationism.

Next time somebody talks to you about efficiency savings in the public sector, there is a question you might want to ask them: "Where is the efficiency in handing £25 million over to the private sector?" The jewel in the crown of our public services is supposedly the NHS. Labour came to power pledged to end the internal market and restore the NHS as a public service working collectively for patients. Those were their words.

Since 2002, the reforms amount to the creation of a competitive commercial market. Hospitals operate on a commercial basis. They compete against one another. Services that run at a loss are closed. The diversity agenda sees services provided for profits, not for patients. To attract new providers, the Government have provided a total range of subsidies. Collective planning is replaced by commercially-driven services. Services will be more unequal, less publicly accountable and of poorer quality. Who suffers? Us, the patients! Congress, those who reject our values are those for whom profits for multi-nationals rank above our people. That is why the Services Directive referred to in the motion is so important.

Congress, we have just seen an absolutely horrendous example of the neglect of public services. It was lack of investment in the public drainage system that caused New Orleans to flood. Louisiana lost out on that lack of investment, and who suffered? Those who public education had failed - 60 percent had no qualifications; those whom the public health system had failed - 75 percent had no cover - and those whom public transport failed - 60,000 had no means of personal transport, but relied on the buses sitting sodden now in New Orleans.

Our sympathy, as a movement, goes out to all of those who were involved in the floods. However, the reality is the black working class in New Orleans had been left

behind long before the hurricane hit. The floods simply revealed that to the world.

Gordon Brown today called for greater equality. As a movement, I think we need to stand up for what we believe in. That is collective provision and fairness. It is the only way to tackle inequality. That is the way we will see a fairer society. Public services are not, and have never been, an end in themselves, but they are a means to an end. That is the argument we can never forget. Please support this motion.

Sue Rogers (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*) seconded Motion 32.

She said: We all know what public services are. Do we really know, though, what a public service ethos is? Can it be identified? Does it exist? Can you touch it? Can you feel it? Can you smell it? I believe so. I have been a teacher for 30 years and I still am. I have certain basic beliefs that brought me to this job. I believe in education for all. I do indeed love learning, Gargi, for its own sake. I have a joy of working with young people and I believe in public service for the public good. It is that sense of service that keeps thousands of teachers in the job day in and day out.

We saw this kind of sense of service when the emergency services faced the crisis in the London bombings where, in spite of their exhaustion and shock, they kept going. It is an attitude which Gordon used the words for, solidarity, not selfishness. That is what it means.

In the public sector, we have always had a relationship with the private sector. We bought books and equipment. There were no problems with that. However, what we are facing now is private takeover, private control and private profit in our public service. We started in the 1980s when we saw, in fact, the privatisation of the schools' meals service. In Birmingham, for example, when the schools meals service was privatised, 3,000 people lost their jobs. The whole situation evolved that there was a depressing of working conditions. Children were served burgers and chips. We are now reaping the rewards of that with obesity and ill-health.

The competition for contracts simply becomes who can screw down pay and conditions? Who can worsen conditions to maximise profits? The idea has grown up, has it not, that somehow public is bad and private is good. It is just not true. So far, approximately 18 percent of £60 billion which is spent on public services has been privatised. There is a total emphasis on saving money, not standards of service.

Labour Research has shown that 66 percent believe that privatisation has not delivered the promised benefits. Twenty per cent has failed in two years; 50 percent has failed over five years. There is much focus on the attitude of the individual services. However, what about those private companies who have taken over whole education authorities? It almost makes the horror of city academies look mild. Leeds, Bradford, Walsall and some of the London boroughs have been taken over wholesale. This is absolute destruction of our public services. It is a destruction as well of democratic accountability that is at the base of our public services.

Remember, colleagues, we are paying for these services. It is our expense. However, there are no elected capitalists on local authorities. In Leeds, we have seen school closures despite the views of parents and of staff. The focus totally is finance. The public service ethos demands good governors and management accountability inside a democratic process. We should not have to go into the board room but into the town hall. That is where our public services are answerable. Indeed, I will quote Gordon again, public service is a calling, not just a career. If that is what you believe, Gordon, then make sure we

do not see the privatisation of our public services and the total loss of democratic accountability.

Tony Donaghey (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) supported Motion 32.

He said: I wish to highlight what is happening to Caledonian MacBrayne, a publicly-owned company providing vital services to the Western Isles in Scotland. The Scottish Executive is insisting that these services go out to tender under the EU Directive. The Scottish Parliament has opposed such privatisation. The STUC is also opposed to the tendering. The people of the Western Isles, of course, are opposed. The RMT and other seafaring unions have been campaigning against this dictat of the European Union.

It is not only us, of course. A recent report from the Economics Department of Glasgow University states categorically that this sell-off would be far more costly than the existing method of ownership. The services would be broken up. Even if TUPE were to apply, pensions would not be guaranteed and safety regulations would be split. For these reasons, comrades, we would ask for your support in our campaign. Thank you very much.

Gary Doolan (*GMB*) supported Motion 32.

He said: 'Transformation', 'contestability' and 'choice'. These are the new public service buzzwords. You know a government is losing the plot when they keep changing the language. What is desperately needed is a change of policy.

What were the areas of greatest negative publicity for the Government during the election campaign, apart from, of course, Iraq? Dirty hospitals and junk school dinners. What do those service areas all have in common? They have been sucked dry by generation after generation of low-price, low-quality and low-life private contractors. They employ mainly part-time women who bear the brunt of this downward spiral; women who every time the contractor changes find their livelihoods on the line once again. Having screwed our members' wages and conditions to the floor, the margins have got so tight that contractors like Scolarest are complaining that there is just not enough money to be made. Sad, isn't it?

No wonder PFI is so popular! There are plenty of opportunities for making money - pots of money, especially if you charge premium prices for building something and then once it is up you go off and refinance the deal. Consider the shareholders who invested in Octagon, the special purpose vehicle, or should it be special profits vehicle, which won the Norfolk and Norwich PFI hospital. They went into the deal expecting a rate of return on their investment of 19 percent, which beats sticking your spare money in a Post Office savings account, I suppose. However, after five years, refinancing has seen them right. Now the rate of return is up to a whopping 60 percent.

Congress, it would be one thing if these companies were delivering world-class services, but they are not. Instead, we are getting poor design, sick buildings, reduced capacity and increased charging. The public is being ripped off and so is the workforce. Congress, we need to raise public awareness. We need to name and shame. We need to redouble the efforts and expose the fundamental failures of this Government's privatisation policies before it is too late and there is nothing left.

Finally, Gordon Brown stated this morning: "Let's not settle for second best". The time has come to end the privatisation gravy train for private contractors and bring all the contracts back to public ownership. Please support the motion.

Gerald Imison (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*) supported Motion 32.

He said: I am the Deputy General Secretary of ATL, the education union. That is why my comment is about education, although I suspect it could be equally about health or any of the other public services.

ATL fully supports this resolution. I do not want to reiterate the many points that have been validly made and genuinely accepted by you already. I am fully aware that there has been privatisation by stealth and the creeping privatisation of many of our public services, over many years. What concerns us, however, is the future because the key may not be at local level. It may not be the Leeds, the Bradfords, the school cleaners or the school dinner services. The Government is moving us on to an international level. That is why the TUC must work with its European partners through the ETUC, as asked for in this motion, because we now face privatisation on a much greater scale and at a higher level than we have before.

Education is a defined service and a service that will be put out for competition. It is now part of the globalisation process and provision of education will go where the private money is. Sadly, in education, in many cases, that means America. We will be talking about the privatisation of education services which are attractive to a number of companies. Many American educational companies are already casting avaricious eyes on the English education service. Such a scenario as this has to be opposed and the TUC has to be the body that leads and co-ordinates that opposition.

We cannot have a public education service run primarily to provide dividends for shareholders. We have to keep public services publicly run and publicly accountable. If you think that American companies do not want our services, you are wrong. If you think that they will provide a better education service than we can provide through our own Government, I ask you to contemplate this: it was the American education service that gave the world George Bush!

Helen McFarlane (*Amicus*) supported Motion 32.

She said: I am a health service worker from Amicus, often known as the private sector union.

Tony, Tony, Tony, what are you doing spending a fortune making a mess in Iraq? Come home and concentrate on getting your priorities right here. (*Applause*) Tony, or whoever replaces you, we are the trade union and labour movement. We are your specialist advisers. We are your think-tank. We are your support, financial and physical. I will keep it simple for them. There are two things we need you to do. Priority number 1, get a manufacturing strategy in place. We need to make things to make money. Priority number 2, spend the money on good, effective world-class public services. Stop courting big business. Stop privatisation. Amicus urges support. Thank you.

* *Motion 32 was CARRIED*

Civil Service job cuts

The President: I now call Motion 33. The General Council is supporting this motion.

Mark Serwotka (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) moved Motion 33.

He said: President, Congress, I ask for your unanimous support for Motion 33. This time last year, I stood here and asked for your support in response to the Government's devastating attacks on Civil Service jobs. 104,500 job losses were announced by Gordon Brown live on television. That is the reality of the Chancellor's so-called efficiency reforms in the public sector that he recommitted himself to this morning.

In this address, I want to tell you what the real effects of those so-called efficiency reforms are on the public services of this country. However, today I want to start

by thanking you, Congress, the unions in this hall and the members you represent for the magnificent solidarity and support that we received when 200,000 PCS members took strike action last year in the first national civil service strike for a generation. The November 5th strike taken by PCS members was a vibrant campaigning day showing that trade union members are prepared to stand up and fight when faced with job loss and redundancy.

As a result of that strike, the Government made some serious concessions; backtracking on their plans to stop sick pay for civil servants for the first three days of sick absence and conceding national level measures designed to avoid compulsory redundancies. Today, Congress, we have been successful in avoiding compulsory redundancies, but that is only one part of the story because now we are moving into a new situation. The reality of the job losses that have taken place through natural wastage and voluntary severance exercises are beginning to bite for the people of this country.

Gordon Brown said this morning that reforms mean world-class public services. Congress, the reality behind the rhetoric could not be more different. Let me give you an example of some of the cuts that are taking place as we sit in this hall. We are seeing pension centres and benefit offices closing throughout the country. Pension centres in York and Liverpool have already closed. Norwich is now earmarked for closure. Forty-one Job Centre Plus offices in the Greater Glasgow area alone are now earmarked for closure. Thirty thousand jobs are being cut in the Department of Work and Pensions. The cuts that have already taken place mean that over 50 percent of telephone calls from the public designed to make claims for benefits in this country are going unanswered because of chronic staff shortages. These are telephone calls from people, not ordering catalogue goods or booking a holiday, but people who want to register claims for benefits which can mean for some people the difference between life and death.

This is the reality of Gordon Brown's efficiency programme. It now takes a week longer to make a benefit claim in this country than it did before the efficiency programme started. Staff are suffering massively from increasing workloads and stress. The violence which results in Job Centres is now reaching staggering proportions. There was a 62 percent rise in violent attacks on PCS members in the last two years as jobs are being cut and offices are being closed. These are not violent incidents where people are being sworn or spat at, but we have members attacked with axes, hammers and having had petrol poured over them. These people have been violently abused and attacked because the public are frustrated that they cannot access the benefit system.

However, it is not just about benefits. In Blackburn and other locations, ACAS are closing offices. Our members are being balloted on industrial action because, of all people, ACAS management are not consulting staff about changes being imposed upon them by this Government. In the Ministry of Defence, we see 10,000 jobs disappearing as a result of a massive privatisation programme being carried out by this Government. In one establishment alone in Crombie, in Scotland, 131 out of 157 jobs are to be axed. In the Office for National Statistics, as a result of Gordon Brown's efficiency drive, we are seeing the privatising and off-shoring to the subcontinent work associated with the Register of Births, Deaths and Marriages.

In the Export Credits Guarantee Department, PCS members in Cardiff recently took unofficial strike action because the Government, who supposedly want to relocate 20,000 jobs from London to impoverished parts of the UK, are closing an office in Cardiff and,

wait for this, relocating it to the Docklands in London! One third of jobs are being cut in the Department for Education and Skills. That is why in the *Guardian* today you read about real problems with the Government's Sure Start programme. Later in the week we will see a devastating announcement from the Learning and Skills Council regarding redundancies from a Government that is supposedly committed to the education and skills agenda.

However, at the same time as we see these cut backs in front line services, the Government, which we were told this morning want value for money, sit back whilst the taxpayer funds £1 billion a year in consultancy fees in the public sector alone. We have consultants being brought in to tell Job Centre managers that they should put potted plants in offices in order to boost staff morale. We have consultants in the MoD who have been brought in to write reports on what other consultants have done. At the same time, in one department, staff are compelled to go to a training course under threat of disciplinary action. When they attend, the course involves throwing toy fish around, flapping paper fish on the floor and dancing and singing to one another!

Conference, I think it is fair to say that it is no exaggeration to describe this as absolute madness. It is not efficient to pay consultants £700 a day when we should be paying public sector workers to deliver front line services. If all of that is not bad enough, let me tell you this in conclusion. Earlier this week we saw a letter leaked from a senior civil servant to Margaret Hodge, the Minister for Work. Ian, if you are still here, it is not about unions attacking ministers; it is unions standing up for public servants and for the members of the public of this country. *(Applause)* That letter to Margaret Hodge advocates a feasibility study to seek to outsource massive functions from the Department of Work and Pensions in Job Centre Plus.

Let me remind you, Congress, in 2005 there was a general election. One Party had a manifesto commitment to privatising Job Centre Plus. It was the Conservative Party. Now we see leaked letters telling us that New Labour is considering dismantling the Welfare State with potentially the biggest privatisation of public services that we have yet seen.

Congress, we ask you to carry this motion. We ask you to support us in the campaigns ahead. We ask you to support our 11,000 members in London DWP balloting for strike action now because chronic staff shortages mean they cannot do their jobs. We ask you to support our members in the Driving Standards Agency who have already voted for strike action because of cuts in their jobs. We ask you to support our members in the Ministry of Defence balloting for action against privatisation and to support us when we consult our reps next month on further action if the Government does not roll back the clock.

This is the reality of efficiency 2005 New Labour style. We thank you for your support. We ask you to stand with us. The people of this country and our low-paid members deserve a government truly committed to public services, not one to private profits. I move. *(Cheers amidst applause)*

Alan Grey (*Prospect*) seconding Motion 33 said: Congress, when the Chancellor announced the 100,000 job cuts in the Civil Service 11,000 of these were to come from the MoD. Defence ministers assured us that these were not new cuts but were simply some of the estimated cuts expected from ongoing efficiency initiatives in which the trade unions were involved, and would be a combination of actual cuts and outsourcing depending on the outcome of those initiatives. It will be shocking to see the overall impact on jobs so starkly displayed. We were further assured that these cuts were part of a £2.8bn efficiency savings target and that

if the trade unions could find alternative savings measures we could offset some of these job losses.

These assurances, Congress, proved to be as empty for civil servants as was Gordon Brown's speech this morning. I have to say, Congress, that as a civil servant I was incensed that he publicly thanked a long list of public servants yet made no mention whatsoever of civil servants, the Government's own employees. Could I stress that the public servants he listed deserve that public gratitude and I want to echo and endorse wholeheartedly his comments but without the blatant hypocrisy that underpinned his contribution. Civil servants also deserve public recognition for providing an excellent service and work that can often be in difficult circumstances, and the Chancellor not to provide that recognition was a slap in the face for every serving civil servant.

Congress, those 11,000 job cuts, which were only estimates of what may be achieved across a ten-year efficiency programme, became a straightforward headcount reduction target to be made not in ten years but by 2008: people not posts, no matter what level of efficiency savings was achieved. It is an absolutely nonsensical approach that has meant the initiatives on which these estimates were actually based are now secondary to the achievement of arbitrarily imposed staff cuts. It is an approach that means some key areas of the department, up to 25 percent of filled posts, will be cut. Staff will either lose their jobs or be relocated to another part of the department, or even to another government department, providing there are vacancies.

That is the crux for the members we represent, finding suitably funded vacancies for those who want to stay in the department and having a properly funded early release scheme for those who want to leave. The department says it can meet those targets through limiting recruitment and promotion, through natural wastage and voluntary redundancy, and through co-operating with other government departments on a surplus management scheme.

Prospect is concerned that natural wastage will be reduced to a trickle because people will not resign when there is a chance they can leave with a cheque in their back pocket. Those who were planning on taking retirement will take advantage, probably through necessity, next year when the age discrimination laws are introduced, and limiting recruitment will have minimal impact when there is limited natural wastage. Close departmental co-operation when most departments are cutting back is also a pipedream.

A bigger concern for Prospect, Congress, is that the reduction in jobs is so great that the remaining staff will be over-stretched; they will not be able to deliver the required service, will be classed as inefficient, and subjected to further privatisation. Even more worrying is that outsourcing of staff scores against the headcount reduction. Line managers are looking to outsource where they believe the work needs to be done, but they have to get rid of those people. Gordon Brown spoke about efficiency and value for money. It would be inefficient and expensive to transfer this work to the private sector along with the staff that do it.

Congress, in seconding Motion 33 I have tried to show the impact of these cuts in just one government department. Prospect truly recognises the damage being done across the whole of government and pledges to continue to work closely with PCS and the FDA in opposing these cuts, and outsourcing, offshoring, and other initiatives being used to achieve them. We ask for your support in the campaign.

* *Motion 33 was CARRIED*

Post Office

The President: I now call Motion 36, the Post Office. The General Council supports the motion.

Billy Hayes (*Communication Workers Union*) moved Motion 36. He said: I like everybody else listened to what Gordon Brown said today and listened to what Ian McCartney said today in terms of the Warwick Agreement. I was at Warwick, together with Dave Ward, our Deputy General Secretary, and people from our union. I remember the words that we agreed at Warwick. On the Post Office, we said our ambition is to see a publicly owned Royal Mail fully restored to good health, providing customers with an excellent service, and its employees with rewarding employment, and that we have no plans to privatise the Post Office. That is pretty clear, all the commas are there, and all the full stops are there in terms of what it means. That was a positive commitment to distinguish the Labour Party from every other party that had contested the election.

Barely had the vote been counted when the Chairman of Royal Mail, Allan Leighton, in the *Sunday Times*, started to indicate that there was a possibility of a share sale and Royal Mail being privatised. It would only be a 20 percent share sale. It would only be to the workers. As I said, I was at Warwick but I will tell you who was not at Warwick, Alice in Wonderland. You will remember the words from Alice in Wonderland, "Words mean exactly what I say they mean." No, they do not. When it is stated there are no plans to privatise Royal Mail, that is what it means. It does not mean that there is some area where maybe we can just talk about 20 percent.

Prior to the election and talk of privatisation of Royal Mail, the Liberals - remember them - dillied and dallied about the whole question of privatisation. Now we find the election is out of the way and the Liberals are saying they want to look at privatisation, a John Lewis style privatisation with some shares opened up to the workforce and other shares opened up to the wider public. That, in my book, is privatisation, absolutely no equivocation about that from the CWU.

We heard a lot of talk about internationalism today, and about standards. I will tell you a little bit of what is taking place in the UK with our letter monopoly, which has existed for 350 years from when Charles II first introduced the post. On 1st January 2006 we are going to lose our letter monopoly in the UK in advance of every other single country. We will face the farcical situation in Europe whereby Royal Mail's ability to deliver will also be alongside Deutsche Post delivering your mail, and La Poste could also deliver your mail; but it does not work the other way. Royal Mail, as a result of the EU directive, will be prevented from delivering mail in France, in Germany, and any other part of the European Union. We, the British, will be allowing our mail to be opened up to competition in advance of the European Union directive which is currently scheduled for 2009, with review periods.

Does that sound like common sense? Does that sound like protecting the universal service? Not only that, Royal Mail will be the only company that is subject to strictures in terms of quality and in terms of price. Every other company can put up their price, and every other company does not have to worry about equality criteria and the like. All those restrictions are put on a publicly owned company and we are told that that is how competition works.

When I went to school we had fields and some fields were like THAT (*indicates a steep slope*) and you could not play a decent game of football on them. We feel as if we are playing on this so-called playing field at a sharp angle and that is why we are having problems in terms of our industry. We are absolutely clear as to the commitment we had at Warwick. We are absolutely

clear what is happening to our postal industry. The Labour Government talked about delivering and that we as trade unions delivered that victory, but for the CWU members that is quite literally true. It was postwomen and postmen who delivered those election leaflets that said, "We have no plans to privatise Royal Mail." We intend to ensure that that promise is carried through. When we talk about public services we all know that it is us who have the greatest interest, those people whose lives and reputation is based on that service.

What are some of the solutions that we are suggesting as the CWU? First of all, we need to start investing in the postal industry in this country in the same way that the Dutch post office invests in its postal services, the same way that the German post office invests in its postal service, and the same way the French post office invests in its postal service. If there is one issue that is the theme of this Congress, it is the need to start investing in our country, investing in our public services, and that is just as true for your postal service.

I would ask you to do one thing and then I will sum up on this, Jeannie. Every single one of you in this hall has a postwoman or a postman that delivers to your front door and delivers to your offices. I would like you, when you go back from this Congress, to say to your postwoman or your postman, "We are 100 percent behind you, we are not going to stand for this nonsense about a parcel share sale. We went out on the knock for the Labour Government at the election, we will be standing shoulder to shoulder with you and, by the way, you're going to get a Christmas tip." Thank you.

Derek Simpson (*Amicus*) seconding Motion 36 said: You have to follow Billy on these questions. Let me start by saying, first of all, what is our interest in this apart from the general one. Amicus, billed very often as the private sector union, does have 12,000 Post Office managers. We used to have 15,000 Post Office managers but the last reorganisation saw 3,000 of them disappear. Privatisation, in our view, would see not just our managers but, as Billy says, many jobs at risk. Often you hear Amicus talking about the manufacturing industry, the offshoring in our finance and insurance sectors, and jobs going abroad, but the reverse of that is low-paid workers being brought in to do jobs that cannot be moved. You cannot deliver a letter to a UK address in China, you have to do it here. Private industry of course thrives on competition, ever seeking cheaper workers, and Gate Gourmet is an example but we do not want that happening to the Post Office. Therefore, it is very important that we stop this before it starts and ask the Government to make sure it honours its commitment. What we want is a trumpet for a first-class postal service, not another last post for UK jobs.

* *Motion 36 was CARRIED*

The National Health Service

The President: I now call Composite Motion 12, the National Health Service. The General Council supports the motion.

Hazel Harriet-Jones (*Society of Radiographers*) moved Composite Motion 12. She said: Radiographers recognise the fact that the NHS needs to be more efficient. We also recognise that patients should not have long waiting times for scans for the diagnosis of life-threatening conditions but to bring this important aspect of healthcare into effect, we need more highly skilled and committed staff. As the workloads increase without a corresponding increase in the number of radiographers, stress levels and sickness rates impact upon patient care.

The answer, we are told, is to invest in private health, not in the NHS. What we are seeing now is investment

at the expense of the NHS, not in support of it. Congress, we were told by this Government that the private sector would only be used to increase capacity for our NHS. We were told the introduction of independent privately funded treatment would be used to free up the front-line staff of the NHS to diagnose and treat patients, and meet the targets that this Government has imposed. We are not opposed to private healthcare. We recognise that choice for patients is important. However, we are opposed to private companies operating from hospital car parks at the same time that NHS equipment is lying under-used or redundant. The policy of integrating healthcare with private providers was done without consultation of people that know the service. There was no consultation with our members, the very healthcare professionals who undertake these scans. So, what we now have is the worst of both worlds, NHS expertise utilised by private healthcare to make profits. NHS trusts even pick up the electricity bill for this service.

We, at the Society of Radiographers, have recently surveyed our members and they are telling us private sector scanners will only take fit routine patients; others are kept waiting longer. Our waiting times for routine scans have fallen. However, there is little impact on urgent or supervised scans. This policy breaks the healthcare pathway by importing private health employees who rely on the NHS to complete the service they started and to pick up the ongoing care of these patients. There is no direct access to the reporter for the referrer. This can result in repeat scans or reports being undertaken. To maintain a good and effective health service we need more NHS facilities, not more private practice. Mechanisms are also needed to address the increasing levels of sickness and absenteeism because of the uncertainty, poor conditions, and unreasonable targets for service delivery.

This Government speaks of choice. It is our choice that the NHS is the means by which we deliver healthcare. This motion is not just about funding, it is not just about conditions of service, it is about the future of our NHS.

Ann Duffy (*Community and District Nursing Association*) seconding Composite Motion 12 said: NHS funding is an issue affecting all areas in delivering healthcare, not only in the acute sector but also in primary healthcare. As the demands on the NHS continually increase, it becomes much more apparent that often the NHS service loses out to private delivered service in private settings, using private hospital equipment, leaving very expensive NHS equipment standing idle. It is the Government's responsibility to ensure hi-tech, high-expense equipment, purchased with NHS funding, is used to its full capacity at all times on our NHS patients.

Also of great concern is the recruitment and retention problems now facing the NHS as the stresses grow affecting more and more staff daily. The shortage of qualified professionals is having such a huge effect on staff morale resulting in increased absenteeism and more and more professionals leaving the NHS earlier than they had originally hoped for, cutting short professional careers, many people leaving on ill health grounds, which is a very sad reflection on the environment that we now work and live in. The loss of this valuable resource must be addressed today by government as high demands are placed on the remaining staff that are essential to keep the health service going.

NHS staff need to be treasured and careful planning must go into seeing to their work-life balance. Top priority should be given first and foremost to staff safety while in the workplace. More and more staff now come to work where during the course of the day they can be physically abused or even attacked while

carrying out essential patient care. How many other large organisations outside the NHS would treat employees' safety with such little regard? Staff visiting in the community often work alone in all areas of this country, from large high-rise flats in the inner city to remote country areas. No one knows what awaits staff when they enter patients' homes. This group of staff is very vulnerable, especially when delivering an evening or a night-time service. A high proportion of this staff group are not even provided with mobile phones as a measure of being able to stay in contact with their base if there is a need to raise an alarm. We have community staff walking our streets, including night-time, community staff driving through remote country areas, and yet there are no national guidelines for their protection.

We should look after our staff, protect our staff, before we lose any more, Congress. Thank you.

Lesley Mercer (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*) supporting Composite Motion 12 said: Imagine, Congress, a situation where you have a shortage of skilled workers in a particular sector, any one of your sectors, and in response extra training places are created. Three years later the new graduates, the extra graduates, emerge and significant numbers of them cannot find a job. If that sounds kind of nonsense to you, it is exactly what is happening in the NHS right now. It has been happening to our members, physiotherapists, since last year. Now junior doctors are in the same position and there are emerging signs that nurses and other groups of health professions are starting to have it happening to them too.

The vacancies for experienced staff are still there in the NHS, still desperately needed, but there are not enough jobs at the junior level for new graduates to get the experience then to go on and fill the vacancies higher up. It is down to a failure of workforce planning in the NHS compounded by very real financial pressures now being felt by many NHS trusts.

Congress, it is such a waste. It is a waste for our members who want to work for the NHS but will walk away if they cannot find work. It is a waste for patients too. The NHS needs its skilled workers if it wants to seriously cut waiting times, speedy rehabilitation for workers who are injured, and prevent hospital admissions in the first place.

Congress, I am not pretending there is no recognition in government that this is a problem and certainly CSP as an organisation is working with the Department of Health on possible resolutions, practical solutions to this problem, but as anybody will know there are so many competing priorities in the NHS right now. Our fear is that this priority, this particular priority, will just slip down the list if we do not use every opportunity to keep it in the limelight. What better opportunity is there than a gathering of nearly 70 different unions, big and small, every one in this hall united in wanting to see the very best NHS we can get. Congress, please support the motion.

Sheila McKane (*GMB*) supporting Composite Motion 12 said: GMB members are proud that Labour is investing more money in the NHS than ever before. By the year 2008 total healthcare spending will be 9.4 percent of the national income, which is well above the current EU average of 8 percent. Massive sums are needed to rectify the years of Tory neglect and to raise the NHS standards to European standards, but if British people are to get the same high-quality of care as their EU counterparts then the NHS needs high-level investment sustainable over the long-term. Short-term funding, even at record levels, simply does not deliver the services people expect. Congress, let me tell you why more investment is required.

Last year witnessed the landmark NHS Agenda for Change agreement. This delivered a new pay system to

support the NHS modernisation. It is designed to meet equal pay for work of equal value criteria and to provide both career and pay progression. It is early days but the GMB will strive endlessly to ensure the agreement meets our members' aspirations. While the agenda for change marks significant development, it does not apply to all workers; it only applies to directly employed NHS staff, not to the private contractors working alongside them, the poorest paid of them all. Those workers suffered under privatisation when staffing levels were slashed and workloads increased, and are now being denied a chance to share in the benefits of Agenda for Change.

Congress, it is perverse. How can we expect top quality services when we deny so much to so many? Where is the quality and fairness in that? The GMB has been in discussions to get the Agenda for Change terms extended to all workers; that is what our members want and so do the contractors. Who will pay for it? At last the Department of Health has accepted the principle of funding Agenda for Change. We are still in discussions but it is a major breakthrough and it demonstrates the need for sustainable long-term funding. Please support the composite.

Christine Wilde (*UNISON*) speaking in support of Composite 12 said: this composite highlights two opposing faces of the NHS; on the one hand the havoc being wreaked by the Government's privatisation policies and on the other hand the unstinting dedication and service of NHS staff, such as community midwives, community services, and district nurses. There are few better examples of what privatisation is doing to our NHS than the Government's independent sector treatment centre programme. When the programme was first introduced we were told that they were about bringing in overseas staff in order to overcome staffing shortages in the NHS and to bring down waiting lists. The reality has proved very different.

First, it transpired that rather than adding to the total number of operations in the NHS, many independent sector centres would simply take over work that would otherwise have been done by existing NHS hospitals. Then we discovered that as well as this a significant proportion of independent sector centre staff would be transferred across from the NHS. Now with the recently announced second wave of independent treatment centres we are seeing the relaxation of the previous restrictions preventing the centres from poaching NHS staff, not to mention the transfer of several NHS provided treatment centres to the private sector.

The result of all this is services threatened and wards and equipment lying idle as activity is moved across to private independent centres; a lack of training opportunities for junior doctors as NHS hospitals are left with only the difficult and complex cases; and massive wastage and little demonstrable impact on waiting times. This is a shameful example of the private sector siphoning off relatively simple treatments that attract little input but large megabucks.

Contrast this to the situation of community midwives, community services, and district nurses. Successive patient studies have shown that the work they do is absolutely vital, helping patients avoid hospital admission, supporting rehabilitation, and providing advice and relief to relatives, yet they often find themselves the subject of abusive and even violent behaviour by drug abusers who believe that they are soft targets carrying drugs, or by the perpetrators of domestic violence, and the fact that they often work alone and inflexible hours makes them even more vulnerable.

Given this background, it is an absolute scandal that many employers refuse to provide them with mobile phones; they are too expensive. The Government can

find billions of pounds to throw at private healthcare companies so surely they can find the modest amounts of money needed to supply the mobile phones. What price can be set on safety and protection for NHS workers whose role takes them out into the community and into the homes of the general public? The government should move immediately in order to ensure the financial resources are made available to implement safety systems of working for this vulnerable group of staff.

Congress, I urge you to support the motion. Thank you.

* *Composite Motion 12 was CARRIED.*

Patient-led NHS

The President: I now call Emergency Motion 3, Patient-led NHS. The General Council support the motion.

Dave Godson (*UNISON*) moved Emergency Motion 3. He said: A major set of reforms with profound and far-reaching implications for both patients and staff, all these were quietly and almost secretly announced on 28th July by Sir Nigel Crisp in a communication called, Commissioning Patient-Led NHS. The Department of Health's press office did their best to divert attention away by focusing on the proposal to undertake a mental health nursing review also announced on the same day.

Congress, let me try and describe these arbitrary reforms which have been directed to the service without any consultation with patients, the public, or the staff via their trade unions. I may also add that this approach to yet more change is a serious blow to the partnership the health service partners have worked so hard to try and progress. What are these reforms?

First, strategic health authorities are required to conduct a structural review of primary care trusts and strategic health authority functions in their area. The timescale for the review is that the proposed submissions are due in by 15th October and they are to be concluded by the end of November, a frighteningly unrealistic timetable for such wide-ranging and profound changes to the structure of primary care services where 75 percent of the NHS budget resides and where the vast majority of care takes place. Where is the consultation with the service users? Where is the consultation with the staff and their trade unions? Bluntly, there is not any, yet we are told this is all about choice: choice for whom?

The only good thing about these reforms is that primary care trusts are to be reconfigured to bring them in line with local government boundaries. Strategic health authorities will also be expected to align with government office boundaries, something that is long overdue; that is the only good thing. The consequence of that, however, is that those cuts in service will mean strategic health authorities will reduce from 28 down to nine and that PCTs are likely to see a 50 percent reduction from 303 down to 150.

However, it is not the structure that is the main link to the reforms, the main area and our concern is around the new role and function of primary care trusts. PCTs are to become commissioning-led organisations with their role of provider of services reduced; in fact, they can only provide services where it is not possible to have a separate provider. Arrangements are to be made to secure services from a range of providers in order to introduce deliberate competition between the community-based service providers. PCTs will also have to make 15 percent reduction in management administration costs and strategic health authorities will also have to make significant reductions in management administration costs as well.

The PCTs will also be charged with ensuring the full implementation of GP practice-based commissioning by the end of 2006. This means that all GP practices will take on responsibility for commissioning services and will manage the commissioning budget covering acute services, community services, and emergency care. Remember GP fund-holding? It sounds very familiar, does it not? What did that do for care provision?

What are the consequences? Congress, this is not about reform of the NHS, it is the end of the NHS as we know it. These changes will mean massive instability for the provision of primary and community care, existing services will be broken up and outsourced, and it is likely that many staff will be transferred to the private sector. This will result in a worse deal for the NHS patients and staff as services are fragmented and new providers seek to achieve staff efficiency savings. If we look at the cleaning contracts in hospitals, if they are anything to go by then we will see cut-backs in clinical staff, such as community nurses, with worse pay and terms and conditions.

The changes will also have serious implications for the way that the NHS services are commissioned. Primary care trusts currently play a vital role in service commissioning ensuring that a planned holistic approach is taken, and hold acute sector providers to account. If practice-based commissioning is introduced, their ability to do this will be fatally weakened as most of the commissioning power will be passed down to the practice level. Primary care trusts currently do a vital job in planning the provision of services in order to meet the health needs of their local communities and they do this through established committees with the community health professionals, such as doctors and nurses, and patients groups.

It is very worrying that it remains unclear what arrangements will be put in place to ensure proper patient and public involvement and what will happen to the established patient and public forums. It is alarmingly ironic, Congress, that given the title of reform, Commissioning a Patient-Led NHS, there has been no consultation with patients. Practice-based commissioning will also give rise to ethical dilemmas and conflicts between clinicians, obligations to a patient's health needs, and the pressure to remain within commissioning budgets. Removing service provision from the PCT and introducing competition between new providers will lead to major disruption and instability for services.

Congress, I have a lot more to say but I will close and say that we need to support this motion, we need to stop the marketisation of the NHS, and hopefully Gail will fill in as I have run out of time. Thank you, Congress.

Gail Cartmail (*Amicus*) seconding Emergency Motion 3 said: I want to highlight three concerns, to reiterate the point made by Dave on consultation, or rather the lack of it, to explain an example of privatisation in this context, and to share with you the cuts already made in primary care services as a result of the shambles around budgets.

First of all, on consultation, delegates, there was no excuse not to consult the workforce on these changes. Days before the document was published there was a social partnership forum where all the relevant stakeholders were present and not a word was mentioned. It strikes me that partnership is part-time when it comes to the Department of Health sharing with us this type of initiative that has such an impact on the services provided by the members we represent.

On privatisation the motion covers restructuring, it covers splitting commissioning from providing, yet there is no guidance in the documents from the Department of Health and therefore all decisions about the employment of our primary care health

workers are left at a local level. So what does this mean in reality? The cat is out of the bag, delegates, because one primary care trust has already jumped the gun. It is proposed that Central Surrey Healthcare should be established as a limited company to provide community nursing and therapy services. I do not think that is acceptable, delegates, and I do not think you will either.

The cuts in PCTs are as a result of budgets in crisis, not because there is not record spending on health but because the management of those budgets is appalling. What our survey of members has revealed is that we have job freezes and redundancies. So, whilst somebody rearranges the deckchairs on the Titanic, someone else is going to have to explain to the bullied child because he stinks why the one person that could effectively represent his interests, an expert school nurse on enuresis, is not available. Who is going to tell the abused and neglected child that their care needs may be missed because the health visitor's caseload is frozen? How can we justify any dilution of essential speech and language services to disabled children such as those with Downs Syndrome?

We agree there may need to be change but what we insist upon is change for the better, not change for the worse. Congress, I urge you to support the composite.

* *Emergency Motion 3 was CARRIED.*

Scrutineers Report

Tracy Clarke, Chair of Scrutineers, presented the Scrutineers Report, as follows:

GENERAL COUNCIL

SECTION A

Unions with more than 200,000 members

UNISON (*six members*)

Jane Carolan	Dave Prentis
Alison Shepherd	Liz Snape
Keith Sonnet	Sofi Taylor

Amicus (six members)

Gail Cartmail	Tony Dubbins
Doug Rooney	Derek Simpson
Ed Sweeney	Paul Talbot

Transport and General Workers' Union (four members)

Barry Camfield	Jimmy Kelly
Patricia Stuart	Tony Woodley

GMB (three members)

Sheila Bearcroft	Allan Garley
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)

Lesley Auger	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

Prospect : Paul Noon

Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians

Alan Ritchie

SECTION C

unions with fewer than 100,000 members

Eleven to be elected

Jonathan Baume (*FDA*) 503,000*

Brian Caton (*POA*) 648,000*

Bob Crow (*RMT*) 346,000

Jeremy Dear (*NUJ*) 453,000*

Gerry Doherty (*TSSA*) 498,000*

Matt Wrack (*FBU*) 297,000

Ian Lavery (*NUM*) withdrawn

Michael Leahy (*Community*) 493,000*

Paul Mackney (*NATFHE*) 401,000*

Joe Marino (*BFAWU*) 351,000

Judy McKnight (*Napo*) 653,000*

Robert F Monks (*URTU*) 58,000

Doug Nicholls (*CYWU*) 358,000*

Ged Nichols (*ACCORD*) 414,000*

Brian Orrell (*NUMASTO*) 487,000*

Tim Poil (*NGSU*) 383,000*

SECTION D

Women from unions with fewer than 200,000 members

- Four to be elected

Sue Ferns (*Prospect*)

Anita Halpin (*National Union of Journalists*)

Sally Hunt (*Association of University Teachers*)

Lesley Mercer (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*)

SECTION E

Member representing black workers from unions with more than 200,000 members

Roger King (*NUT*) withdrawn

Mohammad Taj (*T&G*)*

SECTION F

Member representing black workers from unions with fewer than 200,000 members

Leslie Manasseh (*Connect*)*

SECTION G

Member representing black women

Gloria Mills (*UNISON*)*

SECTION H

Member representing trade unionists with disabilities

Mark Fysh (*UNISON*) 5,282,000*

Tony Sneddon (*CWU*) 1,013,000

SECTION I

Member representing lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender trade unionists

Maria Exall (*CWU*) 1,495,000

David Lascelles (*GMB*) 4,771,000*

SECTION J

Member under 27 years of age

John Walsh (*Amicus*) *

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

five to be elected

Tony Cooper (*T&G*) 5,797,000*

Phil Davies (*GMB*) 5,633,000*

Peter Hall (*RMT*) 3,866,000*

Gerald Imison (*ATL*) 774,000

Steve Kemp (*NUM*) withdrawn

Linda McCulloch (*Amicus*) 5,585,000*

Annette Mansell-Green (*UNISON*) 5,984,000*

Andy Reed (*ASLEF*) 1,702,000

Bernard Regan (*NUT*) 635,000

(*Congress adjourned at 5.30 p.m.*)

**THIRD DAY: WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14TH
MORNING SESSION**

(Congress reassembled at 9.30 a.m.)

The President: I call Congress to order. Good morning, everyone. I hope you all had a good evening and that we have a good day's business ahead of us. I would like to say, first, a word about unfinished business, so if you could listen carefully because you may be affected by this. I am optimistic that at the end of this morning's session we may be able to take some of the unfinished business from earlier in the week. If there is time, I will take unfinished business in the order in which it was lost, beginning with Motion 19 in the name of BECTU on a union diversity fund.

I now call on the Chair of the GPC to give a report on progress of business.

General Purposes Committee Report

Annette Mansell-Green (*General Purposes Committee*): Good morning, Congress. I am not sure my glasses are making much difference this morning! You may be aware that the sole remaining item of business outstanding from the published agenda was Motion 75 on Europe from the RMT, with the amendment from Community. There have been discussions on a possible composite but it has not been possible to reach agreement. Consequently, the motion will stand, together with the amendment in the name of Community, which will stand against the motion. Thank you.

Pensions and Welfare

The President: We turn now to Chapter 3 of the General Council's Report, Pensions and Welfare, on page 43. Congress, we start this morning's business by introducing the Chair of the independent Pensions Commission, Adair Turner. The Commission will be reporting to government at the end of November. The Pensions Commission is an independent body set up to keep under review the regime for UK private pensions and long-term savings. The Commission was announced in the pensions green paper published in December 2002 and consists of three commissioners. The Commission is responsible for looking at how the pensions system is developing over time. Based on the Pensions Commission's findings, the Commission will make recommendations on whether the pension system should move beyond the current voluntary approach. At the end of Adair's address to Congress there will be a short question and answer session.

Adair, we are absolutely delighted that you could join us, particularly this early hour in the morning having come all the way down from London. Please address Congress. Thank you very much.

Address by Adair Turner, Chair of the Pensions Commission.

Adair Turner: Jeannie, thank you. I am very pleased to have this opportunity to talk to Congress today, but I am also very aware that I have a problem, which is that anything I say may be taken down and used as evidence for assertions about what the Pensions Commission is going to recommend. In fact, in the Pensions Commission we are pretty much now in our equivalent of pre-budget purdah ahead of the publication of our second report on November 30th. Obviously, we already know something about what we are going to say - it would be rather concerning if with two-and-a-half months to go that was not the case - but there are still quite a few details to be pinned down. Revealing those recommendations clearly has to

wait till we have all of the details pinned down, and until November 30th.

What I would like to do today is to highlight two of the difficult issues with which we have been wrestling and which I suspect will be the subject of major public debate after November 30th, whatever we then recommend. The first relates to the demographic challenge and the state pension system. The second relates to the issue of compulsion.

We cannot avoid facing the demographic challenge. Life expectancy is increasing and will continue to do so. I have to say that, despite having spent much of the last two years talking to actuaries, I insist on calling increasing in life expectancy good news, not bad news, but it does clearly create a challenge for all aspects of the pension system, for the state system, for private sector defined benefit schemes, for public sector schemes, and indeed for defined contribution schemes, though with the crucial difference that in the defined contribution environment all the risks are borne by individuals facing declining annuity rates at any given age, not by government or employers. The scale of that challenge appears to grow with every new estimate of future life expectancy.

One of the odd things about working for the Pensions Commission is that John, Jeannie, and I, have realised that we appear to have become immortal in the sense of each year that we work we hear from the Government Actuary's Department that the estimates of life expectancy have been increased by one year. In 1980, decisions about public pension policy and about the affordability of defined benefit promises were being made on the basis of estimates that male life expectancy for a man aged 65 in 2005 would be about 14 years, but now we have reached 2005 the estimate is 19 years. Looking forward, the current official base case forecast is 22 years of life expectancy for a man reaching 65 in 2050, but many experts believe that will be revised up significantly as new information becomes available. I would anticipate that we will soon be looking at higher estimates still. We really do not know how high it is going to go, it is quite possible by 2050 it could actually be in the high 20s.

Taking those life expectancy increases together with reasonable assumptions about fertility and immigration, and despite the fact that the immigration assumptions have been increased significantly by the Government Actuary's Department over the last two years, taking all of their best estimates together, the ratio of people above 65 to people of working age is going to go from about four today to about two in 2050.

As a result only four things, or a mix of these four things, can happen:

- Either pensioners will get poorer relative to average earnings;
- Or taxes or National Insurance contributions will have to rise to pay for more general state pensions;
- Or savings flowing into private pension funds must rise;
- Or average retirement ages and pension ages must rise.

In part the trade-off between those four options will be made by individuals. Increasingly in the world of defined contribution pensions individuals will have to make their own trade-offs between how long to keep working and how much to save versus their desired income in retirement. The challenge there is to make sure that those people who want to work are able to do so. That is why the Pensions Commission has strongly supported the introduction of anti-age discrimination legislation and why we would prefer there to be no maximum age to its application.

If we turn to the state pension system, the trade-off will not be made by individual choice but by decisions about public policy. The trade-off in the state system is three-way: less benefits relative to average earnings, higher taxes, or higher pension ages. Present policies have chosen the first option. If continued indefinitely, present policies will mean substantially smaller pensions for people on average earnings relative to average earnings. Pensions expenditure is planned to stay roughly constant as a percentage of GDP increasing only from 6.2 percent to 6.4 percent over the next 45 years. The state pension age is assumed to stay constant at 65 after the equalisation in 2020, but the proportion of the adult population over 65 will increase by around 45 percent. If you run the mathematics, as night follows day, that means by 2050, on average, pensioners will receive about 30 percent less relative to average earnings than they do today. The replacement rates that the state, on average, gives people will fall by 30 percent.

The Government is committed to ensuring that that falling provision is not at the expense of the standard of living, relative to the rest of the society, of the poorest pensioners. To achieve that the Guarantee Credit is, quite rightly the Pensions Commission believes, linked to earnings. That in turn means the contributory state pension enjoyed by the average earner – the person on £22,000/£23,000 per year – will have to fall even further than the 30 percent. If we have a 30 percent fall on average and we are making sure the poorest are protected against that, the fall for people above the poorest will be even greater, in fact it will be a bit over a third relative to average earnings. That also means the system will become steadily more means tested over time.

All of that defines the essential dilemma of state pension policy which we have to grapple with if we are going to talk about what we need in a state system to be a coherent basis for private saving on top.

The Commission is told repeatedly that means testing is a big problem. Pensioner groups dislike it and the private pension industry tells us that it is a disincentive for private pension saving. The Pensions Commission is also left in no doubt that there would be many people, in particular business groups, who would oppose any significant increase in the level of tax or national insurance devoted to pensions. We are also left in no doubt that there are many people, and institutions, who do not want an increase in state pension ages.

The state pension system is either going to become more means tested, or it is going to require higher taxes or National Insurance contributions, or there are going to be higher state pension ages, or there is going to be a mix of all those three things. There is nobody clever enough to design a state pension policy in the face of the demographic challenge which does not involve one of those three things, or a mix of them.

Whatever we decide, whatever the Government decides on the state system, increased saving into funded pensions will also have to be part of the response to the demographic challenge, if people are to be not only defended against poverty in retirement but to achieve pensions that they will consider adequate relative to their income in life.

Both the present government, and previous Conservative governments, have certainly believed that that increase in private savings is required. Indeed, the overt aim of British pension policy for several decades has been that the percentage of pension income coming from non state-funded sources should rise.

It is, however, clear that we are not on target for a sustained rise in private pension income, whether from occupational pensions or from personal pensions; indeed, rather the opposite. Participation rates in private sector pension schemes, be they occupational

or personal, are in slight decline and average contribution rates will fall over the long term as the shift from defined benefit to defined contribution works through the system. The state is planning to do less for the average earner and neither the average earner herself nor her employer is doing more to fill the gap.

The Pensions Commission has become increasingly aware of three inherent barriers to that gap being filled by a voluntary system:

First, the fact that many employers do not see it as their role to provide pensions simply for reasons of social responsibility, to do what they see as being the job of the state, focusing only on what advantages they get in the labour market. Many are also convinced that pension promises, deferred pay, do not bring them as much bang for their buck in the recruitment and retention market as cash wages.

Second, the fact that many individuals find it very difficult to make sensible decisions about long-term savings without encouragement and advice, particularly when the whole pension system is so complex and difficult to understand.

Third, the fact that it is very difficult for the financial services industry actually to sell pensions to people on average earnings and below, working for small and medium size companies, or to sell pension schemes to their employers, at annual management charges sufficiently high enough for them to make a profit but also sufficiently low enough to present good value for money for private savings.

It is simply very expensive to get to individuals working on average earnings for small and medium size firms and when we do that at 1.5 percent annual management charge, a significant amount of the total pension is going in management charges by the time somebody gets to retirement.

Some people and institutions faced with those barriers urge the Pensions Commission to recommend compulsion. We know from surveys that there are indeed many people who say they would like to be compelled to save but we also know many who say very clearly that they do not want compulsion. We know that resolving that conflict by saying, "OK, let's just compel employers, not employees," is not really an answer since there is a wealth of economic theory to suggest that in the long-term compulsory employer contributions will be at the expense of cash wages. Indeed, in a major developed country which has introduced compulsory pension savings in the last two decades, Australia, that trade-off (the pension contributions were instead of cash wage increases) was a deliberate aim of the policy recognised by government, employers, and unions alike.

Finally, we know that simply compelling people to save does not necessarily fix the cost efficiency problem which we believe is a key thing to be addressed.

Australia again is a case in point, they do have compulsory savings. Theoretically, compulsory savings ought to be able to reduce significantly the management charges in pensions, but actually Australia has pretty high annual management charges.

To conclude, I hope I have managed not to give away at all what we are actually going to recommend but what I will say is that on compulsion quite as much as on state pensions, taxation, and pension ages, there are no easy answers; indeed, all the Pensions Commission can promise you, or government, or business, or individuals, is that there are going to be no easy choices at all among the recommendations we present on November 30th. Thank you very much.

The President: Thank you for conveying what is a very complex issue in such a short time with such clarity. Thank you very much indeed, Adair. I am going to

take a block of three questions, which I think is the best way to start.

Les Dobbs (GMB): Adair, what could be done to give people more choice not just about when they retire but how they make the transition from full-time work to full-time retirement?

Lorene Fabian (Amicus): I have a very straightforward question from our union. We believe there is a missing link. Without compulsion on employers and employees to contribute to a pension scheme, where on earth do you believe individuals will find the substantial, very substantial, proportion of income that would be required to provide retirement security, given the financial pressures that already exist in the shape of mortgage payments, personal debt, and growing educational commitments? This is the real world.

Linda Taaffe (National Union of Teachers): My question is about affordability. Adair Turner has mentioned the problems that are seen concerning affordability but there are some factors which I think I would like to ask him about. He says that taxes might have to rise in order to cope with the demands of the pensions but my question is, what about the taxes that are in place now? In a recent article in *The Guardian* it was pointed out that accountancy firms are specialists in avoiding tax, so much so that £100bn has been lost to the Treasury by perfectly respectable accountancy firms getting around the so-called laws; in fact, they are contemptuous. They say that however long it takes a piece of legislation to go through Parliament, they can avoid it within a couple of hours.

My question to Adair Turner is, what are you going to do about those firms? What laws are you going to introduce to make sure that the rich are taxed as much as they possibly can be?

Also, according to Treasury figures produced by HM Treasury, the UK spends only 5.5 percent of gross domestic product on pensions when the European average is around 10 percent. Let us hear what Adair Turner has to say about that before he comes to us and tells us that they have to reduce our pensions or increase our National Insurance contributions.

The President: There are the three questions for you, Adair.

Adair Turner: Thank you very much. The first one, how do we create more choice in the process of retirement? I think it is absolutely the aim we want to have. I think the idea that people should work full-time up to some given date of retirement and then stop thereafter is just an old idea, in fact it has changed for a lot of people already, but we need to encourage that to change.

We will within our report have one chapter which focuses entirely on removing barriers to people who want to work late, and will set out some issues about flexible retirement. Obviously, the anti-age discrimination legislation will help.

We should also look at some of the details of the way that pensions are paid. One specific idea which we did flag up in the first report relates to the ability to defer your pension and get a higher amount. Already it is the case that, although the official state pension age for the basic state pension is 60 for women, 65 for men, and at 65 you get £82 fully paid up, you can choose to defer that and get a higher figure later. For instance, if you defer it to about age 70, you get I think about £130 in this deferral option.

At the moment, that deferral option is inflexible, you either have to defer the whole of it or none of it. We should definitely be moving into an environment where some people have the option of taking half of their state pension and continuing to work part-time, if that is what they want to do, so that they are living a bit on state pension and a bit on earnings, and

deferring the other half so that that is going up. There are other issues of that sort that we will be looking at, about how we create greater flexibility for people to have periods of life where they are dependent both on pension income and on earnings in a combination.

On the point of how is it going to be afforded, is compulsion not the only way to make it affordable? Of course, compulsion on employees does not change the nature of affordability. You are simply saying you would have found it very difficult because you are on quite low income and you have mortgage commitments to save, but I am now going to compel you to save. That does not actually provide more resources, it simply says I am going to make sure that you make what we think is a sensible decision to save for retirement.

