

# Congress Report 2006

The 138<sup>th</sup> annual Trades Union Congress  
11-14 September, Brighton



# Contents

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| <b>General Council members 2006 – 2007</b> .....                   | 4    |
| <b>Section one - Congress decisions</b> .....                      | 7    |
| <b>Part 1</b>  |      |
| Resolutions carried.....   | 8    |
| <b>Part 2</b>  |      |
| Motion remitted.....   | 28   |
| <b>Part 3</b>  |      |
| Motions lost.....  | 29   |
| <b>Part 4</b>  |      |
| Motion withdrawn.....  | 29   |
| <b>Part 5</b>  |      |
| General Council statements.....                                    | 30   |
| <br>   |      |
| <b>Section two – Verbatim report of Congress proceedings</b> ..... | 35   |
| <b>Day 1</b>   |      |
| Monday 11 September .....  | 36   |
| <b>Day 2</b>   |      |
| Tuesday 12 September.....  | 76   |
| <b>Day 3</b>   |      |
| Wednesday 13 September.....  | 119  |
| <b>Day 4</b>   |      |
| Thursday 14 September .....  | 159  |
| <br>   |      |
| <b>Section three - unions and their delegates</b> .....            | 183  |
| <b>Section four - details of past Congresses</b> .....             | 195  |
| <b>Section five - General Council 1921 – 2006</b> .....            | 198  |
| <b>Index of speakers</b> .....                                     | 203  |

## **General Council Members 2006 – 2007**

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*

Jane Carolan  
*UNISON*

Gail Cartmail  
*Amicus*

Brian Caton  
*Prison Officers' Association*

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

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*

Maria Exall  
*Communication Workers Union*

Sue Ferns  
*Prospect*

Pauline Foulkes  
*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*

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  
*University and College Union*

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

Jimmy Kelly  
*Transport and General Workers Union*

Paul Kenny  
*GMB*

Mick Leahy OBE  
*Community*

Paul Mackney  
*University and College Union*

Leslie Manasseh MBE  
*Connect*

Judy McKnight OBE  
*napo*

Lesley Mercer  
*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*

Gloria Mills CBE  
*UNISON*

Ged Nichols  
*Accord*

Paul Noon  
*Prospect*

Brian Orrell OBE  
*Nautilus UK*

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 (chair)  
*UNISON*

Derek Simpson  
*Amicus*

Steve Sinnott  
*National Union of Teachers*

Liz Snape MBE  
*UNISON*

Patricia Stuart  
*Transport and General Workers Union*

Ed Sweeney  
*Amicus*

Mohammad Taj  
*Transport and General Workers' Union*

Paul Talbot  
*Amicus*

Sofi Taylor  
*UNISON*

John Walsh  
*Amicus*

Tony Woodley  
*Transport and General Workers Union*

Matt Wrack  
*Fire Brigades Union*

Brendan Barber *General Secretary*



# Section 1

## Congress Decisions

*Listed below are the decisions taken by the 2006 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

### 4 Strengthening workplace democracy

Congress deplores the archaic form of dictatorship, under the guise of management prerogative, which often prevails in workplaces.

Congress notes this is tempered only by recognised union representatives accountable to their members, and expects this essentially democratic function to be reinforced by government.

Congress resolves to prioritise a campaign for workplace representatives (including health and safety and union learning reps) to have:

- i) stronger statutory rights to paid facility time and facilities, including the removal of barriers to part-time workers' involvement and unequivocal rights for elected national negotiators to attend national negotiations;
- ii) statutory rights to negotiate on pensions, training and equality - including the right to request an equality audit of employers' employment practice;
- iii) information on good practice and legal rights through TUC Education (unionlearn), including the argument for a Trade Union Freedom Bill a century after the 1906 Trades Disputes Act;
- iv) access to groups of non-union members to explain the benefits of union membership; and
- v) the right to establish workplace education and training committees and meet members to discuss training requirements.

Congress will:

- a) campaign for public sector bodies to set an example by adopting some of these measures immediately;
- b) approach the Government to secure at least two trade union representatives on learning and skills bodies and post-16 college and university governing bodies;
- c) encourage unions to develop their lifelong learning policies in partnership with public sector universities and colleges; and
- d) oppose privatisation and cuts in courses.

### University and College Union

### 10 TUPE regulations

Congress welcomes the recent changes to the TUPE regulations (Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2005).

However, Congress is concerned that the exemption to make fair dismissals for 'economic, technical or organisational (ETO) reasons' is so broadly defined that, in essence, it provides a 'catch all' opportunity for employers to dismiss in transfer situations. Congress calls upon the General Council to open discussions with the Government with a view to abolishing circumstances where an ETO reason may apply.

### Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists

### 11 Redundancy law

Congress believes that current redundancy laws lack clarity, are not strong enough to ensure meaningful consultation with trade unions and do not provide sufficient protection or compensation for affected staff. Congress notes that a particular weakness is the

lack of any duty to consult collectively if fewer than 20 redundancies are proposed. Congress also notes that some employers fail to begin consultations as soon as redundancies are contemplated and have little intention of reaching agreement through a process of meaningful consultation.

Congress therefore calls on the General Council to seek changes in existing legislation to ensure that redundancy laws are made more transparent, and in particular that collective and individual rights in redundancy situations are improved.

### Association for College Management

### 12 Irish Ferries

Congress notes with concern the events surrounding the Irish Ferries dispute last year and congratulates the Irish unions for ensuring, through the settlement to the dispute, that the Irish minimum wage will apply to migrant workers on Irish Ferries' ships. Congress condemns the company's attempts forcibly to replace British and Irish seafarers with low-cost, non-resident labour (paid at less than UK/Eire rates), and notes with particular concern the use of uniformed security guards in an attempt to end a sit-in by crew members and to remove them from the ships.

Whilst congratulating the TUC on its work to address the exploitation of vulnerable migrant workers, Congress highlights the lack of similar protection for workers on merchant ships and calls for particular attention to be given to this special area. Recognising the importance of the ferry sector for the employment of British and Irish seafarers, Congress calls on the Government to act to prevent the exploitation of such crews by rigorously enforcing ILO convention requirements on employment conditions and to protect the EU maritime skills base by ensuring that all seafarers working on UK ferries or ferries trading regularly between the UK and other EU member states have terms and conditions that are compatible with both member states, irrespective of the flag of the vessel.

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

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Add new final paragraph:

'Congress believes the exploitation of foreign national seafarers on UK ships and in UK waters also needs to be addressed by the removal of the seafarers' exemption contained within the Race Relations Act 1976 and by ensuring that such seafarers are no longer exempt from the national minimum wage.'

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

### 13 Penalties for failure to implement statutory provisions

Congress believes that the failure of employers to implement statutory provisions affecting employees working conditions is becoming increasingly common. Congress asserts that it should not be the responsibility of the individual employee to engage in lengthy and costly litigation to ensure the implementation of statute.

Congress calls upon the Government to provide an effective and efficient mechanism whereby employers who fail to implement legislation are put on notice and subject to a substantial fine and/or custodial sentence if they do not comply.

### National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers

### 14 Flexible working



Congress welcomes the recommendations of the Women and Work Commission. Congress notes the emphasis on flexible working and agrees that promoting access to flexible working is one of the most effective ways of tackling occupational segregation and raising the status of part-time work.

Congress is also aware that many workers need to care for their children before or after school but are unable to agree working hours that enable them to do so. Parents are also legally responsible for ensuring their child attends school and can be prosecuted if their child is persistently absent, yet may struggle to take personal responsibility for their child's school attendance whilst needing to attend their paid work at the same time.

As a result, in their efforts to balance their contractual duties with their parental responsibilities, parents of school-age children often find themselves caught up in disciplinary action or falling foul of sickness absence procedures because ultimately the care of their children has to take priority.

Therefore, Congress calls upon the General Council to:

- i) lobby Government to stand by its expressed intention of extending the right to request flexible working to all parents of dependent children and to implement this as a matter of urgency;
- ii) continue to commission research into working-time flexibility and circulate best practice amongst affiliates; and
- iii) work with affiliates in building the business case for the extension of the right to request flexible working to all employees.

#### **Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Insert new sub-paragraph ii) and re-number subsequent sub-paragraphs:

'ii) remind the Government that its drive to raise achievement of those pupils who are currently least successful needs the active support of parents. Many of these are restricted in offering support because of lack of flexibility in their working arrangements;'

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

### **15 Equality reps**

Congress believes that discrimination on grounds of gender, race, sexual orientation, disability, age and religion or belief still persists in many UK workplaces. Congress welcomes the Government's Discrimination Law Review and urges the Government to use this opportunity to strengthen and improve anti-discrimination laws. Congress also believes that in addition to strong legislation, effective collective bargaining and union representation are the best means of tackling discrimination at work. In order to be able to deliver on equality and discrimination issues at work unions need to have representatives who are dedicated to promoting equality and trained to handle discrimination issues. These representatives should also be an integral part of unions' negotiating teams on all workplace issues, not marginalized.

To this end, Congress welcomes the recommendation of the Women and Work Commission to provide £5 million for a capacity building exercise for union equality representatives. Congress urges the Government to ensure that a ring-fenced grant allocation of £5 million is provided within the Union Modernisation Fund budget and that separate and specific criteria are devised, in consultation with the TUC, for grant applications.

Congress additionally calls on the General Council to co-ordinate union applications for money for equality representatives capacity building so that the best possible spread of activities is organised and the case is made for moving equality representatives onto a

statutory footing, so that they have guaranteed access to paid facility time.

#### **Nationwide Group Staff Union**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Add new final paragraph:

'Congress further calls for full funding for the implementation of all the recommendations of the Women and Work Commission, and for the EOC, in order to meet its additional duties as required by the Women and Work Commission, prior to the establishment of the Commission for Equality and Human Rights.'

#### **napo - the Trade Union and Professional Association for Family Court and Probation Staff**

### **16 Violence against women**

Congress deplores the problem of violence against women and girls within the UK and around the world.

Congress asserts that violence against women is an affront to human rights, a blight on civil society and undermines equality, social justice and democracy.

Congress welcomes the constructive development of international campaigns, such as the International Day Against Violence Against Women led by Amnesty International and a coalition of women's organisations and trade unions.

Congress re-affirms its opposition to all forms of violence against women and calls on the General Council to:

- i) lobby the Government to establish a cross-departmental working group, involving trade unions and women's organisations, to establish a coherent national strategy to end all forms of violence against women and girls in the UK;
- ii) ensure the fullest participation of all TUC affiliates in the international campaign to end violence against women;
- iii) work with affiliates to develop and disseminate campaigning and organizing materials to help stop violence against women and to increase workplace and public awareness on this issue; and
- iv) compile evidence on the impact of violence against women and girls on their educational access and participation, employment and careers.

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

### **17 Valuing trade union race equality committees**

Congress believes that more must be done to ensure the voice of black workers is heard throughout the trade union movement and congratulates all TUC affiliates who have strong and effective race equality committees - the T&GWU, for example, is proud of its democratic, constitutional, national and regional race structures, made up of elected lay delegates from across the union.

Congress also fully recognises that due to continual barriers in workplace, branch and industrial structures, race committees have been pivotal in ensuring the involvement of black members.

Congress believes that the progressive work of union race equality structures is central to growing trade unionism amongst black and migrant workers, and in challenging racism and fascism. It is vitally important for black members to come together to set the agenda for advancing race equality in the workplace and unions to play a full role in organising diverse workers. Congress must also have rules to ensure that black members are represented at all levels of unions.

Congress calls upon the General Council to promote the value of constitutional race equality committees

and rules to tackle under-representation in effecting real change for black workers and to highlight this in the next TUC Equality Audit.

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

### 18 Islamophobia and racism

Congress is anxious to counter the growing culture of Islamophobia as another manifestation of racism, which is borne out of a transatlantic agenda for the Middle East and the consequent terrorist atrocities of recent years. In the workplace the impact of this can be corrosive on relationships and it impacts on Asian communities as a whole. Fear and ignorance breeds prejudice and prejudice is undiscerning. Many innocent people suffer as a result. It is every bit as important that we combat racism, fear and prejudice as it is that we combat terrorism.

Congress, therefore, calls upon the General Council to:

i) encourage affiliated unions to share and promote good practices aimed at countering Islamophobia in the workplace, as part of their anti-racist strategies; and

ii) use these examples to promote a similar sense of responsibility amongst employers such that a joint approach to this aspect of racism and discrimination may be developed - one that is inclusive and which values racial, religious and cultural diversity.

**napo - the Trade Union and Professional Association for Family Court and Probation Staff**

*The following AMENDMENTS were accepted*

Insert new second paragraph:

'Congress notes that the fascist BNP made the promotion of Islamophobia a key plank of its election campaign.'

Add new sub-paragraph iii):

'iii) continue to support campaigning against the BNP as a priority in the coming year.'

**Communication Workers' Union**

Add new sub-paragraph iii):

'iii) ensure Islamophobia and racism plays no part in the sentencing of offenders and is given a zero tolerance in the criminal justice system.'

**POA**

### 19 Deportation of children of asylum seekers

Congress is concerned that the processes for deportation of 'failed' asylum seekers do not take into account the needs of the families of asylum seekers and the communities of which they have been a part during their residence in the United Kingdom. Congress is aware of the damaging emotional and psychological effects on children, both those of asylum seekers and those children of UK citizens who have become their friends, brought about by the sudden deportation of asylum seeker families. Congress expresses its concern about the additional psychological demands this process places on children who will already have had significant traumatic experiences prior to their arrival in the United Kingdom. Congress further notes that the deportation of the children of asylum seekers is contrary to the guiding principles of the Government's strategy for children Every Child Matters.

Congress instructs the General Council to investigate further the effects of this experience on children in our communities and to make representation to the Government to ensure that the needs of children and their communities become important criteria in the consideration of requests for residence by asylum seekers and that these are fully taken into account in any decision-making.

## Association of Educational Psychologists

### 20 Access to Work and the public sector

Congress notes with alarm the proposal to withdraw the Access to Work scheme from public bodies, and calls on the TUC to campaign against this. The scheme provides vital support to disabled people in employment and its withdrawal would certainly add to the unacceptable proportion of disabled people excluded from work. There would be a loss of valuable skills to public bodies and a contradiction with their statutory duty to promote equality would be created.

Congress further notes the incompatibility between this proposal and the Government's professed objective of transferring large numbers of disabled people from dependence on benefits to employment. These inconsistencies demonstrate the increasing gap between the political rhetoric of inclusion and the resources necessary to make inclusion a practical reality. They also highlight a worrying lack of 'joined up government' that will further compound the social and economic disadvantages already faced by disabled people.

**TUC Disability Conference** (exempt from 250 word limit)

### 21 Remploy

Congress welcomes the advances, under Labour, in getting more disabled people into work, but recognises that real progress has been slow.

A decade after the Disability Discrimination Act became law disabled people are still twice as likely to be out of work as non-disabled people.

Congress is concerned that discrimination by many employers is rampant and this is why many disabled people are not working.

Congress recognises the supportive environment that Remploy factories offer to disabled people, when run well.

Congress acknowledges that although the Remploy Review has caused uncertainty and widespread anxiety to our members, it has afforded us the opportunity to show the Remploy management structure as bureaucratic and lacking accountability. It has also allowed us to highlight the low level of commitment and professionalism of certain key management positions.

Congress regrets that the terms of reference set for the Remploy Review were based on flawed unit cost comparisons contained in the National Audit Office report.

Congress rejects arguments that Remploy's factory-based businesses are unsustainable and is firmly opposed to Remploy becoming an employment agency at the expense of its manufacturing businesses.

Congress calls on the General Council to:

i) support the campaign to defend Remploy factories from closures;

ii) lobby the Government to make the businesses profitable and streamline the top-heavy management to create even more jobs for disabled people; and

iii) lobby Government to ensure Remploy factories benefit from positive procurement strategies.

**GMB**

### 26 TUPE and pensions

Congress notes that the TUPE Regulations in the UK still do not make any requirement for the provision of comparable rather than minimum pensions for transferred employees.

Congress reaffirms its view that the protection of workers' pensions is essential in the UK's excessively flexible labour market. In the light of this, Congress condemns the view expressed by the Chief Executive of the National Association of Pension Funds that employers should be able retrospectively to reduce benefits in final salary schemes and notes that this is a completely inappropriate and unacceptable policy position for an organisation with a pro-pension mandate.

Congress calls on the General Council to continue campaigning to protect workers pensions and specifically to seek an amendment to the TUPE Regulations to require the provision of comparable pensions for transferred employees.

#### **Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union**

### **27 Manufacturing**

Congress expresses its concern at the crisis in manufacturing industry, with tens of thousands of job losses and the threatened closure of factories from Peugeot Ryton to HP Sauce.

At the present rate, and with the growth of China and India as industrial powers, manufacturing will disappear in Britain within the next twenty years, to the detriment of the country's economic health and the security, living standards and job opportunities of working people.

In no other European country would industry face such difficulties without government assistance and Congress believes that there is an urgent need to rehabilitate the idea of state intervention to help ensure that balanced economic development challenges prevailing free-market dogma.

The admission by the President of General Motors Europe that it is easier to sack British workers because of the flexible labour market reaffirms the need to bring UK law into line with the consultation obligations of the EU Directive on Collective Redundancies.

Congress therefore instructs the General Council to campaign for pro-active government policies including:

- i) public sector purchasing designed to support UK jobs;
- ii) the state to identify 'manufacturing champions' and, where necessary, use public funds to take a stake in such companies and support as appropriate;
- iii) legally binding commitments to refund any aid received by an employer that decides to relocate or close; and
- iv) preventing companies relocating without first consulting in depth with their employees and the local community alternatives.

#### **Transport and General Workers' Union**

*The following AMENDMENTS were accepted*

Add paragraph at end of the motion:

'Congress urges the Government to make the regeneration of British manufacturing a primary national goal to be taken into account in all national economic, trade, energy, and foreign policy decisions and to ensure that British manufacturers can compete on equal terms with counterparts in other EU countries.'

#### **Community**

Insert new paragraph 2:

'Congress is also concerned with the impact of privatisation that has directly resulted in the demise of the nation's railway traction and rolling stock manufacturing capability. This is in spite of the railways being subsidised heavily by the taxpayer.'

Insert new sub-paragraph ii) and re-number existing paragraphs:

'ii) measures to reverse the demise of the indigenous railway manufacturing industry;'

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

### **28 Science**

Congress recognises that science and technology play a key role in underpinning economic success and in delivering wider societal benefits. Yet despite the high profile given to science and innovation through the Treasury's ten-year investment framework, science for the national good is under threat.

World-leading research programmes, including into breast cancer, agri-engineering and animal diseases, have been closed. Research on the impacts of climate change, pollution and biodiversity currently faces substantial cuts.

It is not in the national interest to close down so much work of practical application, peer-reviewed for quality, and providing direct support for the UK's international commitments on climate change and the environment. It also puts the UK at real risk of being unable to respond when the next major crisis occurs.

Congress is concerned that there is no effective central oversight for the health of the nation's science base. Policy management and decision-making have become very fragmented and lack strategic coherence.

Congress therefore calls on the General Council to campaign for a joined-up approach to science policy-making that recognises the value of public sector science. This must include designated ministerial responsibility and authority for:

- i) exercising effective powers of scrutiny over proposals to close research facilities and publishing their findings on a timely basis;
- ii) establishing a database of public sector scientific capability, including collecting, analysing and reporting on annual returns of scientists employed by government, their location and areas of expertise; and
- iii) taking forward a strategy to maintain and enhance the science skills base.

#### **Prospect**

### **30 Bank holidays**

Congress welcomes the Government's recent announcement to treat public holidays as an addition to the 20 days' annual leave entitlement in the Working Time Directive, but is concerned that workers will have to wait up to three years before the eight days' additional leave is fully implemented.

Congress notes that approximately one million of the UK's worst paid and poorly treated workers stand to benefit from the addition of bank holidays to statutory paid holiday entitlement.

Congress rejects any proposal that would lead to this increased entitlement to be offset against future increases in national minimum wage levels because low wage workers are those most likely to benefit from the additional holidays.

Given the commitment made in the Government's manifesto to exclude bank holidays from the minimum holiday requirements of the Working Time Directive, Congress believes that this commitment should be implemented in full with effect no later than from 1 October 2007 and should not be subject to a phased approach over the next three years.

#### **Amicus**

### **34 Accountability and standards in public service**

Congress recognises a continuing decline of public trust in governance at all levels. Reasons for this include behaviour that flouts ethical standards, and confusion

about effective accountability of both elected politicians and public servants. The prevalent culture of scapegoating compounds this confusion, when the response to the emergence of problems in policy or service delivery is often to demand the sacking of individuals rather than seek to understand the complexity of how services are best designed and delivered.

Congress therefore believes it important that all in public office uphold the highest ethical standards, and that there should be a clearer understanding of the respective accountability of politicians and individual public servants. Politicians should be prepared to acknowledge their own responsibility for the policy framework and delivery of services within the provision of adequate resources whilst acknowledging the professionalism and expertise of public servants.

Congress urges the General Council to foster public debate about how to ensure fair and meaningful accountability that recognises both the rights of politicians and public servants and also provides effective mechanisms to hold individuals to account, and help reassure the public, when problems emerge.

Whilst welcoming the revised Civil Service Code (which offers greater clarity about the rights and responsibilities of individual civil servants) Congress calls for comparable changes to the Ministerial Code. Congress further reaffirms its support for a Civil Service Act which will give statutory force to the values and ethos of the civil service and the accountability of civil servants.

#### **FDA**

### **35 National register of assaults on public sector workers**

Congress believes that there continues to be justifiable, deep concern about the number of public sector workers who are subject to physical and verbal abuse in the course of their work.

Congress asserts that although numerous strategies have been adopted at local and national level to seek to address these, they have failed to resolve the problem because one of the major barriers to effective targeting of action to protect staff is the absence of accurate, national data on the nature and incidence of such assaults. In local authorities many individual workplace-based records of assaults on the workforce are not passed to the local authority and those that are referred are not reported or recorded in a standardised way.

Congress calls upon the General Council to campaign for a national, public register of incidents, updated annually, of verbal and physical abuse in each of the public services. Further the General Council should press the Government to require standardised record keeping and a statutory requirement for referral to the national register by local employers. Penalties and remedies for non-compliance should also be devised.

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

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Add new final paragraph:

'Congress notes that budget cuts increase the risk of assaults and that current legal avenues do not provide redress to injured workers. Congress agrees to launch a campaign for adequate staffing levels and for the introduction into law of a new offence of assaulting civil/public servants during their work.'

#### **Public and Commercial Services Union**

### **36 Regional pay in the public sector**

Congress regrets the remarks made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to a CBI dinner on 5th June about

doing more to encourage local and regional pay in the public sector.

Such a move would:

- i) erode the genuine efforts being made to introduce pay systems based on equal pay for work of equal value into the public sector;
- ii) undermine the integrity of existing national pay review bodies; and
- iii) introduce significant inefficiencies into the public sector by replacing unified, national bargaining arrangements with many hundreds of local negotiations.

The decision of the Chancellor to make his announcement in this way was also counterproductive to established partnership working with trade unions in the public sector.

Congress acknowledges the difficulties of working in high cost areas of the UK, the solutions for which go wider than pay. Congress calls on the TUC to support affiliates to engage constructively in addressing these difficulties rather than going down the dead alley of local and regional pay.

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

*The following AMENDMENTS were accepted*

Insert new paragraph 4:

'Congress opposes moves to devolve the pay of teachers in Wales to the Welsh Assembly Government, resulting in worse pay and conditions for those teachers. Congress also supports efforts to seek pay and conditions for teachers in Northern Ireland that are comparable to England and Wales.'

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

Add at end:

'Congress calls on the General Council to:

- a) raise these concerns with the Government at the earliest opportunity;
- b) provide research assistance to affiliates on the development of local/regional pay in the public services; and
- c) provide political support to those affiliates seeking the retention or introduction of national pay.'

#### **Fire Brigades' Union**

### **37 Fire and rescue service strategic planning**

Congress notes with concern that the 'modernisation' agenda within the fire and rescue service appears to be focused on cost-cutting and reducing levels of emergency cover rather than on genuine improvement.

The Buncefield oil refinery explosion and fire in Hertfordshire was the biggest peace time conflagration since the Second World War, requiring resources and assistance from numerous United Kingdom fire and rescue services and other emergency services.

This incident, along with incidents such as the July 2005 bombings, clearly demonstrates the need for new national standards of emergency response, capable of dealing with three simultaneous 'New Dimension' type incidents in geographically different locations in the UK; as well as the need for strategic planning for all incidents at a local and regional level. Such strategic planning must involve fire and rescue services, and other services likely to be involved. It must also ensure that local democratic accountability is maintained.

The current national framework and guidance for fire and rescue service 'integrated risk management planning' does not adequately take account of such needs. This weakens the ability of the service to respond to incidents requiring a regional, supra-regional or national level response.

Congress calls on the Government to address this matter urgently in consultation with fire and rescue

service employers, the FBU, and the public and to ensure sufficient investment is made available to individual fire and rescue services to ensure that they are able to plan, control, manage and deliver the appropriate emergency response to all incidents on all occasions.

#### **Fire Brigades' Union**

#### **42 NHS Breast Screening Programme**

Congress welcomes recent advances in the treatment of breast cancer such as herceptin and notes the vital role unions played in supporting their members so that decisions on prescribing the drug were made on clinical grounds and not on cost.

Congress applauds the tremendous work of radiographers and other NHS staff in making the NHS Breast Screening Programme - which saves 1400 lives a year - so successful.

Congress notes this year marks the 20th anniversary of the Forrest report which led to the founding of the NHS Breast Screening Programme and calls on the TUC's General Council to back Breakthrough Breast Cancer's new campaign to improve the effectiveness of the screening programme.

Congress recognises that in line with the recommendations of experts, the NHS breast screening programme aims to screen eligible women once every three years but, in reality, too many women are forced to wait longer. Congress further recognises the main reason for these delays is often a lack of capacity in the NHS Breast Screening Programme.

Congress notes there are a growing number of women becoming eligible for breast screening, and that the Government expects this increase to peak in 2015, resulting in a 20 per cent increase in women aged 50 to 70, in England, between 2005 and 2025. Congress calls on the TUC General Council to support Breakthrough's campaign to ensure the 2007 Comprehensive Spending Review increases the capacity of the NHS Breast Screening Programme to meet this demographic challenge.

#### **Society of Radiographers**

#### **43 Obesity crisis**

Congress remains acutely concerned about the escalating obesity crisis in the country, particularly regarding children who are now affected.

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

- i) increase support for local food projects that contribute positively to nutritional status and increase skills and confidence among young people;
- ii) ensure a drastic reduction in targeted advertising of 'less healthy' foods to children;
- iii) encourage manufacturers and retailers to promote 'healthy foods' to the public;
- iv) encourage manufacturers and retailers to provide a consistent and clear approach to labelling foods (signposting);
- v) highlight the dangers of 'special offer' promotions that encourage the purchase of large quantities of high calorie/high fat foods for children and also lead to excessive alcohol consumption amongst adolescents and young children;
- vi) seek an improvement in nutrition education in schools by supporting healthier food choices, re-introducing cooking skills within the national curriculum, teaching young people about healthy eating and how to understand food labelling; and
- vii) promote healthy eating campaigns through workplaces to benefit the health of workers and to

support them in guiding their children towards healthier eating patterns.

#### **British Dietetic Association**

#### **44 Zahid Mubarek Inquiry**

Congress welcomes the recommendations of the Zahid Mubarek Inquiry. Congress recognises the work already done by the POA, NAPO, PCS and all criminal justice unions to ensure that the criminal justice system continues to address racism and discrimination in all its forms.

Congress demands that the Government adopts a rigorous zero-tolerance approach to racism and violence amongst the prison population.

Further, Government should provide all the resources required to ensure appropriate treatment, therapy and care is given to all offenders who have mental health aspects to their criminal behaviour.

Congress expresses its heartfelt condolences to the Mubarek family following the preventable murder of Zahid and pledges to campaign in his honour to ensure that prisons are improved, made safe and are free from discrimination.

#### **POA**

#### **47 Early years education**

Congress urges the General Council to ask the Government to:

- i) re-consider the current plans for the curriculum for early years children, which represent an over-prescriptive and formal curriculum for reception-aged children;
- ii) take into account the progressive experience of Wales in the New Foundation Stage and also the Scandinavian experience of countries such as Finland in the planning and implementation of an early years curriculum; and
- iii) take account of current psychological knowledge and research into child development and learning.

#### **Association of Educational Psychologists**

#### **48 Class size**

Congress notes that the UK has some of the largest class size averages across the European Union and further notes that existing research evidence suggests that reducing class size can play a significant part in improving attainment, pupil motivation and pupil behaviour.

Congress also believes that children learn better and that teaching conditions are enhanced in classes with smaller numbers of pupils. Reducing class sizes is also of particular advantage to children in the early years of education, assists with social inclusion and allows for a greater level of pupil/teacher interaction.

Congress, in particular, welcomes the recent announcement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer committing a future Government to match the per-capita spending on public education with that in the private sector. This should ensure that class sizes are reduced in the public sector to bring them into line with those in private schools.

Congress, therefore, calls on the present 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 in the United Kingdom.

#### **Educational Institute of Scotland**

#### **49 Local authority support for schools**

Congress recognises the important functions undertaken by local authorities and related agencies in

working with local schools to achieve a range of key educational objectives, including:

- i) a broader and more flexible 14-19 curriculum;
- ii) the provision of valuable in-service professional development opportunities for classroom teachers;
- iii) effective external support for schools causing concern, to improve their performance;
- iv) holistic child development via closer links between formal education and other children's services;
- v) facilitation of sustainable inter-school networks and collaboratives; and
- vi) specialist advice for schools via ICT, SEN, ethnic minority achievement, early years and other dedicated support services, to raise standards of attainment.

Congress acknowledges that these functions require the deployment of highly trained educational improvement and children's services development professionals. Indeed, Congress favours systematic investment in professional learning and development at all levels of the education workforce, to ensure high-quality service delivery, at all times, in the interests of the nation's children. Congress, therefore, urges the Government to maintain and enhance its encouragement of the National Standards for Educational Improvement Professionals, originally launched by the DfES in 2003, and to support the professional accreditation of educational improvement and related staffs and consultants, based on these national standards.

#### **Aspect**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

In sub-paragraph ii), replace 'classroom teachers' with 'school workforce'.

Insert new sub-paragraph v) and renumber sub-paragraphs accordingly:

'v) intervening to tackle poor performance by schools in the management of the workforce;'

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

### **52 'Journalism Matters'**

Congress welcomes the launch of the NUJ's Journalism Matters campaign, which aims to highlight the important role journalism can play in promoting democratic participation in local communities and across the UK.

Congress condemns the actions of those media and publishing companies who are axing frontline newsgathering and specialist reporters, closing editions, reducing news pages, marginalizing public service programmes and cutting editorial budgets whilst posting record profits and increased shareholder dividends.

Congress believes the result of such cuts is to reduce local and specialist media coverage, leading to a detrimental effect on local communities, public knowledge and democratic participation.

Congress calls on the Government to investigate the operation of regional monopolies in the local newspaper industry which act against the citizens' interest, and the failure of OFCOM to maintain and strengthen public service broadcasting across the ITV regions.

Congress urges affiliates to back local Journalism Matters initiatives with the aim of pressuring local media to invest in and promote rather than cut back newsgathering resources.

Congress believes the Government should consider urgent action to promote greater plurality in media as a step towards encouraging greater democratic participation.

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

### **53 Status of the artist**

Numerous government ministers have cited the UK creative industries as a means to combat the threat that our traditional manufacturing industries face from the new economic giants of China and India. Congress agrees that support and encouragement for the 'creative economy' will be beneficial and provide us with effective means by which we can compete on a global scale in the 21st century.

However, Congress is concerned that the support for the creative industries will ignore the status of the actual creators who provide the essential raw material for these industries. Congress, therefore, calls upon the UK Government to examine the UNESCO Status of the Artist Treaty (1980) and the subsequent recommendations resulting from a review of the status of the artist in 1997. These international instruments address many aspects of this sector's status including tax and national insurance, pensions and, most importantly, they recognise these individuals' right to come together to form their own trade unions to negotiate and set minimum terms and conditions and to promulgate other basic rights that are essential to the well-being of all workers, no matter what employment relationship they have.

UNESCO has recognised the unique contribution that creative workers make to society; the UK Government should embrace its work and ensure a secure future for these workers if they want to encourage and expand our country's creative capacity.

#### **Musicians' Union**

### **54 New technology and payments to performers**

Congress recognises that new technology is revolutionising how many people consume music, films, radio and television programmes.

These exciting developments mean that high quality sound and images can be accessed anytime, anywhere, on a range of devices. Even traditional TV viewing is changing, with the Government confirming the switch to digital between 2008 and 2012.

Congress supports the right of performers and other rights holders to share in the success of their work, by receiving ongoing payments for the use of their work.

Trade unions must continue to have a central role in this process by reaching collective agreements with broadcasters and producers achieving rights under contract.

However, Congress also calls upon Government to create a framework that provides more support to the creators who are essential to the UK's creative industries.

As a result Congress calls upon the Government to take measures to improve the current legal framework:

- i) introduce a levy on recordable media and associated devices, coupled with a broader exemption for fair use by consumers;
- ii) confirm support for an international audiovisual treaty on performers' rights through the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO);
- iii) extend the current term of copyright protection on sound recordings and performers rights; and
- iv) implement the manifesto commitment to work with industry to address the threat of piracy.

Congress calls upon the Government to implement these policies both through its review of the UK intellectual property framework and in its discussions with the European Commission regarding its review of EU copyright legislation.

#### **Equity**

## 55 Public funding for theatre

Congress supports public funding for the arts and theatre in the UK. Theatre in this country is hugely popular and the envy of the world - based on a strong tradition of public subsidy enriching the nation's cultural health.

Public support for theatre makes sense artistically due to its intrinsic value and the need to provide a range and quality of new work; it makes sense socially by providing a means to explore cultural identities and an as educational instrument; and it makes sense economically, as theatre has an economic impact of £2.6bn a year from an annual UK subsidy of £120m.

Congress recognises that the Government has a positive record of supporting theatre since 1997. This included an additional £25m in funding for producing theatres in England in 2002.

These relatively small sums helped to revitalise theatre over this period. However, Congress shared the widespread disappointment at the real terms cuts in arts funding announced in 2004.

Any reduction in funding will only lead to less activity and diminish the positive work achieved by earlier investment. The structure of the theatre industry means new technology offers no identifiable scope for efficiencies and the sector is already characterised by very low wages.

Congress calls upon the Government to identify an above-inflation settlement for theatre when it announces funding allocations in the next Comprehensive Spending Review in 2007.

Congress also believes that UK theatre requires a more consistent approach to long-term funding, so the benefits of the previous uplifts are not lost.

### Equity

## 56 Transport policy

Congress believes that the reunification under public ownership and control of the national railway system is central to a strategy for the future of Britain's railways. Congress believes the policy for a publicly owned and accountable railway should begin with the passenger train operating companies.

Congress recognises the threat of terrorist attacks on public transport remains high and supports efforts to counter this. Like employers such as Transport for London, Congress considers the workforce has a vital role to play in the fight against terrorism. Congress is, therefore, critical of the reluctance of the railway industry collectively to engage with the unions on this matter. Congress calls on the General Council to continue to work with the rail unions to ensure their full involvement in transport security.

Congress supports campaigns for safer stations. However, Congress is concerned that action often results from high profile, violent incidents. Congress demands that stations are made safer by ensuring they are adequately staffed, protected, equipped and maintained at all relevant times. This must be done in a way that doesn't compromise health and safety and staff are fully protected regardless of shift times.

Congress considers leaving many stations in a poor state of repair is a false economy. Congress believes that investment in improving the station environment will result in improving personal safety and significantly more journeys being made by train. Congress calls on all concerned to work together to deliver the improved facilities and services that passengers deserve and a better working environment for staff.

### Transport Salaried Staffs' Association

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Insert new paragraph 2:

'Congress calls on the London Mayor to retain the London Underground East London Line in the public sector and to not allow this service to be privatised as is currently being proposed. Congress fully supports the rail unions' campaign to keep the East London Line wholly in the public sector.'

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

## 59 Energy prices

Congress notes that when it comes to the price and supply of energy there is no level playing field for UK manufacturing compared to its EU partners. Congress views this as a significant factor, particularly for heavy industrial users of energy, in the determination of future investment in UK plants and their overall viability in the short to medium term.

Congress believes that government needs to adopt a strategic view of the industrial impact of energy prices and calls upon the Government to introduce regulatory steps to ensure security of supply to industry until such time as the UK becomes self-sufficient in energy supply.

Congress further instructs the General Council to support the campaign to persuade the Government to:

- i) encourage the creation of a 'reserve market' for gas where industrial users can be properly rewarded for reducing demand when supplies get tight;
- ii) establish a strategic gas storage plan which could be implemented through the National Grid;
- iii) compensate industry in the event that gas supplies are cut off in an emergency;
- iv) facilitate and encourage diversity of energy source;
- v) send the appropriate signals to discourage market speculators whose actions are undermining industry's ability to compete on an even basis with sister plants in the EU and elsewhere; and
- vi) bring together representatives from industry and the owners of the Interconnector gas pipeline with a view to establishing a tri-partite group through which greater transparency and visibility of the Interconnector operation can be achieved.

### Amicus

## 60 Energy Review

Congress notes the Government's Energy Review and agrees with the premise of the review that climate change must be tackled, but the UK also must ensure it has secure energy supplies at affordable prices so that the poorest in society are not adversely affected by changes in energy charges.

Congress therefore calls on the Government to promote the use of renewable resources such as solar, wind and water power in combination with other initiatives such as clean coal technology, which is addressing the problems of coal's excessive production of carbon dioxide.

Congress believes that it is vital for the UK economy and environment that UK energy use becomes more sustainable and that the UK should aim for a long-term self-sufficiency in its energy needs and requirements.

Congress also notes that transport is one of the worst polluters in the UK environment and welcomes the Government's target for 10 per cent of transport fuel to be from renewable resources by 2015. However, to increase this further Congress believes that the UK rail network should be fully electrified and that all public transport in urban areas should be run on bio-fuel in order to help cut emissions into the environment.

### Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen

## 65 Trident

Congress notes that the Prime Minister has stated that a decision on whether or not to replace Britain's nuclear weapons system, Trident, will be taken this year.

Congress welcomes the demand of the Defence Select Committee for a full public and Parliamentary debate on this issue.

Congress believes that Britain's nuclear weapons are weapons of mass destruction, capable of killing millions of people and are tied into US military and foreign policy and that far from deterring nuclear threats, replacing Trident may increase the risk of nuclear conflict.

Congress is alarmed that a successor to Trident could cost tens of billions of pounds.

Congress believes that in the absence of any rational argument for Trident replacement such expenditure would not only be immoral but a scandalous waste of public funds that could otherwise be invested in health, education, pensions, transport and manufacturing.

Congress also notes that the UK is a signatory to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and has made 'an unequivocal undertaking' to accomplish the total elimination of its nuclear arsenal.

Congress calls upon the Government not to replace Trident and also requests that the General Council urgently explores how it can work with the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament to oppose the replacement of Trident.

Finally Congress urges the Government not to reach a final decision on Trident replacement before issuing a consultative Green Paper on all the options for replacement, including non-replacement and a policy of arms diversification, followed by a White Paper and a deciding vote in Parliament.

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

## 66 Control Arms Campaign

Congress welcomes the UK Government's commitment to ensure negotiations for an international Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) begin 'no later than 2006' and their aim to table a resolution to open negotiations at the UN General Assembly (UNGA) later this month.

Congress notes that Amnesty International and Oxfam have combined with IANSA to campaign for an ATT through the Control Arms Campaign and encourages trade unions to support this campaign.

Congress notes that international support for an ATT is growing with over 50 supportive countries but more are needed to pass the resolution by a majority vote and take the initiative forward.

Currently, there is no comprehensive international agreement governing the transfer of weapons, yet over 1,000 people are needlessly killed by armed violence every day.

Congress notes that existing loopholes in UK arms control legislation can undermine the UK's credibility on this issue. 2007 is the three-year review of this legislation.

Congress calls on the UK Government to:

- i) encourage as many governments as possible to support a resolution to open negotiations for an ATT at the UNGA, based on states' existing responsibilities under international human rights and humanitarian law and for those negotiations to include tough enforcement and monitoring mechanisms and be completed within the fastest possible timeframe; and
- ii) ensure the review of UK legislation upholds the 2001 manifesto commitment to regulate arms brokers and traffickers wherever they are located.

Congress calls on the General Council to raise these concerns with the UK Government.

### **Accord**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Add at the end of sub-paragraph ii):

"and at a minimum for these to include full extra-territorial controls for those involved in brokering and trafficking of small arms, light weapons and ammunition."

### **Nationwide Group Staff Union**

## 68 Responsible use of the internet

Congress, noting the potential benefit of the internet in democratising knowledge capital:

- i) affirms that the right to knowledge is an essential human right;
- ii) condemns the reported action of the search engine website Google in responding to political pressure to limit that right; and
- iii) calls on the General Council to campaign, both nationally and internationally, for responsible use of the internet.

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

## 69 Fairtrade and seafarers

Congress welcomes the agreement earlier this year on an international Bill of Rights for the world's seafarers. Congress recognises the intense levels of exploitation and wage dumping within the shipping industry and urges the TUC to maintain pressure upon the UK Government to ratify, implement and enforce the provisions of the Maritime Labour Convention 2006 as soon as possible.

Congress particularly welcomes the concept of a Maritime Labour Certificate to demonstrate compliance with convention standards. Congress is concerned that seafarers' working conditions are not presently addressed within the criteria for Fairtrade products and services, even though more than 90 per cent of world trade is moved by ships. Congress also notes with concern the fact that considerable proportions of aid and relief cargoes are carried by ships registered in flag of convenience (FoC) countries, which regularly infringe minimum international safety and employment standards. Congress therefore urges the General Council to campaign for UN agencies, charities and relief organisations to use ships that are not registered with FoC states and that meet international safety and labour standards.

Congress also calls for dialogue between the TUC and Fairtrade groups to ensure that seafarers' working conditions and shipboard social standards form part of the assessment process for Fairtrade status.

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

## 70 International development

Congress believes that at the beginning of this new millennium, the current levels of global poverty and deprivation are still unacceptably high and remain an affront to humanity.

With the resources available to the international community there is no excuse for this situation to remain. Unbelievably the number of children that still live in poverty is 1 billion, every second child - a fact we all should be ashamed of.

Congress reaffirms that it is time to 'Make Poverty History'.

The efforts of the UK Government in raising the issues of aid, trade and debt in order to create a more



prosperous and just world are to be applauded. But more must still be done.

Unions are unique in their ability to build capacity and to develop and support effective civil societies.

Therefore, Congress calls on the UK Government to make greater resources available for the trade union movement to carry out this work. This is common practice in the Nordic countries, Germany and the Netherlands and must become common practice in the UK.

### **Derbyshire Group Staff Union**

#### **72 Cuba**

Congress expresses its alarm at the recent aggressive lobbying by the US Government, which is an attempt to involve the UK and European Governments in the further tightening of the US illegal blockade of Cuba.

Congress records its serious concern at the 'classified' meeting between FCO officials and Caleb McCarry, the Bush administration's Cuba Transition Co-ordinator.

Congress deplores the contents of the report by McCarry's Commission aimed at the destabilisation of Cuba following the death of President Fidel Castro and in turn exposes US plans for possible attacks on Cuban living standards involving the disbanding of co-operatives, privatising hospitals and schools and dismantling social security and pension provision.

Congress condemns these plans with their classified annex of measures which remain secret for 'national security reasons' with the object of ensuring 'effective implementation' and calls on the UK Government to raise these concerns with its counterpart in the US administration.

Congress is aware of the ongoing efforts of the TUC and Cuba Solidarity Campaign (CSC) and congratulates them on successfully organising the European Trade Union Solidarity Conference in February 2006, recognising its vital importance in the face of these new threats to the Cuban people.

Congress resolves to maintain its support for the efforts of trade unions and the CSC within the trade union movement to build alliances and intensify through a broad-based campaign the fight against these new threats and to bring to an end the illegal and inhumane 45-year US blockade which is a violation of Cuba's sovereignty.

#### **National Union of Mineworkers**

*The following AMENDMENTS were accepted*

Add new paragraph at end:

'Congress recognises Cuba's outstanding international solidarity despite the blockade, including 25,000 health professionals in 69 countries and 10,000 free medical scholarships for students from developing countries. Congress particularly praises humanitarian efforts for Pakistani earthquake victims, 73 per cent of whom were treated by Cuban doctors - facts largely unreported by the media.'

#### **National Union of Mineworkers**

Amendment

Insert new paragraph 4:

'Congress notes that the report opposes Cuba's 'interventionist and destabilising policies in other countries'. This indicates a threat to the supply of thousands of Cuban doctors to poor communities in Haiti, Guatemala, Bolivia and Venezuela.'

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

#### **75 unionlearn and new opportunities for union members**

Congress welcomes the creation of unionlearn as a means for unions to open up learning opportunities to their members.

It notes that different unions have used these new opportunities to provide new learning initiatives and it particularly welcomes the Professional Footballers' Association commitment to education as the vast majority of PFA membership require re-training to learn new skills in order to enter into new occupations as their football career ends.

Through the PFA Education Department the union spends several million pounds every year on vocational training and specially tailored university degree courses. Every player who has been a PFA member, even if only as a trainee, has access to funding and advice in order to develop their future career or personal development. Courses can be as diverse as sports science, law, accountancy, plumbing or black cab and taxi driving.

Through the unionlearn initiative the PFA has recently appointed Oshor Williams as its first union learning representative linked to football clubs in the North of England. It hopes that he will be the first of many.

Congress notes the PFA's wholehearted endorsement for the unionlearn initiative. It welcomes many other imaginative initiatives taken by unions to increase opportunities for their members and urges the General Council to continue to develop and promote the delivery of learning services through unionlearn.

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

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

At the end of the first sentence add:

'The development of the learning and skills agenda and the rapid growth in the number of union learning reps offer unions a means to build workplace organisation, meet a vital membership need, appeal to new generations of workers and strengthen collective bargaining arrangements.'

#### **Connect**

#### **78 Occupational health**

Congress notes the high level of work-related illness in the construction industry:

- i) three million days per year are lost in the construction industry due to occupational ill health;
- ii) 7 per cent of the workforce is affected by illness related to their working environment;
- iii) workers in construction have a higher than average prevalence of work-related ill health; and
- iv) the Building and Civil Engineering Benefit Scheme reports that the average age of retirement out of the industry is 62 as a result of poor occupational health.

Poor occupational health and the inadequate coverage of pension provision in the construction industry means that many building workers are forced to rely on state benefits and this places a huge financial burden on the welfare state.

Congress notes the completion of a pilot occupational health scheme in the construction industry, Constructing Better Health, which was managed by a joint board of trade unions, employers and health specialists. The pilot scheme found that one-third of the workforce needed early intervention on health issues.

Congress calls on the General Council to mount a campaign for a national occupational health scheme for the construction industry and for the establishment of a board representing stakeholders across the industry charged with the responsibility of managing the scheme.

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

#### **79 Health and Safety Executive**

Congress calls upon the General Council to do all in its power to secure better enforcement of health and safety legislation by the HSE, particularly in the music and entertainment sectors. This matter is given added importance by the forthcoming application to these sectors of the Control of Noise at Work Regulations in February 2008.

Congress believes it is vital that the noise regulations are properly enforced in order to protect many workers in the entertainment industry from suffering further hearing damage or loss. Unions representing these workers are concerned that the HSE neither affords the sector sufficient attention nor allocates the necessary resources needed to ensure that employers are meeting their obligations under the legislation. Consequently, the precious resources of the health service are often unnecessarily called upon, so creating additional costs for government and the taxpayer. It should also be noted that vigorous enforcement of the noise regulations will also benefit audiences.

Congress agrees that if the General Council receives an unsatisfactory response from the HSE it should coordinate a campaign to bring pressure on the Government in order to achieve a truly protective regime for workers and members of the public alike.

#### **Musicians' Union**

*The following AMENDMENT was accepted*

Insert new paragraph 3:

'Congress supports the principles proposed in this motion. The trend for the HSE to become less of an enforcement agency and more of an advisory body is symptomatic of a deregulatory approach. This is epitomised in the recent, scandalous decision to take textured coatings out of the asbestos licensing regime.'

#### **GMB**

### **80 Safety footwear**

Congress recognises the need for healthy feet for all in our community and the important role played by HPC registered podiatrists/chiropractors in educating the public in this area. However, Congress is concerned that in many parts of industry where there is a requirement to wear safety footwear this same attention to detail is often missing. Congress believes that the provision of appropriate and properly fitted safety footwear is of vital importance to safeguard workers from occupational ill health.

Congress believes that it is unacceptable for employers who provide safety footwear simply to block buy safety footwear and instruct workers to wear them. It believes that HPC registered podiatrists/chiropractors should be involved in the assessment and fitting of such footwear as needs of individuals will vary.

Congress calls on all affiliates to ensure that this matter is high on the negotiating agenda in all areas of industry.

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

### **81 TUC policy and campaigning**

Congress welcomes the work of the TUC, its General Secretary and staff in providing the foundation, process and expertise to progress TUC resolutions.

Congress notes the success of recent campaigns taken forward by the TUC with unity, determination and enthusiasm. Further, Congress recognises that all TUC affiliates have a part to play in fully supporting all campaigns of general interest.

Congress acknowledges that when TUC policy is adopted by Congress TUC affiliates and the TUC itself should fully support any campaign that seeks to achieve any such policy.

Congress recognises the right of any affiliate union to campaign on behalf of its members. The TUC will

always seek to maximise the impact and effect of any affiliate union or groups of unions campaigning that seeks to achieve Congress policy.

#### **POA**

### **Composite 1 Organising**

Congress welcomes recent government figures on union membership and density in 2005. This growth reflects continuing TUC and union commitment to organising and recruitment.

Congress congratulates those unions that have engaged in successful organising campaigns and notes that organising must remain central to the work of trade unions.

But despite these efforts there is still much for unions and the TUC to do to meet the organising challenge in both the public and private sectors. Fewer than one in five private sector workers are members of a union and union members make up the majority of the workforce in only 8 per cent of private sector workplaces.

Congress believes that the priority of the British trade union movement, and therefore the TUC, is to organise and grow. Union organising efforts also need to concentrate on more than simply increasing membership. Expanding our reps base and building effective workplace organisation are just as important.

Congress urges all unions and the General Council to ensure that appropriate and substantial resources are devoted to organising and recruiting. Congress therefore agrees to ask the TUC's Organising and Representation Task Group to review and increase current TUC resources and support for organising, and calls for unions and the TUC to focus a minimum of 5 per cent of income, and, as soon as possible, 10 per cent of income, on measures to research and assist unions' organising.

Further, Congress calls for the following measures to be introduced as a matter of urgency:

- i) amendment of TUC practices and procedures to prevent any return to past practices where unions accepted 'sweetheart' deals or were invited into workplaces by employers in order to undermine the organising efforts of sister unions and workplace democracy and to assist unions organising against such practices by non-TUC unions as at the Racing Post;
- ii) promoting the benefits of trade unionism amongst young people within schools, colleges and universities, and consulting affiliates on young member structures and how to best organise young workers. A report to be presented to Congress 2007;
- iii) the re-focus of TUC international work to encourage and support unions in organising together in solidarity at European and global level;
- iv) TUC-led measures to assist the work of affiliates in the private sector, including work to research the needs, concerns and aspirations of workers within key parts of the private service sector, and to make recommendations for developing this vital area of work;
- v) the TUC to use the forthcoming DTI review of support for workplace representatives to make the case for an improved framework of time-off, facilities and support for union reps; and
- vi) the TUC's Organising and Representation Task Group to encourage unions to forge community alliances that will add value to organising initiatives, particularly those targeting the most vulnerable workers in the private sector; and provide resources and support for unions in their community organising endeavours.

#### **Mover: Transport and General Workers' Union**

#### **Secunder: Accord**

**Supporters: Public and Commercial Services Union**

**National Union of Journalists**

**FDA**

**Community**

### **Composite 2 Migrant workers**

Congress notes that migrant workers bring benefits to all UK communities, both rural and urban, in relation to seasonal working and permanent employment in industries with skills shortages.

Congress recognises that the question of migration can be a contentious one involving issues relating to 'irregular' migration, exploitation of workers and abuse of women and children by unscrupulous agencies and employers. Congress notes that migration has caused tensions in some local communities which have become increasingly diverse and which have had greater demands placed on services.

Congress congratulates unions such as Usdaw for making unions accessible to people whose first language is not English by producing recruitment literature setting out the benefits of union membership and making this available in 35 different languages.

Congress commends the TUC for its support of migrant workers, its useful advice contained in [www.worksmart.org.uk](http://www.worksmart.org.uk) documents, and the reports *Overworked, Underpaid and Over Here* (2003) which highlighted employer abuse of migrant workers and *Organising Migrant Workers in Construction* (2006), which reported on a project to recruit migrant workers in the North East.

Congress notes with regret that, despite efforts by government, devolved government and the TUC to deal with such issues, exploitation of migrant workers continues. Congress notes that migrant workers with families often have no access to education, language provision or other local support services and face racism within local communities.

Congress, therefore, urges the General Council to:

- i) continue its encouragement to affiliates to recruit migrant workers;
- ii) use every opportunity to publicise the benefits of migrant workers to the national and local economy;
- iii) challenge myths about migrant workers;
- iv) publicise the exploitation of migrant workers;
- v) enter discussions with government and campaign for a working group comprised of trade unions and government to tackle issues such as education, language, local service provision and racism;
- vi) share best practice in the recruitment of migrant workers and managing the practical issues affecting migrant workers;
- vii) insist Government ends adult education cuts and funds skills and language courses for migrant workers and their families;
- viii) provide guidance to Trades Councils on working with local decision makers and community groups to dispel myths about migrant workers;
- ix) work to establish 'befriending' campaigns in workplaces and communities; and
- x) issue generic leaflet templates in multiple languages that can be badged with individual affiliates' logos. This will assist smaller affiliates to recruit in this very important area. Individual affiliates to pay for printing costs, not translation.

**Mover: Educational Institute of Scotland**

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

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

**University and College Union**

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

### **Composite 3 Agency workers**

Congress congratulates the General Council on its Working on the Edge campaign. Congress is concerned by the exploitation of temporary agency workers in the UK and the growing evidence of the unfair and discriminatory conditions under which agency workers can be employed. Agency workers are often subject to:

- i) unfair treatment, with no statutory bar to employers discriminating against agency workers in terms of pay and/or working conditions;
- ii) exclusion from a range of other employment rights, including maternity, paternity and parental leave, redundancy pay and sick pay; and
- iii) lack of training, access to pensions or protection from unfair dismissal.

Congress is equally concerned by the Government's persistence in blocking the passage of the EU Draft Temporary Agency Workers Directive, despite its commitment under the 'Warwick Agreement' in 2004 to help the directive become law. Of the 25 EU member states, 16 have laws that guarantee equal pay for agency workers, and many also guarantee equal terms and conditions. Studies show that these countries have not compromised their productivity or competitiveness: on the contrary, such measures have raised levels of skill, motivation and commitment amongst the workforce.

Congress agrees it is time to end the exploitation of UK agency workers and to introduce laws that give them the recognition they deserve and the equality to which they should be entitled in a just society. Congress therefore urges the General Council to intensify pressure on the UK Government to ensure the introduction of effective statutory control, either through the EU Temporary Agency Workers' Directive or domestic regulations or both, which would deliver:

- a) equal treatment for agency workers, with 'day one' rights to basic terms and conditions of employment no less favourable than directly employed workers;
- b) extended employment rights for all agency workers to ensure they are as well protected as all directly employed workers; and
- c) an effective licensing system for all employment agencies with a resourced enforcement regime able to identify and combat rogue agencies effectively.

Congress calls on affiliates to work with the General Council to reach out to and organise agency workers in key sectors of the UK economy and to campaign for equal treatment and full protection for all agency workers.

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

**Secunder: Communication Workers' Union**

### **Composite 4 Employment status**

Congress notes the DTI's response to the employment status review, contained within *Success at Work* and expresses its strong disappointment that at the end of the extremely protracted Employment Status Review, the Government has adopted a strategy of no change to the legal framework in this area and that the Government preferred the views of employers instead of the broad consensus among unions, voluntary sector organisations and legal experts that the present legal framework lacks certainty, could often lead to injustice for workers, and is interpreted unpredictably by the courts and tribunals.

Congress deplores the increasing use of contractual arrangements denying employment rights in the name of employer 'flexibility' in both public and private sectors.

Congress further notes the Government's actions in continuing to block the draft EU Agency Workers Directive.

Congress reaffirms the TUC's policy that the law needs to be amended to ensure that full employment rights are extended to all workers who are not in business on their own account and regardless of individual tax status.

Therefore, Congress calls on the General Council to:

- i) campaign for the Government to reconsider its approach to employment status for atypical workers;
- ii) continue pressing the Government for an extension of employment rights to all workers from day one;
- iii) press the Government to honour its Warwick commitments by supporting the principles that underpin the draft EU Agency Workers Directive;
- iv) highlight the activities of companies that deny employment rights to workers by manipulating contractual conditions;
- v) campaign against the casualisation of the workforce, denying basic rights to public and private sector workers;
- vi) campaign for a new and wider definition of 'worker' in the European Commission's forthcoming Green Paper on labour law; and
- vii) work with other campaigning organisations to further these aims.

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

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

**Supporter: National Union of Teachers**

#### **Composite 5 Trade Union Freedom Bill**

Congress reiterates its support for the repeal of all anti-union laws, including changes to legislation the Government made in the fire service dispute of 2002/2003 which it can use in the event of any fire service dispute. Congress further calls upon the General Council to lobby Government to ensure that no further anti-trade union laws are placed before Parliament.

Congress congratulates the General Council for agreeing proposals for the Trade Union Freedom Bill, which include better protection for striking workers, fairer industrial action ballots / notice procedures, reform of the use of injunctions, regaining full trade union rights for prison officers and allowing supportive action in certain circumstances.

Congress places on record its appreciation of the work of John Hendy QC and the Institute of Employment Rights for their assistance in developing the content of the Bill.

Congress welcomes the huge support from MPs who have signed the Early Day Motion in support of the campaign.

Congress believes it is important to maintain the momentum of the campaign to keep the Trade Union Freedom Bill on the political agenda and ensure its provisions become law.

Congress urges the General Council to continue to promote the campaign, until the Bill becomes law, including:

- i) continuing to lobby Government;
- ii) working with sympathetic MPs to promote and publish the Bill in Parliament, including sponsoring the Bill as a Private Members Bill if possible and/or as a Ten Minute Rule Bill;

iii) setting a date for the lobby of Parliament as per the 2005 Congress Composite 1;

iv) organising a national demonstration, separate from May Day, in support of the Bill in 2007; and

v) under the auspices of the General Council, establishing contact meetings of affiliates, on a similar basis as the May Day contact meetings, to assist and involve TUC affiliates in the promotion of the campaign.

Congress notes the content of Composite 1 Congress 2005, regarding the establishment of a fund covering legal challenges, as deemed appropriate by the General Council. Congress commits to further financial/practical support to affiliates, lodging proceedings with the European Court of Human Rights under article 11 of the European Convention.

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

**Seconder: Fire Brigades Union**

**Supporters: Prison Officers Association**

**Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen**

#### **Composite 6 Pensions**

Congress welcomes the publication of the Pensions White Paper but is concerned by the potential delay implementing substantial sections of reform. Congress does not accept that the state pension age must rise to fund proper state provision.

Furthermore, Congress is concerned that the government's White Paper plans for state pensions do not go far enough to provide decent pensions. Congress notes that the White Paper does not include a substantial rise in the state pension. Congress agrees to campaign for a major increase to the state pension to be made in the lifetime of the current parliament, to give all pensioners a decent living wage, and for an end to means testing.

The experience of the Working Time Directive shows that allowing an individual opt-out from the Personal Saving Accounts (PSAs) will lead to some employers putting pressure on employees to exercise this right. Congress is also concerned that the White Paper gives no consideration to those who have had their employment status incorrectly classified as self-employed in industries such as construction. Employers must contribute a viable amount to all their workers' pension saving, regardless how little they pay them. Government should lead by example in implementing best practice pension provision. Furthermore, Congress believes that personal accounts - effectively defined contribution schemes - contribute to the transfer of risk to individuals. Administering them through the private sector would compound this risk further.

Congress is also concerned at proposals to increase the state pension age above 65 and calls on the General Council to campaign against this. Congress agrees that the General Council oppose any increase in state pension age and notes a default retirement age of 65. Congress agrees to:

- i) campaign for the reinstatement of the basic state pension indexation link to earnings before the next general election and ensure that the value that has been lost since the link was broken is restored. Uplift the state pension to £114 per week immediately and re-establish the link to earnings in 2007;
- ii) oppose any increase in the state pension age;
- iii) campaign against any decision to allow a workplace saving opt-out;
- iv) resist any moves to allow the private sector to profit from the administration of PSAs; and ensure that the National Pensions Savings Scheme (personal accounts)

- is administered within the public sector, and that contributors have a simple default investment option;
- v) ensure that PSA administration costs do not exceed the Pension Commission's 0.3 per cent target so individuals' pension pots are maximised;
- vi) lobby government to ensure employer contributions are paid on the basis of all employees' pay;
- vii) ensure that the low paid have the right to contribute to the NPSS on all earnings, with accompanying compulsory employer contributions;
- viii) call on the Government to ensure that workers are correctly classified and that employers will pay a contribution into their PSA; and
- ix) campaign to protect workers from any increased risk.

Congress rejects attacks on occupational and state pensions, and the notion of a general pensions crisis used to justify them, and opposes transferring pensions' risks from government and employers to individual workers. Congress reaffirms its support for good quality, affordable, final salary pension schemes in both the private and public sectors. Furthermore, Congress considers that it is of great importance that occupational pensions do not become a divisive issue between workers in the private and public sectors as some interest groups would like. Congress recognises the crucial part the TUC has to play in making sure that this does not happen and calls on the General Council to develop a strategy accordingly.

Congress calls upon the Government to ensure that all workers whose defined benefit schemes are or have been wound up with insufficient funds are fully compensated and to fund the Financial Assistance Scheme and to secure changes to the Pension Protection Fund to enable this to be done.

Congress notes that protection for existing public sector workers won in the PSF framework agreement has been attacked since its agreement in October 2005. The PSF agreement was possible because of the unity between the public sector unions, and Congress agrees that unity will be needed to secure decent pensions for all.

Congress deeply appreciates the work done by the National Pensioners Convention regarding pensioner poverty and restoring the link with earnings. Congress therefore commits to both working with and maximising support for the NPC in their campaign to restore the link as established in legislation, by the Labour Government in 1975. Congress calls on the General Council to involve union members at all levels and pensioners groups including the National Pensioners Convention, in a campaign to:

- a) defend the PSF framework agreement;
- b) protect occupational schemes from unilateral reductions in benefits; and
- c) campaign for good quality, defined benefit pension schemes across the public sector, accessible to all workers engaged in public sector work irrespective of salary or employer.

Congress notes with concern the continuing trend of employers to close pension schemes and cut benefits, and condemns employers that have acted in this way. Congress calls on the General Council to continue to assist in mobilising and co-ordinating support of affiliates in defending members' pensions. In particular, Congress calls on the General Council to provide strong support to those 11 unions still involved in defending the Local Government Pension Scheme, regretting that the employers and Government did not see fit to apply the same principles adopted by the PSF for other public sector schemes.

Congress condemns the announcement by the BBC of its intention to close its final salary pension scheme, one of the largest in Europe, to new members, to

significantly increase member contributions and increase the retirement age by five years, and welcomes the joint unions' campaign against such plans.

With regard to the Railways Pension Scheme (RPS), Congress welcomes the establishment of a Pensions Commission to examine the funding problems of the RPS for the long term. Congress would like to put on record its gratitude for the work of the TUC in facilitating a potential resolution to this specific problem.

Congress further calls for action to increase awareness among young people of the value of pensions, through the TUC's existing work in schools and colleges and through government-funded advertising

**Mover: GMB**

**Seconder: Public and Commercial Services Union**

**Supporters: Communication Workers Union**

**Transport Salaried Staffs Association**

**Amicus**

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

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

**Transport and General Workers' Union**

**Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen**

**National Union of Mineworkers**

**UNISON**

**Chartered Society of Physiotherapy**

**National Union of Journalists**

### **Composite 7 Quality of work**

Congress notes that the question of the quality of working life is rapidly rising up the political agenda and has created an opportunity for a wider discussion about this issue.

Congress further notes that while the UK has more highly skilled workers, managers and professionals than at any time, there is also strong evidence to show declining satisfaction with the overall quality of work, particularly pay, working hours and involvement in decision-making. Furthermore, there is evidence to show that people are having to work longer today than a decade ago, that they have less control over their work and are subject to more extensive performance management systems.

While managerialism may argue that fewer workers means better productivity, the effect is often the opposite. Doing more with fewer people often makes their workloads intolerable and leads to poor quality of life, stress and poor job satisfaction: the so-called work/life balance ceases to exist.

Congress calls on the General Council to investigate and promote the factors that deliver high levels of job satisfaction and high quality employment, paying particular attention to:

- i) work organisation and job design;
- ii) autonomy and control over the process of work;
- iii) long-term health;
- iv) flexibility in working arrangements, in particular, the prevalence of remote working and virtual teams which are changing the nature of office-based working;
- v) fair reward;
- vi) the importance of collective and individual employee involvement as instruments that deliver a higher level of satisfaction and fairness in employment;
- vii) employment security; and

viii) equality issues.

Congress further calls on the General Council to establish a Quality of Work Task Group to develop an agenda that can be pursued in the workplace and a series of practical proposals for discussions with employers, government and other political parties, and to prepare a report for the 2007 Congress.

**Mover: FDA**

**Seconder: University and College Union**

**Supporter: Connect**

### **Composite 8 Public services**

At a time of unprecedented change in public services, when 'reform' has rapidly become a fundamental attack on the role of the public sector, Congress believes we must provide a strong and relevant response to government policy, whilst also presenting progressive, positive and practical alternatives based on the values and experience of our members.

The legacy of record investment, public sector jobs growth and commitment to funding through general taxation is being overwhelmed by a 'reform' agenda which is based on the philosophy that the threat of privatisation is a necessary driver for performance and will see public services being sold-off in 'competitive' processes that discriminate against the public sector. Congress notes that this policy is threatening not only the effectiveness of public services, but in some cases, the very existence of those services. There is no role for markets in public services because they are harmful, wasteful, and unjust. Furthermore, Congress views with concern the view in Government that pays little respect to the importance of the public service ethos.

Congress also recognises that the quality of services and employment will be further undermined by the Government's dogmatic determination to privatise work and have more public services delivered by the so-called 'third sector.' Congress reminds government that there is no evidence that the third sector is able to deliver better public services. These policies deny the legitimate role of the public sector and lead to a loss of local and national accountability, 'marketisation', and the atomisation of public services. Wealthy individuals and private companies exploiting workers and the public alike should be named and shamed.

Congress is committed to the achievement of world-class public services and rejects the current government public sector reform policy. Congress calls on the Government to revise its public sector reform policy with a view to ensuring that all plans for public sector reform:

- i) are accompanied by a clear and evidenced-based business case to demonstrate how they will improve the specific public service; and
- ii) take account of staff, public and parliamentary responses to full consultation and the need to win staff support.

Congress congratulates the thousands of civil servants who have taken action over the past year in opposition to the Government's politically driven budget cuts, headcount reductions and privatisations that are damaging services and worsening working conditions.

Congress recognises it has been the willingness of union members in the civil service to take action that has so far prevented compulsory redundancies.

However, Congress notes that the Government's next Comprehensive Spending Review will intensify the drive for cuts and so-called 'efficiencies'. This will contribute to increasing workloads, stress, delays, backlogs, failing services and assaults on staff.

Congress calls on the General Council and Executive Committee to:

a) offer full support to the civil service and other public sector unions in the event of further industrial action to defend jobs and services against cuts, privatisation and offshoring;

b) ensure public sector unions are engaged with the Government on the Spending Review 2007;

c) coordinate a high profile campaign on the threat to public services from the Government's current public sector reform policy; and

d) mobilise parliamentary support for the TUC's policy and work with public sector affiliates in organising a rally and lobby of Parliament, and debate proposals for the organisation of a national demonstration and campaign day to promote public services and to oppose the policies of contestability and privatisation, at the earliest possible date after Congress.

Congress calls upon the General Council to lead a vigorous campaign, uniting all unions by:

- 1) continuing to provide critical analysis of private sector initiatives;
- 2) promoting progressive alternatives;
- 3) building the international coalition against the global trade in education, health and other public services;
- 4) organising communities against the transfer of public land and assets to the private sector;
- 5) campaigning against destructive reforms in health, education, local government and criminal justice and wherever they appear in public services across the UK;
- 6) building campaigning alliances on key issues to maximise political and bargaining strength;
- 7) providing affiliates with campaign material and advice;
- 8) developing the case and campaign for a strong and accountable public sector, as a vital contribution to the cohesive, economic and social well being of the UK as a balanced and economically mixed democratic society; and
- 9) preparing a thorough response to the Prime Minister's Strategy Unit's Discussion Paper *The UK Government's Approach to Public Services*.

**Mover: UNISON**

**Seconder: PCS**

**Supporters: Napo**

**GMB**

**National Union of Teachers**

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

**Prospect**

### **Composite 9 National Health Service**

Congress remains concerned at the lack of clear government policy on plurality of provision within the National Health Service.

Unprecedented investment and the repeated objective to provide health care free at the point of need are obviously to be welcomed and applauded.

However, at a time when the NHS workforce is under stress, not least because of mixed messages over funding levels and performance, all staff and the public deserve to be told the truth about the Government's intentions.

The current lack of clear direction is damaging the health service. For example, service reform is held up as a central objective whilst resources are given disproportionately to outdated and inefficient models of provision in the private sector.

The dedication of all who work in the health service has traditionally maintained the NHS despite underfunding, misguided policy and attempts to

fragment it. It is disgraceful that this exploitative approach seems to be being pursued once again and scandalous that this should be by a Labour Government.

Congress calls on the Government to treat the workforce and the public with respect. If privatisation is the objective, ministers should state openly that this is so. If integrated service delivery is desirable, let us see policies that encourage this. If the Government really cares about good practice and reform in NHS services, we should see them encouraging and backing these reforms.

Congress values the NHS and calls upon the Public Services Forum to insist the Government makes clear its policy on public service provision.

Members want to deliver high quality, accessible public services. Congress therefore also calls on the General Council to galvanise collective pressure to secure a commitment from the Government for proper dialogue with trade unions over the future direction of the NHS.

Congress believes increased investment in the NHS and the consequent improvements for patients and staff is vital.

Congress, however, notes the creeping privatisation of the National Health Service and the exorbitant costs of the hospital building programme under the Private Finance Initiative. Congress, condemns marketisation of the service in all its forms, most recently the plan to privatise English primary care commissioning services revealed by an advert in the European Union official journal. Private firms will decide which treatments and services are available to patients and whether NHS or private hospitals provide them. As with Commissioning a Patient-Led NHS in 2005, these plans have been drawn up without consultation.

Congress believes the General Council has an instrumental role to play in confronting privatisation, job losses and service cuts and calls upon the General Council to:

- i) coordinate a major campaign across health unions, patients, users and professional groups and communities, to challenge the marketisation of the NHS, halt further privatisation and expansion of private sector involvement;
- ii) campaign for a fully-funded and resourced NHS with an emphasis on quality of service as opposed to cost-cutting and wasteful pursuit of targets;
- iii) campaign for a nationally planned and managed service;
- iv) call on the Government to engage in partnership with all staff to promote co-operation and positive transformation;
- v) defend and promote systems of greater cooperation and collaboration in Scotland and Wales, that provide an alternative vision of healthcare;
- vi) provide capacity-building advice for unions to collaborate and to challenge marketisation; and
- vii) lead a political campaign to defend and promote existing excellence in the NHS, using all means at the disposal of the trade union movement.

Congress calls on the General Council to organise a demonstration in spring 2007 to take forward these demands.

Congress notes that, despite record levels of investment in the NHS and real advances in patient care, many NHS organisations are struggling to overcome large financial deficits.

Congress regrets that the NHS faces a £620 million deficit in 2006, and it recognises that sending in teams of accountants to improve the financial management of the worst performing NHS Trusts does not alleviate the effects of the deficits on members of the public who need to use NHS services. Among other unwelcome occurrences, a number of Trusts have been

forced to delay operations, close hospital wards and impose recruitment freezes. The recovery programmes being put in place by Trusts are now starting to bite hard, with both patients and staff suffering, including many thousands of new graduates who cannot find work in the health professions they have trained for.

Congress also notes that proposals to invest in health promotion set out in the Governments' White Paper, Our Health, Our Care, Our Say are undermined by the rush to tackle historic deficits resulting in 'slash and burn' cuts to services such as health visiting, mental and sexual health.

It is no coincidence that against a backdrop of rapid reform and wider market-based initiatives, such as Payment by Results, job losses are being announced on a daily basis with many PCTs and hospitals facing financial deficits. These are stymying the efforts of members who support many aspects of the modernisation agenda and want to see the NHS thrive.

Congress calls on the Government to take a more realistic approach to resolving the current deficits, which does not put short-term expediency before the long-term health of the NHS. Specifically:

- a) longer timescales for NHS trusts to establish financial stability;
- b) an end to job cuts and freezes;
- c) an urgent rethink on the expensive distraction of bringing competition into the NHS;
- d) a halt to the quick fix of targeting staff training and development for cutbacks; and
- e) the development of a long-term strategy, including a financial strategy, for health service staff education and development which provides stability, is sustainable and is informed by clear and unambiguous data from effective workforce planning.

**Mover: UNISON**

**Secunder: SoR**

**Supporters: Prospect**

**Chartered Society of Physiotherapy**

**Amicus**

#### **Composite 10 Education and Inspections Bill and marketisation of education**

Congress condemns the 'direction of travel' towards privatisation contained within the Education and Inspections Bill. Congress believes the Bill will increase marketisation in the education service, encourage social segregation and undermine equality of access for young people to high quality education.

Congress believes that the TUC must continue to give the highest priority to exposing and campaigning against the damaging effects of such legislation.

Congress welcomes the Government's commitment to raising the average investment per pupil to today's private school levels and instructs the TUC to press the Government to achieve this target.

Congress expresses its deep concern, however, that the Government's funding target has been obscured by its determination to press ahead with the divisive proposals within the Bill.

Congress instructs the General Council to:

- i) establish a working group to draft a strategy paper to be presented to the Government setting out the TUC's alternative to Trust, Foundation and Academy schools;
- ii) continue to give the highest priority to campaigning against the Government's attempts to privatise public services and co-ordinate a national demonstration against the marketisation and privatisation of education and the Government's Academies and Trust Programme;

iii) hold a conference to launch the strategy with the aim of enhancing comprehensive education, developing the campaign to block the damaging aspects of the Bill and raising the level of school funding; and

iv) monitor the Government's progress in securing parity in funding with private schools and press the Government to achieve this target by the end of this administration.

Congress notes that the Government's pre-occupation with diversity and independence of secondary schools contradicts its earlier mantra 'standards not structures'. It notes further that historically major advances in levels of achievement have followed expansion of opportunity or curriculum and assessment change. Congress, therefore, calls on the Government to recognise that further improvements to pupil achievement depend on substantial reform of curriculum and testing arrangements from 0-19 to encourage children and young people to develop the broad range of skills and understanding they will need as adults.

Congress believes that such reform could contribute towards a range of social justice outcomes including reducing pupil disaffection, reducing damaging class differentials in achievement, and improving the acquisition of key skills to enhance employability.

Congress condemns current thinking on provision of schools, which tends to fragment the system and distort proper public service accountabilities and the funding regime encouraging local authorities to support academies and adopt PFI, including Building Schools for the Future.

Congress recognises that central government, the local community, parents, carers and pupils should all be entitled to a say in shaping the service, but rejects both the present overwhelming predominance of Whitehall to the detriment of other stakeholders and also the handing over of schools to unelected and unaccountable bodies whether or not they are profit-motivated.