Obviously, it does feel at first sight different if what you do is compel employers, but I have to say that all of the evidence of economic theory does say that over time, if you compel employers, it will tend to be at the expense of cash wages. You will tend to produce a lower level of cash wages over time. I repeat that in the only major country which did introduce compulsory savings in the course of the last 20 years, which is Australia, compulsory pensions were introduced as an overt part of an incomes policy which was designed to constrain cash wages and instead put money into pensions. Again it did not magically give people extra resources, it was an indirect mechanism of making sure that people ended up with somewhat less cash wages but higher pension contributions.

Finally, on the issue of affordability and on tax evasion, I think at this stage I do have to say that we have had in the course of our work some frisson of excitement with elements of the Government as to whether we were going beyond our remit. I think if I was suddenly to start expressing points of view on what we do about tax evasion, a missive from the Treasury would appear on the Pensions Commission desk tomorrow.

I would, however, return to the fundamental point, wherever the money comes from the choice is more means testing, a higher state pension age, or more resources devoted to pensions. If you look at the TUC pension report it is clear what is proposed by the TUC, it is honest and it is straightforward. It is proposing that the cost of state pensions as a percent of GDP go from 5.8 percent today to somewhere in a range of 8.7 percent to 10.6 percent in 2050. If the Government was to accept that, it would have to decide where the tax revenues were going to come from, but that would amount to an increase in tax revenues devoted to pensions. The only alternative to that is more means testing or a higher state pension age.

The President: Thank you very much. I will take another three questions.

Tony Lennon (Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union): It seems to our union that most of the debate about pensions at the moment is framed around fairly typical workers and fairly typical employers, but on behalf of a union where we have thousands of members who work either in freelance or atypical ways, where their National Insurance contributions and their tax arrangements are through no fault of their own idiosyncratic, I would like to ask where that kind of worker actually fits into whatever the solution is for the future.

Brian Caton (Prison Officers Association UK): I did not actually count them but you used the word "average" on a number of occasions throughout. The average worker is going to be covered by your recommendations but what about the non average worker? What about someone who does not live much longer than 18 months following their retirement? Those are the facts and figures we have for prison

officers. Are we going to be caught up in your average figures to a position where our members will not even live to see retirement? I wonder if you could have a look at that and give us an answer, please.

Angela Gorman (UNISON): Thank you for this opportunity. I have been a nurse for nearly 30 years and surrounded by people who are on very low wages. On the statistics that you have given we know that the lowest paid in our society do not live longer, so are you asking people to work longer to enjoy a shorter retirement? How do you square the fact that the MPs have voted themselves a higher pension and the rest of us not? (*Applause*)

The President: I had a feeling that one might come up! Adair, that is another triple.

Adair Turner: On the first one, which is atypical workers, actually many of them are typical workers. Lots and lots of people work for small firms, an increasing number of people are self-employed, and an increasing number of people dip in and out of self-employment and employment contracts during life. We are very well aware that those are some of the segments where some of the biggest problems of under-provision of pension savings exist.

That is why, for instance, I focused in my comments on people working for small and medium size firms, although there are certainly problems of participation rates and sometimes of contribution rates among large companies. The biggest problems relate to small firms, that is where you are least likely to get an employer contribution. It is also where, unless there is an employer contribution, frankly, the financial services industry is not interested in going and trying to talk to people. There is no way they can make a profit except at reduction in yield so high that it would be pretty absurd for somebody to save. That is a problem and it is one of the arguments for compulsory schemes, or national schemes, that enable people in those sorts of firms to save whether it be by employer or employee contributions on a cost efficient basis.

There is then a very particular problem for the self-employed and I have to say that this is one of the areas where we are continuing to try and work out what we do. Even in compulsory schemes it turns out to be very difficult to compel the self-employed to save simply because of the way that they settle up their National Insurance at the end of the period. That is why, for instance, the Australian compulsory savings scheme does not cover the self-employed and the New Zealand new auto-enrolment scheme - it is not compulsion but it is auto-enrolment into a national scheme - again does not cover the self-employed.

We are still thinking about this. There are no easy answers in relation to the self-employed. They are a problem in relation to pension systems, whether state or private, throughout the world but be assured we are aware that that is a significant slice of people who have particular problems.

The second point is about averages. We are well aware that there are differences in the life expectancy by different socio-economic groups. Our latest look at the figures does not suggest that it is widening that dispersion. It looks as if there is a dispersion and life expectancies are now increasing in all socio-economic groups but they are increasing in parallel at different levels. There is something like a five-year difference between the life expectancies of what is characterised as social class one, professional people, and social classes four and five. That is what the figures show. They do, however, also show that we are now achieving increases in life expectancy in all of those groups. We will have to think about that.

I would also add that there is one way the figures sometimes get used that I think we have to be a bit cautious of. I sometimes see people taking life

expectancy at birth figures which say this group of people will live on average to 70, and then say that means they are only going to get five years in retirement at 65. That is a bit of a statistical cheat. You really do have to look at life expectancy at 65. When you take in life expectancy at birth you are pulling down those figures by the fact that some people die early in life well before retirement. If you do it on that basis, you will prove that back in 1950 nobody had any time in retirement because life expectancy at birth was below the retirement age.

That, I think, is overstating the case but we are well aware of the differences in socio-economic class and, indeed, the *Sunday Times* reported three months ago that I had thought up a magic scheme of different retirement ages for graduates and non graduates to deal with this. Actually, neither I nor the Commission have done that but at least it illustrates we are trying to think about that particular problem.

Finally, I think the UNISON point was again this point about people who do not live longer. I hope I have addressed the point by pointing out that we are aware of the figures, we have looked very carefully at the figures, we think we have the best shot at what those differences by socio-economic class are, and we will refer to them in the report, so I think I have answered that already.

As for MPs, I will leave it to Alan Johnson to answer that question.

The President: That was a very good concluding line. I now have to close this session, I am afraid, because we have to get through other business, but I did want to say, Adair, thank you very much indeed for coming and giving that presentation and certainly for being prepared to stay and take some questions. Thank you very much indeed.

Solving the pensions crisis

The President: Congress, the TUC's Pensions Report, *Solving the Pensions Crisis*, is as a result of two-and-a-half years' work undertaken by the TUC Pensions Task Group. Pensions are one of the key issues facing the trade union movement at the moment. The report outlines our vision on how the UK pensions system should be designed and what we believe needs to be done to solve the pensions challenge. You all will have received copies of the Pensions Report in your packs.

I am now pleased to call on the General Secretary to present the TUC's Pensions Report. Thank you, Brendan.

Brendan Barber (General Secretary): Thank you, Jeannie. Good morning, Congress. This is the time of year that we have to listen to employers and sundry right wing commentators telling us that unions have had their day, we are out of touch, part of the fossil record, not the future. Everyone here today could produce myriad reasons why that is wrong, but if we have to choose just one, our campaign for pensions justice would be a strong contender for that award. Unions have been right at the forefront of those exposing the depths of the pensions crisis. If it was not for union campaigning there would be no pensions protection fund, no financial assistance scheme, no continuing campaign to make sure that the people who need the support of that scheme get the resources they need; employers would still be free to scrap pensions schemes without a scrap of consultation and, indeed, it is an open question as to whether Adair would have had a pensions commission to chair were it not for union campaigning for a new pensions settlement.

We need to do more than sound the alarm and campaign to right the injustices suffered by the victims of today's pensions failures. Without radical change,

millions of people at work today will face poverty on retirement. We also have a responsibility to set out how to solve the pensions crisis of the future. That is exactly what we do in the General Council's Task Group report, which we ask you to adopt today.

First, we must set out what is wrong. We need to put the spotlight on the employer retreat from their pensions responsibilities. On Sunday we published a shocking dossier of new evidence. Only one in four workers in the private sector is now a member of a workplace scheme, half of salary-related pensions closed to new entrants in just three years between 2000 and 2003, two-thirds of final salary schemes are no longer open to new members, and contribution rates to money purchase schemes are half that to the schemes they have replaced.

Our unions, and some employers to their credit, have helped to resist that tide but if the trends continue just one in ten will have a work-based pension open to them in 20 years' time in the private sector. There is one group, however, that has successfully resisted pensions cuts, Britain's top bosses. They have been happy to tighten everyone's belts but their own. The UK's most senior directors share a cool £1bn in their pension pots: even Sir Digby says it is wrong.

While it is right to put the spotlight on employers, we should not let the Government off the hook either. The rot started with the Conservatives, they cut the link between pensions and earnings, hollowed out SERPS and presided over the pensions misselling scandal that destroyed trust in private pensions for a generation. This Government has done better. There have been real efforts to cut pensioner poverty; winter fuel allowances, free TV licences, and more, but some two million pensioners, mostly women, still live in poverty. The state retirement pension is one of the lowest in Europe and we join with the National Pensioners Convention in saying today, it is shameful that it is still not linked to average earnings. Indeed, let me say how good it has been to see Jack Jones with us here at Congress this week still battling for pensions' justice for the pensioners of today.

An awful lot remains to be done. As ministers accepted when they set up Adair's commission, current policies simply do not add up to a long-term solution, and that is what we set out today. First, we need action on the state pension. Everyone in retirement should be able to build on a strong state pension, set high enough to lift all out of poverty and ending the need for means testing. Most of all, it should be linked to earnings again so that pensioners can share in rising prosperity, not fall behind each year. It must better serve women; just 16 percent of women get a full basic state pension in their own right at the moment. That is why today we say that everyone should get a full basic state pension in their own right.

Second, it is time to make employers face up to their responsibilities again; voluntarism has failed. The genie has escaped from its bottle and it cannot be put back. That is why compulsory savings are at the heart of our pensions' solution through the good occupational schemes we want to retain and extend, through new schemes, and also through a modernised state second pension. But in putting forward our solution we also have to guard against the quack remedies. Let us be very clear today. We say no to a higher state pension age and the work-till-you-drop policies of making people work until they are 70. Of course, if people really want to work longer that is fine, and finding new routes to retirement for those who do not want to work full-time one day and retire full-time the next, that gets our support too. It has to be a genuine choice, not driven by poverty or lack of proper pension availability.

This is our message to government on public sector pensions too. Public servants have been made a

pensions promise and they expect that to be kept. We welcome the government's recognition before the election that they had this wrong. I welcome their willingness to negotiate on the normal pension age in the public sector. Alan Johnson, whom we welcome this morning, is leading for the Government and is playing it straight. I think he understands the strength of feeling on this issue and he certainly will after today's debate, I am sure. I think he is genuinely trying to find a solution with us. We are not there yet, but I believe a solution can be found, based on a genuine choice and flexibility, not on an imposed across the board increase in the pension age.

So, Congress, let us adopt the policies before us today, but let us do much more than that. In the coming months -- as Ministers consider the Turner Commission's Report -- we will have to take our pensions' campaign to the next level, not just to our members who depend on us, but on pensions (as on so many other issues) we are the voice of Britain at work. Therefore, for today's and tomorrow's workers do not just vote for the report today but go back to your communities and workplaces and let us step up our campaign for pensions justice. Let us get to it.

(Applause)

Public Service Pensions

Dave Prentis (*UNISON*) moved Composite Motion 8.

He said: I am proud of the part UNISON played with our sister unions in forcing the government climb down on pensions in the spring of this year, averting the biggest strike seen in this country since 1926. Congress, I was privileged to work with eight other public service unions, more than 1.5 million members in central and local government determined to fight to defend their pensions, winning a famous victory. To those in New Labour watching and listening today, make no mistake, we will do it again if we have to.

(Applause)

A year ago, when we last debated pensions, there were many in government who doubted the strength of feeling of our members; many in government who underestimated our members' anger at the plans to break up their pensions schemes; and many in government, Alan, who failed to understand the outrage felt by our members at the hypocrisy of politicians voting themselves the best pensions scheme in Europe whilst attacking ours. To those who think that that anger has subsided I say "Think again". To those who promised genuine negotiations who think they can get away with re-packaging their old proposals, I say: "Think again". To the Tory-led Local Government Association, if you think our members will pick up the bill for the plundering of their pension fund by the last Tory Government, to reduce poll tax, you can think again as well. To John Prescott, under pressure from the Tory local government employers to go back on his word, I say: "Stand firm" because I promise you this, public service unions will not be divided; we are stronger and more united than ever. We will take strike action to defend our pensions; we will fight proposals to increase the pension age and cut benefits; we will fight for pensions that give dignity and security to our members in retirement. Those who deliver public services deserve nothing less -- those on the front line praised by politicians for their selfless sacrifice and heroism one day but let down the next.

Divide and rule will not work. Those working in the private sector would gain nothing whatsoever from cutting the pensions of those working in their local hospital, school or local Job Centre. Ministers claim it is unfair: they say it is unfair that public sector workers should get a decent pension while workers in the private sector see theirs slashed. Two wrongs do not make a right. I will tell you where the real divide is, it is

between the rich and the poor, the haves and the have-nots: the double standard that dictates that the rich and powerful can award themselves multimillion pound pensions while the average pension of a local government worker is £73 a week. Whilst the fat cat directors, the so-called captains of industry, still award themselves a pension worth an average £2.5 million, those who rely on state benefits live in poverty.

Part of our campaign is to restore the earnings link to state pensions. So no more talk of divides between public and private, between workers and state pensioners. This rejects completely a race to the bottom, utterly rejects a levelling down. On life expectancy, it may have gone up for the more affluent but for the worst off it still remains the same.

I say to the Government and I say to Alan, be in no doubt, we reject the politics of envy and divide and rule, we will fight to defend our pensions, we will fight to win better pensions deals for all workers, fight to end the scandalous pension plight facing millions of women in our country, and we will campaign to lift ourselves off the bottom of the European pensioners league table.

Congress, as a movement we have a duty not to fail our present members. We also have a duty not to fail our members of tomorrow. We must not allow this generation of public service workers to be the last to enjoy decent pensions. They deserve more from us than that. Let us be the ones who stood up united, fighting for what is fair and just, united in anger, united in our determination, united in our belief that we can win.

Congress I move. (*Prolonged Applause*)

The President: You have a few supporters there, Dave!

Janice Godrich (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) seconded Composite Motion 8.

She said: Yesterday Congress heard Mark Serwotka outline the attacks on job security PCS members face. Working in the civil service and related bodies can be a pretty dismal place at present: the constant anxiety over job security, injustices and unfairness in pay and performance systems, now compounded by the prospect of working longer with poverty in retirement.

Over many years our employer has tried to justify holding down civil service pay levels by arguing that we get a good pension. It is vital to rebuff these myths. In the 1970s the civil pension scheme was the eighth greatest in value in the UK. For PCS members now the average pension in retirement is £4,800 -- hardly a golden handshake -- because low pay equals low pensions.

In December 2002 the Green Paper outlining major changes emerged. We have long supported and argued for a flexible decade of retirement that would allow staff to retire at any time between 55 and 65 to suit their particular personal circumstances. The government's proposals effectively shut the door on this by robbing civil service workers of their right to a full pension at 60. The Government claim that the present system is unaffordable, yet they have wasted billions on failed IT systems and spent further billions each year in the civil service on private sector management consultants, whilst presiding over £25 billion of uncollected tax at the same time as cutting jobs in the Inland Revenue.

It soon became clear that the attack on pensions of PCS members affected large numbers of other public sector workers. Faced with a threat of such magnitude, only a united response would suffice. PCS has always recognised this and was pleased to place this position before last year's Congress. Earlier this year we saw this demonstrated in action. Whatever your views on the cynical timing, the threat of joint action on 23 March this year, the potential of over one million working

people acting in a united way achieved what should have been the natural instinct of any decent employer -- start from the beginning and negotiate with the trade unions. Our responsibility is now to ensure that that unity continues and we are in the strongest possible position to defend our members' position.

PCS endorses the demands made within the composite. The threat of a compulsory increase in the retirement age is unacceptable. Any detriment to our members' pensions will mean more misery and poverty in retirement. Colleagues, in parts of the west of Scotland the average male life expectancy is 64. Unless we stop these proposals these members will not even live to pick up a pension. What a disgraceful legacy that would be in the 21st century.

I am confident that we will send a clear message from this Congress: we are united, we are determined. An attack on our members' pensions on this scale will mean poverty in retirement. PCS is pleased to second Composite Motion 8.

Occupational Pensions

Tom Brennan (*GMB*) moved Composite Motion 9.

He said: It is the case, and well documented, that pension benefits in every sector of the United Kingdom economy have eroded substantially in the last decade. Workers in the private sector have suffered most from unscrupulous employers who are abandoning schemes altogether or changing from final salary to inferior money purchase schemes. With this scenario, one would have expected -- and our members should have been entitled to conclude -- that under the public service umbrella at least their pensions were safe, in good hands, and particularly during the reign of a Labour Government. Not so. Despite the statement from Chancellor Brown on Tuesday, that we work better when we work together -- with which we entirely agree, of course -- if it means what it says why is John Prescott, on behalf of the Government, attempting unilaterally to reduce our members' pensions benefits? That is most certainly not working together in anyone's language.

This issue is not just about raising the retirement age; it is also about raising contribution rates beyond the affordability of the lowest paid workers, and it is the lowest paid workers who do not join the scheme in the first place. Raising contributions will inevitably lead to less participation and a greater dependency on state benefits in future: therefore, economic madness. In simple terms, this government are asking our members to pay more contributions for less benefit.

It is all right for John Prescott. He is one of the endangered species who has not felt the draught in the pensions crisis. Yes, the Members of Parliament have developed an immunity against this contagious disease through vaccination that was self administered. It is not all right, Jack. I do not mean to get personal, not with Johnny One Punch, I would not dare, but he has 25 years service and probably the best pension scheme in the land with a potential income of £83,000 a year. Contrast that with an average local government pensioner surviving on less than £3,800 per annum. Even if there were local government workers on his annual salary of £134,000 and with 25 years' service, they would receive less than half of his pension for sitting on the green benches. Different standards and double standards.

This is not news, but just in case there is any shadow of a doubt GMB are not prepared to allow this Government, or any future government, to reduce our members' pensions benefits wherever or whenever they work. We will take whatever action is appropriate to defend our members' pensions. Selling out future generations of public service workers, by condoning the introduction of inferior schemes for new starters,

will undermine the fundamental principles of our movement today and fracture the solidarity of tomorrow. We will not allow this Government to divide our members through differing employment conditions in the same way as employers have done with pension benefits in the private sector. We must stand united and say with one voice, no forcing our members to work until they drop, no forced increase in contributions for no extra benefit, no inferior scheme for new starters.

The only comfort for many public sector workers is that they can be fairly sure -- fingers crossed, of course -- that their employer will not go bankrupt and take the pension fund down with them like those who have already suffered this fate and are looking to the financial services scheme for justice, with no guarantee that they will receive one penny. This Government is leaving tens of thousands in limbo because the FAS liferaft is too small. The £400 million available will not go far with over 100,000 potential claims in the pipeline. When that money has been spent on those nearest retirement, it will leave 50,000 plus claimants in the wilderness. An immediate injection of cash to resolve this problem is now a priority, along with proper pension projection legislation so that this does not happen again -- sympathy not cash for many of the victims of bankrupt pension schemes. This Government must act now.

This Labour Government needs to remember why it was created, why it was supported by working people, why it won the election. Britain needs a government prepared to protect its people in childhood, in work and in retirement. It is time they did just that.

In conclusion I will refer again to Chancellor Brown's speech. We agree entirely: what we stand for, what the movement stands for, is dignity and financial security in retirement through good pensions. I rest my case.

Robbie Ridoutt (*Prospect*) seconded Composite Motion 9.

He said: how many times this week have we heard that the Government value local government workers and, in particular, those low paid workers without whom the infrastructure of local government would collapse.

The Government also tell us that they are committed to a good work/life balance policy. Is not a dignified retirement part of a good work/life balance? It is a disgrace that these people who went into local government service on low wages, and willingly paid six per cent of their wages into a pension scheme on the understanding that they would receive a reasonable pension based on their final salary when they retired, now find that their deferred wages have been taken from them with no guarantee of receiving their expected pension. That, Congress, is a pay cut.

This motion recognises the immediate need for a pension tax incentive to encourage a greater level of investment in pension schemes. However, that can only be a long-time benefit. The more pressing need is to ensure the immediate security of pensions for low paid workers, workers whose average wage is only £3,700 a year, £70 a week. Yes, the government have attempted to provide security through the Pension Protection Fund and the financial assistance schemes, but both are seriously underfunded, and by definition will only provide some assistance. They will not top-up all the short fall in pension expectations. Congress, we must not allow low paid workers to become victims. Support this motion and send a message to the government that it must take immediate steps to provide a guarantee for these pensions. I understand that there are billions of pounds of national insurance contributions sitting in the Treasury's coffers. Here is an opportunity to put that to good use.

Prospect is pleased to second this motion.

Keith Turner (*Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists*): This is my first time at TUC Congress. I speak in support of Composite 8, Public Service Pensions, and I am sure that all in this room support wholeheartedly what UNISON, in moving the motion, and PCS, in seconding it., put forward.

As Adair Turner said earlier, drawing attention to this TUC document, it highlights the challenging but in the TUC's view achievable target of encouraging 80 per cent of those available for work into taking rewarding employment. It firmly rejects any notion of increasing the state pension age.

As regards specifically the NHS pension scheme, the consultation period took place earlier this year, the responses to which concluded in April. In relation to age, a familiar theme emerged: the management side partners believed that a reasonable response to demographic pressure facing the NHS pension scheme would be to increase the normal pension age from 60 to 65 years. The staff side response -- chaired by Eddie Saville from my own union -- was to vehemently oppose this.

Colleagues, podiatrists, like other NHS workers, face ever increasing workloads, creating greater physical and mental stress. The last thing that workers need to hear is that they might have to work longer to receive their contractually entitled pension. Earlier this year -- no doubt due to the threat of industrial action by other public sector union colleagues -- the Government initiative appeared to be to move towards formal negotiations rather than the previous consultation based on the premise of increasing the normal pension age. In March, Alan Johnson wrote to Brendan indicating that the Government were prepared to negotiate on all aspects of the proposed changes, in particular the proposal to increase the pension age. It will be interesting to hear his response in relation to that today. We appreciate, as we said earlier, that some people might wish to work beyond the normal pension age. Flexibility and choice, but moreover voluntariness, are clearly the way forward.

The TUC Pensions Group Report itself welcomes, it commends, efforts through collective bargaining to create a flexible decade of retirement, based on individual choice, taking account of the individual's differing circumstances. It acknowledges the vitally important role that unions should play in such negotiations. If I can summarise, retention of the normal pension age without increase, individual choice based on voluntary and flexible approaches, final salary bases creating certainty. These are the objectives. The view that the NHS pension is a deferred pay, a contractual entitlement, is clearly the correct approach.

Finally, colleagues, may I commend the composite motion to Congress, congratulating the TUC so far on its work and calling on it to continue its high profile and most valuable work in defending legitimate public sector worker expectations. I thank you and ask you for your support in supporting Composite 8.

The President: Thank you, Keith, and welcome to your first Congress.

Gail Cartmail (*Amicus*) Supporting Composite Motion 8 said: *Amicus's* contribution to this debate is on the issue of consultation. But while I am up here and on my feet I do want really just to get a message across to Alan, which is that all our public service members in health, in local government, in higher and further education feel passionately about what they regard as their contractual entitlement to the pensions scheme that they were promised when they signed on the dotted line and dedicated themselves as public servants. It is shameful that our members have to go to the brink of industrial action to get our Labour Government to consult, to listen and to work with us, to reach agreement. We are overwhelmed by our

members' anger, Alan, and we really cannot emphasise enough the power of the support in the talks that we are having with you.

To be fair, John Prescott did eventually listen and he pulled the regulations and met our demands -- no dictats, consultation, disclosure of facts, and meaningful negotiation -- but the draft regulations implementing the new Pensions Act 2004 will not give all workers the right to consultation. Small and medium size firms are excluded. Trades unions can be ignored as employers have choice with whom they consult. Does not that word 'choice' crop up in a very negative way very frequently at the moment? Ill health pension provision could be snatched away without consultation; employers would be obliged to consider comments but not required to provide a reasoned response.

The consultation Amicus wants is before decisions are made, with an expectation of proper talks to agree changes. I spent Valentine's Night with John Prescott -- and not many people can say that! -- with Dave and others, in compressed talks at the eleventh hour, on the brink of industrial action. Now, happy to do that John, happy to do that Alan, but let us not make a mess of the draft regulations, let us get them sorted out and let us give all workers the right to consultation and right to influence via their recognised trades unions.

I urge colleagues to support Composite 8.

Steve Sinnott (*National Union of Teachers*): This is an important debate for millions of public sector workers, an important debate for my members, members of the National Union of Teachers; and this stage, this time, is an important time for us too. It is important because there is a real challenge being laid down to the trade union movement and to the unions representing public sector workers. How we respond to that challenge will affect the lives of the current generation of public sector workers, but also many future generations of public sector workers. It can also influence the quality of the public services by the way in which it has an impact on the recruitment and the retention of public sector workers.

We in the NUT recognise that our pensions are important, and we also recognise that the pensions of our colleagues who are in the private sector are important too. We reject any artificial divide between those two sectors. The theme of this debate has been set, and it includes the issues of unity and a real determination to protect and defend our members' pensions. That unity in the course of the past few months has been assisted by the real work of the TUC, in ensuring that in the public sector the PSF process moved smoothly and protected and ensured that that unity assisted us in the negotiations and discussions. The unity that was forged in the period before the general election created the success of the movement in persuading government to negotiate with us properly on the issues of pensions. That unity was the result of our determination, some of us by the ballots that we held in order to make very clear our determination to protect public sector pensions.

However, we all must recognise that at the moment, as we move into the details of the pension discussions, there are real pressures arising from the different priorities existing within different unions and different schemes. Now is the time for us not to be split by looking at those different priorities in a way other than the impact in the way we press for one will have on us all. We in the National Union of Teachers are fully committed to ensuring that there is unity across the public sector. We too are fully committed to ensuring that in our scheme-specific negotiations the teachers' organisations stick together. I have to say that I am very confident that that will be the case. I am confident too that we will ensure that we say to everybody, and

in particular to the Government, that the real issue of the 60 to 65 ages must be properly addressed, for it is only if that is properly addressed will it have the agreement of the National Union of Teachers.

Support Composite 8.

Tom Robson (*Prison Officers Association UK*): I spent Valentine's night in jail!

Earlier this week, the Prison Officers Association was very happy to support Motion 18 as part of Composite 7. That was regarding the giving of rights to individuals, supported by their trade unions, to make their own decisions regarding retirement. We are all different individuals with individual needs but there are still many occupations where, sadly, life expectancy is below the norm. Despite what may have been said earlier today, it ain't getting any better. Individual unions must be given the opportunity, through the TUC, to genuinely argue their case and to be taken heed of rather than having revised retirement ages imposed upon them merely to balance the budget. Trades unions can supply statistics, and have supplied statistics. Sadly, I can tell you that prison officers are amongst those who, in general, have a poor life expectancy following retirement -- and we are talking about 18 months average.

The POA in placing this amendment worries about those who may be expected to continue to cope with rigorous physical and mental demands, which not only shorten life expectancy but do actually kill our members. Individual workers need to leave essential services at a time that suits their own individual needs. For prison officers, to be fighting with inmates in controlled situations, and in riot conditions, well into their sixties cannot be safe and simply cannot be justified.

In closing, however, it must be remembered that following long service to the public the ability to retire at the right time must be linked to the provision of decent and fair pensions allowing for comfort and recuperation in retirement, because by God our members have earned it. Remember that any compulsory extension to the retirement age is wrong; it is unacceptable and it is dangerous. Reject it for your members. Support the composite and the Prisons Officers Association fully supports this campaign.

Thank you, colleagues. Thank you, President.

Steve Connolly (*Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*): Rising in support of Composite 8 referring to the question of pensions and, in particular, state funded pensions.

Congress, President, sisters and brothers, in 1980 the Thatcher Government abolished the link with earnings. That resulted in a cut, a short- fall in the state pension - £30 a week for a single pensioner 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, keep yourself warm in the winter, enough to clothe yourself and enjoy a few simple pleasures in life.

So, why have not Labour restored the link? Why, when we have the most successful and buoyant economy for the last 30 years? It is a fact that we are the fourth richest economy in the industrial world, yet the Chancellor of the Exchequer says our nation cannot afford to pay a decent pension to state pensioners. It is a myth; it is a myth of monumental proportions. By the way, these are Labour politicians, people who should know better.

Last year the National Pensioners Convention published the Pensions Manifesto. It is a good read because it tells the truth. Its full title is *Towards Dignity, Security and Fulfilment in Retirement* -- a very appropriate title. The manifesto clearly illustrates that one in five, over two 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 cost of council tax and utility bills, yet it does not end there. Pensioners who receive an income from one source or another of £131 pounds a week pay income tax. It does not seem true but it is. Over four million pensioner households -- let us be clear, not individual pensioners -- have savings of less than £6,000.

But the problem does not end there; it does not end with current pension poverty. The Government appear to have a plan to reduce the amount of the nation's wealth, GDP, it spends on the state pension by more than 20 per cent. There can only be one result from this awful decision. It is a time bomb. The problems of pensioners today will be increased sharply for the pensioners of tomorrow. Why, when there is a record level of money in the National Insurance Fund, a massive £30 billion -- not £30 million, £30 billion -- of usable surpluses? What is the hidden agenda? Why cannot our money, pensioners' money, stored in the National Insurance Fund, be spent on state pensions? The answer is clear: there is not the political will. The Government that we supported and elected are putting the needs of big business first. That can be seen wherever you care to look.

It is an absolute mistake. Pension provision is a vote winner not a vote loser. Let us be clear, state pension remains the bedrock of the pension system. Hopefully, restore the link and support the pensioners manifesto.

Diana Markham (*British Dietetic Association*): Supporting Composite 8. As we represent dieticians working in the NHS our union welcomes the Government's move to formal negotiations instead of consultation on a compulsory retirement age of 65. Flexibility and a voluntary retirement age are paramount to successful pension reform. There are workers who value the opportunity to work beyond the age of 60 and receive a pension enhancement that continued employment brings them. Indeed, it was a dietician that took this issue to the European Court to enable women to have the right to work beyond the age of 60.

A recent Women and Work Commission report has shown that women are disadvantaged in terms of pension provision. Being able to work beyond the age of 60 could obviously be a benefit to these workers. Other people may choose to reduce the number of hours they work each week as they approach retirement age. The flexibility to do this is desirable. Some healthcare workers are burnt out by the time they reach the age of 60 and the prospect of having to work to 65 in order to receive their full pension is unacceptable. Continued working could be damaging both to the workers' health and to the health and safety of the patients they are treating. The current final salary pension scheme is easy to understand, and in order to plan for retirement workers need to be able to calculate clearly the amount of pension they will receive.

In conclusion there is an issue of trust linked with public sector pensions. Pensions are deferred pay and they must be maintained on a final salary basis, not moved to a career average formulation, which is likely to be detrimental given the career patterns of many public service workers, particularly women. An increased pension age should be voluntary, not compulsory.

Congress therefore urges the TUC to continue its campaign on public sector pensions. Please support.

Jerry Bartlett (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*): Speaking in support of Composite 8.

TUC public sector affiliates have achieved an unprecedented unity around our joint determination

to defend our pensioners' normal pension ages. Accordingly, we were delighted by the Government's change of approach from dictat to commitment to negotiate. This conversion had nothing to do with the impending general election of course! We are now becoming extremely cynical. Hours of meetings and informal talks post-election have failed to achieve any real progress towards maintaining current normal pension ages. Such proposals as have emerged would require public sector workers to themselves fund maintenance of current scheme provision, through the payment of additional contributions, or the diversion of funds from possible scheme improvements long campaigned for. The Government must not underestimate our members' anger over this matter. The extent of their determination to defend their pensions schemes has taken some of us by surprise. It is a matter of certainty that failure to negotiate an acceptable settlement to this dispute will result in united industrial action across the public sector.

The Government's determination to save money on public sector pension schemes is driven by the increasing life expectancy of public sector workers. Longer life is of little benefit to workers who, in increasing numbers, struggle to reach normal retirement age in good health. If they are required to work even longer to achieve normal pension age, then their quality of life in retirement is going to be that much poorer.

As this dispute progresses, we must not allow the Government to create divisions between our public and private sector memberships. The argument is deployed that current public sector pension provision cannot be justified because of appalling provision in the private sector. We look to this Labour Government to address inadequate pension provision wherever it occurs. We want levelling up, not equity of misery in old age. What about the argument that current public sector pension provision cannot be justified because levels of pay are now alleged to be higher in the public sector than in the private? Abysmal levels of low pay exist amongst certain working groups in both the public and the private sectors. Again, we expect this Labour Government to address low pay and inadequate provision wherever it occurs.

I appeal to you not to allow the Government to play off groups of workers against each other, whether that is within the public sector or between the public sector and the private sector. We must stand together to win this dispute. Please support Composite 8 and Composite 9.

Tony Woodley (*Transport and General Workers' Union*): Supporting Composite 8 and Composite 9. Millions are facing pensions insecurity and thousands are being robbed by company closures. Opportunist bosses have taken billions from pensions holidays during the good times and -- surprise, surprise -- when they have to put their hands in their pockets they squeal like the proverbial pig.

But how do we tackle the pensions crisis? Firstly, a decent pension linked to earnings. We must find the means to restore the link, not the means testing. We have to protect occupational pensions. Secondly, if the pensions blackhole is to be closed, then we must have compulsory employer contributions. There is no other answer, irrespective of what the CBI say when they look after their own pensions. Thirdly, comrades, in the public sector we as trades unions must remain united and determined to fight for our members' pensions. If that means a national strike, as was almost the case this year, then so be it. Lastly, but not least, we must safeguard workers when their company schemes go bust. What a relief it was for MG Rover that the Pension Protection Fund came into force only the week before the company collapsed. We welcome the schemes for workers at firms like UEF, who have

already seen their pensions vanish through no fault of their own. But be clear, £400 million shared between 80,000 workers gives them less than 70 pence a day. We say that the fund and the scheme should protect every single worker's pension.

Do not let anyone tell me that the third richest country in the world cannot afford pensions justice. I do not need lectures from Adair Turner or any MPs to tell me we cannot have pensions justice for working men and women in our country when they look after themselves. It is one law for the rich and one law for the poor.

I will finish on this, comrades. He who aspires to become Prime Minister should put a windfall tax on the obscene profits of the greedy oil companies -- and when they have done that they should also do exactly the same thing with the greedy banks. Even the Tories when they were in power did that.

I support Composite 8 and Composite 9. Thank you.

* *Composite 8 was CARRIED*

* *Composite 9 was CARRIED*

Address by Rt Hon Alan Johnson MP, Secretary of State for Trade and Industry

The President: It is now my great pleasure to welcome Alan Johnson, Secretary of State for Trade and Industry, into the lion's den. Alan, of course, is no stranger to Congress. Last year he addressed us in his previous role as Secretary of State for Work and Pensions. For many years before that he was a familiar face at the rostrum in his former role as leader of the Communication Workers Union.

Alan, yesterday we heard the Chancellor, Gordon Brown, and the Chair of the Labour Party, Ian McCartney, both reconfirmed the central importance of the Warwick Agreement to Labour's third term. Of course, your new department has a key role to play in delivering that agenda so that together we can make a real difference to working people's lives. Alan, we look forward to hearing how we can make progress towards our shared goals. The rostrum is yours. We look forward to hearing from you.

Rt Hon Alan Johnson MP: President and Congress, thank you for giving me the opportunity to address you today, and thank you, Jeannie, for that introduction.

As Secretary of the Jeannie Drake Fan Club I have to say she serves to remind us all of how much we have lost by not being able to attract more women into senior trade union positions.

Congress, I want to talk this morning about some of the challenges of our changing society. I want to talk about the change in the context of trade, employment rights and our industrial infrastructure. Now, more than ever before, change is constant and inevitable -- it can be managed but it cannot be stopped.

In Lampedusa's great novel, *The Leopard*, the hero Trancredi, surveying the collapse of the old order in 19th century Italy, says, "For everything to stay the same, everything must change".

We have an opportunity to shape that change in accordance with our principles and our beliefs, or be overwhelmed by it, to the detriment of the people you represent.

The debate this morning on pensions epitomises this dilemma. In 1900 when Keir Hardie's Labour Representation Committee was established life expectancy was 47. Now after a century of progress and half a century of the National Health Service it's 78.

In 1908 when the state pension was first introduced, there were 14 people working for every one person retired. Now the ratio is 4 to 1, and by 2050 it will be 2 to 1. With a declining birth rate and increased longevity, we have a cradle to grave welfare state with fewer cradles and a thankfully longer journey to the grave.

There is not a single trade union in this Congress which has not had to tackle the ramifications of the dramatic changes that Adair Turner highlighted in respect of the pension provisions of your members. Indeed, every trade union here has had to review their pension arrangements as an employer for their own staff. There should be no surprise, therefore, that Government, as a major employer, has had to do the same.

President, I fully accept that our original approach was wrong. Public services have a right to expect proposals to change their pensions arrangements to be discussed and negotiated with their trade unions. That wasn't happening before. I hope that Brendan and his colleagues accept that it is happening now.

Whilst we do want to change the retirement at 60 ethos, this is in the context of preserving high-quality, defined-benefit, index-linked pension schemes, making improvements to other elements of the schemes, preserving the current arrangements in the unfunded arrangements for existing staff for almost a decade and introducing arrangements which give individuals a choice about when they retire -- be it aged 60, 65 or later. But we can only deliver this within a scheme that is capable of withstanding the demographic changes that are bound to have a radical effect on pension provision. I look forward to further discussions and if we face the fact together, I am confident that our negotiations will succeed.

I would just like to make two more quick points on pensions. Firstly, the latest evidence shows that unions and employers are increasingly including pensions within the voluntary bargaining process. As that trend continues, pensions should become a core part of collective bargaining. And in our deliberations following the Pensions Commission's final report we have to do more to ensure a fairer deal for women in the provision of the state pension.

Perhaps the most prominent of the winds of change are the trade winds blowing from China and India. I have just returned from the EU summits with those countries which highlighted the scale of the challenge and the opportunity that globalisation represents. Since 1985 China's economy has grown by 9 percent annually, India's by 6 percent. In 1990 China and India together produced fewer than two million graduates between them. Now they produce four million every year.

The talks in China were initially overshadowed by stockpiles of sweaters and lingerie. We secured an agreement on textiles to resolve the problem, which as I told Peter Mandelson demonstrated that both China and the EU have politicians in command of their briefs. (*Chuckling*) He did not laugh either, funnily enough.

But the dispute over textiles is part of a much wider debate about trade and protectionism. Our industrial strategy has to rise to the challenge of globalisation and compete by supporting companies and their workers while they improve skills, diversify into higher value added products, and invest in new technology to drive up productivity.

Despite their enormous advances, more than 47 percent of the Chinese population and more than 81 percent of the Indian population are living on less than \$2 a day. India and China can at least look forward to increase rewards from their participation in global markets. But for many least developed countries, there are barriers to effective participation in trade. That is

why I am glad that Jeannie has made 'Make Poverty History' one of her themes this week because trade is every bit as important as aid and the cancellation of debt in the fight to eradicate poverty across our planet. That is why it is crucial that we have a pro-development, pro-poor outcome to the Doha Round.

Trade represents an opportunity for developing countries to lift themselves out of poverty, but only if the rich world reduces barriers for products which developing countries can sell. In particular, that means cutting agricultural protection and trade-distorting subsidies in developed countries.

As we said in our manifesto, we do not believe that poor countries should be forced to liberalise. They must be free to introduce trade reforms gradually so that they can build their capacity and improve their infrastructure. Colleagues, if we succeed in the World Trade talks in Hong Kong in December, we can lift 140 million people off subsistence of less than \$2 a day – 60 million in sub-Saharan Africa alone – and increase global prosperity by producing benefits of between \$250 billion and \$600 billion annually.

Alongside the challenges, globalisation means new markets and new potential for trade partnerships. Chinese demand has helped our steel industry to recover. In New Delhi last week we clinched a deal to sell 43 A320 Airbus planes to Air India. The modern world is not an easy environment for our manufacturing industries. Manufacturing has declined as a percentage of our GDP as it has in every part of the developed world in each of the last three decades.

But manufacturing continues to be crucial to this country. Our response to the challenges we face is to work with unions, employers and the RDAs to realise every element of the manufacturing strategy we agreed between us three years ago. We have established the Manufacturing Forum. The number of young people participating in apprenticeships has risen by more than 200 per cent since 1997. We are establishing the Manufacturing Skills Academy, linking FE with higher education through vocational two year Foundation Degrees, and through radical reforms to secondary education, ending the prejudice against vocational in favour of academic qualifications.

Another idea emerging from our strategy, the Manufacturing Advisory Service, designed to respond to the need for expert accessible advice, has now generated £175 million of added value for the firms it has helped.

The announcement I made with Peter Hain in May, pledging £180 million of support to Bombardier Aerospace in Belfast, is a tangible demonstration of our commitment to manufacturing.

And, of course, we understand completely the importance of the new Airbus A350 project, which will require investment in the latest composite technologies and advanced manufacturing techniques so that Britain can maintain its lead in wing construction and design.

Manufacturing matters but we are also fortunate to have a vibrant services sector in the UK. During the past two decades knowledge-based business services have accounted for more than half our job growth. We lead Europe in our share of the expanding services market. But the European Union has yet to honour its Constitution in this area. The Treaty of Rome established the free movement of people, capital, goods and services. A combination of Byzantine licensing systems, discrimination based on nationality and onerous requirements to register with national and local authorities hamper and restrict the growth in jobs that liberalisation of the services sector would bring.

The European Services Directive is necessary to address these problems. Whilst the UK now has almost 75 percent of our people in work, Germany is on 66

percent with 4.3 million unemployed, while France is on 63 percent with 2.5 million people out of work.

Just as unions such as Amicus have argued correctly that the European single market has secured hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs, there is the potential to secure up to 600,000 extra jobs across Europe through a single market in services that provides real benefits to customers and new opportunities for British business. But this must not be at the expense of key labour standards or protection for our workers. In particular, Alan Ritchie and his colleagues in UCATT are right to stress the importance of UK health and safety legislation applying to all construction workers on all UK sites irrespective of their nationality or that of their employers. We will ensure that this and other crucial workplace standards are respected as we make progress on the Services Directive during our Presidency.

The world of work has undeniably changed for the better since 1997. Before we came to power workers could be paid as little as an employer could get away with. A quarter of a million employees, let us remember, were paid less than £2 per hour. A part-time worker could be paid less than a full-time employee doing exactly the same job. A full-time worker on a temporary contract could also be paid less. There was no entitlement to annual leave or even a day off every week; no entitlement to rest breaks and no limit on working hours.

Trade unions could be de-recognised at the whim of the employer and had no rights to recognition irrespective of how many members they had in a company. Union activists could be blacklisted. There was no right to a fair discipline or grievance procedure and certainly no right to call in a union representative – whether the union was recognised or not – to accompany a worker through the discipline process, even where one existed.

Women had a right to only 18 weeks' maternity leave. Now it's 26 weeks paid and 26 unpaid. In 18 months time it will be 39 weeks paid and eventually 52 weeks paid. Eight years ago maternity pay was almost half what it is now. There was no right to paternity leave, or to time off for domestic emergencies. Adoptive parents, who are giving disadvantaged children a stable family life, received no help at all.

There were no rights to be informed and consulted about workplace issues, no help to switch to a more flexible working pattern and no protection against discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation, religion or age.

We have addressed all of these issues and much, much more. In eight years we have put in place a comprehensive set of minimum standards and, as Ian McCartney said yesterday, established more than 50 new rights for people at work.

This Government can be accused of many things, but failing to protect people at work does not happen to be one of them.

I understand the concerns that the Gate Gourmet dispute has aroused and I will, of course, consider the points put to me by Brendan and Tony Woodley, but policy has to be decided on a wider basis than one dispute, no matter how painful that dispute has been.

This movement abandoned its preference for legal immunities for trade unions over basic rights for all workers in the 1980s. For the first 130 years of the TUC there was no collective protection for striking workers at all. This Government introduced protection for the first time and we are extending it as part of the Warwick Agreement. But that protection is conditional on all workers having the right to be balloted and on the dispute being between employees and their own employer. These are central aspects of the balance

between rights and responsibilities which have to be preserved.

During the course of this Parliament we will implement the further commitments on employment rights made in our manifesto. On one aspect – ensuring that bank holidays are additional to the four weeks statutory annual leave entitlement – I can today announce my intention of taking a power in the forthcoming Work and Families Bill to enable us to put this commitment into effect. The same Bill will extend the right to request flexible working – a huge success for the parents of small children – to workers who have other caring responsibilities such as looking after elderly parents.

We want to do more – moving towards an 80 percent employment rate, achieving a step change in health and safety protection, establishing the Union Modernisation Fund whose Supervisory Board, under the chairmanship of Sir Bill Connor, will be announced today.

The changes we have to adapt to are all in essence positive and progressive. Demographic changes because people are healthier and living longer, changes in trade policy that can lift millions out of poverty, changes in European regulation that could put hundreds of thousands of people into work and changes in the UK that have promoted social justice and attacked social exclusion.

Working together we can face up to these changes with confidence ensuring that continued economic stability leads to genuine social progress for all of our citizens. We can only do that if we work together and I am pledged to ensure that, despite the areas and problems we have discussed this week, we will do that and we will ensure, on behalf of your members and the people of this country, that we have a decent and fair society. Thank you. *(Applause)*

The President: Thank you very much, Alan, for that thoughtful speech, particularly on the issues of today's global economic challenges because I do not think there is a union in this hall or a sector in the UK that is not affected by the developments in China, India and elsewhere. I think you were right to remind us of the action that the Government have taken on diversity and equality. We would encourage you to take more. We would certainly encourage you to do more on childcare and family friendly policies. Thank you very much for that.

Defending public broadcasting and UK television production

Jeremy Dear (*National Union of Journalists*) moved Composite Motion 18.

He said: Comrades, sisters and brothers, on behalf of my union, BECTU and Amicus, I want to thank Brendan, to thank you and to thank your members for the magnificent solidarity that they showed on 23rd May when, for the first time in a decade, 15,000 BBC workers across the UK and across the world took strike action to protest at the most savage jobs cull in the BBC's history. *(Applause)* We had picket lines from TV Centre in London, to the Bureau in Moscow, from Brighton to Stornoway and, in a probable first for the British trade union movement, a picket line in Kabul.

Like all managements do when faced with a massive strike, BBC bosses said our action had no impact as, first, the Today programme, then Breakfast News, then regional news, live broadcasts, Newsnight, local news and current affairs on TV and radio were taken off air to be replaced by repeats and pre-records. The 23rd May was a bad day for the BBC and public services, but it was a good day for Nicholas Parsons, who earned more in repeat fees than at any time in his life. It was also a good day for trade unions with a 22 percent rise

in membership of the three unions at the BBC. Those people joined and our members took action because they were angry, angry at the scale of job cuts – 3,780 job losses in public service broadcasting – one in five jobs axed; 21 percent of those who make documentaries; 420 jobs in News; 19 percent in new media and 46 percent in professional services. Those people were angry at the impact of those cuts.

The BBC bosses say, "We don't want you to work harder, we want you to work smarter", but they failed to explain how you make better programmes by sacking staff in human resources, training, health and safety and then forcing the hard pressed programme makers to take on those tasks. They peddle the lie that this is about cutting bureaucracy to fund frontline services. It is not. It is self-harm on a grotesque scale aimed at appeasing the BBC's critics in Government and the commercial sector. If it was about cutting bureaucracy the BBC would not be sacking thousands of programme makers and support staff whilst increasing tiers of management. Not one single senior manager in TV News will lose their job, whilst journalists, producers, researchers and news gathers will be axed. They peddle the lie, too, that we are opposed to change. We are not. We are opposed to cuts which damage programmes, devalue the BBC, compromise quality and worsen working conditions.

However, there is waste that can be swept away – the tiers of management with no involvement in programme making, the £9 million spent on consultants, the £5 million on leadership courses and the hundreds of thousands paid out in bonuses for managers.

In the wake of our action, the BBC agreed to talks. We are in those talks now. We are hopeful, but the BBC should stand warned. We remain ready, willing and able to take further action to save jobs and protect quality. Of course, you would expect us to fight for jobs but this dispute and composite is about more than jobs. It is a fight for public service values, a fight for a publicly owned, publicly accountable broadcast network, catering for all sections of the community, reaching all parts of the country regardless of cost with a remit to educate, entertain and inform. Everywhere across the globe, increasing pressure on public finances and neo-liberal trade policies are forcing cuts, privatisation and greater commercialisation on public service broadcasting. Public service values are under threat from corporate and political pressure. Everywhere, media employers sacrifice the core principles of reliable, independent and quality journalism in the pursuit of market imperatives that serve only the narrow interests of owners and shareholders.

So it is not just the BBC, but ITV, too that slashes its regional non-news programmes, cuts jobs, closes studios, marginalises current affairs, whilst rewarding shareholders for their success.

Liberalisation and broadcasting de-regulation deliver not better quality, not more choice and not better representation. They deliver conformity, less choice and fewer jobs. Commercial broadcasting is based not on the sale of programmes to audiences but on the sale of audiences to advertisers. Media union members will stand up for jobs, for working conditions and for quality.

This composite asks you to stand with us to defend public service values. Thank you.

Hugh Stoddart (*The Writers' Guild of Great Britain*) in seconding the composite motion, said: President and Congress, in our original motion we spoke about *Doctor Who*. We did not do that just because of the exhibition right here on the Brighton pier celebrating that programme and we did not do it just because some members in my Guild, such as me, would all love

to be like *Doctor Who* and stay the same age, or possibly get even younger. No pension problems there.

The reason why we spoke about *Doctor Who* is because it is a perfect example of what is very precious; that is to say, home grown TV drama. If *Doctor Who* had stepped into his Tardis at the end of the first programmes and stayed there until the recent series that we have just seen, written by Russell T. Davis, and stepped out again, then surveying the media landscape he would certainly have been astonished. The exponential growth of technologies and the number of channels on offer by satellite and cable have made enormous changes which the BBC and all of us have had to face.

Such an array of choice is, in many ways, good. None the less, it is worth remembering that sometimes this choice can appear to be mythical because many of the channels may be offering what is basically the same thing. It is what we might call 'Product'; something which is created either with the aim of merely filling in cheaply between advertising or created for global consumption, in which case the lowest common denominator often comes into play, and the individual voice, the quirks and the particularities of a culture, are ironed out because they have to be.

A drama like 'Shameless', created by one of our members, Paul Abbott, is not 'product'. It says something about where we are now in our particular time and culture. Such writers as Paul work for both commercial channels and the BBC and, you may say, "Well, what's the problem?" The problem is how are the opportunities for the best of such British TV and radio drama to be preserved? It is my belief that you can draw up guidelines and try and set standards as much as you like but, at the end of the day, it is only if we have a securely funded public service provider that we can, if you like, hold the line.

To put it crudely, we want a situation where commercial channels are competing upwards and not one where the BBC is competing downwards.

Journalist Johann Hari, writing in the wake of the Hutton Inquiry and all that followed from that, said this: "The BBC is necessary because, unlike all the other media outlets, it is accountable to us, the viewing public, rather than to billionaire owners and corporate advertisers". I urge you to vote in favour of this motion.

Tony Lennon (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*): Since Doctor Who has been raised, I can tell you why I would like to be Doctor Who. I would like to go back to the 1980s and find out when it was that we did actually trade off our right to organise collective action amongst our members in return for the individual rights of workers. I was there and I don't remember it. (*Applause*)

Now, to the subject: I think from what the previous two speakers have said, you will understand one of the key reasons why the BBC is worth defending. It is actually, going back to what Jeannie Drake said in her address. It is one of the things we, perhaps, ought to shout about as a success and shout more often. The BBC is publicly funded, publicly run and it delivers a service that everybody around the globe accepts is world class and it does it with a unionised workforce from top to bottom, and I think that is a success for trade unions generally. It proves that public can be good and that unions and quality can go hand-in-hand.

However, in this composite we have referred to a threat to that quality, integrity and diversity that makes the BBC so special. It is a plan that colleagues in the health service will know well. The BBC hopes that it will increase, and perhaps even double, the number of programmes that it does not make itself now but buys in from other providers. That is a familiar health service story. If the plan goes through it means by

2007 nearly half the programmes you watch on BBC television will not have been made by the BBC but will have been bought in from somewhere else.

I am not going to say that they will, necessarily, be bad programmes because of it and I am not going to say that the BBC is always brilliant, but from a trade union point of view that shift of production means that there will be thousands more people in our sector who work as freelancers, not as staff; they work in a position of no job security; they have no pension; they have poor control over things like working hours and health and safety; they have to pay for their own training, and when it comes to who gets the work they are far less likely to be women, to be members of an ethnic minority or to have any disability than the people who work at the BBC today. In short, the plan to increase independent production at the BBC means pumping hundreds of millions of pounds into a sector of the industry that, frankly, does not support the progressive workplace policies that we heard so much about this week.

That is why BECTU is arguing that the BBC's commitment to buy in programmes from outside should remain where it is, at a level that we have all come to accept and, frankly, it should not be increased for political reasons, which is why the plan has been put forward.

I will finish, if I can, by reflecting on the industrial action of earlier this year. It breaks my heart, frankly, that in our industry, because it so high profile, when we go on strike we get on to the front page of every newspaper, yet I read in the *Morning Star* almost every day of those groups of workers who have been out for days and weeks who never get a mention in the national press. Despite that publicity, we welcome the support of the TUC. Brendan himself took an active part in our day of action, and I hope you will follow this up by supporting our composite. Thank you.

The President: I am going to move to the vote on Composite Motion 18. The General Council supports the composite.

* *Composite Motion 18 was CARRIED.*

Diversity in portrayal

Harry Landis (*Equity*) moved Motion 64.

He said: President and Congress, we live in Britain today with a wonderful mix of people – Afro-Caribbean, Asian, Chinese, all British having been born here. The Chinese have been here for more than 300 years. There are 18,000 in London alone. They make up our doctors, nurses, lawyers, as well as shopkeepers and civil servants. This situation is not reflected as much as it should be on our screens.

Our members are incredibly diverse, not just in their performance abilities but their ethnicity, sexuality, age and physical abilities. We have been lobbying for many years for this variety in performers to be reflected on our screens. Yes, you might say we see more ethnic minorities on our screens than ever before, but I think you will find that they are usually young and good looking. Where are the middle aged Asians, the older Chinese or black people?

It has long been recognised that there is an intrinsic value in seeing your kind reflected on screens. It is beneficial. The UK has been a multi-cultural society for many decades. There are no longer any valid reasons for this not to be reflected on television or film. I could go into percentages and figures gleaned from Government sources but I find when that is in the offing that you suddenly find you want a cup of tea. So I will put it this way. The proportion of those from minority and ethnic groups, working in the UK performance industry, is lower than those in employment in the rest of the UK economy. Of Equity

members, men are more likely to have found work than women in the past year, and the proportion of disabled people in our business is much lower than in the UK workforce as a whole.

Equity has already done much to improve on screen portrayal for performers from ethnic minorities by promoting an integral casting policy which also is included in all of our agreements. We have a very active Afro-Asian-Oriental-Caribbean committee and we want to ensure that our performers are engaged for all minorities, be they Chinese, Indian, Pakistanis, British, African-Caribbean and so on, and that the roles should be for a variety of ages.

Equity has undertaken a significant amount of work in the area of disability. We have a disability register and a guide for casting directors. Prejudice can affect the decision to engage a disabled performer, whether it relates to their needs on set or their ability to fulfil the requirements of a role. Need exists to educate casting directors, production companies and writers about the value of employing disabled performers, and the role that they play does not need to be that of a disabled person, either.

The UK Film Council is spearheading a campaign, backed by Equity, to identify and tackle the barriers that lead to exclusion and under-representation in our industry. This motion criticises the film and television industry for not doing enough to reflect in its output the rich and diverse and mix of gender, ages, ethnic origins, disabilities and sexualities in the UK population.

Finally, Equity wants the TUC to urge Ofcom and the UK Film Council to ensure that film and TV producers engage a truly representative spectrum of performers. Thank you.

Hugh Stoddart (*The Writers' Guild of Great Britain*) speaking in support of Motion 64.

He said: President and Congress, when I was a student thesp at the end of the 1960s I was given a book on theatrical make-up, and on the cover the book's lead story was of Lawrence Olivier blacking up as Othello. Some years after that it seems to have become established that this was in fact unacceptable, and rightly so. Othello thus became, as it were, reserved for a black actor. That is progress of a kind but, in another sense, a bit of a trap and too many years passed before a black actor had the chance of playing Hamlet.

There are issues here. The first we can call the 'Othello issue'. We need there to be more stories in our film, TV, radio and theatre which are written about, and preferably by, people from the full range of our culture and society. Here my own union, the Writers' Guild, has an important role to play. We supply the stories, the plays and the scripts. We are not, I am afraid, as inclusive as we should be, though I think it is fair to say that we are trying and we are signed up alongside other organisations to initiatives in this regard.

The second issue, really, is that of inclusivity to be there simply without comment. Here we have a long way to go. I mean, we have, even yet, not escaped the idea that wearing glasses signifies that a character is studious rather than happening to have, as I have, defective vision.

There are many people who want to be on stage or in front of a camera and, as a matter of fact, those who want to be backstage and behind the camera, and people who feel that they are being kept away. When Hamlet in the play is coaching his own actors before they present his own play, he tells them "Hold up a mirror to nature". Well, let all our film, TV, radio and theatre, likewise, hold up a mirror to contemporary Britain. Thank you.

Winston Phillips (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*): Congress, if you cast your mind back to a time not so long ago you may remember the handful of black and ethnic minority actors that you would have seen on your screens. Sadly, they played muggers, crooks and rapists which went a long way to strengthening the negative stereotypes that faced our community in those days. Slowly, and thankfully, the roles are now being changed and we are now being presented in a more positive role.

Whilst we support Equity in their quest for a more diverse representation in films and television, we would like to go one step further. We would like to see black cameramen, black technicians, black engineers and the like all represented behind the scenes. Sadly, at this moment in time, we are not represented in those areas. As I look round the hall this week at Congress, I see very few cameramen operating in this arena.

So, in support of this motion, we are saying, yes, for diversity in portrayal, but also yes for more diversity behind the camera as well. Please support.

The President: The General Council supports Motion 64.

* *Motion 64 was CARRIED.*

Conscience clause

Tim Lezard (*National Union of Journalists*) moved Motion 65.

He said: Congress, not all journalists are bastards. I know some of you here will look at newspapers and have a different view, but I can assure you that some of us do have a social conscience. Sadly, though, our concerns about the state of the media are not shared by members of the media establishment. Far from it.

Take, for example, the media's coverage of refugee and asylum issues. The NUJ is doing all it can to douse the race hate flames stoked up by the national press. Newspaper proprietors and the industry's watchdog, the Press Complaints Commission, look the other way. It is hardly rocket science, but surveys looking at the coverage of asylum issues show the more prejudicial the reports, the more likely there are to be racist attacks.

I have a friend who works for the *Daily Express* and she has told me that the owner, Richard Desmond, comes into the newsroom as deadline approaches and personally writes inflammatory headlines attacking refugees and asylum seekers. What are journalists supposed to do about that? Sadly, some of them agree with their newspaper's policies, and I am making no excuses for them. But what of the others? Why don't they speak out? Some of them have.

Last year seventy of my NUJ colleagues at the *Daily Express* decided that enough was enough. You may remember the newspaper ran a story saying: "All one-and-a-half million Roma families in Eastern Europe were planning to come to Britain when the EU was expanded". They were all coming on the same EasyJet flight, presumably. That was the last straw for journalists who took the incredibly courageous step in reporting their own newspaper to the Press Complaints Commission, seeking their protection if they refused to write racist articles. Sadly, but not unsurprisingly, considering the editor of the *Express* sits on the PCC, the complaint was thrown out. That is nothing new. The PCC consistently lets newspapers off the hook by refusing to enforce its own code of practice, which states: "The press must avoid prejudicial reference to an individual's colour, religion or race." Do you see newspapers abiding by this code? I do not.

The weakness and ineffectiveness of the PCC is such that they will not accept third party complaints, for example, which means that we cannot complain about this coverage. It seems that newspapers operate with impunity, and they do.

We asked the Society of Editors to include a clause in its code of practice that would protect journalists who refused to write racist stories, but the Society of Editors refused, basically, telling journalists, "We are the editors. We will tell you what to write".

We are not taking 'no' for an answer. We are not giving up that easily because the NUJ will not stand for racist stories appearing in our media.

Having given the establishment the chance to stand up for our profession, which they have clearly failed to do, we have now taken it into our own hands by adopting our own conscience clause, which I bring to you today, to ask for your help and support in putting pressure on editors to accept.

All members of our union, when they join, sign up to a code of conduct, a code that sets the standards of ethical journalism. Amongst the paragraphs in the code are ones which say that journalists shall not mention a person's race, colour or religion unless strictly relevant to the story. They shall not write stories which encourage discrimination, ridicule, prejudice or hatred, and they must strive to ensure that the information they print is fair and accurate.

Our conscience clause would safeguard our members from disciplinary action should they refuse to write a story that contravenes our code. It will allow journalists to be able to say 'no' to writing stories which whip up racial tension against refugees and asylum seekers; to say 'no' to stories that incite hatred against religious and ethnic groups, which is more important now than ever before in the wake of the London bombings, and it will allow journalists to say 'no' to covering the racist lies of the British National Party. It will also allow us to support journalists when they follow their conscience to stand up for their beliefs and, just as importantly, I think it will improve the standard of the media by allowing the public to engage in a balanced debate.

The conscience clause for which I am asking your support reads as follows: "The journalist has the right to refuse assignments or be identified as the creator of the editorial which would break the letter and spirit of this code. No journalist should be disciplined or suffer detriment to their career for asserting his or her rights to act according to the code."

We hope, with your help, to put pressure on editors to include that clause in journalists' contracts. There is no excuse for any editor, anywhere in the land, not to sign up to this, but not all of them will. Which editor, I wonder, will be the first to disown it? Which editor will be the first to stand up and say, "I don't want ethical journalism in my newspaper"? Which editor will be the first to say, "I don't want a balanced debate" in their pages, and which editor will be the first to admit he or she is happy to continue printing lies?

The NUJ believes that journalists play a vital role in the democracy of this country and we are proud of that, but democracy can only truly function if people engage in debate and hear both sides of the argument so that they can make a balanced judgment, and that is not happening here. Worse than that, not only is the debate one-sided but that one side is full of lies.

I spoke to David Aaronovitch, a journalist about the idea of the conscience clause and asked him if he supported it and he said that there would be no point because journalists liked writing this rubbish, and the only way to stop them would be to march into the newsroom and give them a good kicking. So I have warned my fellows on the press bench that if they see

a fat white boy coming towards them, do a runner. Because not for the first time David Aaronovitch is wrong. Some journalists do like writing rubbish, but the majority do not and our conscience clause would protect them. It is not about attacking journalists but attacking bad journalism. Please support.

Lesley Mansell (*Amicus*) in seconding the motion, said: Conference, we need a conscience clause to strengthen the code of conduct if we are to protect the integrity of our skilled journalists who are fighting to give us anti-discriminatory and positive images of black and Asian people.

I would love to be able to stand here and debate the cultural hegemony but I cannot do that in three minutes, but I can try and show the impact that our stage managed media has. Since 1990 I have organised union recruitment stalls at lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans-pride, yet reporting of these events is minimal. Reporting usually focuses on a gay man in a pretty frock, unless, of course, there is a murder and we get a bit more. So the positive portrayal of our lives is ignored and remains invisible. That is discrimination.

Since 7th July the image of discrimination intolerance has been so persistent that within one month there have been a thousand racist attacks which have been recorded but not reported. The type of incident that has carried on has been from name calling, through spitting to murder. Such incidents have not just happened in London. In the south-west, where I am based, there have been attacks in Bristol, Exeter and Chard in Somerset, and across Britain attacks have taken place in Croydon, Bedford, Halifax, Sheffield, Llandudno, Newcastle, Carlisle, Glasgow, Peterborough, Abergavenny, not to forget Liverpool and Nottingham, both places where murders took place.

Of course, this is not new. James Baldwin, a black American writer, was so frustrated at the lack of positive images and also the work of black writers being portrayed, argued that white Americans should thank all black Americans for showing them where the bottom is. In just these past few weeks, we have again seen where the bottom is in America.

Comrades, we can all give examples as to how the media carefully manages what it wants us to see. In the 1980s this country witnessed 'race riots' as termed by the media. A *Sun* journalist wrote of how black people were sheltering in doorways to stay out of trouble, but Rupert Murdoch carefully leaned over his shoulder and blue pencilled out his copy so it was not reported.

The media carefully crafts what it wants us to see and know about. This contributes to the institutionalisation of racism, not to mention sexism and homophobia. Our journalists need to have their integrity protected and they must be able to report what they see and not the skewed image that the media barons and the Government want us to see.

I urge Conference to support the motion and to give our journalists the protection that they need at work. Please support.

The President: The General Council supports the motion.

* *Motion 65 was CARRIED.*

Against censorship

Lydia Rivlin (*The Writers' Guild of Great Britain*) moved Motion 66.

She said: The very first thing that happened on Monday morning was that somebody from the General Council – I will not say who – said, "We are supporting your motion but you have to make it clear that we do not endorse anything we might consider offensive".

That's the little problem, isn't it, with freedom of speech, because with freedom of speech you have to hear something you would rather not?

The alternative is censorship. The problem with censorship is that you have to say something you would rather not because censorship makes liars of us all. If there is a choice between being offended and being turned into some sort of a machine for producing lies, I suppose you can work out where your sympathies lie. But the question is, where do your sympathies lie? The point is that we are faced with a law of the most gob-smacking dishonesty. The Racial and Religious Hatred Bill says that race and religion are the same thing and can be treated in the same way under law. Let us analyse that. Race is a physical characteristic. You cannot do much about that. Religion is an opinion, and what is democracy if it is not the testing, the criticising, the lampooning and, yes, even the hating of opinions? That is what democracy is all about.

The next thing they say is this. They are not going to apply the law to everyone! Hello! What is a law if it is not going to be applied to everyone? Either it is a law or it is not. It is a cheat.

I do not expect Rowan Atkinson to be arrested on stage in the middle of a joke, not while he is famous, at any rate. But the less famous, if they have any sense, will just shut up before they say the few words which are going to plunge them from the world of lightened reason to some sort of a lunatic nightmare which is being experienced by a young playwright, right now, called Gurpreet Bhatti. You will remember that she wrote a play in which she made the observation that sometimes men in religious authority abuse the trust of their congregants. So a mob of Sikh militants decided to take violent offence, and in the atmosphere, at least in part, I am sure, created by the discussions on the proposed legislation, they probably have half an idea that they were going to get away with riot and death threats. Do you know what? They did get away with it. To date there have been no arrests and no charges. Gurpreet is still in hiding in fear for her life in this country! Colleagues in the TUC, in this country, in the cradle of democracy, a writer is incarcerated, under a death sentence for what she has said. So the racial and religious hatred law is already being applied by proxy. It is ugly. It is a Frankenstein monster of a law. Like the monster, it has been stitched together out of grotesquely mismatching components. It was made for the wrong reasons and it cannot differentiate between good and evil, between right and wrong and between criticism and criminality. Worst of all, it embodies the basest in human nature, the viciousness and the vindictiveness, and it lets it all out.

The Writers' Guild appeals to you to put all your weight behind our support of Gurpreet Bhatti and all your weight behind our fight for freedom of speech. The monster is still on the table. It is only twitching its fingers. Stop this reckless experiment before it breaks free and tears our democracy apart brick by brick. Thank you.

Natasha Gerson (*Equity*) seconded Motion 66.

She said: I am seconding this motion because at the heart of it are the principles of freedom of speech and the right to artistic expression. I fundamentally support the right of people to protest and believe that, as trade unionists, we should all fight to protect that right. However, artistic expression is a fragile and at times nebulous and controversial concept which also requires our support and protection. Without the freedom to think and express itself, humanity will never prosper.

Often in defending one right, we can inadvertently trample on another. Even in this motion, there may be

a perceived danger that artistes are seeking protection from legitimate protests. That is not my view. I believe that this motion is seeking to ensure that the fundamental principles of freedom of speech and expression, which are central to the arts, are thoroughly protected. Again in my view, this motion is not about preventing people from doing things; quite the opposite, it is about precisely what it says, stopping censorship. Please support. Thank you.

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*) speaking in support of the motion said: Congress, the General Council supports this motion, but it has some concerns that I have been asked to explain. This is a complex debate, but it is not one that has figured on either the General Council agenda or, indeed, that of the Congress in recent years, nor has the General Council considered either of the specific instances referred to in the motion, the cancellation of the 'Behzti' play or the protests against the screening by the BBC of 'Jerry Springer - The Opera'.

Opposition to censorship, in principle, is certainly in line with traditional TUC policy on the arts and very much in line with our policy on the BBC Charter, which stresses the importance of a BBC free from pressure by government and commercial interests. In the same way, I am sure we would want to challenge censorship from organised pressure groups seeking to ban works to which they are opposed.

However, I encourage you to look at the last paragraph of the motion because this sets out a call for a blanket responsibility for the TUC to publicise cases of censorship and to co-ordinate resistance to them. I encourage you to consider the potential conflict that could cause with TUC policies in other areas.

As our campaigns against fascists show, we are not in the business of condoning racism; we are not in the business of condoning sexism and we are not in the business of condoning anti-trade union activities or propaganda either. In fact, in our rules we have a clear commitment to promote equality in everything we do. So I wanted to welcome the clarification that, in particular, the Equity delegate provided in her contribution, to make it clear that this should not be seen as artistes seeking protection against legitimate protests.

I should also say in this context that we believe there has been much misinformation about the new laws on incitement to religious hatred. The offences created by these laws have a very high threshold and do not encompass material that merely stirs up ridicule or prejudice or causes offence. Parallel provisions on incitement to racial hatred have existed since 1986 and have not prevented actors, writers and comedians from addressing controversial issues relating to race and culture. Delegates, with those points of explanation, I commend the motion to you.

The President: The General Council is supporting.

* *Motion 66 was CARRIED*

Broadcasters and entertainment promoters' honesty code

Barbara White (*Musicians' Union*) moved Motion 67.

She said: There is an increasing use of recorded and digitised music in live productions and also on TV programmes. There are obviously some instances where there is no alternative but to use recordings. We do not object to recordings which are used in an imaginative and creative manner and are artistically valuable. However, it is clear that unscrupulous companies are using them in order to create greater profit margins or to hide a lack of talent.

Unfortunately, the general public is seldom made aware of the use of recorded music backing in live shows. The Musicians' Union campaigned against the

use of recorded playbacks in pantomimes a couple of years ago. Pantos have, of course, traditionally used live music. We consider that it is an integral part of the magic and spontaneity of this type of entertainment. A live band can respond to improvisation by the actors as well as adding to the excitement of the show and are able to follow the performers, whatever happens on stage.

When people going to pantos around the country were asked whether they were aware that recorded backing was being used, many of them subsequently complained to the management of the theatres that the lack of live music was not mentioned in the publicity and they, rightly, had assumed that a live band would be present to accompany the singers and dancers.

Part of the reason why theatrical and other productions are so exciting and different from, for example, film is the unique quality that live music brings to the occasion. The sound quality is different. The performance is more spontaneous. It can be electric. The players can follow the action on stage with greater subtlety and nuance and the whole experience is enhanced for the audience and the performers. In other words, the audience has experienced a one-off performance. Similarly, certain dance companies tour with tapes and, as well as reducing valuable work for our members, it makes a difference to the quality of the performance and, therefore, the likelihood that audiences will not return.

This is the reason for our motion asking for an honesty code for broadcasters and entertainment promoters. We believe that the public have the right to know when live music is not being used before they lay out good money for tickets. We believe that the blanket use of recorded music in live events not only under-values the skills of musicians, but also undermines the distinctive uniqueness of live entertainment. The honesty code would also reward those productions that use live music, so everyone would benefit.

The MU would like to see promoters, managers and producers sign up to the code, which would require them to label clearly all their advertising productions where recorded music was being used. We suggest the statement "Recorded music is being used in this production" should be clearly visible on all promotional material, so that audiences would have no doubt as to the nature of the production.

Similarly, in broadcasts, we would like to see the honesty code adapted by the removal of microphones and guitar leads from those bands who are miming to play back. After all, they do not need them.

The viewing public have of late clearly demonstrated their preference for artistes to perform live on TV, which can be witnessed by the continued success of programmes such as Jules Holland's 'Later', which features live performance exclusively, and the continuing demise of programmes such as 'Top of the Pops', which still relies heavily on artistes performing to backing tracks.

We believe this motion has a three-fold benefit: firstly, to enable consumers to make an informed decision before they ostensibly pay for live events; secondly, to reward those producers, promoters and programme-makers who continue to use live music, and, thirdly, to encourage provision of more work for our members.

Sally Treble (*Equity*) seconded Motion 67.

She said: There cannot be too many delegates here today who have not been to a theatre or a musical event during the past five or ten years. It may have been because you took the children or the grandchildren to a panto and perhaps booked to see an opera or a ballet, or you just had a pint at your local

social club and happened to catch the artiste who was performing. I bet you a pound to a penny that many of you watched on television the fantastic show with the artistes and musicians performing in Buckingham Palace during the Queen's Jubilee. Whether it was at your local social club or whether it was at the Party at the Palace, you will have seen, heard and I hope enjoyed singers who were actually singing and musicians who were actually playing. We are talking live performances.

However, sadly, this is changing as the emphasis on live performances is slowly being eroded. Pit orchestras, bands and backing groups are being replaced by pre-recordings. Artistes are often forced to work with backing tapes or even mime to their own recorded material.

The unions who represent artistes and musicians, MU and Equity, find this situation absolutely deplorable. However, no matter how hard we campaign and complain, we are unable to stop these insidious cost-cutting exercises. Consequently, we believe that audiences and viewers are being cheated. This motion is calling for an honesty code to ensure that all promoters, broadcasters and producers give clear and unambiguous information in their advertising, so that the general public can make an informed choice as to whether they want to buy a ticket or switch on their television.

I have already said that the emphasis on live performances is slowly changing. I would like to leave you with a thought as I ask you, please, to support the motion: in the future, a General Council of the TUC may even consider replacing your live performances at Congress with pre-recordings and video links and they would save an awful lot of money. Isn't that the object of the exercise? I ask you, please, to support the motion.

The President: The General Council supports the motion.

* *Motion 67 was CARRIED.*

Social responsibility

Bobby Barnes (*Professional Footballers Association*) moved Motion 72.

He said: I have been coming to Congress for two or three years. I am very proud to stand in front of you representing our national game. (*Applause*) I think it is very important to remember that, as the national game, it obviously is something which touches communities all around the country. It is very important that, as a union and indeed as an industry, we are aware of the impact that football and our members, indeed the professional players, can have on their communities at large.

Football clubs are very much focal points of their communities. It is very important that communities have access to football clubs and to football players to ensure the best impact and the best use of that influence. Delegates from the NUT, for example, will know that increasingly at professional football clubs you have after-school learning clubs where children are encouraged to participate in basic literacy in order to bring them into the mainstream in terms of education.

It is all very well when you can get kids into the classroom, for example, and encourage them, but I am sure any of you who have worked in the teaching profession will know, there is no greater impact to be achieved than when players and heroes from your chosen clubs come into the classroom and speak to the children. We do a lot of work with the National Literacy Trust where we have reading champions who encourage children to read. From knowing that their heroes out on the field on a Saturday afternoon

playing football think it is cool to read, young people will also follow that lead. That is very powerful.

Football has always looked at the bigger picture and we have been aware of our responsibilities. Nowhere was that more evident than, for example, when we had the terrible events of the tsunami last year. Immediately, there were appeals made and money being raised everywhere. The football industry immediately stepped forward and pledged £1 million to that particular cause. However, that was not all. Basically, we were receiving phone calls from players all over the country who wished themselves to make private donations. Some very significant donations were made by professional footballers.

Sometimes, when we look at the lurid headlines and negative press, it is worth pointing out the number of hours that our players put in to community work. This is not just the amount of community work they are compelled to undertake, because you may or may not know that in every professional football contract each player is obliged to commit a minimum of two to three hours per week to community projects. That is always done willingly and is regardless of the individual charitable projects which individual players themselves carry out.

In terms of our responsibility as a union, we are conscious that, although we are a small union, we have a very high profile, whether it be in the media or in influence. We are very mindful of that particular responsibility. We will always encourage our members to get involved with charitable works and work for the community.

To give you a brief idea of some of the people we actually work with as a union, we work very closely with Oxfam to whom our players last year donated one day's salary for Christmas. We work with various cancer research organisations and the National Literacy Trust. We work very closely with, and are funders of, the Prince's Trust. Through this trust we work very closely with young people in trying to turn their lives around. We make a very significant financial donation to the Prince's Trust every year together with other major partners, such as Marks & Spencer and the Royal Bank of Scotland.

We have worked very hard in this particular area because we feel it is our responsibility. That is why we have put a motion forward on social responsibility. We hope that fellow unions will follow our lead. Please support the motion.

The President: Thank you, Bobby. May I say that I think you personally are a great ambassador for the PFA? Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

Before I call the seconder, I have had an indication from the CWU and POA that they would like to speak in this debate.

William Maxwell (*Equity*) seconded Motion 72.

He said: How often do you read and hear that footballers are over-paid pampered brats and that show biz people, especially actors, are self-regarding prima donnas? This motion from the PFA proves otherwise. Equity, the entertainment union, has its largest committee, the Committee for International Artistes' Freedom, which means social inclusion, which is what this motion is all about, world-wide and not just at home. This Committee has brought to international attention artistes who have suffered torture, imprisonment and death through daring to criticise autocratic regimes, which are not just politically extreme, but religious fundamentalists, which is why our Government's Incitement to Racial and Religious Hatred Bill is so dangerous. Race and religion are two entirely different things. The first must always be defended and the second must always be open to challenge.

However, at home, our social inclusion, like the PFA's, mostly concerns the young. Theatre in education: throughout the country we have provincial repertory theatres with education departments that visit schools with plays about drugs, teenage pregnancies, bullying and paedophiles, and with workshops afterwards for the kids, exercising their minds and building audiences for the future. Of course, we also have shows for the very young which are pure entertainment. They in their own way are just as worthwhile.

The Thatcher years saw drastic cuts in our business, but particularly they hit Theatre in Education companies until there were only four companies left in Wales for the whole of Britain. Then they had the gall to criticise the increase in juvenile crime!

Equity has also small-scale theatre groups touring parts of the country without theatre. Also, there are professional groups who undertake work in prisons. I undertook Shakespeare workshops in some prisons, including the Feltham Young People's Institute, where we would go one-to-one with various inmates and discuss Shakespeare's sonnets. After such a discussion with one inmate, he duly went off and came back with one of his own, which he composed in 10 minutes flat! I could not do that! That was absolutely amazing.

A young actor with a wife and two small children contracted septicaemia, which resulted in the loss of all his limbs; an elderly stage door keeper was rescued from the streets; a young actress with three children under the age of six died of breast cancer; an opera singer suffering from cancer of the throat was no longer able to perform - all these people were supported by theatrical charities which have been supported by Equity. Why do we not hear about this in the papers? Oh, no. It is much easier to tell people about the scandals in the football and entertainment industries and, besides, we are trade unions; trade unions are not supposed to do that sort of thing!

Madam President, with regard to what you said earlier in this conference, that when we do something new and innovative, we should shout it from the roof tops, well, let's shout this from the roof tops. Let's have trade unionism in general and things like this in particular reported in a proper way because it is long, long overdue. I have pleasure in seconding the motion. *(Applause)*

The President: Lots of approval there!

Carl Webb (*Communication Workers Union*) supported Motion 72.

He said: First of all, I would like to thank my fellow delegates for agreeing to allow me to speak on this. First of all, I would like to congratulate the PFA for the work they undertake and for submitting this motion.

Ten years ago, CWU humanitarian aid was set up by the Communication Workers Union. In those ten years, we have delivered over 750 tons of aid worth over £500,000 to disadvantaged children across Europe. We have also sent aid to India and to the street children in Mongolia. We have also been involved in renovating centres for street children. We have been able to help remove children from prostitution and drug abuse in a number of countries. We have done work within the UK to raise specialised equipment for young children.

The reason I am saying this is because the other speaker mentioned that this really is not highlighted within the TUC nor within the media. I am not just talking about the work that we do as the Communication Workers Union. I am talking about the work that I know the GMB do and probably the T&G do. There is a lot of charitable work that our members perform. At the moment I have 16 lay members who are delivering 40 tonnes of humanitarian aid to destitute families in Moldova, the poorest country in Europe. They are sleeping and eating out of their wagons. With the support of Royal Mail and British

Telecom, courtesy of Jeannie, who got involved and helped raise that support, we will help thousands and thousands of children and also deliver incubators to hospitals.

Like I said, I believe that we should highlight this work. I also believe that we could work maybe with the PFA because, as you quite rightly said, your members have a high profile. They are hero-worshipped. As my mate, Bob, said who is a Newcastle fan: "Get a t-shirt signed by Micky Owen" and that will raise a lot of money in the mail centre in Newcastle for our charity. Just a simple thing like that would have amazing results.

I look forward, hopefully, to talking to the PFA, working with them and raising the profile. Again, I do believe that the charitable work that all the unions do for the good of children and families should be highlighted more in the media and highlighted more by the TUC. Thank you very much.

Victoria Anderson (*Prison Officers Association*) supported Motion 72.

She said: We too deal with the organisations often in our working lives and our private lives which the Professional Footballers Association have mentioned. We have prison officers seconded to the Prince's Trust to undertake work to help turn around those young lives.

However, I want to talk about social responsibility from a different angle. I believe that social responsibility is the common thread that underpins unionism. All the motions that are in the motion book have that common theme running through them. For example, we recognise our social responsibility to develop working environments that are decent and egalitarian. We recognise our social responsibility to protect retirees from poverty. We recognise our social responsibility to resist further attempts at privatisation and we recognise our social responsibility to demand that people's assets are returned to them and taken from the fat cats who took them.

Remember, we are a society and we must also recognise our social responsibilities as a society. Remember, the work which I undertake is a social responsibility of this society; the unpleasant task of administering the justice system in order that victims may feel that they have some recognition under that system.

The Government have a social responsibility to deliver that on our behalf. That is why prisons must be public organisations, not vehicles of profit which is made on the back of misery, trauma and terror. We must remember our social responsibility as a society and we must go on continuing to remind the Government of their social responsibility to us. Thank you.

The President: I heard this is your first Congress, Vicky. You are really welcome. Thank you. The General Council support the motion.

* *Motion 72 was CARRIED*

The President: Thank you very much. Congress, I mentioned yesterday that in your delegate wallets you should have found a TUC White Band for which we asked you to make an appropriate donation. The PFA have generously agreed to match the amount of money raised by the collection. The total amount raised was £750. I would like to invite Bobby Barnes to hold to the promise and present the matching cheque. Thank you. (*Applause*)

He is also bringing with him his colleagues, Cyrille Regis, John Beresford, Warren Barton and Pete Smith. (*Presentation made amidst applause*)

Bobby Barnes (*Professional Footballers Association*) said: It is becoming a little bit of a feature of Congress over the years, but I would like to take this opportunity to introduce our delegation from the PFA. All of these

guys have generously given up their time and travelled from all over the country to come along today to be part of Congress. They have been very grateful for the warm welcome they have received, not just here in the hall, but outside and around the building.

I would like to take the opportunity to give you a brief outline of the players who have come along today and some of the charitable work they undertake. On the far left we have John Berrisford who I am sure will need no introduction for you, Newcastle United supporters. (*Applause*)

To give you an idea of some of the work undertaken by John, he has been a tireless worker for all the charitable projects of the PFA. He does a great deal of work with 'Show Racism the Red Card'. In particular, in November, John is representing the Bobby Moore Cancer Fund, and he is going to live in a tent for 10 days in 35 degrees of heat and help rebuild a school and a football pitch. (*Applause*)

To the right of John, we have Pete Smith. Pete is a local lad who has served your local team, Brighton & Hove Albion. Pete was with Brighton for a number of years and has been a good servant to the club. Pete works with me at the PFA and does some tremendous work on all of our charitable projects, in particular, our anti-racism project, 'Kick it out'. Ladies and gentlemen, Pete Smith. (*Applause*)

Newcastle supporters are in for a bit of a treat today because we have someone who also needs no introduction, and that is Warren Barton. (*Applause*) I do not really know where to start in describing all the work Warren does, but just to give you a potted history, he has done the Great North Run and the London Marathon. He is an ambassador for 'Show Racism the Red Card'. As I referred to earlier, in terms of footballers' response to the tsunami appeal, Warren did not just write a cheque, he took a plane and went out to South East Asia and coached young kids just to take their minds off the horrors that were around them at that particular time. He brought a lot of excitement and comfort to those lads at the time. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Last, and certainly not least, here is a fellow who I am sure everybody in the conference hall will know. He has been here with me before. Certainly, it is always a great pleasure for me to meet Cyrille because, as a youngster, Cyrille was one of my heroes. It is a pleasure to work with him now. He is a massive, strong, wonderful footballer, but off the field, he is a real gentleman. He never says "no". You can get on the phone to Cyrille and you can ask him: "Cyrille, would you come along and do that? Could you go to this project?" and the guy never says "no". I would just like to thank him personally and introduce Cyrille Regis to you, ladies and gentlemen. (*Applause*) Thank you very much. (*Applause*)

The President: My street cred has just gone up with my sons! Good stuff, that! They will not believe it! Anyway, once again, Bobby Barnes, Cyrille Regis, John Beresford, Warren Barton and Pete Smith. Thank you very much indeed. It is absolutely wonderful to see you. Thank you. (*Applause*) Thank you very much for your support in backing our collection for Make Poverty History.

I would now like to read out to Congress a letter. It is a great privilege to say that we have received a letter from Nelson Mandela which is actually addressed to this Congress and signed by him. If you would bear with me, I would like to read it to you:

"Dear Trades Union Congress delegates, I am sorry that I cannot be with you in person for your annual Congress. The trade union movement in Britain, as in South Africa, has a major role to play in the world, and it is important for all of us that you play that role well."

"This year, of course, is the year we try to 'make poverty history' and I am pleased to know that British trade unionists are contributing to the struggle to free Africa from the chains of poverty, illness and debt, just as you contributed to the struggle to free South Africa from the chains of apartheid.

"I was privileged to launch the Make Poverty History campaign in London earlier this year, and as you know, the world's leaders are gathering this week in New York for the UN Millennium Development Goals summit. The Global Call to Action against Poverty, to which you all belong through the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, wants to see poverty made history at the UN this week.

"I am glad that the British trade union movement is playing its part, and I urge you to do everything that you can in what remains of this historic year.

"Yours in solidarity, Nelson Mandela."

(Applause)

The President: Here is the original, signed, personal letter to us all from Nelson Mandela.

Union diversity fund

Suresh Chawla (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*) moved Motion 19.

He said: How can you top the PFA and Nelson Mandela, but I will certainly give it my best shot!

President, Congress, sisters and brothers, this motion is about the kind of workplace you want to work in. It is about what kind of country you want to live in and what kind of society you want to be a part of. Setting up the Union Diversity Fund is about how we help make it a reality.

As we know, there has been feverish debate in the media ever since those dreadful bombings about what kind of society we are, whether multiculturalism has gone too far and what it means to be British. The fact is that Britain is already a multi-racial, multi-cultural society. The problem is that it is not integrated. Different cultures and communities are still segregated from each other to an appalling degree. This is reflected in the workplace.

Take the film and broadcasting industries, more than half of which are based in London. Seven per cent of the industry comprises black and minority ethnic workers compared with 8.3 per cent of the UK population and more than 30 per cent in London. Some areas are worse than others. 2.7 per cent of camera people are BME and 4.7 per cent work in sound. In radio broadcasting, BME workers number just 1.8 per cent. On the other hand, one category of the film industry has 22 per cent ethnic minority workers - yes, that is cinema cleaners.

There have been many demands that ethnic minority communities must do this and must do that and what their leaders must and must not do. However, the really obvious underlying truth that has not been acknowledged is that no minority community can integrate with the majority if the majority does not take a step too.

Demands that British Asians integrate sounds a bit like a house owner marching around to his next door neighbours' house to tell them that they ought to be more sociable and then not inviting them to his barbecue! If we really want this country to integrate, the message it has to dare to send out is that from now on integration has to be the concern of every British citizen.

This is why BECTU devised 'Move on Up'. It involved people who can really make a difference, people who

hire and fire and people who can decide which programmes to commission and which films to fund. We hoped that if BME professionals could make personal contacts with these executives, in the long-run it might lead to contracts or commissions. We organized 530 meetings on one day at the TUC. We were right; we did a survey a few months later and 10 per cent of those who responded said that they did, in fact, go on to get work as a result of it. The executives appreciated it too. They made valuable new contacts.

After well over a year of applying and applying and applying for funding, we finally succeeded in securing funding from the Equal Fund to run three more such events. This funding, however, covers only half the costs and the rest has to be found from the union, the industry and other funders; yet one funder is now approaching the anniversary of receiving our first request, but cannot quite get around to telling us what decision they have made. The Equal Fund itself has finished its last funding round, so it will not be available in the future.

It is absolutely clear to BECTU that trade unions could play a huge leadership role in integration in the workplace. No other organisation is so well placed to intervene and work constructively with management to bring about change for the better. BECTU has built these partnerships with key employers in our industries and it has worked extremely well.

Setting up meaningful initiatives like these reassures BME workers that the union really is serious about representation. BECTU received a 37 per cent increase in new joiners from ethnic minorities after the event, and now 12.5 per cent of the union's NEC is BME, up from zero less than two years back.

However, if trade unions are to lead the way to an integrated workplace, we need the resources to do it. We urge the General Council to lobby the Government to set up a Union Diversity Fund that we can all apply to specifically to help us set up initiatives to encourage integration. Integration of the workplace will take years and years if we leave it to the employers. This country cannot wait that long.

Support this motion and together we can help to build the new Britain and the new integrated society that we know we will achieve one day. Let's bring that day closer.

Sam Allen (*NATFHE The University & College Lecturers' Union*) seconded Motion 19.

He said: We are absolutely delighted, as a union, to second Motion 19. This fund represents a great opportunity for trade unions. Creating a diverse workforce at every level, in every industry, is too important to leave to employers alone. If we did, it would take decades before we actually achieved it.

A Union Diversity Fund would give your union the resources to intervene in partnership with the employers to quicken the pace of change. It would not be up to the fund to say what should be done. It would be up to you as leaders and activists within your union to set the key factors working against achieving diversity and then formulating a project to tackle. It would give you the opportunity to work with employers in a different way.

It may well bring you into contact with sections of the workforce you have not yet reached. It would certainly persuade BME workers that your union is really serious about representing them. It will also encourage the pace of change which cannot be fast enough.

We are absolutely delighted as a union to support this. I would urge you, not only just to vote for this motion, but to put it into practice in your individual union. I am privileged to be able to operate this magazine which has been put together (*shows magazine*). It is wonderful to see people with smiling faces who have

already benefited from some of the pilot programmes. It is a delight and a joy to see. I urge you to support this motion. Thank you.

The President: The General Council supports the motion.

* *Motion 19 was CARRIED*

(Congress adjourned to 2.15 pm)

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

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

The President: Delegates, I call Congress to order. We will now have the report from the GPC.

General Purposes Committee Report

Annette Mansell-Green (*General Purposes Committee*): Congress, delegates, I am pleased to announce that the GPC approved two further emergency options, Emergency E4 on BNP and the Race Relations Act, and Emergency E5 on Women in Iraq. Copies of these emergency motions will be distributed to delegates tomorrow morning in time for the start of business.

Address by Elizabeth Bunn (sororal delegate AFL-CIO)

The President: Congress, the oldest tradition we respect at every Congress is the address from the delegate from the AFL-CIO. Indeed, it is worth reflecting that in this age when everything about globalisation seems to be new the trades unions' commitment to solidarity in fact stretches back over a century. This July I was actually very proud to take the TUC's commitment to solidarity all the way to Chicago to address the AFL-CIO convention myself. So, it gives me great pleasure now to return that courtesy. Congress, please welcome the sororal delegate from the AFL-CIO, Executive Council member, and United Autoworkers secretary/treasurer, Elizabeth Bunn. Elizabeth, welcome, and please address Congress.

Elizabeth Bunn (AFL-CIO): Thank you, Jeannie, and delegates, for the kind introduction. Let me express my gratitude to the Congress for inviting a representative from the AFL to participate and let me thank you more than that for the remarks that Jeannie Drake made on your behalf at our recent AFL-CIO Convention. It was an emotional and inspiring moment for our delegates and for our women delegates it was a moment of pure pride, but more than anything, on behalf of the AFL-CIO and the millions of workers we represent, thank all of you for 111 years of friendship, assistance, and solidarity.

Let me also say by introduction, congratulations on the English victory in cricket!

Sisters and brothers, I bring you greetings from AFL-CIO President, John Sweeney, Secretary-Treasurer, Richard Trumka, and Executive Vice President, Linda Chavez-Thompson, all of whom have had the honour of addressing this Congress in recent years. I stand here today as the proud representative of the American house of labour – the AFL-CIO – a house built with the bricks of worker solidarity and the mortar of trade union democracy; a house strong enough to withstand the hurricane force winds of the Bush Administration, global capital mobility, right-wing religious extremism in our country, a house strong enough to withstand dissension from within, a house strong enough to withstand the departure of some of our family.

My message today is a message of anger and grief, but in greater measure of gratitude and hope. My message today is of solidarity because in the struggle for justice it has always been our most effective

weapon and because in today's world we are linked like never before.

Four years ago in the wake of the most terrible tragedy of 9/11 we marvelled at the courage and honour of our emergency rescue workers, nearly all trade unionists, and included in that honour roll of heroes were members of your Fire Brigades Union. Two months ago, we shared your horror, anger, and grief, at the London bombings but it was with a dizzying sense of déjà vu that we also marvelled again at the courage and honour of your emergency rescue workers. We are all in this together.

In the last two weeks, you grieved with us again at the worst hurricane in US history striking the Gulf Coast but, please, make no mistake, although the disaster was natural, the real tragedy was almost entirely manmade. From George Bush's steadfast refusal to acknowledge the causes, the severity, even the fact of climate change that exacerbates the force of the winds, to the Bush Administration's callous lifting of restrictions on the development of wetlands which also serve to temper the winds, to the slashing of governmental funds to repair and bolster the levees, and finally to the incomprehensible, indescribable, incompetence and indifference of the governmental response to the evacuation and rescue efforts – all of these blunders resulting in the sickening and inevitable suffering and loss of lives of the poor, the weak, the sick, the elderly, the vulnerable, so many of them people of colour.

Though I stand here today as an American in mourning, I know that I share my grief and anger with the trade unionists in this room. For trade unionists solidarity has no borders, for trade unionists respect for human life recognises no colours, and for trade unionists the value of life is not measured by net worth. The AFL-CIO and the TUC have always known this. It was our past shared solidarity that beat back US corporate greed in organising and collective bargaining drives at Ravenswood, Tate & Lyle, Continental Tire and Yale University.

In a more recent display of solidarity, the support of the TUC, Prospect, and the other civil service unions, helped us organise the local staff at the British Embassy and consulates in the United States and here in Britain. The AFL-CIO and the United Steelworkers worked with the T&G to defeat pension cuts at Imerys. Today, I tell you that the AFL-CIO, and all of its affiliates, stands in solidarity with the TUC and the T&G against the assault on workers at Gate Gourmet. An American tycoon may have enjoyed his £10m birthday, but his party is over.

In solidarity, we supported the efforts of heroic South African freedom efforts to topple apartheid, in solidarity we supported the efforts of Polish trade unionists to overcome martial law and establish free independent trade unions, and in solidarity we assist those forced to walk minefields in Burma, and those facing death squads in Colombia. We are in this together.

We face, however, a monumental task. Since the toppling of the Berlin Wall, hegemony of global capital has been largely unchallenged and the mobility of global capital largely unrestricted. Capital has little or no respect for political borders. It is our challenge to ensure, yours and ours together, that political borders do not prevent us from continuing to foster a global trade union movement that rewrites the way capital operates for it is not the 'globalness' of the economy that is the problem, it is the rules by which that economy currently operates. Sisters and brothers, it does not have to be this way.

The theme of your Congress resonates around the world – we can make poverty history. Your resolutions resonate around the world as well: the celebration and nurturing of our diversity, the battle to eliminate the

persistent gender wage gap, the strengthening of public services, the rededication to organising, the commitment to getting British and US troops out of Iraq so that the Iraqi people and a strong independent democratic trade union can secure justice for its own citizens.

At our recent AFL-CIO Convention, we had many of the same debates and discussions, about diversity, organising, Iraq, preserving the social security system. We debated public policy and we also debated how to restructure our federation to meet today's challenges, we took bold measures to shift priorities and redirect our energy to advance our commitment to diversity so that our leadership looks like our membership. Debate and discussion inside the trade union movement keeps us energised and creative, it helps us to prosper and grow.

Unfortunately, as many of you know, several of our unions made the decision to disaffiliate because they did not prevail on certain of the proposals that they were advocating. Their suggestions were seriously considered and debated. In fact, many of the changes we adopted flowed from their proposals but in the end a majority did not support the changes; rather than accepting the results of the democratic will, they fled the house of labour.

Many have asked me over the last several days about the underlying dispute. There is not time to describe the nuances of the differences but let me be very clear about what this dispute is not about: it is not about a commitment to politics versus organising; the dispute is not about whether to pursue a progressive agenda or a conservative one; the dispute is not about service sector unions versus manufacturing ones; it is not about who has the boldest and most creative ideas to transform our movement, who is the most militant, who has the courage to change or the passion to win.

We are left now with a divided house and a divided house is, by definition, a weaker one. More importantly, the departure has caused a terrible diversion and a terrible blow to the bedrock principles of unity and solidarity from which our strength derives. It is a diversion because the time, energy, and resources, we spend on this internal struggle is time, energy, and resources, we are not spending on the struggles that really matter to our movement.

It is a blow to unity and solidarity because the fact is that none of us has all the answers and we need each other to continue learning, changing, strategising, and growing. We need all of our collective resources – financial, intellectual, sectoral, numeric – in order collectively to win the battle against global capital in which we are engaged. We need all of our undivided collective power to take on multinational giants, right-wing governments, and the corporate trade policies of the WTO. We need all of our undivided collective power in order to organise millions of workers. We need all of our collective power to engage our allies among NGOs in the struggle for social justice, to create the conditions throughout the world in which true, independent, democratic trade unions can flourish and grow, to bring global corporations to a global bargaining table so that capital competes on the basis of innovation, design, creativity, productivity, efficiency, and not on the tragic Wal-Mart model of securing the lowest wages, the worst benefits, the least secure pensions. We need to alter world politics so that governments can adhere to a social model which nurtures communities and serves people, not capital.

In short, to win we have to continue building a unified global trade union movement, overcoming political and ideological divides, advancing the efforts of the ICFTU, and others, to unify the global movement. We must resist the temptation to let whatever strategic and tactical differences we may have hinder our efforts to unify and build together. The challenges of the

global economy are daunting but, at the same time, the potential to secure worker justice, to make poverty history, is in our grasp like never before. In my AFL-CIO heart, I remain an optimist about the wisdom, the courage, and the collective power of working people.

In our generation we have been witnesses to the power of the idea of political democracy and justice, we have seen that idea topple regime after repressive regime. The ideas of workplace democracy and worker justice are equally powerful. Trade union solidarity is our weapon to breathe life into this idea. It is our creed, it is our history, it is our foundation, and together we must make it our legacy and our future. Thank you.

The President: Thank you for that fantastic speech. I was shown so much warmth by the AFL-CIO in Chicago and I was there at what was a very very difficult time in the history of the American labour movement. I hope they find a way of reuniting because the only gainers are George Bush, the Republicans, and the employers when labour movements split. Around the world trade union movements are emerging in very fragile circumstances with great suppression around them and we who have the privilege of mature trade union movements that are together and strong need to send them a clear signal that they should not split, that they should stay strong together.

I am absolutely delighted to present you with the TUC Gold Badge and also a personal present. (*Presentation of the award*)

Elizabeth Bunn: Thank you, Jeannie, and thank all of you. Your hospitality has warmed my heart for several days and it has just been a true honour for me to be here with you. Thank you.

Global Solidarity

The President: Thank you. Congress, we now go to General Council Report Chapter 5, Global Solidarity, page 69. I call Motion 73, Women Internationally. The General Council support the motion. It is to be moved by Diana Holland on behalf of the TUC Women's Conference and seconded by Anita Halpin on behalf of the TUC Women's Conference. Diana, welcome, and please move the motion.

Women Internationally

Diana Holland (*Transport & General Workers Union*) moved Motion 73 on behalf of the TUC Women's Conference.

She said: Thank you. A young woman garment worker in Bangladesh earning just 60 pence a day, an older woman textile worker in Scotland facing redundancy, a woman railway worker in Zambia losing her job when the railways are privatised, a woman from Nigeria working at two, three and four jobs as a cleaner in London catching up on sleep as she travels between them, a woman in Argentina told by the courts that she is not fit to be a mother as she is an aviation worker, a British Airways woman pilot refused her request to reduce to part-time hours to look after her daughter, an Asian woman worker at Gate Gourmet victimised for asserting her rights, a Polish woman employed by an agency in Britain contracted to work at Heathrow: what brings all these women together? Globalisation, exploitation, and the need to organise together.

Women are half the world's population, working two-thirds of the world's working hours, earning just one-tenth of the world's income, and are the primary victims of violations of workers' rights worldwide, and yet yesterday for the first time we had the threat of the United Nations admitting that the millennium development goals to end poverty by 2015 may not be met. We cannot let this be our legacy to future

generations. This is why the TUC Women's Conference voted to bring this motion here and why the struggle for fair pay and women's equality are international issues central to this global solidarity debate.

This year internationalism has mobilised millions across the world, making poverty history our shared vision. The world spends \$839bn on arms and the military, four times what it would cost to provide decent housing, healthcare, and education to all citizens. That is why we cannot let the millennium development goals be lost. The UN platform for action set in Beijing ten years ago at the World Women's Conference sends a clear message on four points: equality for women and girls is central to ending poverty; issues like childbirth are critical to women and to children's lives; women involve other women in communities, workplaces, unions, in struggle, in governments, and we need to be involved. If you get it right for women, you get it right for everyone.

As part of this international struggle the UN has called for countries in the world to celebrate International Women's Day. On 8th March this year the T&G presented a 10,000-signature petition to ministers calling for International Women's Day to be made a public holiday as it is in many other countries, one of the most popular campaigns I have ever been involved in organising. Thank you to all of you who signed up. Our voices were joined by millions all over the world that day.

Too often women are presented as victims but, as this motion says, women trade unionists in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, have been at the forefront of struggles. The messages that I received from trade union sisters and brothers after the bombings in London were extremely powerful and moving, and demonstrated what international solidarity is really about: none of us are alone.

Women in Britain, too, have been struggling for centuries and I wanted to highlight just one, the chain makers of Cradley Heath, who nearly 100 years ago organised against starvation wages; they won and established the movement towards a national minimum wage in this country. I hope all of you will join the first women chain makers festival on October 22nd this year.

This motion calls for a fair deal for women worldwide and action in four key areas:

- Campaigning with governments on women internationally, including on basic core labour standards and fair trade.
- Building links with women trade unionists worldwide, like the delegation to Colombia later this year.
- Supporting the world march of women goals on women's poverty and violence.
- Campaigning for International Women's Day; women's rights are human rights and international solidarity needs to be practised.

In conclusion, as our sisters in South India say, "As birds are born to fly, so are women born to be free." Stronger together is the theme of this Congress and stronger together is how we are.

Anita Halpin (*National Union of Journalists*) seconding Motion 73, said: I am speaking for the TUC Women's Committee on the first international motion to come from our equality conferences. Sisters and brothers, the motion graphically describes the plight of our sisters in the developing world and Diana has given you a quick sound bite of events around the world. It is the first motion in this section and thus acknowledges the particular role, I believe, that women have in building sisterhood and understanding, sisterhood to give confidence and solidarity,

understanding of the perpetrators of exploitation and the causes of misery.

Like many of our unions, the NUJ has international policy on a wide range of issues covering all five continents, but all too often these stand alone, there is no strategic cohesion and they vie with each other for priority. I believe this motion and what my union is now doing is important to give a focus and a context in which we set our international work.

That is why we have been able to embark on a project that, hopefully, will create a context in which we can all set our international policies. I would urge you, sisters and brothers, to look maybe at doing the same. Our project is designed to let us work to our particular strengths as a union of journalists, to give focus to our internationalism.

There are three strands:

First, to raise awareness of the millennium development goals as Diana has outlined and obviously I hope we will give that a strong equality strand.

Second, to encourage journalists to look behind the often patronising stereotypes of society and the developing countries; again, as has been said, they are more than victims, they are human beings with rights and we will support our journalists who are brave enough to tell it how it is, whether it is in Colombia or elsewhere.

Third, to encourage the development of a diverse media around the world to give voice and expression to hopes and aspirations.

We were promised more public holidays. International Women's Day is a great celebration. I can remember having very close friends who were socialists and they had a tradition where the sisters would send each other flowers on International Women's Day, but there are other days when we can celebrate that together we are stronger. Please, let us have International Women's Day but do not forget, if I may say as joint chair for the London May Day Rally, that May Day is International Workers Day; international women, sisters and brothers, we have a responsibility.

Please support the motion, take forward the millennium goals, and work to create within your union on the back of this and other motions in this section a focus of cohesion and, therefore, a much more effective expression of our international solidarity.