Congress notes that the terms and conditions of support staff have been the first casualties of fragmentation, marketisation and privatisation.

Congress calls upon the General Council to commission research and a report into the whole Academies programme, including:

- a) admissions procedures;
- b) the impact of the current funding regime in promoting academies;
- c) the impact on standards achieved by pupils; and
- d) the impact on the whole education service in the communities in which they are based.

The findings of such research should be published widely.

**Mover: National Union of Teachers**

**Seconder: Association of Teachers and Lecturers**

**Supporter: UNISON**

### **Composite11 Education and training, age and employment rights**

Congress notes that by 2014 there will be more people over the age of 65 in the UK than under 16. Research shows that 29 per cent of people have experienced age discrimination, which can be linked to new stresses in later life both at work and at home.

Congress notes that many employees want the right to continue working after 65 and believes all employees should receive the same employment rights irrespective of age.

Congress supports a new partnership between the state, employers and individuals to take responsibility for meeting the cost of learning. The value of that partnership will depend on ensuring that education and training remains accessible to the least well-off; that employers undertake their share of financial responsibilities; and that fee increases are managed in such a way that their introduction does not inhibit learner participation.

Lord Leitch's analysis identifies the upskilling of the adult population as a top national economic priority. The measures identified here are central to high levels of participation from the whole of that population.

Congress notes the important role further and higher education (F&HE) have in allowing all to access employment:

- i) two in three jobs created over the next ten years will have to be filled by adults;
  - ii) the Government's FE white paper focuses on vocational skills for the 16-25 age group, shifting funding away from adult learning; and
  - iii) the impending retirement of thousands of F&HE staff will lead to severe difficulties, potentially affecting the quality of the education provided.
- Congress believes employment rights for all and full access to education across age ranges is critical in meeting these challenges. Congress therefore calls on the Government to:
- a) ensure that the most disadvantaged in society have access to education and training;
  - b) invest more in adult skills and reverse the current and impending cuts to adult education;
  - c) overcome its reluctance to put pressure on employers, and identify strategies for ensuring employers' financial contributions to training provision;
  - d) revisit the timescale for the changes to fee assumptions, with a view to introducing these more gradually, and over a time period that makes the increases more palatable to potential learners and their employers;
  - e) address F&HE recruitment and retention problems by ensuring secure funding for competitive salaries and closing the FE pay gap; and
  - f) amend the Employment Equality (Age) Regulations to offer full protection for people dismissed from employment at or over the age of 65, allowing them to continue working if they are willing and able to do so.

**Mover: University and College Union**

**Seconder: Association for College Management**

### **Composite 12 Integrated transport**

Congress notes that one of the biggest threats to the UK's future prosperity is the continuing damage caused to the environment by over-reliance on private transport and the social exclusion caused by a transport network that does not reflect the needs of the UK.

Nearly 40 per cent of CO2 emissions are from transport. It is also estimated that traffic congestion costs businesses £20 billion per annum, with private car usage estimated to grow by between 15 and 20 per cent in the next decade.

Congress also notes that cities in the UK have the smallest cost differential between using a car and using public transport, which has a detrimental effect on modal choice. The most expensive public transport fares in Europe are found in the UK, making many journeys impossible due to cost and thereby increasing social exclusion and increasing pollution.

Congress believes that the transportation of freight must become more integrated and supports the use of road rail and port hubs which are fully modally



integrated to help reduce carbon emissions from freight transport which increased by 59 per cent between 1990 and 2002.

Congress welcomes the TUC's work with the aviation, road, transport and rail unions in raising the profile of transport. However, Congress calls on the General Council to set up an integrated transport committee so that transport unions can work together to promote a transport policy that allows for economic growth and environmental sustainability.

Congress believes that in order to maintain the micro-economic well-being of the United Kingdom, professional drivers should be encouraged to remain within their industries and those industries should attract new driving recruits. Congress supports the global campaign to organise logistics and transport workers in order to fight back and drive up international standards.

Congress asks the General Council to endorse the United Road Transport Union's stance and lobby the Government to seek to have scrapped the Government's proposals to charge individual professional drivers a proposed fee of between £20 and £50 for the forthcoming introduction of professional drivers' Certificate of Professional Competence accreditation.

Congress calls for a campaign for the Workplace (Health, Safety and Welfare Regulations 1992) to be applied to lorries, buses and commercial vehicles.

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

**Secunder: United Road Transport Union**

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

### **Composite 13 Clean coal and energy**

Congress welcomes the commitment to security of supply through a diverse fuel mix in the report by the Government following the Energy Review. It should therefore ensure the UK is best able to meet the challenges set out in the review. The Government must take urgent measures to ensure the UK develops and maintains the skills needed to support a diverse and secure energy supply base.

Congress is pleased with the role envisaged for the development of Clean Coal Technology (CCT) and Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) as a necessary response to climate change.

However, Congress is concerned that there are insufficient incentives in the report to encourage the private sector to make the necessary investment in coal and nuclear stations on the scale and within the timeframe required.

Congress believes the market remains uncertain and that the Government must re-consider what incentives it can introduce to include appropriate financial incentives if the current fleet of power stations is to be replaced. Failure to do this will cause delay that could compromise the ability to meet the country's electricity demand.

Congress also notes that the report of the Government's energy review The Energy Challenge clearly signalled that clean coal allied to the UK's indigenous coal reserves has a role to play in the future energy mix. Congress notes that during winter 2005, over 50 per cent of electricity generation came from coal-fired power stations, with about half from UK mined coal. Clean coal technology, including both carbon capture and storage, could cut CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from coal-fired power stations by up to 90 per cent.

Congress agrees that clean coal technology has a major contribution to make in clean power generation not only in the UK but in China and other nations still dependent on coal as a major energy source. Congress

further notes the major employment opportunities that will follow the successful development of this technology.

Congress welcomes the work of the TUC in relation to clean coal technology and therefore Congress calls on the General Council to take forward the case for clean coal and the great potential of the UK's indigenous mined coal in providing secure clean energy for the future.

Congress further notes that at this year's NUM Conference it was agreed that the NUM seek to arrange a conference of current and former European coal producing countries to discuss the issue of clean coal technologies.

Congress therefore welcomes the decision of the Biennial Conference of the National Union of Mineworkers and calls on the General Council to support this initiative. Congress agrees that the conference should be held in a northern region of Britain.

Congress also welcomes the proposal to convene a Coal Forum involving all stakeholders to secure a long-term future for indigenous coal production. It is essential that this forum is able to deal urgently with the sustainability of indigenous production if the domestic coal industry is to survive.

**Mover: National Union of Mineworkers**

**Secunder: BACM-TEAM**

**Supporter: Prospect**

### **Composite 14 Internationalism and globalisation**

Congress expresses the profound concern of the trade union Movement at the minimalist approach of the British Government to its international obligations as demonstrated by its persistent violation of the ILO Conventions on freedom of association and collective bargaining; its refusal to apply in full the EU Working Time Directive and its routine opposition to other EU provisions and initiatives which protect the entitlements of working people; and its efforts to move away from solemn commitments to refugees. Congress is convinced that this approach to its commitments is undermining the authority of the United Kingdom in international organisations.

Congress recognises that one effect of globalisation is the growing number of UK companies that establish operations in parts of the developing world. Congress has a clear policy on outsourcing but Congress now needs to define more clearly the ethical standards that should apply to such operations that should drive up labour standards rather than simply take advantage of low labour costs. Congress believes that UK companies that outsource work to developing countries should abide by the Base Code of Practice developed by the Ethical Trading Initiative which complies with the ILO core labour Conventions and in particular:

- i) ensure at least a living wage is paid throughout the supply chain;
- ii) ensure that the right to join a trade union is guaranteed and appropriate trade unions are recognised throughout the supply chain; and
- iii) contribute a percentage of their profits to local health, education and housing projects.

Congress believes that the FCO and DTI should encourage UK companies to adopt these standards in order that developing countries can benefit in full from UK investment and that the benefits of global trading be distributed more evenly. Congress calls on the General Council to work with other national trade union centres to create an awareness that the growing threats to economic and political stability and to peace arising from the widening inequality in wealth and income distribution within and between nations -

pockets of wealth alongside large-scale poverty - climate change and energy concerns; terrorism and crime; rapidly-increasing global migratory pressures; and the spread of trafficking in labour at present are threats well beyond the scope of action by existing international institutions and that leaving the resolution of the economic threats to market forces and multinational companies would only aggravate them. Congress urges the General Council to press on the Government its view that these threats may be tackled with a reasonable chance of success only with international organisations with relevant authority and powers and with the involvement of the business world and the trade unions.

**Mover: Community**

**Secunder: Connect**

### **Composite15 Workplace bullying**

Congress agrees that bullying in the workplace remains a major issue which unions must and do tackle on a daily basis. Congress recognises that this is a difficult issue to tackle successfully yet the costs to individual targets and the workplace as a whole are massive. Congress also recognises the work done by affiliates on this over the years both at national and local level.

Survey evidence suggests that the targets of bullying are much less likely to pursue complaints than people who have never suffered from bullying. This suggests that as well as helping individuals who are targets, unions must also formulate a collective response to tackling bullying in the workplace.

Congress believes that all employees deserve to be treated with dignity and respect at work. It condemns managers and other staff who abuse their positions and seek to humiliate, isolate and belittle their colleagues.

Congress condemns the rising tide of bullying behaviour that is affecting increasing numbers of teachers and support staff across the education service and deplores the pressure placed upon public sector managers and professionals from government, local authorities and Ofsted by poorly designed targets and other performance mechanisms which often take little account of available resources and, together with the use of educationally damaging league tables, creates pressure, criticism and unreasonable expectations on schools which, in turn, helps to create highly stressful environments in which bullying can become commonplace.

Congress congratulates school representatives and safety representatives for the valuable work they do in defending and supporting colleagues subjected to bullying and welcomes the important role played by school-based safety committees in seeking to promote a culture in which bullying is no longer tolerated.

Congress calls upon the General Council to:

- i) continue to campaign publicly on the issue of workplace bullying;
- ii) promote the role of safety representatives and safety committees as a means of improving union organisation to improve the health, safety and welfare of all staff;
- iii) put pressure on employers to implement effective policies to combat bullying which have been agreed with the recognised unions; and
- iv) publicise cases where unions have intervened successfully to support members who have been subjected to bullying behaviour;
- v) draw up guidance, building on the excellent TUC/Industrial Society guide *Beat Bullying at Work* for unions with examples of collective responses that have been identified by affiliates; identification of new forms of bullying such as abuse of performance management and discipline procedures; and

monitoring and sharing initiatives to identify and tackle patterns of workplace bullying.

**Mover: National Union of Teachers**

**Secunder: Connect**

**Supporter: FDA**

### **Composite 16 Palestine**

Congress supports:

- the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination;
- the right of Palestinian refugees to return to their homeland;
- the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied territories; and
- the removal of the illegally constructed 'apartheid wall'.

Congress believes that the achievement of justice for the Palestinians will help bring peace to the Middle East and to the people of Israel.

Congress condemns the Government of Israel's suspension of revenue payments to the Palestinian Authority (PA) and the suspension of aid by the European Union, the United States Administration and others. These actions, which threaten the wages of approximately 160,000 workers and the well-being of the Palestinian people as a whole, are condemned by the Palestinian General Federation of Trade Unions. Congress condemns the recent Israeli attack on the Gaza City power station, the use of sonic booms over Gaza, and the seizure of members of the democratically elected Palestinian government. Congress resolves to ask the General Council to:

call on the British Government to maintain all funding to the PA and call for the restoration of all EU and other international aid to the PA;

pressurise the Government of Israel to restore the revenues collected by them to their rightful owners, the PA;

make appropriate representations to the quartet (US, EU, Russia and the UN) to take immediate steps to achieve a negotiated settlement based on justice for the Palestinians;

raise these issues in the ETUC, ICFTU, Histadrut and ILO and all appropriate international and national bodies;

continue to make every effort to promote dialogue between Palestinian and Israeli trade unionists and the building of direct links with Palestinian trade unions;

seek to bring about greater cooperation amongst solidarity organisations supporting the rights of the Palestinian people, such as the Palestine Solidarity Campaign, and encourage all affiliates to affiliate; and

call on the British Government to make public its concern at Israel's continued attacks on Gaza.

**Mover: Fire Brigades' Union**

**Secunder: Educational Institute of Scotland**

**Supporter: Transport Salaried Staffs' Association**

### **Emergency 1 Attacks on fire cover and trade union organisation by Merseyside Fire Authority**

Congress condemns the recent decisions of the Merseyside Fire and Rescue Authority to implement cuts which will lead to a reduction of 120 frontline jobs. Congress notes the dispute which has arisen as a result. The Fire Authority proposals include:

- i) introducing a 96-hour continuous shift at six fire stations;
- ii) imposing a new shift system in the emergency fire control centre which will result in 15 job losses; and

iii) reducing night-time cover at four busy city centre fire stations.

Congress is concerned that this level of job reduction in an emergency service will place at risk both the public and the firefighters serving them.

Congress is alarmed at the anti-union stance which appears to have been taken by the Chief Fire Officer in Merseyside and by the Fire and Rescue Authority. This has included the removal of check-off arrangements; the removal of union notice boards and information from fire stations; and threats to the careers and promotion prospects of union members including new recruits.

Congress is further alarmed that the Fire and Rescue Authority have refused to allow any national assistance in the resolution of the dispute and procedure which is a normal and regular part of industrial relations in the fire service.

Congress urges all affiliates to provide whatever financial and moral support they can to FBU members in Merseyside. Congress further supports the call made by the Fire Brigades Union for an independent inquiry into industrial relations within the Merseyside Fire and Rescue Service.

**Mover: Fire Brigades' Union**

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

#### **Emergency 2 Thomson/TUI Call Centre, Glasgow**

Congress records its anger at the shameful announcement on 30 August by Thomson Holidays that their TUI Glasgow Call Centre would close on 12 December 2006 with the loss of 450 jobs.

Congress notes that all workers were served with their statutory redundancy notice one week before the £1.4m public subsidy received from the Scottish Executive was due to end and before any attempt was made to open consultation with employee representatives or trade unions.

Congress believes that Thomson have been cynical in attempting to present employees with a fait accompli and had been planning this closure for some time.

Congress further notes that Thomson announced that they will be creating 100 new jobs at their call centre in Coventry.

Congress calls on Thomson to:

i) review their decision to close the Glasgow call centre; and

ii) begin meaningful consultation with employee representatives with a view to agreeing ways of:

avoiding the dismissals;

reducing the numbers of employees to be compulsorily dismissed; and

mitigating the consequences of any necessary dismissals.

Congress notes that TUI promotes itself as an employer whose ambition is to make people happy, something which they claim applies to staff just as much as customers. Congress views Thomson's actions as those of an employer more concerned with making workers profitable.

Congress notes that many trade union members use Thomson Holidays and calls on the General Council to circulate affiliates with a request for them to ask their members to boycott Thomson Holiday products should this matter remain unresolved.

**Transport Salaried Staffs Association**

#### **Emergency 3 HSE job cuts**

Congress notes with deep concern the announcement by the Chief Executive of the Health and Safety Executive on 10 August 2006 that due to financial constraints it is intended that between 250 and 350 HSE jobs will be cut by 2008. Congress also notes that the HSE's budget may be cut further as a result of the Chancellor's decision to cut the budget of the Department for Work and Pensions, the HSE's sponsoring department, by 5 per cent for the 2008-2011 CSR.

Such a reduction in HSE funding and staff would, if enacted, inevitably have an adverse impact on the HSE's effectiveness and ability to enforce health and safety standards at work.

Congress also notes that current indications are that the cuts will primarily hit administrative and policy functions. Experience of widespread cuts throughout the Civil Service, resulting from the implementation of the Gershon Review, shows that this has serious consequences for delivering key services. In the HSE, it will have a detrimental effect on recent developments of frontline roles to support and enhance the work of inspectors. Congress recognises that cuts in any area of staffing will undermine the HSE's campaigns to reduce work-related deaths, injury, ill health and sickness absence. In particular, it would leave workers in high-risk industries such as construction and agriculture vulnerable to hazards at work. Congress expresses further concern at the particular implications for young and migrant workers, many of whom work in low paid and high-risk jobs.

There is still some way to go to meet the HSE's public service agreement targets, which requires maintaining the right mix of skills and expertise, and the staff numbers to deliver them.

Congress reaffirms TUC policy of proper levels of funding for the HSE to enable a substantial increase in the number of inspectors to provide a robust regulatory regime of inspection and enforcement, as well as guidance and education.

Accordingly, Congress calls upon the General Council to seek Government intervention to ensure that the HSE has the resources to prevent job cuts and avoid reversing the gradual improvement in the health and safety record of Great Britain; and to give full support to any campaign against the cuts by the HSE trade unions for the Health and Safety Executive to be properly funded and resourced.

**Mover: Prospect**

**Seconder: Public and Commercial Services Union**

#### **Emergency 4 Corporate manslaughter**

Congress notes the introduction into the House of Commons of the Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Bill on 20th July 2006.

Congress is alarmed that in spite of the conclusions of the Joint Report from the Home Affairs and Work and Pensions Committees, and the Scottish Expert Group on Corporate Homicide, the Bill specifically excludes the possibility of an individual being guilty of aiding, abetting, counselling or procuring the commission of an offence of corporate manslaughter.

Therefore Congress calls upon the TUC actively to campaign within the parliamentary timetable at the various stages of this Bill for the specific inclusion of secondary liability for corporate manslaughter against individual directors and senior managers.

The penalties for such an offence should include imprisonment.

**Amicus**

### **Emergency 5 Closure of the Northern Foods Bakery in Trafford Park**

Congress is appalled by the recent announcement by Northern Foods on the proposed closure of the Trafford Park bakery in Manchester with the loss of 700 jobs, in addition to the closure of the Shropshire plant. The Manchester plant supplies pies and pastries to Britain's multiple grocers. It is one of many closures of factories that supply prepared foods to the supermarkets.

Congress calls on the General Council to make representations to the competition commission investigation into the powers of supermarkets. This submission should deal with how the multiple retailers are abusing their purchasing power in the UK and overseas to depress wages and conditions of workers in the supply chain, leading to job losses as employers like Northern Foods resign from unprofitable supply contracts. This proposed closure should be cited in detail as a prime example of this abuse of power.

Congress considers that the shift in relative bargaining power between the suppliers and the multiples can only be addressed by the creation of an independent regulator with powers to ensure that workers in the supply chain in the UK and overseas get a fair deal. Congress calls on the General Council to campaign for this.

Congress notes that the company is currently involved in the 90-day consultation period with GMB on these 700 redundancies. Congress calls on Northern Foods and the multiple grocers to reconsider the proposals to close this plant and to come forward with viable proposals to secure the future of the plant.

**Mover: GMB**

**Secunder: Bakers, Food and Allied Workers Union**

## **Part 2**

### **Motion remitted**

#### **73 Venezuela**

Congress welcomes the success of the visit by President Chavez and the important work of the TUC delegation to Venezuela which helped establish strong solidarity links between trade unions in the UK and Venezuela.

Congress reaffirms its support for the process of social and economic change in Venezuela that has resulted in:

- i) Venezuela being declared free of illiteracy by Unesco;
- ii) more than 1.2 million people being given access to healthcare;
- iii) the building of 657 new schools and eight universities;
- iv) millions of hectares of land being redistributed; and
- v) the creation of the UNT as an independent trade union federation.

Congress also welcomes the growth of new media organisations such as Vive TV, Catia TV and TeleSur which help to combat the campaign of misinformation being run by sections of the media.

Congress applauds the work of solidarity campaigners in the UK who have built social, political and cultural support for the Bolivarian Revolution. Congress believes that it is vital to build practical trade union solidarity with UNT.

Congress therefore resolves to:

- a) establish a campaigning trade union solidarity group, to co-ordinate solidarity work, comprising representatives of affiliates and a representative from each of the three existing solidarity organisations; and
- b) task such a group with campaigning, amongst other things, for affiliates to deliver assistance to independent trade union organisations in Venezuela, against misinformation in the UK about the situation in Venezuela and to oppose any attempts at external interference in Venezuela's democratic process in line with Congress policy.

**National Union of Journalists**

# Part 3

## Motions lost

### 71 European Union trade policy

Recalling trade union support for the ending of dumping of food exports from the European Union in order to give small-scale producers in developing countries opportunity to make a sustainable living for their families, Congress is deeply concerned at the failure of the European Union to reach an equitable agreement on the elimination of agricultural subsidies. Congress notes with deep concern the plans of the Commission Member for Trade to weaken unilaterally the minimal instruments available to the European Union to defend EU manufacturing industries against dumping since they would be likely to accelerate the decline of manufacturing employment in the United Kingdom, particularly in the clothing, footwear and steel industries, while encouraging governments in other countries to continue to intervene directly in the sectors by denying trade access, subsidising investment, maintaining undervalued currencies, and permitting the violation of trade union and other basic human rights in employment.

Congress rejects the view that the UK and other EU countries are entering a post-industrial era and calls on the General Council to work through the ICFTU and the ETUC for a multilateral agreement to liberalise fair trade, in particular by enabling the poorest developing countries to gain access to markets of industrialised countries. Congress urges the British Government to resist EU proposals to dismantle means of action to resist dumping.

#### Community

### 82 The importance of equality

Congress records the important role that equality issues play in building up trade union organisation and membership. Campaigning on equality issues such as work/life balance, gender and race pay gaps, on rights for disabled people at work and against harassment and bullying can help take our movement in the new areas where trade unions have yet to organise and can help strengthen our movement in areas where we are already involved.

Congress also notes that new legislation giving LGBT workers, older and younger workers and workers with religious affiliations more rights creates further opportunities for the trade union movement to take initiatives in the area of equality.

Congress believes the General Council must listen to the voices of the equality conferences as the collective opinion of workers affected by discrimination and prejudice. Therefore Congress asks for the General Council to consider the right of:

- i) the equality conferences to submit two motions to Congress; and
- ii) direct representation from the equality conferences to the General Council.

Congress asks for a report to be produced in time for the TUC LGBT Conference in 2007.

#### TUC Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Conference (exempt from 250 word limit)

# Part 4

## Motion withdrawn

### 67 New trade union international body

Congress notes that on 1 November the founding conference of a new trade union international body will take place in Austria. This new organisation will result from the merger of the ICFTU (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions) and the WCL (World Confederation of Labour).

This merger at a world level poses a series of problems concerning the defence of basic trade union principles. Not least the recognition that society is divided into antagonistic interests.

The objective of this new organisation will no longer be exclusively to defend the workers' interests but to promote the social dimension of world governance: that is globalisation.

Congress doubts that a trade union organisation worthy of the name can fight based on these premises. We all know that as this project is implemented on an international level, the proposals will find relays in each country in very concrete ways.

The statutes of all real trade union confederations will contain a phrase defending the specific interests of workers as a class whose content (if not its form) is the same.

Congress therefore calls upon the TUC delegates at the founding conference to:

- i) reject the creation of this new international body that will not be based on trade union principles; or
- ii) reject any constitution that would not be in line with the TUC's basic principles, that is the recognition of two classes with antagonistic interests.

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

# Part 5

## General Council statements

*Congress adopted the following statements:*

### European migration

1 The TUC wants workers to be treated with respect, treated fairly and treated equally, wherever they come from. Government and employers have responsibilities to ensure that people who come to Britain to work are not exploited, and are able to do a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. If migrant workers are treated fairly and paid a decent wage, they represent no threat to the livelihoods of people who are already living and working in the UK, and the work they do and the wages they get for it will pay for the increase in services required to meet the needs of new arrivals. Unions must, and are committed to, play our part in making sure indigenous and migrant workers are treated equally and have their rights respected.

2 The TUC welcomed the extension of the European Union in 2004 to cover eight countries in Eastern Europe, Cyprus and Malta. We further welcome the negotiations for the accession of Bulgaria and Romania. Expanding the European Union is a good thing for Britain because it produces more markets for our goods and services and more people to do the jobs the British economy and society need. And it is good for the people of Eastern Europe because it provides them with growth, better jobs and wages, and spreads and deepens European democratic values. Creating a common market means that workers must have rights as well as businesses, and there must be freedom of movement for workers as well as for capital, goods and services.

3 We note that the accession of Bulgaria and Romania will take place on either 1 January 2007 or 1 January 2008 and that a decision will be taken by the European Council in the autumn. When that decision is taken, Member States will be presented with the opportunity of placing transitional restrictions on the free movement of workers from Bulgaria and Romania to the rest of the EU, though the TUC considers that no persuasive case has been made for such restrictions. Movement by the self-employed cannot, in any event, be restricted.

#### *The economic impact of migration*

4 We note also the debate that has taken place this summer in the UK over our experience of the impact of the last accession in 2004. Since then, large numbers of workers from Eastern Europe have entered the UK labour market, although there is little knowledge about how many remain. In general, over that time, employment has grown strongly, although unemployment has recently increased as well, and over the economy as a whole, wage growth has been slow. There are reports of pressure on public services created in particular areas by increased numbers of migrant workers, often with limited English, although it is uncertain how much pressure is being put on services like schools (many of the migrant workers are young adults without dependants) or health services, and how much of the pressure on housing and transport is due to migrant workers. Certainly we would welcome increased funding for investment in the infrastructure of public services that would improve the ability of such services to react, especially to unforeseen and

sudden increases in demand and there is a clear need to develop better co-ordination among the agencies providing services to migrants, as work by the Eastern England Development Agency in association with unions and others has shown.

5 The TUC is concerned about indications of rising unemployment, but we note that unemployment has not been rising in the parts of the country where migrant workers have moved to, nor have the skill and labour shortages in the sorts of jobs that migrant workers are doing (eg agriculture, warehousing, construction, personal services and hospitality) disappeared. We do believe that more effort needs to be put into preventing job losses in manufacturing, improving skill levels generally, and tackling unemployment among particular groups at a disadvantage in the labour market. Similarly, the TUC is concerned about displacement of labour from full-time, permanent employment by agency labour, often recruited from Eastern Europe. However, we reject the fallacy that there is a fixed amount of work to go round, and that any increase in the number of working people in a country will automatically increase competition for those jobs. Migrant workers have filled many hard-to-fill vacancies, in some cases vital work in areas of the economy such as education, health, social services, transport in the public sector and in agriculture, construction and hospitality in the private sector. The impact clearly needs to be better understood, and the TUC would welcome moves by the Government to improve our understanding of the impact of migration

6 The TUC also notes the arguments about the slow growth in wages in the economy overall, and the possible attribution of this to migration. We are aware of severe levels of exploitation of some migrant workers, although some of course are well-paid professionals, and others are engaged in industries like the health services and education. There are many accounts of undercutting of normal wage arrangements, especially in construction although this may be the result of self-employment rather than employment. However, there is comparatively little evidence that the number of migrant workers entering the economy has had a direct effect on wage levels as a whole. It may simply be that the growth in employment has been primarily in lower wage employment filled by Eastern European migrants, holding average wage growth down across the economy without affecting the wages of the vast majority of indigenous workers.

7 There has also been considerable debate for some time about the impact of migrant workers on the economy as a whole and on the exchequer. Most of the evidence suggests that migrant workers have a positive impact on the economy - increasing growth rates over the last few years by between 0.5 percent and 1 percent, and making a net contribution to the Exchequer. Socially, there have been concerns, often whipped up by racist parties and the right-wing media, about lack of integration and social conflict, but overall the picture seems to be one of migrant workers being welcomed into Britain and valued for their contribution (although we acknowledge that in different economic circumstances, those pressures might well change).

8 The TUC believes that migration so far from Eastern Europe has filled an important gap in a growing labour market and has contributed to the growth of the UK economy in the last few years. The experience has therefore on balance been positive for the UK economy as a whole. Much less attention has been paid to the impact of migration on the labour markets of Eastern Europe and the TUC will be keeping this under review with trade union colleagues in these countries.

#### *Exploitation and fairness at work*

9 We are particularly concerned about the way that some migrant workers are exploited. By exploitation we mean outright illegality (pay levels below the minimum wage, unlawful deductions, withholding of passports and so on); immoral treatment (low wages, long hours, sub-standard accommodation, misleading promises, abusive management), and comparative exploitation (lower wages or worse conditions than their fellow workers). Some migrant workers are well-paid or decently treated, but many are not, and it is these workers who we believe need protection.

10 Such exploitation is not necessarily because they are migrant workers (some indigenous workers are exploited as well) but several factors make this more common for migrant workers:

- lack of knowledge about their rights, and lack of the means to enforce them (although these apply to many indigenous workers too);
- the tendency for migrant workers to be counted as self-employed with the attendant difficulty of providing protection;
- language difficulties;
- their conditions of entry into the UK (eg being recruited by agencies who thrive on lower wages);
- being away from home (fewer support structures, being separated from their families, temporary nature of their experience); and
- even some Government policies (restrictions on claiming benefit make it difficult to walk away from exploitative or dangerous work, even where theoretically migrant workers have that right).

11 Although the actual legal status of migrant workers from other EU nations is clear because of the free movement of workers, there can be confusion about what precisely their legal status is, especially when they are self-employed, and these issues are of course particularly a problem for migrant workers from outside the EU. The TUC believes that there should be a rational public debate about how to ensure that migrant workers are engaged in regular legal employment.

12 Examples drawn from one TUC region illustrate the sort of exploitation referred to:

- Polish and Lithuanian workers engaged for the daffodil season in Cornwall reported that they had been stopped from working for the first few weeks so that they were in debt to the agency for travel, rent and other fees. They were packed eight to each caravan with no heating, and charged £50 a week, including £5 a day transport to get to the field. They were even charged for the elastic bands to tie the flowers. When the police raided the site they found some workers who had been doing 70 hours a week but after all the deductions were left with just 21p.
- The South West TUC discovered three Polish workers living in the back of a trailer lorry on an abattoir loading bay. When confronted, the employer claimed it was like a palace to them and he didn't know what the fuss was because there was no window for anyone to see in. The skilled bone cutters were paid less than the local workers, abused and denied basic rights.
- Latvian building workers were being paid £4.50 an hour cash 'off the books' by a Torquay building contractor. When they complained, the builder called the police to 'evict' them from cramped accommodation he was charging them £50 a week each to live in. Before they could collect outstanding

pay, workers had to sign agreement not to report builder to press or Inland Revenue. The workers were left homeless, without any rights to employment law or benefits.

- A farm worker in Somerset was paid £5 an hour (well under the agricultural wages board minimum). The wage did increase to £5.40 (still below the proper rate for the job) but so did the £100 a month rent. Electricity and other fees were deducted from pay. He worked for over a year but was not allowed to take holidays.
- Workers at a distribution depot in Avonmouth were told that they were not entitled to take a Bank Holiday because they were Polish.

13 There are, traditionally, three ways in which workers' rights can be improved. Firstly, they can be given more and better rights at work; secondly more can be done to encourage the implementation and enforcement of those rights; and thirdly, they can act collectively to improve their position - the latter avenue is dealt with in the next section.

14 In terms of stronger rights at work, the TUC welcomed the Gangmasters' Licensing Act as a key measure to assist migrant workers (and others) to resist exploitation. But much more is needed, such as:

- the adoption of an EU Directive on Temporary Agency Workers. Comparators between agency staff and permanent employees need to be enforceable from day one. Exclusions of areas like pension rights from such comparisons could provide a massive loop-hole for exploitation and undercutting;
- the scope of the Gangmasters Act needs to be extended to provide a broader licensing regime across the economy - not just agriculture, horticulture, gathering shellfish and food processing;
- there needs to be effective implementation in UK law of the Posted Workers Directive, especially to ensure that posted workers' pay etc is determined by existing national level agreements;
- the territorial scope of UK employment rights needs to be clarified and this area of abuse closed down; and
- the extension of employment rights to all workers (rather than solely employees as is the case in some laws) and tightening up on bogus self-employment.

15 Of course, improvements in the law will not on their own improve conditions for migrant workers. The laws must be enforced, and employers should be encouraged to implement them in spirit as well as to the letter. More enforcement of existing rules could mean more government inspection (health and safety, minimum wages) or self-enforcement: support for unionisation, community groups and welfare advice services, better language training and translation of key information. The TUC supports a substantial expansion in the provision of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL). There could be substantial fines and/or custodial sentences for employers when they consistently do not comply with the requirements of employment law. There should be measures to discourage the development of an informal sector, with dubious self-employment, persistent temporary contracts, hiring by the day and so on. There should be a ban on those agencies who employ workers solely on bogus self-employed status from winning government contracts.

16 In Ireland, the government, unions and employers have reached a new social partnership, Towards 2016,

which includes a number of measures designed to protect the rights of both migrant and indigenous workers, such as:

- the establishment of a new Office of Employment Rights Compliance (ODERC) with an increase from 21 to 90 in the number of Labour Inspectors in addition to new support posts, allowing for joint investigation units to target serious abuses of employment standards;
- the tax system will be reformed to prevent people in the building industry and elsewhere from being forced into bogus self employed status to allow employers to avoid pension contributions etc;
- employers will be obliged to keep accurate employment records in a prescribed format for inspection by the Labour Inspectors;
- there will be a new Employment Rights procedure to allow easier access to justice and with compensation where rights are denied. Powers to award up to two years pay by way of compensation is a very significant change and will help many migrant workers whose cases are usually about bread and butter issues like payment of correct wages;
- in effect, the exploitation and abuse of workers is now a de facto criminal offence;
- new standards of compliance with labour law in order to tender for public procurement contracts - in other words, the taxpayer will no longer subsidise exploitation or sharp employment practices;
- legislation to regulate employment agencies and educational establishments to prevent them from undermining employment standards and immigration law;
- legislative changes to prevent Irish Ferries type collective redundancies and 'Gate Gourmet' type unfair dismissals; and
- a code of practice to protect people working as domestic servants.

17 The TUC intends seeking discussions with the Government about this important Irish initiative and ways to strengthen the rights of people at work so that exploitation is eradicated.

#### *Union action*

18 As indicated above, collective action by and on behalf of migrant workers is a key component in combating exploitation. Unions are increasingly engaged in ensuring equal treatment for migrant workers, whether through agreements with employers, the use of supply chains, or the provision of information and services tailored to migrant workers' needs, as the following examples show:

- the T&G made Sainsbury's and Tesco aware this July of examples of bad practice at S&A Produce at their Brook Farm, Herefordshire strawberry farm. Their intervention helped persuade the employers to enter into talks with the union, where agreement has so far been reached on dropping charges for basic medical services and providing accommodation for workers overnight at the end of their contract (not all problems have yet been resolved);
- at London Luton Airport last autumn, the T&G discovered that baggage handlers brought in by an agency from Poland were being paid around £2 an hour less than the ground staff employed by Big Orange Handling, which is a jointly owned venture

between easyJet and Menzies. The T&G threatened strike action unless the issue was resolved and the Polish workers won an immediate pay increase to bring them up to the same level as the permanent employees;

- similarly, the T&G stepped in when local stewards in Exeter discovered the problems being faced by Polish agency workers at a meat processing company. These included worse employment conditions than British workers, and housing which put ten workers into a two bedroom property with rent of £40 per person per week, payable to the agency. With assistance from the Federation of Poles in Britain, the T&G got the contract with the agency terminated and all the agency workers taken on as direct employees;
- an USDAW rep won the TUC Midlands Regional Union Learning Representative of the Year award after Project Troika, ESOL courses for small groups of migrant workers, was launched by the union and management at the Christian Salvesen service and returns centre in Lutterworth. The turnover of new starters at the vehicle service and returns facility where more than 70 percent of workers come from all across the globe - including Eastern Europe - has fallen from 80 percent to 18 percent;
- when Unison in Scotland discovered that twelve nurses had paid £500 each to St George's Recruitment Agency to get placed in employment with the NHS - payments which are unlawful in the Philippines - they worked with the Philippines government to take legal action against the agency. Unison has set up an Overseas Nurses Network in Scotland;
- GMB Midland and East Coast Region, in partnership with Prospects Services Ltd, won an award for its project, Reaching Out to New Communities which responded to the increasing number of people coming to the region from Eastern Europe and Portugal. The main focus of the project was to enable migrant workers to learn English and thus learn about their rights, but it also involved the development of a Handbook containing practical advice. The Handbook was developed for the GMB by two young people who are themselves from Eastern Europe, and it is available in English, Polish and Lithuanian; and
- a number of unions have started to use workers from the migrant communities to recruit and represent them. Last year, Polish union confederation Solidarnosc seconded an organiser to the North West TUC to develop contact between Polish workers and trade unions in the region. The T&G has begun to employ Polish workers (and British born Polish speakers) as organisers to recruit and represent Polish migrant workers in the construction and food processing industries, and UCATT has recruited Polish workers who speak English as reps on large sites in the North East.

19 Unions need to continue to develop and strengthen initiatives aimed at recruiting, organising and representing migrant workers. Links with local communities inside the UK, and also with trade union movements in Eastern Europe, can be particularly helpful in making contact between unions and migrants, and in this context, the TUC has been developing closer links (often on specific projects such as the EU-funded ICICLE project which dealt with the implementation of information and consultation regulations) with Bulgarian and Romanian trade union



confederations, as well as stepping up links with Turkish trade union confederations (the ETUC has covered all three countries for some time).

### *Conclusions*

20 The TUC will continue to support stronger employment rights for migrant workers to ensure that they are treated equally with indigenous workers, and as more migrant workers enter the UK labour market, the need for such rights becomes ever stronger. Unions must also continue to strengthen their capacity to recruit, organise and represent migrant workers. The TUC supports the free movement of workers in the European Union, and believes that where there is a single market, and increasingly a single labour market, there must be EU-wide regulation of that labour market.

*adopted 7 September 2006*

### **Joint statement with the Muslim Council of Britain**

The TUC and the Muslim Council of Britain will work together in support of workplace justice and against Islamophobia

The TUC and the Muslim Council of Britain make this joint commitment to work together on issues of common concern in the belief that by combining together we will be able to achieve more towards those objectives we share in common than we can do by acting alone.

Our two organisations may have different origins but we share many important common goals and beliefs.

The Muslim Council of Britain is an umbrella organisation which brings together hundreds of faith organisations across Britain, all representing members of one of the world's great religions. The Council's aims are to benefit members of the Muslim community and promote a greater understanding of that community within society as a whole whilst working towards the common good of all. It seeks the eradication of disadvantage and discrimination and the betterment of community relations.