Mary Page (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*) supporting Motion 73, said: I would like to refer to the sentence in the motion which asks us to recall the struggle by women for the right to participate in society on an equal footing to men. That is a struggle which we are all too well aware is an ongoing one. I would like to draw delegates' attention, in particular, to the proposed Iraqi constitution which has been accepted and is now being put to a referendum, and which has very disturbing implications for the rights of women in Iraq.

I do not know an awful lot about this constitution, although I know enough to be concerned, but I do know quite a lot about being a woman, albeit a privileged white Western one. I wanted to speak on this subject because of an incident that occurred at a party I went to recently. A discussion arose about beliefs and values and in the course of it I was called a cultural imperialist for criticising some religious and cultural beliefs which disagree with equal rights for women and gay and lesbian people.

Congress, I respect all beliefs and values, apart from those that are racist, fascist, and homophobes. I know, as we all know, the true values of all major religions promote equality and respect. But, Congress, if being against female circumcision, forced marriages, the stoning of women for alleged sexual misdeeds, and the

general oppression of women and their treatment as second-class citizens, makes me a cultural imperialist, I am happy to wear that label and you can make me the T-shirt. It seems to me there are inalienable truths that there are some rights that are fundamental and are shared and practised amongst all faiths and creeds, and high among those is equality of and respect for both genders.

Congress, what is happening now, and is proposed for the future of Iraqi society, does not promote equality and respect for women. Before the invasion in 2003 Iraq, although a despotic regime, was a secular society where women played an important and valued role in civil and political society. No one wants to go back to that kind of tyrannical regime but trade unionists, socialists, all human beings, must fight for the rights of our Iraqi sisters. We must work with all trade union organisations in Iraq to bring pressure to bear in any way we can to resist any attempts to restrict and degrade the role and dignity of women in Iraq, whether in the trade unions, political parties, or on the streets and in the homes in the towns and villages of Iraq. Someone in an earlier debate mentioned a woman's right to choose. We in the UK have fought for that right and we may well have to do so again, but at least we have the right to fight, and even this right is under threat in the proposed constitution.

So, I would like you to support the motion, please, and our Iraqi sisters whose fundamental rights are under attack.

Madam President, could I digress very slightly and take this opportunity while I am here to thank everyone in this hall for the work that was done in securing survivors' pension rights for me and my partner. We could not have done it without the trade union movement behind us and when we eventually sign our civil partnership next year it will be at my trade union headquarters because my trade union, and every other union, helped me to get to the position where I could do it. Thank you very much indeed.

Barbara Murray (*Amicus*) supporting Motion 73, said: Congress, I call upon you to support Motion 73, Women Internationally. I would just like you to take a couple of seconds to think about all the women within your families; your wives, partners, daughters, mothers, aunts and nieces, all of these women in your lives are internationals. International Women's Day, March 8th, is a day celebrated by women's groups around the world. March 8th is a day which is also commemorated at the UN and designated a national holiday in many countries. 2005 brings a review of the UN decade for women, a new era for platform for action, and of the millennium development goals to eliminate poverty and promote gender equality. Every single day women are killed, kidnapped, raped, and mutilated, normally at the hands of someone they know. Women in the poorest regions are twice as likely to live and die in poverty as men; 70 per cent of the world's poor are women, and around the world their basic human rights are being violated continually. Half a million women die every year during pregnancy or childbirth. Women's rate of HIV infection has overtaken those of men. Two-thirds of children not enrolled in school are girls. Women's work, including caring, is undervalued, underpaid, dangerous, and stressful. But women around the world are under-represented, excluded from political involvement, war, and militarisation. This just breeds new levels of violence towards women.

We have all seen the news and documentaries this year of the women and girls in Africa and the Congo who are forced to fight, raped continually, and are slaves to their male paramilitary leaders. Here in the UK two women are killed every day by their partners; that means since Congress started on Monday four women have been killed already this week and by this time tomorrow it will be six. You may think that now we

are in the 21st century the lives of women would already be on an equal footing to men, but we still have a long way to go.

The idea of International Women's Day first arose at the turn of the last century, and it was only then that women in the UK campaigned for and succeeded in getting the right to vote. The 1944 Education Act meant that women teachers were no longer required to leave their jobs when they were married. In 1964, the Married Women's Poverty Act gave wives the legal right to half of their savings from a housekeeping allowance; before this was introduced women could be thrown out of their homes and straight into poverty.

There are many more dates throughout history where women have fought for and gained improvements but do not forget, although the laws and legislation have changed, it is sometimes no different than before. The Equal Pay Act in 1970, 35 years ago, six years before I was born, still does not ensure equal pay but we are still campaigning for this basic equality. It was only in 1991 that the courts in the UK acknowledged rape within a marriage, which means that only 14 years ago it was the husband's right to force his wife to have sex against her will.

All of these reasons, and many more, are why you should support International Women's Day. Women, your wives, mothers, grandmothers, daughters, deserve the right to be celebrated for all they bring to society in every aspect. We need to campaign for International Women's Day to be made a national bank holiday to enable women around the world to celebrate together in solidarity and honour for all they have achieved. Ultimately, if successful, this motion will enable more than half of our population, who are often downtrodden, discriminated, and maligned, in a politically correct 2005, to mark a significant day in the year for the members of their gender and to encourage men to do likewise. Please support this motion.

Tracy Clarke (*Community*) supporting Motion 73, said: Delegates, the Meadows statue outside the TUC shows a man helping his fallen brother. This is not how it is in the developing world. Women grow most of the food and they are often also in the lead of trade union fighting to end this appalling injustice. Mari Benkara, for example, was a great leader of HMS in India. She was the main inspiration behind the first equal pay legislation years before Barbara Castle. Today, women trade unionists in India lead the fight against child labour, despite the violent attacks of those who would exploit the weak and under-privileged.

In South Africa Emma Mashinini was one of the fearless women union leaders in the COSATU during the 1980s; a mother of three she was detained and tortured for six months. She has gone on to play a crucial part in promoting reconciliation in the wondrous new democratic South Africa.

In Colombia, and other Latin American countries, today many women lead workers' struggles, and many have paid with their lives. Their fight goes on.

The World Trade Organisation and the IMF are accessories in these murders. That is why Congress should applaud our government's efforts to lead the fight to make poverty history. It is pressing hard to reform the Common Agricultural Policy, which pays \$2 a day for every European cow; three billion people exist on less than that, and our government is trying to end the export subsidies that deliberately starve farmers in developing countries.

There has been another great advance: Hilary Benn understands that unions are partners in development, not obstacles. The Africa Commission this year concluded that the absence of accountable government is the main obstacle to development. Unions can make good the crucial missing element.

They did it in South Africa, they did it in Poland exactly a quarter of a century ago, and they did it in Chile.

Delegates, we should give an unambiguous call to enable unions to play the part of which only they are capable and end world poverty. Support this motion.

* *Motion 73 was CARRIED*

The President: I thank you for that. As Diana said, "Birds are born to fly; women are born to be free." Thank you.

Globalisation

The President: I now call Motion 74. The General Council support the motion.

Tony Richardson (*Bakers, Food and Allied Workers Union*) moved Motion 74. He said: Congress, this resolution is a culmination of a year-long project developed from the GFTU, international development champions programme taken through our national conference and here to the TUC. I am sure that delegates would agree that globalisation and the dominance of global capital is one of the biggest challenges facing trade unions and workers around the world today. It is a phenomenon generated by the worse excesses of the capitalist multinationals, and it flourishes due to favourable government policies, all to the detriment of workers everywhere. The ease with which transnational corporations ply their trade across national boundaries looking to exploit poorly regulated countries and unorganised workers is abhorrent, and a practice only for the gutter. It is a practice that should sicken all right thinking people and it is up to us in the trade union movement to work to mitigate its effects.

How do we combat the practice? What steps do we take in order to redress the balance? It is no good thinking it will go away; it will not. It is a juggernaut. If we are to protect our members and the workers of the developing countries, we must box clever. The only way to deal with globalisation is through concerted international trade union activity and solidarity, to educate, organise, and raise standards for our comrades in the exploited countries. Whether that be in the industrial relations field or ensuring high health and safety standards, we must manage and manipulate the situation to our advantage, to extend our expertise to those who need it.

You could ask, how does globalisation affect the Bakers Union whose industry is obviously nationally based? My answer is twofold: firstly, globalisation affects all sectors, all industries, manufacturing, services, IT, and manual work. Already a major cake manufacturer that we organise is under threat of production being moved to Eastern Europe. Secondly, all trade unions, no matter where we organise, have a duty to stand together in solidarity to fight this threat.

We all know the transnationals and multinationals will relentlessly pursue every penny of profit, they will squeeze until the pips squeak. Whether that means reducing health and safety standards or exploiting defenceless workers they will look for the cheapest option, the best deal, and the lowest common denominator in a race to the bottom, leaving misery and devastation wherever they operate.

Congress, that is why our motion, as amended, calls on the TUC to make the links at all levels with the developing institutions in the developing nations; to give our expertise and knowledge to our brothers and sisters in those countries so they have the tools to raise themselves up and do the job against the odds; by using our affiliates across the globe we can get that assistance where it is needed; and we must campaign for regulation, decent standards, and workers' rights. We believe in a capitalist world, let us use those

capitalist methods against the multinationals and create a level playing field that will benefit all workers.

Congress, we all know the multinationals will continue to drive down standards, diminish conditions, chase the profit, and ruin lives. It is up to us in the Labour Movement to begin the process, to start the programme, make the links, create the solidarity, unite all workers of the world and, yes, comrades, help them to lose their chains.

Hugh Lanning (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) seconded Motion 74.

He said: Clearly supporting everything that has been said about the role of trades unions, but our amendment stressed the role of the public sector in achieving health and safety standards, and that is the theme I want to develop.

Yesterday, Gordon Brown -- en route to New York -- said that the UK would be arguing for free universal public services. We agree, but what was not said is who will be delivering those services. We do not believe that private companies, consultants and contractors can deliver free universal public services across the world. Last year, we challenged the Government on conditionality, the theme of making privatisation a condition of aid. The UK has moved its position but the World Bank has not. In the UK we still use consultants while cutting 100,000 jobs. In the Make Poverty History campaign we said that promoting public services was an important theme, and we think that is the next logical step not just against privatisation; we believe that public services are part of the solution, not part of the problem.

The World Bank has had three phases of trying to attack and diminish public services. I quote from a report: there is a view amongst donor agencies that public service organisations in developing countries and in particular Africa are too big, unwieldy and cost too much and therefore should be cut by predetermined percentages within a short space of time. In Europe, under the Services Directive, we are arguing with the UK Government, and others, that there are core public services that should not be subject to the market. Just referring to Alan Johnson, every job created in the UK will be a job lost somewhere else in Europe under the Services Directive. As we heard from our delegate from America, the Katrina hurricane has shown that you can only neglect the public realm for so long before the levee breaks. We want the UK Government, in talks on globalisation in the UN, in the UK Presidency, in the World Trade Organisation later this year, to perhaps just cherish and develop core public services rather than demean and diminish them. Our view is that a strong public sector and free trades unions are part of the building blocks to reduce poverty across the world.

Please support the motion.

Anne-Marie Green (*Association of University Teachers*): Motion 74 clearly draws attention to the negative effects that globalisation can have. This means that there can no longer be only national or local trades unions. We have to be an international movement. The higher education sector is one that is touched just as greatly as any other by the hands of globalisation. A recent survey found that 40 per cent of new staff entrants for higher education come from outside of the UK. The greatest current growth in undergraduate student numbers at my own university is from China and India. As an example of the effect of this, the push to gain income from overseas fees has led to ever increasing student numbers, but at the same time staff numbers are being cut.

Moreover, universities all over the UK are setting up campuses abroad in China, the Middle East and Malaysia, with my own currently undertaking a feasibility study into a Singapore campus. These

campuses are often set up in countries where trades unions are not allowed, where academic freedom is curtailed and where the nature of employment rights is very unclear. Promoting the role of trades unions is crucial in fighting for common employment and democratic standards, and is a principle which the AUT amendment to Motion 74 seeks to emphasise.

At AUT Council in April this year, Abdul Hussein of the Iraqi Trade Union Federation and the Iraqi Teachers Union, and himself an academic, spoke eloquently about the real difference that having trades unions can make to working conditions. In our local context it is the trade union rep who challenges abuses of employment rights and points out the potential problems of human rights in those campuses abroad. Trades unions act as a critical challenge to senior managers as ever too caught up in the push towards University PLC.

Our amendment also reflects our feeling that the positive aspect of globalisation should be recognised. Globalisation can provide great opportunities as well as threats. Academic arenas can remove political, ideological and economic barriers. As my AUT colleague suggested, education is international and international solidarity is a benefit of globalisation. We can never forget how lucky we are to have the freedom to join a trade union. I am a teacher of industrial relations. Some of my international students had never learned of a trade union and had never lived in a society where trade unions could even exist. Unless we use globalisation in the way in which we want it to be used, they never get the chance.

Please support the motion.

Stewart Brown (*Fire Brigades Union*) speaking to paragraph 5.1 said: May I first of all thank you for the bucket collection for J-Flag, the Jamaican forum for lesbians, homosexuals and gays. We raised £400. Thanks very much to Congress. These comrades have had their finances cut by the Jamaican Government, ironically at the same time as they are being forced -- through pressure from the UK Government and Amnesty International -- to amend legislation outlawing homosexuals. We welcome this climb down and continue to work with J-Flag in the struggle for decent human rights that we take for granted.

Another area of concern is the brutal killings of young innocent men in Iran accused of rape and sentenced to public hangings. I urge you to raise this most important issue with your respective membership. To continue to submit motions to Congress and the equality conferences on international issues is all good and well, but it is true solidarity that our brothers and sisters around the global community need. That is why the TUC LGBT Committee -- in conjunction with Owen Tudor and the International Department -- has organised a conference on 6 February 2006. This will be a one-day conference at Congress House, and we urge you to look out for the formal notification and urge you to promote this to your branches and your members. Thank you.

* *Motion 74 was CARRIED*

China

The President: I now call Motion 76, China. The General Council support the motion and I will call Sally Hunt during the debate to explain the General Council's position.

Paul Gates (*Community*) moved Motion 76, China.

He said: We need to grasp the opportunities that this development can create for people throughout the world. With the expectation that over 50 per cent of the world's steel and textile production will be coming from China over the next five years, our union has a first-hand knowledge of the rapid development of the

Chinese economy. The changes in globalisation are being accelerated by China, and indeed India's rapid growth. But China has the potential to raise living standards globally and we must grasp that potential. It can help and contribute to the end of world poverty.

But, in approaching it, we must not make the same ideological mistakes of the past. If globalisation is going to work for working people, then it must develop a new dimension. Currently, the growth in China is no different from what the growth globally has been in the past. Globalisation is controlled by three elements: financial institutions, politicians and multinational corporations. We need to introduce a fourth element, people, workers, and make them the real beneficiaries of globalisation.

If we are to get the benefit of the Chinese economic miracle, then so must the workers of China themselves, and a key part of ensuring that move is to provide them with the support, education and training to develop trades unions themselves within China. We have seen the benefit in countries like Poland and South Africa, the role that free trades unions can play in developing the economic and political welfare of their countries for the benefit of working people. So, colleagues, let us roll out the whole international trade union movement to support the development of workers in China.

Conference, I said to you that we must not make the same ideological mistakes of the past. Protectionism is not the answer to creating and developing jobs in the western world, and never will be, I have worked in the textile industry most of my life and I have seen first hand the failure of that single policy. But neither is it a benefit to workers of the world in the developing countries to allow multinational corporations to freely exploit and dispose of labour. Human rights and core labour standards are crucial. By improving the real living standards of the millions of working people we can ensure that workers everywhere prosper.

Over the past few weeks I have been asked dozens of times what was this bra war all about. Will it mean more jobs in the UK? Well, what a myth. It is what happens when a so-called arch moderniser like Peter Mandelson falls back on old philosophies and ideological terms. It was about an attempt to separate the right from the left while still trying to support them both. Mr Mandelson, not one manufacturing job would have been created in the UK as the result of your policies. Jobs may have gone to Bangladesh, India, Sri Lanka, Eastern Europe, but not back to Europe. The price difference was far too great for that. But many jobs were on the line. Small private businesses, that had developed those businesses with high skilled design and development operations, were under threat. They had been developing partnerships and relationships with Chinese companies. Having the production and money tied up at bonded warehouses put their jobs, and the jobs of many retailers, under threat as well -- totally misguided and totally outdated.

China is creating problems for workers in the developing world through its entry into the WTO. There is the issue of the Chinese currency, but again -- to the people who are concerned about this part of the resolution -- this is not protectionism, it does not affect jobs in the western world but it does affect job in India, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka. One million textile jobs have been lost there as a result of the difference in the currency arrangements there. Conference, this is about grasping the opportunity of China.

I ask you to support the resolution, support the people and support the development of people throughout the world.

Paddy Lillis (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*) seconded Motion 76.

He said: At the height of the industrial revolution Britain was called the workshop of the world. That title today undoubtedly belongs to China, the world's largest producer of coal, steel, cement, and a great deal more as Gordon Brown made clear yesterday. Seventy per cent of the world's photocopiers, half the world's cameras and virtually all the world's toys are produced in China, not just a major producer but also a major consumer -- the world's second largest consumer of energy and the third largest importer of oil. Taken together as both a producer and a consumer, China is now a massive and growing presence on the world's stage and in the global economy.

Both the Chancellor yesterday and the motion today make clear the consequences for manufacturing and manufacturing workers both here in the UK and globally, and they are right to do so. But there is a growing trend towards globalisation in the service sector too. Retailers whom we always thought were tied to the domestic markets are also going global. Wal-Mart, for example, are now through Germany, the UK and into Russia. Tesco have moved through eastern Europe, south-east Asia and have been in China since last year. These are major companies looking beyond the mature western markets and looking for immature markets they believe they can develop. With 1.3 billion consumers they do not come any bigger than China.

The challenge to the trade union movement globally is clear to see. It is not just about trade exchange rates and fair competition, it is no longer just about manufacturing, it is about services too, and in every case it is about working conditions, independent trade union organisation and human rights. It is, therefore, about the challenge we face as a movement not just to compete as a trading nation ourselves, to protect and promote our members' interest, but to ensure that we level up globally, and that is going to mean a massive effort in every forum and through every channel that we can reach -- the ICFTU certainly but also every Secretariat and International Federation that we affiliate to.

Whether it is in manufacturing or the service sector, China is going to figure large as a consumer, a producer or both. So, if we aspire to protecting and promoting the interests of workers globally, then our reach has to extend to China as the largest trading nation and workforce on earth. Please support.

The President: I am getting indications that there are unions at Congress who either oppose or have significant reservations about this motion. I was trying to move towards the vote, but if there is opposition or reservation I need to deal with that to give justice to the debate. I will call UCATT, then I will call in NATFHE who are going to oppose the motion, and then Amicus who I think have some strong reservations. Then I will go to Sally Hunt, and the right of reply. This will eat into time but I cannot deny that there is opposition on the floor.

Chris Murphy (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*): To make our position clear before people get carried away, UCATT is not opposed to free independent trades unions; we do wish that we had free independent trades unions in this country that could represent their workers.

Not having a degree in economics and being a common carpenter for many a year, I read this resolution the first time and, being a bit slow -- because I am getting old and grey -- I missed some fundamentally important parts. Sitting there reading it again this morning, waking up after last night, I began to get worried about it. It seems to emphasise quite clearly that all the economic ills of the west and the world, with global warming/climate change, are down to China. We take no responsibility for Europe or the United States. The United States did not sign the Kyoto Agreement. Bush walks around imagining it does not

exist and that global warming or the burning of oil and other pollutants do not affect the state of the climate in the world, where scientists after scientist -- especially in Europe -- is telling them differently.

I am not here to defend the Chinese economy. I have never been to China, I cannot speak it and I cannot read it, but the facts of life are that we are looking at a country that, over the years, has been attacked because of its political system; people did not like it. It has come out of that to a degree where it is a manufacturing nation; it is trying to improve the lot of the people working in that country, who depended mainly on agriculture. They are getting foreign income. The last speaker touched on the question of importing or exporting to China. The facts are that with the economy in China, the way it is, they do not have the money to import our goods at the price we sell them for and the only way they are going to improve their lot is by exporting. I do not have a problem with trade agreements.

I will finish on this. We had a motorbike industry in this country many, many years ago. It was a famous motorbike industry, had some very good makes. It was not this country that put import controls on the Japanese so that they could not sell their bikes in this country, or the benefits or up the taxes. It was the Americans who did that for Harley Davidson; they did it for five years and our motorbike industry virtually went bankrupt and theirs survived. Protectionism does not work. What does work is working with other countries, working with their trades unions. International relations has been touched on earlier today.

I ask you to oppose this resolution, basically on the grounds that I think it is misguided, ill conceived and terribly written. Thank you.

Dennis Hayes (*NATFHE*): To oppose Motion 76. Earlier in the week we were told from the platform that Congress is the biggest marketing opportunity for the trade union movement, for the TUC and its values and principles. Ask yourself before you vote on this motion -- I hope you vote against it -- what message it will send out to workers in Britain and to people in China. As the last speaker rightly said, although it is qualified in this badly worded motion it does say that China could substantially aggravate climate change and economic problems; it could increase global unemployment; it could cause detrimental working conditions in every other country in the world. It also says it needs effective trades unions. It says it needs national policies determined over here on currency restructuring and on opening up imports. I ask you, this is development but -- you can develop but on certain terms. You can have trades unions but on certain terms. You can have sovereign national policies but on certain terms.

International solidarity, which we made much of, is not about telling other countries how to run their internal affairs. We know where that leads. The most populous nation on earth can determine these things for itself. If you pass this motion the danger is that you will come out -- as the TUC has unfortunately many times before -- as the concerned and morally superior arm of the contemporary capitalist status quo; that is what it will seem like. Before you vote remember you are the Trades Union Congress and not the CBI. I oppose the motion.

The President: Everyone is waking up this afternoon!

Helen McFarlane (*Amicus*): This motion is not all it seems. Have you really read this motion closely, delegates? You have now haven't you!

On first read delegates would think it supports the efforts of the people of China, designed in some way to be helpful. However, second read, delegates will note it refers to China as a dominant influence in

global economic development. The impression is created that this is inherently wrong or sinister in some way. Well, if that is the case, what about the dominant influence on the global economy of the USA? That is all right, I suppose.

While I am talking about the USA, who will benefit most if China devalues its currency, as the motion calls for? The good old USA, you are right, and Mr Bush, not China.

But Congress, let us think for a moment about our members. Members of Amicus -- and I am sure other members too -- work in many companies that now have subsidiaries in China such as General Motors, Ford, Kimberly Clark, IBM, and so on. There is even one that sounds a bit like 'cheesecake' but I do not think that is right! China is of central importance to our members, therefore. Amicus has been instrumental in pushing for a China policy both within the International Metal Workers Federation and within Union Network International.

We think that there are three points that are needed for any policy on China, and unfortunately the motion here only makes a start and does not go far enough. One, an ongoing pressure for China to have fundamental trade union rights. Two, we, the trade union movement in this country, should assist Chinese workers to develop their trade union organisation. Assist, not dictate. Three, we should target multinationals operating in China to respect and encourage workers' rights through the making of global agreements. It may well be that in the new China -- sounds like New Labour, scarcely -- the ACFTU, the All China Federation of Trade Unions, will be given room to adapt and change. If it is, we need to be there to offer support and assistance in that process.

Amicus supports the motion but really wanted the opportunity to express our reservations. Thank you.

The President: I now call Sally Hunt to explain the General Council's position and then I will move to the right of reply.

Sally Hunt (General Council): I have been asked to speak on behalf of the General Council to give an explanation of its position on Motion 76, which feels quite strange, explaining something that my union I hope is opposing! We will see.

Back to the script! Congress, it would be very difficult indeed in 250 words to sum-up everything that there is to say on this subject, and I think the comments that have been said so far have made that very clear. On that basis, that is where we felt an explanation was needed.

We all as trades unionists want to see free trade unionism develop in China, as it has developed in so many other parts of the world. That requires serious pressure on the Chinese Government to respect ILO Conventions, but it also requires solidarity with those in China who are campaigning for workers' rights, such as the trades union movement in Hong Kong and the China Labour Bulletin. It requires constructive but critical engagement with the All China Federation of Trade Unions whose General Secretary visited the TUC in May.

We hope over the coming years to step up our work with both the Chinese and Hong Kong trades unions, and one area where we have a particular interest is the operation of the British American, Korean and other multinational companies who are currently seeking to enter the Chinese market and who are sometimes the worst offenders against human rights and trade union rights. The General Council believes that we need to make a special effort to address the organising challenges presented by those multinational companies, and that this is one area where we need to work with global union federations as well as the

ACFTU who are particularly keen to develop joint approaches with us.

We know that there are concerns about the motion's focus on the World Trade Organisation, and on the exchange rate. The TUC believes that the WTO is an incredibly important tool for influencing the Chinese Government, and the WTO itself needs to address the implications of China for the industries of the global south such as textiles. The TUC will continue also to prioritise the issues of ILO Conventions and deal with the concerns about Chinese exchange rates in the same way as we would look at the US Budget deficit.

These are, of course, matters for the trades unions in those countries and we must take the issue of sovereignty seriously. But the decisions of other governments also impact on people we represent too we cannot avoid taking a view. Thank you, Congress.

Paul Gates (Community) exercising his right of reply on Motion 76 said: If I can reply to the three points made, on the UCATT point, I did say right at the start that this was a move away from the old right/left ideological arguments and UCATT re-introduced them back here. We are not saying that the western world does not have responsibilities in terms of climate and environmental issues, but there is a need to develop trade with environmental and climate issues throughout the world to the benefit of working people. The point that this resolution is making is that we must grasp the Chinese expansion for the benefit of working people and not for the benefit of capitalism and multinational corporations.

On the NATFHE position, again they talked about the climate situation and they talked about effective trades unions. We have a responsibility as trades unionists in this country -- along with trades unionists in every other western country -- to ensure the development of trades unions in the developing world. We must work - as Sally said on behalf of the TUC -- with the All China Federation of Trades Unions and other working people who want to improve democratic trades unions in China. That is what this resolution is all about, and indeed it was summed up by Helen from Amicus.

I accept the Amicus reservations completely, and if we could have made the resolution even longer we could have included the three points made by Helen. Indeed, I spoke about the three points: the growing pressure on trade union rights is important, it is part of what I said; on the question of the assistance that the western trades unions need to give to the developing trades union in China in terms of education, the TUC here is already playing its part in that; and then there are the multinationals and their respect for human rights. That is what the resolution is all about. Maybe it was not long enough to put all those things in, but that is what it is all about.

I said to you, Congress, that it is about grasping the benefits of China. Do not fall into the old ideological trap are arguing left versus right. Make sure that the people of China benefit and the people of the world benefit. Thank you.

A card vote was called the result of which was as follows:

For the motion	3,305,000
Against the motion	2,919,000
Majority in favour	386,000

* *Motion 76 was CARRIED*

Iraq

The President: While we were taking that vote a statement was handed to me, which I am going to read to you. We have just heard through our colleagues from the Iraqi Federation of Trades Unions that there were two horrific suicide car bomb attacks in Iraq this

morning, Over 200 people, who were waiting at job centres for construction and cleaning work, are believed to be dead. These people were ordinary workers seeking to feed their families, and I would like to ask Rasem from the IFTU to take our condolences to the working families of Iraq. Thank you.

Fittingly, I now call Motion 77 on Iraq. The General Council support the motion and I will call on Sally Hunt during the debate to explain the General Council's position.

Doug Nicholls (*The Community and Youth Workers' Union*) moved Motion 77.

He said: Our message in this motion is mainly for our government, but now that George Bush has finally taken full responsibility for the disastrous response to the hurricane in his country let us say to him that it is time to take your 150,000 troops back from Iraq and send them to the Mississippi and Louisiana to save lives and rebuild the homes of our brothers and sisters there.

As a national union, with our headquarters in Birmingham, we say to our own government that if you did not believe in state intervention to save Rover and the mining industry then you cannot afford one more penny than the £5 billion you have already spent on state intervention to devastate Iraq. Bring our 9,000 troops back and invest here.

There are 27 million people in Iraq. Thirty-nine per cent of them are under the age of 15, and half the population are under 18. No surprise then that since the invasion two years ago at the very least 3,500 of the official 25,000 killed have been innocent kids. A quarter of the children in Iraq suffer from chronic malnutrition. Diarrhoea killed two out of ten children before the war; now it is four out of ten. US and British troops have systematically targeted water purification and sewage works; the infrastructure is in tatters. Most houses do not have safe water, infant mortality is rising, and half the houses are damaged. Whole cities like Fallujah -- as big as Coventry where I am from -- have been cleared and blitzed. Electricity supply is universally unreliable. Ninety-six per cent of families are on food rations.

War brings the poverty which we seek to make history. The average Iraqi household income in the year before the war was \$255. This year it is half that. In 1990 Iraq was ranked fiftieth out of 130 countries on the United Nations Human Development Index, which measures national achievement in health, education and GDP. Now it is right down to 127th on the list, and this represents the most dramatic decline in human welfare in recent history anywhere.

The Medical Journal, the *Lancet* estimates that in reality 100,000 civilians have been killed by the war in its first 18 months. Most, of course, were women and children. All hospitals and schools need rehabilitation. The poverty of mass illiteracy has returned. Gordon said yesterday that poor people in poor countries should not be left defenceless against high oil prices. Well, Gordon, oil prices have doubled since the war, as they always do at times of instability in the Middle East, and we are killing people and making them poorer in a brutal, barbaric and illegal war. It is a war led by the US so that it can build permanent bases on a place it does not see as a nation but as an oil field.

The US and British Governments are past masters at occupation. Their tactics are simple: they fan the flames of sectarian hatred and seek to introduce a constitution to divide the country into competing regions. It is they who fan the flames of terrorism. To the terrorists who killed British workers and Iraqi workers, including all those mentioned by our President just now, we say "By killing the innocent you support those you most condemn and like them you have nothing but murder in your hearts. If you do not

believe you can create paradise on earth and have to kill workers to get there, leave those of us who believe we can build a better world alone."

Gordon also reminded us yesterday how easy it is to be unambitious and not to aim high, but we must aim high on this one. Our movement is the highest custodian of the highest aspiration, that is for world peace. We agree with Gordon, we have the power to shape history with a close relationship with this government and more power than we think.

We believe that in passing this motion we should expect Brendan and the General Council to use all of their formidable powers of negotiation, campaigning and influence and recognise that of all the mandates we have given them this week this the most crucial. How can we really hold our heads high in the struggles we have for manufacturing, public services, education, health and social justice at home, while British troops are destroying these things in Iraq?

The UN mandate, which the British Government claim legitimises their position, is up for renewal in December. Let us make sure it is not renewed. We want the TUC and its affiliates proudly marching against the war on September 24, but above all it is not the special relationship with Bush that interests us but our special relationship with our government. We believe this will be seriously jeopardised if they continue to ignore the TUC's united policy on early withdrawal.

We do not want to have to put this motion again next year, and the extent to which we are successful in pursuing this policy will be a measure of our success on all the other issues we have debated. We are truly not free in Britain as workers while weapons of mass destruction rain down on Iraq. I move.

Mary Davis (*NATFHE- The University and College Lecturers Union*) seconded Motion 88. She said: This time last year in this very hall we passed a resolution calling for solidarity with Iraqi trades unions who had just begun a legal existence after years of repression under the Baathist dictatorship. We knew how important solidarity was. The motion was practical. Actually, the TUC has to be congratulated because it did exactly what the motion asked: we set up the TUC Solidarity Committee; we have arranged bilateral visits and things have gone ahead. In fact, there is a very good publication that tells trades unions practically what they can do to help.

I do not think, though, that when we passed that motion any of us realised just how vital that solidarity was going to have to be. I do not think any of us realised just then how it was that trades unionists now have become within that year the target of the most violent abuse from people who call themselves -- I do not know, they might call themselves resistance but they seem to target trades unions. We have had a succession of murders of leading trades unionists in Iraq and, as you have just heard, there has been the brutal and appalling suicide bombing today of workers simply waiting to work.

That is not the only time that has happened. But there is a new situation, which is as worrying and as daunting. The new constitution in Iraq, the long awaited constitution, has now decreed -- decree 875 -- that the state has to take control of all monies belonging to the trades unions and they should be prevented from dispensing any such monies. That means trades unions cannot function. That means that decree No. 3, which at last allowed trades unions and the IFTU in particular, to flourish and grow, is aimed at them. The TUC, Brendan Barber, has written to the Iraqi Ambassador expressing grave concern about this, saying it is a prima facie breach of the ILO core convention on freedom of association and a deeply worrying attack on human rights in Iraq. You cannot

take control of unions' finances and still pretend unions can function because they cannot. We know that because our government tried to do it. This makes the work of solidarity more and more vital.

Passing this motion is not just a few words; passing this motion today, and particularly the NATFHE amendment, really must mean that the solidarity action that we have begun must be re-doubled because without trades unions civil society cannot flourish. Governments make war; trades unionists make peace.

Dave Green (*Fire Brigades Union*) said: We are pleased that our amendment has been accepted as it does enhance and support the aims and sentiments so well articulated by the CYWU and NATFHE.

It is vitally important that the message that goes out from Congress today is clear, concise and sets out a way forward. This Government – our Labour Government – is implicated and remains implicated in an illegal war and now an illegal occupation. That, I believe, we can never forgive or forget. However, we also need to look constructively forward with a sense of purpose to the future. How do we all help to re-build Iraq? Of course, this process can only begin with a speedy withdrawal, but it can also be progressed by insisting that resources are immediately made available at least to begin to right the wrongs in this disgraceful episode in our history.

The FBU has, in its own small way, attempted to carry on the ethos of us being part of a 'can do' service. Along with our good comrades from the IFTU, we have identified ways to assist, practically, our fellow workers in Iraq. Myself and fellow Executive Council member, Brian Joyce, visited Iraq and Iraqi Kurdistan, Brian visiting on four separate occasions. This enabled us to gain first hand experience of the incredible needs and difficulties faced every day by trade unionists and ordinary workers. Our grateful thanks are, once again, extended to Abdullah Muhsin and it is great to see him here today, along with Rasem Alawady, the President of the IFTU. This experience allowed us to identify areas where immediate support was required. I have to say the result was astounding.

FBU regions from across the UK have collected and sent to Iraq fire kit, equipment and money to help the workers.

Fire fighters in Basra, Baghdad and Iraqi Kurdistan no longer fight fires in T-shirts and trainers but in fire tunics from Bristol, Newcastle and Lincoln and, by Christ, they need it, don't they? We have offered support in as many areas as we can, but what we have done is, truly, a drop in the ocean. By seeing first hand their problems you begin to realise how much is needed and how much remains to be done.

So what can we do? It is incumbent on all governments and institutions to act immediately and together in cancelling all debts incurred by Saddam Hussein in his crazy pursuit of power and war. These are not debts incurred by the Iraqi people. How can we even claim to want to help them when this money is clawed back? That is another hypocrisy of this sordid chapter in world history. It is essential that the new Iraq, and I call it that in a wholly positive way, has laws and practices which embody the ILO core conventions and that Iraqi trade unions are fully involved in that process. Crucially, we must, they must, reject privatisation of essential public services and vital resources, oil being the most striking example.

Comrades, it is a tall order but we all have to act. Our Labour Government must act. Support the motion.

Sally Hunt (*General Council*): The General Council wants to give an explanation to this motion. It is broadly in line with Congress policy but a lot of work has been done, as has been talked about this afternoon, and we wanted to reiterate our support for

that and for the work that needs to go on in the future.

Firstly, under the auspices of the TUC/Iraq Solidarity Committee, whose work is reported in the General Council Report – I am sure you have read it on page 92 – considerable work is already underway to promote solidarity and provide practical support for the Iraqi trade union movement. This has included a whole range of activities, namely, exchange visits, trade union education and other material support – practical help for our brothers and sisters which, we hope, will help them to build a free society.

We have with us on the platform, as has been said, Rasem Alawady, the President of the IFTU and we are very pleased to have you with us. We rely on them to provide us with the information and advice on Iraq. It was their contact which broke the news to the trade union world about Decree 875, which has already been mentioned. As a result of that, we have alerted the ILO and they are taking action as we speak to pressurise the Iraqi Government into abandoning this move, which I think we have to say is an absolute disgrace.

Secondly, the motion reconfirms the existing policy to seek early withdrawal of British troops. UN authority for the presence of these troops expires at the end of this year, and at that point the Iraqi Government are due to indicate their preferences regarding the continuation of that presence and when the British Government could, themselves, set their own unilateral date for an early departure. But whatever the outcome of the current discussions on the constitution, the General Council will continue to support the development of free and independent trade unions in Iraq, recognising, as we all do, that trade unionism is a key pillar for any genuine, free and democratic society and this, in turn, can only be secured through the cessation of violence from whatever quarter and through the development, we hope, of lasting peace. Thank you.

Keith Sonnet (*UNISON*) speaking in support of the Motion said: Congress, the situation in Iraq is tragic with the continuing spiral of violence that will not end until the occupation ends. So, as the motion states, we have to continue our campaign to ensure the withdrawal of British and American troops. I hope that all unions will support the Stop the War Coalition's demonstration on 24th September. It is important that we get as many members attending as possible.

Also, as the motion states, we must condemn the deliberate targeting by assassination and bombing of trade unionists of innocent men, women and children. Those who do that do not want to liberate the Iraqis. Instead, they seek to enslave them under a new dictatorship of one fundamentalist religious or political faction or another. We can only admire the brave people in Iraq who are struggling to rebuild their shattered economy and society. I am pleased that Rasem Alawady, the President of the IFTU, is here today. Next week, on 19th September, Mr. Alawady will be signing a joint declaration between the IFTU, the GFTU and the GFTU about the creation of a single trade union federation. So the trade unions in Iraq are getting their act together and making progress, but it is clear, as other speakers have said, that Iraqi and Kurdish trade unions need our solidarity but they also need our practical assistance. They face problems which are only too familiar to us in Britain and particularly the privatisation of their assets and their economy. It is disgraceful that the American administration force through orders to ensure that American corporations could buy up whole swathes of the economy. It is equally disgraceful that much of Britain's aid is provided on the same basis.

However, we must congratulate the Iraqi trade unionists, such as those in the oil industry, who are

opposing privatisation. The Iraqi trade unions want a new constitution that enshrines an independent, secular and democratic Iraq, a constitution that recognises trade unions, endorses ILO Conventions and standards and provide equal rights for men and women. The draft constitution is very worrying in those respects. Order 875 recently issued, as Mary Davis said, freezes the funds and assets of the trade unions and puts them under the control of government ministers. The Government of Iraq is also setting up a committee and preparing papers on the structure and organisation of trade unions in complete contradiction to ILO conventions. We must support the Iraqi trade unions in ensuring their independence from the State. I very much welcome the action the TUC has already taken on the constitution and particularly on Order 875.

Congress, Motion 77 and its amendments give us a clear policy and commitment to work with the Iraqi and Kurdish trade unions. Please support.

Tony Woodley (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) in speaking in support of the motion, said: President, I am grateful for the consideration which you have given me, bearing in mind the strong feelings of my union, and personally, on this issue. I am most grateful.

Colleagues, the illegal invasion of Iraq has been an absolute disaster and our troops should now be pulled out, and I do mean 'now'. A year on we see a hundred thousand civilians dead, degrading scenes of torture at Camp Bread Basket, terrorism which never existed before and the senseless on-going deaths of British soldiers. We have seen the total destruction of large cities, gas shortages and, unbelievably, little petrol in a country sitting on oil. Thereagain, you cannot steal £1.8 billion worth of oil and supply it.

We see the political process in turmoil and the country in chaos, where the Government lacks legitimacy because they depend on foreign military. There is no doubt that any sane person can see that the occupation is now the biggest problem, not the solution, to the Iraqis' needs. Any sane person knows that the war is helping to make our own country even more of a target to the evil of terrorism, but that is not a reason to pull out. Indeed, that would be appeasement.

We say we should pull out because it is the right thing for the Iraqis. In their eyes, we are not liberators but occupying forces.

President and comrades, I support the amendment and motion. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak.

The President: The General Council supports Motion 77.

* *Motion 77 was* CARRIED.

The Western Sahara

Vicky Knight (*Fire Brigades Union*) moved Motion 78. She said: Comrades, for decades the Saharawi people from the country of Western Sahara in north west Africa have been denied the right to self-determination. Colonized by Spain for 90 years, these desert people's right to self-determination was first recognised by the UN General Assembly in 1966.

In 1975 Morocco invaded, occupied and imposed its repressive rule in Western Sahara, undermining Saharawi aspirations for independence, dividing a nation and forcing a majority of the Saharawi people to live in exile in tented cities in south-west Algeria near the border with Western Sahara.

Women, children and elderly make up 80 per cent of the refugee population and are dependent on aid to exist. For thirty years they have had to struggle against

all odds to survive in what is the most inhospitable desert environment in the world. In summer, temperatures soar to above 130 degree Fahrenheit and plummet to below zero in winter.

Flash floods, violent Sirocco winds and locust invasions periodically wreak havoc and devastation.

Despite all these challenges, with the women at the forefront, the refugees have built schools, hospitals and developed democratic structures of governance in these camps.

Today two hundred thousand Saharawis continue to live as refugees while tens of thousands more live in a police state under Morocco's oppressive rule in Western Sahara and where a largely unreported *intifada* has been going on since May 20th this year. The response of the Moroccan authorities to the widespread and growing numbers of peaceful Saharawi demonstrations has been to savagely beat, rape, torture, imprison, abduct and disappear scores upon scores of participants, to the great alarm and concern of Amnesty International. Their crime was expressing their desire for an end to the Moroccan occupation and affirming their Saharawi identity.

Currently, 37 illegally imprisoned Saharawi activists are staging a hunger strike which began on August 9th. I am led to believe this afternoon by one of our comrades from the Polisario Front that the first woman activist from the Saharawi camps went into a coma this morning. She is one of the leaders of this struggle to the right to self-determination. That fact should concern us, Congress.

Ever since 1975 the Polisario Front has been campaigning to end the Moroccan occupation of the Saharawi homeland in the hope of ensuring independence for the Saharawi people.

The advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in the Hague clearly stated that "Inter alia, there is no legal basis for the sovereignty claims of Morocco which could oppose the exercise of the right to self-determination by the then people of Western Sahara."

So today the Saharawi people still cannot understand why the world is willing to punish some countries for violating UN resolutions and human rights and not others, like Morocco. They do not understand why the world knows about the wall in Palestine, yet are totally unaware of the 1,700 mile long wall in Western Sahara dividing every Saharawi family.

The Moroccan-built defence wall is fortified by up to ten million landmines and is staffed by more than a hundred thousand soldiers.

In early 1992 the UN was supposed to organise a referendum for Saharawi self-determination after both Morocco and the Polisario agreed to a ceasefire in 1991 to end the conflict in Western Sahara through a peaceful process.

Basically, the question is whether the people of Western Sahara, including the two hundred thousand refugees in Algeria, want independence from Morocco or not.

Every independent commentator forecasts that there would be an overwhelming vote for independence in such a referendum. Because the Moroccan regime does not wish to lose control over these territories it has stalled and played for time until in 2003 it finally revealed, after wasting more than half-a-billion dollars of UN resources, that it would refuse to co-operate with a process that threatened 'Moroccan sovereignty'. As a result, there is no agreement on the rights of refugees.

January 2005 saw the King of Morocco pronounce again that he and his people would never give up sovereignty in Western Sahara, regardless of any UN resolution. Imagine if Saddam Hussein had said that in

relation to Kuwait or weapons of mass destruction and the international community had remained silent.

All this continues whilst the world of politics looks on in silence at a nation undergoing cultural genocide.

Comrades, Western Sahara is Africa's last colony. Its people are living in poverty and oppression with the majority in refugee camps, whilst the rich and powerful place over a hundred thousand troops to militarily defend the indefensible.

Sisters and brothers, let us press the Government to put pressure on Morocco. We must highlight the plight of the Saharawi people. Please attend the fringe meeting tonight at 5.30pm in the Belvedere Hotel and hear more about the struggle.

Your unions should be a part of the Saharawi people's future because that means support for a democratic Muslim people who do respect the rights of women and human rights and who, in times of extremism, pursue the path of non-violence to advance their cause and aspirations.

Comrades, join your Saharawi brothers and sisters so that they can look forward to a future with hope and optimism. Thank you.

Annette Mansell-Green (*UNISON*) in seconding the motion, said: I do not think it is really necessary to cover any of the other points. They were adequately and eloquently covered by Vicky from the FBU, but what I would like to do on behalf of UNISON and on behalf of the movement, really, is to applaud the work of the FBU in their support for the Saharawi people, which has been an excellent job. I urge you to attend the fringe meeting.

A 32-year conflict that very few people are aware of has been going on in Western Sahara. There is a lack of political awareness and a lack of political action on the plight of the Saharawi people. It is a silent and invisible issue.

The one point that I would like to finish on is to ask you to attend the fringe meeting and find out about the Sandblast Project. They are a very artistic people. They are film-makers, dancers, singers, musicians and artists. The best method of communication, as far as I am concerned, is through the arts. Encourage people to attend. Encourage your unions to get involved in the project and support it financially and spread the word about the plight of the Saharawi people. It is a desperate situation. Thank you.

Barbara White (*Musicians' Union*) supported the motion.

She said: I will be very brief because you have been told quite a lot about what is going on at the moment. We know that the Western Saharawi refugees have occupied a region of land since 1976 and we know that these people have been forced to live in one of the most hostile and brazen landscapes in the world. We are speaking of a fiercely independent group of people, so is it any wonder that almost 30 years after their homeland was invaded, from 20th May to 4th June was an intifada. It started peacefully but, as you know, at the end of the day, protesters were beaten and injured in the streets and those detained were, allegedly, savagely tortured.

The Saharawis are of a nomadic background and draw their cultural roots from a fusion of Berba, Afro-Arabic and Spanish influences. They have a wealth of cultural identity but their life in exile poses great challenges to their culture. So I, too, would like to mention Sandblast. The main aim of Sandblast is to hold a series of artistic, cultural and educational events to mark the Saharawi's 30 year struggle for self-determination.

In recent years, with Live-Aid, we have witnessed the power of music. Please support Sandblast and encourage your union actively to support this event. By doing this, there is a chance of not only preserving

the Saharawi culture but also of a future of peace and reconciliation.

The President: The General Council is supporting Motion 78.

* *Motion 78 was CARRIED.*

Address by Carlos Rodriguez, President of the Colombian CUT

The President: Congress, I am particularly pleased to welcome to the rostrum the General Secretary of the Colombian CUT, Carlos Rodriguez. Everyone in this hall knows how brave the Colombian trade union movement is and how much we, as British trade unionists, want to support the Colombian workers' movement. Carlos is the foremost example of the Colombian movement's bravery and his trade union confederation is the leading example of what we are seeking to support.

Carlos's words today will be translated by Mariella Cohen, who is well-known for her work for Justice for Colombia. I would urge everyone here support the work that JfC do for us and for the Colombian labour movement. Carlos, you are very welcome here today. We are delighted that you could be here and we look forward to hearing what you have to say. (*Applause*)

Carlos Rodriguez (*President, Colombian CUT*): First of all, on behalf of all Colombian workers affiliated to the CUT, I would like to send you our fraternal greetings.

To me it is a great honour to be here and I would like to thank you for your co-operation and the continued support which the TUC has given us.

Unfortunately, I have to tell you that social and democratic rights continue to be violated in Colombia and this goes alongside the assassination of trade unionists as well as the extermination of collective bargaining.

The assassinations continue. So far this year, in 2005, 33 trade unionists have been murdered. Just this week they murdered another trade unionist. That is 26 men and seven women who have been murdered. Since the CUT was founded in 1986, there has been a demented campaign against trade union activity and more than 3,000 trade unionists have been assassinated.

There is no other country in the world where trade unionists suffer such violence from illegal armed groups. That is why we need your solidarity and your accompaniment for our struggle. We need you to help us to denounce these violations at the international level to help stop the wave of brutal violence.

Alongside the murder of trade unionists is also the disappearance of collective bargaining. In 2004 only 44,000 workers were covered by collective bargaining agreements out of one million organised workers.

Casualisation and part-time contracts are favoured by the government. They are pushing for a flexible workforce and they are privatising public services.

Despite all of these difficulties, the Colombian trade union movement continues to be motivated and we are ready to do battle in a civilised and democratic way to create the conditions for trade union activity.

I would also like to share our joy and triumph with you at the decision made at the last ILO Conference in Geneva to send a high level tripartite mission to Colombia to see for itself the violations of trade union rights.

I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate my deep thanks to the TUC and the ICFTU for their work, which made possible the visit of a Colombian trade union delegation around Europe. I would also like to say how much we appreciate the delegations organised by Justice for Colombia which allow for a real understanding of Colombia, and they also contributed

positively by making the Colombian trade union movement feel the practical support given by British trade unionists.

The Colombian Government are scared of any kind of international solidarity and that is why they try and obstruct such solidarity. An example occurred last year when they tried to block a British trade union delegation. Fortunately, thanks to the bravery and determination of the TUC delegation, the Colombian Government had to back down and let them come into the country.

Finally, I would like to say that Colombia needs co-operation for peace and not for war. Violence cannot be fought with more violence but with more democracy.

We do not think that the British military aid is helping to strengthen democracy and for that reason we ask you to support the campaign to end British military aid.

Colombian workers are tired of violence. That is why we ask for co-operation and peace because true democracy needs to be synonymous with the right to freedom of association and to carry out trade union activities.

I thank the TUC and all delegates at this important Congress. I send you a strong hug and fraternal greetings. Thanks again, on behalf of the Colombian trade union movement. *(A standing ovation)*

The President: I would like to thank you, personally, Carlos. I would also like to thank you for your bravery on behalf of your colleagues. You can see from the response that you received the continued support and commitment of your British trade union colleagues to your cause.

Let me also say that the British trade union delegation to Colombia was led by Frances O'Grady, our Deputy General Secretary. *(Applause)* The whole delegation – I will not list them here – showed great courage in standing their ground and getting into Colombia so that they could see their trade union colleagues.

I would also like to thank Mariella, who does so much for Justice for Colombia and is so often unrecognised for her contributions. *(Applause)*

Venezuela

The President: Congress, I now call paragraph 5.5 and Motion 79 on Venezuela. The NUJ has indicated that they want to come in on paragraph 5.5. I will call them in on that paragraph after I have taken the supporting speakers, but could you make your interjection on the paragraph brief because I do want to do justice to the motions from other unions which we are in danger of losing.

The General Council supports Motion 79.

John Wilkin (NATFHE – The University and College Lecturers' Union) moved Motion 79.

He said: This motion on Venezuela has its origin in debates at NATFHE's annual national conferences for two years in succession. We take our international concerns very seriously and for a small union (soon to be part of a much larger one, we hope, when we come together with AUT to form the University and College Union) we are proud of the solidarity work that we do with link to trade unionists across the world from Colombia to Iraq, Africa and elsewhere.

Why Venezuela? An earlier version of this motion referred to the Bolivarian Revolution – a long slow burning process which started with the election of President Hugo Chavez in 1998. I have a feeling that we should have kept the word 'revolution' in the motion but other views prevailed and we left it out.

What is the Bolivarian Revolution? I've seen it at first hand. I have just come back from a holiday and

solidarity visit to meet Venezuelan trades unionists and see what is happening. Thanks to the work of several solidarity organisations in this country and of affiliated trade unions, we have a visitor here at this Congress this week from the new national union Federation – the UNT in Venezuela (*ooennetay* in Spanish). I hope he is in the hall now because to Orlando Chirino, we say: *Companero de la UNT, bienvenidos al TUC Britanico. (Applause)*

The UNT is a new federation of unions which was formed in response to the 2002 failed coup d'état and prolonged oil industry lockout organised by the employers and supported by the old unions of the CTV. Imagine the CBI sponsoring a national lockout supported by the TUC in order to bring down a Labour Government. They wanted to replace Chavez with a right wing military regime in the style of Pinochet's Chile. No wonder Venezuela needed a new union federation.

Until recently 80 percent of Venezuela's 26 million people have been excluded from the benefits of living in an oil rich country of great wealth and natural resources. For the first time in its history, the Government of Venezuela is pumping the oil wealth into the barrios of Caracas and the depopulated countryside. They are using it to create innovative health and education systems which emphasise the development from within and the active involvement of the communities themselves. They call it 'sowing the oil' so that present and future generations reap the benefits.

The oil money is being used on a massive scale to develop new social programmes which have really changed lives in the past two years. Most important of all is the so called *Mision Barrio Adentro*, literally means 'neighbourhood within', which is an extraordinary medical programme staffed by hundreds of Cuban doctors and dentists working together with Venezuelan medics in the poorest neighbourhoods of Caracas and other cities. With expertise and support from Cuba, Venezuela is building a national health service, perhaps the first on the South American sub-continent to be completely free of charge and available to the whole population.