The TUC is a non-religious organisation, bringing together unions whose members include people of different religions and none. It speaks on behalf of people at work and campaigns for workplace justice. It is committed to the promotion of equality for all and the elimination of all forms of harassment, prejudice and unfair discrimination.

Our two organisations respect our differences and recognise everyone's right to hold their own beliefs but we share the view that they must do so in a way that respects others' rights and does not impose their beliefs or lifestyle on others.

The shared belief of the MCB and TUC in justice, equality and opposition to prejudice is matched by our belief that these objectives can be better achieved in the workplace by a framework of legislation that provides for workplace justice and by workers joining together in independent trade unions. We believe it is in the interests of workers to join the appropriate trade union at their workplace and that employers should recognise such unions.

We do not underestimate the scale of the challenge facing us today.

The TUC report *Poverty, Exclusion and British People of Pakistani and Bangladeshi Origin* published in 2005 demonstrated that many people from substantial parts of the Muslim community suffer massive disadvantage and discrimination: 69 per cent classified as poor compared with 22 per cent of the country as a whole. Overall British Muslims are three times more likely to be unemployed than the population as a whole.

Islamophobia is a real and present threat, fuelled by misunderstandings, prejudice and the characterisation of whole communities because of a small number of dangerous extremists and a loud but tiny fringe made larger than life by some sensation mongering and self-fulfilling reporting in some parts of the media. Such groups threaten their own communities just as they threaten society at large.

Whilst much reporting, especially in the immediate aftermath of the 7 July 2005 bomb attacks, has been sensitive and emphasised the strength of society achieved through diversity, there have been too many examples of stereotyping, prejudice and even incitement in the media's handling of community relations.

The rise of the far right and electoral successes of the BNP, sometimes through the exploitation of heightened feelings of deprivation and discontent amongst certain white groups, are alarming features of recent years and we commit ourselves to work together to address both the problems faced by these groups as well as counter the political exploitation of this constituency.

In order to develop our joint working we will continue with a regular dialogue between our two organisations and look to go beyond this framework through more detailed contacts and jointly organised events for members of our two organisations.

The TUC will use its networks to counter widespread misunderstanding of Islam and the way the religion relates to modern society, whilst the MCB will use its networks to raise awareness within the Muslim community of the values of union membership and the important role which unions have in seeking justice and fair treatment in the workplace and in wider society.

*Adopted 7 September 2006*

### **Trident**

The trade union movement has long campaigned for peace and disarmament, and in particular against weapons of mass destruction. We recognise that in today's international climate, the possession of nuclear weapons would either have no effect on, or increase, the threats of terrorism and nuclear brinkmanship that we face.

The General Council therefore renews its call, as set out in the 2003 Congress resolution on disarmament, for 'efforts to rid the world of weapons of mass destruction and [our call] on those with the biggest arsenals to initiate multilateral initiatives under the aegis of the United Nations to achieve substantial progress towards world disarmament.'

The General Council notes that the decision on a possible replacement for Trident will be taken within the next year. The General Council is concerned about the potential economic impact that the non-replacement of Trident would have on both the MOD civilian workforce and on manufacturing industry generally and specifically those working in the defence industry. We remind Congress that many of these people live and work in remote parts of Britain where there is little other alternate employment let alone skilled employment of this nature. Therefore we believe that the issue of diversification to protect the jobs of those engaged in work that could be affected by this decision needs to be fully explored, as does the alternative defence initiatives.

The General Council also recognises that many unions have not yet reached a view on this issue, and believes that there should be an opportunity for a proper consultation on the issues of jobs, defence and public expenditure within the trade union movement, pending the publication of a Green Paper, and that the General Council should initiate such a consultation

without undue delay before a final Government position is reached.

The General Council is also concerned that the cost to public expenditure could be tens of billions of pounds, which could otherwise be invested in manufacturing, health, education, pensions and transport and this is another important factor which has to be considered in this debate.

The General Council therefore calls on the Government for a full, rational and open public and Parliamentary debate on the replacement of Trident before any final Government decisions are taken, including a Green Paper covering all the options for replacement, including non-replacement, a White Paper and a deciding vote in Parliament.

*Adopted 13 September 2006*

## **Section 2**

### Verbatim report of congress proceedings

The following pages give a full verbatim report of the proceedings of the 138<sup>th</sup> annual Trades Union Congress, which met in Brighton from Monday 11 September to Thursday 14 September with Gloria Mills presiding.

Congress decisions are marked with a \*

**FIRST DAY: MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 11  
MORNING SESSION**

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

**The President** (*Gloria Mills*): Delegates, I call Congress to order. The programme of music this week has been put together by *Music for Youth*, and many thanks to Havant Clarinet and Saxophone Choir who have been playing for us this morning. *(Applause)*

Congress, I have great pleasure in opening this, the TUC's 138<sup>th</sup> 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 11 of the General Purposes Committee Report booklet, with one amendment, and that is that Tracy Clarke from Community has been replaced by Helen Elliott of Community. Is that agreed? *(Agreed)*

May I remind delegates to switch off their mobile phones. You should also find on your seats details of the emergency procedures. Please familiarise yourselves with them. If there is an emergency, I will give further instructions. If any delegate requires first aid, the first aid station is situated behind the food servery in the east bar, the doors to which are to my left, your right.

**Welcome to Sororal and Fraternal Delegates**

**The President:** Congress, I now come to the introduction of sororal and fraternal delegates and visitors who are seated 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. Joining us tomorrow is Thabitha Khumalo, who is Third Vice President of the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions. She will be accompanied by Kathryn Llewellyn from Action on South Africa. Also joining us tomorrow will be Bill Lucy, the International Secretary/Treasurer of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees and this year's fraternal delegate from the AFL-CIO. I will say more about each of them when it is their turn to address you.

Other international guests here on the platform are Thorben Albrecht from the DGB, which is the German TUC; Penny Schantz and Jerry Zellhoeffer from the AFL-CIO's European Office, and John Monks, General Secretary of the European Trade Union Confederation. There will be a number of other representatives of global trade 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 all together as a global union family.

This year's fraternal delegate from the Trades Union Council's Conference is Eric Bradley. Congress, we are expecting other guests here during the week and I will introduce them as and 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 George

Brumwell CBE, former general secretary of UCATT; Imogen Bunting, a member of the TUC staff in the South West from 2003 to 2004; Dick Dale, also known as Clunie Dale, a former head of the Social Insurance Department at the TUC from 1946 until his retirement in 1971; Gerry Eastwood, former general secretary of the Association of Patternmakers and later assistant general secretary of MSF; Bill Fry, the first president of the CWU; George Guy, who served on the General Council from 1976 to 1983 and was General Secretary of the National Union of Sheet Metal Workers, Coppersmiths, Heating and Domestic Engineers; Wilf Jowett, who was a member of the General Council from 1986 to 1988; Colm O'Kane, a former deputy general secretary of UNISON; John Richards, a former industrial correspondent; Alan Sapper, former general secretary of the Association of Cinematograph, Television and Allied Technicians and a former TUC President; Ed Scrivens, a former member of the AEU National Executive Committee and Peter Smith CBE, former general secretary of the ATL.

Congress, let us also not forget the terrible loss of life on September 11<sup>th</sup>, five years ago in New York. This year has also seen the tragic suffering in Lebanon and elsewhere in the Middle East. Let us, therefore, re-commit ourselves to the cause of world peace. Please stand for a minute's silence. *(Congress stood in silent tribute)*

**Jeannie Drake** (*Vice President*): Congress, I now call upon the President to address Congress.

**President's Address**

**The President:** Good morning, delegates, visitors and international guests. Welcome to the 138<sup>th</sup> annual Trades Union Congress. It has been quite a year for us, a year when trade union membership has risen again, a year when we launched unionlearn, and – perhaps most welcome of all – a year when Digby Jones retired from the CBI. *(Cheers and applause)* How we will miss him. The man who said trade unions were an irrelevance. Digby, you may be gone but we are still here.

This Congress is the highlight of our calendar. Four days of debate and 82 motions. Do not believe those cynics who say it could quite easily be the other way round, but this Congress, our Congress, is unique. It gives me huge pride to address you today as a lifelong trade unionist, activist and campaigner, as a passionate believer in our public services and our public servants, and as the first black woman in history to preside over this great event. *(Applause)*

Congress is a tremendous opportunity for us to showcase the best of our movement, to work out our priorities for the year ahead and also to celebrate our many achievements. Just think about some of the progress we have made since we gathered in this hall just 12 months ago – stronger rights for same-sex couples, legislation on corporate manslaughter, new equality reps with £5 million of funding, the Services Directive seen off and a hundred thousand workers receiving learning opportunities through their union.

So when people dare to suggest that trade unions have had their day, that we are stuck in the past and that workers can look after themselves in the knowledge economy, let us say to them loud and clear: You are wrong, wrong on every count. Congress, the case for trade unionism has never been more compelling. We are the difference between a job lost and a job saved. We are the difference between poverty pay and a living wage, and we are the difference between workers exploited and workers respected. But as we reflect on all of this, let us not under-estimate the mighty challenges that remain, the battles still to be fought and still to be won.

Indeed, we meet at a critical time, when speculation is building about the future of our Labour government, when large parts of our manufacturing industry teeter on the brink of collapse, when our public services are being contracted-out, marketed-tested and privatised as never before, and when inequalities are rising in our workplaces and our communities. Congress, only last week we saw the disgraceful handover of NHS Logistics to DHL. We are told that these jobs have been outsourced. Well, Congress, I know a sell-out when I see one and public sector jobs are being sold off to the private sector where people are treated as products where there is profit to be made, and that is a disgrace. *(Applause)* This is at a time when inequalities are rising in our workplaces and our communities. That's why our struggle for equality and for workplace justice goes on.

Those two goals, perhaps more than any other, are what bind us together as trade unionists. They are fundamentally and inextricably linked. You cannot have one without the other. In the UK and indeed overseas, decent work, underpinned by strong rights, is the best way of empowering people to lift themselves out of poverty – the best way of narrowing the gap between rich and poor.

But despite genuine progress since 1997, Britain remains a fundamentally unequal society. And for many workers justice remains an illusion rather than a reality. This is a country where top bosses pay themselves telephone number salaries and then complain about the minimum wage. This is a country where the unemployment rate for black people is over twice the national average. I know some black males of my generation who have never had permanent and stable employment. This is a country where, over three decades on from equal pay legislation, the gender pay gap remains the widest in Europe.

What is the consequence of all of this? Just two per cent of the population now owns one-third of all the wealth in this country. It is a shocking statistic for sure, but it does not begin to tell us the full picture. It does not tell us about the migrant workers doing the jobs nobody else wants to do and doing them for a pittance. It does not tell us about the young mothers trapped in low-paid, part-time work far below their skill level, and it does not tell us about the millions of vulnerable workers for whom insecurity, exploitation and minimal rights are a daily reality.

We know what the problem is – an employment relationship where the balance of power is grotesquely tilted in favour of the employer. It is the direct consequence of a labour market that some people like to boast is the least-regulated in Europe made worse, much worse, by globalisation, liberalisation and privatisation. The result, whether in the public or private sector, is that workers are under increasing pressure to do more in return for less; to work longer hours, yet put up with less job security; to embrace continual change, yet suffer constant attacks on pension rights; to bend over backwards to be flexible, yet endure management by diktat.

It is high time that the pendulum swung the other way. That is why our campaign for workplace justice is so important. Of course we welcome the many good things this Labour government has done, from the minimum wage to recognition rights and new family-friendly entitlements. We recognise that no other political party would have done this. But Britain at work could and should be so much better. Now is the time to bring employment rights in this country into line with those in Europe, creating a level playing field so that UK workers are never again sold down the river by the shameful behaviour of companies like Peugeot.

That means improved protection across a range of areas, from redundancy to working time. That means employment rights from day one for everyone, and that means giving us, the trade unions, the chance to do our job properly. That is why, a century on from the Trades Disputes Act, we are campaigning for a Trade Union Freedom Bill. We want basic changes to the law that would give us the same freedoms as unions enjoy throughout Europe. It cannot be right that UK trade unions are more restricted now than they were at the beginning of the twentieth century. It cannot be right that UK workers are denied the most basic collective right to take solidarity action.

Let us be clear about one thing. This campaign is not about wild rhetoric or a desire to turn the clock back to the 1970s. It is about removing trade unions from the tightest of legal straitjackets. It is about the UK complying with ILO conventions that it has signed up to, and it is about providing checks and balances to unfettered corporate power.

Let me read you a quote from a young and ambitious employment lawyer speaking in the 1980s. He described the Tories' attack on secondary action as "a draconian limitation on effective industrial action which involves anyone other than the immediate parties". They are the words of Tony Blair. With outsourcing all the rage, what he said then applies even more now.

Our position is clear. We will not stomach any more Gate Gourmets. Basic labour rights must be put back on the menu. Without justice at work there will never be true equality. It is no coincidence that since the anti-union laws were introduced in the 1980s the dividing line between the haves and the have-nots has widened dramatically, and it is no coincidence that as employment protections in this country have become among the weakest in Europe, Britain has become one of the continent's most unequal societies.

But as we campaign for a better framework of rights, we must not lose sight of perhaps the greatest challenge of all, and that is the need to rebuild our movement and the need to rebuild our collective strength. Sure, the legal framework is hugely important; but it is also up to us to shape our own destiny. In the past two years we have seen small increases in trade union membership – that is a welcome step forward – but as all of us know there is an awful long way to go.

One thing is for sure. All unions must sign up to an agenda for growth. We must continue to do more, to use our time, energy and resources to organise workers. We must reflect the diversity of today's workforce. That is why trade unionists are supporting the Charter for Women and the TUC's Black Workers' Charter to drive forward progress on equality. Congress, today I would like to ask you to support the TUC General Council Statement on Racism, which we hope unions will sign and take action on the relaunched Charter.

Finally, we must focus on the issues that matter most to workers. That is why we have led the debate on pensions, securing the restoration of the earnings link, a better deal for women and a new national savings scheme with compulsory employer contributions. That is why we have introduced unionlearn, massively increasing the quality and quantity of the union learning offer. And that is why we have kept up the pressure on quality of working life, running campaigns that have really caught the public's imagination.

None of this has been easy. Moving from stability to growth is hugely difficult. But I am confident that we can rise to this challenge. During my spell as President, I have been struck not just by the commitment of trade union colleagues but by the range of our talent and the depth of our ideas. This movement is much more

than the sum of its parts. That owes more than a little to the TUC itself. In the past year, I've seen first hand the effective leadership that the TUC gives to this movement, often unglamorous work behind the scenes but no less valuable for that. When a deal needed to be struck to protect the pensions of public servants, the TUC was there. When disputes needed to be resolved at ASDA, in the rail industry and in our university system, the TUC was there. When the poison, violence and hate of the Far Right needed to be fought, the TUC was there, and when our comrades in places like Colombia and Iraq needed support, the TUC was there. Congress, there is no greater calling for us as trade unionists than the promotion of international solidarity. We live in a world that is seemingly becoming more unequal and more unstable by the day. As ever, it is ordinary people, the working poor and those without work, who suffer most. They suffer unimaginable poverty because of a global economic system that is rigged in favour of the rich. They suffer violence because of aggressive western policy and the vengeful reaction it inspires. From Colombia to Iraq, from Zimbabwe to Palestine, we must not – cannot – walk on by. In the finest tradition of labour movement internationalism, we must keep struggling for a fairer, more just and more peaceful world.

We must reassert the most basic of trade union values, values that have stood the test of time: collectivism, solidarity and respect for all. They are values that make us proud to be trade unionists. In this country and overseas there's never been more need for trade unionism. In the UK and elsewhere, ordinary people are crying out for an alternative to free market globalisation. They want equality and they want justice. For our movement, this can be an age of opportunity. Now is the time for us to write the next chapter in our history. A trade union resurgence in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. We can do it; we must do it; we will do it. Thank you, Congress. *(Applause)*

### Vote of Thanks

**The Vice President:** I call upon Dave Prentis, the General Secretary of UNISON, to move the Vote of Thanks to the President.

**Dave Prentis (UNISON):** I am proud to be moving this vote of thanks to Gloria; proud that Gloria is a member of my union; proud that Gloria is a friend and proud that Gloria is the first black woman to hold the post of President of the TUC. *(Applause)*

Gloria is a role model for women and for black people. She is a great ambassador for our union and the labour movement. She is well-known and respected by people from all walks of life, from the family of Stephen Lawrence to the Commission for Racial Equality, and her colleagues in UNISON and the TUC. She has been a General Council member since 1994, awarded the MBE and then the CBE, and she is a CRE commissioner. Those are great achievements. She is a great woman, she has a great smile with an infectious giggle but, Conference, do not mess with her.

It has not been easy for Gloria. She became involved with the trade union movement as a young woman working at a law publishing firm, Reed International. She joined NATSOPA. Before the year was out, at the tender age of 20, she had become mother of the chapel. While today we ask "Why has it taken so long for a black woman to become president of our TUC?", just think of a young black woman, just 20, becoming mother of the chapel in a male dominated industry. It took a great deal of guts that she still displays now. The difference in the way that women and men were treated in that industry fuelled her approach to life and fuelled her anger. She saw women getting a hard time if they were late for work because their kids were

sick, yet men who were late because their cars broke down did not. Gloria channelled that anger into getting even. She has championed women all her life. She believes that children are our most precious asset. She lives for her nieces. She is determined that, as girls, they will have access to all that life has to offer. They are a very real part of her everyday life. Her mum, Olga, and her dad, James, have always been key figures in her life, watching Gloria today on the Parliamentary Channel with a pride that only parents can have.

Gloria has never, ever, lost a case when representing members. She has always been able to run rings round employers who tried to discipline our members. Gloria was once asked to represent a member who was caught leaving work with bacon in her knickers. Bang to rights, you would think! The member faced dismissal for theft. But at the hearing Gloria asked if there were any marks on that bacon to prove it was the employer's. There were not. The employer then said, "But she must have stolen it because she had hidden the bacon in her knickers". Gloria's response to that was that there was no law to say where or not you could carry your personal belongings. *(Cheers and applause)* The member had all the charges dropped and she returned to work.

Gloria is an endangered species. She is a socialist. She believes in the power of education as a path out of poverty and that education extends to teaching German tourists, German tourists who put towels on the sunbeds at 6 o'clock in the morning. On one holiday Gloria bounced down from her room, gathered up all the towels and threw them in the pool to the applause of all the Brits who were watching from their balconies. You could say that Gloria is a fanatic. She is fanatical about equal opportunities, Coronation Street, football and cricket. She is also passionate about Arsenal. But she can still ask friends about their teams without spitting blood, apart from her partner, James, who is an ardent Manchester United supporter. Gloria has a great sense of humour, a generous laugh and it is very rare to see Gloria under the influence of alcohol. One Babysham tips her over. A Redbull and vodka sees her dancing the night away, and that is some sight.

Gloria, you have been a fantastic President. You have quietly and calmly chaired the General Council. That is no easy feat. With one possible exception of Mark Serwotka, you kept all of our speeches very, very short. Gloria, on behalf of Conference and UNISON, I hope you have a great week, that *this* lot don't give you too much trouble, that Arsenal beat Sheffield United and when you get back at the weekend I hope you have a few hours to yourself to watch all of those episodes of Coronation Street that your mates have taped for you. Gloria do have that Babysham because you deserve it but do stay off the Redbull and vodka. *(Applause)*

**The Vice-President:** I call upon Louise Couling, a member of the UNISON NEC, to second the vote of thanks to the President.

**Louise Couling (UNISON):** I am just as proud as Dave in being able to second this vote of thanks. I have known Gloria for years but how do you sum-up that knowledge and the essence of a person in a few seconds? Gloria and I have a common bond. We were both NATSOPA girls and we were known as NATSO's, but Gloria came to be known as 'the NAT'. She would not tolerate inequality or any injustice, and she still will not. She has an irritating knack of fighting intransigence, awkward and bad management, and forcing them to change their policies. As Dave said she was very young when she became mother of the chapel and she needed grit, guts and determination. I

know because I know what the industry was like then. It was a macho male-dominated union.

Gloria does not have to rant and rave to achieve what she wants. She is the original iron fist in a velvet glove. I think in every respect she is great in one thing. Have any of you ever been driven by her...twice? She is the only person who I know who can drive from London to Blackpool in third gear on the hard shoulder and not be pulled over, and then she arrives smiling, serene and ready for conference.

Seriously, Gloria has been fantastic for women. Most of her women were cleaners and kitchen assistants and absolutely terrified of speaking in public, but with Gloria's support they faced their fear and they were able to state their case. Gloria has given the same support to many, many women in the union, which has made it a place where everyone, no matter what race or gender, feel they have a voice and are an important part of the union. She looked after women, fought their corner and reached down and helped them up the ladder. It takes a great woman to do that. To the best of my knowledge, like Dave has said, I do not think she has ever lost a case, certainly not when she has been representing. She never forgets the people who she has worked with. Even though she has not seen them for many, many months, she always finds time to talk or even give them advice when needed, but she does not suffer fools gladly. But if you are in need of help and support you can always count on her. I know of no finer person. We need more people like Gloria in the trade union movement. We certainly need Gloria.

Gloria, I bring you greetings from Kath Murphy, who was to have delivered this seconding speech, but unfortunately she is a visitor, not a delegate. I also bring you greetings from Micky Briant, who was one of your ex-presidents in a predecessor union. Most of all, I bring you greetings from the grateful members whom you have helped and advised over the many years, for the example you have set to activists and different races and genders.

It gives me great pleasure to second this vote of thanks and, please, do not give up your day job ever.  
*(Applause)*

**The President:** I thank both Dave and Louise for those warm words.

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

**The President:** Congress, I now 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.

**Annette Mansell-Green:** Good morning, Congress, I am another one of Gloria's girls in presenting this report this morning.

The General Purposes Committee has approved Composite Motions 1 – 15, which are set out in the GPC Report and the composite motions booklet which you have all received. Also in the booklet are the General Council's statement on migration and the General Council's statement jointly with the Muslim Council of Britain.

In addition, the GPC has approved Emergency Motion 1 'Attacks on fire cover and trade union organisation by Merseyside Fire Authority', to be moved by the FBU, and Emergency Motion 2 on 'Thomson/TUI Call Centre', Glasgow, to be moved by TSSA. Copies of the FBU emergency motion are on your seats and copies of the TSSA emergency motion will be on your seats at lunch-time and the President will indicate when it is hoped that they will be taken.

You will see that the printed GPC Report indicates where the movers of motions have agreed to accept amendments to their motions. You will see that the only grouping which has not been agreed concerns Motion 74 on Palestine in the name of the FBU and amendments to that motion from EIS and TSSA. We are still seeking agreement on that grouping.

Congress, as has already been mentioned by the President, there has been an amendment to the tellers listed on page 11 of the GPC Report. Helen Elliott of Community has replaced Tracy Clarke.

In order to ensure that we do not fall behind with Congress business, could I remind you to be ready to come to the rostrum quickly if you are scheduled to speak. It is very important that you respect speaking times which, unless reduced, are five minutes for moving a motion, three minutes for seconding and all other supporters.

Finally, could I remind all visitors and delegates to keep their mobile phones and any other portable ringing devices, whatever they are, switched off and that you will need your Congress credentials and the appropriate photo-identification with you at all times. I will report further to you on the progress of business and other GPC decisions when necessary throughout Congress. Have a good morning. *(Applause)*

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

I intend to take the joint statement with the Muslim Council of Britain and the statement on European migration this afternoon. I will endeavour to take Emergency Motion 2, which will be circulated at lunch-time, on the Glasgow Call Centre closure, in the transport debate on Wednesday afternoon. I hope to take Emergency Motion 1 on the Merseyside Fire Brigade dispute either this afternoon or tomorrow morning. However, this scheduling may change depending on the progress of Congress business.

Delegates, we move now to Chapter 3 of the General Council's Report – Pensions and Welfare on page 45 of the Report. I will now explain how I intend to take the pensions debate. First, I will call Jeannie Drake to move the statement on behalf of the General Council. You will find the statement set out on page 45 of the General Council Report. Then I will call on the mover and seconder of Composite Motion 6 on Pensions. I will then take the debate including supporters of the composite before moving, after the right of reply, to the vote on Composite Motion 6 and then the vote on the General Council's statement.

#### **General Council's Statement on Pensions**

**Jeannie Drake** (*General Council*) moved the General Council's statement on Pensions. She said: Congress and President, workplace pensions in Britain have been under attack and pensions policy has been at the centre of the domestic stage. Employers have been reducing their commitment to and their engagement in contributing to security in retirement and individual workers are taking on more and more of the responsibility. But we, as a movement, can be proud of what we have achieved in campaigning for better pensions, although the challenge is far from over. We put pensions at the top of the political agenda and there is now a White Paper before Parliament. We have secured some long-standing trade union demands especially those benefiting women and carers. We fought hard to defend workers' pensions under attack from employers in both the public and private sectors, and the local government unions can be proud of their hugely successful day of action in March of this year defending the Local Government Pension Scheme.

With the introduction of the Pension Protection Fund, we have won support for workers who, through no fault of their own, would lose their pension rights when their employers become insolvent. But there are still people who remain outside the protection of the fund, and although the Financial Assistance Scheme is welcome it is not enough. The TUC is determined to support those unions campaigning for full compensation. We campaigned for compulsory employer contributions to pension schemes and that is what we have achieved with the Government's Pensions White Paper, which proposes that all employers will have to make at least a minimum contribution.

On state pensions the White Paper commits to a long-standing trade union demand, the earnings indexing at the increases in the basic state pension. The White Paper also sets clear goals to help women and carers get better pensions by reducing the number of qualifying years required to get a full basic state pension from 44 to 30. There are welcome reforms to the arrangements for carers to be given credits to accruing pension entitlements to both the basic state pension and the state second pension. However, the General Council believes that the welcome reforms to state pensions should be introduced sooner. We will continue to lobby the Government to introduce the Compulsory Employer Pension Contribution and the new National Pensions Saving Scheme, and for the new scheme to be run centrally and not through the private retail pensions industry.

If the National Pensions Saving Scheme is to work for those millions of low paid and moderate income workers who currently have no access to an employer sponsored pension scheme, it must be run at very low cost and under strong governance. There are, however, areas of state pension reform that the General Council opposes, and in particular the proposed increase in the state pension age. The Council is concerned that the Government should commit to ensuring that the Pension Guarantee Credit remains available from age 65. The Guarantee Credit, which was introduced by this Government, has made such a major contribution to addressing the extremes of pensioner poverty, most of whom were women, and it must continue to do so.

Congress, there is so much more to do. The General Council believes that the White Paper offers real opportunity to address some of the historic weaknesses in the UK pensions system. For the year ahead, the General Council believes that the priorities are clear: to make sure that the new pensions settlement is for the benefit of ordinary working people and not for the finance industry; to resist any further attacks on or disengagement by employers from workers' pensions and to secure a better standard of living for today's pensioners through an immediate increase in the value of the basic state pension and addressing the needs of those existing women pensioners who are unable to accrue entitlement to full basic state pension.

The General Council has made it clear that it will not support an increase in the state pension age. Congress, I ask you to support the statement.

## Pensions

**Paul Kenny** (*GMB*) moved Composite Motion 6.

He said: I am moving Composite 6 on pensions and very much endorsing and welcoming the General Council's statement. In a world of greed and self-interest, our trade union movement can be proud of the role it has played in championing the cause of fundamental reform of the nation's pensions. I do not recall ever, and I doubt if I were to stand here for 100 years I would ever listen to, the CBI Conference calling for justice and equality for pensioners. It is the British

trade union movement that has led this charge and we should be proud of it.

When rag-bag defeatists try to tell you that the trade union movement is failing or is irrelevant, show them how we, trade unions, have forced pensions on to the political map and be proud of our commitment to fight and not to capitulate. This movement stands for and fights for justice because British pensioners deserve dignity in retirement, not fear and form-filling. British workers must be able to save for their retirement, secure in the knowledge that their employer and their Government will keep their part of the pensions contract. There are employers who think pensions are an unnecessary burden on free enterprise. There are even people in the pensions industry who think pensions are a licence to print money for themselves. There are even some people in the media who think pensions are a luxury. They are all wrong. Pensions are what stand between an independent, confident retirement and benefit dependency and fear.

Following pressure from this movement, the Government are at last proposing some seriously overdue changes; restoring the basic state pensions linked to earnings; reforming the contributory system to recognise discrimination against women and carers and, finally, getting employers to contribute a small amount, to start with, to occupational savings.

All this seemed impossible just a short time ago. "It could not be done", you heard people say. It is very welcome and we are very pleased with the progress so far, but the job is far from over. We need full compulsion on employers to contribute a proper amount to all workers' pensions. The move to restore the link cannot wait until 2012. Who in their right mind would let the basic state pension wither to less than 20 percent of average earnings before restoring earnings indexation? Which energy company is going to wait until 2012 to increase its heating bills? Which local authority is going to hang around until 2012 to put up its council tax? The issue which we must condemn is the proposal that to pay for this workers will be forced to work longer.

Don't get me wrong. If people want to work, I do not have a problem with that. In fact, I saw a guy -- some of you may have seen him on the television the other day -- who was celebrating his 100th birthday at work washing vans. I am sure, looking at Derek Simpson, he will be able to go on until age 70 or 75, which will be a comfort for my good friend Tony Woodley! However, for most people, retirement is an economic decision. A lot of people would like to retire, but they just cannot afford to. If you were to tell many workers in the public services or those in heavy industry that the average life-span is age 88, they would laugh at you. Maybe it is so for judges and MPs or even Prime Ministers, but not for construction workers, welders, ship builders, steel workers or many of those in the service industries who are actually worn out by the pressures of work by the time they get to retirement age as it is now.

Our message to the Government is clear. The GMB and the entire trade union movement stand together continuing to fight for justice and equality for British workers throughout their lives. This means "yes" to a proper state pension; it means "yes" to a good occupational pension provision and it means "yes" to pension security for all. We, as the trade union movement, should be proud to do so. (*Applause*)

**Janice Godrich** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) seconded Composite Motion 6.

She said: Congress, every form of pension for working people has been under attack, whether it is the basic state pension, the second pension or occupational schemes. What we have been offered by the finance



industry instead has been characterised by mis-selling and failure.

There is nothing inevitable about this. We are supposed to be scared into panic responses by the idea that people are living longer. It is supposed to be common sense that if this happens, society cannot sustain supposedly generous pensions. However, it is not common sense at all. It is clear more people are living long enough to draw their pensions, but we should be celebrating this, not bemoaning it.

We can easily afford to provide for today's and tomorrow's pensioners. It is not just the pensioner dependency ratio that matters; it is total dependency. As there are fewer children and more workers, this is at an historic low at present, and even by 2030 will only be back at the level seen in the 1970s. When you take into account the growth in the economy and in productivity since then, you will see that it is not the means that are lacking; it is the political will.

There has been a consensus amongst the powerful that workers, if they are going to have the cheek to live longer, need to stop relying on the state and put more money in the hands of city financiers. Employers do not want to carry the risk of occupational schemes if they can get their workers to take all the chances.

That is what the proposed National Pensions Savings Scheme, or personal accounts, will do. It means that workers, many of them so low paid that they can ill-afford the additional contributions, will be paying into schemes from which, as they are currently proposed, they will have no guarantee of getting out even what they have paid in.

We know from research conducted by the DWP that this is what would most worry people. They want to get back at least a guaranteed sum from their pension account, what they have paid in plus a percentage on top. It is not much to ask, you might think, but we all know it is more than the finance industry can provide.

The trade union movement's response to the whole pensions question needs to be strong. We must not be scared into responses we might later come to regret. The threat of action across the civil service successfully defended the final salary scheme and the raising of the pension age. Members stand ready to defend that agreement again should there be an attempt to renege on it by this or future governments. In the same way, we must not be scared into accepting that the state pension age should increase, or that the index linking of an increased basic state pension should wait, or that workers' savings should be gambled on the financial market.

Congress, we exist to raise aspirations, not dampen them. Let's refuse to be intimidated, show a clear lead, speak with one voice, trust in our members and end poverty in retirement. *(Applause)*

**Tony Kearns** (*Communication Workers Union*) supported Composite Motion 6.

He said: In dealing with the issue of state pensions and state pensions now, there is a problem on two fronts with the White Paper. First of all, it talks about increasing the state pension from 2012, but there is a significant problem with 2012 in that it comes after the next general election. If they carry on behaving like they behaved last week, they might not be the Party in government in 2012! I do not really trust the Conservative Party when they say, "Trust us, we will restore the link" as they took the link away in the first place. So the problem for today's pensioners is not about promises for tomorrow. It is about an increase in state pension in the lifetime of this parliament, not about tomorrow, but about today.

Of course, the big stumbling block when you talk to the Government is the issue of affordability; We need to plan for 2012 and 2020 through reasons of

affordability. You can get this information from the website of the Department of Work and Pensions. The Government's actuary who looked at the figures when the Treasury was balancing the books estimates that by 2020 there will be a surplus in the National Insurance fund of £60 billion. Of course, the Government or the Treasury now keeps that surplus, which I think is currently at about £20 billion or £24 billion, to balance the books whilst it is spending money on wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Of course, while that is taking place, the money in the National Insurance fund is not being used for what it was raised for. It was raised to pay National Insurance, which was raised to pay for pensions.

The issue is: can they afford it? Yes, they can. The issue is: can they afford it in 2012? They probably will be able to afford it because estimates at that point in time put the National Insurance fund surplus at something like £40 billion. The main point is can they afford it and afford it now, in the lifetime of this Parliament? There are 11 million elderly people in this society and growing. Come the next general election, unless those people are given something that they want by this Government, 2012 will not matter for the promises that are made because this Government will not be in power to implement them. On that basis, you should carry this composite motion. *(Applause)*

**Gerry Doherty** (*Transport Salaried Staffs' Association*) supported Composite Motion 6.

He said: I am very pleased to join with colleagues in making absolutely clear in outlining the Trade Union Congress's total opposition to the principle that medical advances in increasing life expectancy have to be matched and funded by an increase in the time that people spend at work.

In a country enjoying the fourth largest economy in the world, the so-called 'captains of industry' enjoy lottery standard contributions to their own personal pension schemes, whilst at the same time shedding crocodile tears over the unaffordability of their final salary company pension schemes in favour of inferior money purchase schemes or, even worse, no pension provision at all for their employees. That is the unequal world in which Britain's workers find themselves at the turn of the new millennium.

However, may I restrict my remarks to that part of the composite that refers to the Railway Pension Scheme in particular? In so doing, may I record my union's thanks to the TUC and, in particular, to the Deputy General Secretary, Frances O'Grady, for her help in trying to resolve the very difficult problems facing the Railway Pension Scheme at this particular time? There are something like 130,000 members in the Railway Pension Scheme, that is, pensioners, deferred pensioners and contributing members as well.

Time does not allow me the luxury of explaining in any sort of detail what those difficulties are, but suffice to say that when the Tories, in their infinite wisdom, decided to fragment and privatise the railway industry, they also at the same time fragmented and privatised the pensions of railway workers and pensioners. A single pension scheme now consists of more than 100 different sections, more than 100 different administration costs, more than 100 different legal costs and more than 100 different actuarial evaluation costs, as opposed to one.

Coupled with the fact that some of those sections have been closed off to new entrants -- let us say, privatised industry has sought to make gains through the privatisation -- and the fact, of course, that the stock market in general has declined since the turn of the millennium, the overall effect is that over two-thirds of the sections are now in deficit. Again, without going into detail, what this actually means is that in some

cases the schemes have become so expensive for existing members that they are simply walking away and exacerbating the situation.

Since privatisation of the railways, there has been no forum whatsoever available to discuss industry-wide problems between employers and employee representatives. With regret, I have to say that it was only with the threat of industrial action that the Railway Pensions Commission, which the composite invites you to welcome, was established. However, it will not resolve things. The difficulties are still there. They will have to be addressed and it may well take industrial action to resolve it. If it does come to that, it will be with regret, but we are not going to stand back in the railway trade unions and see railway workers paying for the cost of Tory privatisation and the failure of New Labour to address it. *(Applause)*

**Ian Allison** (*Amicus*) supported Composite Motion 6.

He said: At the heart of the justification for attacking our pension rights is the argument that we cannot afford decent pensions, but don't tell me that business cannot afford it when you see that Lord Browne, the boss of BP, if he retired tomorrow, would be getting a pension of more than £19,000 a week. Don't tell me that business cannot afford it. At my own company, the boss received a package which was worth £1.7 million last year and many staff are getting paid less than one percent of that. Meanwhile, like so many others, our defined benefit scheme was closed to new entrants and a defined contributions scheme set up. The truth is most of the new starters have not joined a pension scheme through the company at all. That is a time bomb ticking away for the future when large numbers of people will have no support in old age.

Then you come to the state pension and the proposals to increase the state pension age. People have already talked about how many people actually live to reach an increased state pension age. There is another question: how many of us can keep our jobs that long? Certainly, where I work, it is unusual, even when the normal pensionable age was 60, that you could survive until age 60 without getting made redundant or sacked.

Whilst Gordon Brown can afford to fund Tony Blair's disastrous wars abroad, don't tell me that Britain cannot afford decent state pensions. I am sure this composite will pass, but the question throughout, Congress, is going to be how our unions can use the muscle we have to deliver industrially and politically the contents of this motion to make it happen and how we can build that muscle where we do not already have it. *(Applause)*

**Chris Murphy** (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) supported Composite Motion 6.

He said: The White Paper is fundamentally about increasing the pension provisions within society as a whole. The proposal to introduce a system of automatic enrolment with compulsory contributions by employees and employers is a step in the right direction, but the White Paper does not go far enough in ensuring that this is not just a paper commitment.

In the construction industry, less than a third of employees have a pension. If you include the bogus self-employed, coverage is even worse. To change the culture of our industry will take more than good intentions. We have already seen employers trying to evade extending benefits to workers. There have been systematic efforts by employers to avoid paying holiday pay since the introduction of the Working Time Directive in 1998. My union has had to take employers through all the legal loopholes at great expense just to nail down the statutory right of paid holidays.

We face the same resistance from employers over pension payments. There are two devices they will use, firstly, by encouraging employees to opt out. The pressure to introduce a qualifying period is just the first part of the campaign, but if that does not work, they will fall back on avoidance. The White Paper does not have a lot to say about avoidance. Agency workers will have to establish who they are employed by to get a contribution into their PCA; casual workers will be excluded if there is any sort of qualifying period and false employment in the construction industry will once again mean workers miss out on the benefits that should be extended to them. Employers will see a contribution of three percent to the pensions as a new tax. They already have accountants drafting contracts to deny workers their rights. Very little will change in the industry if the Government does not deal with bogus self-employment.

There is still time to tackle the problem. They should not give employers the option. The right to a pension should be extended to all workers. The Government's policy aims to do that. As some of you might not realise, in 2006, in Great Britain, the building industry is still a jungle, and I mean a jungle. It is difficult to organise.

We ask that you support Composite Motion 6 and that pressure is brought to bear on the Government to eliminate bogus self-employment. Thank you. *(Applause)*

**Jeff Broome** (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*) supported Composite Motion 6.

He said: USDAW welcomes the Pensions White Paper and especially the proposals that bring in compulsory employer contributions for the first time.

I want to concentrate, however, on how we, in USDAW, believe the proposed National Pensions Savings Scheme should be run and make three main points.

Firstly, we need automatic enrolment from day one. TUC analysis published at the end of last month highlighted the vast number of staff who change jobs frequently and who would lose out with a waiting period of a year. In retail, one in five people have been in their jobs for less than a year. It is usual for more than 50 percent of the staff recruited to leave within that first year. These are the very people who should be the target of the NPSS, not those who are excluded. Employers have to pay National Insurance contribution from day one, so why not payments to the NPSS?

Secondly, auto enrolment into the scheme should be just that, so that workers do not lose out because they do not know which box to tick. We have had lots of experience of members putting off joining good company money purchase schemes because they cannot decide which fund to invest in. That is why USDAW is arguing for a default option, which should be in investment funds carefully chosen by the trustees of the National Pensions Saving Scheme administered by the public sector.

Thirdly, the proposed NPSS only has compulsory employer contributions set at between £5,000 and the upper earnings limit. Excluding earnings below £5,000 would mean that most retail workers on 16 hours or less are left out completely. Don't let's fool ourselves on this one. The vast majority of this group will be women and women will be disadvantaged yet again. Those earning £10,000 a year would only have employer contributions paid on half their income.

The argument for excluding these earnings is to reduce the risk of people being mis-sold the NPSS when they might otherwise receive means-tested benefits. However, this takes an oversimplistic view of working patterns and assumes that people's hours and pay stay

the same during their working life. This is just not the case. We need the facility for workers to have the option to pay on all earnings and then be entitled to the employer's contribution to match.

Congress, our members tell us that pensions are their number one worry, so we need to ensure that the NPSS meets their needs with employer contributions on all earnings from day one with a default investment option. Please support. *(Applause)*

**Barry Camfield** (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) supported Composite Motion 6.

He said: I rise to make three particular points; firstly, the idea of a living wage. This policy composite calls for all pensioners to have a decent living wage and for an end to the hated means test. The fantastic rally yesterday of our pensioners was testament to the campaign that we have for this living wage. Pensioners now are living in and suffering from appalling poverty in Britain. Just compare the state basic pension to our National Minimum Wage for a moment. Next month, the minimum wage goes to £5.35 or, on a 40-hour week, £214 a week. Compare that to the state basic pension. At £84.25 for a single pensioner, it equates to £2.10 an hour for a 40-hour week or, alternatively, if we are paying the National Minimum Wage to pensioners, capping it at 16 hours. We are forcing British pensioners to live in appalling poverty. So £214 a week is the National Minimum Wage level and the NPC are demanding just £114 a week. It is time this Government did something for today's pensioners and did it now. Hopefully, the new leadership will address that. *(Applause)*

Secondly, the campaign against the increase in the state pension age; I, and I am sure you, will not sell out my grandchildren or your grandchildren who have no voice in this debate about their retirement age. These are our kids today. We are their voice; we are their conscience. Babies and little children will have inflicted on them the state pensionable age of 68 and, if the CBI have their way, the age of 70. Would the Labour Government get elected if it went to an election and said to the people, "You will not get a basic pension until you are aged 68"? No. It is going to inflict it on a generation which has no voice; so we have to stand up and oppose the age 68 position and defend the age of 65 as the outer limit.

Finally, I have a point on this default retirement age. The battle is being waged today to move workers to work ever longer. Don't fall into the trap of campaigning for so-called choice, or the right or the freedom to work beyond 65. Workers need the absolute right to retire by age 65 with a full living wage and a decent pension. Surely, then, it is our time to live, to learn, to express life and, as the old trade union campaign adage says, "We should work to live and not live to work". So let's defend today's pensioners and battle for our members and tomorrow's pensioners too. Support the composite. *(Applause)*

**Alan Donnelly** (*Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*) supported Composite Motion 6.

He said: First of all, I would like to place on record ASLEF's sincere thanks, total support and appreciation for the work and commitment shown by the National Pensioners Convention along with its members and those who assisted in restoring the link between state pensions and earnings or, its proper title, deferred wages and current earnings. Don't kid yourselves. State pensions are not a hand-out. They are contributions made during your working life.

Let me make it clear. I am not being critical at all of the TUC report on state pensions. It is a very good

report, but I think it needs to go much further. To make an amendment to a motion, you are allowed 50 words. Five thousand words would not cover the injustice that is happening to the pensioners and the pensions of this country.

Whilst it should not be the TUC alone putting pressure on the Government to bring the 2012 date closer, at this point in time we should all be putting pressure on the Government to make sure the issue is addressed within the life-time of this Parliament.

The extortionate increases in energy costs, council charges and the prices of fuel and any other essential increases that are way above inflation have a direct effect on pensions and pensioners and a decrease in the living standards of pensioners. The winter is not far away. This Government's own official figures recorded 22,000 deaths in 2004 due to cold-related illnesses. Not restoring the link between deferred earnings and today's current earnings, plus these huge increases in energy fuel and council charges, will affect the pensioners of this country, our pensioners.

I do not know what the death figure will be in 2012. I bet it will be more than enough to fill any Olympic stadium that is built of any size. It is hard to believe that Great Britain is among the top five richest countries in the world.

I would like to tell you about a certain club in this country that has around 11 million members. It does not care if you are tall or small, black or white, red or blue, gay or straight, or even if you are round the bend it is not a problem! That is the pension club. Listen to me when I say you can colour your hair, you can replace your teeth, you can increase your chest and even have your skin stretched, but you are one of the 50 million people who, if the Devil does not take you, will become a pensioner.

Don't just support the composite. Assist the National Pensioners Convention and correct the wrong and put right a social injustice. *(Applause)*

**Steve Kemp** (*National Union of Mineworkers*) supported Composite Motion 6.

He said: Congress, I know that on 25th April this year, Brendan said that the TUC remains opposed to the Turner proposals regarding the raising of the retirement age. Therefore, this argument that we have heard from comrades who have spoken this morning requires logic. So where is the logic behind forcing workers, in particular in manual occupations, to work beyond ages 66, 67 and 68? Does the Government really believe that working past this age is good for workers? Does it think that mineworkers who work 12-hour shifts in appalling conditions appreciate the proposals in the Turner Report? It is not only miners, but railway workers, fire fighters and workers in engineering; what must they be thinking when people are asked to retire beyond age 65?

The NUM welcomes the White Paper where it indicates the introduction of the National Pension Savings Scheme with a minimum employer contribution, but the NUM watched in utter dismay when Turner and the Government spokespeople gave the reason as to why the pension age is going up as "people are living longer". That is a pathetic answer and hypocrisy of the worst kind. No wonder some members of Parliament wanted the state pension age to increase. Just a couple of weeks before, that lot recently awarded themselves not only the best pension increase in the UK, but also awarded themselves a shorter working week! Nice if you can get it! *(Applause)*

What is good for the goose is good for the gander. Talking about geese, never mind the Government cuddling up yet again to the CBI and Digby Jones and his like, let us start by pushing the link with earnings and by raising the issue of a quarter of our state

pensioners living in poverty. What a disgrace in a so-called modern society and what a shameful record this country has! The fourth richest country in the world has a quarter of its state pensioners living in poverty.

Congress, what about the ever-increasing council tax that many pensioners are also forced to pay? They are paying for decreasing services caused by councils being forced to tender services out to private companies. It is wrong, it is improper and it has to be ended. This composite is not new policy, but it does suggest a sense of urgency. The principles in the composite are sound and will strike a chord with trade unionists and the country as a whole if proper campaigning takes place.

To campaign on a dual ticket of a proper retirement age with a proper state funded pension will capture people's imagination; so the task is difficult but it is not insurmountable. As a nation, we have reserves of money in the National Insurance fund to pay for the restoration of the link. With that said, I ask Congress to support the composite and then actively to campaign on the issues contained within the composite itself. Please support Composite 6. *(Applause)*

**Carole Maleham** (*UNISON*) supported Composite Motion 6.

She said: I am speaking on behalf of two million public service workers still defending the Local Government Pension Scheme.

We have been fighting for almost two years now. We have been in discussions, consultation, negotiations, campaigning and eventually industrial action on 28th March this year. We have not finished yet. We are still in negotiations with the Government and the employers for equal treatment along with teachers, civil servants and NHS staff. Right now we are up to our eyes in trying to get a better deal for our members by improving protection and a scheme for the future from the massive savings they have made from cutting our members' pensions' rights. It is our money and our right to decide what to do with it.

If there is one thing that really irritates me, it is the press calling my pension 'gold plated'. I do not think so. We pay six percent of our earnings into our pension scheme all our working lives, but women, who are three-quarters of the members, get an average pension of £31 a week. What can we do with £31 a week? It is not exactly a fat cat's pension, is it?

We also have too many members in low paid jobs without a pension. This is a serious issue for local government pension schemes. We are trying to change that to help members joining the Local Government Pension Scheme. We hope Lord Sandy Bruce-Lockhart, leader of the Local Government Association, and the Government see sense. My grandad always said, "Where there is no sense, there is no feeling". Well, we will wait and see. I do not want to go to work on my Zimmer frame! If they do not see sense, we will be back out on those picket lines. We are not giving up this fight yet, but we all need to get together. *(Applause)*

With more than two million members, you all know someone who is in the Local Government Pension Scheme. We all need your support, whether it is your auntie Mary, your uncle Tom or your kids' school meals worker. I want you all to write to your local councillors, lobby your MPs, your MEPs and join the Local Government Pension Scheme campaign. I thank you all in advance for your support because I know you will support the composite. *(Applause)*

**Iain Loughran** (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*) supported Composite Motion 6.

He said: I am speaking as a new delegate and first-time speaker. *(Applause)* Thank you.

I would like to start by placing on record the appreciation of the CSP for all of the work the TUC does in the area of pensions. This was clearly highlighted earlier this year when health unions had to call directly on the service of the TUC. With our own talks on a new NHS pension scheme running into trouble, the help of the TUC has been vital in reaching agreement on fundamental changes to the scheme. We have now moved on to the membership consultation phase.

However, with regard to the amendment that we have submitted, there is one aspect of the whole pensions debate which I want to highlight in particular. It is the fact that today's young people and the youth workforce at large have little understanding of the need for a pension provision. Adding to this problem is the lack of commitment from the Government to continue its work in improving public understanding of pensions.

Well acknowledged in the Pensions White Paper is the fact that young workers are more likely to live and spend for today. That is quite true. They tend to have other more pressing financial priorities, such as paying off education debts. Again, that is quite true. Also, the thought of buying a new car will always be more attractive than starting a pension. With a clear White Paper reference to the fact that many people are failing to plan adequately for their retirement, there is surely definite concern that there is no White Paper slant on young workers. With further evidence to suggest that young workers are significantly less likely than older workers to have a reasonable understanding of pensions or retirement investments, the concern grows.

As a young worker myself, relatively speaking, I am not surprised by these findings. What does surprise me, however, is that the issue does not figure more prominently in the White Paper and carry a stronger government backing. To put this right, we are calling for a commitment from government to initiate an advertising campaign targeted specifically at young people. Its aim would be, not only to raise awareness of the changes that are going to be introduced, but to counteract the possible efforts of unscrupulous employers to persuade workers into opting out of the new arrangements.

We also see a role for the TUC and individual unions here; the TUC acting through its existing network in schools and colleges and for individual unions acting through their journals and websites.

Conference, I feel it is stretching a point too far to say that pensions are an issue that will ignite the enthusiasm of young people, but, given what has been said, the need at least to try is all too evident. I thank you and ask you all to support the motion.

**Jeremy Dear** (*National Union of Journalists*) supported Composite 6. He said: Paul Kenny opened this debate by telling us that there are some people in the media who believe that good pensions are a luxury. He is right; there are: managements at Cumbria Newspapers, Trinity Mirror, ITV and the BBC among them. I asked our delegation to ensure our libel lawyers were on stand-by for the next three minutes but they reminded me that in libel cases truth is an absolute defence. The truth is that BBC management -- responsible for one of Europe's largest company pension schemes -- have broken promises, lied to staff and failed in their duty to protect staff pensions. As a result of their failures, they want staff to pay more and work longer, simply to receive the benefits to which they are currently entitled.

The truth is that BBC senior management have lied. In 2003, at the first signs of a pensions surplus reduction, the then director-general wrote to all scheme members. He said, "Members' normal contribution rates will never be more than a maximum of 7.5 percent of pensionable salary." Now they want staff to pay 20 per cent more than that. So much for the BBC's promises, but -- as they explained in negotiations -- "never" it is a tricky word. Clearly, in the BBC Thesaurus, it can be used in place of "next year", "some time soon", or "whenever we decide". As they explained, what they said in 2003 was not so much a lie as a mistake.

What adds insult to injury is that this is not a scheme in crisis. The 2005 valuation showed a surplus; the latest interim valuation shows a bigger surplus. No deficit, no crisis, but what there is is a BBC management jumping on the pensions crisis bandwagon in a blatant attempt to shift an increasing proportion of the cost of the scheme on to their staff -- this in the wake of the BBC having already saved over a billion pounds as a result of paying only partial contributions.

Like the Government, BBC management love a good consultation. A good consultation in their eyes is one like this, which asks questions such as, "Would you prefer (a) to pay higher member contributions or (b) to build up your pension at a lower rate in future?" No is the answer, the answer they received from the overwhelming majority of their staff. They ignored it. What they could not ignore was the strong stand and the threat of industrial action from the unions. As a result the worst changes have been deferred. We remain committed to ensuring they are not just deferred but abandoned.

But our campaigns must not be in isolation. They must be part of an active, high profile and uncompromising TUC-led campaign in support of the fundamental defence and promotion of both occupational and state pensions. This composite is a vital starting point for that.

\* *Composite Motion 6* was CARRIED

\* *The General Council's Statement* was ADOPTED

## TUPE and Pensions

**The President:** I will now call Motion 26, TUPE and Pensions. The General Council support the motion.

**Tony Lennon** (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*) moved Motion 26. He said: 'Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union' is a bit of a mouthful, I admit, which is why we abbreviate it to BECTU, but not so much of a mouthful as the Transfer of Undertakings, Protection of Employment Regulations 1989, mercifully abbreviated to TUPE, and something that has become a factor for most of us on a daily basis.

Let us be frank about why TUPE is so important. The avalanche of outsourcing and privatisation that was kicked off by the Tories in the eighties has continued unabated since 1997 and, if anything, is beginning to accelerate. I am for ever in the position where I am trying to explain to members who face outsourcing and privatisation what TUPE is all about. It is strange, whenever I get into the description I am reminded of a Monty Python sketch in which the unwritten law featured. Very quickly, for those not of a certain age, this sketch was a spoof documentary about a gangster whose trademark was to nail people's heads to the floor, and one of his victims -- having insisted "He is a really nice bloke, he's a lovely boy." admitted that he had transgressed the unwritten law but did not know what he had done because the unwritten law had not been written down!

If you look at TUPE and apply the Monty Python test, it is very much about how long is a piece of string. The average member says, "Well, the P stands for protection so what is protected?" Well, the actual answer is terms and conditions but do not pin me down too much on what that actually means. "All right", says the member, "if you cannot tell me what is protected, how long do I get protection?" Ha, ha, that is back to how long is a piece of string because actually I cannot give you any definite promise on that. Finally, the member actually cuts to the quick and says "Look, the real bottom line here is if I get outsourced can they sack me the day after I am taken over by a new employer, or can they make me redundant?" and your initial answer is, "Of course not", but then you stop and think and say, "Well, they cannot actually do it on day one, but at some time in the future". There you have the unwritten law of TUPE. Better than having nothing at all.

But the one area where it is absolutely silent is on this crucial area of pensions and what we have experienced with thousands of our members is that the absence of TUPE protection for pensions has led many, many employers to use outsourcing and privatisation as a back door route to kick people out of their pension funds and thereby save a lot of money. If you think about it from the employer's point of view, outsourcing people does not involve headlines in the paper saying you have closed your pension scheme. The rules of most pensions schemes do not even require a proper consultation with members when this happens and, as a result, in our union alone we now have thousands of people who have been transferred out of safe, secure occupational schemes and are now uncertain as to what their future pension prospects are.

All this motion is asking is that the TUC should continue its campaign to get pensions drawn into that net of protection and, if you can do anything to strengthen the TUPE regulations in the process, you would be doing us all a very great favour.

There is another issue in this motion, which is part of the current debate going on in view of the White Paper about how pension schemes should operate in the future. There has been a suggestion -- and it has been taken up quite seriously by a lot of participants in the debate -- that if schemes get into trouble whereas they are currently obliged to meet all the pension obligations that people have earned up to date (whether they have been out-sourced or not does not matter), if pension schemes get into trouble they can re-visit the benefits that people have earned often over decades and actually reduce the value of the money that has been put away in their pension scheme by their employer. Quite frankly this is a dodge that even Robert Maxwell would not have dreamed up because it amounts to legalised, institutionalised theft of benefits that our members have built up. I hope the TUC will do everything it possibly can to kill off this notion that schemes should be allowed retrospectively to go and change the pensions that our members have all earned.

That is Motion 26. I did not realise you were going to take the vote on the General Council's Statement on Pensions. I just want to make one point. This concerns the White Paper on Pensions; consultation closed today. Sadly, for half of my members this document is almost completely irrelevant, that is the half of my members who describe themselves as freelancers. They are caught in this weird hinterland where they are not quite employees but they are not quite self-employed business people. When it comes to pensions for many of those freelance people, because of their employment histories, by the time they get to retirement some of them would think that £84 a week was a luxury, because they do not qualify in full for even a state pension. I was very dismayed that the

Government, despite all the entreaties made by the unions in our sector -- including the artists unions representing actors and musicians who are almost exclusively freelance -- the Government has missed out that key group of workers. What I would really like to hear is an assurance from the General Council that they will not make the same mistake and that they will not turn their backs on a group of workers in this country that is growing on a daily basis and are often in a position where the nature of their employment is one that does not even entitle them to start building up credits for the basic state pension. We have thousands of them; I think there are hundreds of thousands or even millions out there working in the UK economy. I hope I will get an assurance that they are included in the General Council's concerns about pensions.

I move motion 26. Thank you very much.

**The President:** We will have a reply from the General Council at the end of this debate. I now call Prospect to second.

**Dai Hudd** (*Prospect*) seconded Motion 26. He said: The regulations under The Pensions Act 2004 came into force as the Transfer of Employment Pensions Protection Regulations 2005, bringing with it a minimum standard for pension protection on transfer. The Transfer of Undertakings, Protection of Employment Regulations 2005 came into force in April 2006 and, whilst they did some tidying up, they unfortunately did absolutely nothing to improve this minimum standard. Our concern is expressed in the final paragraph of the motion and we seek to improve that minimum standard.

The current regulations would potentially allow a new employer to substitute a good final salary scheme with one of the three following: a defined benefit scheme meeting the requirements of the reference scheme test; a scheme equal to the value of the member contribution plus six per cent from the employer of pensionable pay; or a money purchase scheme where the employer matches the employee's contribution up to a maximum of six per cent. In other words, a good quality pension scheme can be replaced by a stakeholder arrangement with a maximum payment from the employer of six per cent. This is wholly inadequate. It is far less than many of the agreements we have been able to negotiate, some underpinned by legislation in previous transfers. Unfortunately, these regulations we believe could potentially undermine our ability to do that in the future. For example, in the privatisation of the electricity supply industry we were able to create protected purchase provisions as part of the Electricity Act 1989. In current discussions on the potential make-up of the nuclear de-commissioning industry we are discussing an industry-wide scheme. We believe these regulations should be strengthened. We believe adequate prevention, similar to those arrangements prior to transfer, should succeed any subsequent transfers that take place.

I second the motion and hope you will give it your wholehearted endorsement.

\* *Motion 26 was CARRIED*

**The President:** I will now ask Jeannie Drake to reply on behalf of the General Council to the point raised by BECTU on pensions.

**Jeannie Drake** (*General Council*): The General Council can give the assurance that BECTU seek: that we will address the issue of self-employed freelance workers and their current inability to have access to the state second pension scheme and the proposed employer compulsory contribution, and will lobby the Government further on how best to improve the ability

of freelance and self-employed workers to build up their pension entitlement. I can give that assurance.

## Public Services

**The President:** I call Composite Motion 8 on Public Services, which the General Council supports.

**Jane Carolan** (*UNISON*) moved Composite Motion 8. She said: Probably everyone in this room thinks they know what public services are. Hopefully, that definition would include that they are publicly owned, publicly controlled and universally available, but what is and what is not a public service changes. Twenty years ago in this hall we would have been opposing CCT, where council contracts went to the highest bidder. Twenty years ago and we were arguing about the sell-off of the great state industries -- the railways, gas, electricity. I recently watched a debate in the European Parliament where a Greek comrade argued passionately that energy supply was not a commodity but a human right. We lost our human rights in Maggie's great sell-off, and maybe as consumers see the bills going higher and higher coming through the door they understand our argument a bit better. However, in losing that argument our society changed and if we lose it now it will change irreparably.

Naively, like probably everyone else in this hall, I had great hopes at the election of a Labour Government. We hoped that a Labour Government had a different sense of values. In halls just like this one we had proclaimed that the Tories knew the price of everything and the value of nothing. A Labour Government would know better. How naive can you be? A new mantra rapidly established itself. What matters is what works. That was the mantra of New Labour and continues to be the mantra of New Labour.

However, as the motion notes, there have been record levels of investment but at the same time record levels of privatisation. What else can you call it when councils divest themselves of their housing stock to bodies run by banks and insurance companies? What else can you call it when benefits, finance functions and so-called strategic partnerships are run by multinational corporations? It is privatisation. You may call a programme 'building schools for the future' but if it is divesting local authorities of their assets it is privatisation.

Now there is talk of a third way. We are told that social enterprise is the way forward. UNISON is proud to represent its members in the voluntary sector but we do not see that the case has been made for the benefits of so-called social enterprise. Does it avoid costs and bureaucracy as claimed, or does shifting the emphasis to localism have an impact on universal standards of care and provision? One thing can be deduced from the example of registered social landlords. It means huge wage hikes and an explosion in management structures -- hardly the way forward. Real voluntary organisations add value. The social market hampers cooperation as they bid against each other and seek to undermine each other to win contracts. It leads to fragmentation.

We seem now to be on the brink of another change. Maybe this year, maybe next; one man knows and he ain't telling. The old joke goes, "What is the difference between Tony Blair and Gordon Brown? One thinks he is God and the other knows he is God." But, listening to Gordon on Sunday morning, there were no words there where you could find a difference between him and Blair. This is not a debate between personalities and vanity. It is not a debate about old Labour and New Labour. It must be a debate about the values and principles that shape our society.

Let us go back to an honest version of an ABC. A is for accountability. For those who support privatisation, it does not matter who provides the service, but what happens when the service goes wrong? We have to remember that their only bottom line is the bottom line of the profit margin and the shareholders. We have seen what has happened, the tragedies that have happened in the rail industry as a result of that. I am not a parent but I care passionately about education. At the moment I can exercise a say in that through local elections. Now it will be moved on and any dodgy car dealer with a million to spare and a belief in little green men can open his own academy and the community doesn't get any say in it.

Then B is for being honest. The CBI continually repeats the claim that projects are delivered on time and on budget. Like a lot of things they say, just because they say it does not mean it is so. Less than two-thirds of schools currently being repaired and renewed come in on time; 61 per cent of funds involved are hit with penalties for non-performance on contracts. Look again and you will find architects saying that the buildings are not fit for purpose. You can say the same about PFI hospitals, built a few years ago and now white elephants.

Lastly, C is for cost. It is not just that we need an acknowledgement that PFI costs more than conventional procurement; it is that our taxed pounds are no longer going to provide services, they are going to make profits. *The Guardian* estimates that something like £3.3 billion was made last year so the next time you hear about city bonuses you are going to have an extra smile on your face when you think "I contributed to that". Why are we not taking that argument to the taxpayers and the public?

The argument against running public services as public services is a straw man. We were told that we were inefficient and resistant to modernisation, but we support and welcome change based on reasoned argument, firmly based on the support and knowledge of the workers. We have to make the case in our own defence. We need to build key alliances. Let us get on with the job.

**Mark Serwotka** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) seconded Composite Motion 8. He said:

Everyone who will speak in this debate -- in fact, everyone in the trade union movement -- would agree that we should oppose job cuts in the public sector and we should oppose job cuts and privatisation, but the real debate that we need to start today is how do we oppose the privatisation, how do we oppose cuts and what do we need to do to build a vibrant campaign involving all of the unions to tell the Government that they have got it wrong? PCS hopes that debate will start here today and will go on in every single union to ensure that we can mount the most effective campaign now to ensure the leaders of the Government realise that we are not going away and they had better change tack or there will be industrial action and joint campaigning.

Let us remind you of the experience of PCS members delivering front line public services: 100,000 jobs to be cut by Gordon Brown announced in 2004; tens of thousands of PCS members have already been on strike over the last two years. Recently we have had strikes by our driving examiner members, members working in tax offices, members working in the Department of Work and Pensions, some of Britain's lowest paid public servants who have now had 13 days of national strikes in the last three years. Why, Congress, are these civil servants having to take industrial action? Let me tell you why.

The Government's proposals currently in front of us mean that at the Ministry of Defence 20,000 public

sector workers are faced with privatisation or job losses. December is likely to see the biggest privatisation in civil service history with a £19 billion defence training contract handed over to multi-national companies; 40,000 job losses in the Department of Work and Pensions, 63 per cent of violent assaults on our members as a result. A Select Committee in Parliament described a catastrophic collapse in service delivery in DWP, 20 million telephone calls from members of the public unanswered because we did not have the staff there to do it and now we see the Government lining up charities to do departmental front line work in what is a throw-back to the 1930s. That is a disgrace and we should all tell them it is unacceptable.

At the same time we see now the Government spending £2.2 billion on private sector consultants on an average pay of £750 a day when civil servants were paid £120 to do the same work. The next cuts are going to be in the National Minimum Wage Inspectors that will see 150 employers, who should be visited to check they are complying, get off the hook.

All this is unacceptable and that is why PCS announced yesterday that we are now consulting our representatives about moving to a further national ballot for national discontinuous strike action unless the Government sees sense in the coming weeks and accepts that these proposals have to stop. Congress, you supported us last time we took national action. This composite calls on you to support us unequivocally again. If our members go on strike it is a not just to defend jobs, but it is to defend the public service that we all depend on from a brutal onslaught from this Government who, frankly, should know better.

I want to finish by saying this. We are clear about what we have to do to defend our jobs and our services but the real issue now is what we do as a movement to tell the Government that they have got it wrong. Everyone knows that on this composite there were differences between the unions as to whether we should call a national demonstration and a national day of action. Let me say that PCS is quite clear: mobilising activists and mobilising members and mobilising communities would be fantastically popular and would be a brilliant antidote. Let us remind those who have been performing like a circus act in the last two weeks about who leads the Labour Party that in the real world people are suffering and it is time they smelt the coffee and changed direction.

PCS has a suggestion. Our suggestion is this: in response to the leaked memo to Tony Blair saying he should do a victory tour leaving the crowd demanding more we should say "If you do your victory tour there will be a demonstration outside every hospital, every school, every job centre and every public sector building where our members work and have had to suffer the consequences of your action".

Congress, support the composite. Let them know you support civil servants striking to defend front line services. We support all those in the health service and elsewhere facing the brunt of these government policies. We will not tolerate it. Now is the time to mobilise our members in a vibrant campaign and tell them to change direction or face the consequences.

**Judy McKnight** (*napo*) supported Composite Motion 8. She said: Congress, for the past two and a half years *napo* has been fighting government plans for dismantling and privatising the probation service. It was in January 2004 that Patrick Carter produced a report that was immediately accepted by the government, without any consultation, to introduce the National Offender Management Service -- known as NOMS -- which brought under a common umbrella the provision of probation and prison services on the

basis of dismantling and fragmenting the current public probation service, seeking to introduce an internal and external market, bringing in the private and voluntary sectors not on the basis of partnership but on the basis of competition and market testing -- contestability, as it is now known.

Two and a half years, three Home Secretaries and two chief executives later, no one is much clearer where NOMS -- also known as the nightmare on Marsham Street -- is going and what it means for the probation service. No one has come up with an organisation model for NOMS that has lasted more than a few weeks. Legislation has appeared and disappeared again as quickly. No one has come up with a reason for dismantling our service, which is performing better than ever against all targets. No one has come up with a business case to explain how dismantling and fragmenting our service will better reduce reoffending, will better protect the public.

The Government have lied. I do not know if Jeremy's libel lawyer is still in the house, but, yes, I will say lied. The Government have claimed that the National Audit Office has found evidence that privatisation and the threat of competition in prison has improved performance in prison. There is no such evidence. If you look at the National Audit Office reports you can see that private prisons are run cheaper than public sector prisons because they pay lower terms and conditions, but there is no evidence that competition has increased performance. Many private prisons have indeed been fined for their poor performance.

On consultation exercises, there was a consultation exercise last autumn on the latest proposals. Ten out of 748 responses supported the Government's proposals. Despite the massive opposition the Government have said they know best and legislation is to be brought forward to privatise the service. It is expected in the Queen's Speech next month. In the meantime, and because of the delay in legislation, they have just announced that probation work must be contracted out -- 5 per cent of budgets this year, 10 per cent next year, just making it clear that their real agenda is getting the private and voluntary sectors into our service at all costs.

We have to continue all our different campaigns in our own service areas but we must also come together. We must ensure that, as we set out in this motion, there is a major TUC organised national rally and lobby of Parliament at the earliest date after Congress. One thing is certain, that Government and Downing Street are very concerted in their campaign to dismantle and privatise our services. We must be equally concerted, equally single minded in our campaign to harness the full weight of the trade union movement to save our public services before it is too late.

Please support Composite 8.

**Brian Strutton** (*GMB*) supported Composite Motion 8. He said: Every year we come to this Congress and every year we spend time defending Britain's public services from attacks. Despite almost a decade of a Labour Government, GMB public services members still have to campaign against privatisation in everything they do. Call it what you like, PFI, PPP, best value, contestability or choice, it all amounts to the same thing -- privatisation -- and privatisation does not deliver better public services; it results in worse public services.

At the same time, the private sector is making a huge fortune at the taxpayers' expense. For example, last year public sector contracts amounted for 53 per cent of Capita's £1.4 billion business, or 'Crapita' as some call them. Those companies have an appalling track record and that should be clear to all, including government. It is not my idea of public sector reform and I am sure it is not yours either. All the while, our

members' livelihoods have been squeezed so that fat cat directors can stash the cash into their lucrative pension pots, following closely on the heels of MPs of course.

The latest government wheeze is to involve third sector so-called organisations in the delivery of public services. But where is the evidence base that the third sector can deliver better public services than the public sector? There is none. The third sector does not simply involve non-profit organisations; it includes profit-seeking organisations with directors on six figure salaries.

Congress, public service workers are strongly opposed to government handing over the control or delivery of public services to private companies and others, and that opposition is feeding through into opinion polls and, where it really matters, elections. So we must step up our opposition to the fragmentation and marketisation of the public services. We must ensure government hear, understand and take heed. The trade union message is very clear. Changing the captain on the Titanic would make no difference at all unless the ship changed direction. If this Labour Government, and whoever leads it, choose not to listen they will not get our members' votes next time. It is as simple as that. Please support.

**Jerry Glazier** (*National Union of Teachers*) supported Composite Motion 8. He said: The NUT is pleased to be supporting this crucial composite motion. Work in the public services is the choice of millions of workers who do so to work for people and not for profit. Public service workers are motivated not by money but by caring for the people for whom they work, caring for the young and old needing healthcare, caring for the young and old needing education and caring for the young and old needing services -- social services and many other crucial important public services.

Sadly, we are seeing this Government paying increasingly little respect to the importance of public sector ethos and seeking to undermine it through the encouragement of private sector involvement that is usually greatly detrimental. We are seeing a government that believe that improvement in 21st century provision is dependent on a perverse misplaced notion of 19th century philanthropy but with added profit and control. Academies are a case in point: government touting for sponsors who are asked for £2 million in exchange for £20 million of government funding and control of the school.

Congress, we need no convincing that the threat to public services is real, is dangerous and is increasingly happening at this moment. To improve public services we do not need hospital trusts, academies or school trusts, marketisation or privatisation. What we need is a government that provides proper and extended levels of expenditure on public services. What we need is a government that provides public sector workers with the highest quality tools and training to do their jobs effectively, and what we need is a government that trusts public sector workers.

As unions we have a duty to campaign together, maximising the power of us all -- especially public sector unions -- working together, in the way we have done on pensions, to defend our public services. Unanimously pass the composite and unite in a determined campaign to defend what we fought so long to achieve.

**John Mayes** (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*) supported the motion. He said: In supporting this motion NASUWT will focus on subsections 3 and 4, that is around global trade and organising in communities. What I say about global trade in education almost all applies to health and



other public services. The 1994 GATT Agreement removed restrictions and barriers to trade. It included education as a market for private companies. Overall GATT is worth -- according to Education International -- an estimated £1.5 million a minute. The fourth Congress of Education International in Basel in 2004 noted that commercialisation of education alone across the globe first of all dis-empowers local people; it prevents education from carrying out its traditional role such as supporting democracy; it allows the state to abdicate its responsibility in the provision of education, and it restricts education for those who can afford to pay.

In England we are experiencing an experiment in privatising education called 'academies'. There is no risk at all to the investment put into these schools by private companies. The Government will no doubt bail out all those when things go wrong. What a dream world, a no-risk private sector. When this experiment goes global it will result in increasing inequalities in the countries involved, in other words education for those who can afford it.

I cannot deal with this topic in three minutes, so a plug: NASUWT's fringe event on our research into academies is advertised on pages 17 and 32 of the *Congress Guide*. It is a lunch event. Come along and find out a little bit more. We are part of building the international coalition through Education International and this involves all the unions in all public service spheres -- or it should do. We should be confident in organising outside the trade union movement -- in local communities as has already been said -- to prevent the movement of assets into the private sector. Whether it is land or buildings or services it matters not. Vote to protect the public services from being gobbled up by the private sector. Support the motion.

**Dai Hudd** (*Prospect*): Speaking to an amendment that forms part of the composite motion said: As a union, we have roughly half of our members in the private sector and half in the public. We reject and condemn statements by ministers and employer body organisations that try and portray this debate as private good, public less so. We particularly condemn ministers who, for short-term political reasons, create a false and misleading argument in relation to the public sector under the guise of public sector reform.

We would argue that since the Second World War we have begun to live in a complex inter-related mixed economy. The relationship between the public, private and, yes, even the third sector, is one truly of interdependence, not as is trying to be created now, wasteful competition and conflict and the pursuit purely of profit. This has benefited the type of society we are. The fact that this has created a variety of employment experiences we would argue has strengthened our democratic structures, including those within our own trade unions. The public sector offers significant contributions to this mix. The proportion of women employed is greater in the public sector than it is in the private. The gender pay gap, which we must work hard to try and eliminate, is narrower in the public sector than it is in the private sector. Policies and employment practices in relation to the recruitment and career development of ethnic minorities and people of an ethnic background in the public sector is significantly greater than in the private sector. Diversity action plans are more likely to be found in the public sector than in the private sector and are often mandatory and, yes, we should not ignore the fact you are more likely to be covered by collective bargaining in the public sector and be a member of a trade union.

Apart from very clear direct and indirect contributions the public sector makes to the economic and social well-being of our society, I would argue that the public

sector has as much to add to the social cohesion and the democratic institutions in which we all take part. Far from denigrating the position of the public sector, we believe these are many qualities that should be the cornerstone of the campaign now being argued for in the composite. I hope that this amendment adds another dimension to the debate and I hope you accept it and take the composite forward.

**Roz Foyer** (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) supported Composite 8. She said: Congress, the T&G fully supports the campaign to defend the public sector. However, we would like to address paragraph 3 of the composite, which refers to the role of the so-called third sector. The T&G represents over 30,000 members in the voluntary sector and these members are almost all involved in the delivery of vital services to the public. They are deeply committed; they work in this sector because they care deeply about vulnerable people and the services available to them. Whether it be through the development of the hospice movement, new forms of rehabilitation for drug users or cutting edge support for victims of domestic violence, our members in the voluntary sector have always carried out a very specialised innovative and high quality role. That is why we strongly oppose the contract culture that is now developing in this sector -- mergers, restructurings and cuts have all resulted in the corporatisation of the voluntary sector and all those good organisations are losing precisely the qualities that made them so special in the first place.

Unfortunately, increased third sector involvement has become the Government's latest weapon of choice in the privatisation agenda. The Government are using the third sector as the cuddly, more palatable alternative to outright privatisation. It means they can still drive down costs through outsourcing, funding cuts and competition without being accused of lining the shareholders' pockets. As a result, it is our members who see their pay, pensions and other conditions rapidly decreasing while their workload rapidly increases. Ultimately, this approach crushes morale and fails the service users that our members care so deeply about.

The T&G will continue to stand strong and fight back against the continued attack on our members in the public sector, but we must never forget and we must continue to recognise the key role played by our members in the voluntary sector.

\* *Composite Motion 8 was CARRIED*

### **Accountability and standards in public service**

**The President:** I now call Motion 34, Accountability and standards in public service. The General Council supports the motion.