In Venezuela I found a tremendous sense of optimism and enthusiasm among people whose lives have been blighted for generations by a privileged controlling elite. It's the same throughout Latin America wherever US policies of total subjection to the world market, with convenient lucrative access for US companies, have prevailed.

Of course, there is the opposition. But it's like the *curcuracha* – the cockroach in the song. *Ya no puede caminar* – it can't walk because it's missing a leg. Without financial support from its friends in Washington, it would not exist.

Since 2002 the revolution has gone from strength to strength. There is a slow burning revolution with an optimism that has to be seen. It's a revolution with a sense of humour that can laugh at itself and its president. There have been no arrests or punishments for the opposition leaders who supported the coup and encouraged sabotage in the oil industry. Even the US opinion polls brought in to give comfort to the opposition concede that support for Chavez is overwhelming and growing.

All this would be enough for us to congratulate and support the Bolivarian Government of Venezuela. But even more significant for us, as British trade unionists, is the determined opposition to the neo-liberal economic system of the IMF and World Bank.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela is increasingly leading the way not just in Latin America but worldwide to show what can be done by mobilising

people and resources for the benefit of the majority, not just the privileged few.

I move the motion. Please support.

Simon Renton (*Association of University Teachers*) seconded the motion.

He said: President and Congress, comrades, the AUT is delighted to have the opportunity to second Motion 79 proposed by NATFHE. The danger facing the government and people of Venezuela is acute at the moment, so this motion is both timely and important. The Bolivarian revolution has the support of the vast majority of the people of Venezuela which sets out to put right the results of decades of injustice is under attack by the globalisers and imperialists of the US and elsewhere in alliance with the exploiting elite of Venezuela itself.

We have all seen what can happen to countries which fail to fall in line with the wishes of the US and its allies in terms of economic policy.

A democratically elected government is often no defence against attacks, as the case of Yugoslavia demonstrates, I think, convincingly. But in Latin America these memories are very close to home. No Latin American who presses for social justice, progress and for the liberation of the working class, of peasant farmers and of the poor and oppressed in general can forget the case of Chile, where a democratically elected socialist government, that of Salvador Allende, was crushed by a US sponsored coup. Not only communists, socialists and trade union activists and their families found themselves in the national stadium in Santiago, but even social democrats and social liberals, like New Labour, were tormented and murdered by the armed wing of transnational capital in that country. Comrades, we must not let this situation happen again.

With our support the Venezuelan people can continue to move forward, to build the health service, education system and social services they need and deserve based upon real democratic control. What can be achieved can already be seen by the example which Cuba has given us. Despite the piracy, boycotts, terrorism and blockade of the US Administration, enormous progress has been made in education and healthcare, for example. Every country that builds socialism and rejects the domination of international capital weakens our class enemies and reduces our employers' power to exploit and oppress us.

Comrades, we must support and defend the people of Venezuela, the trade unions that represent them and their immensely popular government, both because they need it and because we need it. An injury to one is an injury to all. Both locally and internationally, we really are stronger together. Thank you.

Mitch Tovey (*Transport Salaried Staffs' Association*) speaking in support of the motion, said: Comrades, many of us in this hall today, when hearing about the attempted coup in Venezuela back in 2002 must have thought about the very events that you have heard about in Chile some 30 years previously. The CIA and coups in Latin America go hand in glove, the CIA providing the money and the logistics and reactionary elements providing the rationale and disunity.

The very fact today that the Venezuelan revolution, and indeed Chavez's life has been maintained, is overwhelmingly the responsibility of the Venezuelan trade unions and progressive organisations and their ability to mobilise the people.

The role that Venezuela plays on the world scene today is a tremendous testament of what organised labour and alliances can do. A small country in the very backyard of the world's only superpower is showing that there is an alternative if only the will exists.

Venezuela follows another small country in America's backyard – Cuba. Cuba is standing up to the intimidation. Indeed, both Venezuela and Cuba offered aid to the United States in their hour of need following Hurricane Katrina, with Venezuela offering fresh water and food and Cuba offering a thousand doctors, and that is to a country which has spent untold millions of dollars trying to economically break them and, in Cuba's case, outright assassination.

Venezuela shares another honour with Cuba. Venezuela recently hosted the World Youth and Student Festival, with more than 15,000 people from throughout the world attending, young people dedicated to peace, freedom and international solidarity.

The Venezuelan trade union movement has described what is happening today as 'Socialism in the 21st Century', but not that you would have known very much about what is happening in Venezuela from the mainstream media. Just as in Chile in the 1970s, good news is not seen to be news at all.

Only the *Morning Star* in the mainstream media gave a voice to those who wanted the world to know that big things were happening in Latin America, not just in Venezuela, but in Brazil, Argentina and Ecuador and the rest. Our association looks forward to Congress having the opportunity at first hand to being addressed by an authentic voice of Venezuelan labour. Thank you.

Alan McQuire (*Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*) speaking in support of the motion, said: President and Congress, I saw a programme on television called 'Neighbours from Hell'. It was all about people next door acting badly. Think about this. What would it be like to be a South American? Their neighbours are the United States. Talk about the neighbours from hell!

In years past successive US governments have treated the continent to their south like an unofficial colony. Little has changed since Henry Kissinger talked about South America being the US's backyard. It is of no importance to the US Government that an independent poll, in July of this year, showed more than 70 percent support for the Venezuelan President, Hugo Chavez. Chavez has been making himself unpopular in the US by having the audacity to implement changes which are popular with Venezuelans. Venezuela has oil. Living next to the US, having oil and a lefty government is a dangerous combination. It makes you unreliable, it makes you powerful and it makes you a target, especially when the Venezuelan Government threatens, as it did last month, to suspend oil exports to the US if attacks on its government continue.

But oil is a touchy subject with Americans. Not selling oil to the United States is, in the eyes of the British Government, not a commercial or political decision but a crime. Chavez has even dared to say that his country's oil will be for the Venezuelan people, then the people of Latin America and the Caribbean. To the Administration of George Bush, that is fighting talk.

These are worrying days for the Venezuelan Government, for its President and for the 70 percent of the people who support them. That is why we urge you to back them in the struggle to self-determination, for democracy and for the right to choose how they wish to live.

We salute Chavez's party, the Fifth Republic Movement, in its efforts to improve the standard of life for its citizens. We applaud its efforts to raise literacy levels and establish free health care in poor communities. We stand side by side with all people who are threatened by the desire of the US Government to make the world American. The beauty of our world lies in its diversity, both at the domestic

and global level. If we want a world that lives at peace with itself, we must learn to welcome, not just accept, different customs, economic systems and cultural richness.

It is in that spirit that ASLEF asks delegates today to declare its support for the independence of Venezuela and the right of its people to choose its own government with the interference of the neighbour from hell. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Global Solidarity

Jeremy Dear (*National Union of Journalists*) spoke to paragraph 5.5 and, in particular, the section on Colombia.

He said: People have probably seen the leaflets that are in the hall which say "Colombia - the most dangerous place in the world to be a trade unionist." Of course, there are many chilling statistics that Carlos brought home to us. Last year, 17 trade union leaders and 71 trade union members were assassinated and hundreds abducted, threatened or arbitrarily detained. However, it was brought home with a vengeance yesterday when we received news that Luciano Romero from the Food Workers' Union who had been exiled for three years and had just returned to Colombia disappeared last Saturday. His body was found on Sunday. His hands were tied behind his back. He had suffered 40 stab wounds and he had been brutally tortured before being killed.

Now, more than ever, those Colombian trade unions need our solidarity. As Carlos said, they are asking us to pressure our Government to stop the secret military aid given to the Colombian army; military aid, which trade unions believe is reaching the very paramilitaries who kill our sisters and brothers in Colombia. Britain must end its military aid until human and trade union rights are respected.

Luckily, we have made it easy for you to show your solidarity. All you need do is go to the Justice for Colombia stall, fill in one of these postcards, hand it back to the stall and we will deliver it to the British Government as soon as Congress is over. I am sure, President, you would like to join with me in urging people to do just that.

The President: Considering you succeeded in getting a very important point over in 1 minute and 30 seconds, I certainly will urge people to do that! Thank you very much.

Mike Kirby (*UNISON*) spoke to paragraph 5.5 and particularly the section on Cuba.

He said: I want to recognise and thank the TUC for its efforts to support Cuba throughout the past year. On Monday night at a packed Cuba Solidarity reception, a message from Pedro Ross, the President of the CTC, was read out. I would like to quote from that:

"Comrades, we are grateful for all the messages and efforts made by the TUC and British unions in favour of our cause. We are strengthened by knowing that we are not alone and that in every corner of the world there are men and women like you ready to raise their voices to condemn the inhumane US blockade and hostile policies towards Cuba and to defend our right to self-determination."

Congress, that, for me, says everything about how important it is that our solidarity is shown with that small socialist island. I was a delegate last year to the conference referred to on page 90. It was an excellent occasion, not only because of the strength of support for Cuba, as shown from our own affiliates, but also because that conference was attended by 27 Cuban trade unionists who participated as guests of our movement.

As the Report highlights, a further conference is planned for February in City Hall. It is excellent news that London's Mayor and the TUC are supporting this important event. I would urge all unions to visit the Cuba Solidarity stall on the ground floor. Pick up a copy of this leaflet advertising that conference next February and make sure that you sponsor your European counterparts and, more importantly, that your own union is represented at that conference. Thank you very much, President.

Mary Turner (*GMB*) spoke to paragraph 5.5 of the General Council Report.

She said: I will be extremely brief because some of it has been covered. I speak to paragraph 5.5 on Colombia and it is in relation to the aid that is given by our Government to Colombia. Our Government, and we have met with Hilary Benn, have said they do not give military aid to Colombia. Well, they give aid to Colombia and they are saying it is in respect of the drugs cartel. Our trade union brothers and sisters in Colombia say that aid is being used to kill our brothers and sisters in Colombia.

The aid has to stop. We have to know the value of that aid as well. I am asking all TUC members who are affiliated to the Labour Party and who have members on the NEC, like myself, to make sure that Lord Treisman answers that question. We should now bring pressure in the same way as we did for our brothers and sisters who were being murdered in South Africa. It is time the killing stopped. It is time we showed real solidarity and, while we do have a Labour Government, to make sure that they are aware of our feelings. Thank you.

The President: The General Council supports the motion.

* *Motion 79 was CARRIED*

The President: Let me just reiterate what Jeremy said, concerning Luciano Romero's appalling fate. Our brothers and sisters in Colombia really do need our support.

Address by Guy Ryder (General Secretary of International Confederation of Free Trade Unions)

The President: Colleagues, we now come to an historic address. Next year, we hope to put nearly 60 years of Cold War split beyond us. We want to create a new united global trade union movement. We want to take on the multi-national corporations at their own game. The man who has done so much to bring about that historic movement is here today, Guy Ryder, General Secretary of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. Guy, you are most welcome today and we are delighted and looking forward to hearing what you have to say. Thank you.

Guy Ryder (*General Secretary of International Confederation of Free Trade Unions*) said: President, Congress, greetings from the ICFTU. Thank you for this opportunity to tell you something about what we are doing in the international movement and to say why we believe it matters to British trade unionists, and also to ask you for your support and for your engagement.

Firstly, I want to say that we are grasping the challenge that globalisation presents to all of us in the trade union movement, not just in words but in action; action directed particularly today at creating a new united world trade union international. Very soon, the ICFTU will cease to exist and will give way to an organisation that will bring together all of the world's forces of democratic and independent trade unionism, including important national trade union centres, which, for different reasons, have not chosen to affiliate internationally in the past.

We are confident that this new international will be established next year, not long after the TUC conference next meets. This is important, but, of course, it will not of itself provide all or even most of the solutions to the issues that working people face in the global economy. However, what I do think it provides is the means. It is an instrument to build those solutions together and the opportunity to make them stick.

In that sense, colleagues, I think that the whole thing is less about being a new international and more about building a new trade union internationalism. Global labour, yes, needs to be bigger, but it needs to be different and it needs to work differently too. We would be wrong to believe that the methods, the structures and the strategies of the past, whatever results they have given and there are plenty of them, will do the job in the future and would be well advised to put our best collective efforts into designing an international trade union movement capable of confronting global business strategies with global strategies of our own; capable of delivering solidarity which is effective, practical and timely and not just an international concoction of tea and sympathy and capable too of bringing change to the ground rules of globalisation.

It is precisely because the logic of globalisation is bringing about a convergence of national and international trade union agenda, bargaining agenda, organising agenda, that all of this is relevant to just about every issue on Congress's agenda in Brighton this week, not just the international ones, but all of them.

The question is not so much, do we need to mainstream international issues? They are mainstreamed. The question is whether you and us are able to react to that reality and to address them adequately.

I would like to underline two of the elements that we think can help us do so. The first is very simple: unity. Our aim is a strong, unified world confederation made up of united, strong national centres, working together for agreed goals. Anything different from that is second best and, more than likely, a very poor second best. The different pieces of the international trade union movement need to join together better than they have in the past. There are 10 Global Union Federations, in which your unions are key actors, who are themselves key players in the international trade union movement. We need to work out the ways of co-operating together more systematically and more closely so that we truly are a single, cohesive global trade union movement. I ask you to help us do that.

The second point I want to make is that effective trade union internationalism can only be built on lasting structures and on permanent commitment of political effort, resources and on democratic decision-making which reflects the views and priorities of workers in all countries, south as well as north.

Internationalism-on-call just to react episodically to needs as they arise or built only to respond to specific national agenda, however important they may be, is again second best. It is not good enough. It is a distant relative of the permanent mechanism of solidarity that we need to forge.

Congress, as we move forward to this goal of a new international, I want to tell you also that the ICFTU is continuing to mobilise and to campaign hard. To give you an example, take the Athens Olympic Games last year. We pushed the International Olympic Committee to provide the guarantees necessary for any of you buying any article bearing the Olympic logo to know that it had been produced in satisfactory and acceptable working conditions. We did not get those guarantees. It is an on-going struggle with the Olympic movement. It is a struggle that may well go on until 2012 to make the London Games (which, in

the absence of our French affiliates, I want to congratulate you on getting the Olympic Games held London) a further campaign vehicle. Throughout this year, the ICFTU has played a leading role, of course, in the Make Poverty History campaign. I think we are quite proud that our affiliates around the world have really bought into this campaign, none more so, of course, than the TUC, as the Congress theme this year demonstrates.

The G8 Summit in Gleneagles did not end poverty. That 'other' conference taking place this week, the UN Summit in New York, will not end poverty either. However, the fact of the matter is the campaign has made a difference. It has made a very significant difference. We have to continue the work on debt relief and on international aid flows and we need to keep the momentum going.

Our next opportunity will be at the WTO Conference in December. That is the next 'white band day'. We will be focusing there on the third element of the campaign, which is trade justice. We will be in Hong Kong marching with the Hong Kong People's Alliance to say that trade justice requires more than simply finishing off the Doha Round successfully. Above all, it requires guarantees of universal enforcement of fundamental workers' rights and, being in Hong Kong, why not start talking about China in that respect as well?

Colleagues, the bottom line is that globalisation means interdependence. That translates as saying that your sisters and brothers all around the world need your solidarity, but it also means that sometimes you need theirs. Iraqi workers who again paid such a tragic price in blood today need your solidarity to build free trade unionism in the aftermath of a war, which was opposed unanimously by the ICFTU's membership. They need help also to secure decent labour legislation which accords with international labour standards.

As Carlos Rodriguez just told us, Colombian trade unions, whose struggle is too often not just for the survival of their movement but for the lives of their members, also have a call on your solidarity, just as, equally, Gate Gourmet employees have a call on the solidarity of the international trade union Movement. The ICFTU will play its part in responding to that call, as we must.

I could go on. The list is depressingly long. It shows that globalisation has brought in some heavy weather for trade unionists everywhere. The right thing to do now, colleagues, is to make sure that our defences, our hurricane shelters and our levies of international solidarity are in good order. Let us invest now together in making our international Movement strong enough to be equal to whatever storms may come our way and to the task of globalising solidarity. Thank you. Good luck.

(Applause)

The President: Thank you very much. Thank you, Guy. Expanding on our Congress theme, 'Together stronger', this Trades Union Congress is putting the case as to why, as trade unions, we need to co-operate internationally and, as a trade union movement, we need to be united. Quite right, now more than ever, given what we have heard in the international debate, do we need trade union solidarity.

Migrant workers

Alan Ritchie (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) moved Motion 80.

He said: We have heard this week of a global market of labour. In many instances in construction, it is being organised by agencies making billions of pounds by exploiting migrant workers. The construction industry has always relied on workers who travel to find work.

We ourselves are often migrant workers. All over the world construction craftsmen have worked in Germany, Canada and America, and the list goes on. When our workers go abroad, we expect them to be treated no less favourably than they are in this country. We should expect the same for migrant workers in this country today.

Tony Woodley mentioned in the debate on Gate Gourmet about the exploitation of good, honest working people in this country. This happens in construction far too often. Workers are queuing up to get in a white van, not knowing where they are going or who they are working for. None of these workers come under the minimum standards set out in our industry's agreement. Criminal gangs operate in this underworld, threatening contractors if they do not take on their workers. For these bosses, safety is a secondary consideration. Migrant workers are forced to take up dirty, dangerous jobs that nobody else wants, working in poor conditions.

My officials came across a group of eastern European workers working for an agency in Glasgow. The main contractor was a multi-national company with a turnover of millions of pounds a year. The agency employed the workers as labourers for less than £5 per hour. If this was not bad enough, we found that an agency employed Polish plasterers on the minimum wage. They were illegally deducting accommodation costs, airfares and Home Office registration fees from their wages.

This sums up the employers' attitude in the construction industry to migrant labour. It is easy to exploit, cheap to employ and easy to dispose of. It is time the Government woke up to the reality of the treatment of workers in industries like construction.

We do not need a Thatcherite services directive that will lower labour standards across Europe. We need legislation that protects collective agreements and strengthens the right of migrant workers in the workplace. We know that employers will play lip service to the formal rights of workers, but when the enforcement authorities are gone, gangmasters use fear and intimidation to force down wage rates. Regulation only works if workers know their rights and they are enforced. That is why our role, as a trade union movement, is so important.

Only trade unions can challenge the boss in the workplace. Only trade unions can ensure regulations are properly enforced. It is unacceptable that workers are exploited and killed for a quick profit. We have to take away the fear from challenging the boss at work. When the job is unsafe or the wages are too low, this trade union movement must be present to organise. Our movement is strengthened by the recruitment and organisation of migrant workers. We have to make this a movement that is open, inclusive and relevant to migrant workers today. That means confronting exploitation in the workplace, opening up our union to migrant workers and confronting racist sentiment whenever it raises its head.

We know that the far right have been trying to make political capital out of the use of migrant labour on building sites. They tell construction workers: "If you do not have a job, it is because foreign Joe over there has it. Vote for us and we will put that right." They seek to get influence by playing on the insecurities of construction workers by whipping up right wing nationalist sentiment. We need to expose these far right groups for what they are, racists and opportunists. We must make it clear from this TUC Congress that our movement will not stand by and let this happen. We gain nothing from division and treating foreign workers as scapegoats for all our problems.

As the voice of working people, we must stand side by side with our brothers and sisters. Our employment rights should be their employment rights; our movement is their movement; injury to one is an injury to all and through unity this movement will never be defeated.

Bev Miller (*UNISON*) seconded Motion 80.

She said: Congress, the issue on treatment of migrant workers deserves closer attention. Migrant labour is not about race, culture or integration. Often it is just about exploitation and the selling of people like commodities. However, as the motion states, migrant workers make an important contribution to our society and our economy. For example, there are 44,000 overseas doctors, nurses and health professionals working in the National Health Service. The majority of migrant workers are women. Migrant workers are often concentrated at the bottom of the ladder in jobs which are dirty, dangerous and difficult. And how does this country pay these workers? With racism and prejudice. If we are to change attitudes and policy, unions have a key role to play. We can stand up for the rights of migrant workers and we can help them organise.

UNISON launched the Overseas Nurses Network in Scotland in 2002 to give advice to nurses from the Philippines, Zimbabwe, Malawi, South Africa and India. These nurses work primarily in private nursing homes where they secure jobs after paying agencies £2,000 to get work in the UK. Once here, they often work long hours for low rates of pay, live in appalling housing conditions and are threatened with deportation or sacked if they carry union information with them.

The ONN provides nurses and health care workers with information, in their own language, regarding trade union, employment and welfare rights. In addition, they are given the opportunity to network with nurses in a similar situation to their own. There are now migrant worker projects in London, Northern Ireland and, more recently, Oxford, all of which exist in recognition of the need to organise workers in the public and private sector.

UNISON's work with Public Services International includes a survey conducted from 2003 to 2004 which covered workers in 14 countries: Fiji, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Ecuador, Chile, Netherlands, Antilles, Barbados, Kenya, Ghana, Poland, USA, Canada and the UK. Of the 50 migrant workers interviewed in the UK during phase 1, more than half do not intend to stay here due to the racism and discrimination they experience.

Phase 2 of PSI's work intends to provide information packs to migrant workers prior to departure and upon arrival. The information will be given to future migrants who are considering migrating to work in Britain. PSI are also negotiating bilateral and multilateral agreements between trade unions to provide protection to migrant workers. However, those fleeing to this country do not just need help with rights at work, they also need help into work.

The current consultation document on immigration - Making Migration Work for Britain - contains proposals that will make it harder for migrants to get work in Britain. Basically, they will only qualify if they are highly skilled or have large sums of money.

Congress, I urge you to go beyond debating these issues in conference halls and to go out and campaign, organise and support the workers who really need you. We can do this individually and through the TUC by supporting this motion.

David Lascelles (*GMB*) supported Motion 80.

He said: Migrant workers are an essential component of the UK workforce. They make up a cheap and flexible source of labour used by companies to meet

the seasonal consumer demand and skills shortages, but they are treated very differently compared with the directly employed. Migrant workers face daily exploitation in the workplace and are treated as a throw-away or a disposable commodity. These vulnerable workers face cultural and educational barriers. They are often unable to access information about UK systems and procedures. They desperately need our help, as my sister from UNISON has just told you.

We support all the initiatives taken by the TUC and affiliates. The GMB is particularly proud to have been given a special TUC learning project award for our work in this area. The project based in our Midlands and East Coast Region has identified a need for migrant workers to be able to speak up for themselves and understand their rights in basic health and safety information.

The project has provided English language training together with advice and guidance in the workers' own languages. This has boosted the morale and self-confidence of many workers and created some very talented union representatives. I have been privileged to meet two of them. We need to continue to campaign for more and better regulation. The little regulation we have is far from perfect.

The GMB is working closely with the TUC and the GLA. We are calling on the Government to introduce legislation to regulate gangmasters and other labour providers in all areas of employment. Due to complex immigration laws, some migrant workers end up working invisibly without documents and without rights. You need a degree in bureaucracy to understand current regulations, restrictions and work permit schemes for migrant workers.

What chance do these workers have? Migrant workers are here to stay and make a valuable contribution to our society. All trade unions now face a challenge of how best to represent and organise them. This means more creative approaches. We need a level playing field. We need to work together to develop best practice so that we can reach out to these workers and not drive them away.

Colleagues, £65 a week was charged to a Polish worker, an agency worker, in Scunthorpe where I come from for a room with no window. On the third translation from Polish, I realised that meant the 'window' was open to the elements. There was no glass in it. There was nothing. £50 a week each for eight people to share a three-bedroomed terraced house again in Scunthorpe. The actual rent to the landlord is £100, so the agency is ripping off £300 before they even get to the work gate. Yes, indeed, colleagues. This needs our attention. Do please support it. Thank you.

Collette Cork-Hurst (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) supported Motion 80.

She said: Organising and representing migrant workers is one of the most important priorities for the trade union movement today. The T&G is, therefore, very pleased to support this motion. Our union has long recognised the valuable contributions made over many years to our economy and society through migrant workers. We all know that without migrant workers, institutions like the NHS would be unable to cope.

There are many good reasons why unions must put all our efforts into organising migrant workers; firstly, to protect these workers from exploitation from bad employers; secondly, to build and grow membership, particularly as migrant workers are likely to be employed in growth industries; thirdly, because, as we all know, it is the right thing to do.

No doubt, many of you have had experiences of unscrupulous employers who are trying to get away

with employing migrant workers on rubbish wages under bad terms and conditions and with the sole intention of taking full advantage in every way possible of this often vulnerable group of workers. If that was not enough, many migrant workers also have to contend with various so-called agencies who set up outrageous operations in order to fleece migrant workers, deducting huge amounts from their tiny wages, housing them in appalling conditions and denying them basic information on their rights as workers.

The T&G was at the forefront of fighting for the Gangmasters' Licensing Act. It will continue to do its best to ensure that it is effectively implemented, but also to ensure that more agencies in more industries are properly regulated.

Congress, as trade unionists, we cannot allow employers and agencies to get away with these atrocities. We must take the lead in effecting positive change through lobbying for more legal protection but, most importantly, through good organisation. On a practical level, organising migrant workers can be challenging, but it is a challenge that trade unions must face head on. There are issues addressing divisions between different groups in the workforce; issues dealing with immigration, health and safety, housing and benefits and issues meeting language needs to ensure full involvement of all workers in organising campaigns on workplace matters.

The T&G in many of our organising campaigns has worked in a number of ways to develop language facilities, through building links with community organisations, setting up language training courses and through supporting the migrant workers themselves in translation and interpretation. A key part of this is getting migrant worker trade union representatives.

We have also set up a migrant worker telephone legal advice line to assist on concerns such as visas, deportation and welfare rights. We continue to try to deal with tensions that can be built up when migrant workers are brought into a workplace. This is not always easy, but we have found that a lack of communication between these groups makes matters much worse. Therefore, we have a vital role in trying to unite the workforce because the only winner in a divided workforce is the employer. Whilst we know that the worst employers will try to exploit migrant workers and use them to undercut wages, when we are strongly organised, they are not able to get away with it.

Congress, migrant workers need unions and unions need migrant workers. Please support.

The President: The General Council supports the motion.

* *Motion 80 was CARRIED*

Organising in Europe

Jim McAuslan (*British Air Line Pilots Association*) moved Motion 81.

He said: There are two key challenges that I wish to highlight. These are not interesting theoretical diversions. They are real challenges that our association faces today and which, I would suggest, one or more of us will face in the future.

The first challenge is about representing the individual. I want to give two examples. A UK-employed BALPA member working for a Swedish company doing a walk round of an aircraft for a subsidiary company, had an accident. Swedish law does not allow him to sue the employer. UK law does not allow him to sue either because he was working for a subsidiary. Another BALPA member, a Dutch national, who is flying for a UK airline and is based in Germany, has recently been dismissed, we believe unfairly. Where is the case to be

heard? Bizarrely, the solution seems to be to hear it in a German court using English law. It really feels to us that we are having to make it up as we go along.

Following the failed referenda in France and Holland, you can feel European leaders putting the brakes on the extension of the European social model just as employers get their wings and start basing their operations seemingly in mid-air floating above domestic law, leaving workers exposed.

BALPA would like to see the TUC at the forefront of those pressing for a legal framework to underpin European collective bargaining and pressing for the right to enforce individual contracts in any EU state.

The second aspect, more fundamentally, is the clash of cultures between the national approaches as to how unions operate. As we cannot seem to agree even in this hall on how we should organise workers in this country, finding a way to do it in Europe is, perhaps, a pipe dream. So what are these cultures? I know this is a huge generalisation, but some nations want to manage employment relations through the law. Some want to do it through works councils. Certainly the UK model that BALPA aspires to is to have good agreements, to deploy them with ingenuity and flair and, most importantly, to have higher levels of membership and to focus on organising people at work.

Again, this is not just a nice conceptual debate. Let me tell you about a practical challenge that we face in BALPA. In a UK company with all employees on UK contracts, negotiations over pay and conditions take place in Luton. The operation's HR function is based in Luton and the final stage of a grievance procedure for an individual is held in Luton, but with employees based in Dusseldorf and Paris and in any one of 26 countries. The logic, to me, is that a UK-based union should organise the employees, just as we would have to accept the logic of a German carrier with employees in Stansted being organised by a German union.

However, when we speak to our German or French colleagues, their answer is clear: 'No, thank you very much.' They would prefer to recruit those people into their union. Regrettably, they never seem to get around to doing it, or recruit them and then do little for them or, worse still, frustrate our efforts to organise them.

There are answers. For instance, a model whereby the lead negotiating union organises, recruits and services the bargaining agenda, but has a service level agreement with the other unions, making an annual payment to get legal support for individuals and influencing social issues in those countries, or, even more radical, why not create a new union just for that employer with the various unions as sponsors? A new union with no baggage and a clean sheet to start from - how liberating would that be?

Congress, BALPA does not have all the answers on how we deal with transnationals. I do not even know if I have thought of all the questions. What I do realise is that it is ambitious. It is an agenda that tackles big issues: European social legislation; the complexity of competing European employment laws; clashes of national cultures; and how we organise and deal with inter-union rivalries that we struggle with on these shores, let alone with 26 other countries.

Yes, it is ambitious, but, frankly, employers are oblivious to these complexities. They just get on and do it. We need to get our collective act together and get on and do it.

Jack Dromey (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) seconded Motion 81.

He said: Sadly, since 1980, membership of trade unions, not just in Britain and Ireland, but across the world, has been falling. In the meantime, global

capital is getting stronger and more dominant. Gate Gourmet, for example, has kitchens, not just at Heathrow, but all over the world from Argentina to Singapore. What is more, Texas Pacific, the venture capitalist that owns Gate Gourmet, also owns Burger King, Debenhams, Ducati, Bally, American West Airlines, Scottish and Newcastle Brewers and even Metro Goldwyn Mayer, the giant Hollywood studio now in the hands of a Texan maverick who produced the film, *I kid thee not*, 'The Good, the Bad and the Ugly'.

That is why support for our members at Gate Gourmet is not just here in Britain and Ireland. I am proud to say that only yesterday hundreds of workers took action in America in support of our members in Gate Gourmet. Thousands more will take action over the next seven days in America and Australia. (*Applause*)

We will not have the strength to stand up to these global employers unless we are better organised and unless we co-operate across national boundaries which they ignore. Organising means a serious co-ordinated effort here in Britain. That is what we are doing in the T&G. It is not easy, but it is essential, first and foremost, in Britain and Ireland, but also across national boundaries. That is why we are working, for example, with the service employees international union in taking on British-based bus companies that say here they encourage union membership, but in America say, "Over our dead body will we ever recognise a trade union". If we do not take that on in solidarity with them in America, soon such standards will be imported into Britain. That is why with other unions around the world we are entering into the global organising alliance, for the first time targeting major multi-national companies, moving internationally at the same time.

In Europe, we already have a long and honourable tradition of inter-union co-operation. This intelligent BALPA motion asks us to explore the next rational step. Not a free-for-all with Lithuanian unions competing with USDAW for membership in Italian stores, but a sensible, co-operative framework for effectively representing members in the new globalised world. How is a matter of judgment. What is essential is that we debate how.

Finally, globalisation demands that we act together, organise together and negotiate together ensuring no under-cutting and no competitive trade unionism as we together raise standards across Europe and the world and here in Europe defend our social model against the toxic Texan cowboy.

Frances O'Grady (*Deputy General Secretary*) said: Thank you, President. The General Council have asked me to explain their position. The General Council welcome much of the fresh thinking in the motion precisely for the reasons outlined: globalisation and the rise of European-wide multi-nationals mean that we are going to have to find new and imaginative ways to organise both workers and ourselves as unions.

In November, the TUC is hosting a summit of EU union centres with the support of the ETUC to start developing practical strategies in this area. However, the motion does raise some quite specific issues, for example, European-wide Bridlington principles and rules, legally enforceable collective agreements that are interesting but potentially quite controversial. They do require, we believe, deeper debate within the movement.

Our own Organising and Representation Task Group chaired by Tony Woodley and that planned summit in London in November will start to provide opportunities to begin a deeper debate and explore a whole range of ideas. Therefore, please support the motion with that explanation.

The President: The General Council support the motion.

* *Motion 81 was CARRIED*

The President: Conference, I am afraid that we are running over time so we are unable to complete all of this afternoon's business. We, therefore, will be taking all outstanding motions tomorrow. However, in the light of the amount of business outstanding, including emergency motions, I shall be seeking the advice of the General Purposes Committee as to whether I should consider restricting speaking time. I will report on this early tomorrow morning.

I have a couple of other comments. As a reminder, please make sure your equality monitoring forms are returned as soon as possible if you have not already done so. As I mentioned, the best party in town, the entertainment unions party, is being held in the Emperor's Ballroom at the Grand Hotel from 10.00 pm. There are various meetings taking place. They are detailed on page 17.

As a favour to the RMT, I am going to plug a book called 'Railway Women', which is available at their stall, and also attended by the author. It is the history of the involvement of women in the railway industry. Conference is adjourned. Have a good evening and I will see you tomorrow morning.

(Congress adjourned at 5.30pm)

**FOURTH DAY: THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 15
MORNING SESSION**

(Congress reassembled at 9.30 a.m.)

The President: The order of the outstanding business, just to remind you, is as follows: Motion 34; Motion 35; Motion 75 with paragraphs 5.3 and 4.15; Composite Motions 15, 53, 54 and 55. Thank you.

I would ask delegates to respect the speaking time limits because we have an extraordinary amount of business to get through today. I will be using my bell more ruthlessly. If you do hear that the point has already been covered in debate, I am sure people would appreciate it if you did not repeat it because we do have to seize time. If you are able formally to second a motion, I would be very grateful.

I also remind you that if you are taking up time speaking on paragraphs, you are likely to be restricting your colleagues' contributions to their own tabled debates. Similarly, I am not minded to take many extra speakers on debates in order that we can get through all of the business.

Stress and job design

Peter Clements (*Prospect*) moved Motion 86.

He said: Congress notes with concern the rising tide of work-related stress which affects all sectors of the workforce. Stress can affect anyone and among the reasons for the current increase in the levels of work-related stress is the growing emphasis on individual performance, redundancies, job insecurity, increasing workloads and demanding deadlines.

We have all heard the media and businesses describing work-related stress as 'the new bad back'. Indeed, HSE-commissioned research indicates about half a million people in the UK experience work-related stress at a level they believe is making them ill. About 5 million in the UK feel 'very' or 'extremely' stressed by their work. A total of 12.8 million working days were lost to stress, depression and anxiety during the year 2003/2004.

However, labelling work-related stress in this way is both unfair and short-sighted. Congress, it is unfair and short-sighted because with enough trained personnel, employer co-operation and a funded programme of HSE enforcement, cases of work-related stress could be reduced.

In the public sector, stress is one of the major causes of long-term sickness absence. The Government have set a target of reducing this sickness absence by 30 percent by 2010. Major risk factors for stress include the lack of control over work and the management of change; yet both these risk factors are an increased reality for the public sector workers. It is another case of lack of joined-up thinking.

With this in mind, we support the HSE revised management standards and call on all affiliates to work with the HSE and employers to agree and implement standards of good management practice for preventing work-related stress, recognising that any approved code of practice adopted must be backed by a funded programme of HSE enforcement.

Congress also calls on the General Council to seek changes to the RIDDOR reporting system criteria in order that companies have to report absences from work due to stress. Work-related stress injures people and should be properly recognised as an industrial injury.

Malcolm Sage (*GMB*) seconded Motion 86.

He said: Is stress a workplace issue or an imaginary problem? Well, safety reps across all industries and all trade unions definitely know it exists. In just about any

survey in recent years, it has been their top problem in the workplace.

Last year, Dorset County Hospital became the first employer to receive a work-related stress enforcement notice from the HSE. However, there are no specific regulations on work-related stress. It can be argued that under the Health and Safety at Work Act there is a duty of care, but for some the time and stress involved means this is not worth pursuing.

The trade unions have for a long time been pressing the Health and Safety Executive for at least an approved code of practice on managing stress. An approved code of practice, or an ACOP, as it is better known, is not the same as regulations, but it can be used in a court of law to help prosecute rogue employees.

An ACOP on stress does exist, or sort of exists. One was, in fact, drawn up in 1999, but it sits gathering dust on some shelf in the HSE headquarters. Why? Basically, because the employer organisations did not want it! Now the HSE have come up with management standards for stress in the workplace. They look at consultation on new job elements, resources in terms of time and money and control of speed of work and the working environment. They are all valuable and useful items in the effort to manage stress.

However, this approach contains one major flaw. There are only guidelines. They are only voluntary. As usual, better employers may well use or adapt them, but where the real problems exist, what are the chances of any improvements happening? That is the crux of the matter.

The HSE, at the behest of the Government, are pursuing a regulation 'light' agenda. The GMB think that this is a completely wrong approach. We need more enforcement of existing regulations. We need better and more relevant legislation for the modern industrial world and we need regulations and guidance on stress to stop a major problem developing into an epidemic.

This will require the workforce and their safety reps to be fully involved in both the risk assessment process and implementing the standards. Congress, the GMB second. Please support.

The President: The General Council supports the motion.

* *Motion 86 was CARRIED*

Second-hand smoking in the workplace

Danny Longstaff (*Musicians' Union*) moved Motion 87.

He said: Good morning, President and Congress. I would like to start with a thank you; a thank you to the General Council for all the work they have done so far on the issue of smoking and passive smoking, et cetera. However, sadly, at this stage it has proven not to be quite enough.

I would also like to thank the young musicians who have performed throughout the week at this conference. It is fantastic to see so many youngsters at the beginning of their careers having the opportunity to perform live in this wonderful smoke-free environment. The irony is that the natural progression for a musician is to start doing gigs, for example, in pubs. This is the way it goes. These people are at the beginning of possibly a 50 to 60-year career in music, should they so wish to take it up. I hope they do. However, as youngsters, would you send your children up a chimney? I think not.

However, pubs are where musicians of all genres, whether it be classical, folk, rock, pop, Banghra or rap, learn their trade. It is where they hone their skills and

learn what to do. Some then spend a life-time working in the pub scene, but why should young musicians or musicians working in the pub scene have different conditions, for example, to musicians who work in a symphony orchestra or who work in smart concert halls in a smoke-free environment here and abroad?

However, musicians are not the only people affected in pubs. You have the bar staff, the door staff and, of course, the management. If this exemption is carried, will the managers have the right to decide whether or not their pub becomes a smoking pub, or will it be insisted upon by the public companies that they remain smoking pubs? Do they have that choice? This is not clear.

One of the other things is that no one has any right over anyone else to breath clean air. We all have that right. However, some musicians, for example, singers, brass players and wind players, need that air as a tool for their trade. You cannot shallow breath if you are playing a musical instrument that requires both to make it work. We all know the very sad case of Roy Castle, one of our members, whose death was related directly to passive smoking.

Let us have a look at the proposed exemption. If you do not serve food, you can have a smoking pub. What about the nightclubs? Very few nightclubs serve food. Will all nightclubs become smoking clubs? Some have said that they will serve food at lunchtime but not in the evenings. In the evenings, they will become smoking pubs. Maybe you could follow the argument through very slightly: take an old Victorian pub on a street corner, maybe off a city centre somewhere, which has never ever sold food and has very inadequate, if any, ventilation. Can you envisage that these become new super king size no-filter smoking pubs? Will they have a sign outside, a Government health warning over the door, warning: 'This pub could kill you'?

Who are the Government appealing to with this exemption? I really am not sure and I would love to hear from you if you have any ideas at all. They are giving us a period of consultation. Well, this is it and I think you know what my answer to this would be.

What is the NHS position? I thought it is time for a little research. I thought I will do what I normally do, gather my thoughts, and go and have a pint. I sat with my pint to contemplate how I could best deal with this. I looked through my pint and suddenly saw at the bottom of my pint a notice which said: 'Second-hand smoke is a killer.' This is magic! I thought: "This is coming to me from the ether!"

So I had another drink and I saw: 'Being around smoke increases your chances of lung cancer by 24percent.' I had another drink. I was getting a bit nervous now! Then I saw in the top corner of my pint: 'NHS'. All the information I needed was there on a beer mat in a pub. What is going on? We have the Government suggesting that we consider an exemption and you have the NHS quite categorically stating the dangers of passive smoking. It seems to me that the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing.

There is one group of people I have not mentioned and that is the customers who use pubs. I am a customer too, but what customers have over people who are employed there is the choice; the choice to be there or not.

To conclude, we have, as the Musicians' Union, a duty of care to our members. We must not let them down, but we all have a duty to our collective health. Please support this motion.

Samantha McIntosh (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*) seconded Motion 87.

She said: We fully support the motion and strongly agree that all workers should be treated equally and have a smoke-free workplace. However, let's pause for a moment and think about the health implications. Lung cancer is not the only disease the worker in the smoking workplace can look forward to. There is also heart disease, stroke, nasal cancer and reduced lung function.

However, if you are a worker who already suffers from asthma, a smoky atmosphere could be especially dangerous for you as your lung function is already reduced without the effects of the second-hand smoke. The passive smoker has up to a 24 percent increased risk of being affected by these diseases I have just mentioned compared to a non-smoker.

Passive smoking can also affect others too. For instance, a pregnant woman who is in a workplace that is not smoke-free can be putting her unborn child at risk. The child is at risk of having a low birth weight and then, once they are born, the increased risk of cot death, asthma, bronchitis, pneumonia and ear problems - all of which are possibilities.

Just to emphasise, one bar worker a week is currently killed because of second-hand smoke in the workplace. With the exemption suggested, it will leave 164,000 pub workers unprotected from second-hand smoke in the workplace. This figure does not include the musicians and entertainers who may also work there. Some areas of the UK will have up to 88 percent of their licensed premises exempt from the smoking ban due to not serving food. Surely, a smoking ban for workplaces should include all workplaces, so protecting all workers from the effects of second-hand smoke.

A quick reminder: the Health and Safety at Work Act of 1974 states: "The employer has a duty to provide and maintain a safe working environment, which is, so far as reasonably practicable, safe without risk to health and adequate as regards facilities and arrangements for the welfare at work."

With the exemption, some employers will be able to opt out of the Health and Safety at Work Act and leave their employees at the risk of life-threatening diseases from second-hand smoke. Surely, this should not be happening. Please support your fellow workers and support the motion. Thank you.

Tony Burke (*Amicus*) supported Motion 87. He said: I am sure you will understand that the ban on smoking in public places is a very emotive issue for our union. I will explain why. We are supporting Motion 87 and the accompanying amendment on second-hand smoking in the workplace because we are very sympathetic to the sentiments behind the motion. We understand the health dangers related to smoking and second-hand smoke and welcome moves for cleaner and healthier working environments.

However, we believe there is an alternative to an outright ban on smoking in all public places. We represent 7,000 people working in the tobacco industry and over 1200 members working in the packaging sector producing cartons. Many of these workers have high quality, well-paid jobs in their localities. We also represent a substantial number of workers employed in the supply chain as well as other members from interested parties, including, of course, our members in the Health Service. We have serious concerns about the economic impact on jobs, and this has to be considered when bringing about a change.

We do believe that by better ventilation in those public areas, where smoking is still permitted, a compromise can be found. Congress, the answer really is to help people stop smoking and it can be found by better education and realisation of the health consequences. The answer is not to oversimplify the facts of a total ban on smoking in all public places.

President, we ask the General Council to consider our position very carefully, particularly for those of us with members working in the industry, although we do recognise this is a very emotive issue. We have to take out some of the emotion and recognise that we may well be losing many highly skilled and well-paid jobs.

We in Amicus know that there will be a loss of employment and we need to protect our members. That is why we will be asking the General Council to support us to ensure that where there are these job losses in well-paid jobs those colleagues who may lose their employment are assisted by considerable retraining and reskilling programmes and obviously help for the workers in those localities who are going to be affected.

President, thank you very much for allowing me to give that explanation. We ask Congress to support the motion, but ask the General Council to consider the implications for many thousands of our members. Thank you very much.

The President: The General Council supports the motion.

* *Motion 87 was CARRIED*

Fatigue at sea

Clark Bowie (*National Union of Marine, Aviation and Shipping Transport Officers*) moved Motion 88.

He said: I am going to start by making you all a little jealous. I should imagine some of you will be going back to work tomorrow or maybe you are lucky and will be off until Monday. I do not return to work until 16th October. So I will tell you my travel story.

On Friday, the 14th October, I will get up, say 'Goodbye' to my family as they go off to work. Before they come back, I will head to Glasgow airport. I will catch the 1715 flight down to London. I will then hang around Terminal 3 until 2200 and catch the flight out to Rio.

I should think by now you are all quite jealous. No working until mid-October and then off to Rio. It sounds great. When I arrive in Rio, some 12 hours after I leave London, I then have a two or three hour taxi ride to a place called Macae. This is where I am going to digress a little from the fatigue point.

Some eight weeks ago, four of my British colleagues took this journey. They met up with one Frenchman and a number of Brazilian colleagues. They headed to Macae. They filled in their day and eventually went off to bed only to be woken up at approximately 0200 by a group of gun-toting thugs. They were bound, gagged, led off to a room and held hostage by one of these thugs while his colleagues ransacked the hotel. They then went out and joined the vessel and carried on working.

Anyway, back to my story. I, like my colleagues, will fill in my day until it is time to go to bed. I will get a call at six o'clock on the Sunday morning. I then head off to a helicopter. If I am lucky, I should be on board by nine o'clock in the morning. I will complete a shift of only two or three hours, finishing at noon, and then start again at midnight. On the other hand, some people do all this travelling, have two or three hours off and then work a 12-hour shift.

I should think by now a number of you are thinking: "It does not matter. He is on the other side of the world." I hate to say this, but the same thing is happening around the UK coast. I have listened to a number of people at Congress this week complaining about the 48-hour cap-out clause. We do not even get that privilege. Tony and his Government do not think we are worth being given such an opportunity as we are not even taken into consideration in the limitation of hours.

I would like to finish with two points: (1) I personally work an 84-hour week when at work. OK, I work six weeks on and six weeks off. I suppose you could then say I work a 42-hour week 52 weeks of the year. I doubt if there is anyone here today doing the same number of hours. If there are, I would suggest they speak to their union! (2) We need an outcry for our industry. Ships carry thousands of passengers and hundreds of thousands of tonnes of hazardous cargoes. Seafarers' hours are a scandal, and a dangerous scandal at that. It is time to put an end to it. NUMAST is asking for you to help in doing just that. Please support this motion.

Rod Earl (*Prospect*) seconded Motion 88. He said: It gives me great pleasure to second the motion proposed by my colleagues from NUMAST. We have heard throughout Congress this week about deregulation, reduction in the health and safety inspections, exploitation of workers, long working hours, poor working conditions and more. Seafarers, ladies and gentlemen, are severely affected by most of these.

My colleague from NUMAST, speaking from personal experience, eloquently delineated the problems in his sector. Excessive working hours and inadequate crewing levels inevitably result in adverse health effects. According to the HSE, it is now generally accepted that some 80 percent of accidents involve human factors. One of the most important human factors is stress, which has already been mentioned by my colleague earlier. One of the key factors of stress is fatigue. The causes of fatigue can include not only severe physical effort, but also the effect of working at times that are contrary to the body's natural inclinations, for example, at night, some systems of shift work, intense concentration and working continuously for long hours.

In addition to physical fatigue, there is also mental fatigue. This is actually the most dangerous type. It can result in errors of judgment. The causes of mental fatigue include the need for concentration for long hours, excessive working and sleep deprivation. Some of you may be suffering from that this morning!

Most of these conditions apply to seafarers. It is, therefore, unsurprising to learn that many are affected by fatigue. Fatigue can be insidious. It may develop slowly and is not always apparent to those concerned or to their supervisors or colleagues. Nevertheless, fatigue can lead to severe accidents.

The large number of accidents around the UK coast involving ships in collision or running aground are as a result of seafarer fatigue. Despite the existence of national, European and international regulations, these are ignored quite regularly. Colleagues, I would urge you to support this motion and stop seafarer fatigue. Thank you.

Richard Crease (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) supported Motion 88. He said: I represent the coastal maritime sector of the docks, waterways and fishing trade group. We share the concerns of those who have spoken before in the debate. The issue of fatigue is one of concern. To express these issues to an employer who is only interested in market share and bottom line falls upon deaf ears.

It gets worse. We have seafarers who are creative with their recorded rest sheets. Why? They live in fear of losing their jobs. The highly qualified seafarer is often told: "You are too expensive, too problematic. It will be easier to replace you with someone cheaper, or we will change the vessel to a flag of convenience."

With our fellow seafaring unions, NUMAST and RMT, we argued the case for a review of the safe manning certificates. It was not forthcoming. Meanwhile, the work loads on seafarers increase. In the industry in which I work, the seafaring section has gone through

an exercise where the workforce has been reduced from four men to three. This was forced upon us by the employer. The consequence was six accidents within one year! There is the potential loss of life and the environmental impact - more accidents than we have had in the past 10 years in total!

We need legislation that looks after the welfare of seafarers; the review of safe manning certificates and enforcement of hours of work regimes. Finally, we seek a level playing field so that our members do not live in fear of losing their jobs because someone else can do it cheaper with fewer men.

I would make one last point: should EU ministers get their way under the liberalisation of ports, the workloads of the seafarer will increase yet again. In July, in Parliament, we gained cross-party support to oppose this needless and unwanted package, which threatens the safety standards in our ports. Believe me, ports are still a dangerous place to work with a higher accident rate than construction sites.

We hope the Government were listening and I hope they are listening to what we are saying today. I urge Congress to support Motion 88. Thank you.

The President: Well done! That was a good point. 1 minute and 50 seconds. You kept to your half of the bargain. Thank you.

Terry Britton (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) speaking to paragraph 7.3 of the General Council Report said: Last year I stood on this platform and I raised hell about the fact there were only a few paragraphs regarding asbestos which were tucked in the middle of the General Council's Report. However, this year, although there are still a few paragraphs stuck in the middle of the Council's Report, I have to give all credit to the TUC and the T&G who have made great strides in the last 12 months regarding asbestos. There is a long way to go.

I have to give thanks to Susan Murray. She is head of Health and Safety at the Transport and General Workers' Union. She has been a great help to me and other people. We have support groups all over the country. We have support groups all over the world now. If some information is not available on the TUC website now, it soon will be. There are millions of pounds available for asbestos sufferers. It will not ease the pain, but it will help. If anybody needs any information, they can always access the TUC website and the information should be there. If the information is not there now, it will be soon. Thank you.

The President: Thank you for that. Thanks to the TUC. It sounds as though the head of Health and Safety at the T&G deserves a rosette too! The General Council support the motion. I will put Motion 88 to the vote.

* *Motion 88 was CARRIED*

Rail safety

Bob Crow (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) moved Emergency Motion 2.

He said: Comrades, I have pleasure in moving this motion. May I make it quite clear that if there is some kind of problem with the motion as it stands, once we get our 'yes' vote for strike action, which I am sure our members will back, when we start talking about conditions of service, obviously, the involvement of our friends in ASLEF and TSSA in those discussions will be more than welcome.

Putting that to one side, I will ask this conference to reaffirm its policy on our position on corporate manslaughter and, secondly, about what took place. The travelling public lay dead; our members lay injured and in some areas members of the public are still frightened to travel on those trains due to the trauma

that they suffered on that particular day in Hatfield. It was caused by privatisation, in our opinion. Railtrack employed two contractors: Balfour Beatty, who was responsible for the maintenance of the railway, and Jarvis, who was responsible for the renewal. Balfour Beatty thought it was their responsibility not to maintain it because they believed that Jarvis was going to renew it. Jarvis believed it was not their responsibility because Balfour Beatty should maintain it. As a result, all Railtrack did was to say: "Both of you will be fined if you do not replace the rail quick enough."

These are not my words, but the words of the Safety Committee that was set up to adjudicate on this matter. They said that the piece of rail was so badly maintained and reviewed, it was like a steamroller going over a digestive biscuit breaking into 300 pieces with trains of up to 110 miles travelling over it.

In my view, that is neglect. It is neglect by Balfour Beatty, neglect by Jarvis and neglect by Railtrack. (*Applause*) It is remarkable that -- I accept the justice system -- the justice system could not make a decision as to whether these people could be prosecuted for manslaughter. That is what took place. A deal was done where the directors of Balfour Beatty agreed that there were breaches in the health and safety procedures, but they were acquitted of manslaughter. The prosecutors said to the judge that they could not identify the individuals responsible for manslaughter. I will tell you one thing: there is no problem in the railway industry at the moment identifying the chief executives and bosses so they may receive hundreds of thousands pounds in bonuses when they are making money, so why can you not identify them when they injure and maim our workers in the industry? (*Applause*)

Of course, comrades, we want protection for people who put our members in an unsafe situation. Why is it they can sack train drivers for going through red lights? Why is it they can imprison train drivers in certain places, like Purley, but they cannot identify individual workers and directors when it suits them? There are no problems when workers are killed through gang masters and no problem when workers are killed on building sites week in and week out, but they cannot identify those chief executives responsible.

What has happened since then? You would not believe it. I was going to take two aspirins and lie down in a dark room when I heard that this Government were going to reprivatise South East trains! South East trains is being run by the Government at the moment due to financial mismanagement by Connex. Since it has been run by the Government, punctuality has improved, staff costs have increased and staff morale has gone up. Instead of that being the beacon for the rest of the industry, they reprivatise it and it is now up for grabs in October! And what do the Government do in the run-up to privatisation? Rather than let the new company which takes over try to put together a redundancy package, it now wants to get rid of over 120 jobs in the South East Trains area. After July 7th and July 21st, the travelling public want to see more staff on the stations and more staff on trains. They do not want to see staff being got rid of.

I ask this conference to pass this motion on two aspects: (1) that this Government must do what they say in establishing corporate manslaughter laws to protect workers, and (2) also carry out the position of this conference, to reconfirm its position, that we want the railways brought back into public ownership. You cannot blame this one on the Tories for privatising it. It is New Labour that is privatising it. It is wrong and that is why I ask you to carry the motion.

Jack Dromey (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) in seconding the emergency motion, said:

The Transport and General Workers' Union stands at this rostrum to second on the sacred issue of principle for the T&G of holding negligent bosses who kill to account. I am glad about what Bob said on the fourth paragraph. There is a dispute. Other unions have an interest and we wish all of the rail unions the very best as they work together in unity to find a solution.

Let me tell you a simple but sad reality. One person a day dies as a consequence of work-related accidents – 10,000 in the past 30 years – yet only five bosses have ever gone to jail for killing workers.

Let me tell you two stories. First, there was a construction safety summit, chaired by John Prescott and a video was shown which had a heart-breaking litany of stories of broken lives and broken bodies, like the wife of an Essex building worker, who said, "I loved him. He was the centre of my life. He made me laugh. We had a great life together. I kissed him goodbye, he went to work and I never saw him again". The second story concerns the 2004 Workers' Memorial Day. I addressed a rally of a thousand building workers outside of Wembley Stadium commemorating the death of Patrick O'Sullivan. He was working on the ground and a work platform was being carried by a crane. It collapsed on top of him because there was no crane co-ordinator. The mother could not speak because she was so overwhelmed by grief. The daughter spoke on behalf of the family. I will never forget what she said. She said: "Our lives have changed forever. Sometimes when we sit down for tea we all look together at the door somehow hoping that he will walk in. He was the best dad that any family could ever have and now he has been taken from us."

There is a simple truth: a hard day's work never killed anyone. Negligent bosses did. That situation will not change until the law changes. In 1997 the Government gave a pledge to act on corporate manslaughter. At last they are acting, but two things are key. First, we do not want to see Crown immunity. Workers should be protected, public and private. Secondly, there needs to be what are called 'Directors' Duties' so that directors who knowingly preside over unsafe working practices that kill go to jail.

I will close by saying this. Tough legislation is necessary. Just as we won the legislation over gangmasters, a memorial to those 22 Chinese workers who died a terrible death on Morecambe Sands. Now, at the next stage, we need tough legislation on corporate manslaughter. Does anyone doubt that if we had tough legislation the first building boss who goes to jail would transform safety standards overnight on building sites the length and breadth of Britain and Ireland?

Frances O'Grady (*Deputy General Secretary*): The emergency motion raises crucial issues about health and safety in the rail industry and highlights the well proven links between lives lost and policies of privatisation. We welcome the fact that the emergency motion highlights the need for strong new legislation to bring business to account for health and safety failings and to put corporate killers in the dock.

In addition the emergency motion calls on the Government to re-think their decision to re-privatise South Eastern Trains. The General Council believes that the Government decision makes no sense when South Eastern Trains, which is now publicly owned, has so clearly out-performed its private predecessor. The TUC has actively backed the rail unions' opposition to rail privatisations and shares their strong concerns which have been expressed by all the rail unions about the impact on terms and conditions for workers as well, of course, as the impact on the quality of services for passengers.

However, the General Council wants to make clear that questions of industrial tactics are, of course, a matter for the recognised unions concerned and, of course, to their members. But let there be no doubt that the General Council fully supports the joint union campaign to keep South Eastern Trains public.

The President: The General Council supports Emergency Motion 2.

* *Emergency Motion 2 was CARRIED.*

The President: Let me speak to Mary Boustead of ATL. Your delegation has invited me to ask Congress to wish you Happy Birthday today. Happy Birthday. (*Applause*) Your heart can stop beating now. She was looking for her speech and at the motions. Panic went round. I can imagine it.

Trade Union Organisation

Ian McGarry (*Equity*) moved Motion 89.

He said: I think keen observers like yourself, President, of Congresses over the years will realise that Equity has tended in the past to put down motions of specific concerns to its members and the industries in which they wish to work. This year we decided to stray from that, apart from our motion yesterday, and look to see if we could find a motion which might have wider interests to the whole of the Congress and the whole of the movement. I think by finding Motion 89 we have succeeded in that task because, clearly, from the feedback that I have had this week, this is an issue which does engage most of the delegates who are here.

I want to start by saying what this motion is not. It is not anti-merger. Indeed, it is not anti anything. Please read it. It was drafted very carefully. It starts by recognising the often compelling case for unions to come together and to merge. Equally, it reasserts or asserts the position of those unions like my own who do not want to tread that particular path. We have wanted to retain our identity and our independence and we appear able to do so, and that is the path that we have chosen. It does not mean it is better or that the other course is worse. It means that my union and many others have chosen that particular path. The relatively small unions which make up a large part of this conference, if I can speak on behalf of them all, very much value their membership of the TUC. We are proud members of the TUC and we believe we gain from our membership of the TUC. We get services from them that we cannot necessarily meet ourselves and they frequently provide us access to government ministers and others whom we would not otherwise meet. We are grateful for that as we think it is important.

We also believe that smaller unions bring something to this Congress. I think we often fight well above our weight. There could be no better example of that than yesterday when the PFA did a service to the entire trade union movement by its presentation and motion.

I think it is also fair to say that many of the small unions have proved that you do not have to be a giant to achieve a high density of membership or to have recognition or good collective agreements or an effective voice and campaigning organisation on behalf of your members. I think we have done that and proved it.

This motion seeks to address the consequences of unions following those two alternative paths. It seems to me that very soon we are likely to find a TUC with a small number of very large unions and virtually nothing in between them and that clutch of small professional unions, like my own, of around the 30,000 membership mark. I think we need to look at the consequences of that. We are putting forward a

suggestion that we should reflect on what someone called during the week 'the changing landscape'. I think we should look at the consequences of those changes in relation to the relationships between affiliates and the consequences for the TUC itself.

I have to confess that Equity has no preconceived ideas and no solutions that it would want to impose on this process but, surely, we must all recognise that life will be different, not necessarily better or worse, if two or even one union can determine every decision that comes before any future Congress.

We also ought to reflect on how that domination will or should affect the composition of the General Council itself. We, especially the small unions, want to know what, in those changed circumstances, will be the level of services that the TUC, as a trade union centre, will be able to provide to us, the smaller unions, and what part can we play because we do not simply want to be spectators when the TUC – not the affiliated unions – is talking to government. We want to have an input into that and play a part in that. What we want is an open, honest, grown-up and yet comradely debate about all of these issues, and we want to be equal partners in that debate. If we have that debate, I believe it will only serve to strengthen the TUC and help us build a new partnership between all affiliates and the General Council. If we do not have it, I think it will lead to disaffection and division. If that happens, all of us will be weakened whether we are big or small. Thank you.

Jim McAuslan (*British Air Line Pilots Association*) said: An insignificant official in an insignificant union seconding an insignificant motion. I am about to make myself unpopular but it has to be said.

I may have a view about whether a merger for a new superunion is right but it is an issue for members of those unions. As a household that includes members of one of those unions, I look forward to being asked and convinced because all that I have heard so far is that the new union will be big, powerful and listened to. If that is the only reason, it will be a wasted opportunity because the idea, like it or not, of a merger does provide a once in a generation opportunity to bury inter-union rivalry that masquerades as competition and to give a voice to the kaleidoscope of identities which will make up that superunion. It is a chance to re-write the rulebook from first principles, without all the political compromise and baggage that so bedevils this great movement of ours.

If you want a mere member's advice: Don't squander the opportunity.

However, I am not speaking today as a potential member of a superunion but as a general secretary of a very small union, a niche union, if you will. I would argue that we may not be big and powerful and have to be listened to, but we have strengths which are different, strengths that bring to the TUC variation and shading. One size, even a big size, does not fit all, and the absence of a niche voice will leave the TUC grey and two dimensional. I say this as someone whose membership is always very close to him, who are very keen to take an interest in their union and who come into union headquarters and plant themselves at the end of my desk. Congress, the tragedy is that in the past months not one of them has plopped themselves down and said, "Tell me, Jim, what's happening at Congress this year". That is a concern to me and a concern to us all. That is why our amendment calls for a positive attempt to draw in a wider audience to this review and not just the usual culprits, culprits like me.

Let me return, Congress, to whether we have a debate at all about the consequences of this new superunion. One of the best pieces of union advertising in the past 20 years was from UNISON. It was of ants marching in

a column demanding the attention of a polar bear. I do not think that ants and polar bears mix in real life. I presume that where polar bears live is a bit cold for ants but in trade unions this ant has met the union's polar bear and I find it warm, friendly and prepared to listen, but I am not alone in being concerned about the new bear that is emerging. Despite public statements this bear struts its stuff in the corridors of Congress. It is the type of bear that might step on an ant without noticing – a grizzly bear. In real life, ants only march in column when they want to. When you intervene in an ant column, it goes off at all angles. So this little ant with its little voice is giving a warning to that great anthill in Great Russell Street to be careful. Watch the grizzly, because when an anthill gets trodden on, you will have anarchy. It is as serious as that. Listen and explore, even if it makes us all feel itchy.

Judy McKnight (*Napo*) speaking in support of the motion, said: Congress, our trade union movement has always been a mixture of large and small unions reflecting the different needs and industrial logic of different groups of workers. As has already been said, there is no one-size-fits-all. We are all different and we all have to seek to ensure that our own structures and organisations are best suited to the needs of our members.

For many of us, remaining as small unions suits us in best protecting and promoting our members' interest. For NAPO, although only a small union of about 8,500 members, but a union that is growing, we like to think that we punch above our weight not only in our negotiations and in the services where our members work but also in our campaigning and media work in promoting the work and professions of our members.

We have motions coming up this morning on the major issues facing our members, for our CAFCASS members who work in family courts, seeking TUC support for maintaining the principles that their role in protecting the interests of children remains paramount when families separate; for members in probation will be seeking your on-going support in our campaign to oppose the privatisation of our service.

We have hugely appreciated the support which we have received from our fellow unions in that campaign to date and the specific support which Brendan Barber has given us in that campaign. The professional support, the comradeship and the solidarity that we have received by being part of the TUC is critical and central to what we are about. Likewise, the very nature of the trade union movement is that support, comradeship and solidarity is reciprocal. It works both ways and we all value the opportunities to support sister unions in struggle to ensure that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.

In the developments of unions looking at bigger mergers, let us not forget the importance of keeping that overall solidarity of the TUC. Whether we are Davids or Goliaths in the trade union movement, let us ensure that none of us lose out on the special strength that is unique provided by the TUC. Thank you.

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*) said: President and Congress, I am speaking on behalf of the General Council to support the motion but to make a point of explanation.

It is now almost 12 years since we re-launched the TUC as an organisation more focused on outcomes than process, looking to make a difference rather than to make documentation. It has made a big difference to our work. But at the time of the re-launch we recognised that there were some loose ends. The old committees, and in particular the industry committees, might have had their drawbacks but they did provide a means of involving unions, and especially non-General Council unions, in practical and industrial work through the TUC.

During the past decade we have made some further constitutional changes. The equality conferences now play a more prominent role for instance, but, all the time, we have sought to maintain an external rather than an internal focus. Now, Congress, I think we have reached a point when we do need to pay some more attention to those loose ends, and we need to look again at the relationship between the General Council and the Executive. We need to look at how we can involve all unions more effectively in the work of the TUC.

It is not easy to devise an effective structure that can take account of all of those diverse characteristics that go to make up the British trade union movement; that involve all unions, large and small, general and specialist, private sector and public sector, Labour affiliates and the politically independent, but it is something that we need to do if we are to be the voice of Britain at work.

So I am grateful to Equity for putting this issue firmly on the agenda at Congress, and we will certainly be taking action.

As I said to the General Council last week, I believe that an important first step is to bring together all unions to share their views, so I am proposing that we hold a meeting this autumn of the General Council, together with those general secretaries who are not members of the General Council, to open a discussion on these issues. There are no pre-determined outcomes, but I would certainly hope that we would have firm proposals to bring to next year's Congress.

The motion proposes a task group on one aspect of this issue, and I would not want to be tied and the General Council would not want to be tied to that specific way of dealing with the issue. What I do want is to ensure that we involve all unions.

With that explanation, the General Council is asking Congress to support the motion.

The President: Thank you. I assume that Equity has no comments in reply?

Ian McGarry (*Equity*): Not until next year.

The President: Not until next year. You will be very welcome next year. Thank you, but we need your time now.

* *Motion 89 was CARRIED.*

Equalities seats on the General Council

The President: Congress, we are under pressure of time and if we are still running late by later this morning, although it is highly regrettable, we may well need to restrict speaking times.

I now call Motion 90, Equalities seats on the General Council. The General Council oppose the motion and I will be calling the General Secretary during the debate to explain the General Council's position. It will be moved by Manny Blake on behalf of the TUC Black Workers' Conference, seconded by NATFHE. I will call the General Secretary. I have a long list of speakers but I cannot call all of them in. In order to have a balanced debate, I will call in PCS and UNISON. I will give the right of reply and then I will to the vote.

Anita Halpin (*National Union of Journalists*): On a point of order, Chair. I am mindful of the pressure of time, as we all are, it does strike me, and I hope much of Congress, that it seems rather strange that the debate is curtailed on the single motion in front of you which the General Council oppose. In the fairness of debate and as this is a policy-making Congress, I ask the President to reconsider the speakers she is calling. Obviously, this is not personal pleading so I will be withdrawing my request to speak in support of the motion in favour of other more valuable speakers. Please extend the debate.

The President: Conference, I think we should push ahead because I want to do justice to the other motions. There is a simple choice. I can either bring in two speakers or four speakers to give balance to the debate. I want to leave it at two other speakers. I will invite you to agree with that. If you do not agree to that, I will move straightaway to all speakers. I invite you to agree that I call in two other speakers on this debate. Those in favour? Those against? I will call in four other speakers.

Manny Blake (*Communication Workers Union*) moved Motion 90.

He said: President and Congress, earlier this year at the Black Workers' Conference many motions were debated over three days, and this motion was overwhelmingly supported with only two – just two – unions speaking against it.

This motion was then selected to be sent to Congress. For your information – I am sure most of you already know – a similar motion was debated and passed at the Women's Conference. It was passed at the Lesbian and Gay Conference and passed, also, at the Disabilities' Conference.

Conference, turn to page 51 in your pad and you will see that the motions and nominations and numbers who we elect to serve on the General Council sections D – J. The TUC Race Committee and the Black Workers' members have a lot of respect for the General Council members but think in a democratic society, in a democratic trade union movement, it is now time for a change and reform of the old election process. It is all about, Conference, accountability and self-organisation. Trade unionists have been attending the equalities conferences for many years and we believe that we are now mature enough to elect our own members to represent us on the General Council. We want to be able to lobby, to be able to persuade and influence our own General Council members to campaign and support issues that are important to us. We want to be able, most importantly, to remove them if they do not support our aims and objectives after judging their performance as our representatives. What is wrong with that? Tell me, Conference, what is wrong with that?

Trade unions across the country, I am sure, are listening to this debate and they are listening to the outcome because what is surprising me about this is that the General Council is opposing this motion. Why? Ask yourselves why?

Conference, the trade union movement was formed mainly by white working class men to protect their interests, to enhance their working conditions and to protect them from unscrupulous employers. Today we have the same problems with the employers but our membership has changed. It has changed, Conference. We now have members from the ethnic minorities, women, workers from the lesbian and gay communities, disabled members and many young people. That fact is not reflected in our General Council.

Only one in ten young people in work join the trade union movement. Why? Ask yourself why? Black people are not really rushing to join the trade union movement; women feel unrepresented and lesbian and gay workers feel ignored. Conference, our membership has fallen from more than 13 million to under 7 million. We must treat all of our members seriously and listen to them.

The trade unions also attended the equality conferences and they are asking for reform. Members who attend equality conferences are members of unions. They are not strangers from off the street. We do not go and say, "Oh, come in". They pay their union dues as well. They have a right to be listened to.

Cop now the words of the motion: "Congress instructs the TUC Race Committee to liaise with other TUC equality committees in order to progress a reform of TUC procedures". What is wrong with that? We are not putting a time limit on the demand. We are asking to work together. We are not setting out a framework. We are asking to work together with other equality committees. Conference, our General Secretary, bless him, we love him to death, said in his speech on Monday several times: "Together, stronger". Put those words into practice, Brendan. Pass this motion.

The President: You may love him to bits, Manny, but he still has to oppose. I call NATFHE to second.

Mary Davis (*NATFHE, The University & College Lecturers' Union*) in seconding the motion, said:

I am very pleased to be seconding this motion, and I think I do it not only on behalf of my own union but on behalf of the Women's Conference and the Women's Committee. I would like to ask Conference – I beg you to consider this – who is more representative of non-white males than this Conference? The answer is the equality conferences. Look around you.

Those equality conferences have all given you a message. I know what the counter argument to this is going to be: "Ooo, we need Congress as a whole to elect our leading committees", but you do not elect your leading committees. Sections A and B are not elected, and section C is certainly elected by some unions but it is not necessarily representative of the unions. It is all stitched up. We all know how it is done. (*Laughter and Applause*) It is a fact. We have got, I think, a major equality deficit in this Conference. I am not arguing that the people who are presently taking the seats on the equalities committees are bad people, not at all, but I would say that our equality work would be greatly enhanced in ensuring that the equalities conferences themselves, who have asked for this, put this through.

You have got to look in your hearts, because I know you have all been mandated to vote against this, how does it come about that members of your union attending the equality conferences could vote for this? Because they did. How would they have been passed, otherwise? Why are you not reflecting what those members wanted or are we all schizophrenic? Are we different people when we come here and different people when we go there?

I ask you not to obey the mandate. You think about what the members who are represented by those equality conferences really want, and this is what they want. We have pushed the boat out on a lot of things. The price of progress is eternal vigilance. This is one more thing that we have to push on. There will be plenty of others, by the way, because the structure is not perfect. We know that, don't we, Brendan, which is why you passed the previous motion. You are going to have to look at it all. If you are going to look at it all, you must play to your strengths and one of the big strengths of this movement is that we have an equalities structure which is excellent. Listen to what more than half of the trade union movement is asking for. We are not a minority. We are the majority. You listen to us otherwise this movement will be in a very bad way. So, ignore your mandate and vote what your equality conferences wanted. (*Applause and cheers*)

The President: Thank you, Mary. I am not sure from the Chair that I can be associated with telling delegates to ignore their mandate, certainly not the CWU delegation. My God! (*Laughter*)

The other two unions which I will call in to give a balance is the CWU and the NASUWT, then I will move to the General Secretary and then I will move to the debate. I call PCS.

Emmet O'Brien (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) spoke in support of Motion 90.

He said: Congress, I must express my disappointment that there is opposition to this motion. The British trade union movement needs to be an open, transparent and all-embracing and inclusive family. Like what the previous speaker said, we need to reflect what is on the floor today. We are, as a movement, struggling to attract trade union members who are black, Asian, LGBT, disabled and women members. We only need to look around the hall and those communities which I have just mentioned, really, are not visible to me.

This is the 21st Century and we are five years into it. We live in a very diverse society today in Britain, a multi-cultural society. The TUC equality conferences are all agreed that the reform of the TUC procedures are needed to reflect our changing society in Britain today. Those opposing this motion should at least open their minds up and participate in this review between the equality groups and the General Council, and next year perhaps we could come back with a clearer and better idea as to where we stand.

Today, if Congress votes down this motion then, regrettably, the trade union Movement will remain disconnected and disjointed within the equality field.

Congress, it is now time to overcome self-interest and vote for a movement that reflects our society today by being an inclusive TUC and not an inclusive club. When we show our British workers what we mean and the business that we mean, I will have no doubt that our membership will continue to grow with more people expressing confidence to join a trade union Movement that is reflective of Britain today.

The words behind me, 'Together stronger' mean exactly that. Support Motion 90.

Alison Shepherd (*UNISON*) opposing Motion 90, said:

Congress, I speak in opposition to Motion 90 on the equalities seats on the General Council and I will explain why that is the decision of my delegation.

We are opposing this motion on two grounds. The first is that it is not competent and it muddles, unhelpfully, several issues and, secondly, we have not come to a conclusion ourselves about the correct electoral constituencies for these seats.

The motion covers the equality seats recently added to the General Council where UNISON has an interest: young members, LGBT and disabilities. It also includes sections for black workers and women workers where we have a partial interest. We do not have an interest in all of those sections. We think that it would be wrong of us as a union of 1.3 million members, of whom 1 million are women, with guaranteed seats on the General Council in section A, where we can elect our own women to muscle in on smaller unions' opportunities to elect women members, as in section D.

We are also not too keen on the TUC Race Relations Committee being charged with progressing a reform of TUC procedures. We do think that this duty belongs to the General Council. Maybe some lobbying is what was intended in the spirit of this motion and maybe our interpretation is a bit over hard and we have construed that wrongly.

The final and best reason is that we have not come to a conclusion about electoral constituencies ourselves. Some of our equality self-organised groups – this is how we operate in UNISON. We have a very mature structure – think that election from the equality conferences is the way to go but some do not favour this route at all. From UNISON's point of view we need to start work to develop an internal view before we set the TUC on a particular course.

I think, as other speakers have said, the definitions of equalities constituencies and accountabilities is an issue. We cannot just sweep it under the carpet. It is something we need to look at, but we do not think that this motion, on this agenda, is the correct and competent solution right now. That is why UNISON is opposing this motion. There is work to do and we will be participating in that. Thank you.

Billy Hayes (*Communication Workers' Union*) supported the motion. He said: I have listened to what the previous speaker said. I am not absolutely clear why this motion is being opposed. Are we saying that the equality conferences, which all support this change, are not aware of the change that they are proposing? Are we saying that? Or are we saying that when your delegates came back from the equality conferences that they did not know what they were doing and you did not endorse their decisions or otherwise? What is being said? Are we saying that?

I think we are at a turning point in the movement. There was a very nasty piece in *The Guardian* this week about how unrepresentative we are by the writer, Simon Hoggart. It was a particularly snidey piece, I thought, but there was a germ of truth in it. We do not reflect the composition of Britain in the 21st Century. We do not reflect the rich diversity that is Britain in the 21st Century and you are going to have to get to grips with it, because if you do not there will continue to be lots of trade unionists getting up to speak, like me, white middle aged, over 40 and not what Britain is today is the 21st Century.

The position is this, and I think this is the nub of what it is all about. It is about being truthful and honest. It is about vested interests. I think that is the brutal and stark truth of it. The point is that we have to allow the people who are facing oppression to speak on behalf of themselves, not by allowing others to do it for them.

A famous Irish Socialist said: "There are none so fit to break the chains as those who wear them". You may oppose this motion today and vote it down, but this is a movement whose time has come. If we do not get to grips, and the TUC has done some excellent work on equalities and diversity, with this issue and make sure that those who wear the chains, those who face the discrimination and inequality, are allowed to speak, this movement will truly die. I believe, maybe, today you may take a decision that in years to come you will regret. I ask you to reconsider and vote for the proposition.

Sue Rogers (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*): The position the NASUWT has taken, which is one of considerable sympathy with what people have said, is one of total integrity in that we have opposed this topic and spoken against it at all equalities conferences. Our position has always been clear.

The point is that for us this is not an issue of not being in sympathy with our black colleagues and this is not an issue of not being in sympathy with any of our other colleagues from any of the equalities conferences. For us this is an issue of accountability. It is also an issue of having to address and look within ourselves as a trade union movement.

Let me take the first point of accountability. We are accountable to our trade unions. I am woman, I am on the General Council, I am a teacher and a lay member, but I am NASUWT. That is my union, that is my belief, that is my strength, that is my focus and that is what I stand here for representing. When you come to Congress, the decisions you make are the decisions of the whole of this movement. Therefore, it is the responsibility, I believe, of the trade unions in Congress to elect and to put people on the General Council who they see representing themselves and their unions.

If there is, and the General Council seeks to reflect that membership, within your delegation or within your nominations to General Council a dearth of black representation, then look not to, I say, the equalities conferences to address it for you but look to yourselves. Look to your own systems and structures and bring forward those members who are not being brought forward in the way we believe the movement should do so.

As Alison said, the whole composition of the General Council is very carefully constructed to try and ensure that there is that kind of balance between women and men and between colleagues in all sorts of areas. It is a very delicate and well-balanced structure. If we are going to change it, then we need to look at it within General Council itself and to try and see if we are going to change it that those decisions and debate goes on within the General Council. The point is that at the end of the day, for me the nub of this, Billy, is not freeing people from their chains but the accountability we owe to our own unions and the responsibilities our unions have in deciding and putting forward issues, policies and agendas. It is for that reason why the NASUWT is opposing this motion, because the composition of General Council is one which is very delicately and carefully balanced.

Although emotionally you can feel considerable sympathy, and emotionally I do, address the issue within your own union, oppose this motion and honour the accountability which has always existed within this Congress and General Council to the trade union movement and to your own individual unions. I oppose.

The President: I call on the General Secretary to put the General Council's position.

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*): Thank you, Jeannie. Congress, I listened very carefully indeed to the speeches by those supporting this motion and, Manny, I love you to death, too. Mary, I thought you made a powerful and persuasive case that, in the interests of advancing greater democratic accountability, the first thing I should do is ignore my mandate from the General Council, but I am afraid it did not persuade me and I am asking Congress to oppose this motion.

The equality conferences play an important part in the working of the TUC and they have undertaken really important campaigning work, too. They have signalled to women, to black workers, to disabled workers, to LGBT members and to young members that unions are on their side. During the past few years they have brought important issues direct to Congress, but this motion does not seek to engage with Congress. Rather, it seeks to separate the conferences from Congress. It would create two classes of General Council members; those from unions accountable to Congress, and those elected by the different conferences, accountable to them.

But there are practical difficulties, too. Not all unions send delegates to the equality conferences. At none of our equality conferences were more than 40 unions represented this year. At the Youth Conference only 20 unions were represented and there are 66 affiliates of this Congress. So, under this proposal, those not in attendance would be excluded from participating in the election of part of the General Council.

Of course, the larger unions are required to include at least one woman in their delegations to the General Council. What would happen to that requirement? What about the representatives of black women workers? Who would elect them?

To be fair, the motion recognises that the proposals it contains have not been fully worked through, but look at what it says about carrying them forward. It does not ask Congress to do this. It does not even ask the

General Council to do this. It does not even ask all of the equality committees to do so on an equal basis. It asks the Race Committee to take the lead.

Congress, as I said a little while ago, we need to take a look at constitutional issues on an open-minded basis, but we should do this together, involving all unions and not by diluting the powers of Congress itself and giving one committee responsibility for carrying forward some incomplete proposals.

The General Council is asking you to oppose this motion.

The President: Manny, do you want to exercise your right of reply? I do not think there is any doubt that you want it.

Manny Blake: Brendan, I am so disappointed because I thought I had persuaded you. I am so disappointed also that I thought if I had not done the job then Mary had done the job because I thought she was absolutely superb. Furthermore, I am disappointed because I thought that if Mary had not done the job, then my own general secretary, Billy Hayes, did the job because he touched on some points that I failed to talk about.

One of the points he raised, and it is something I am sure I cannot accuse this Congress of, is vested interests. We all know that we need members because they rely on us to lead them, they rely on us to represent them and I am sure that must be reflected in the decision that you are going to take now. I am sure that many of you are going to change your minds because I am sure you know that this is the right thing to do. The right thing to do is to support this motion.

I appreciate that the General Secretary, in his response, said that the motion was badly written. It might have been badly written but the sentiments are there. You know what we are trying to do.

Of course, there is some suggestion that the Race Committee wants the TUC Black Workers' Committee to lead on this particular motion. The reason why it is worded in the way it is because it came from the TUC Black Workers' Conference. Come on, let's not split hairs. What is this all about? It is all about giving representation to all of the equality committees. Therefore, concerning all the red-herrings and splitting of hairs that you heard from, for instance, the NASUWT, who have always spoken against this, what are you afraid of? What are you afraid of? How many members of your delegation today are from the black community? You have black teachers.

Please ignore the rhetoric and pass this motion. The reason why you are going to pass it is because you know it is the right thing to do. If you do not, it will not go away. It will come back time and time again because we passionately believe that this is a democratic way forward and it is only a matter of time before it takes place. Please pass this motion.

* *Motion 90 was LOST.*

TUC Accounts

The President: Could I now draw your attention to Appendix 3 on page 168 of the General Council's Report, which is the TUC Accounts. The Auditor is present on the platform -- sigh of relief from me! Does Conference accept the accounts as set out in the Appendix? *(Agreed)*

Criminal Justice

The President: I call Composite Motion 19, Criminal Justice, which the General Council supports.

Colin Moses (*Prison Officers Association*) moved Composite Motion 19.

He said: This composite deals with a criminal justice system that does and should belong to each and every

one of us: the composite thanks Brendan Barber, the General Secretary of the TUC, for the work he has done with the criminal justice unions. What Brendan has learned in working closely with us in the criminal justice system in recent times is that we have a system over-stretched and, I have to say, under a Labour Government over-privatised: The criminal justice system should in any civilised society belong to the public. Currently in Britain we have a criminal justice system that, by stealth, has been sold off to the very multinationals that Gordon Brown stood here and talked about.

We believe in a criminal justice system -- and ask you to support this composite -- that stays public. It is a criminal justice system, that since the Labour Party took power, has put an extra 40,000 people in prison. This is a criminal justice system that is often driven by your red top newspapers who will decide on who goes to prison and who does not. This is not just about prisons; it is about the whole system.

We also ask that the criminal justice system be given the opportunity for a proper debate at our Congress. Year on year we find ourselves in the very position we are in now, on the last morning of Congress, talking about criminal justice. In a recent election, those of us who went round the doors, campaigning, what were we asked about? We were asked about safety on the streets; we were asked whether our homes could be safe. Were we asked if multinationals could run 12 per cent of the prisons in Britain? Were we asked whether we should have a prison population in its numbers that has more young black men in it than we have in our universities? Will the private companies put that right?

Congress, we find ourselves at a crossroads. The Labour Government has created the National Offender Management Service, a joined-up up service that should be end to end management of those who have got put through the courts, but in fact what it is is a sell-off; it is a vehicle to privatise probation, to privatise prisons and to privatise the criminal justice system. Part of the plan is to build what they call super prisons. I do not know what is super about a prison, by the way, but they want to build super prisons. We as a union are opposed to that, the reason being that if you put 3,000 people on one site where are you going to put that site? Do you want it at the bottom of your street? They are talking about prisons of 3,000, that is what they are talking about, and you will have people being dragged from all over the country -- and I mean dragged -- to serve their sentences in that prison. Greenfield sites? Mr Prescott makes great play of greenfield sites. You tell me which greenfield site are you going to put a 3,000-4,000 bed prison on?

Where does this example of super prisons come from? It comes from South Africa, where after the apartheid system was dismantled -- and quite rightly so -- it was decided to build 3,000 bed prisons. So what we are now doing is following the example of a place that under apartheid did not build enough prisons. We now build 3,000 bed prisons in this country, built by privateers. Today, we are locking up the equivalent of a small town. We are locking up the equivalent of the population of Luton in prisons in England and Wales. We are asking that Congress support our campaign to stop private sector building, to stop contestability.

I will round off now by saying please support this composite. The criminal justice system should belong to the public, not to the private sector.

Judy McKnight (*Napo*) seconded Composite Motion 19. She said: Staff in the probation service work with people who have committed offences. They are often vulnerable, often damaged, often dangerous people. We work with them with a view to getting them to address their behaviour and their attitudes, with a view

to reducing reoffending, with a view to protecting the public. This work is necessarily highly skilled and necessarily based on an ethos and a set of values that we believe require it to be a public service, not a service that should be driven by profit. Yet, Congress, that is what we have been campaigning to oppose since January of last year when the government announced, without any consultation, that it was establishing the National Offender Management Service, bringing prisons and probation together under a common umbrella, purely to introduce the model that 10 Downing Street is seeking to roll out across the public sector, a model that provides for the purchaser/provider split, a model that has been dubbed 'contestability' or 'competition' between the public, voluntary and private sectors, a model that is effectively privatisation.

When we asked under the Freedom of Information Act for the business case to justify NOMS, to explain how contestability would help to reduce reoffending, we were told that its disclosure would "Jeopardise the establishment of NOMS by undermining staff commitment." When we sought clarification on whether our service would still exist to celebrate our centenary in 2007 and whether contestability threatened our very existence, we were told that the Government would ensure that there would always be a public probation service of last resort. Being assured of working in a service of last resort is not the best way to ensure a motivated workforce, but nor can that assurance be guaranteed. The reality is that once the forces of the market are unleashed there is no guarantee that basic public services will be retained, even on the basis of last resort, as the victims of Hurricane Katrina in New Orleans and Louisiana found to their cost.

Congress, please continue your support for our campaign, for the criminal justice system is not for profit. Please support Composite 19.

Chris Baugh (*Public and Commercial Services Union*): Offering PCS support for Composite Motion 19. I think it is confirmation of how the frame of political debate has shifted to the right that in 2005 Britain has the most privatised Prison Service in Europe. This, as we know, is part of a growing international trend towards opening up the private sector to private investment, but while globalisation may be inevitable there is nothing inevitable about the gradual privatisation of public services.

PCS believes that we should reject the fatalism promoted by some Ministers this week and have confidence that a united trade union movement can make a difference on behalf of our members and can make a difference in counteracting the onward march of the market into public services in the UK and internationally. We also hold the view that a joined-up criminal justice system, efficient justice with confidence from the public, is compromised by under funding, compounded by arbitrary civil service job cuts and by government infatuation with the benign force of the market and -- it should be said -- by a policy that is tough on crime but less tough on its causes.

There are two final points I really wanted to make on behalf of my union. The first is to endorse the comments that have been made by the moving and seconding speakers in that there is no place for the market in prisons, the probation service and the criminal justice system. The unified court service which came into force on 1 April 2005 created the conditions, it should be said, for the merger of the Association of Magisterial Officers with the PCS. There is an industrial logic to it, which should strengthen the voice of unions in the court service. However, there is early evidence that creeping use of PFI projects increases pressure to centralise services and reduces access to the courts. An example, a new £30 million magistrates court in

Manchester, which boasts massive palm trees and supermarket escalators, has not provided even enough court rooms and staff are expected to work under extremely cramped conditions.

In endorsing the remark about the opposition that we need to hold towards the privatisation of prisons, I would also refer to the fact that the PCS is engaged in a legal action, an equal pay case, in the Prison Service where it is evident that the Prison Service management are prepared to spend over £1 million in legal fees in defending pay inequality. Again I highlight the fact that we need to put pressure on all areas of the public sector to ensure that the promises and assurances that are given about equality are reflected in practice.

On that basis, I am sure Conference will wish to support the motion and PCS will wish to continue working with all unions in the justice sector in opposing the onward march of the market.

* *Composite Motion 19 was CARRIED*

Children in family court proceedings

The President: I call Motion 71, Children in Family Court Proceedings. The General Council support the motion. May I remind you that the amendment has been withdrawn.

Rob Thomas (*Napo*) moved Motion 71. He said: Some of you may be sitting there thinking that we should have both justice for parents and support for children. Our members know that one principle sometimes conflicts with the other. Why is Napo concerned about this now? There are three main reasons: firstly, the emergence of a number of fathers groups, including Fathers for Justice, commonly known as F4J. Some people see F4J as an eccentric group of men who get involved in stances such as climbing up cranes and throwing condoms filled with purple paint at the Prime Minister. Notwithstanding the view that offering condoms to Tony Blair was a helpful gesture, we believe that this pressure group has conned many of the public -- and some politicians -- into believing that the interests of fathers is exactly the same thing as justice for all parents and their children. What F4J would not like you to know is that they engage in other activities that are less entertaining: threats and intimidation to lawyers, court staff, judges and CAF/CASS workers, and sometimes have a history of appalling behaviour with their ex partners and children. They would also have us all believe that the family courts are biased against men, that our members are anti-men and that these alleged prejudices are bad for children. In reality, only one or two per cent of fathers are denied contact with their children, usually because of violence and child protection issues.

The second reason is the need to raise awareness. Our members work for CAF/CASS, the Children and Family Court Advisory Service, which was established as a new agency in 2001. They need co-operation from other social workers employed by local authorities. They need understanding from other workers who come under the influence of the Department of Education and Skills. They may need support from the TUC if the Government decide to legislate to alter the present presumption of welfare of children being the most important priority in family court proceedings. Our members specialise in writing reports for courts where there is a dispute between parents about contact with their children or about which parent a child should live with. They know that the welfare principle makes sense and that the interests of children should be paramount.

Finally, there are the politicians as fathers groups are sometimes effective in their lobbying of MPs. They managed to sew so many seeds of doubts in the Tories minds that Theresa May at last year's Tory Party

Conference announced that it was their policy to abolish CAFCASS, and that they would even act on this in their first week of coming to power. We all know that is not likely but there you go. They seem to want to do this because they believe that CAFCASS are biased against men and there should be some sort of model that saw fathers' rights to have control over their children's lives enshrined in legislation. The propaganda had worked on the Tories.

Then the Green Paper on contact with children following court proceedings was published by the Government. That was toying with the idea of a presumption in favour of shared contact between parents in most circumstances. If that were enshrined in legislation then the rights of parents would sometimes be allowed to over-ride the rights of children through a dispassionate analysis of what is in their best interests, but current legislation -- as laid out in the 1989 Children's Act -- states that in family court proceedings the court must treat the welfare of the child as the paramount consideration when reaching any decision about their upbringing. That must be right.

The guide to the Act makes it clear that the legislation does not attempt to steer the court one way or another over parents' contact with children after a separation or divorce. British courts are not alone in holding this view. The UN Convention on the rights of the child also establishes the welfare principle in international law. Article 3 of that Convention states that the best interests of the child should be a primary consideration in courts of law. Article 12 holds that children have a right to be consulted about their views and to be able to influence decisions about their lives. Article 8 makes similar statements about their rights to personal development being paramount in all legal and administrative decisions. The British Government have ratified this Convention and so they just cannot set it aside.

So we have our own well established legislation, we have the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, and UK practitioners are all united on what is best for children. I say, when something ain't broke don't fix it. Please support this motion.

Charles Ward (*Association of Educational Psychologists*) seconded Motion 71.

He said: When I first saw this motion the AEP submitted what it thought was a friendly amendment seeking to illustrate the positive role that applied psychology can play in the lives of vulnerable young people and the value of that advice it can give to the courts when faced with very difficult decisions. However, after contact from our brothers and sisters in Napo we realised that the amendment could be misinterpreted and be a stick to beat our highly professional colleagues in CAFCASS. When the AEP learned this, it immediately withdrew its amendment and we were delighted to be asked to second the motion.

Our brothers and sisters in CAFCASS have been regularly attacked and vilified most unjustly by the media and organisations like Fathers for Justice. Family court proceedings are never easy. The worst issue is the rights of parents often conflict with both, and the rights of the child can conflict with the rights of the parents. Colleagues in CAFCASS like educational psychologists stand firm by the principle enshrined in the Children's Act that the rights and the needs of the child are paramount in these issues. This is often a brave decision to have to defend, especially when the hounds of the media are in full flight.

Congress, it has been my privilege to serve on an adoption panel. I do not intend to regale you with horror stories but I want to say one thing. I have admired the professionalism of the work of colleagues

preparing applications for that panel. What I have noticed though is that in many cases a considered psychological analysis adds to the understanding of a child's development, her adjustment, his needs, and the long-term psychological effect on the child's history and separation. What the AEP sought in its amendment, now withdrawn, was an acknowledgment of the value of applied psychology in the preparation of reports about children and young people for the courts and the benefits it can have in making the best plans for them.

As a former single parent, I need no reminders either of the problems the loss of a parent creates for young people and that is why I support this motion. Research evidence from as recently as 2002 shows clearly that interventions involving CAFCASS have increased the levels of parental contact for children, so let us have no more of the slander of taking children away from their parents.

Congress, this motion seeks a single straightforward statement of TUC policy, supporting colleagues working to support vulnerable children. This TUC policy should be supportive of our colleagues under the irresponsible attacks from right-wing politicians and the sensation seeking media. Together we can be stronger. I am honoured to second the motion.

* *Motion 71 was CARRIED*

Criminal Justice Issues

Bob Crosby (*GMB*) speaking to paragraph 4.13 said: Privatisation of the Prison Service is often presented as a PPP success story. There is no doubt that private prisons are cheaper to run than public prisons, but why? Longer working hours, fewer holidays, lower pay, and inferior pensions. So the employees are paying the cost. If you are a manager in a private prison, the position is reversed. You have vastly superior terms and conditions to your counterparts in public prisons. The Treasury maintains that the PFI is only used where value for money is not achieved at the expense of staff terms and conditions. This is odds with the evidence, evidence from the Pay Review Body, House of Commons, Public Accounts Committee, National Audit Office, the Prison Service itself, and even the CBI.

The second point I would like to cover is staffing ratios and turnover. Among PCOs in private prisons turnover averages 25 per cent greater than the 2.4 per cent rate among public sector prison officers; in some cases it is as high as 40 per cent. Juliet Lyon at the Prison Reform Trust said of one private prison "The staff turnover would disgrace many burger bars"! According to the National Audit Office, the pay and benefits package, and absence of much opportunity for pay progression, contributes to the continuing high turnover in private prisons. There are also concerns about safe staffing levels. How would you cope alone on a wing of 70 convicted criminals who are unlocked for most of the time?

The President: Delegate, you are making a speech. You should close now.

Bob Crosby (*GMB*): I will cut it short. The people who work in these prisons need the support of their trades unions to challenge contractual arrangements that cause such dangerous staffing levels and poor terms and conditions.

Finally, do not even get me started on Section 127 of the 1994 Criminal Justice and Public Order Act. That denies prison officers and escorts in the public and private prisons the right to take any form of industrial action. It is vital we step up our campaign and continue to press these issues with government at every opportunity.

The President: I know there are other indications on paragraphs. Please do not come in and make speeches.

You are supposed to raise a specific question on it. Thank you very much.

I now move to unfinished business; so I am now moving on to that. I call Motion 34, Diversity. The General Council support the motion.

Diversity

Glynn Burgess (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapists*) moved Motion 34.

He said: We live in a diverse society. Twenty-two per cent of adults and five per cent of children in Great Britain are recognised as disabled. It is estimated that one in around twenty people are gay, lesbian or bisexual. Nearly eight per cent of the population is made up of black and ethnic minority people and British society is set to diversify further. Finally, we have seen enormous changes in recent decades in the social roles and working lives of men and women.

What does this mean in practice? The CSP believes that equality in diversity is recognising and valuing difference in its broadest sense. It is about creating working cultures and practices that respect and harness difference for the benefit of the organisation and the individual. In its White Paper on modernising government, the Government made a specific commitment to delivering public services that are sensitive to the needs of different groups of people and for these services to be delivered in an accessible way. Out of this thinking came a brand new group at national level, which the CSP is proud to have one of only two union seats on, the Diversity Sub-Group of the Public Services Forum. This forum itself was set up two years ago and its work programme is directly endorsed by the Prime Minister. The aim of the Diversity Sub-Group is to take a fresh look at work force diversity in a way that will hopefully have greater impact at the front line. The sub-group is currently working on proposals in three main areas: firstly, building the capacity of trade unions and employers to make a stronger service to create a business case for workforce diversity; secondly, creating leaders who are better equipped to lead and manage diversity throughout the workforce; and, thirdly, identifying best practice amongst both employers and trades unions.

The sub-group is due to report back to the Public Services Forum in October and to recommend the way forward that will be of benefit right across the public sector. This is no simple task, nor is it one that will be achieved unless adequate resources are dedicated to its work and sufficient time allowed. Hence our decision to table this motion to Congress. We must collectively take responsibility in the trade union movement to ensure that the work of this group is fully supported and that this collaborative approach should lead to real and sustainable improvements, both for providers and users of public services.

Please support this motion.

Jackie Lewis (*UNISON*) seconded Motion 34. She said: Congress, those of us who work in public services know that considerable work is being done to ensure that services more closely meet the needs of those who use them. But precisely because we work in public services we also know the real effects of social exclusion and economic disadvantage on those very same people. We know that deep rooted institutionalised discrimination blights the lives of millions both as citizens and as workers, and there is still much to do to ensure that we who deliver public services are representative of our diverse society and understand the differing needs. We know that staff who feel valued can have a fair and equitable working life no matter what their differences may be, a staff with increased motivation who are likely to stay with an employer over a longer time ensuring delivery of high quality services.

UNISON, with the other public services unions, are adamant that public services should remain in the public sector, and that staff be well paid, well trained and treated with respect. Good employers put values of equality and fair treatment firmly at the centre of their workforce policies and practices and know the benefits this brings not just to individuals but also to their business, to communities and to society at large. Good trades unions, as we all are, know that by working with governments and employers we are more likely to be successful in achieving our objectives for proper treatment of our members. To take one example, earlier this year UNISON in Greater London working with the Greater London Authority, convened a conference of trades unionists and public service employers in order to address institutionalised racism at work. This valuable initiative moved us a little forward on one important part of our diversity and equality agenda. The PSF task group offers us the possibility of wider progress on that agenda. Its report will recommend a new framework for developing and implementing diversity policies in support of greater work force flexibility.

For our part, as trades unions we know that we can commit to turning that framework into practice. We can and must work with governments and employers to uproot and de-institutionalise discrimination. For government's part they must recognise that this cannot be done overnight and that it will take resources. On Tuesday -- it was good to hear, wasn't it -- Gordon pledged to close the gender pay group and skill up our workforce. That cannot be done on a shoestring. We have to say, "Gordon, give us the money". Congress, you tell him. Support Motion 34. I second.

* *Motion 34 was CARRIED*

The Supporting People Programme – Quality Assessment Framework

The President: I now call Motion 35, The Supporting People Programme - Quality Assessment Framework. The General Council support the motion.

Tony Carey (*Bakers, Food and Allied Workers Union*) moved Motion 35.

He said: I am proud to be moving Motion 35 on behalf of our great union. May I begin by saluting the work of the TUC Disability Conference and its leadership and those within our movement who fight the fight for social justice on behalf of disabled people, championing the fight for inclusion rather than exclusion and seclusion within society, throwing away the shackles of social injustice.

Not wishing to steal Ian McCartney's thunder, he did say the other day, "Give me a government that has done this and give me a government that has done that and I will give you one". What he forgot to say was "Give me a government that has repealed the vile anti-trade union legislation". I will give you one, this Government. He could not say that because they have not done it.

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister runs the programme Supporting People. It is designed to offer support to people within our society, who are in many cases at the bottom of the ladder in terms of social economic well-being and in many cases suffering from illness. The support covers a diverse and wide-ranging number of service users needs, enabling those who are supported to live their lives with dignity and respect upon a level playing field within society, irrespective of their illness or disability. There are many of us who value the work of the support staff, and I believe that the work they carry out is a contributory factor in relation to social inclusion rather than exclusion. Sound policy and practice lead to social inclusion whereas unsound policy and practice lead in this case to social exclusion.

As a consequence of target-setting, support service provision is limited by timescales. The bureaucratic intervention is both unsound and bad practice, with restraint placed on both the service provider and the service user. For many people, early withdrawal of necessary support can have dire consequences, leaving unsupported people in many cases in emotional and financial turmoil, leaving a supported person isolated and unable to be adequately compatible within the social and economic society and within their communities. A wall built without the right structural support will fall; it will fall because of restrictions that are in place and the unnecessary removal of support can lead to collapse, with often catastrophic consequences. You can rebuild a wall; it is a lot harder to re-build a life. If support is needed it should be there for as long as it takes. It should be based upon need, not bureaucratic time scales; it should be based upon sound principles and sound practices and should champion the cause of social justice and inclusion rather than seclusion and exclusion.

We should fight the fight as trades unionists and fight the cause for social justice shoulder to shoulder. We all understand what it is like to be unable to lead a compatible and economic and socially integrated life style, and we can well understand the value and timing necessary to help in receiving support in order for a person to once again feel functional within society and to increase one's self worth and self esteem. I know this because I receive support from the Supporting People Programme as a disabled person. I do not believe it should be up to political dictates, it should be up to the people who provide the service and a service that is supposed to be service-user led. We should be leading as service users, to understand the value in helping me to sustain and move forward with my life but also it helps others to move forward and sustain their life. Just one person falling through that gap through lack of adequate support, or through lack of commitment from government to fund it adequately, one person falling through that net is one person too many for me.

Disabled persons and people who suffer from other types of illness need that support. It is a social and moral right and we should support it. It is an important right for all mankind. Remember our theme this year: together is stronger. Stand together on this issue. I move.

A delegate (*Community*) formally seconded the motion.

* *Motion 35 was CARRIED*

EU Constitution

The President: It has not been possible to reach an accommodation on Motion 75, EU Constitution, and therefore the amendment in the name of Community will stand against the motion.

Bob Crow (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) moved Motion 75.

He said: Can I make it quite clear that this resolution is about the European Constitution, not the European Union. I have had a number of people who have asked me what the situation is; it seems that some delegations have not been told exactly what we are putting here. It is about the European Constitution.

I have also had a number of people come to me and say why will we not have a compromise with Community's amendment? No disrespect to Community, we are always quite happy to have a compromise, but the fact is that in our opinion the Community amendment is a wrecking amendment and would wreck the actual content of the resolution.

We believe that this Congress should have the opportunity to have a say on the question of the

European Constitution. Last year you passed a resolution for a balanced debate. We have had that balanced debate and now we should make a decision. Never mind what they do in France, that is up to the French people; never mind what they do in the Netherlands; and never mind what they do in Luxembourg. But let us start saying what agenda we want for working people on the question of Europe and throughout the world.

I raise the question: why should you turn it down on one aspect? In the European Constitution it says that you will have the right to strike. That is fantastic, but in the curate's egg part of it it says "subject to national law". You heard what Gordon Brown and Ian McCartney said this week, you ain't having it off them, so on that basis alone you should turn the constitution down. All of these Directives are about the privatisation of your services.

All this week we have had the prison officers coming here, the Fire Brigade, GMB, T&G, UCATT, and what we are being told is more and more services are being privatised. That is not what I believe working men and women want in Britain. They want efficiency, yes, they want good services, yes, but also they want public control over the services they work in and the people who operate in them. Let me tell you what happened this summer. As a Millwall supporter I have not been watching a lot of football recently and people said, "Bob you are becoming frustrated in your life". Being a Millwall supporter I have learned to live with frustration; it is something that goes with being a Millwall supporter. There was a knock on my door one midweek night. It was the gasman. I do not know whether they were Paul Kenny's members or T&G members, but they said to me "We are from the Gas Board, Bob". I thought I had not paid my bill. He said, "We are flogging electricity". I said "What is this about?" He said, "Sign this form and I can save you £27 a year". I said, "To be honest with you, I would rather the gas supplied the gas. It would be a bit strange in the railway industry if the shipping industry were providing rail services". The very next night the electric man comes round, the old LEB, and he is flogging gas. But to top it all off, the week after Thames Water turned up and they were flogging electric. When I went to school I was told that electric and water could not mix, but it makes profits and it certainly mixes for that.

Comrades, what we want is real a European working-together, like standing down at Cherbourg with people like Graham Stevenson from the T&G and others, CGT and SIPTU, like defending the Swansea to Cork services with our colleagues in the European unions and the Irish unions. That is real solidarity, when groups of strikers go on strike throughout the world to allow other groups of workers to black their work and boycott it and give it to the people who need protection at that moment in time.

I will say to you, the question of this motion should be carried here today by the TUC and if it is dead, then why is it there was a vote in Luxembourg? Why is it that there are some people still saying in six months' time, in nine months' time, it will come up in some other form? Well, when it comes up in some other form we can look at that Constitution then but the Constitution as it stands at the moment does not give the right to working men and working women to keep their services public. What it means is a European undemocratic super state that backs big business to privatise the services. What privatisation means in the public services is simple. You have public services at the moment, they are taken off you, they are run by privateers, a few people get profits out of it and then they sell back that service to the public that had it the day before at more expensive cost with jobs and

conditions cut in the industry to boost the profits for the big businesses that run them.

I say to people, yesterday the Executive decision in Scotland was an absolute disgrace. Yesterday, took a decision to privatise through tender Caledonian MacBrayne. What a shame when we had the Tories yesterday in Scotland saying they did not want privatisation and New Labour and SLP voted for privatisation. That is New Labour for you and that is why you should support this resolution and oppose the amendment completely.

The President:: Thank you, Bob. The temperature has gone up two degrees!

Bob Oram (UNISON) seconded Motion 75.