**David Watts** (*FDA*) moved Motion 34. He said: Accountability and standards in public life have received some attention in the last few months. This issue is of very direct concern to FDA members many of whom work closely with ministers of whichever party forms the government. It is also relevant to those working in local government and the wider public sector. It should be of concern to everyone in this room as a citizen.

Britain's public services are admired across the world. We should and do expect the highest standards of all those who engage in public life, whether as elected or appointed politicians or as employed officials. When things go wrong the public want to know what has happened, why, and who was responsible. Sometimes there is an obvious individual but more often it is a combination of circumstances; nevertheless, as our motion says, the demand is that heads must roll, knees

jerk, fingers point. All too often a public servant is singled out by an elected politician. Our members in the NHS or in central government know this only too well. Let us be clear, I am not saying that a public servant should be unaccountable where they have been at fault; of course they should be held to account.

About three months ago a revised civil service code clarified the core values of the civil service: integrity, honesty, objectivity, and impartiality. We also need more clarity about the accountability and responsibilities of elected or appointed politicians and the standards expected of them. The committee on standards in public life, the Nolan Committee, lists seven similar principles which should apply to all in the public service, which means paid officials and elected and appointed politicians. The relationship between the elected and the employed should also be much clearer so that it is understood by the individuals concerned, by those who are affected by their decisions or actions, and by those who look on.

Some contend that the traditional responsibility of ministers for everything that is done in their name is unreasonable and outdated. In central government ministers must always have the responsibility for both the policy framework and the resources to deliver services. Civil servants provide advice on policy and endeavour to deliver the services through the means available, often quite inadequate.

This motion calls for the General Council to foster a public debate intended to create a common understanding of the relationship between elected and employed public servants. We believe that public trust in government at all levels and in our public institutions, in our politicians, and in our employed public servants, would be enhanced if everyone engaged in public life behaved with integrity, honesty, and objectivity. Ministers should observe the same standards as those required for civil servants.

The accountabilities of civil servants should be publicly stated in a civil service act which sets out the values and ethos of a high quality public service and affirmed by parliament. Let us have no more scape-goating. Congress, I beg to move.

**Geraldine O'Connell** (*Prospect*) seconded Motion 34.

She said: In seconding Motion 34 *Prospect* is keen to support the FDA's demands for proper accountability of both civil servants and ministers across the whole of the public sector. Accountability needs to have a common standard against which judgements can be made. The introduction of the new civil service code is generally welcomed and sets out the strict protocols by which civil servants are expected to perform. Government now needs to go further and translate these protocols into a civil service act.

By contrast, the publication of the Ministerial Code of Ethics and Procedural Guidance last year whilst welcomed as a step in the right direction does not go far enough and does not apply the same standards. The Civil Service Code is straightforward, civil servants are appointed on fair and open competition and are expected to display core values of integrity, honesty, objectivity, and impartiality. Ministers are appointed and although they were elected as MPs and as such by fair and open competition that is where the similarities with ministers end.

The Code of Practice for Civil Servants is overseen by senior civil servants and ultimately politicians. It is the duty of the civil servant to report breaches through their line management. Ministers are personally responsible for deciding how to act and how to conduct themselves in the light of their code and for justifying their actions and conduct in parliament. The code is not a rulebook and it is not the role of the

Secretary of the Cabinet or other officials to enforce it or to investigate ministers.

Ministers only remain in office for so long as they retain the confidence of the prime minister. He is the ultimate judge of the standards of behaviour expected of a minister and the appropriate consequences of the breach of those standards. The difference between ministers and civil servants is that ministers are responsible for self-regulation until the prime minister tells them they are not and apart from personal integrity to date the only effective control on ministerial behaviour has been delivered through the press.

Congress, the public has the right to be able to trust its government, whether its appointed officials or its elected representative, and appropriate standards need to be applied in a consistent and fair way, and applied to all. I support the motion.

\* *Motion 34 was CARRIED*

### **National register of assaults on public sector workers**

**The President:** I now call Motion 35, national register of assaults on public sector workers. The General Council supports the motion.

**Chris Keates** (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*) moved Motion 35. She said: Right across public services on a daily basis workers continue to be physically and verbally abused by their clients, by parents and relatives of clients, and by intruders onto the premises in which they work. Like many unions here at Congress I could give a catalogue of horror of the abuse perpetrated on workers. I could list the results of surveys which reveal that in some parts of the country every seven minutes a worker is verbally abused. As unions who represent these workers we are aware that a significant number of cases go either unreported or are only reported at the most basic level with the information being kept in-house.

Why does this underreporting occur? In too many cases when verbal abuse is involved its unacceptability and its impact is either underestimated or minimised. Often it is dismissed as part of the job and yet verbal abuse unaddressed over a period of time can be as damaging and debilitating to the health and welfare of a member of staff as a physical assault.

In education one of the main reasons for underreporting is employer pressure arising out of concerns about the image of the school, or the service. Staff who are assaulted or abused are encouraged to play down the incident. They are told that a school where staff are assaulted could be considered to be a failing school and this will have consequences for the recruitment of staff.

It is asserted that parents in the community might think that there are discipline problems in the school and may choose not to send their children there. They are told this could result in falling rolls leading ultimately to job loss. So overwhelming is the concern for the image of the school rather than the welfare of the staff member that victims are rarely told of their rights and entitlements, the importance of seeking medical advice, the need to complete an incident report, or the desirability of making a complaint to the police. Necessary support can be withheld and pressure not to have any time off work is applied. In fact, evidence shows the contrary, that the public in the local community applaud and support those who take a strong stand against such behaviour. Even more invidious is when the tactics to dissuade the victim from making a report involve seeking to imply that the incident occurred because of some negligence,

inappropriate behaviour, or even incompetence on behalf of the victim.

NASUWT has encountered too many cases where the first question to members who have been punched, kicked, knocked down, or subjected to verbal abuse, is not an enquiry about their wellbeing but, "What did you do to provoke that reaction?" Even when incidents are reported the recording of them is currently dispersed in several places making it difficult, with confidence, to address the scale and type of problem. Workplace incidents and accident logs are the most common but in the education service, with the fragmentation of employer responsibility and the loosening of ties with the local authority, the likelihood of schools passing on those reports to the local authority is at best patchy. The method of logging reports in local police forces is inconsistent and many employers flout their responsibilities to report under health and safety legislation.

Establishing a national register of verbal and physical assaults on public servants underpinned by a statutory requirement to comply with stiff penalties for non compliance would in itself send a strong message of the crucial importance of registering such incidents and the unacceptability of assaults on staff. It would highlight and emphasise the vulnerability of public service workers to attack. It would enable the scale of the problem to be identified, any common patterns of behaviour to be detected, and appropriate protective and preventative measures to be introduced.

At the heart of public services is the commitment to protect the vulnerable in society. Those who strive every day to do this deserve their own vulnerability to be recognised and addressed.

Congress, please support this motion and end this scandal of concealment of worker abuse.

**Hugh Lanning** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) seconded Motion 35. He said: You can be assaulted in many ways, verbally, shouted and sworn at, physically attacked, psychologically, not liked or appreciated, or politically undermined. The civil service feels battered, bruised and attacked in every way. Broadly speaking, if when going about your job properly you are attacked, you expect your employer to support you, to help you, to be on your side. Our problem is that our employer is the Government. We are the convenient bat for every mistake, every problem; blame the workers, not the policies.

When the Chancellor two years ago announced 100,000 job cuts it not only set the tone, gave the message, but it also had real consequences, a real impact. Mark earlier mentioned that in the last months there has been an increase in violent incidents in the DWP by more than 60 percent. In order to cope with fewer frontline staff at the job centres the DWP management has introduced a system called Managing Footfall. It means rather than speaking to someone in the office face to face you are made to phone the call centre; it is not an option, you have to.

We had a recent case of a member of staff in Birmingham who was attacked with a machete. The staff in the office actually understand how people feel and they know they are not delivering the service that people want. This person went to the office, English was not their first language, and was told that he had to phone the call centre. He could not understand why but after the discussion went off and did so. The call centre was in Wales. He could not make himself understood and no one spoke his first language as they had locally. He got nowhere and in the end went back to the office only to be told yet again to go back and phone the call centre. That was when the machete came out.

With this motion we want employers to support their staff. We support the idea of the register. We want improved legal rights for our members. The very staff who are attacked are very often left alone to deal with the consequences of that attack. Not only that, they often find themselves being used, having the managing attendance procedures used against them when they are off as a result of the attack. Most of all we want the Government to put resources where they are needed. Technology can assist but it cannot replace face-to-face contact. Our members have to face the public every day, not just at election time. Please support the motion.

**Matt Wrack** (*Fire Brigades' Union*) supported Motion 35, as amended. He said: It is a vital issue for all public service workers, all workers have the right to attend work without fear of violence, threats and abuse, either from colleagues or from members of the public when the workers are trying to perform whatever public service they are involved in. Our experience has been of large numbers of unreported and unrecorded attacks which are not analysed and, unfortunately, not addressed. Over the past couple of years we have had to undertake our own research on attacks on firefighters. Our research has demonstrated quite clearly that there is a huge level of underreporting in terms of attacks, both physical and verbal, on firefighters, a very small section of the public sector but nevertheless we have identified over 40 attacks taking place each week. These vary between verbal abuse, stones being thrown, to much more serious attacks taking place, airguns being used, missiles being used, scaffold poles being thrown at fire crews, and attacks of that sort of measure.

A colleague earlier mentioned both the physical and the mental damage that that can do to the workers involved. In one particular case that I am aware of a particularly horrific case where a false alarm call was put in to a fire station and when the fire crew turned up into a certain alley which had been planned very carefully, the crew were surrounded by a large gang and threatened with knives, baseball bats, and screwdrivers; absolutely horrific attacks, totally and utterly unacceptable.

So, yes, we fully support the idea of a register. I think one concern we would raise is that any register needs to be simple, it needs to be easy for workers to complete. Our experience, unfortunately, in the fire service is that it is made extremely difficult for workers to report such attacks and the paperwork and bureaucracy that people have to go through is one of the causes for the underreporting that has been mentioned already. It needs to be simple. There needs to be measures in place to ensure that public authorities carry out the completion of any such register.

In relation to the legislation mentioned in the PCS amendment, we also welcome that and would point to some of our experiences on that issue. We have seen legislation already in Scotland in relation to attacks on emergency service workers. We now have a private members bill currently going through the House of Lords, the Emergency Services Workers Obstruction Bill, which will also address the type of issues raised in the resolution. We welcome that and we support the idea that such an approach should be widened across the public services so that all public service workers can enjoy that level of protection.

We would also raise in Congress today that we need a wider approach as well, we need to address the issues, the causes behind these attacks, we need to stop them happening. In the Fire Service there is a whole number of initiatives aimed at breaking down barriers and we welcome and support those.

Trade unions also have a key role. I will just give one example of that before finishing, President. In one particular fire station in East London we had had a whole number of attacks. The thing that turned the corner for us was our dispute in 2003 when suddenly we had gangs of lads who had been throwing stones at firefighters who wanted to get involved in supporting those firefighters during that dispute.

The trades union movement can play a key role in this. I think we need a wide-ranging response. Trade unions need to be at the heart of it. Support the motion.

**Katrina Purcell** (*UNISON*) supported Motion 35, as amended. She said: Sadly, if you ask a public service worker about violence in the workplace it does not take awfully long until you get their own experiences of violence and aggression. It is a daily occurrence. Statistics gathered by the STUC Scottish Executive Partnership on work-related violence in June this year showed that one in ten workers had experienced physical assault in the course of the last 12 months and nearly 40 percent had experienced verbal abuse. When you start talking to women the numbers are a lot higher.

I have been proud to be involved in this partnership for the last three years, a partnership created by the then Minister for Public Services that took on many of the arguments of the STUC, a lot of them highlighted by the FBU earlier on. It requires a lot more than just legislation - for us the Emergency Workers (Scotland) Act - actually to tackle the levels of violence and aggression.

We received three years' funding for an awareness campaign, streamlined reporting systems, the first in-depth research on work-related violence and, importantly, talking about people who work with the public, not public service workers. We are able to bring in the retail industry and transport sectors who are not necessarily deemed to be traditional public sector, and for the first time we are able to look at no longer just anecdotal evidence. Along with that came a secondment of members from the STUC General Council into the unit. That is good because it is about as easy to find somebody who admits to abusing a public service worker as it is to find an American who admitted voting for Bush last time round, but he was still elected, and people still get abused.

If I ask you honestly, have you ever been frustrated when you have been waiting to get to speak to somebody in a call centre, and if you have not and admit to that, you will get my order for a pint later on.

Whilst we need sanctions like the one referred to in the motion and also legislation like the Emergency Workers (Scotland) Act, it also needs to be extended to cover more people and also extended to cover England, Wales and Northern Ireland. We need national registers. We need to use national ASBOs, and we need to transfer data. Just as importantly we need proper risk assessments which identify where the hotspots are and staffing levels increased to make sure that we get adequate cover at those times. We need funding to be able to make sure that there are enough people to provide the service. More than that, what we need most is for it to stop.

One attack on a public service worker is one attack too many. If we change hearts and minds as we have on domestic violence, or drink driving which are no longer acceptable, then we might actually be able to stop violence to public service staff. Congress, please support this motion.

**Janine Booth** (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) supported Motion 35. She said: I work on a London Underground station. Everyone I

work with has been verbally abused and many of us have also been physically assaulted. As we have heard from the other speakers already, workers in other public services and industries have a similar experience. I believe that both the employers and the Government are making this situation worse when they should be trying to make it better.

The employers cut staffing levels and they leave people working alone and vulnerable in remote work locations. They fail to provide safe transport to and from work for people working extreme shifts. They harass people back to work who need to take sick leave to recover from the injuries and trauma of their assault.

I have to give a dishonourable mention here to the Mayor of London, Ken Livingstone. Last week at the London Chamber of Commerce he was asked by a boss what employers should do about workers who are off sick for several weeks. Livingstone's reply, and I will quote him verbatim, was: "My advice is to sack them and let them make their case at the industrial tribunal."

The Government under-funds, fragments, and privatises our public services, leaving those services overstretched and service users so angry and frustrated that some of them spill over into violence. The Government are also consulting on proposals to restrict criminal injuries compensation so that people injured by crimes while at work will be less entitled to compensation payouts than they are now. Trade unions and the TUC must respond to this consultation and tell the Government that their plan is not just wrong, it is outrageous.

The decisions and policies I have described are made by well-paid politicians and pen-pushers who do not themselves work on the front line. They do not work in railway stations, in benefits offices, in casualty departments, or in classrooms. We need to defend ourselves and our workmates from assaults, not just from the person who throws a punch but from the employers and a government that does not care.

\* *Motion 35 was CARRIED.*

### **Valuing trade union race equality committees**

**The President:** I now call Motion 17, valuing trade union race equality committees. The General Council supports the motion.

**Sybil Dilworth** (*Amicus*) moved Motion 17 on behalf of the 2006 TUC Black Workers' Conference. She said: Each union deals with race equality in its own way. So, congratulations to the unions who have strong and effective race equality committees and to those making moves in that direction. Amicus puts equality at the centre of its policy. The rule says, all conferences, committees, and councils, shall endeavour to ensure gender balance at elections for elected reps.

The key to getting the rule to work for black and ethnic minority members is, first of all, getting to the meetings in the first place. Members continue to face barriers from employers reluctant to release members who also question whether race equality meetings are trade union activities and/or at the last minute decide to cancel leave. This will in some instances preclude members from participating in elections, contributing to key debates, and receiving training. Then there are the barriers within unions mentioned in paragraph 2.

Congress, we all have a duty to encourage black and ethnic members to get involved. To achieve proper involvement includes unions providing equality training, in-house or by the TUC. With the necessary training and support members will be more confident, confident to speak at general and race equality meetings and formulate the agenda which we require

and which our respective unions will listen to and act upon.

It is estimated that by 2009 black and ethnic minorities will contribute an extra 21 percent of the workforce. It is essential that our voice is heard and acted on by our respective unions.

As unions wish to recruit more members what better way than for black and ethnic minority members to see and hear of actively working race equality committees, sectional, regional, and national, and to find out that national executives are also taking our issues seriously.

Self-organisation gave birth to the TUC for male workers. Black self-organisation is not a new phenomenon. In 1849, Derek Douglas, a black abolitionist, insisted self-organisation should be developed alongside the need to build black and white unity. The TUC Race Relations Committee, as referred to by Gloria earlier, has updated and is re-launching the TUC Black Workers' Charter to help address the work on race equality. The General Council will formally approve the statement, which highlights the needs for unions to continue their work on race equality and to sign up and implement the charter.

Unions need to promote good practice in-house and to share these with other affiliates through the TUC Equality Audit and the TUC Black Workers' Conference. I look forward to reading the next TUC Equality Audit showing real effective changes highlighted by each affiliate, whilst acknowledging affiliates are at different parts of the journey in producing vibrant and effective working equality committees.

I call on you, delegates, to support the motion.

**Kuldev Singh** (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) seconded Motion 17. He said: Congress, when our union put forward this motion at this year's TUC Black Workers' Conference we wanted to highlight the value of constitutional trade union race equality committees and their important role in bringing forward black and ethnic minority members. What do we mean by constitutional race equality committees? We mean black and ethnic minority members being elected on to committees where we have the right to set the agenda for race equality in our union and its structure that allows us to take part in the decision-making process.

For example, over the last few years our race equality committee has put forward to our executive issues like ID cards, migrant workers and anti-fascism. Giving my own example, I was elected here through my regional race equality committee in Wales and without this it would be unlikely that I would be standing here in front of you at Congress.

Let me tell you what else my union race equality structure has done for me. It has given me the confidence to participate and speak out from workplace level to national level. It has given me the opportunity to raise my voice against fascist organisations like the BNP. Through discussion with other ethnic minority members I have been able to promote race equality and race awareness in my workplace and branch.

Congress, I can sincerely say to you that my involvement in the T&G race equality committee has made me a different person. Black and ethnic minority workers deserve a voice. We deserve to help shape the policies of our union and we deserve to be represented at all levels. Please support this motion.

**Zita Holbourne** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supported Motion 17. She said: If it was not for black members equality structures in my own union I doubt very much I would be standing here today addressing you, Congress. When I started out as an

activist some 15 years ago it was the black members' structures in my union that embraced me, mentored, supported, advised, and nurtured me and allowed me a bigger and more far reaching voice in TUC structures. PCS and its predecessor unions have a proud history of black members' structures and we have various committees and forum at all different levels in the union for black members.

I know as someone who set up and has responsibility for our London and South East black network that having black structures can make the difference to whether black members play an active role. Since this network was set up I have seen ordinary members within it not only become active but become branch officers and reps on group-wide and national committees. Having such structures gives black members the opportunity to share experiences and get advice and guidance, and importantly gain confidence in a safe and welcoming environment so that when they go into the main committees and structures of their unions, if they overcome the barriers to participation in the wider structures, they can better cope with the isolation or disregard which they may still have to face in this century.

Whilst we have come a long way over the years, and 30 years ago I doubt a black woman like myself would be standing here, I do not want to wait another 30, 20, or even 10 years to have the pleasure of seeing another black woman like Gloria chair this Congress and no disrespect to Brendan but I do not want to wait decades to see a black person standing in his shoes either. I do not want to be standing here as one of a tiny minority. I do not want to be the only black person when I walk through the door at a TU event and I do not want to be known only as 'the black rep'. I want to walk into this conference centre in the future and see a sea of black faces across the hall.

Whilst having black structures is essential for the trade union movement to thrive and grow, in order to honour its commitment to keeping equality at the heart of all it does we black activists who like our white counterparts dedicate our time and commitment to this movement deserve and have earned our place in the main structures.

If you want to be truly inclusive, Congress, and ensure that all the voices of your membership are heard, understood and represented, we need to be at the heart of all trade union activity, negotiations and representations. Racist attacks are on the increase. This year the BNP gained more seats than ever. We need to put up a united front. Every year ordinary black people are forced to sacrifice their daily lives and become political activists because their loved ones have been murdered by racists or because they are facing discrimination in the judicial system. When they turn to the trade union movement for help they need to feel in their hearts that unions are fully committed to tackling racism. How can they do this when they see so few black faces in union structure sitting on decision-making bodies like the General Council? The trades union movement must demonstrate that it is inclusive and committed to routing out racism and fascism from our movement as well as society. The trades union movement must practise what it preaches to employers and until black people are fully embraced by this movement there needs to be rules in place that allow us a foot in the door so that we can represent other black members. We who have had to spend our lives facing and combating racism since birth know firsthand what it is like to experience racism and have the skills developed over those years in tackling it. We are the people that you need if you want this movement to grow and to be fully diverse and representative. Congress, support the motion.

**Gargi Bhattacharyya** (*University and College Union*) supported Motion 17. She said: Thank you very much to the chair for letting me speak. I will be very brief. I know this seems like another boring structures motion and those of us from the Race Relations Committee and Black Workers' Conference have tried to say that we are really working hard to move our focus away from that kind of structural issue towards organising and rebuilding links with communities, and getting back to where black trade unionism's heart is. The structures still matter. As people have already said in this debate, a lot of black people who become active in trade unions become active in race equality structures. If we forget that, we lose the grounding that our existing black activists have.

I also think it is important for the movement to recognise what is going on around the politics of race. I live in Lozelles and this year there has been all kinds of horrible stuff about how racism is really between minority communities. It is not bosses, it is not capital, it is not the majority, it is the minorities who cannot get along with each other, it is those Muslims who are too extreme, it is those foreigners who cannot integrate into a British way of life. As a movement for social justice we need to reclaim an analysis of racism that says it is about power, and that it is a trade union issue not because we want to be nice to each other but because it exploits people in the workplace.

The re-launched Charter for Black Workers and the statement against racism that the General Council is putting out is very clear. Racism is not about, "Oh, I don't like curry. I don't like the way you dress. We are a bit culturally different," it is about systematic exploitation in the workplace. When you support race equality structures and support me, it is not because you want to be kind, it is because your rights are tied up with mine. If I cannot be a trade union rep safely, neither can any of you. If I am not safe in the workplace, neither are any of you.

While David Cameron is busy going to South Africa and India and reclaiming diversity for the Right, we need to say again that trade unionism fights against racism because it is in all our interests, it is in the interests of all workers, and it has to be at the heart of our movement. Without race equality structures we have lost that battle. Thanks.

\* *Motion 17 was CARRIED.*

## Race Equality

**Mohammad Taj** (*General Council*) speaking to paragraph 2.9 of the General Council Report. He said: The TUC Race Relations Committee worked during the year to update and re-launch the TUC Black Workers' Charter as a means to prioritise the issues that trade unions need to address to make their work on race equality more effective. The General Council sees this initiative as an important part of the commitments that were made at the 2001 Congress to promote equality for all and to eliminate all forms of harassment, prejudice, and unfair discrimination both within its own structures and through all its activities including its own employment practices.

The General Council's statement issued to this Congress calls upon affiliates to sign up to the newly revised charter. We are asking unions to sign up to a pledge to promote and implement this charter to ensure that as a movement we make significant progress to eradicate racial discrimination in the world of work. General secretaries are invited to and can sign the pledge at the information stand or at the TUC anti-racism rally, which is taking place on Wednesday lunchtime this week. Thank you, Congress.

**The President:** Thank you very much, Taj. Congress, that completes our business for this morning. Congress is now adjourned until 2.15 this afternoon. Thank you very much.

*Congress adjourned until 2.15 p.m.*

## MONDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

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

**The President:** Delegates, I now call Congress to order. Many thanks once again to the Havant Clarinet and Saxophone Choir, who have been playing for us this afternoon. Let us show our appreciation. *(Applause)*

## National Health Service

**Dave Prentis** (*UNISON*) moved Composite Motion 9.

He said: I am moving Composite Motion 9 on the National Health Service, celebrating Labour's finest achievement, our health service, saved by Labour in 1997, with record investment, massive improvements in waiting times, in quality of care and in patient outcomes. But in 2006 we have an NHS in crisis, threatened as never before. We hear of daily reports of service cuts and redundancies. Many who survived the Thatcher years now are falling victim to Labour's market madness in the NHS. Newly qualified nurses, doctors and health professionals are struggling to find jobs to use their vital skills to save and improve lives. What a waste! Congress, what arrogance when we see Patricia Hewitt's pronouncement that the NHS had enjoyed its best year ever. Best year for whom? I will tell you what. It has not been the best year for patients, for families who saw wards closing and beds disappearing. She cannot have been talking about health workers, who have been demoralised by a tidal wave of reform, sweeping away reforms which are just taking place, dazed by permanent revolution and driven by those who believe that the market knows best, and reeling from the instability as NHS trusts compete against each other for patients. She certainly was not talking about the workers I am proud to represent, some of whom are in the balcony today. We have an award winning service delivering supplies across the country to hospitals, GPs and wards, dedicated loyal staff, part of the NHS family. I am talking about NHS Logistics, known, trusted but far too successful. It is a service worth £4.2 billion. A Labour government, yes, a Labour government, quite literally parcelling it up and packaging it off to DHL, the German parcel firm! A privatisation driven by dogma, delivered by diktat. But I am proud to announce that today UNISON members in NHS Logistics have voted overwhelmingly to take strike action to protect their service. *(Cheers and applause)* Our people are here with us in the back of the hall.

These are not troublemakers, not hardliners, but workers who care deeply about the NHS, who want to stay part of it, who want to play their part in saving it for hardworking public service workers who have never, ever, taken action before, making a stand today to protect their service and to protect our NHS.

I want to say from this platform that our members will have the full support of my union and the resources available to it. Your fight is our fight.

Best year yet? Perhaps Patricia was thinking of the shareholders of the private healthcare companies, or the privateers making record profits from PFI, or the accountancy firms making millions by supposedly turning round debt-ridden NHS trusts by slashing jobs and sabotaging services.

This is a government creating an impression of ineptitude when it comes to health reform, a government which has lost the plot. We have a new

NHS IT system which is now a fiasco; a secretary of state who hands over £3 billion to independent treatment centres as soon as Labour takes office; at £3 billion those independent treatment centres do not have to carry out a single operation; millions have been squandered by abolishing the NHS University and the Commission for Patient and Public Involvement before they even got going; handing over primary care commissioning to private companies without warning or consultation. This has all been done in the arrogant self-belief that they know best, while the real experts, the dedicated, caring and compassionate staff, those at the sharp end, those now facing job insecurity, are having to cope with yet more upheaval. Those we are privileged to represent are dismissed as a producer interest.

Solidarity will be crucial in the coming months as the NHS faces its biggest test yet. With a new campaigning coalition – NHS Together – at the heart of our campaign, a broad alliance to defend the values and ethos of our NHS, to build on the principles of cooperation and collaboration, to defeat the marketisation and privatisation of the NHS. As we move forward towards a change of Labour leader, I have a message for those waiting in the wings. You've ridden on our backs for too long. Don't take my union and this movement's support for granted. You'll have to earn it, and it starts with our NHS. (*Applause*)

Let's see a Labour leadership that treats workers with dignity and respect, that abandons the attacks on public services and abandons the ideological assault on the NHS. If the current direction of travel continues there will be no going back and, trust me, there will be no fourth term. That is why nothing we debate at this Congress is more important than this campaign to save the NHS, and nothing we do in the next few months will be more crucial because this is a fight we must win. This is a fight we can win and, Congress, with your support this is a fight we will win. Defend our NHS.

**Gemma Richardson-Williams** (*Society of Radiographers*) in seconding the composite motion, said: We have always expressed concern and alarm at the incorporation of the private sector to provide services for the NHS. In 2001 the UNISON General Secretary, Dave Prentis, echoed the thoughts of many health service unions when he said, "It's time to say no to creeping privatisation and, yes, to well-funded, publicly provided, democratically accountable public services".

The development of foundation trusts, the inflated costs of the hospital building programme and PFI and, most recently, the plans to privatise English Primary Care Commissioning Services have now made it more important than ever to stop the imposition of privatisation and the expansion of the private sector at the expense of NHS core services and the taxpayer.

If the rush to incorporate and encourage the development of private services continues, our/your NHS will be no more than a logo for a group of corporate chains and the key principles from the original Labour Government's National Health Service Bill will be lost for ever. Money that should be spent on frontline care is being used to foot the bills for bringing in the private sector and to line shareholders' pockets. Moving services out of the NHS and into private hospitals will de-stabilise NHS hospitals' budgets and impose unnecessary and wasteful friction between the NHS and the private sector.

What good is an NHS where patients are seen as commodities and come second to profit? Why are we encouraging free enterprise when there is no evidence that this will improve services or cut costs? Why aren't we putting our money into our NHS?

Cuts in staffing have already been made as finances are stretched. Newly qualified health professionals, keen to be a part of the NHS, whose training is paid for by the NHS, are rapidly becoming disillusioned as they fight for jobs. This talent and money is in danger of being lost for ever. What good is reform if there are no staff to deliver and innovate? The Government must make clear its intentions. If it wants to privatise, so be it. At least we will then know where we stand. What we cannot allow to continue is privatisation under the guise of reform. We need to call a halt to this folly and establish a progressive, open and honest dialogue with trade unions about the future direction of the NHS. We all want our NHS to be the best. We want it to be our NHS, not the property of a handful of shareholders.

On behalf of the Society of Radiographers, I, therefore, second this motion.

**Irene Danks** (*Prospect*) supported the composite motion. She said: Anyone who is at all familiar with Prospect will have an idea of our membership profile. We range from tree huggers, like myself, and proud of it – each tree needs a cuddle – to the nuclear energy 'Safe as Houses Brigade', like we have never seen sub-standard houses. However, what our membership does not comprise is workers in the National Health Service. So why Motion 39 from Prospect? It is quite simple, really. We have members, like every person in this hall, who use the National Health Service.

The motion in the order paper forming part of this composite was overwhelmingly passed at our conference in May, passed by as diverse a group of people as you could meet, with one definite thing in common. We are sick of the number crunchers, the phoney targets, the postcode lottery, the PFI, PPP, B-U-L-L-S-H-I-T mantra that dictates that our hospitals must be mortgaged to the hilt so private companies, their directors and shareholders can make a profit.

Health is a devolved issue, so there are obvious differences in the running of NHS Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, but not everything in the NHS Scotland garden is rosy. Any new hospital is, more likely than not, funded by a PFI contract. Lanarkshire Health Board recently had to make the decision as to which of three local hospitals to downgrade to remove the A&E facility. Two were PFI and one was Monklands General, which was not. Guess which one they chose? Far be it from me to say there is a connection but this, as they say, will run and run.

The local MP, Dr John Reid, the current Home Secretary, although I am sure he has got ambitions somewhere else, made his displeasure known, though, frankly, it is easy to vent righteous indignation when you cannot do anything about it because health is a devolved matter. Regardless of which side of the border you live, be it England, Scotland, Wales and across the Irish Sea to Northern Ireland, it is our National Health Service and it must be defended. Support the composite.

**Gail Cartmail** (*Amicus*) speaking in support of the composite, said: Amicus has described the cuts as a result of deficits and top-slicing budgets as 'slash and burn'. This comes when the Government's published White Paper *Our Health, Our Care, Our Say* implores us to support a shift to services nearer to home, to prevent disease and ill-health, a policy in general terms that Amicus would support, but what is the reality? Look at the people who provide primary care services – health visitors. Their numbers are at an all-time low for 12 years. In other words, there have not been fewer health visitors during the past 12 years as compared with today, yet 100,000 women suffered post-natal depression last year and the NSPCC continue to report

the suffering of children at the hands of their parents and carers. They need health visitors.

Look at school nurses, whose jobs are being cut while they are at the front-line of delivering the, literally, growing problem of child obesity, and with the European Union's highest rate in the UK of teenage pregnancy. We need school nurses. Look at sexual health advisers, who are having to stand by with their arms folded while GUM – Genito-urinary medicine – clinics are being shut down when we know, because government statistics have told us, that one in ten young women under 26 is suffering sexually transmitted infection, many of which are linked to lifelong infertility and cervical cancer. Take, for example, the Amicus Mental Health Survey which last week exposed that over half of all trusts are implementing cuts when one in four of us will suffer a mental health problem in our lifetimes. Examples of those cuts are the loss of an eating disorder service, a children's in-patient service, an adolescent unit, an acute ward, the list goes on. So we say let us redefine the White Paper's title *Our Health, Our Care, Our Say*. Let us have our say. We say no to privatisation; we say no to fragmentation; we say no to cuts and services, and we say yes to investment in frontline services delivered and decided by our members who have the skills and commitment to deliver excellence and innovation.

As has already been said, we all in this hall have one thing in common. Yes, we are trade unionists, but the only thing we have in common is that we all rely on the NHS, so we say yes to solidarity of our whole movement to end the madness current government policy so that together we can keep the NHS public.

**Alex Mackenzie** (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*): Congress, as a practising physiotherapist who has spent 15 years working for the NHS it gives me no pleasure to be standing here drawing attention to what is going wrong with the NHS. I want to start by making it clear that the CSP is not interested in talking up the problems of the NHS. Indeed, there is much about the NHS which one can be very proud of and that we probably need to be celebrating more publicly, but overshadowing any positive progress and new developments are the financial problems currently facing the NHS. These have to be resolved if public confidence is to be retained and to keep the confidence of NHS staff themselves. This is not going to be achieved by suggesting that it is simply down to NHS trusts to manage their affairs better.

Firstly, the scale of the problem needs to be recognised. The CSP has been systematically tracking the impact of deficit situations on both our members' jobs and on patient services, and it makes grim reading. We are seeing a widespread and growing pattern of physiotherapy posts being axed, frozen or downgraded and restrictions being placed on the use of temporary staff, waiting time for physiotherapy going up, especially from muscular skeletal outpatients, but also access to paediatric services, services aimed at those with disabilities, older patients and people with long-term conditions.

Some specialist services, such as hydrotherapy, children's services and outreach work in the community, are being suspended or withdrawn altogether and a squeeze is being put on staff training and development, which should be the investment by trusts in the future. This is the real impact of the financial deficit and it is hurting for our members and especially for our patients.

There is no doubt, too, that the deficits are compounding the difficulty our new graduate members are already facing trying to find their first job in the NHS. More than 90 percent of those who

graduated this year are still without a permanent job. That is a truly shocking figure. If our new members cannot find work in the NHS, they will walk away from healthcare for ever. There are no magic solutions to this situation, but the CSP believes that the Government can and should take four immediate steps to rebuild trust in the NHS and with NHS staff. Firstly, they should give NHS organisations more realistic timescales to address these deficits. The shorter the timescale the more the risk of knee-jerk decisions being taken. Secondly, they should put an end to the current damaging round of job cuts and freezes. Thirdly, they should urgently re-think the current policy of bringing competition into the NHS, which is an expensive diversion of money, time and energy away from patient care. Fourthly, they should stop the quick fix of targeting staff training and development for cutbacks and ensure that the NHS retains its skilled workforce now and in the future. Please support this motion.

\* *Composite Motion 9 was CARRIED*

**The President:** Let us support our NHS and public sector workers. (*Applause*)

### **NHS Breast Screening Programme**

**Zena Mitton** (*Society of Radiographers*) moved Motion 42. She said: Motion 42 calls on Congress to back Breakthrough Breast Cancer's Campaign to improve the effectiveness of the National Health Service Breast Screening Programme, ensuring our colleagues have the levels of staffing and equipment they need to operate effectively and save as many lives as possible.

You may ask why the National Health Breast Screening Programme is a matter for the trade unions. Cancer is the number one health concern for us all, our members, our families and our friends. Breast cancer was, until recently, a taboo subject, even though more than 41,000 women and 300 men – yes, men – are diagnosed with this disease every year. It is a matter for all of us to be concerned about and we need to be active in bringing about change and improvement.

Mortality rates are still unacceptably high, yet they have been drastically reduced in the past 18 years by the introduction of the National Health Service Breast Screening Programme. The workforce should be, rightly, recognised for their hard work and achievement in making the programme such a success.

Science has also played a part. For instance, the drug herceptin is estimated to save up to a thousand lives a year and is now available on prescription from the National Health Service, but this is only after a hard won fight by cancer charities. We have to push for the best treatments for all of our patients rather than the cheapest for the primary care trusts to administer.

The successful battle for access to herceptin led to a new fast track National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence approval process for live saving drugs from which we can all benefit. So we know that campaigning works. On paper every woman should be offered a breast screening programme appointment every three years to aid early detection and increase the chances of successful treatment, but the truth is that many women are not seen every three years. Some are seen as infrequently as every five years and lack of capacity in the service is denying women just entitlement. Every delay between screenings increases the risk of not being treated early enough to save a life. We will soon see an increase in the number of women becoming eligible for screening. According to the Government's own figures, by 2015 the ageing baby-boomers will have increased demand for breast screening by 20 percent. Without an increase in expenditure and resources within the National Health



Service Breast Screening Programme the system will not be able to cope and the women will be at risk.

The breast-screening workforce itself is part of that baby-boom generation. A third of our 22,000 membership are due to retire by 2020. Without investment now the service will not be fit for purpose in the future. How can we, as trade unions, help? Supporting this motion will send a message to the Government that we will fight for our National Health Breast Screening Programme to be resourced with sufficient staff and equipment to meet the current targets and to expand capacity as the target population increases. An improved service with increased staff and better-utilised equipment will save more women's lives every year. Supporting this motion is also crucial in highlighting us, the unions, as an effective force to social change, engaging in issues of concern to the general public and, in this case, putting us at the forefront of the health agenda. The government needs to do more, the employers need to do more and so do we. By supporting this motion we commit Congress to the fight and offer our expertise and support to the patient organisations and charities, like Breakthrough, which are committed to saving lives and improving the outlook for all of us. I urge you to support this motion.

**Norma Stephenson** (*UNISON*) seconded the motion.

She said: Congress, today more women, and incidentally more men, than ever before are recovering after a breast cancer diagnosis, but it is still the case that the earlier you can be diagnosed and treated the better the chances of recovery. The importance of breast screening cannot be under estimated. As the motion reminds us, not everyone has the opportunity to take-up breast screening, often because of the lack of capacity. The expansion of this service should be given, but the issue of money may well get in the way. Congress, the motion makes reference to recent advances in the treatment of breast cancer and singles out the drug herceptin and its potential for treatment in early as well as late-stage cancer. Yet you all know the recent history of how individual women have had to fight to be allowed this drug. That was not because they did not fit the clinical profile but simply because of cost. Other excuses have been found but money was the real reason.

Congress, we can congratulate those women on their personal fight at a time when they needed their energies elsewhere, and for those unions which supported members in what has now become a successful decision that it should be prescribed on the National Health, not least my own union, UNISON, which supported and funded the case which, I am sure, nobody missed, that of Elizabeth Cook and, I am pleased to say, it was successful.

If this is an indicator of how much we are going to have to fight to ensure that the screening programme is adequate, not just for today but for all those people in the future, I, for one, hope not. Let us take this opportunity to express in words and actions the support of the trade union movement for the Breakthrough Breast Cancer Campaign. Support the motion.

\* *Motion 42 was CARRIED*

### Address by General Secretary

**The President:** Congress, it is now my great pleasure to invite our General Secretary to give his address. It has been a challenging year for the movement and we have all appreciated Brendan's tremendous support and help, not least in making progress in areas of pensions and ensuring that issues which matter to working people are not forgotten either by the

Government or the media. I invite the General Secretary to address Congress.

**Brendan Barber** (*General Secretary*): President and Congress, it's been a year of many highlights. Last September Gloria took over as our first ever black woman President, and not before time, and she has been doing a tremendous job.

In February we mobilised successfully against the ill-fated Services Directive. I would like to pay a tribute to John Monks and his colleagues in the European TUC for the tremendous job that they did. (*Applause*) We marshalled our arguments. We lobbied in all the capitals of Europe. We applied every bit of persuasion and subtlety that we could muster to the politicians and opinion formers. All of this, I thought, was so memorably reflected in my favourite trade union headline of the year: UCATT take the credit – 'Bollocks to Bolkestein'.

In May we even welcomed to Congress House a man widely recognised as the Leader of the Free World. I refer, of course, to Hugo Chavez. And as a measure of our appreciation to the people of Venezuela, we bestowed upon them the ultimate honour. A General Council delegation to Caracas.

But let's not forget the real high point. The most important victory of all. Everton 3, Liverpool 0. I promise, that will be the last mention of that this week.

Congress, overall, I believe that this has been a year of solid progress for our movement. It was a year when we secured genuine advances for our members, with unions leading the way on debates of national importance like the future of pensions. A year when we launched unionlearn, one of the most important developments in trade unionism in decades, opening up new opportunities for a generation of working people, and a year when we led the battle to defend and promote our diverse multicultural society, so that on May 5<sup>th</sup> many of our towns and cities remained free from the poison of the BNP. (*Applause*)

I am also proud that over the past year the TUC has been able to help many unions resolve disputes and make real gains. Proud that we were there to work with the rail unions to defend the pensions of their members. Proud that public sector unions working hand in hand through the TUC won a historic deal on public services pensions. There is work still to do in local government and, of course, right across the private sector. But we have shown what can be achieved when we act together in unity. And proud that we saw the GMB secure a tremendous result in its dispute with ASDA – taking trade unionism forward in the Wal-Mart empire.

Of course, this has also been a year when our movement has won real gains from government. Once upon a time, people said to me that our demands for compulsory employer contributions to pensions and a state pension re-linked to earnings were not so much as old Labour, as Neanderthal Labour. But thanks to trade union campaigning, they are now part of the political consensus and the Government's modernising agenda.

Once upon a time, conventional wisdom held that energy had to be left to the market, while our arguments for greater intervention to create a balanced, secure, environmentally friendly supply were ridiculed. But thanks to trade union campaigning, our case has largely won the day in the Government's Energy White Paper.

Once upon a time some people dared to suggest that there was little governments could do to halt the rising inequality between those at the top and bottom of our labour market. But thanks to trade union

campaigning, there is at long last recognition from this Government that millions of workers have not shared in the UK's prosperity.

Earlier this year the Department for Trade and Industry published an important report, *Success at Work*. Unusually, it was not full of bland assessments of how good everything was. Sure, it set out genuine achievements of which Labour can be proud, but the report also recognised that not everyone has benefited from the UK's economic stability – a key advance for our arguments.

That's why this year I want the trade union movement to put the concerns of vulnerable workers right at the top of our agenda. Yesterday, I launched the TUC's 'One in five' campaign. Because behind the shiny façade of corporate Britain, there is a vast hidden army of vulnerable workers – many of them migrants – often suffering gross exploitation, doing the work that nobody else wants to do and doing it in return for a pittance, all too often out of sight and out of mind, people without whom our economy and our public services would simply fall apart.

The agricultural workers who ensure that our supermarket shelves are stocked. The care workers who look after the disabled, the sick and the elderly in our society, and the cleaners who make sure that our workplaces are fit for us to work in. Like the contract cleaners in the Houses of Parliament – migrant workers from all corners of the world – but treated like fifth-class citizens.

When I met them, their stories were heartbreaking. People like Evrard Ouale from the Ivory Coast, starting a 12-hour shift at 4 o'clock in the morning every day in order to scrape together £225 a week, and then told not to use the staff canteen. Tesfaalen Gebru, doing two cleaning jobs in the Commons and working 64 hours a week, all to make ends meet in Europe's most expensive city. And Nestor Barona from Colombia, working an 11-hour shift in Westminster before heading to his second cleaning job in the West End, until he became too ill to continue.

Congress, if this can happen in the cradle of our democracy under a Labour Government, it can happen anywhere. Our biggest challenge – indeed, our moral duty – is to organise vulnerable workers, to reach out to those whose need is greatest, because the best protection that vulnerable workers can have is the protection of a trade union. So I think we should applaud the T&G for winning a dramatically improved deal for the House of Commons cleaners earlier this year. (*Applause*) And let us recognise the great work that other unions are doing with Britain's most vulnerable workers.

From UCATT's groundbreaking work with Polish construction workers – and what better way to remember George Brumwell – through to UNISON's work with overseas nurses, we are beginning to make a difference where it is needed most. But more, much more, needs to be done because unless we act now, and act decisively, the UK risks creating a permanent underclass of exploited workers.

Of course, trade unions can only do so much. We need more from government. We need action to stop workers being abused illegally, but we also need action to stop the abuse that is within the law; the rights that agency staff don't get. The rights that those without a contract of employment don't get. The rights that homeworkers don't get.

But this is about more than just the law, because the vulnerable workers issue cuts right to the heart of what kind of economy we have, what kind of society we live in, and what kind of political programme we want. Indeed, we have reached a critical juncture in the life of this Labour government. It is a defining moment for

progressive politics and all of us who believe in social justice.

Now, I am always careful to give ministers praise when it's due, and when people say there is no difference between the two main Parties, I have to confess I give them a rather curt two-word response: John Redwood.

But it's also right that we act as a critical friend to this Labour administration, and tell them when we think they are getting it wrong. Make no mistake, this Government is getting things wrong. Some of the criticism is undeserved. Too many take the strong economy and better public services for granted and forget just how bad things were under the Tories. Some of it is totally expected. With an Opposition that now looks more credible, it is hardly surprising that the right-wing press has been on the attack. But what pains me are the self-inflicted wounds. An autopilot foreign policy that has tied Britain to the United States, regardless of whether our national interest is being served or whether it is the right thing to do. A laissez-faire approach to our manufacturing industry that has seen a million jobs lost since 1997, in contrast to the experience of our European neighbours, and a disturbing faith in flexible labour markets, with British workers still the easiest and cheapest for multinationals to sack when the going gets tough.

Like the 700 workers at Imerys in Cornwall and the 2,300 workers at Peugeot – facing the dole queue because our employment protections are the weakest in Europe. So let's all get behind the campaign by Amicus and the T&G to stand up for British manufacturing. (*Applause*)

But just as worrying is an approach to public service reform that has alienated both public servants and public alike. Take the health service, which we have just debated. Yes, record investments have made a difference for patients, with waiting times down and the quality of treatment up. Staff can point to real gains, too. More jobs than ever before, and for many pay has rightly gone up. Yet in just a couple of years all sense of progress has gone. You don't have to be a genius to work out why. We have seen a crude approach to the financial difficulties facing some trusts, with no time allowed to get their finances back on the level. We have seen constant calls for reform that falsely give the impression that the NHS is in crisis, and destroy staff morale. And we have seen an ideological preference for private sector solutions that makes a mockery of the idea that what matters is what works. Let us be clear about this. Patients are not the same as customers. Accountability to the taxpayer is not the same accountability to the shareholder. The ethos of public service is not the same as the ethos of the market.

Where is the evidence that markets work in healthcare? There is none. Look at the scandal of Norwich and Norfolk Hospital, where the consortium behind the PFI deal has pocketed a £100 million windfall at the same time as staff have been threatened with redundancy.

Where is the evidence that private is more efficient than public? There is none. Remember the Wanless Report a few years ago – a report written by a banker – which said that the NHS was the most efficient large-scale healthcare provider in the world.

Where is the evidence that the private sector is the primary way of delivering innovation? There is none.

Just think about success stories like NHS Direct and indeed NHS Logistics, now scandalously being parcelled off to DHL. This is not the NHS Aneurin Bevan had in mind all those years ago. This is not the NHS the public or its workforce wants. This is not the NHS that befits a third term Labour government. On the Health Service and much else besides, we expect better and we demand better.

So my challenge to the Government today is simple. You need to get your act together. Voters need to see a new sense of purpose. Not just competent management, not just policies that people can identify with – but a clear vision. A sense of what a Labour government is for. An overarching commitment to social justice – not a leadership soap opera. Sustained strategies for improvement – not government by initiative. Proper debate, as we had on pensions – not knee-jerk announcements driven by tabloid prejudice. That is the challenge the Labour Government – our Labour Government – now faces.

But it would be wrong of us to focus on the Government's difficulties without taking a long hard look in the mirror ourselves. For unions also need to recognise the challenge that confront us. This next year must be one in which we raise our game. Yes, our membership is holding steady but at a time of economic stability and record employment that simply isn't good enough. Frankly, we spend too much time talking to ourselves, often in impenetrable jargon. We've got to reach out beyond our comfort zone into that growing rump of non-union Britain.

I've already set out our top priority – reaching out and winning a better deal for the most vulnerable workers. But that is only part of the wider task we must face up to. We need to reach out to all of our communities. That's why we will be welcoming Dr Bari from the Muslim Council of Britain later today – and why we have agreed a joint statement that attacks intolerance and makes it clear that the MCB backs the trade union movement.

We need to reach out to young people. That's why we will be welcoming Gemma Tumelty from the National Union of Students, and why we have signed an agreement to work together with the NUS highlighting the need for students to join their appropriate unions.

We need to reach out in our campaigns. That's why we are working with voluntary groups such as the Citizens' Advice Bureaux and National Homeworkers' Group around a common agenda – that this will be a major part of our programme of work.

One thing is for sure. Black or white, young or old, gay or straight, we must welcome all workers into the trade union family. We must reach out to those who suffer poverty pay and those who do not. Reach out to those who are exploited and those who are not. Reach out to those who need our help most.

We have a word for it in our movement. We call it solidarity. It's how we argue for justice and a fair deal. It underpins everything that we do as trade unionists. And it goes with the grain of what the British people believe.

So our mission this year is clear. Our movement renewed. Our Government revitalised. Our country stronger and fairer. Thanks for listening. *(Applause)*

**The President:** Thank you, Brendan, for that challenging and thought-provoking address. It was very interesting.

### Organising

**Jack Dromey** (*Transport & General Workers' Union*) moved Composite Motion 1. He said: Conference, the T&G is proud of its history. My trade union has been led by the giants of the 20th century - Ernie Bevin, Frank Cousins and Jack Jones. We grew to be over 2 million strong. Key was the building of a strong shop stewards' movement, but trade unionism world-wide has been in decline for 20 years. We are no different. Workplace organisation is not what it once was. Our movement is ageing and a generation is growing up no

longer looking to join a union. There are those who say that continuing decline is inevitable. Unions with a great past, they say, have no future. They are absolutely wrong. However, the cynics will be proved right unless we make organising the top priority with us all having the courage to change and the determination to invest in growth. Old style recruitment with unions fighting over the same members has failed. That is why the T&G and other unions here embraced the organising agenda. There is no substitute for constructing a strong, self-confident, self-sustaining workplace organisation as we rebuild where we have our existing membership and as we seek to organise the unorganised.

We have also learned from the experience of others the importance of being strategic, sectoral and global. Strategic: we should no longer react to the agenda of employers, but, instead, ourselves, think ahead to where we want to be in two, five and ten years' time. That is what we have done through our economy map, informing our strategic priorities, but also informing us where we need to work with other unions and where we should not because other unions are best placed to organise.

Sectoral: we need to organise across all key companies in the growing sectors of the economy. That is what we are doing now in aviation from cabin crew to contractors, raising standards for all and ending the undercutting of the reputable by the rogues. Again, we want to work with and not against other unions. Logistics, for example, is a dominant priority for the T&G, but in the parcel sector we are working with, and rightly so, is the CWU and the GMB.

Global: labour is local, but capital is global. That is why we are working with other unions targeting multinational companies that operate world-wide in contract cleaning and contract catering.

Congress, this composite details, amongst other things, four practical steps. Firstly, it calls on all of us to invest a minimum of 5 percent rising to 10 percent. In the T&G, we have taken on 66 organisers, soon to be 80 and rising to over 100 in 2007. In that process we are changing the face of the union. Nearly one-third are women from black, Asian or ethnic minority backgrounds. One third are under 30. Our 10-strong team of building organisers is like the League of Nations from Africa, Latin America and South America. Four are cleaners who emerged out of successful organising campaigns at Canary Wharf and in the House of Commons.

Secondly, we must build community alliances reaching out to our natural allies in the migrant organisations and the churches. I will never forget the May Day Mass when 3,000 migrant workers gathered together in Westminster Cathedral with the churches, the mosques and the synagogues standing together in support of migrant labour. What gave immense strength to our 150 cleaners who were there was that their church was on their side as well as their union.

Thirdly, we need action by the Government to improve facility time for trade unionists, honouring a pledge made at Warwick. Now there is to be a DTI review. In too many workplaces, fewer working harder have seen facility time cut back. All our workplace reps, shop stewards, health and safety, union learning, equality in the environment, need time and support to do their job. This is an area in which the Government can help unions grow.

Fourthly and finally, crucially, as Tony Woodley has rightly argued, we need an end to competitive trade unionism; instead, we need cooperative trade unionism. For too long dog eat dog, cut-throat competition has played into the hands of the employers. Time and again, a union organising has been undercut by a sweetheart deal offered to another

union. No union is blameless. Sometimes we too have been guilty of the bad practices of the past. That must end. We need to change our procedures, therefore, putting in place a process that actively discourages any form of sweetheart culture encouraging agreement rather than heightening tensions; a process that is quick, consistent and independent with a necessary transparency commanding confidence.

More generally, the TUC should move beyond firefighting and should be actively promoting sectoral cooperation by unions to work together to organise the millions of unorganised workers. The old legend of the trade union movement remains true to this day: 'Unity is strength and the unions united can never be defeated'. (*Applause*)

**Ged Nichols** (*Accord*) seconded Composite Motion 1.

He said: Congress, the simple fact is that we cannot deliver on the things that are important to our members and their families unless we have a strong, growing and dynamic trade union movement. However, in the private sector, only 8 percent of workplaces have more than 50 percent union membership and less than one in five workers belong to a trade union.

Overall, we represent less than 30 percent of the people at work in Britain today and every non-union worker directly undermines our ability to get a better deal from employers and to represent our members most effectively. So driving up membership and membership density must be our priorities because only by growing our membership and our density can we make employers sit up and take notice of the things that our members want.

How do we grow? We have first to acknowledge that serious growth requires hard work, commitment and, above all, a willingness to invest in the long-term future of the union. We need to invest in organising and in dedicated, properly trained and supported officers and organisers. My union, Accord, which represents staff in the Halifax and Bank of Scotland group, sponsor TUC Academy organisers as part of our organising team. This is part of our growth effort and it is working. Accord has grown by nearly 10 percent this year already, but, to achieve this, we have had to put our money where our mouth is and invest resources into organising.

Congress, we all need to make sure that in everything we do, whether it is bargaining with employers, developing the life-long learning and skills agenda or in our campaigning and political work, we support the thrust to increase membership, strengthen workplace organisation and build stronger unions.

My point is this. Meeting the organising challenge, organising the 19million non-union workers out there in British workplaces is a job and responsibility of the whole of the trade union movement. We need to work together and learn from each other. The scale of the challenge we face is enormous, but if we want to leave behind a strong trade union movement for our children and for future generations of workers, it is a challenge that we all have to step up and meet. As Brendan said in his keynote address, we all have to raise our game. (*Applause*)

**Chris Baugh** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supported Composite Motion 1. He said: Composite 1 refers to the need to focus our efforts on arresting the decline in membership that the earlier speakers have referred to. It is this decline that has prompted something of a reassessment within the trade union movement out of which came a shift to organising, not merely as an exercise in increasing membership, important though that is, but in winning new activists, building a durable form of workplace organisation

from the ground up, promoting an active rather than a passive membership and recognising that it is not necessarily new, and organising is not an end in itself. In fact, it is the basis upon which we bargain from a position of strength with the employer.

Composite Motion 1 recognises that this approach is already having a good effect. Despite the decline in numbers that we have seen in the last couple of decades and the industrial battering that many unions have received over that period, we are able to show that we have halted a decline in total union membership. There have been a number of very successful campaigns run by TUC affiliates. The work of the TUC Organising Academy has proved invaluable in supporting unions and training and bringing hundreds of young organisers into the ranks of the movement itself.

In giving support to the general approach, the organising approach set out in this motion, and the practical steps that the moving and seconding speaker have highlighted, my union wanted to draw particular attention to the question of how we organise young workers where only 7 percent of union members are aged 18 to 24 and only 17 percent of workers under age 30 hold a union card with the effect, of course, that the average age of union membership is rising.

The object of our amendment, which is incorporated in the motion, firstly, is to look at what we can do to build on the solid work that has already been done to train trade unionists on putting the case in schools, a training package for teachers and the protocol with the NUS. This is all very good, but a voluntarist approach is not likely to be enough. The social benefits of trade unionism need to be built into the national curriculum. We need to consult unions on how we put pressure on the Government to achieve this.

Secondly, we want to take the views of affiliates on new structure, what works best, as a bridge into activity.

Thirdly, we want to provoke a wider debate about how we organise young workers. All the serious studies show that they are not Thatcher's children and that they are not against trade unions. The single biggest reason why young people do not join the trade union is because nobody has asked them. The reasons are because of employer resistance and labour market conditions, and yet we find, even in union workplaces, young people are less likely to join than older workers. All of this, in our view, makes the case for looking at the message that we convey as a movement and looking at how we best organise young workers; so let's not turn our back on another generation of young trade unionists. Please support the Composite. (*Applause*)

**Michelle Stanistreet** (*National Union of Journalists*) supported Composite Motion 1. She said: This motion rightly stresses the importance of union organising and workplace recruitment, getting new chapel reps on board and training and supporting them once in place. It is something the NUJ has put at its heart in recent years; a strategy that has paid off with successive rises in membership and the securing of around 170 new recognition agreements, meaning that now almost 50 percent of our members have the right to collective bargaining.

However, some of our campaigns, despite their successes, have been hampered by the trade union laws which still prevent us gaining true recognition for our members. Take the case of the *Racing Post*, owned by Trinity Mirror and a glaring example of a failure to deliver fairness at work. In May 2003, the NUJ wrote to the company seeking a meeting to discuss recognition. The meeting followed in early June at which the

management made clear it would agree a voluntary deal if we could demonstrate majority support. No problem; we had it.

Two weeks later, it transpired that a secret sham recognition deal had been cooked up between the company and the British Association of Journalists. Almost all *Racing Post* staff immediately signed a petition making it clear they wanted the NUJ, not the BAJ, to represent them. The BAJ membership stood, and stands, at zero in the bargaining unit.

The CAC subsequently judged the agreement to be "unsatisfactory, inefficient and unfair". For the staff at the *Racing Post* it was a huge slap in the face and something to this day they cannot believe the management got away with. The case shows how companies can, and will, get away with recognising unions like the BAJ over campaigning, active and democratic unions like the NUJ.

The CAC said our case demonstrated a 'lacuna' in the legislation. Whatever a lacuna is, it represents a huge injustice in our legislation. Our subsequent appeal was rejected. The courts ruled that the law did not have to deliver any kind of justice or fairness. We are left with a huge bill. Our members are represented by a sham union. Only the employers are happy. Something has to be done.

On the back of this composite, we look forward to the TUC's help in securing genuine recognition deals, putting an end to undemocratic sweetheart deals with so-called unions acting in cahoots with management who have always been hostile to the trade union movement. Please support this motion. (*Applause*)

**Jon Restell** (*FDA*) supported Composite Motion 1.

He said: We are grateful to the T&G for accepting our amendments. We thought it was important to acknowledge that different unions start from different points when it comes to resources for organising and recruitment, but we strongly support the goal of spending at least 10 percent of our income -- not just the TUC's -- on growing our unions.

In supporting the composite, we want to highlight the importance of research. Last year, UNISON and FDA launched a new organisation, Managers in Partnership, whose sole focus is organising senior managers in healthcare. In itself, this was an innovative step for two very different trade unions. At the time the *Guardian* said it was like an elephant mating with a mouse; rather indelicate and not entirely flattering to either union, but it made a point.

MIP was the product of careful research. We found out, by asking them why managers had not joined a union, what they wanted from us and how they wanted to be organised. We did not second-guess what they wanted. This research has paid off with a little help from Patricia Hewitt. Early results suggest that our growth this year will be 25 percent in our first year. Unions need to share ideas and research. Through the TUC, unions as diverse as T&G and Connect have all influenced how we recruit and organise senior managers in the health service. If you would like to know more about MIP, let me know.

Congress, survey after survey tells us that most people in this country are positive about trade unionism. The problem is they do not know much about trade unions, and so this positive majority does not join. They do not hear from us enough and, when they do, they often do not know what we are talking about. The action in this motion will help us get our message across to people who want to hear it. Please support. (*Applause*)

**Tracy Clarke** (*Community*) supported Composite Motion 1. She said: Supporting this motion is our top

priority as a union. The motion refers to the small improvement in trade union membership and the rate of organisation, but we know that there are few grounds for thinking we have cracked the problem in Britain or anywhere else in the industrialised world.

The reality in Britain is that with the growth of employment and fairly good economic growth, we should be doing much better in attracting new members into unions. We can complain with justice that public policy is not as fair as it should be. Certainly, British industrial relations legislation does not meet even the basic requirements of the ILO Conventions 87 and 98 after nine years of a Labour Government. But that is not likely to change and, anyway, it is our responsibility to attract members.

In Community, the focus of our work is on communities, communities around steelworks, hosiery, knitwear, carpets and footwear factories, from which in the 1960s and 1970s came large proportions of the 12 million members in the TUC. The daughters and sons of these people are no less in need of a collective voice at the workplace and in society, but unions have lost touch with them. They do not see us as relevant.

We see the way forward to establishing unions as a vital force for good through building again the alliances which gave working class people some control over their lives. Alliances with political parties certainly, but, more importantly, with churches, schools and other places of learning, with organisations of national minorities and with other associations of like-minded people with an interest in the common good of their families and their communities and an abiding concern for justice and defence for the oppressed.

This is no easy task. It calls for commitment and compromise as well as an automatic tendency to cooperate. It means developing practical ties of mutual solidarity strong enough to flourish after immediate campaigns have run their course. We support this motion. (*Applause*)

**Bill Greenshields** (*National Union of Teachers*)

supported Composite Motion 1. He said: Our members, and I am sure those of our sister teaching unions, are justly proud of our very strong records in recruitment and organisation. The Government and employers know that it is a very rare event to find a school teacher who is not in a union, but recent experience of teachers underlines the need not just for membership, but for active participation.

More than 60 years ago, the new Education Bill promised to extend education opportunities to working class children. The then NUT President, G.C.T. Giles, in calling for progress to what we now know as state comprehensive education, said this: "The reactionary die-hard forces, which too often in the past have succeeded in strangling education and social progress, have not undergone a sudden and miraculous change. They have not gone away. Against them we shall need all the strength, experience, leadership and resources of our great union and of a united profession. We shall need, and can win, the active sympathy and cooperation of a public opinion more enlightened and more determined than ever before to sweep aside the obstruction of vested interest and privilege."

However, 60 years on, the reactionary die-hard forces are attacking every aspect of teachers' lives. The state education system and our members have recently been involved in campaigning and, in some cases, in industrial action on issues of pay, pensions, abolition of posts and jobs in our schools, increasing workload, discrimination, pay linked to spurious concepts of performance, divided competition between schools, the continuation of selective school intakes and now

the marketisation, privatisation and destruction of the state education system.

To tackle all these and to reverse the political direction of travel, we need strong, organised, active memberships in every workplace, to make every school a fortress in the battle. We need our members to be well informed and represented, confidently taking on the issues at work and building broad alliances in the local community with strong accountable leaderships responding to their priorities at local and national level. That is our model of teacher trade unionism, the organising culture, the organising agenda.

The motion recognises this must be our priority, but recognises that there is also a danger of a return to past practices where unions have accepted sweetheart deals or were invited into workplaces by employers in order to undermine the organising efforts of sister unions and workplace democracy. We must all be aware that any such top-down deal or exclusive partnership with employers or the Government grown out of old sweetheart deals, which promised industrial peace and the isolation of those outside the loop, will result in the exclusion of other unions from proper consultation, negotiation and collective bargaining. Clearly, no TUC affiliate could or should countenance such a situation simply to maintain a partnership. *(Applause)*

Therefore, the TUC needs, as this composite says, to encourage all affiliates to establish a vibrant organising culture and must, if necessary, take steps to prevent any exclusive sweetheart partnerships from undermining the work of other unions. The NUT is 100 percent committed to an organising culture. We are engaged in a pivotal struggle for education and we look forward to continuing that alongside our sister teacher unions and to work towards one teacher union. Thus, Congress, we are strongly in favour of this composite. Endorse it unanimously. *(Applause)*

**Sam Allen** (*University and College Union*) supported Composite Motion 1. He said: In supporting this motion, we welcome it and urge all unions, including my union, to make sure that we can organise and encourage younger generations to see trade unionism as something they can not only support but also join.

We are equally very proud in my union of our continuous working relationship with the National Union of Students, not least in the recent industrial dispute in the higher education sector where we enjoyed so much support from the NUS.

The NUS is an organisation which represents 5.3 million students in both further and higher education -- and I do not want to steal the thunder of the President who, I am sure, is going to address you later. We work closely with them, but we equally recognise the gap between when they are student activists and when they move into full-time employment. We need to do more to make sure that they want to consider joining a trade union or at least to make trade unions relevant to them.

We welcome the section of this motion calling for a report by 2007 to come to Congress. We, in my union, the University and College Union, look forward to this report and to be able to use this report as part of the tools in taking the organising agenda forward.

In the words of the TUC General Secretary in his address to Congress: "We spent too much time talking to ourselves often in an impenetrable jargon". I think we need to simplify that. We need to make it even more relevant to younger generations. We need to make sure that in a Congress like this we see a lot of younger faces. I have been coming to this Congress for some time. I am not saying that people are getting old, but it seems that I tend to see the same faces! So we need to do a bit more. I urge you to support this

composite motion, not only just to support it, but to go back to our union to make sure we provide adequate resources to take this agenda forward. Thank you. *(Applause)*

**Paul Talbot** (*Amicus*) supported Composite Motion 1.

He said: Colleagues, I am always encouraged, coming to the rostrum on this particular debate and once again this year, because there are a large number of trade unions who speak on this particular issue. The fact that this is on everybody's agenda and everybody is working on it in this particular way in order to try to build up trade union membership gives us great confidence. It is why, of course, at the end of the day, we are here.

It is a positive message and a positive message for this very simple reason. We start today on the basis that there are just under 29 million people employed in the United Kingdom. That is an all-time record. It is the highest percentage of people employed in any of the G8 leading countries. We should be proud of that situation. However, having recognised that, we also recognise that the nature of the workforce has changed quite dramatically during the course of the last 20 years. Just under 16 million men and just over 14 million women are now employed. That is a fundamental change in the composition of the labour force compared to the situation 20 years ago.

Taking figures from the last five years or so, women now take up two-thirds of all the new jobs that are created in this economy. There are more young people in employment. The jobs in IT, finance and business services now occupy some eight million employed people in the UK, which is more than double what they were five years ago. In the service sector, which includes the public sector, astoundingly, nearly 25 million people are employed; yet, overall -- and here is the downside -- we represent just around 29 percent of the working population and less than one in five in the private sector.

In the words of one recent national newspaper when they were reporting these figures: "The employment history of the last 20 years is one of coal-face to keyboard". Our challenge, and I think the debate reflects this so far, is to reach out to these new areas of the economy. We have the policies. We are debating policies here this week, on pensions, on employment, on stress, on equal pay, and so on. However, we need to work hard in getting that message across. I would suggest that message has to be positive. It has to be what the trade unions can achieve, because if you are not asked to join the trade union, as a previous speaker said, the chances of you joining are really not very high. You must work on it. We must work on it. We must overcome this view, which is held in certain parts, that trade unions are no longer relevant, 'For other people but not for me'.

Organising is not a quick fix. Organising, in our estimation, involves the build-up of a lay representative structure which will generate the next generation of trade union members. My own union recruited more than 85,000 people last year. In net terms, we did not do as well as that for all the obvious reasons, but we are going to stick at it, we are going to work at it and we are going to keep pounding out that positive message. I am sure all colleagues in this hall will do exactly the same. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

\* *Composite Motion 1 was CARRIED*

#### **Strengthening workplace democracy**

**Paul Mackney** (*University and College Union*) moved Motion 4. He said: Congress, I do not know whether this week is going to be the TUC's finest hour, but I do know that we need to be saying now that we need

new policies, a re-emphasis on our core values, the full implementation of the Warwick Agreement, an end to relentless privatisation and an end to war and the occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan. *(Applause)*

I am sure it is a relief to us to realise that the TUC is not going to get these from Tony Blair. We need a change of direction. Whether we have the neoclassical endogenous growth theory of Gordon Brown, the socialism of John McDonnell, the charm of Alan Johnson or the honest brutality of John Reid, we need a change of direction. I would advise against having the last one round to babysit, never mind run the country! *(Laughter)*

This motion seeks to identify some of the elements of that change we need because it is a fact that whilst we get a vote in national elections every four or five years, citizens spend most of their working life under conditions which future generations will see as a form of dictatorship. Democracy and collective control over our lives require much more than deciding every four or five years who will represent or, worse still, misrepresent us.

Most of our working life is spent doing what someone else tells us when they want us to do it and with little right to question what is going on. The only democratic and humanising countervailing force to this so-called management prerogative is our cadre of union reps, equality reps, shop stewards, safety reps and learning reps who can present the point of view of those who elected them.

Of course, union executives and general secretaries are important, but for most union members the workplace reps are the union. They should be cherished for the valued contribution they make, not just to the union, but also to workplace democracy. The principal task of most unions should be to get support to their reps and their role should be strengthened by any government that sees itself as progressive.

In the tradition of Jack Jones, we are calling on the TUC to campaign for the rights of workplace reps with stronger statutory rights to talk to non-members, with the removal of barriers to part-time workers paid facility time and unequivocal rights for elected national lay negotiators to attend national negotiations. Here I am particularly talking about Newcastle College, which has a big TUC contract but obstructs our national further education chair from attending negotiations.

It is time for statutory rights to negotiate on equality, training and pensions. All the fine words on equality mean little without the right to an equality audit of employment practice. If Alan Johnson really believes, as is publicised here, union learning reps are "an extraordinary plus for the trade union movement", they deserve the right to bargain over training and education. Our learning reps should have the right to meet members to discuss training requirements and to bargain on training in workplace, education and training committees.

I am a bit tired now, after all these years, of meeting ministers who say, "Well, of course, these are very interesting ideas, but the CBI will never agree to them". If the Government does not have the bottle to require the private sector to adopt these measures, they can still at least set a good example by taking some bold initiatives in the public sector. Rather than the polite contempt with which we have been treated of late, the Government should signal their respect for trade unions by requiring two trade union reps on all training and education bodies.

The current training priorities are wrongly focused on the narrow immediate needs of employers, rather than the aspirations of the workforce or the needs of industry as a whole. Even as we debate this motion, there are people working on how to extend privatisation into the college sector and private

training outfits are slavering at the prospect of getting their hands on more government cash. We are just waiting to see how many sticky fingers are in the pudding.

One hundred years ago, the Trade Disputes Act provided basic trade union rights, many of which were taken away by Thatcher. We need to educate the new generation of reps through the TUC education service on the need for a trade Union Freedom Bill. Napolean said that the British were a nation of shopkeepers. More importantly, we are also a nation of shop stewards. Thank you. *(Applause)*

**Annette Mansell-Green** (*UNISON*) seconded Motion 4. She said: Congress, when we talk about workers' rights, we are talking about more than just our basic employment rights. There are areas which are less clear-cut and where greater rights are needed. Workplace representatives need to be given better and much clearer rights to facility time for union activities if we are to carry out our duties to other members properly.

UNISON recognises the inequalities and barriers to effective representation caused by inadequate recognition and facilities offered by many employers. Whilst we welcome the extension of facilities and rights to union learning reps, we must recognise that the level of trade union rights for workplace representatives within the current ACAS guidelines is inadequate and that there are correspondingly unhelpful and, in some cases, punitive restrictions on trade union representation and rights contained in current employment laws.

UNISON is clear that the extension of time off with pay for representatives with responsibility for equality is the only real and meaningful protection against discrimination and equality in the workplace. Maybe if we were to achieve this particular right, then we could move towards increasing the number of part-time and, therefore, women taking up elected positions in our unions.

Congress, UNISON fully supports the campaign for a Trade Union Freedom Bill. It really now is time to progress from a Thatcherite individual rights agenda to one based on collective rights. As Paul said, it is now 100 years since the introduction of the Trade Disputes Act. It really is atrocious that trade union rights have deteriorated since 1906 and that unions are again liable for damage caused by strike action.

Finally, the issue of education and learning: education in the workplace benefits the individual, the collective trade union, the company and wider society. In short, everyone wins. Workers need not only the opportunity to become union learning reps or to sit on workplace education and training committees, they need to be actively encouraged to do so by their employers, employers who are, in turn, backed up by the policies of the Government.

The motion acknowledges that once privatisation has taken place, one of the first things to be cut back is learning. It is, therefore, even more important that legislation is there to back up education initiatives so that they cannot be removed so easily. Please support the motion. Join the campaign for a Trade Union Freedom Bill and ensure that our rights are no longer undermined but rightly strengthened. *(Applause)*

**Richard Angell** (*Amicus*) supported Motion 4.

He said: Congress, the gulf between too many of our members in education and college management is ever growing. The wholly negative privatisation and marketisation of education in the FE and HE sector means the corrosion of our collegiate structures; the bypassing of academic committees and the top-down dictates of college principals and vice chancellors.

Our role at work is ever changing. Creeping privatisation is corroding our workplace progression, rights for part-time workers, powers to negotiate on pensions and access to non-union members. These are not boxes to be ticked, but all battles to be won!

The place of trade unionists on learning and skills bodies, college boards and university councils, alongside learners, is a must! The perverted form of customer that top-up fees has created -- and vice chancellors are now seeking to prevent -- may be the key to upholding learner and student members of these governing bodies in the short-term but without workers, academics, teachers and support staff, free from management control, this learner voice is being isolated in favour of lay members who feel no effect from the decisions they take.

As someone who has sat as a student on an HE governing body, I have watched the pure rubber stamping of the vice chancellor's mates, where the great and the good act as cannon fodder for the college managers. Together, trade union reps and student unionists -- the two progressive forces on campus -- can work together, win together and prevent these attacks.

In conclusion, cuts in courses cannot simply mean the last line of a motion because they are never without their impact on our jobs and alterations to meet the market, but they are about job losses for our members, whether they be lecturers or support staff. They are about regional skill gaps that sever local opportunity and the removal of an ability for many second chance adult learners, especially in the further education sector.

So, please, I implore you, support this Motion.

*(Applause)*

\* *Motion 4 was CARRIED*

### **Campaign for Workplace Justice and Trade Union Freedom**

**Amanda Haehner** (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*) spoke to paragraph 1.7. She said: Could the General Council please inform Congress of the proposals to take forward the motions passed at Congress 2004 and 2005 relevant to trade union self-governance?

**The President:** Thank you for that question. I now call on Tony Woodley to respond on behalf of the General Council.

**Tony Woodley** (*General Council*): Thank you, Congress, Chair. Colleagues will remember that during the course of the year the General Council has indeed run a very high profile campaign for workplace justice and for trade union freedoms in line with what was Composite Motion 1 that we adopted at the 2005 Congress.

Central to the campaign has been the call for the Government to cut red tape for unions and to free unions to represent our members effectively and democratically. We will have to continue to call for a reduction in the excessive regulatory burdens on trade unions, including the reform of rules which restrict unions from disciplining members who break union rules or, indeed, fail to participate in lawful industrial action.

We have been working extremely hard on this. We have said that we want the substantial simplification of industrial action noted in balloting rules, therefore, enabling unions more effectively and more efficiently to implement the democratic wishes of their own members.

In September 2006, the TUC office submitted a detailed

report to the ILO Committee of Experts listing the areas where UK law actually breaches ILO Conventions 87 and 97, including sections 64, 65 and all of those other areas within it.

During the coming year, I can confirm that the General Council will indeed continue to press for the reform of the laws which really do restrict union autonomy, including calling on the Government to review the 1992 Act as part of the DTI simplification plan. It sounds complicated. It just allows us, comrades, to manage our own affairs. I hope our colleagues in NASUWT and Amanda are happy with the response from the General Council. Thank you.

### **Address by Gemma Tumelty – National Union of Students**

**The President:** Congress, it is now my pleasure to introduce Gemma Tumelty, the President of the National Union of Students. Gemma graduated from Liverpool John Moores University in 2005 when she was also elected National Secretary of the National Union of Students. This year Gemma became the first NUS President to be elected from a post-1992 university and only the second woman to be elected President in its history.