He said: I am happy to be supporting this motion and opposing the amendment. At our conference last year, UNISON like the French and the Dutch thought the results of our votes had consigned the European Constitution to the dustbin of history. We all recognised the pivotal role played by unions in the 'no' campaigns. Voters in France and Holland were not xenophobes from the right. The majority rejected the Constitution because of public anger at continuing unemployment, low economic growth and attacks on working hours, pay and pension rights. One of the key causes for this anger was the crisis in public services across Europe caused by the liberalisation and marketisation policies adopted by the EU. Brussels mistakenly believes that these policies are crucial for the future of Europe. They are not, they are policies that expose health services, education services, energy services, water, the railways – everything - to privatisation and marketisation. Health and social services are to be dealt with the same as IT consultancy and private security firms. It is against everything that we hold dear: collective agreements and better working conditions, pensions and dignity for the old, decent public services for our children. These 'no' votes were historic because, for the first time ever, people in Europe voted to reject the neo-liberal policies and stood up for a real social Europe where public services matter.

Our voices are still being ignored. Unelected and unaccountable corporate elites still hold power in Europe. They issue countless directives that demand the deregulation of industries and services including the so-called Frankenstein -- sorry Bolkestein -- Directive, more commonly called the Services Directive. This nasty piece of work demands the liberalisation and deregulation of all service activity in Europe and includes the country of origin principle where companies from other Member States can operate our public services without having to comply with British law or standards, not just employment law but equality standards, public health standards and environmental protection. The responsibility for pride in a care home service, for example, will lie in a country of origin somewhere else in Europe. Our General Secretary, Dave Prentis, has said both in Britain and Europe this would provoke a race to the bottom for staff pay and conditions. Offshore firms would be allowed to operate in deregulated health and education sectors and ignore minimum standards.

We will maintain our opposition to this Services Directive and continue to join events like we did this year in March in Brussels with a 70,000 demonstration. We do not want an agenda driven by an unaccountable central bank. We need a common agenda with our European sisters and brothers that opposes the one size fits all single market neo-liberalism that enforces privatisation policies across Europe. We should be at the forefront of opposing these policies but we should also be at the forefront of proposing progressive alternatives. The TUC needs to be part of that campaign to reform the motion and

this motion allows us to do it. Please support it unamended.

Michael Leahy (Community) moved the amendment to Motion 75.

He said: I hope in this debate those who shout the loudest are hopefully not listened to the most. Our amendment reaffirms the values which the British trade union movement has always cherished, the values of solidarity, peace and proper respect for the innate dignity and fundamental right of working people. They are embedded in the draft Treaty of the European Union. You do not have to be old to remember what the repudiation of these values meant to our members. Through the 1980s, and up until 1997, the only progress we made in securing equal treatment for women at work and in society at large was achieved through the EU directives and the decisions of the European Court of justice. Today, Europe is our best ally in reducing working time, pressing our government to abide by the EU rules applying in nearly every other European country. By the way, 90 per cent of British labour law emanated from Europe. It is therefore essential in establishing the level playing field for which the TUC and unions have often called.

If my union and Amicus do force the government to ensure that people regain lost pensions, it will be because the European Court rules that way. What has the EU done to assume the anathema in the motion about EU diplomatic missions or about militarism? Surely it make sense for the economic and political interest of 455 million people to be represented by a single voice overseas. Surely it is helpful to an embassy representing only 60 million people when it comes to fighting US protectionism, and which government in Europe was more militaristic than ours in invading and occupying Iraq with the Americans? Certainly not the French and the Germans who rejected that war and in the process spoke for the majority, the great majority of Europeans, including the people that we represent here.

So who would be our allies if you adopt this motion? Well, *The Sun*, *The Mail*, those beacons of justice and peace would be very happy; so would what is left UKIP with the landmark policy on designating responsibility for cleaning behind the fridge. The Tories too would be glad to see us reject the philosophy which insists that working people should have the right to have a say in decisions affecting their work. The Tories have no place for the strong social framework for which the European workers alone benefited because the EU alone puts social conditions on the operation of market forces.

Look at the only other model on offer, look at New Orleans today to see where there is the crazy attachment to private property, the yawning class and race equality bureaucracy, and competition 'red in tooth and claw'.

Conference, please support this motion and support the amendment. Thank you very much.

Ged Nichols (Accord) seconding the amendment to Motion 75, said: Congress, if the European Constitution is dead, as some people believe, then there seems little point in climbing into the coffin to give it another good kicking. Really, that is not what the motion is about. The motion is blatantly anti-European Union, and describing the European agenda as elitist, militarist, corporate, and anti-democratic, is nonsense. The motion is also inaccurate. It refers to the potential creation of a European defence agency. The European Defence Agency was actually created 14 months ago and it has nothing at all to do with the European Constitution.

So, two countries have voted against the Constitution but why should we attach such importance to their views and reject the decisions of the ten other

countries that have ratified the treaty. Of course, we need to take note of the results of the referenda in France and in The Netherlands, but we need also to consider why people voted in this way. The governments of those two countries are deeply unpopular and would have had difficulty getting people to vote for anything, but if you look at other reasons there is a powerful factor, which was the fear of the growing influence of the US model and what right-wing governments elsewhere in Europe were trying to do to the social protection which has always accompanied EU economic developments.

The European social model is under attack; that is the reason for us to defend it now, not to throw our hands in the air and leave the field free to the free marketeers. They would love the opportunity to dismantle the social framework and try to cut back on the role of the state to US proportions. They would have us renege on the Kyoto commitments because tackling global change is not on the agenda of greed and disregard for the common good.

Congress, please support the amendment. If the amendment falls, then I urge you to vote against the substantive motion. Thank you.

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*): The General Council are leaving the amendment to Congress and are supporting the motion. Let me explain why.

The motion focuses on the proposed European Constitution, which, as we have heard, was rejected so decisively by the voters of France and The Netherlands. It refers also to some concerns over aspects of EU developments, for example the proposed services directive that has led to so many strong concerns over threats that the current draft of the directive poses to the integrity of major public services, and the risk indeed of our employment rights and standards being undermined.

The amendment seeks to temper the absolute rejection of the proposed Constitution calling instead for a period of reflection. It goes on to propose the addition of references to the vital EU role in delivering equality, environmental protection, and employee rights. The GPC had hoped that it might have been possible to achieve a composite motion. Regrettably, that was not achievable so unions are going to have to decide whether or not to support the amendment as it stands.

The General Council's concern is that whatever decision Congress takes on that, the motion fails to reflect the breadth of TUC policy over the European Union. We need to be clear. I do not think too many people out there are uncertain about the EU Constitution issue. As a result of the votes in France and The Netherlands, it is no longer viable. To put it another way and to paraphrase Monty Python, I know a dead constitution when I see one.

Congress, there are much bigger issues now at stake than a sterile semantic debate over whether something should be buried which is already in the mortuary. Whatever threats there are of a new neo-liberal agenda, privatisation, marketisation, and the rest, those threats are not originating in the European Union, we have to fight those battles on every front, including here at home. In recent years, the European Union has actually been seen as a key ally for us in that conflict.

Crucial social advances have been won through Europe. Social dialogue is entrenched in Europe's institutions. We should not forget that it is because of the European Union that we have new laws on equal pay, part-time workers' rights, four weeks paid holiday, and much much more besides. Our economy is crucially interlocked with the rest of the European Union. It is vital, for sure, that we win the battle for a strong social dimension to the EU and we make the case for the European social model strongly too.

Congress, however you vote on the amendment, support the motion but recognising that we have a solid body of established TUC policy on our work in Europe and this motion is accepted against that background.

Paul Noon (*Prospect*) supporting the amendment to Motion 75 said: Prospect has in the past been happy to support the TUC General Council position on Europe and we were content with the balanced General Council statement on the EU Constitution. Members of my union have their individual views on the draft EU Constitution and we took the view that, although there were issues we needed to identify as important, final decisions would be taken if and when the Constitution was put to the British people for ratification. I accept that the political reality is that the EU Constitution is now dead, or at least the present version of it is, but we do not think it needs the TUC to give it the last rights, nor are we happy to reject the EU Constitution, as it said in the motion, based on the outcome of referenda in France and Holland. It should be our decision based on our assessment when the time is right. That is why Prospect will be supporting the amendment from Community. We do not see this as a wrecking amendment, we see it as one which has the potential to build unity in Congress.

We also take the view that other elements of the amendment improve the RMT motion, particularly the deletion of paragraph 3 which refers to the EU Constitution as discredited when we have not made that assessment and not taken that view. It also adds a reference to full employment as the primary goal of our agenda, which we see as helpful. Although there are some elements of the RMT motion which we would support, if it is not amended, we see its tone as hostile to the EU and that has not been our position.

The TUC has a proud and positive record of leadership on Europe and through that we have won employment rights, health and safety rights, equality rights, but we do not want to put that in jeopardy. So, we support the amendment but if the motion is not amended then we reject the motion. I urge you to do likewise. Thank you.

Tony Dubbins (*Amicus*) supporting Motion 75 and opposing the amendment said: Let me say that we support the motion really for the same reasons that Brendan has already spelled out. At our policy conference earlier this year we resolved that, unless the UK Government reaffirms its commitment to the European social agenda and ensures that the rights under the charter, our fundamental rights, go into UK legislation, we would not give active support for the Constitution.

I was pleased to hear what Bob said at the very outset, that this debate is about the Constitution, it is not about other parts of TUC, or indeed Amicus, policy. The reality is the Constitution is dead and we should bury it because it is stopping us moving on to deal with some of the major issues that we need to deal with in Europe. The services directive, if it goes through, needs to protect our public services and it needs to protect our rights. We need to ensure that we get rid of that opt-out in the working time directive and we badly need an agency in the temporary workers directive that protects the most vulnerable people in our labour market.

I am not concerned about what the resolution says but I am concerned about what it does not say. I think it is important we also make that very clear today. I want to make three points on that. Amicus can in the future support an EU Constitution which gives the proper commitments to the development and implementation of the European social dimension, and the charter of fundamental rights to be enshrined properly, not superficially, in UK legislation.

We should also remind ourselves, secondly, that it is still TUC, and certainly Amicus, policy to continue to support joining the single currency when the Chancellor's five tests are eventually met. Thirdly, and most importantly of all, we should remember that it is TUC and Amicus policy to support continued full membership of the EU, and that means taking part in all of its institutions. The reality is, whether or not we like it, the EU is the only show in town, so we must shape it and make damned sure we develop that social dimension so that we can see Europe working for the people that we represent.

Bob Crow (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) replying to the debate said: Mick, it is not about, in my opinion, who shouts the loudest. I listened to great Welsh singers for years and enjoyed every one of them. The point is when you came up to the rostrum today, Mick, you were singing a song which I did not like. That is why our union could not accept your amendment. The reality is, as far as we are concerned, we are talking about the European Constitution. All of us are in some forms of negotiations, whether we are convenors, shop stewards, or Executive Committee members or officers. We are handed a document from the employer, we look at that document and we say, does that document take working-class people forward, the people that we represent. When we look at it, we do a balancing act, and after consulting with people we say yes or we say no, and we then move on the document or reject it.

What we are saying is, we do not know what is going to happen in the future. If all of a sudden there was a total change and a document came up which took working rights forward and gave us the right to strike, repealed the anti-trade union laws and stopped the privatisation of railways and the public services, of course then we can look at that situation. The reality is that this Constitution does not do that. I said from the start that it says in that document you will have the right to strike, subject to national law. Under this Government, you will not have the right to strike. Even if it gives you 12 weeks before you can be sacked, you are still in breach of contract when you take strike action under British law.

I am not going to get mixed up, Mick, with all this UKIP situation, all I know is that I can only speak for my union. In my rule book, and in the previous National Union of Seamen's rule book, and the National Union of Railwaymen's rule book, it is built into our constitution that we want a socialist society. I do not want to be tipped over to say that we are UKIP supporters or supporters of *The Sun* or the *Daily Mail*, or we are Little Englanders who only worry about the Queen's head on a ten-pound note. I could not care less whether the Queen's head or the Queen's backside is on a ten-pound note, to be honest with you; I just like plenty of them to spend.

French workers have better pension rights and if you are an SNCF worker you can retire at 55. Per head, German workers get better pay and conditions than British railway workers. French railway workers received their pensions and German workers received their better pay, not as a result of a European Constitution but they took strike action to defend their services and improve their members' terms and conditions. That is the reason they received it.

So, comrades, I will ask you to turn the amendment down, and turn it down on the basis stated by Tony Dubbins.

On a personal note, without stabbing anyone in the back, when the French voted against the Constitution I was drinking Beaujolais, and when the Dutch rejected it I was eating Edam cheese, and tonight when I get home and you vote for this I will be eating my jellied eels. Good luck.

- * *The Amendment to Motion 75 was LOST.*
- * *Motion 75 was CARRIED.*

Europe – European Social Forum

Barry White (*National Union of Journalists*) speaking to paragraph 5.3, European Social Forum, said: Yesterday morning an Equity speaker said that when we do something new we should shout it from the rooftops. I agree and that call, surely, applies to the involvement of the Trades Union Congress and our affiliated unions in last autumn's European Social Forum. The forum was a splendid example of coalition building, bringing together trade unionists from all across Europe and beyond, representatives of civil society, non government organisations, and individuals, with the common objectives of opposing war and campaigning for social justice both in Europe and worldwide.

I have two points to make. First, there are thousands of anti-globalisation activists who are eligible but not members of our trades unions. We need them urgently and must reach out to them and win back some of the missing millions the President referred to on Monday. The second is a plug for the next European Social Forum in Greece in April 2006, which I am sure the General Council and the TUC will be supporting. We must start getting our union delegations organised now. Congress, we must continue to build the movement with those who want to sweep any neo-liberalism and privatisation into that same dustbin of history that Bob Oram mentioned in his speech on Motion 75. We must get going. Thank you.

Transport – future of the rail industry

The President: I call paragraph 4.9 and Composite Motion 15, Transport – future of the rail industry. The General Council support the Composite Motion.

Andy Bain (*Transport Salaried Staffs' Association*) moved Composite Motion 15. He said: I would like to start by thanking all the trade unions who were at the 2004 Labour Party Conference. You all supported the TSSA's motion on rail public ownership. This policy was carried, despite the Labour Party regions and constituencies being threatened with non funding of local schools, hospitals, and other investment, even London's Crossrail if they voted the wrong way. Before this, the TSSA steered the rail ownership issue through the obstacles of the National Policy Forum. Then they beat the dirty tricks at the conference but, not surprisingly, the policy did not get into the election manifesto of the May election this year. A policy that was very popular with the public was ditched. Why? I will come back to that in a minute because I want to talk first about the issues raised by the TSSA in this motion.

South East Trains has been dealt with in Emergency Motion E2 but I do want to draw attention to the cynical move, while publicly controlled, to cut drastically booking office hours, something that the private train operators may have been too scared to start but will certainly try to follow. The transfer of safety responsibilities to the office of the rail regulator, which has also economic responsibilities, will bring conflicts. They will wash their hands of any responsibility in future big accidents and the private operators and Network Rail will have to fight it out, the ultimate losers being the taxpayer, the passenger, and the railway worker.

Crossrail is a classic example of what happens when government insists on money for financing major public schemes in private. Nobody knows when it will happen or what it will cost. The unions will obviously support Crossrail but we will have our price and we will have our conditions. We also want a significant shift of

freight from road to rail and we do not want bigger lorries, again another popular demand.

The three rail trade unions commissioned Catalyst to undertake two studies to give detailed arguments on this very complex and fragmented mess of the railway industry. They produced excellent papers on the use of public money since rail privatisation and the idea of a rail map for bringing rail back into public ownership. For example, they state: "Privatisation has massively wasted public money. Subsidies are far higher than previously, and will rise. The big rail players face almost no financial risk and are reliant on public money."

The £22bn cost to bring the railways back is bollocks – my words, not theirs. The cost could be minimal. We have the winning arguments, whether it be on cost, efficiency, safety, the environment, or accountability, and I recommend the Catalyst papers for the detailed figures. The rail industry unions have campaigned together and separately within the Labour Party, within parliament, and outside, with some success.

Now back to the big question: why have Blair and Brown not listened? Tony Blair gave the answer at an earlier fringe meeting: they are wedded to the free market, everything must be sold to the private sector and must stay there. For the railways it is an even bigger issue than that. Once you cut through the complex structure of the industry and the circuitous route that taxpayers' money takes to get to the shareholders, the picture is simple and clear. The British electorate understands it, public ownership is popular, it is even Labour Party policy, but still they, New Labour, cannot let it happen. If there was one U-turn there would be an avalanche of demands, not least from all of you, whether it be on health, education, housing, emergency services, or local government. The free market, neo-liberal, private good, public bad, ideology of the Tories and then the Blair years would collapse. That is why they will not take over the railways.

There have been several references to football, and even cricket, this week. Before important matches any team will study the strength and weaknesses of the opposition but they do not have to ask why they want to win, it is obvious. We are involved in something much more important and, if we do not understand why, we will always be defeated. Our opposition is big business, the fat cats, capital, and a government working in their interests. We are playing for our members and most of the British public.

You can help, you can make rail ownership a leadership issue with the Labour Party, you can support the rail unions in the public ownership campaign, you can support future struggles in the rail industry, supporting the unions, and you can raise public ownership when you can, for example in the Labour Party survey into why members are disillusioned; it is not surprising, really. Support the motion. Thank you.

Andy Reed (*Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*) seconding Composite Motion 15 said: We second this motion with some pride that we can speak with confidence that the three rail unions are united in the campaign to ensure that we have a publicly owned and publicly accountable railway system not subject to the vagaries of the private sector.

It would be cheaper for us to have a publicly owned rail network. We have argued this on many occasions on this floor, at the Labour Party, and any other forum that we go to. It would also be safer as we would have a direct access to the people who are maintaining our rail system instead of people saying they are not interested in speaking to us, or it is too much cost-wise to put safety equipment into the cabs of the trains that are travelling at 140 mph, plus. We have had tragic

incidents on level crossings, colleagues, and when Aslef and the other rail unions started looking into it we found out that Network Rail and the private operators did not want to put the technology into the cabs that would have saved the lives of people travelling on those trains on that particular day. It is nothing short of a disgrace that profit is put before the safety of every one of us who use the network. Many of you will be travelling home today on the railways so just think about what they are saying to us and what is happening out there.

South East Trains has been spoken about. It is quite right that we take the stance, along with the other rail unions and other interested parties and MPs in the areas concerned, by asking why should it be going to the private sector. It is no use private sector companies coming to Aslef and to the RMT, and TSSA, asking us to support their bids because they are nice people and they will look after us. We have a clear mandate from our policies and from our conferences, we will not support a private operator operating the rail network of the UK.

We also have a problem, colleagues, with freight trains. We have a campaign running at this moment in time, and I thank the T&G for their involvement and their kind consideration to us in that particular campaign. It is not about taking people's jobs out of the road industry, it is about having an integrated transport policy where the two modes of transport can come together and work in a cohesive environment for the good of the public.

We also have 3,500 members of our trade union driving freight trains and if we have more liberal policies coming out of Europe their jobs will be in direct danger of being lost with the competition that is there. That is why we fight for public ownership of the railways and that is why we stand shoulder to shoulder with our trade union colleagues.

Please support the motion and ensure we go to the Labour Party Conference with the policy that they and we agree to, and is not ignored. Thank you.

* *Composite Motion 15 was CARRIED*

Criminalisation

The President: I call Motion 53, Criminalisation. The General Council support the motion.

Peter McEwen (*National Union of Marine, Aviation and Shipping Transport Officers*) moved Motion 53. He said: Congress, what job could land you in jail for trying to prevent a major environmental disaster? What job could put you in prison for 70 days for having been prescribed sleeping pills? What job could see you deported for carrying out a safety check? Predictably, the answer to each of those questions is seafaring. All three occurrences actually happened and are examples of the way in which ship masters and officers are increasingly being treated as criminals simply for carrying out their job.

Capt. Mangouras of the tanker *Prestige* risked his own life in battling to connect a towrope to take his stricken ship to safety in stormy weather. He was arrested by the Spanish authorities for his troubles and held at a top security prison for near on two years whilst Spain sought to assemble a case against him, largely to cover up the incompetence of their own maritime authorities. His bail was eventually set at 3 million, more than was set for people charged with murder. An officer was detained for 70 days in a Dubai jail, held in a cell with 50 others, after he was found in possession of Valium sleeping pills, which had been prescribed for him by his doctor but turned out to be banned in the United Arab Emirates. An officer was deported from the United States and banned from returning for 10 years simply because he stepped

ashore alongside the ship to read the ship's details for safety reasons at the bow and the stern.

NUMAST does not seek to defend a deliberate flouting of the law but some laws are clearly wrong. There is a new European directive on ship source pollution which exposes seafarers to huge fines and prison sentences even for accidental or non intentional oil spill. The Commission, like others, seems driven by the belief that oil soaked seabirds deserve more protection than the blood-soaked corpses of seafarers. Too often seafarers are getting thrown into jail around the world simply for being in the wrong place and at the wrong time. Too often seafarers are merely a convenient scapegoat for those with the real responsibility who hide behind offshore brass plate companies and flags of convenience. The law cannot find those with real responsibility so to appease some the law deals harshly with full force on seafarers.

The way in which the international shipping industry has become the world's most globalised, liberalised, and casualised industry over the past 50 years means that many seafarers now have no permanent employment relationship or even knowledge of who they work for. They are often serving with mixed nationality crews, on ships that fly the flags of countries that are incapable of offering any social or legal security and lack the political influence, or even the will, to stand up for the crews of their ships. In the United States the so-called war on terror means that seafarers from many countries around the world face the prospect of being detained on board their ships as high-risk aliens.

Seafarers are not the problem, they are part of the solution. Some US ports have armed guards on the gangways to stop seafarers from going ashore, often after months at sea. We talk about one law for the rich and one law for the poor, but there is certainly one law for those ashore and another for those at sea.

Seafarers have human rights too. It is time those rights were respected. Shipping is a vital industry and seafarers keep world trade flowing and every aspect of human life supported from the food that we eat, to the petrol we put in our cars, and it has all come by sea. The blame culture, the scape-goating of the seafaring profession must end. It threatens to drive skilled and experienced personnel from their jobs. Seafarers are virtually unique in their vulnerability after an accident and in often highly charged circumstances following accidents seafarers must have their rights protected.

NUMAST is working through the United Nations agencies, the IMO and the ILO, in an attempt to develop some sort of international mechanism to provide that protection, but if we are to succeed, Congress, we need your support and we need the support of the UK government to ensure that seafarers can no longer be treated as second-class citizens.

Jackie Darby (*Transport Salaried Staffs' Association*) seconding Motion 53 said: You have heard the details and examples of the injustices visited on workers in the sector. Most people would naturally support strong measures against polluters. Pollution at sea has consequences for fishing, tourism, sometimes the entire economy of the region where discharges come ashore. In this motion there is a theme which is quite familiar, with echoes in the railway industry (where I work) and the construction industry, to name but two, which is, get the visible ones, the ones in the front line, the workers, the ones who carry out decisions made by shadowy others, the ones who carry the can, the easy targets. Please support.

* *Motion 53 was CARRIED*

Transport

The President: I call Motion 54 on Transport. The General Council supports the motion.

Robert Monks (*United Road Transport Union*) moved Motion 54. He said: I can already hear you asking, what are digital tachograph smartcards. Very briefly, all large goods vehicles are fitted with what are known as tachographs. Amongst other information, they record on a small round paper chart the amount of driving time a professional lorry driver undertakes during a working shift. The tachograph chart is issued free to professional lorry drivers. From next year, manufacturers of lorries are required to fit their vehicles with a new type of digital tachograph. In order that our members comply with the law they will when driving such vehicles have to utilise what are known as digital tachograph smartcards. Will these be issued free like the paper charts? No. The government in their wisdom has determined that the smartcards are to be issued by the DVLA at a cost of just under £40 to each and every professional lorry driver required to use them.

Speaking in support of Composite 11 on Monday, comrades from the T&G touched on the vexed question of the UK's professional drivers' shortage. A detailed survey carried out this year by the sector, Skills for Logistics, revealed that the UK has a shortage of just under 50,000 professional lorry drivers. Why are people not being attracted to such jobs? One reason is the ongoing cost of retaining a large goods vehicle licence once you have undergone the expensive training.

At last year's Congress, comrades, you unanimously supported a motion from my union calling on the Government to provide compulsory medicals for professional lorry drivers at no cost to the driver. The TUC's 2005 budget submission presented to the Chancellor in February reflected the concerns expressed at last year's Congress on these licensing requirements for professional lorry drivers.

Has the Government acted on these concerns from our movement? They most certainly have. During the summer, conscious of concerns expressed by the employers, the proposed 1.2 pence per litre fuel duty increase due to be implemented this month was shelved by the Chancellor. Thanks, Gordon, for listening to the movement representing working women and men.

Ian McCartney in addressing Congress stated that the empty rhetoric must stop. I hope the Chancellor takes heed of this upon his return from New York. Gordon, do not address comrades at Congress and tell them that our skills are the most valued of assets and that you are investing in transport, if you are not prepared to back it up by investing in the people working within the industry.

Perhaps, as was indicated at Congress with the TUC and the Treasury proposing to work closer together on the Chancellor's pledges, professional lorry drivers' worth to this nation's economic stability and growth will at last be recognised. But, please, when you are working together do it quietly for fear of waking a very tired tiger. Comrades, please support.

A delegate formally seconded the motion.

* *Motion 54 was CARRIED*

Fire and rescue service emergency response standards in the UK

The President: I now call Motion 55, fire and rescue service emergency response standards in the UK. The General Council supports the motion.

Matt Wrack (*Fire Brigades Union*) moved Motion 55. He said: Earlier in the week, Congress, we heard about the intervention of public servants in the bombings in London. I want to expand on some of the other work that the fire and rescue service is involved in and to

give some figures which we have been able to obtain from the Government.

In 2003, Congress, there were 3,868 people rescued from fires in England. They are the most recent figures which are available and they demonstrate a rise of over 42 percent in a decade. The figures demonstrate that nine out of ten people involved in fires are being rescued alive by the fire and rescue service. These are government figures that we have obtained by asking parliamentary questions. They do not include those escaping without the aid of the fire service or those rescued by neighbours or passers-by, nor do they include individuals who are not at immediate risk and who are evacuated from buildings; these are rescues carried out by fire fighters in the course of their duties. These figures we believe clearly highlight the success story of the UK fire and rescue service and we need to protect that success story and protect the fire service.

We have two areas of major concern at the present time, Congress: first, in relation to our emergency fire control. The Government's plan is to regionalise our controls and move from 46 local controls to nine regional controls. In our view it is a costly plan and those costs are escalating and are out of control. The plan will cost hundreds of jobs. It will lead to a loss of the local knowledge of our skilled members in those local controls, and we believe it will lead to a worsening of the service. Unfortunately, despite public opposition, despite widespread opposition in parliament, the Government through the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister is intent on pressing ahead with that decision. We urge you to support us in our campaign against that regionalisation of emergency fire controls.

The second area where we have concerns is in relation to the national standards of cover. These have been abolished and replaced by a move to localised fire planning. From national standards we now have 58 fire authorities who produce 58 different standards. We do not believe that is right. We believe it is introducing a postcode lottery into your fire and rescue service.

In the West Midlands at the current time they have just introduced a plan which reduces the number of fire engines available at night, and within days of it happening a serious fire happened within that brigade and resources were seriously stretched. In London, in relation to the bombings, the local plan has moved fire engines from Central London despite the warnings of the union, particularly in relation to the terrorist threat. In Suffolk, at the present time our members are engaging in strike action against local cuts.

We think the cuts are being justified by misinformation that has been spread by certain people within the service, by councillors on fire authorities and unfortunately on occasion these are being justified by chief officers who are deliberately underplaying the role, the rescue role, played by our fire-fighters, members of our union.

The claim is that intervention does not matter any more because what we are doing is preventing fires from happening and on that basis there should be a shift of resources away from intervention and emergency response to preventing fires from happening. We have nothing against that, Congress; we have supported that for many decades and our members are heavily involved in attempts to educate the public to ensure that fires do not happen. The simple fact is that fires do happen and the figures I have given demonstrate that clearly when they happen what is needed is a rapid intervention by an emergency fire service.

So, we are calling in the resolution for new national standards. We do not want to see a postcode lottery, we want to see national standards. We urge the office

of the Deputy Prime Minister to engage with us in a discussion about how those standards can be introduced. I urge your support. Thanks, Congress.

Anne True (*UNISON*), in seconding Motion 55, said:

I do not work in fire and rescue services, and I hope that my colleagues in those services do not mind if I say I would rather not ever need them, but I do know that if they were not willing to put themselves on the line many of us would be that much the worse off. I would like to think that, no matter where I lived or worked, if I had a house fire or was in an accident then I would get the same speedy response.

This motion speaks on behalf of the Fire Service. My union, UNISON, represents the vast majority of ambulance staff and also many in control rooms and we share the concerns of our sister union that quality and standards are being sacrificed in the interests of modernisation.

The media thinks nothing of praising ambulance workers one day for their response to difficult situations and the next day criticising them for their response times.

Setting standard maximum response times is only the first step. This alone will not deliver minimum acceptable standards of service delivery across the UK. For example, there have been set maximum response times within the Ambulance Service within many years, the duration of which depends on the seriousness of the emergency. However, these have failed to deliver a UK-wide standard of service because there are currently too many and unclear categories of calls and no set standards of how response times should be measured.

Such standards are of no use to the public or the patient and could be said to be dishonest if the clock only starts ticking five minutes after they have dialled 999. It could well take that long to activate a response due to rationalisation of support services which are driven by cost-savings and not service delivery.

The recently Ambulance Review Report sought to address these failings. The motion, rightly, also highlights identification of minimum resource requirements as a key issue. There is little point in meeting a target time if the resources sent to the emergency are ill-equipped to deal with it.

To address this situation, we need standard criteria which measure the effectiveness of response in addition to an accurate record of the time taken to arrive at the scene. The number one priority in setting UK-wide standards for emergency services must be that they clearly and transparently show that they actually improve and enhance the service to the public. On no account should they be used as a smokescreen for cost-cutting measures. Please support the motion.

* *Motion 55 was CARRIED.*

BNP and the Race Relations Act

Joe Marino (*Bakers, Food and Allied Workers Union*) moved Emergency Motion 4.

He said: Given the time constraints, I do not propose, comrades, to go through all the issues which moved us to put this emergency motion forward. I think the reasons are adequately set out in the motion itself.

I want, very briefly, to deal with the three points at the end. They call on Congress and the General Council, as I am sure they will, to support the appeal against the decision which is to be heard shortly. I think that is important because after the debate we had on Monday about the BNP and about infiltration of trade union, we need to show unity. We have all been through the issue of infiltration and we have to find ways of uniting together in order to stop that. What we must not allow ourselves to do is to be in a position

of being picked off one by one. Therefore, the unity through the TUC in order to support this appeal is, I think, essential.

Secondly, we need to be urging the CRE to support the appeal as well because if something like this is not a role of the CRE then we must begin to wonder what the role of the CRE is. I am sure, in discussions we have with colleagues at the CRE, we can get them on board in order to do that. This is an essential issue for all of us for the reasons explained in the emergency motion.

Thirdly, we must lobby the Government to amend the law if the decision is not overturned. We need to do that because when the law is wrong, quite clearly, the law needs changing. I do not need to go into any length here as to how we consider that to be a bad law if that decision is not overturned.

It was said in the debate on Monday that there is no role for fascists within our organisation. There is no role for fascists within society. This is not something that we can compromise over. This is not something that we can do deals over. This is something we have to confront. I am sure Congress will support the emergency motion and I am sure the General Council will take it forward.

Ed Blissett (*GMB*) seconded the emergency motion.

He said: Sisters and brothers, during the past year the GMB in the London Region has been campaigning against the evils of fascism in the East End. We have been successful with our sisters and brothers from the rest of the labour movement in ensuring that BNP councillors have been defeated. We have also been successful in rooting out fascists from the workplace. It is simply unacceptable for the Labour Government to allow a position in which the legislation as it currently stands to be used by fascists under the Race Relations Act that is meant to be in place to protect our black sisters and brothers. If it is the case that this legislation can be used in that manner, then the Labour Government have an absolute duty to change that legislation immediately so, as amended, it protects those black workers and stops the fascists from using that type of legislation.

Sisters and brothers, I call on you, I demand from you, that you support this emergency motion. Thank you.

The President: The General Council supports the emergency motion.

* *Emergency Motion 4 was CARRIED.*

Women in Iraq

The President: I now call Emergency Motion 5, Women in Iraq. The General Council supports the motion. I will be calling Sally Hunt to explain the General Council's position.

Tony Kearns (*Communication Workers Union*) moved Emergency Motion 5.

He said: I do not know if it is just me but I am getting really sick and tired when I wake up in the morning to see *these* type of images on the paper and on the television screens about the continual bombings taking place in Iraq. The situation facing the Iraqi people, and women in particular, continues to degenerate and continues to be of great concern, but this motion differs from the debate we had yesterday because it is about after the occupation. It is about where we go from here. Nothing distorts a nation's development more than foreign occupation.

The debate on the new constitution in Iraq has been completely distorted by the United States' Government. The people who we are appealing to here are trade unionists. We are trade unionists because we know that a trade unionist will defend working people. The bomb that exploded yesterday

killed more than 150 people but it killed 150 working people.

The artificial timescales introduced by George Bush have made the constitution unacceptable. The constitution has now been forced to go to a premature referendum. This is what the constitution says on the position of women. It talks about equality. I refer to article 2(1), section A, of the constitution, which says: "No law can be passed that contradicts the undisputed rules of Islam", and contained within that is the position of women. It was said from this rostrum to loud applause earlier this week that if your religion discriminates, your religion has got it wrong.

However, the constitution goes further. The constitution has enshrined that discrimination into the national law. At the same time, it weakens the role of the trade unions. It is clear now that a danger is emerging that Iraq could slide into civil war. The United States' occupation forces are so unpopular that they can only remain in Iraq by fostering divisions amongst the Iraqis. It is the classic tactic of divide and rule. The shocking condemnation of the position of women and religious minorities is that they appeared to be more respected under Saddam Hussein than under the United States' occupation. This demonstrates that the constitution is solely the business of the Iraqi people and not those of the foreigners who seek to impose their ideas by jets, tanks and guns.

Of course, one notable problem, as I said, is that it Decree 875 puts the position of trade unions in jeopardy. As Mary from NATFHE said yesterday, the decree seizes trade unions' money, to be controlled and dispensed by the Government. The IFTU has asked the Director-General of the ILO to personally intervene in an effort to restore trade union rights.

Conference, in any war civilians are amongst the casualties. In the First World War, 5 per cent of the casualties were civilians. In armed conflicts today, around the world, 75 per cent of casualties in war are civilian, and the vast majority of them have proved to be women. The United States' and the UK Governments have refused to count the victims. In relation to the position of women in war and the position of women in Iraq, I think it was Barbara from Amicus who, yesterday, said that it is quite clear that tens of thousands of women have been abused, raped, tortured, maimed and killed by the Coalition armed forces and heavily armed private security forces. This has given to the green light to the reactionary forces inside Iraq to attack women in a similar manner.

Under the constitution, as we have seen, women in Iraq are threatened with being excluded from society. We think that the TUC must play a part in supporting our goal of achieving better conditions for women.

If you look at the emergency motion, it is not exhaustive. It lists organisations that we believe the TUC should be working with and lobbying to enhance this position. As I have said, the list is not exhaustive.

I remember seeing one particular image from the Balkan war which remains in my mind more than anything else. It was a picture taken on a sunny morning in a woodland area and hanging still from the branch of a tree was a woman who had hanged herself. She had got to the point of giving up because in the village she came from the men had been taken away and murdered and the women who were left were abused, raped and attacked as an instrument of war.

As I said, this is different from the debate about the occupation that we had yesterday. This is about where this trade union movement lays its cards and how it deals with this issue in the future. We are trade union.

Let me show you *this* picture, which says: "Politicians are voted the world's least trusted people". That is

hardly a surprise. So it falls on us as trade unionists to defend the right of other trade unionists and to defend women's rights around the world. Yes, we support the end of the occupation; yes, we support the demonstration on the 24th September but, as trade unionists, we offer the best chance of raising the condition of women in Iraq after the occupation.

Sue Bond (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) seconded the emergency motion. She said: President, Congress, let me spell out for you the reality of what life is like now for women in Iraq. For most it is a living nightmare. For the thousands and thousands of women who once worked in the public sector their jobs have now gone. Unemployment is now running at 70 per cent. Yes, you heard me right: 70 per cent! The occupation has confined them to their homes. Each day begins with a struggle to get the basics of survival for their families, risking their lives in the dangerous streets for food, water, gas canisters and medicine. Each day ends with relief at surviving death threats, car bombs and violent attacks. In a country awash with oil, food is scares and acute child malnutrition has doubled.

Of the one hundred thousand civilian deaths since the invasion, half have been women and children. The land is now riddled with depleted uranium and the terrifying landscape of past and present conflicts.

This motion argues that free trade unions are vital to defend the violation of women's human rights in Iraq absolutely. PCS believes that to bring peace and democracy in Iraq and for free trade unions to build and flourish the occupation must end because that is the main barrier to the development of a democratic civil society. The occupation is the key architect of institutionalised sectarian and ethnic divisions. In the United States opposition to the occupation is accelerating and Mr Bush's approval ratings are plummeting.

What must happen in the UK is that we must keep up the pressure. The anti-war protests here have been an inspiration to others around the world, protests in which trade unions have played a crucial role. We now have a responsibility to make the demonstration on September 24th as big as possible to show that the opposition to the occupation is global. Support our sisters and brothers in Iraq, building genuine free trade unions and organisations in line with the statement to be made by the General Council, and bring the troops home. Bring them home by Christmas and give the Iraqi people back the right to determine their own future.

Sally Hunt (*General Council*): President, I will keep this contribution brief as much as has been said already. The General Council will be supporting this emergency motion but with an explanation. The explanation is very simple. We believe that our primary focus if we are to help women and men, although this motion is focused on women, and trade unionists in particular, and women in general in Iraq, it must be done through the trade union movement as our primary way of working.

The emergency motion is broadly in line with Congress policy. As you will see from bullet point (iii), it singles out just one women's organisation, which is the Organisation for Women's Freedom in Iraq. We do not, at the same time, have reference to unions such as the Iraqi Teachers' Union, the Journalists' Union and many others. However, it was welcome to hear the CWU note that this was not meant to be the absolute in terms of those unions which we should work with. It is very much the General Council's view that we will continue to work with all relevant organisations but primarily with the trade union movement in order to take that work forward. Thank you.

Chris Morley (*National Union of Journalists*) speaking in support of Emergency Motion 5, said: Last month I had the honour of taking part in a UNESCO sponsored conference of Iraqi journalists in Amman, Jordan. It was too dangerous to hold the conference in Iraq. Many women journalists were present from all parts of Iraq, but particularly from the south whose experiences moved me. They were passionate that the emerging Iraq should not snuff out their rights and leave them condemned to irrelevance in that society. Currently about 25 per cent of media workers in Iraq are women but there are virtually none in senior positions, no editors or owners.

One delegate put the situation in perspective when she said that a newspaper boss had told her, "I don't want women in my newspaper. Women aren't interested in politics". Another from the Shia south told movingly how from the day they were born many women felt that they were anonymous even in their own families. This is part of a wider cultural issue but the important question is how do we support women who want to break free and live their lives how they want?

The irony of the invasion and occupation, with all of its blood and tears, is that Bush and Blair threaten to preside over the ending of a secular based society in Iraq. Iraqi women trade unionists are desperate not to be sold out and that is what we are in danger of doing. We must not be complicit in that by our own silence. We must reach out and give support and the benefit of our experience in the struggle for equality to our sisters and brothers in Iraq. We must not let women's rights in Iraq slip into darkness because Bush and Blair need to surrender them to get a short-term deal on the new constitution. Support the emergency resolution.

* *Emergency Motion 5 was CARRIED*

Adoption of the General Council Report

The President: Congress, that concludes the formal business of Congress. I call for the General Council's Report to be adopted.

* *The General Council Report was ADOPTED*

Votes of Thanks

The President: I now have a number of votes of thanks to make to those who have contributed to the smooth running of Congress. I move a vote of thanks to the staff at the Brighton Centre for all they have done to ensure that the Congress runs smoothly, and to the stewards for all their assistance during the week. (*Applause*)

I would like to thank the crèche workers and a special thank you to the team of sign language interpreters and verbatim reports who have worked so hard throughout the week. (*Applause*) Your applause clearly shows that you agree.

A number of colleagues are leaving the General Council. Many thanks to Andy Gilchrist, Bob Crow and Matthew McGregor for their contributions to the work of the General Council. (*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 the General Purposes Committee.

During the course of the year George Brumwell of UCATT, who has served on the General Council for 13 years, left and he is entitled to the gold badge of Congress. George was lead spokesperson on health and safety and enjoyed a high profile as a strong advocate for his union and its members. George is not available to be with us today but we will arrange for

him to receive the badge and we will send him your good wishes. *(Applause)*

Pat Hawkes of the NUT is also departing at this Congress after 13 years and she, too, receives the gold badge of Congress. Pat is the Chair of the Women's Committee and has contributed enormously to the TUC's work on equality. I have great pleasure in presenting you with the Gold Badge of Congress, Pat. *(Presentation made amidst applause)* I am going to invite Pat to say a few words to Congress.

Pat Hawkes: President, thank you very much. I will value this badge. I would like to say thanks to my union, the NUT, and to Steve Sinnott, our general secretary, who has always supported me in representing women teachers in the wider trade union movement. I have been privileged to work on equalities and international issues over the years. I have made some wonderful friends, too. I remember the warmth of working with other union members on the General Council, the Executive Council and the equality committees.

Congress, the TUC staff are a tremendous team with great integrity. Their support has helped us to serve our members and the wider movement. I thank them. I know, Congress, that we are stronger together. I have valued working with all of you. Thank you, President, for this gold badge. I do appreciate it.

The President: Jenny Thurston of Prospect is departing following six years on the General Council. Jenny has served on the TUC Executive Committee and the Industrial Injuries Advisory Council. So, Jenny, I have great pleasure in presenting you with the Gold Badge of Congress. *(Presentation made amidst applause)*

Jenny Thurston: Thank you very much, President. It has been an honour to represent my union, Prospect, on the TUC General Council and also on the Executive Committee. I have been particularly enjoying the work with colleagues from other unions as well as having access to the excellence of our TUC staff.

Although we still have a way to go, I believe that we have made important progress on the issues which motivated me and others to become involved in the movement, including employee rights, equality and social justice. I am honoured if I think that I have made a contribution to that work. Thank you for the TUC gold badge of Congress and thank you to everyone for your friendship and support. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Congress President 2006

The President: Finally, Congress, it is my honour to announce that the next President of the TUC, who takes office from the close of Congress, is Gloria Mills. *(Applause and cheers)* I think that is a yes from UNISON, Gloria. I wish her well and hope that she enjoys her year as President as much as I have done. In fact, if you only enjoy it half as much as I have done, Gloria, you will have a whale of a time. So thank you very much.

Vote of Thanks to the President

Sofi Taylor (UNISON) moved the vote of thanks to the President.

She said: Congress, on Tuesday evening at the General Council dinner Ian McCartney took me aside and said, "Well, Sofi, can you do this little vote of thanks for me. We are both from Glasgow, both about the same height and we both wear glasses, and I don't think Congress would notice the difference". The deal breaker was when he slipped me a fiver. "I'll do anything for a fiver", I said.

Being President of the TUC is no easy task but it is one that Jeannie has risen to in some style. As you would

expect from the General Council's lead on pensions, attention to detail has to be excellent. As you would expect from someone from the CWU, communication has been spot on. *(Applause)*

Congress, chairing the Annual Congress is just one small part of the role. Away from the public eye is the General Council, the Executive Committee to chair; speeches to give; meetings to attend; and ministers to cajole. All this is going on at the same time as Jeannie is doing a demanding job in her own union. It is no wonder Billy talked of Jeannie's ability to multi-task on Monday, and it is no wonder that everybody speaks so highly of her. Indeed, Alan Johnson told us yesterday that he is a founder member of the Jeannie Drake Fan Club.

This fan club is recruiting new members rapidly and a case study will be sent to the TUC Organising and Representation Task Group. We are not slow to learn from new tricks. This week I have seen the very best of Jeannie, not just tirelessly working behind the scenes which begins at 8.15 in the morning and ending late at night; not just the diplomacy and negotiating skills but, above all, the human touch, the warmth and the smile. We see that in the courtesy and the sensitivity shown to all speakers, especially to our first time delegates. Jeannie has not stopped people in mid-sentence. That is evidence of this progressive and humane sentencing policy that even Napo and the POA would be proud of.

I know this has been a week of many highlights for Jeannie. I could tell you about the risqué joke at the General Council dinner but not just in front of the Prime Minister, and she called Tony "Tony", but also her father. Indeed, I can tell you of her enthusiasm when the PFA delegation arrived.

I know that what gave Jeannie the most satisfaction in a year in which we campaigned to Make Poverty History was reading out the letter from Nelson Mandela. That is proof that solidarity matters even more. *(Applause)*

Let me finish on a personal note. It has been a pleasure to work as part of a team on the rostrum but I have to declare a vested interest. I will be chairing the Black Workers' Conference next year and I have done this so that I can learn from the best and, Jeannie, you are the best. *(Applause)* You are not only a great President but a great woman President. England may have won the Ashes on Monday but we will all remember this week because of you, Jeannie. Thank you for your work during Congress; thank you for your work during the past 12 months and thank you for your outstanding work each and every year on pensions and so much more. We wish you the very best.

It gives me great pleasure to present the gold badge of Congress and the Congress Bell to our President for 2005. *(Presentation made amidst applause)*

The President: Thank you, Sofi. I thought that was a brilliant speech, even if it was about me! But it was excellent! The trouble is when people say nice things about you -- it is not an experience I have too often -- I always get nervous because you know you are about to fall flat on your face around the corner. However, I thought that was really nice and thank you very much indeed. Let me, perhaps, say a few words before I hand over to the General Secretary.

I am not one for public emotion - I get emotional inside - but I think if you are a retiring President of the TUC, you can indulge yourself for a few moments, which I will. It has been an absolutely fantastic year. I have met so many people and had the opportunity to participate in so many causes. Thank you, Congress, because you gave me the privilege, because if you had not agreed to me doing it, I would not have been able to do it.

I know at midnight when the clock strikes, the luxuries will be gone, the puff of smoke will appear, the pumpkin and the four rats will be next to me, but it will not matter. I have had a great time. I have had a whirlwind week at the ball. I have sat next to Prince Charming all week! It has been absolutely fantastic and I would not have missed it for the world.

I want to mention one or two people that I want to thank. I want to thank Brendan. He is a complete dream to work with. He really is! He is very clear on what you need to do; he does not leave you confused and he supports you. It is very easy to be a good chair when the backing behind you has such clarity. We meet before General Council meetings and Executive, and he has never left me in any doubt about what is appropriate, what is expected and what my role is. You have been an absolute dream to work with.

The only thing is, a day or so after I was elected as President, I went into Congress House. Everybody kept saying, "Hello, Jeannie! "Hi, Jeannie", "How are you, Jeannie?" Do you remember that scene from *The Graduate* when he goes into the hotel with Mrs Robinson's daughter and the porters and other people are saying, "Hello, hello"? I thought to myself, "Why are they all saying 'hello' to me?" Then I suddenly thought, "I am the President. Oh, right! I am the President." It took me a few days to realise that I was actually the President!

I would like to say a personal thanks to Frances and Kay who have been such a supportive double act. They have completely kept my chin out of the water when it has been going down a few times. I would like personally to say, Frances and Kay, thank you for everything. You have kept me afloat. Thank you very much indeed.

Thank you to the TUC staff. They are just so supportive. My every need in terms of discharging the role of chair has been met. They respond so quickly. They are so committed and the quality of their work is superb. I am not going to single out individual ones because, by implication, that means I am not complimenting the others, and all of the staff at the TUC are fantastic.

I have had a great time chairing the General Council. They have been fun. They are quite fun, you know. They are a nice crowd and they are actually passionate about things. I know they are referred to as the bureaucracy, or this, that or the other, but they are a group of people who care with passion and speak with passion. They do not go into Congress House and suddenly change. They remain passionate and committed people.

However, we do have huge challenges still to come. The biggest must be to recruit and grow. There are millions and millions of workers out *there* in the private sector whom we have to recruit. We must shout louder about our successes. Being the trade union Movement, we tend to spend more energy on criticising each other than going out *there* and telling the world and the workers what we are good at, where we have succeeded and what we have achieved for them. We need to leverage our influence politically and industrially for workers because, as the logo says, we are "Stronger together". We have to set out our course. We have a clear sense of direction, something that perhaps many of us are thinking is lacking in the United States, the most powerful economy in the world in 2005.

However, it is clear they did not have a very good sense of direction in 1995 either because I recently genuinely came across a transcript of the actual radio conversation between a US naval ship and the Canadian authorities off the coast of Newfoundland in October 1995 released by the Chief of Naval Operations.

It reads: "Canadians: Please divert your course 15 degrees to the south to avoid a collision.

Americans: Recommend you divert your course 15 degrees to the north.

Canadians: Negative. You will have to divert your course 15 degrees to the south to avoid a collision.

Americans: This is the captain of a US Navy ship. I say divert your course.

Canadians: No. I say again, divert your course.

Americans: This is the aircraft carrier USS Lincoln, the second biggest ship in the United States Atlantic Fleet. We are accompanied by three destroyers, three cruisers and numerous support vessels. I demand that you change your course 15 degrees north, that is 1-5 degrees north, or counter measures will be taken to ensure the safety of this ship.

Canadians: Well, we're a lighthouse. It's your call."

Unlike the American Navy on that occasion, we know exactly where we are going. We know exactly what our sense of direction is. We just have to have the will to get there.

Finally, I thank my own union, the CWU. They have been nominating me for nearly 18 years. I would not even be here without their nomination. They are a great crowd of people. I will be really pleased to get back there on Friday morning. They have been sending me notes all week, wishing me well. The best one, I have to say -- I have kept it -- says: "There are three great women leaders in this hall. Two of them are sitting in the CWU delegation. Love Jeannie and Andrea." I thought that was pretty good!

The bell is great. I am so pleased with the fact -- I had not realised, guys and girls -- that it has "CWU" on it. Anyway, best of luck, Gloria. As I said, if you enjoy it half as much as I did, you will have a ball. Thank you.

I have finally blown it - I threw my script away! Now I call on the General Secretary.

Vote of Thanks to the Media

Brendan Barber (*General Secretary*) said:

Thank you, Jeannie. As colleagues will know, it is traditional for the General Secretary at the end of Congress to move the final item of business, and that is our vote of thanks to the media. I wanted to begin by just a personal word of thanks to the *Daily Telegraph* journalist who got the week off to a very good start for me by describing me as 'Chief Sitting Duck'.

Thanks, too, to *The Times* leader writer this morning who in a rather condescending and patronising way said that I was 'often sensible'. Well, to *The Times*, I have one thing to say: (*blows raspberry and thumbs nose*) (*Laughter amidst applause*)

So I am beginning to think again about the motion heard yesterday opposing censorship!

It has been a good week for trade unionists. We have shown unity in our support for fairer rights at work; unity in our strong support for the Gate Gourmet workers; unity on pensions and unity in our response to the London bombings and in our opposition both to terrorism and racism. However, I fear that a good week for us is not necessarily a good week for the media.

Those journalists who have been with us during the week have struggled to get a word in edgeways between the Ashes coming home and petrol prices going up. If truth is told, we probably gave our cause no help by beating the journalists at cricket last Saturday. Taking their ball home, you might expect, but I fear some took their pens as well! So we will have to give our own report on the week.

I would like very much to echo Sofi's words. Jeannie has been an absolutely smashing President. She is a

great advert for her union and a wonderful role model for young women activists who are looking to make their mark in the trade union Movement.

No one who knows Jeannie would be surprised by the way she has chaired Congress with great consideration for delegates, a real intelligent appreciation of the debates and never once losing her cool or composure. She has displayed all that legendary impartiality that you would expect from a Congress Chair. All delegates are equal; it is just that women delegates and those from the CWU are just a bit more equal than others!

Jeannie has been a real joy to work with. Certainly everyone in the TUC is very much looking forward to working with Gloria as she assumes her new responsibilities as President. She is the first black woman President of the TUC. That is a rather special day. *(Applause)*

There have been just one or two hiccups; the question of observance of the lights, for example. Not everyone has clearly come to a halt when the red light has flashed. There have been a number of excuses offered. I would like to share a couple of them with you. Paul Kenny said that he actually did not see the red light. Well, that might be good enough for the Metropolitan Police, Paul, but the GPC I do not think will be so indulgent! Ruth Winters came up with the rather novel explanation that FBU members were allowed to pass red lights in cases of emergency. But, Ruth, it was a composite you were moving, not an emergency! The broadcasting unions assured us that in their jobs a red light meant you were on air, so you should start speaking, not stop!

However, for all of you who have been tempted to go on too long -- that might include me at the moment -- let me remind you that, just as it was last year, it has been the non-speaking parts that have really stolen the show at Congress this week. I have already mentioned the Gate Gourmet workers who were in the balcony on Monday. We also had the lay rep award winners and, of course, the emergency service workers who came together with us to remember the victims of the London bombings and whose quiet dignity impressed us all. I do not think that particular session of Congress had a single word of coverage, but for me it was probably the most special moment of the week. *(Applause)*

I got the impression that the highlight of Jeannie's week was the photocall with the non-speaking footballers, of course, followed by the letter from Nelson Mandela. So, remember, next year, the secret of success at Congress is ... Shh. That is, of course, if we are all here next year! I was rather taken by an idea from a BECTU delegate yesterday that we should move from a real Congress to a virtual one. It is an idea that we are already now working on. I think we can cover the formal Congress business pretty easily. It is the receptions and the entertainment union's party that might be a bit more of a problem! On balance, maybe we had better all come together again next year after all!

I hope it has been a great week for you all. Even more importantly, I hope we all go away from Brighton encouraged and inspired to do even more to make life better for the millions of working people who depend so critically on our efforts. I move the Vote of Thanks to the media. *(Applause)*

The President: I now call on Andy Taylor of the industrial correspondents to reply on behalf of the media. *(Applause)*

Andy Taylor (*Industrial Correspondents Group*) said: I have only been employment correspondent at the *Financial Times* for about six months, so I am very much the new boy on the press benches, which is probably why they have asked me to reply to this Vote of Thanks because I have not had time to alienate anybody yet!

I am very honoured to have been asked to reply to Brendan's remarks. This, as I have said, is my first TUC annual conference and it has been a fascinating week: fire alarms in the hotel and false alarms in the conference hall. You see, I have been watching how government ministers handle their speech-making and trying to pick up a few hints as to how to do this. The first thing you do from my observations is you send in special advisers in advance to spell out the kind of tough approach you expect to take towards the unions on issues such as raising the state pension age and sympathetic industrial action, et cetera. Then you arrive in the hall and you make a very different speech, with only obscure references to the issues your team has previously raised, mostly praising the unions for their help and support and stressing the vital role they play in protecting society.

I must apologise here because I do not have a proper handle on this yet. I am afraid I have not managed to complete the first part with the special advisers. Therefore, I am going to have to stick to the bit about thanking and praising the unions, on behalf of all the media, for their hospitality, help and guidance throughout the week.

Although I have only been doing this particular job for six months, I do have previous experience of the generous hospitality of trades unionists. My first job as a journalist 36 years ago was for a dockers' newspaper in east London. One of my first assignments was to go for an interview with shop stewards in the old India/Millwall docks.

The stewards decided to take me to a local pub. They must have liked me because they kept buying me lots of alcohol. The more I drank, the more, shall we say, I became conversational. They must have liked my wit and wisdom because they decided it was too good to keep for themselves alone and they decided they should share it. So they paid for a taxi to take me back to the office with a little bit of extra money for the driver just to ensure he took me personally into the presence of my editor. Having seen some of my colleagues returning to their hotels, I can inform you that trade union hospitality has lost none of its potency. Should those same shop stewards be out there somewhere, I will find you, I can assure you!

After leaving the *Port* newspaper, I joined the *Coventry Evening Telegraph* in the early years of the 1970s where, as a very young and callow industrial reporter, I came into contact with some really helpful trade unionists when I was trying to understand the complexities of industrial relations. Two names stand out. The first is Bill Lapworth of the Transport and General Workers', who had such a hard act to follow in Jack Jones. Bill did that with great skill and integrity. The second is Frank Chater of the then AUEW, an equally dedicated trade unionist and a great help to me.

So it is with trade unionists like these in mind and the new friendships and relationships I am now forging that I am particularly honoured to pay this Vote of Thanks to the trade union movement, and the TUC in particular, for being such generous and helpful hosts. General secretaries, senior officials and shop stewards have been generous with their time and patience at a host of briefings during the week. The social events, judging by the appearance of my colleagues, have been as entertaining as ever! Again, many thanks.

However, I would like at this point to pay particular thanks to the back room staff who have made this conference so successful; the people who have handled our accreditations, et cetera, and particularly the press officers of the TUC and other unions who have worked tirelessly to ensure that we all have the information and analysis that we need in time to meet our deadlines. As ever, we have had a great service. To all the other hundreds of TUC and trade union staff who

have made our stay so comfortable and doing our work so easy, I also say thank you.

When I left the *Coventry Evening Telegraph* in 1976, I joined the *Financial Times* in the hope of becoming part of their labour team. It has taken me 29 years, but it is nice to be here. Thank you very much. (*Applause*)

The President: Thank you, Andy, for that excellent reply.

I now finally declare the 137th Congress closed and ask you to join with me in singing *Old 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 7,728 f 18,031 total 25,759
main trades and industries all staff with in HBOS plc,
including the retail network, Intelligent Finance, HBOS
Card Services, Halifax Direct, Halifax Estate Agents,
HBOS Financial Services
Gen sec Ged Nichols
Delegates
Chris Goldtthorpe Tom Harrison
Marilyn Morris Ged Nichols
Doug Scott
male 4 female 1 total 5

ACM

Association for College Management

10 De Montfort Street
Leicester LE1 7GG
t 0116 275 5076 f 0116 255 0548
e administration@acm.uk.com
www.acm.uk.com
m 1,700 f 1,851 total 3,551
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 female 0 total 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 796 f 2,145 total 2,941
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
J Brian Harrison-Jennings Charles Ward
male 2 female 0 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
total 619 male/female split not available
main trades and industries airline cabin crew
LEC Kevin P Creighan

ALGUS

Alliance and Leicester Group Union of Staff

22 Upper King Street, Leicester LE1 6XE
t 0116 285 6585 f 0116 285 4996
www.algus.org.uk
m 663 f 1,791 total 2,454
main trades and industries represents the majority of
staff working for the Alliance and Leicester plc
Gen sec Debbie Cort
Delegates
Peter Greenwood Rose O'Neill
Nick Wright
male 2 female 1 total 3

Amicus

35 King Street, Covent Garden
London WC2E 8JG
t 020 7420 8900 f 020 7240 4723
www.amicustheunion.org
m 933,014 f 266,986 total 1,200,000
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, printing,
professional staff in universities, commercial sales, the
voluntary sector, banking and financial services, and
the National Health Service
Gen Sec Derek Simpson
Delegates
Anne Abbott John Ayling
Malcolm Ball Richard Baker
Derek Barlow Les Bayliss
Ben Benkarmaz Dave Bowyer
Sandy Boyle Davy Brockett
Jim Buckley Tony Burke
Kevin Carroll Gail Cartmail
Richard Clifton Doug Collins
Richard Cook Nick Corby
Mike Cummins David Cunningham
Liz Daff Tim Davison
Steve Davison Ged Dempsey
Sybil Dilworth James Donaghy
Elizabeth Donnelly Barry Drohan

Tony Dubbins	Siobhan Endean
Lorene Fabian	Tony Fashesin
Tom Feeney	James Friel
Pete Gillard	Colin Green
David Guiry	Lesley Hammond
Joyce Hampshire	Andy Hanks
Margaret Hazell	Simon Hemmings
Paul Heywood	Georgina Hirsch
Ian Jackson	Roger Jeary
Clive Jenkins	Philip Jenkins
David Jones	Margaret Lawson
Lesley Mansell	Alan Martin
Christian Matheson	Richard McCauley
Linda McCulloch	Helen McFarlane
Danny McLellan	Jim McWilliams
Andy Mills	Dave Morgan
David Morgan	Ann Morgan
Sithabile Mpala	Bill Murphy
Barbara Murray	Thomas Murray
John Oliver	Elizabeth Phillips
Brian Rice	Frances Ridgway
Dougie Rooney	Margaret Sharkey
Malcolm Sherriff	Derek Simpson
Jack Skinner	John Smales
Margaret Smith	Ian Smith
Jeff Smith	Bill Spiers
Helen Stewart	Jane Stewart
Mickey Stewart	Wendy Stuart
Ed Sweeney	Paul Talbot
Steve Tattersall	Carolyn Taylor
Jimmy Thompson	Dave Thomson
Brian Tildesley	Pam Tinsley MBE
Agnes Tolmie	Colin Walker
John Walsh	Brian Watkins
Andrew Wheatley	Trevor Whitehead
Eileen Woods	Joe Woods
Susan Worsley	Mark Yates

male 75 female 27 total 102

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 2,336 f 6,616 total 8,952
 main trades and industries staff employed in the Abbey National
 Gen sec Linda Rolph
 Linda Rolph
 male 0 female 1 total 1

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
 m 16,212 f 586 total 16,798
 main trades and industries railways (drivers, operational supervisors and staff)
 Gen sec Keith Norman
 Delegates
 S Connolly Alan Donnelly
 Alan McQuire Andy Reed
 male 4 female 0 total 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.atl.org.uk
 m 29,649 f 82,205 total 111,854
 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
 Paul Day Andy Garner
 Stuart Herdson Shelagh Hirst
 Mark Holding Gerald Imison
 Sherry Jespersen Martin Johnson
 Terry Kenny Martin Lawes
 Andy Peart Angie Rutter
 Eric Stroud Ralph Surman
 Joan Yarker
 male 13 female 6 total 19

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 27,961 f 17,199 total 47,966
 main trades and industries academic and related staff in higher education
 Gen sec Sally Hunt
 Delegates
 Gargi Bhattacharyya Joe Gluza
 Anne-Marie Green Jim Guild
 Terry Hoad Sally Hunt
 Simon Renton Lydia Richards
 Angela Roger Steve Wharton
 male 5 female 5 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 3,148 f 192 total 3,340

Gen sec Patrick Carragher

Delegates

Patrick Carragher Bob Young

male 2 female 0 total 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 7,685 f 347 total 8,032

main trades and industries airline pilots and flight engineers (commercial)

Gen sec Jim McAuslan

Delegates

David Boys Jim McAuslan

male 2 female 0 total 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 179 f 5,569 total 5,748

main trades and industries the science of dietetics in the private and public sector

National officer employment relations

David Wood

Delegates

Donna Duncan Diana Markham

male 0 female 2 total 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 17,698 f 8,587 total 26,285

main trades and industries broadcasting, film, video, theatre, cinema and related sectors

Gen sec Roger Bolton

Delegates

Jack Amos Christine Bond

Suresh Chawla Tony Lennon

Winston Phillips Martin Spence

male 5 female 1 total 6

BFAWU

Bakers, Food and Allied Workers Union

Stanborough House, Great North Road

Stanborough, Welwyn Garden City

Herts AL8 7TA

t 01707 260150 f 01707 261570

e bfawuho@aol.com

www.bfawu.org

total 26,703 male/female split not available

main trades and industries food

Gen sec Joe Marino

Delegates

Tony Carey Vi Carr

Joe Marino Tony Richardson

male 3 female 1 total 4

BIOS

British and Irish Orthoptic Society

Tavistock House North,

Tavistock Square,

London WC1H 9HX

t 020 7387 7992 f 020 7383 2584

e bios@orthoptics.org.uk

www.orthoptics.org.uk

m38 f 1,019 total 1,057

main trades and industries orthoptists

Executive Officer Judith Brooks

Delegates

Lesley Anne Baxter

male 0 female 1 total 1

BSU

Britannia Staff Union

Court Lodge, Leonard Street

Leek, Staffordshire ST 13 5JP

t 01538 399627 f 01538 371342

e bsu@themail.co.uk

www.britanniasu.org.uk

m 600 f 1,737 total 2,337

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

Lisa Beverley John Stoddard

male 2 female 0 total 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 5,753 f 3,413 total 9,166

main trades and industries the ceramics industry (all areas)

Gen sec Geoff Bagnall

Delegates

Paul Longmore Dave Wood
Michael Young
male 3 female 0 total 3

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 156 f 3,844 total 4,000

main trades and industries community
and district nurses

Chair Rowena Smith

Community

The union for life

Swinton House,
324 Gray's Inn Road,
London WC1X 8DD

t 020 7239 1200 f 020 7278 8378

e info@community-tu.org

www.community-tu.org

m 56,712 f 13,347 total 70,059

main trades and industries industries in and around
steel and metal, knitwear, lace, textiles, hosiery, dyeing
and finishing, footwear and leather, gloving, made-up
leathergoods and other apparel

Gen sec Michael Leahy OBE

Delegates

Tracy Clarke	John Daly
Mick Fell	Paul Gates
Richard Green	Mark Hill
Michael Leahy	JM Lloyd
JP Mann	Basil Morris
Roy Rickhuss	Jim Sinclair
Michael Walsh	Errol Woods
David Worgan	

male 14 female 1 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 15,885 f 3,875 total 19,760

main trades and industries telecommunications,
information technology and related industries

Gen sec Adrian Askew

Delegates

Adrian Askew	Terry Eden
Leslie Manasseh	Denise McGuire

male 3 female 1 total 4

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

Glynn Burgess	Kim Gainsborough
Ruth Jones	Samantha McIntosh
Lesley Mercer	

male 2 female 3 total 5

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 193,142 f 48,707 total 241,849

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

Manny Blake	Paul Clays
Pat Clouder	John Colbett
John Donnelly	Jeannie Drake
Maria Exall	Judith Griffiths
William Hayes	Michael Kavanagh
Tony Kearns	Martin Keenan
Bobby Kelly	Brian Kenny
Jane Loftus	Bob McGuire
Bernard Roome	Amarjite Singh
Tony Sneddon	Andrea Snowden
Chris Tapper	Dave Ward
Carl Webb	David Wiltshire

male 20 female 4 total 24

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
total 4,800 male/female split not available
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 Lodge, Duffield Hall,
Derbyshire DE56 1AG
t 01332 844396
e dsmith@dbssa.co.uk
m 102 f 375 total 477
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
e sue.gooderham@diageo.com
m 320 f 190 total 510
main trades and industries staff grades in Diageo in the UK
Chair Sue Gooderham

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 14,073 f 41,729 total 55,802
main trades and industries teachers, lecturers, associated educational personnel (Scotland)
Gen sec Ronald A Smith
Delegates
Jack Barnett Helen Connor
Sonia Kordiak June McCulloch
Alan Scott Ken Wimbor
male 3 female 3 total 6

Equity

Guild House
Upper St Martin's Lane
London WC2H 9EG
t 020 7379 6000 f 020 7379 7001
e info@equity.org.uk
www.equity.org.uk
m 18,578 f 18,090 total 36,668

main trades and industries performance workers in theatre, film television, radio and variety

Gen sec Ian McGarry

Delegates

Natasha Gerson Harry Landis
William Maxwell Sally Tremble
Ian McGarry
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 47,252 f 2,292 total 49,544
main trades and industries local authority fire brigades
Gen sec Matt Wrack
Delegates
Stewart Brown John Drake
Dave Green Vicky Knight
Alan McLean Val Salmon
Ruth Winters Matt Wrack
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 7,687 f 5,078 total 12,765
main trades and industries civil service, public bodies and NHS
Gen sec Jonathan Baume
Delegates
Jonathan Baume Martin Fletcher
Sue Gethin
male 2 female 1 total 3

GMB

Britain's general union
22/24 Worpole Road
London SW19 4DD
t 020 8947 3131 f 020 8944 6552
e info@gmb.org.uk
www.gmb.org.uk
m 337,373 f 234,317 total 571,690
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
Acting gen sec Paul Kenny
Delegates
Altaf Arif Richard Ascough

Rehana Azam	Sheila Bearcroft
Allan Black	Ed Blissett
Tom Brennan	Jude Brimble
Brenda Carson	Jean Chaplow
Edward Clarke	Naomi Cooke
Debbie Coulter	Bob Crosby
Georgia Cruikshank	Elaine Daley
Phil Davies	Les Dobbs
Harry Donaldson	Gary Doolan
Elizabeth Doyle	Alan Dudson
Roy Dunnett	Tommy Fallows
Brian Farr	Jackie Faulds
Trevor Fellows	Peter Foley MBE
Jean Foster	Allan Garley
Dave Gray	Paul Grieve
Colin Gunther	Tommy Hall
Rowena Hayward	Keith Hazlewood
Christine Howell	Mary Hutchinson
Brian Jackson	Kevin Jones
Paul Kenny	David Lascelles
Mick Laws	Nigel Lee
Linda Lord	Kath Manning
Joni McDougall	Sheila McKane
Marie McLaughlin	Noreen Metcalf
June Minnery	Bernie Moberg
Barry Montgomery	Joe Morgan
Kath Owen	Lorraine Parker
Helga Pile	Mick Rix
Charlie Robertson	Thomas Robertson
Edna Rolph	Mick Ryan
Malcolm Sage	Lena Sharp
Kath Slater	Brian Strutton
Eileen Theaker	Mary Turner
Rachelle Wilkins	Andy Worth

male 40 female 29 total 69

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
 Delegates
 Don Rishton
 male 1 female 0 total 1

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 2,485 f 440 total 2,925

main trades and industries hospital consultants,
 associate specialists, SpR grade and staff grade (all
 employed in the NHS)

Gen sec Stephen Campion

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 22,797 f 7,585 total 30,382
 main trades and industries performers engaged in the
 music profession including music writers and
 instrumental music teachers
 Gen sec John F Smith
 Delegates
 Ian Bowser Tom Edwards
 Danny Longstaff John Smith
 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 1,897 f 635 total 2,532
 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

Wadsworth House,
 130-132 Doncaster Road
 Barnsley, South Yorkshire S70 1TP
 t 01226 203743 f 01226 295563
 e natnacods@aol.com
 total 420 male/female split not available
 main trades and industries mining
 Gen sec Ian Parker
 Delegates
 Ian Parker
 male 1 female 0 total 1

NAEIAIC

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 1,753 f 2,032 total 3,785
 Gen Sec John Chowcat LI.B (Hons)
 Delegates
 John Chowcat Christopher Hackworth

male 2 female 0 total 2

NAPO

The Trade Union and Professional Association for Family Court and Probation Staff

4 Chivalry Road, London SW11 1HT

t 020 7223 4887 f 020 7223 3503

e info@napo.org.uk

www.napo.org.uk

m 2,884 f 5,548 total 8,432

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

e chris.keates@mail.nasuwat.org.uk

www.teachersunion.org.uk

m 82,602 f 153,403 total 236,005

main trades and industries education

Gen sec Chris Keates

Delegates

Jerry Bartlett Rachel Cashman

Julian Chapman Sharon Childs

Niall Couper Roger Darke

Lena Davies Nigel De Gruchy

Kathy Duggan Brian Garvey

Mike Grant Amanda Haehner

Karen Hopwood Mary Howard

Michael Johnson Bob Johnson

Chris Keates Roger Kirk

Pat Lerew Chris Lines

Maurice Littlewood John Mayes

Pete McLoughlin Dafydd Morgan

Jennifer Moses Darren Northcott

Mary Page Sue Percival

Patrick Roach Sue Rogers

Peter Scott Narmadha Thiranagama

Tracey Twist Steve White

Dave Wilkinson

male 23 female 12 total 35

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 33,464 f 34,059 total 67,523

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 Lynne Chambelain

Maire Daley Mary Davis

Lucie Dutton Dennis Hayes

Fawzi Ibrahim Jacquie Johnson

Peter Jones Jenna Khalfan

Barry Lovejoy Paul Mackney

Bernice Waugh John Wilkin

male 7 female 7 total 14

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 3,106 f 8,972 total 12,078

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 Sue Palmer

Tim Poil

male 2 female 1 total 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

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

Delegates

Anthony McCarthy

male 1 female 0 total 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 16,750 f 10,754 total 27,504

main trades and industries journalists

Gen sec Jeremy Dear

Delegates

Jeremy Dear Anita Halpin
 Tim Lezard Chris Morley
 Barry White
 male 4 female 1 total 5

NUM

National Union of Mineworkers

Miners' Offices, 2 Huddersfield Rd, Barnsley
 South Yorkshire S70 2LS
 t 01226 215555 f 01226 215561
 e steve.kemp@nationalunionofmineworkers.com
 www.num.org.uk
 total 2,441 male/female split not available
 main trades and industries coal mining
 National Sec Steve Kemp
 National Chairman Ian Lavery
 Delegates
 Steve Kemp Ian Lavery
 male 2 female 0 total 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 enquiries@numast.org
 www.numast.org
 m 18,398 f 321 total 18,719
 main trades and industries merchant navy and all related areas
 Gen sec Brian Orrell
 Delegates
 Clark Bowie Joe Heeney
 Peter McEwen Brian Orrell
 male 4 female 0 total 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 58,811 f 187,465 total 246,276
 main trades and industries teachers
 Gen sec Steve Sinnott
 Delegates
 Lesley Auger John Bangs
 Hilary Bills Christine Blower
 Tony Brockman Amanda Brown
 Graham Clayton Mary Compton
 Emily Evans Barry Fawcett
 Olive Forsythe Nina Franklin
 Dave Gardner Jerry Glazier
 Bill Greenshields Dave Harvey
 Pat Hawkes Mitch Howard
 Janey Hulme Max Hyde

Arthur Jarman Elpeth Jones
 Alex Kenny Roger King
 Gary Lewis Nula McGinn
 Kathy Martin Judy Moorhouse
 Patrick Murphy Martin Reed
 Bernard Regan Richard Reiser
 Glenys Shepherd Steve Sinnott
 Maureen Skevington Linda Taaffe
 Vin Wynne
 male 21 female 16 total 37

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 125,012 f 186,237 total 311,249
 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 Chris Baugh
 Sue Bond Tony Conway
 Mary Ferguson Ian Fitzpatrick
 Derrick Garshore Janice Godrich
 Christine Hulme John Jamieson
 Martin John Emily Kelly
 Kevin Kelly Hugh Lanning
 John McNally Jackie McWilliams
 Glenys Morris Emmet O'Brien
 Lee Rock Gordon Rowntree
 Sian Ruddick Mark Serwotka
 Hector Wesley Garry Winder
 male 15 female 9 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
 total 2,460 male/female split not available
 main trades and industries professional football
 Chief executive Gordon Taylor
 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.poa.uk.org.uk
 m 24,227 f 7,683 total 31,910

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

Victoria Anderson Steve Bostock

Brian Caton Gail Hurst

Colin Moses Tom Robson

male 4 female 2 total 6

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 83,431 f 21,325 total 104,756

main trades and industries engineering, scientific, managerial & professional staff in agriculture, defence, electricity supply, energy, environment, health & safety, heritage, industry, law & order, shipbuilding, transport

Gen sec Paul Noon

Delegates

Katherine Beirne Alan Bennie

Beryl Brine Mike Clancy

Peter Clements Mary Doran

Rod Earl Sue Ferns

Alan Grey Charles Harvey

Graeme Henderson Clare Kelly

George Noden Paul Noon

Robbie Ridoutt Jenny Thurston

Anoop Verma

male 12 female 5 total 17

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 64,010 f 7,534 total 71,544

main trades and industries railways and shipping, underground, road transport

Gen sec Bob Crow

Delegates

Janine Booth Janet Cassidy

Patrick Collins Robert Crow

Tony Donaghey Malcolm Dunning

Derek England Alex Gordon

David Gott Arthur Grundy

Peter Hall Michael Hogg

Neil Keith Ray Knight

Stephen Metcalfe

male 13 female 2 total 15

SCP

Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists

1 Fellmongers Path, Tower Bridge Road

London SE1 3LY

t 0845 450 3720 f 0845 450 3721

e enq@scpod.org

www.feetforlife.org

m 2,605 f 7,060 total 9,665

Chief Executive Joanna Brown

Delegates

Joanna Brown Keith Turner

male 1 female 1 total 2

SKISA

Skipton Staff Association

Connells/Sequence Team

Innovations House

2nd Floor

Shuttleworth Mead Business Park, Padiam,

Burnley BB12 7NG

t 0870 197 6328 f 0870 197 6329

e jennifer.tate@hml.co.uk

m 448 f 889 total 1,337

main trades and industries staff employed by the Skipton Building Society

Chair Jennifer A Tate

Delegates

John Bailey 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 1,725 f 15,525 total 17,250

main trades and industries

National Health Service

Chief exec officer Richard Evans

Delegates

Stuart Clapperton Hazel Harriet-Jones

David Wait

male 2 female 1 total 1

SWSWU

Sheffield Wool Shear Workers Union

129 Roughwood Road,

Rotherham S61 3AA

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 638,494 f 168,444 total 806,938

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

T Abbott	Richard Akid
Elaine Blair	K Bolton
Chris Bond	Pat Breslin
Mike Brider	M Bristow
Terry Britton	Duncan Burnett
Barry Camfield	Martin Carroll
John Childs	Ray Collins
Tony Cooper	S Cope
Collette Cork-hurst	Richard Crease
Sheila Creely	G Day
Mick Dowds	Jack Dromey
Sher Dulai	Steve Elliott
Jennifer Elliott	Gareth Evans
Sean Fay	G Fotry
Andy Frampton	Stella Guy
Michael Hague	A Hayes
Shirley Hewson	Diana Holland
Banaris Hussain	Sharon Hutchinson
Joe Irvin	Brenda Irvine
Marie Jockins	Pat Jones
Chris Kaufman	Jimmy Kelly
Tony Lewis	George Maddock
Martin Mayer	Len McCluskey
John McDonough	Trevor McDowell
Ivan Monckton	Anne Morrison
Dennis Moss	Amanda O'Hare
Dave Osborne	Phil Pemberton
Mike Pendred	Chris Perrett
Mark Plumb	John Roscoe
Mary Scroggie	June Shepherd
John Sheridan	Stan Sims
G Smith	Leonie Snell
Graham Stevenson	Pat Stuart
R Studham	Mohammad Taj
Ken Tuckwell	Mike Ward
Wazim Wardrop	Tony Woodley

male 50 female 21 total 71

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 21,384 f 9,165 total 30,549 (excludes members in the Republic of Ireland)

main trades and industries administrative, clerical, supervisory, managerial, professional and technical employees of railways, London Underground, buses, road haulage, port authorities and waterways in Great Britain and Ireland. Also employees in the travel trade, hotel and catering industries

Gen sec Gerry Doherty

Delegates

Andy Bain	Jackie Darby
Gerry Doherty	Pauline McArdle
Dave Roberts	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 661 f 1,152 total 1,813

main trades and industries All staff within the Bradford & Bingley Group and associated companies

Gen sec David Matthews

Delegates

David Matthews

male 1 female 0 total 1

UCAC

Undeb Cenedlaethol Athrawon Cymru

Pen Roc, Rhodfa'r Môr

Aberystwyth SY23 2AZ

t 01970 639950 f 01970 626765

e ucac@athrawon.com

m 1,060 f 3,745 total 4,805

main trades and industries education - teachers and lecturers

Gen sec Moelwen Gwyndaf

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 111,906 f 1,374 total 113,280

main trades and industries construction and building

Gen sec Alan Ritchie

Delegates

Pat Archer	Roy Bleasdale
John Cronin	N Garnett
Andy Jones	John Kemp
Tom Lannon	Ivan Moldaczuk
Chris Murphy	Alan Ritchie
John Thompson	W Whalen
C K Williams	John Winstanley

male 14 female 0 total 14

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 342,540 f 967,460 total 1,310,000

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	George Allen
Roger Bannister	Kenneth Bell
Michelle Brankin	Valerie Broomhead
Ingrid Browne-Wallace	Jim Burnett
Frank Burns	John Campbell
Malcolm Cantello	Ivy Carlier
Jane Carolan	Sue Clark
Linda Coey	Louise Couling
Lesley Discombe	Ann Donnelly
Margaret Dunbar	Sharon Foster
Mark Fysh	Jean Geldart
Tony Grieve	Lou Gladden
Paul Glover	Dave Godson
Emma Goodall	Angela Gorman
Moz Greenshields	Margaret Greer
Reginald Hamilton	Chris Hanrahan
Mike Hayes	Graeme Horn
Alan Jarman	Helen Jenner
Alison Jewitt	John Jones
Rosemary Kangangi	Denis Keatings
Glenn Kelly	John Kidd
Mike Kirby	Diana Leach
Jackie Lewis	Angela Lynes
Colm Magee	Carole Maleham
Gill Malik	Annette Mansell-Green
Maggie Martin	Tahir Masood
John McDermott	Bev Miller
Gloria Mills	Iain Montgomery
Tracy Morgan	Matthew Muir
Karie Murphy	June Nelson
Bob Oram	Raphael Parkinson
Rahul Patel	Mary Pearson
June Poole	Lynn Poulton
Dave Prentis	Davena Rankin
Elizabeth Ring	Rod Robertson
Julie Robinson	Jon Rogers
Helen Rose	Jessie Russel
Paul Sandford	Tom Sexton
Alison Shepherd	Diane Shepherd
Sylvia Simmonds	Sumana Skillen
Fiona Smith	Eleanor Smith
Liz Snape	Keith Sonnett
Marie Souter	Irene Stacey
Tony Staunton	Eileen Steele
Norma Stephenson	Kathy Symonds

Chris Tansley	Sofi Taylor
Jean Thorpe	Anne True
Steve Warwick	Linda Webb-Thornton
Junetta Whorwell	Christine Wilde
Clare Williams	Malcolm Wing

male 40 female 57 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 15,835 f 325 t 16,160

main trades and industries drivers, warehousing, ancillary workers in the logistics and food sectors

Gen Sec Robert Monks

Delegates

Peter Boswell	Rob Monks
David Swan	

male 3 female 0 total 3

USDAW

Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers

188 Wilmslow Road,
Manchester M14 6LJ
t 0161 224 2804 f 0161 257 2566
e enquiries@usdaw.org.uk
www.usdaw.org.uk

m 141,437 f 198,764 total 340,201

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

Jeff Broome	John Buckingham
Marge Carey	Gwen Cherry
Michael Dixon	Alison Edwards
Lesley Finlayson	Sonia Foster
John Hannett	Ron Hemming
Anne Hill	Ann Hills
Shaun Jones	Paddy Lillis
Ann Lloyd	Karl Lockley
John McGarry	James McMillan
Diane Mitchell	Florence Nash
Sally Neale	Geoff Page
Geoffrey Page	Angela Partington
Paul Reynolds	Brenda Roe
Chris Smith	Kieran Smyth
Val Truesdale	Pete Watson
John Whale	Dave Williams

male 20 female 12 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 1,351 f 733 total 2,084

main trades and industries television, radio, film,
books, theatre and multimedia

Gen sec Bernie Corbett

Delegates

Lydia Rivlin Hugh Stoddart

male 1 female 1 total 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 406 f 1,036 total 1,442

Chair Karen Watson

Delegates

Patricia Cook Susan Hampson

male 0 female 2 total 2

D6-7

Summary

Number of affiliated

unions: 66

membership:

m 3,576, 467

f 2,830, 774

male/female split not
available 45,026

total 6,452,267

Section 4

Details of past Congresses

Section 5

members of the general council 1921-2005

Names of members of the Parliamentary Committee which functioned from 1868 to 1921 are included in Reports up to 1976. From 1921 the General Council became the executive body of the TUC. Dates given below are of the year of the Congress at which appointment was made to the General Council, or in the event of election to fill a casual vacancy the year in which it took place.

Abberley, B – 2005
 Adams, J - 1992-98
 Airlie, J - 1990-91
 Alderson, R - 1984
 Allen, AW - 1962-78
 Allen, J - 1994-95
 Allen, S - 2000 -01
 Allen, WP - 1940-47
 Anderson, D - 2000 -04
 Anderson, WC - 1965-72
 Auger, L - 2005
 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 – 2001-05
 Bearcroft, S - 1997-2005
 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 - 05
 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 - 2005
 Campbell, J - 1953-57
 Callighan, A - 1945-47
 Cannon, L - 1965-70
 Carey, M – 1998–2005
 Carolan, J - 2005
 Carr, J - 1989-92
 Carrigan, D - 2001
 Carron, WJ - 1954-67
 Carter, J - 1989-92
 Cartmail, G - 2005
 Caton, B – 2001-2005
 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 – 2002-05
 De Gruchy, N - 1989-2002
 Dhamrait, M - 1995-2000
 Doherty, G – 2004- 05
 Donaghy, R - 1987-99
 Donnett, AM - 1973-75
 Doughty, GH - 1968-73
 Douglass, H - 1953-66
 Drake, JLP - 1990-2005
 Drain, GA - 1973-82
 Dubbins, AD - 1984-2005
 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
 Ferns, S - 2005
 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- 05
 Gallie, CN - 1940-46
 Garland, R – 1983
 Garley, A - 2005
 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 - 05
 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	Jones, RT - 1946-56
Haigh, E - 1982	Jones, RT - 1921-32
Hall, D - 1996-97	Jones, WE - 1950-59
Hall, E - 1954-59	Jordan, WB - 1986-94
Hallsworth, J - 1926-46	Jowett, W - 1986-87
Hallworth, A - 1955-59	Kaylor, J - 1932-42
Halpin, A – 1996, 1999, 2001- 05	Kean, W - 1921-45
Hammond, EA - 1983-87	Keates, C – 2004-05
Hancock, F - 1935-57	Kelly, J – 2004-05
Handley, RC - 1938-39	Kelly, L - 2004
Hanley, P - 1968-69	Kenny, P - 2000 - 05
Hannett, J – 2004-05	Keys, WH - 1975-84
Harrison, HN - 1937-47	King, J - 1972-74
Hawkes, P - 1992-2004	Knapp, J - 1983-2000
Hayday, A - 1922-36	Laird, G - 1979-81
Hayday, F - 1950-72	Lambert, DAC - 1984-93
Hayes, W – 2002-05	Landles, P - 1995-2003
Haynes, E - 1964-68	Lascelles, D – 2001-05
Henry, J - 1989-90	Lawther, W - 1935-53
Hewitt, H - 1952-63	Leahy, M – 1999-2005
Heywood, WL - 1948-56	Lee, P - 1933
Hicks, G - 1921-40	Lenahan, P - 1991-92
Hill, AL - 1955-57	Leslie, J - 1925
Hill, D - 1992	Littlewood, TL - 1968-70
Hill, EJ - 1948-64	Lloyd, G - 1973-82
Hill, J - 1921-35	Losinska, K - 1986
Hill, JC - 1958	Loughlin, A - 1929-52
Hill, S - 1963-67	Love, I - 1987-94
Hillon, B - 1987-97	Lowthian, GH - 1952-72
Hindle, J - 1930-36	Lyons, CA - 1983-88
Hodgson, M - 1936-47	Lyons, J - 1983-90
Hogarth, W - 1962-72	Lyons, R - 1989-2003
Holloway, P - 1997-2000	Macgougan, J - 1970-78
Holmes, W - 1928-44	MacKenzie, HU (Lord) - 1987-99
Houghton, D - 1952-59	Mackney, P – 2002-05
Howell, FL - 1970-73	Macreadie, J - 1987
Hunt, S – 2002-05	Maddocks, A - 1977-90
Isaacs, GA - 1932-45	Maddocks, WH - 1979-81
Jackson, Sir Ken - 1993-2001	Manasseh, L – 2001-2005
Jackson, T - 1967-81	Martin, A - 1960-70
Jarman, C - 1942-46	McAndrews, A - 1949-54
Jarvis, FF - 1974-88	McAvoy, D - 1989-2003
Jenkins, C - 1974-87	McCall, W - 1984-88
Jinkinson, A - 1990-95	McCarthy, CP- 1983-84
Johnson, A - 1993-94	McCulloch, L - 2003
Jones, J - 1934-38	McCullogh, E - 1958-62
Jones, JL - 1968-77	McDermott, JF - 1949-57
Jones, JW - 1967-69	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 - 05
 Mercer, L - 2000 - 05
 Mills, G - 1994-2005
 Mills, LA - 1983-95
 Moore, JH - 1922-23
 Morgan, B - 1995
 Morgan, G - 1981-89
 Morris, W - 1988-2002
 Morritt, M - 1989-91
 Morton, J - 1975-84, 1987-89
 Murnin, H - 1921
 Murray, JG - 1980-82
 Naesmith, A - 1945-52
 Nevin, E - 1985-88
 Newman, J - 1990-91
 Newton, JE - 1953-69
 Nicholls, D - 2005
 Nichols, G - 2000 – 2002, 2005
 Nicholas, HR - 1965-66
 Nicholson, B - 1983-87
 Noon, P – 2001-05
 O’Brien, T - 1940-69
 Ogden, JW - 1921-29
 O’Hagen, J - 1953-66
 O’Kane, E - 2003
 Openshaw, R - 1948-56
 Orrell, B – 1999-2005
 Owen, J - 1948-52
 Page, M - 1988-89
 Papworth, AF - 1944-48
 Parry, T - 1968-80
 Patterson, CM - 1963-84
 Paynter, W - 1960
 Peel, JA - 1966-72
 Pemberton, S - 1974-81
 Pickering, R - 1985-96
 Pinder, P – 2001-2003
 Plant, CTH - 1963-75
 Poil, T - 2005
 Poole, L - 1957-58
 Poulton, EL - 1921-29
 Prentis, D - 1996-2005

Prime, AM - 1968-76
 Prosser, M - 1985-95
 Prudence, J - 1995-99
 Pugh, A - 1921-35
 Purcell, AA - 1921-27
 Purkiss, B - 1994-99
 Qualie, M - 1923-25
 Reamsbottom, BA - 1992-2001
 Richards, T - 1925-31
 Ritchie, A - 2005
 Rix, M – 2001-2002
 Roberts, A (Sir) - 1940-62
 Roberts, A - 1967-71
 Robinson, SA - 1959-69
 Rogers, S – 2002-05
 Rooney, D – 1998-2005
 Rooney, M - 1990-2002
 Rosser, R - 2000 - 2003
 Rown, J - 1921-34
 Russell, JG - 1982-86
 Sapper, AL - 1970-83
 Scanlon, H - 1968-77
 Scard, D - 1990-2000
 Scargill, A - 1980-82, 1986-87
 Scott, J - 1961
 Scrivens, EM - 1982-86
 Serwotka, M – 2002-05
 Sexton, J - 1921
 Sharp, L - 1957-65
 Shaw, A - 1929-38
 Sheldon, J - 1992-97
 Shepherd, A - 1995-2005
 Sherwood, W - 1934-36
 Simpson, D – 2002-05
 Sinnott, S - 2005
 Sirs, W - 1975-84
 Skinner, H - 1921-31
 Slater, JH - 1974-82
 Slater, JW - 1972-73
 Smillie, R - 1921-36
 Smith, A - 1921
 Smith, AR - 1979-92
 Smith, GF - 1959-78
 Smith, H - 1922-24, 1931
 Smith, LJ - 1980-87
 Smith, P – 1999-2002
 Smith, R - 1957-66
 Smithies, FA - 1983-89

Snape, L – 2001-05
 Sonnet, K – 2001-05
 Spackman, EW- 1945-46
 Spanswick, EAG - 1977-82
 Spence, WR - 1931-41
 Stanley, BC - 1983-85
 Squance, WJR - 1936-39
 Stuart, P - 2005
 Steele, NJ - 1983-90
 Stevens, L - 1983
 Stevenson, RB - 1984-89
 Stott, W - 1936-39
 Stuart, P - 2004
 Swales, AB - 1921-34
 Sweeney, E - 1996-2005
 Swindell, B - 1962-65
 Switzer, B - 1993-97
 Symons, E - 1989-95
 Taj, M - 2000 - 05
 Talbot, P – 1999-2005
 Tallon, WM - 1957-66
 Tami, M – 1999-2000
 Tanner, J - 1943-53
 Taylor, S –2003 - 05
 Thomas, JH - 1921, 1925-28
 Thomas, KR - 1977-81
 Thomas, P - 1989-91
 Thomson, GW - 1935-47
 Thorburn, W - 1990
 Thorne, W - 1921-33
 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
 Walsh, J - 2005
 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 - 05
 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

Anderson, Victoria

Social responsibility 132

Allen, Sam

Union diversity fund 133

Ascough, Richard

Britain's Olympic Games London 2012 72

Askew, Adrian

Working time 58

Azam Rehana

Disability 68

B

Bain, Andy

Transport –future of the rail industry 170

Ball, Carol

Childcare presentation 53

Ballard, Andy

School education 87

Barber, Brendan

Against censorship 129

Britain's Olympic Games London 2012 71

Equality audit 89

Equality seats on the General Council 162

EU Constitution 169

Gate Gourmet 46

General Council statement on the consequences of the terrorist attacks on London 81

General Secretary's address 56

Presentation of lay reps awards 73

School education and inclusion 89

Solving the Pensions Crisis 117

Trade Union organisation 159

Vote of thanks to the media 177

Youth Matters – Green Paper on Youth Policies 91

Barnes, Bobby

Social responsibility 130, 132

Barnett, Jack

Learning and skills 78

Bartlett, Jerry

Public Service Pensions 122

Baugh, Chris

Criminal Justice 164

Baume, Jonathan

Amendment to Equality Bill 65

Discrimination 70

Baxter, Lesley Anne

Parents, carers and childcare 55

Bell, Kenneth

School education 86

Bhattacharyya, Gargi

Education, science and research in Europe 104

Bills, Hilary

School education 85, 87

Blake, Manny

Equality seats on the General Council 160, 163

Blissett, Ed

BNP and the Race Relations Act 174

Blower, Christine

School education and inclusion 87, 89

Bond, Sue

Women in Iraq 175

Booth, Janine

General Council statement on the consequences of the terrorist attacks on London 84

Women's equality 55

Bousted, Mary

Opposing racism and fascism 61

Bowie, Clark

Fatigue at sea 156

Brennan, Tom

Public Service Pensions 119

Britton, Terry

Fatigue at sea 1157

Brown, Joanna

Learning and skills 79

Brown, Rt Hon Gordon MP

Presentation of lay reps awards 73

Address 74

Brown, Stewart

Globalisation 139

Bunn, Elizabeth

AFL-CIO Sororal address 134

Burgess, Glynn

Diversity 166

Burke, Tony

Learning and skills 80

Second-hand smoking in the workplace 155

C

Camfield, Barry

Age Discrimination 69

Fairness at Work 40

Cantello, Malcolm

Union subscriptions and tax allowances 49

Carey, Tony

The Supporting People Programme – Quality Assessment Framework 166

Carolan, Jane

Public services 105

Carragher, Patrick

Energy and climate change 96

Cartmail, Gail

Patient-led NHS 112

Public Service Pensions 120

Caton, Brian

Fairness at work and employment status 43

Pensions Commission 116

Chambelain, Lynne

Disability and employment 67

Chawla, Suresh

Union diversity fund 133

Chowcat, John

School education 86

Clarke, Tracy

Discrimination 70

Scrutineers Report 112

Women internationally 137

Clements, Peter

Stress and job design 154

Colbett, John

Trade unionists in the classroom 91

Connolly, Steve

Public Service Pensions 121

Connor, Helen

School education 85

Cork-Hurst, Collette

Migrant workers 151

Coulter, Debbie

Industrial policy 100

Crease, Richard

Fatigue at sea 156

Crosby, Bob

Criminal Justice Issues 165

Crow, Bob

EU Constitution 167, 170

Fairness at Work 40

Rail safety 157

D**Daley, Maire**

Women and Work Commission 52

Darby, Jackie

Criminalisation 172

Women and Work Commission 52

Davis, Mary

Equality seats on the General Council 161

Iraq 142

Davison, Steve

Opposing racism and fascism 60

Davison, Tim

Re-nationalisation 99

Dear, Jeremy

Defending public broadcasting and UK television production 125

Fairness at work 43

Global Solidarity- Colombia 148

Race equality 64

Dobbs, Les

Pensions Commission 116

Doherty, Gerry

General Council statement on the consequences of the terrorist attacks on London 82

Donaghey, Tony

Public Services 106

Donnelly, Alan

Re-nationalisation 99

Donnelly, Elizabeth

Working time 60

Doolan, Gary

Public Services 106

Drake, Jeanne

President's Address 36

Welcome to sororal and fraternal delegates 36,

Presentation of lay reps awards 73,

London Bombings tribute to the emergency workers 81

TUC Accounts 163

Votes of thanks 175,

Award of gold badges 175

Reply to vote of thanks 177

Dromey, Jack

Organising 46

Organising in Europe 152

Rail safety 158

Dubbins, Tony

EU Constitution 169

Duffy, Ann

The National Health Service 110

Duncan, Donna

Disability and employment 67

E**Earl, Rob**

Fatigue at sea 156

F**Fabian, Lorene**

Pensions Commission 116

Ferns, Sue

Education, science and research in Europe 104

Fletcher, Martin

Union subscriptions and tax allowances 49

Fysh, Mark

Disability 68

G**Gainsborough, Kim**

Greening the workplace 98

Garley, Allan

Fairness at work 44

Garvey, Brian

Fairness at work 44

Gates, Paul

China 139, 141

Gerson, Natasha

Against censorship 129

Gethin, Sue

Working time 59

Godrich, Janice

Public Service Pensions 119

Godson, Dave

Patient-led NHS 111

Gorman, Angela

Pensions Commission 117

Green, Anne-Marie

Globalisation 138

Green, Dave

Iraq 143

Greer, Margaret

Opposing racism and fascism 62

Grey, Alan

Civil service job cuts 108

Griffiths, Judith

Fairness at work 42

H

Halpin, Anita

Point of order 160

Women internationally 136

Hannett, John

Parents, carers and childcare 54

Working time 58

Harriet Jones, Hazel

The National Health Service 109

Hawkes, Pat

Award of gold badge 176

Hayes, Billy

Equality seats on the General Council 162

Post Office 109

Vote of thanks to the President 38

Hayes, Dennis

China 140

Henderson, Graeme

Industrial policy 101

Herdson, Stuart

Education funding 103

Holland, Diana

Women internationally 135

Women and Work Commission 52

Hunt, Sally

China 141

Iraq 143

Women in Iraq 175

I

Imison, Gerald

Public Services 106

J

Jarman, Alan

Amendment to Equality Bill 65

Johnson, Rt Hon Alan MP

Address 123

Jones, David

Education funding 104

Jowell, Rt Hon Tessa

Britain's Olympic Games London 2012 71

K

Kearns, Tony

Women in Iraq 174

Keates, Chris

Opposing racism and fascism 61

Kelly, Kevin

Organising 48

Kemp, Steve

Energy and climate change 96

Kenny, Paul

Gate Gourmet 45

Kirby, Mike

Global Solidarity – Cuba 148

Knight, Vicky

The Western Sahara 144

Kordiak, Sonia

School education and inclusion 88

L

Landis, Harry

Diversity in portrayal 126

Lanning, Hugh

Globalisation 138

Lascelles, David

Migrant workers 150

Lavery, Ian

Re-nationalisation 98

Leahy, Michael

EU Constitution 168

Lennon, Tony

Defending public broadcasting and UK television production 126

Pensions Commission 116

Levinson, Steve

Britain's Olympic Games London 2012 71

Lewis, Jackie

Diversity 166

Lezard, Tim

Diversity in portrayal 127

Lillis, Paddy

China 139

Fairness at work 43

Learning and skills 80

Organising 47

Livingstone, Ken

Britain's Olympic Games London 2012 71

Longstaff, Danny

Second-hand smoking in the workplace 154

Lovejoy, Barry

Learning and skills 78

M

Mannasseh, Leslie

Organising 47

Mansell, Lesley

Diversity in portrayal 128

Mansell-Green, Annette

General Purposes Committee Report 39, 60, 73, 114, 134

The Western Sahara 145

Marino, Joe

BNP and the Race Relations Act 173

Markham, Diana

Public Service Pensions 122

Maxwell, William

Social responsibility 131

McAuslan, Jim

Learning and skills 79

Organising in Europe 151

Trade union organisation 159

McCartney, Rt Hon Ian MP

Labour Party Fraternal Address 92

McCluskey, Len

Industrial policy 100

McEwen, Peter

Criminalisation 171

McFarlane, Helen

China 140

Public Services 107

McGarry, Ian

Trade union organisation 158, 160

McGuire Denise

Vote of thanks to the President 39

Women and Work Commission 52

McIntosh, Samantha

Second-hand smoking in the workplace 155

McKane, Sheila

The National Health Service 110

McKnight, Judy

Criminal Justice 163

Trade Union organisation 159

McLoughlin, Pete

Trade unionists in the classroom 90

McQuire, Alan

Venezuela 147

Mercer, Lesley

The National Health Service 110

Miller, Bev

Migrant workers 150

Mills, Gloria

Race equality 65

Moldaczuk, Ivan

Industrial policy 101

Monckton, Ivan

Greening the workplace 98

Monks, Bob

Working time 58

Transport 172

Montgomery, Barry

Energy and climate change 97

Morriss, Basil

Industrial policy 102

Moses, Colin

Criminal Justice 163

Opposing racism and fascism 64

Murphy, Chris

China 139

Working time 59

Murray, Barbara

Women internationally 137

N**Nicholls, Doug**

Iraq 142

Youth Matters – Green Paper on Youth Policies 91

Nichols, Ged

EU Constitution 168

Noon, Paul

Energy and climate change 95

EU Constitution 169

O**O'Brien, Emmet**

Equality seats on the General Council 161

O'Grady, Frances

Discrimination 70

Learning and skills 81

Organising in Europe 152

Rail safety 158

Oram, Bob

EU Constitution 168

Fairness at work 44

P**Page, Mary**

Women internationally 136

Pendle, Peter

Age Discrimination 69

Education funding 103

Learning and skills 80

Phillips, Winston

Diversity in portrayal 127

Poill, Tim

Amendment to Equality Bill 66

Prentis, Dave

Public Service Pensions 118

Prosser, Baroness Margaret

Address on Women and Work Commission 50

R**Reed, Andy**

Fairness at work 42

Transport – future of the rail industry 171

Reiser, Richard

Disability and employment 66

Renton, Simon

Venezuela 147

Richardson, Tony

Globalisation 138

Ridoutt, Robbie

Public Service Pensions 120

Ritchie, Alan

Employment status 41

Migrant workers 149

Rivlin, Lydia

Against censorship 128

Rix, Mick

Opposing racism and fascism 62

Roberts, Yvonne

Childcare presentation 53

Robson, Tom

Public Service Pensions 121

Rodriguez, Carlos

Address on behalf of CUT, Colombia 145

Rogers, Sue

Equality seats on the General Council 162

Public Services 106

Rowntree, Gordon

Disability and employment 67

Rutter, Angie

School education and inclusion 88

Ryder, Guy

Address on behalf of the ICFTU 148

S**Sage, Malcolm**

Stress and job design 154

Salmon, Val

Opposing racism and fascism 64

Serwotka, Mark

Civil service job cuts 107

Shepherd, Alison

Equality seats on the General Council 161

Simpson, Derek

Industrial policy 100

Post Office 109

Sinnott, Steve

Public Service Pensions 121

Snowden, Andrea

Women and Work Commission 51

Sonnet, Keith

Iraq 143

Spence, Martin

Employment status 41

Stevenson, Graham

Working time 59

Stoddart, Hugh

Defending public broadcasting and UK television production 125

Diversity in portrayal 127

T**Taaffe, Linda**

Pensions Commission 116

Taj Mohammed

General Council statement on the consequences of the terrorist attacks on London 84

Opposing racism and fascism 63

Talbot, Paul

Organising 48

Tansley, Chris

School education and inclusion 89

Tapper, Chris

Opposing racism and fascism 64

Taylor, Andy

Reply to vote of thanks to the media 178

Taylor, Sofi

Vote of thanks to the President 176

Thomas, Rob

Children in family court proceedings 164

Thompson, Philippa

Childcare presentation 54

Thurstson, Jenny

Award of gold badge 176

Tinsley, Pam

Disability 68

Tovey, Mitch

Venezuela 147

Treble, Sally

Broadcasters and entertainment promoters' honesty code 130

True, Anne

Fire and rescue service emergency response standards in the UK 173

Turner, Adair – Chair of the Pensions Commission

Address 114

Turner, Keith

Public Service Pensions 120

Turner, Mary

Global Solidarity – Colombia 148

School education and inclusion 89

W**Wait, David**

Working time 59

Walsh, Michael

Greening the workplace 97

Ward, Charles

Children in family court proceedings 165

School education and inclusion 88

Warwick, Steve

General Council statement on the consequences of the terrorist attacks on London 84

Waugh, Bernice

Organising 48

Webb, Carl

Social responsibility 131

Wesley, Hector

Opposing racism and fascism 63

Wharton, Steve

Education funding 102

White, Barbara

Broadcasters and entertainment promoters' honesty
code 129

The Western Sahara 145

White, Barry

Europe- European Social Forum 170

General Council statement on the consequences of the
terrorist attacks on London 83

Wilde, Christine

The National Health Service 111

Wilkin, John

Venezuela 146

Winder, Garry

General Council statement on the consequences of the
terrorist attacks on London 83

Winters, Ruth

General Council statement on the consequences of the
terrorist attacks on London 83

Woodley, Tony

Gate Gourmet 45

Iraq 144

Public Service Pensions 122

Wrack, Matt

Fire and rescue service emergency response standards
in the UK 172