At a time when the majority of students now need to undertake paid work in order to survive, it is more important than ever that students are protected at work. Therefore, I am delighted that today the TUC and the NUS are launching a ground-breaking agreement. The NUS will support union organisation, organising drive to recruit students and graduates and the TUC will, in turn, support the NUS in making sure that students are treated fairly at work.

I would now like to ask Gemma to become the first NUS President in our history to address the TUC Annual Congress.

**Gemma Tumelty** (*National Union of Students*):

Congress, it is an absolute privilege to be invited here to speak today, an invitation that I hope reflects the growing relationship between the National Union of Students and the trade union movement.

It is also a privilege to be stood here representing the largest democratic student organisation in the world, a movement that encompasses over five million members in further and higher education, a diverse movement made up of individuals who are not just your 18-21 year old stereotypical students but students who are second chance learners, parents, carers and, ultimately, workers too.

This is going to be an historic year for NUS and the trade union movement. Just recently we signed a protocol agreement with the TUC. By signing this agreement and dedicating resources internally, via our Trades Union Partnership project, we are demonstrating a serious, structured, long-term commitment to promote collectivist values, social solidarity and trade union membership amongst young people.

Congress, education is the key to social mobility, to breaking down years of class inequality. With the introduction of top-up fees and student debt at an all time high, so many talented individuals are being deterred from entering further and higher education. Whilst the costs step up and up, the likelihood of education remaining a preserve of the wealthy does too. I have to place on record my gratitude to the TUC and to all of the individual trades unions who have supported our campaigns; and I thank you for standing in solidarity with us in our fight for a free, fair and funded education system.



In October, thousands of students will take to the streets of London to protest against the continuing marketisation of our education system and the damage to access that this causes. We are asking you to join us because education is just the latest in a long line of public services being marketised and privatised. That process that is ripping apart the very fabric of our country must be stopped.

So, our commitment is also born out of practicality, out of a very real understanding that the financial position that students now find themselves in means they are almost inevitably workers too and they need the protection and solidarity of trades unions like never before. But let us be honest. Trade union membership amongst young people is just too low. As the joint TUC/NUS report *All Work Low Pay* shows, only four per cent of students aged 18 to 25 are trade union members.

The report also showed the massive growth of students working to fund their studies. Many of these jobs are low paid, highly exploitative and many working students are unsurprisingly from the poorest backgrounds. It is a fact that the more hours a student has to work, the more their studies are likely to suffer.

Our project aims to work with unions to facilitate access to our membership base, to recruit and develop the members and activists of tomorrow. An NUS that is serious about representation of our members on and off campus should work with trades unions; and trades unions who are serious about increasing membership and activism amongst young people should engage and target students and work with NUS because the people we represent on campus are the people you can represent at work. The people we reach are the people you need to reach.

Congress, my fight is your fight. We need a real and lasting partnership between my union and your unions. We need thousands of new student activists and trade union members injecting our society with our shared values of democracy, collectivism, equality and social justice, but this vision needs to become a reality.

To develop a student community and the trade union activists of tomorrow it is crucial that we develop an organising culture. To do this we are learning from you, moving from a servicing national union to an organising one, a union that is genuinely owned by its membership. Working with the TUC Organising Academy we hope to learn so much from your step change in the way you organise and develop your members. Imagine in the future the government target is met. If 50 per cent of school leavers go on to higher education, over half the population will have been a member of a students' union at one time in their life -- half of Britain. That is our opportunity to empower and influence my members to shape and form our country's future as your members. We should seize the opportunity open to us by organising them, encouraging them to challenge power and enabling them to change not only their course but their workplace, their campus and their community too. We have immense influence and power in our hands and it would be a tragedy to waste it.

Congress, there are so many opportunities through our joint work that will, if recognised and exploited today, secure our future, determine our legacy and cement our values in the Britain of tomorrow. Thank you.  
(*Applause*)

**The President:** Thank you for that speech.

### **General Council's Joint Statement with the Muslim Council of Britain**

**The President:** I now invite the General Secretary to move the General Council's joint statement with the Muslim Council of Britain.

**Brendan Barber** (*General Secretary*): We turn now to a matter that I think is amongst the most important items of Congress business this week, the joint statement of the TUC and the Muslim Council of Britain. This time last year, in the aftermath of the London bombings, the General Council agreed a statement condemning terrorism, warning against Islamophobia and calling for action to counter the social exclusion faced by the Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities in particular. That statement also committed the TUC to working more closely with Britain's diverse Muslim communities. Thus earlier this year, at the invitation of Dr Muhammad Abdul Bari, now Secretary-General of the Muslim Council of Britain, the General Council held its February meeting at the East London Muslim Centre. As a result of that meeting, the TUC and the MCB agreed to develop closer links. Today we are publishing -- and asking Congress to endorse -- the joint statement setting out how our two organisations can work together, where we share common objectives. I am personally delighted that Dr Bari has been able to join us today and will be addressing Congress shortly. You are really very welcome.

I think the joint statement comes at a critically important time. We have seen an alarming increase in support for the BNP, which has been quick to exploit and fuel the rising tide of Islamophobia. Rather than covering the moderate mainstream of Muslim society, the media have disproportionately focused their attention on a fringe of fanatics who have no respect for any way of life bar their own. It is hugely important that we take on the media myths, tackle the extremists and celebrate and protect our diversity from those who seek to undermine it. But it is vital that we work with other organisations too around this common agenda, and that is where the joint statement comes in.

Of course, the two organisations have their differences and those should be respected. The TUC is a secular organisation, the MCB obviously a religious one. We do not pretend to agree on every issue, but the statement identifies two important areas where we can work together in partnership. First, we can use the workplace to promote our shared belief in justice and equality, and opposition to prejudice and discrimination. I know that there has been considerable concern about remarks by Dr Bari's predecessor on lesbian and gay people. We have discussed this issue and the statement's reference to a joint commitment to the promotion of equality for all and the elimination of all forms of harassment, prejudice and unfair discrimination reflects the outcome of that discussion. Indeed, this issue was also discussed at our meeting in February, at the East London Muslim Centre, with Dr Bari.

The statement makes it clear too though, that the MCB supports trades unions, that all workers should be encouraged to join a union and that we need a stronger framework of workplace rights, and through its channels the MCB will promote the benefits of trade union membership. With Muslims three times more likely to be unemployed than the population as a whole, the statement also commits us to addressing together the poverty suffered by large parts of the Muslim community.

Secondly, we can work together to combat Islamophobia. Misunderstanding and misinformation about our Muslim communities is a huge problem in Britain today as the statement suggests. Islamophobia is a real and present threat to our community relations, and not just in terms of the far right -- worrying though that is -- but also through the casual prejudice,

too often directed at Muslims. As trades unionists we have to do everything we can to remove discrimination like this from our society, and I believe that we have much to gain from working more closely with the MCB. Working together we will achieve more than we could working alone. Working together I think we can make a difference where it is needed most.

I commend this joint statement to Congress.

**The President:** Thank you, Brendan. I would now like to invite Dr Abdul Bari, Secretary-General of the Muslim Council of Britain, to address Congress. Last February as Brendan said, the General Council held its meeting at the East London Muslim Centre as one of a number of initiatives to show solidarity with the Muslim community in a climate of rising Islamophobia. Since then, Dr Bari has been elected to the very important position of Secretary-General of the Muslim Council of Britain and I am delighted to be able to tell you that he is also a long standing member of his union. Thank you.

**Dr Muhammad Abdul Bari** (*Muslim Council of Britain*): In the name of God the compassionate, the merciful; President, colleagues, friends, peace be with you.

I would first like to begin by thanking Brendan Barber and the General Council of the TUC for their kind invitation to address this year's Conference. On behalf of the Muslim Council of Britain, I would like to record our appreciation of the TUC's initiative in establishing our relationship, initially through Brendan's visit to the London Muslim Centre last year and subsequently holding a TUC General Council meeting there in February this year. I am really moved by the warmth that Brendan and his team have shown to me today. I take particular pleasure in addressing my fellow trades unionists as I too am a member of the ATL, the Association of Teachers and Lecturers, part of the TUC fraternity.

Congress, today is an historic occasion as you are aware of the joint statement by the TUC and the MCB. We have both pledged to work together on issues of common interest and concern. The MCB brings together over 400 institutions and organisations across Britain, all representing members of the Islamic community. The MCB's primary aim is to work for the common good of all. It seeks the eradication of disadvantage and discrimination and the fostering of improved community relations in our society. There is a shared belief by both the MCB and the TUC in justice, equality and opposition to prejudice. We both believe it is in the interests of the workers to join the appropriate trade unions at their workplace and that employers should recognise such unions.

We do not underestimate the scale of challenges facing us today. Congress, the TUC report *Poverty, Exclusion and British people of Pakistani and Bangladeshi Origin* published last year demonstrated that many people from substantial parts of the Muslim community suffer massive disadvantages and discrimination: 69 per cent are classified as poor compared with 22 per cent of the country as a whole. Over all, Muslims are three times more likely to be unemployed than the population as a whole. Just last week a report by the Equal Opportunities Commission indicated that young Muslim women of Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin are doing far better than others in school but still they are faced with a glass ceiling in career progression and the workplace. Sometimes they have four to five times the level of unemployment compared to the general average.

Further the spectre of Islamophobia is a real and present threat, fuelled by misunderstandings, prejudice and the stereotyping of whole communities. The

Muslim community is a community of communities. People sometimes think that it is a monolithic community; it is not. The European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia acknowledges the role of the media in perpetuating racist and negative stereotypes. The Centre's Director, Beate Winkler, has argued for far more diversity training in the media industry to ensure both good journalism and more effective implementation of the industry's self regulatory codes of conduct. The intent is to develop a better understanding of issues relating to race, religion and culture and to reflect this in the media's output.

We similarly seek to work in partnership with the TUC and through its networks to enhance awareness of Islam and to counter widespread misunderstanding of how religion relates to modern society. At the same time, we all want to be using our own networks to raise awareness within the Muslim community of the values of union membership and the very important role that unions play in seeking justice and fair treatment in the workplace and the wider society. Thus the common objectives of the TUC and the Muslim community fit together in pursuit of equality and fair play.

I would like briefly to discuss the issue of extremism and security. On the fifth anniversary of 9/11 today, we remember the sad loss of innocent lives on that day. The MCB has all along made it clear that extremists and radicals are in no way sanctioned by the Muslim community nor by the religion of Islam. However, it is also clear that the Government are in a state of denial on the effect that their policies, domestic as well as foreign, have had in adding fuel to the fire and bringing about a society with heightened levels of mistrust, fear and frustration. We reiterate our call to the Government to initiate an independent public inquiry into the events of 7/7 to reveal the exact reasons behind the atrocities and, indeed, how the atrocities themselves came to pass. The MCB has been and continues to be committed to work with Government and other organisations on this, and this needs to be addressed for the benefit of our whole society.

Congress, we believe in unity in our diversity, for diversity in humanity is the message of Islam as well. Contrary to assertions that religions have been used to foster hatred and sow destruction, the essential message in our holy book, the Qur'an, is the unity of humankind and its potential as a positive force for harmony and cooperation. Rather than regarding diversity as a source of inevitable tensions, the Qur'an states that human variety is indispensable when defining common beliefs, values and traditions in our community. Our Qur'an says: "O human kind, we have created you male and female, and appointed you races and tribes, so that you may know each other." Imagine a multi-coloured flower garden and compare it to a monochromatic flower garden. Which will people prefer? I believe that both the TUC fraternity and the Muslim community value the essential unity of the human race in its diversity. By diversity, however, we certainly do not mean isolation, segregation or insularity for that surely defeats the whole purpose of diversity.

It is in this spirit that I would like to reiterate our determination to work in partnership with the TUC to bring greater awareness of the problems faced by Muslim workers in the workplace as well as in being members of British society. The MCB believes that the only way to address the manifold problem faced by Muslims in Britain is to engage in the political, social and economic process and to work closely in partnership and in solidarity with all organisations that have an interest in promoting social justice and equal rights for all, as the TUC undoubtedly does. We must create a more participatory economic and social

environment, whereby all communities can become genuine stakeholders. It is thus -- social and political engagement, participation in the democratic process and creating solidarity with all like-minded organisations that the MCB and the Muslim community believes to be the true way forward if we are to meet these challenges and promote equality of opportunity for all in this multi cultural society of ours.

Congress, I thank you all for giving me the privilege of addressing you. Unlike your Prime Minister. I very much hope that this will not be my last appearance at the TUC! Thank you very much. (*Applause*)

**The President:** Thank you very much, Dr Bari.

### Islamophobia and Racism

**The President:** I now call Motion 18, Islamophobia and Racism. The General Council support the motion.

**Mike McClelland** (*napo*) moved Motion 18. He said: Fortunately I had read the joint statement before I prepared my speech, but I had not read the General Secretary's and Dr Bari's speeches so my apologies for any repetition.

Most, if not all, of us will remember exactly what we were doing five years ago today. At about this hour I was returning home from visiting a man in Winchester Prison and, as I listened to the radio I was so transfixed by the news that I lost my way. It is an unexpected juxtaposition that brings me here today moving this motion, but I hope that whatever happens in the future you will feel able to support its sentiments and work together to ensure their implementation.

A little while ago a fellow *napo* member of Indian origin described to me how in the weeks following July 7 last year she had been stopped and searched repeatedly by the police as she travelled to work through her local railway station. She attributed this to her appearance, her colour, and the fact that she happens to carry a backpack. She is not a Muslim; she could understand where the police were coming from but was somewhat irritated by virtue of the fact that as the days went by they continued to search her despite having seen her on many previous occasions. If we examine our own prejudices and blind spots we may well share her understanding. To overcome those prejudices and blind spots is hard indeed in the world as it is today.

However, although the task may be great, since it touches our deepest fears, it is no less important for all that. Quite the opposite. Ultimately, our future safety and well-being will only be assured if we overcome the fear, misunderstanding and prejudice that are the constituent parts of racism and religious intolerance. My friend's experience graphically illustrates how the pernicious tentacles of both racism and terrorism are undiscerning with regard to those they touch.

My background is in probation. A working methodology currently in vogue here is something called cognitive behavioural therapy that involves the recognition and modification of patterns of thinking and associated behaviour. Maybe we view terrorism rather too much from that perspective. Personally, I am a bit old fashioned and I rather like to understand and analyse where behaviour comes from, what are its roots. One continues to have the feeling that it is we in the West who need to examine our own behaviour with regard to the Middle East. Perhaps our actions provoke reactions. Whilst we should be clear, and clearly state, that the pain and suffering caused by terrorism is unacceptable, we should not lose sight of our own responsibilities. It is also sobering to recall that many nation states have their own roots in

behaviour that today would be branded as wholly unacceptable.

I want to focus on what the trade union movement can do. A sheet of burnished metal laid out and exposed to the elements can become tarnished and corroded. To maintain its brightness it needs to be polished and protected from corrosion. Then it will shine and glint in the sun. Racial, religious and cultural diversity are like this sheet of metal: they need to be strengthened and protected from the vagaries of transatlantic foreign policy, from extremism, from the media and from prejudice whipped up by all of those. Then they too will shine. How can we protect and strengthen? Well, we welcome the joint statement presented to Congress today by the General Council and the Muslim Council of Britain. This gives useful direction pointers that echo this motion. Politically we can campaign against the extreme and prejudiced views propounded by the BNP.

The union movement in this country seeks to support its brothers and sisters across the world as it already does. In the workplace union learning and union equality representatives can work to promote equality and diversity and to counter the negative impact of discrimination. Individually we have responsibility to ourselves and our colleagues. Last week I went to a meeting with our employers. Previously I had formed a rather negative impression of one individual on the other side, as it were. I had my fold-up bike with me last week and he commented on this as a fellow cyclist. Somehow this small observation on his part, this point of mutual interest quite apart from work, caused me to view him in a somewhat different light and I think our future working relationship will be all the better for that. Whatever our differences, we also have similarities. We should recognise what we share in our common experience and understanding, but also value our diverse backgrounds that may be approached across common ground.

For many, the workplace is one such common ground, so let us not lose our way as I did five years ago by becoming transfixed by the horror of terrorism. Let us stand firm against this in the certain knowledge that the majority of people of all colours, backgrounds and creeds share a common interest.

**Billy Hayes** (*Communication Workers Union*) seconded Motion 18. He said: The CWU welcomes the motion placed before Congress. It is quite clear that hatred of Muslims is being promoted from a variety of sources. Statistics released by the GLA show that you are eleven times more likely to be attacked if you are an Arab. I know not every person who is an Arab is a Muslim, but that statistic does point out the attacks that are taking place upon Muslims in this country at the moment. It is not just those kinds of attacks that are taking place. Now what we have are columnists, both in the tabloids and in the broadsheets, hacking out articles alleging the incompatibility of Islam with freedom and democracy. There is a suggestion from people like Donald Rumsfeld that there is a war of civilisation; and there is also a new term that President Bush tried to introduce into the language, 'Islamofascism'. How strange that such a term should be used when the British National Party is being consistent in its campaign against the Muslim community.

In the local elections in 2006 Nick Griffin, the leader of the BNP, said that the BNP wants to turn the election into a referendum on Islam. Equally the BNP has been undermining anti-racist legislation in this country by attacking Islam as a code for an attack on black people. The court case against the BNP leaders collapsed, despite the evidence acquired at a secretly filmed meeting of fascists. Obviously, the promotion of anti-Muslim prejudice by the BNP did not result in a prosecution because of the absence of legislation. However, in supporting the *napo* motion we also want

Congress to recognise that the BNP registered a substantial increase in its vote and doubled the number of its councillors. If we are to prevent the BNP from becoming part of the mainstream of British politics we must grasp how they are relying on Islamophobia.

The CWU welcomes the TUC's joint statement and also welcomes Dr Bari's address to Congress. I would like to place on record the CWU's congratulation both on the initiative of holding a General Council meeting in a mosque in East London, in an Islam centre, but also for the response of Brendan Barber personally to the attacks in London. I believe both Brendan's response and the mayor's response to the 7/7 attacks have done so much to recognise and to promote the idea that in diversity there is strength,

**Colin Moses** (*Prison Officers Association*): Speaking to Motion 18 and in particular the amendment put forward by the POA, which adds the words: "...ensure Islamophobia and racism plays no part in the sentencing of offenders and is given a zero tolerance in our criminal justice system."

The POA support the joint statement but we must remember that the Islamophobia we are seeing in our prisons is brought about by ignorance and lack of training, lack of knowledge, but it has also been brought about by -- as I have said to Congress before -- the fact that we have just over 79,000 people in custody in England and Wales, ten per cent of whom are Muslims. It is totally disproportionate. As I have said in the past as well, when you go in front of a court in this country the chances of you being remanded to custody if you are black or Asian is much much higher than if you are white. What we are seeing now is the highest growth in prisons of those from the Muslim faith.

What we would ask is that there is a zero tolerance to Islamophobia and that this Congress asks the criminal justice system to examine the figures it is now producing which clearly point to the fact that we are now placing more Muslims on remand than we are anyone else. The religion is growing in our prisons. We will say to the Prison Service, to John Reid and to government: let us have a zero tolerance on racism in prisons; let us stamp it out in that one place.

**Harpal Jandu** (*GMB*) supported Motion 18. He said: Throughout history there have been a group of people who have suffered prosecution, hostility and exclusion because of their colour, race, belief, or whatever makes people think they were different. Now, Islamic communities in the United Kingdom are subjected to hostility, threat, violence and suspicion. Not a day goes by without reference in the media to Muslims. The fact that Muslims have been living in the country for many years, contributing to our economy and culture, appears to have been forgotten. Instead of describing a person as following the Islamic faith, we should remind Congress to promote peace.

Muslims have become linked to fear and terrorism. Let there be no doubt about it, it is racism rotten to the core. Because most Muslims are easily identified, people think they all are. The only way racism works is to make examples of people and hate their beliefs. That all helps the fascist and racist BNP to improve their chance in elections, working on fear and fantasies. They are fed by endless media scapegoating of Muslims. That is why trades unions have such an important part to play in fighting Islamophobia and racism. Ethnic minorities are seriously under-represented in the trade union movement as members and activists. I am proud to say that my union, the GMB, is seeking to address this by embarking on a major race and diversity project, which will work towards dismantling barriers that prevent people from

black and ethnic minority groups joining a union and participating and becoming activists.

The trade union movement has a tremendously important role to play in challenging those communities where fear, hate and racism exist. Let us eliminate stereotyping in the workplace, promote good practice strategies, work with employers to create an inclusive society that respects different religions and cultural diversity.

**Sevi Yesildali** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supported Motion 18. She said: PCS actively opposes all forms of harassment, prejudice and unfair treatment. At our 2006 Annual Delegate Conference our members voted in support of a motion to oppose the development of Islamophobia in all its forms and to support initiatives against it. As part of this policy, our National Black Members Forum have set up a working group to make recommendations on strategies for tackling the rise in Islamophobia experienced by many of our members and their families.

PCS membership includes front-line workers, such as police community support officers, who employ many young Muslims. Yet despite the fact that many of these workers were amongst the first ones to the scene on July 7, playing a key role in helping London to recover from these terrible events, our research shows that they suffer more than ever before from regular racist abuse, including physical attacks, often from ignorant people whose hatred has been formed by the contributions of government, media and the BNP.

Included in our campaign against the fascists and the far right, PCS has written to the Certification Officer to oppose any attempt by the BNP to set up their own trade union and we urge all other unions to do the same. PCS fully supports this motion and welcomes the statements. We must all stand against extremism and terrorism, whether it is perpetrated by individuals or by government, and unite against the common problems that we face. PCS urge Conference to support the motion as it is essential that trades unions stand in solidarity with the Muslim community.

**Ian Murch** (*National Union of Teachers*): I work in Bradford and I live in Halifax, and like many towns and cities in our country they have substantial and growing communities for whom Islam is a central part of their lives. These are peaceful, law abiding aspiring communities, communities whose members value their own culture but who also want to live and go to school and work with their non-Muslim neighbours.

Despite some media stereotypes, the problem these communities have is persuading other people that it is safe, it can be comfortable and even good to live and go to school and work with people in your town who are Muslims. This problem, which in education is described as white flight, is being made worse by government policy on school admissions. As an example, its determination to impose faith schools on communities that have not asked for them through its academies programme is forcing even more people to make school choices which result in racial and religious segregation. Segregation breeds suspicion and world events -- whether they be British intervention in Muslim countries or acts of terrorism committed by completely unrepresentative people -- can turn that suspicion into prejudice and hostility. Teachers need schools in which young people of different heritages are educated together if they are effectively to demonstrate the falseness of these prejudices.

The National Union of Teachers has, I believe, made important contributions to the good practice that this motion asks to be shared. My own union branch is well attended by teachers who hold the Muslim faith. We have held meetings specifically to discuss how we can

counter Islamophobia and have issued our own advice and our national union's excellent advice on how to tackle it in the context of the invasion of Iraq and 9/11. Working with the Bradford TUC, using regional development funding, we have employed a teacher and a youth worker to develop an anti-racist school kit, tailored to the school curriculum. We have assisted the development of links between schools, allowing young people of a non-Muslim background, who would never otherwise have done so, to meet young Muslims and to work together. Starting this work in schools is vital if it is later to be developed successfully in work places and communities, as children become adults.

I hope that the work that this motion asks the General Council to do will draw down the wealth of experience held by the NUT and the other education unions. It is indeed vital work.

**Mary Page** (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*): I am a representative on the TUC LGBT Committee. We support the motion and have absolutely no problem with the intention or the general sentiment of the statement but we have a problem with the word 'lifestyle' in paragraph 5. We feel it is too vague and, in spite of Brendan's reassurances, is liable to misinterpretation.

I am a gay woman, civilly partnered in June, thanks to the efforts of all of you comrades here in the hall. My sexuality is not a lifestyle. It is not like going to IKEA to buy a mattress or buying a Prada handbag or Dolce and Gabbana knickers. I cannot afford them anyway. It is about me; it is about who I am and not what I choose to be. To describe my sexual orientation as a lifestyle is to reduce it to something superficial.

I am wondering how this choice of words fits with TUC policy on LGBT rights and women's equality. We need to fight racism in all its forms, and Islamophobia is racism expressed as fear. But we must also remember our commitment to universal human values, high among which are respect for diversity and acceptance of those differences which are an expression of who we are, and which harm or threaten no one. By referring to my 27-year partnership as a lifestyle I feel that my love for, and commitment to, my partner is reduced to a consumer choice and thereby demeaned. Think about it. Most of you here are heterosexual. Is that your lifestyle?

**Rena Wood** (*UNISON*): I am very mindful and conscious of the fact that people can reach saturation point in terms of discussing this issue, but the contribution I want to make is very specific. There is a commonality and the theme to the contributions of the speakers who have come up here on this platform today on this issue, but I think it is important to acknowledge that Islamophobia and racism, whether we like it or not, are entwined. Whilst the motion talks about it, it is every bit as important that we combat racism, fear and prejudice as it is that we combat terrorism. You are not going to be able to challenge the terrorism without challenging the racism first. How does it impact on the black community and Muslims? It impacts on them in terms of perceptions of how they see themselves; it impacts on sections of our community that go about minding their own business and are targeted because they happen to look Asian or Middle Eastern. The fact is that a lot of Asian communities are Christians, Hindus and Sikhs. So it is a race issue. That was made very clear by Nick Griffin, who described the Muslim faith as a vicious and wicked faith. He used that, as we know if we look at the election results. We have the May elections coming up next year.

While I think it is important that there are all these mechanisms in place and strategies to challenge the fear and suspicion, we have to be conscious of what it

really means to us. Yes, it is important to acknowledge our diversity, but it is far more important to say we share a lot more in common; there are more things we have in common than the things that actually separate us. Let us look at the growth of young white males who support the BNP, young white Asian lads who want to join the Jihad. You are not telling me that those lads pray five times a day. Those youth share the same issues: they are disaffected young people. That is what unites us.

I am very proud in UNISON; we did a lot of work around community cohesion. My own Regional Secretary, Frank Hunt, has been made a Commissioner of Integration and Cohesion. We worked with the local authority that engaged in dialogue with its community, black and white, and on the basis of that we have produced a tool kit, something that you can use. It is a practical tool kit. The point is that unless you talk to people at grassroots levels and actually understand what are the issues that face their daily lives, then you can educate them. Yes, let us have diversity, let us celebrate it, but let us look at our parallel lives because that is what unites us and that is what we can do within the trade union movement. I urge you to support it.

**Lorene Fabian** (*Amicus*) supported Motion 18. She said: thank you, President, for allowing me to get in on this debate. I will be very brief but it is a different point. I am very much involved in training at the workplace as a tutor delivering trade union courses. On a daily basis I meet shop stewards, health and safety representatives and union learning representatives and I never cease to be amazed by their tenacity in defending their members. However, there is a downside in that we do not see enough black or Asian shop stewards. There are some, of course, but not in the numbers there should be.

If there is a more serious downside then that is the disturbing and alarming attitude of some -- not many, just a few, some -- of the shop stewards who attend the courses I deliver. We often experience shop stewards who demand to be called English, which always throws up a red light with me. Then they often take the opportunity -- not an opportunity I have given them -- to launch into the condemnation of asylum seekers and economic migrants. Invariably this begins with "I am not racist but..." Their usual chant is that these people do not give and as you know -- I know, we know -- that is not true. People who come to these shores do give: they bring a richness of culture and often a richness of political understanding. We must give our shop stewards the confidence, the knowledge and the skills, to combat these spurious arguments based around Islamophobia.

I have also been asked to mention that I am an Amicus delegate on the Southern and Eastern Region of SERTUC. We strongly agree with the points made by the CWU in their amendment and the SERTUC Executive committee have agreed a wide ranging anti-racist, anti-fascist action plan. The BNP held 4.85 per cent in the London Assembly two years ago; a bit further and they could gain a seat in 2008. This must not happen. So campaigning against all forms of racism by the TUC is essential to turn the tide back. I had loads more to say but I will stop there. Please support.

**The President:** I call the General Secretary to exercise the right of reply on behalf of the General Council.

**Brendan Barber** (*General Secretary*) said in reply:

Thank you, Gloria. I just wanted to respond very briefly to the point that Mary Page made in the debate where she highlighted the use of the word 'lifestyle' in

the fifth paragraph and made important points about sexual orientation. Just to say the intention of the drafters was not to see the word 'lifestyle' as specifically relating to the issue of sexual orientation. I think we all recognise that there are a range of different issues, styles of dress, cultural practices, where there is a danger that there can be misunderstandings and tensions, and the fifth paragraph was really intended to relate to those issues and the importance of working together to develop as much mutual understanding of those issues as possible and to minimise potential tensions.

The previous paragraph to which I referred in my opening remarks and the very strong joint commitment to the promotion of equality and the elimination of all forms of harassment, prejudice, and unfair discrimination, was drafted with some of the concerns in mind that I know members of the LGBT community have very strongly felt.

So, with that reassurance and I think this is a textual point, I think Mary said that the sentiment of the statement was strongly supported. I hope that will mean that the statement will be supported by Congress as a whole.

\* *Motion 18 was CARRIED.*

\* *Joint Statement with the Muslim Council of Britain was ADOPTED.*

### **Deportation of children of asylum seekers**

**The President:** I call Motion 19, Deportation of children of asylum seekers. The General Council support the motion.

**Charles Ward** (*Association of Educational Psychologists*) moved Motion 19. He said: President, Congress, the AEP celebrates diversity. The AEP values the variety and talent that individuals who have come to our country bring with them. The AEP takes pride in Britain as a place that many people choose to come to as a safe haven. We cannot, though, always be proud of the way they are treated when they get here. This motion is not about adults who are seeking asylum, it does not seek to comment on the rights and wrongs of deportation, but it is very specifically about children. It is very specifically about very vulnerable and very damaged children. It is also about your children and grandchildren who befriend them.

'Every Child Matters', the Government's agenda states that we all should put children first. "The needs of the child," it says, "are paramount." Every Child Matters is not just about education and social care, Every Child Matters is supposed to run right across all services and through every arm of government but not in the deportation regulations, it seems.

Let me give you a real example of a young girl from Bosnia whose parents sought asylum here during the Balkan crisis. I will call her Nadia. On arrival they were despatched to one of our northern cities. They were lucky because dad found work and the children settled into school and soon made friends. How wonderful that must have been for a young primary school child, dragged from her home, probably with witnessing friends and relatives being killed, abused, or tortured, snatched away from friends and family and not knowing what would happen to them, escaping across Europe goodness knows how, constantly in fear of capture. She would have been unable to understand why everything dear to her and all her points of stability had disappeared overnight to be replaced by a life of hiding, looking over her shoulder in terror of being seen or heard.

Here in Britain she found a community that valued her, and her family. She found friends to play with and a good school with a caring environment where she

could develop again free from fear. Nadia suffered great emotional and psychological stress but had found a new home where she could be nurtured. She had found new friends and built a new life. Then, her father's right to stay in Britain was lost when his asylum application failed. The whole family were thrown back into a life of anxiety and fear of the late night knock on the door and that late night knock on the door still happens. One can only wonder at the levels of resilience that adults need to cope in such circumstances so what must it do to children. In most cases I suggest it will lead to permanent psychological and emotional damage.

In this case it was not only Nadia who was affected. Her friends at school suffered too. They worried about losing Nadia without a reason they could understand. One of their best friends, it seemed, might disappear suddenly overnight without a chance to say goodbye, even. You can imagine the whole well-ordered life of school was disrupted. Nadia's school was experiencing a form of bereavement. We know from research that detachment, separation and loss, the sudden loss of a significant person in a child's life can lead to psychological difficulties, unusual anti-social behaviour, and problems of adjustment throughout life. We also know that a close bereavement in teenage years usually leads to the bereaved child achieving one grade less, on average, in their GCSE results.

Congress, there is a wealth of research that tells us that all children need emotional and psychological security to encourage them to thrive and develop as well adjusted adults. Most children seeking asylum have already suffered the most appalling experiences almost by definition they will suffer post traumatic stress disorder. They almost certainly will have separation or loss difficulties, in many cases significant bereavement. What they need is a stable, caring home in a stable, caring environment. If the needs of children are paramount to this government and to our society, then our immigration laws must ensure that every child does matter. Nadia and children like her may be asylum seekers but they are children and people first.

**Margaret Dunbar** (*UNISON*) seconded Motion 19.

She said: Comrades, we were shocked in Scotland at the inhumanity of dragging children away and separating them from their parents in these dawn raids. Some of these children have spent the best part of their lives in Scotland and you can only imagine the horror of it all. Because of that UNISON did something about it. This Children (Scotland) Act states that the welfare of the child must be paramount. However, immigration law compromises this and so does the Government's reservation from UN convention rights of the child when it comes to asylum seeker children.

UNISON Scotland embarked on a range of discussions with the Scottish Executive about the role of our members in social work alongside other professionals in ensuring that the welfare of the child remains paramount. We welcomed the announcement of the former immigration minister about the measure agreed with the Scottish Executive which did take on board UNISON's points. Those were, a lead professional identified for every asylum seeker family who will coordinate an early assessment of the needs of the children; greater scrutiny of the removal process and enhanced disclosure checks for immigration staff in contact with children, positive steps, comrades, but only the start of the process.

We have also established links with the various organisations in Scotland and our activists and the social work issue group have worked with the British Association of Social Workers to provide a joint guide for social care staff, which will be launched soon.

Our members do not want to put a human face to the total inhumane act, this practice, and we hope that the guide will help the existing laws that keep children's rights and welfare at the top of the agenda, and we pledge our support to them for that. Please support this motion.

**Sharon Hutchinson** (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) supported Motion 19. She said: Congress, asylum seekers are the most demonised group of people in our society. They are also some of the most vulnerable. I want to use this opportunity to place on record our support for one particular family, but they are one of many.

Arif Dar and his family fled Pakistan because of political repression and settled in Bootle, Merseyside. He became a pillar of the local community and a parent governor at his local school where two of his daughters passed their A levels. In May 2005 he was snatched by immigration officers and held in a detention centre after his application for asylum was refused. Following a campaign by the local community his Labour MP and the *Liverpool Echo*, he was allowed out pending appeal. Despite being given leave to prepare an appeal until June, the immigration services raided the Dar family home in April, raided at 7 o'clock in the morning when they were told their bail had been cancelled, their gas and electricity turned off and they were given 30 minutes to pack one bag.

Mr Dar and his wife, Nuzhat, who has suffered a nervous breakdown since, and four of their five daughters, were deported back into the hands of the military regime they fled. In May the *Liverpool Echo* reported that Mr Dar was detained by the military police, interrogated and found bruised on the roadside after being thrown out of a moving car. Since their return to Pakistan Mr Dar has been repeatedly assaulted and intimidated by the security forces and his children have also been assaulted. Mr Dar's eldest daughter remains on the run in England, a fugitive who was guilty of no crime.

Congress, the Dar family have support from the local community, their local council and their local MP. The immigration service refuses to listen. The Government refuse to listen. The Home Office refuse to block deportation procedures. This is the harsh human reality of a government pandering to the junta of a right wing racist press. This is the disgraceful reality of the demonisation of asylum seekers. It should not be tolerated in a civilised society. This motion is about highlighting this human reality and the impact on children. Congress, please support the Dar family and please support this motion.

**The President:** Congress, we are now somewhat behind on the agenda and I will call the NUT, the last speaker in this debate.

**Nina Franklin** (*National Union of Teachers*) supported Motion 19. She said: The NUT welcomes this motion from the AEP which provides a means for those of us working in the education sector to express concern about the damaging impact of deportation or the threat of deportation on a child's education, health and wellbeing. It is also a way to campaign for the rights of families threatened or faced with deportation. The NUT nationally and locally receives many requests for support for local anti-deportation campaigns. In supporting such campaigns the NUT emphasises the importance of the human right of children of asylum seekers to education.

In Bristol where my local branch has made great links with the local Defend the Asylum Seekers Campaign, we have been active in supporting both individual

family campaigns and in trying to raise awareness of this issue by all the usual methods. I would say that when we are asked to support a campaign the request comes very often from school staff and head teachers, and from teachers and pupils within a school.

This is an example of one of the cases which we know about. It concerns a child called Brian who when he was four years old Bolivian soldiers who had come to arrest his father for his political activism shot dead Brian's grandfather in front of him. Brian was so traumatised that it took him two years to smile again. Brian's family then faced deportation after their final appeal for asylum had failed. Brian is one of the many children of failed asylum seekers whose education and safety comes to an abrupt end. It is not uncommon for asylum-seeking children to be taken out of lessons and deported in their school uniforms. The trauma and fear experienced by children of failed asylum seekers is often supplemented with a sense of helplessness within their school communities. As a teacher recounted: "Last week I had to explain to a class of Year 3 children that Angelica, who had been with them since reception, had gone away without being able to say goodbye, and was never coming back." This was like dealing with a death in class. There are no easy words of comfort and I could not even say she was safe."

The NUT believes that it is never in the best interests of children or young people to remove them from their school or community against their will. That hundreds of people suffer this fate every year in Britain is a national scandal and a disgrace. Across Europe campaigns are springing up to end the disgrace of removing children from their school and we urge everyone to meet with these other campaigns and coordinate with them.

At the launch in September 2003 of the Green Paper, *Every Child Matters*, which itself was a response to the death in 2000 of Victoria Climbié, aged 8, Charles Clarke said the Green Paper is ...(*bell rang*)... Why should asylum seekers' children be excluded from the same provisions as other children? Please support this motion.

\* *Motion 19 was CARRIED*

### Presentation of Equality Awards

**The President:** Congress, now we come to the presentation of the TUC Equality Awards. The Equality Awards take place every two years alternating with the TUC Equality Audit. The awards are designed to encourage unions to take action based on the findings of the equality audits. There are two categories of award, an award for a union with fewer than 100,000 members and an award for a union with more than 100,000 members. I now invite Claude Moraes, Member of the European Parliament, former member of the TUC Equal Rights Department, and one of this year's judges, to present the awards.

**Claude Moraes, MEP** said: Thank you very much, Gloria. President, Congress, it is with great pride that I stand here today to present these Equality Awards. Today we have heard in a debate a quite powerful debate for somebody like me coming from the outside to listen to you, a powerful debate about reaching out to vulnerable workers, making tough decisions, whether it was Brendan's comments earlier on the theme to reach out to vulnerable workers, Billy's comments on anti-racism, individual comments about asylum seekers, whether it was any of that, the presence of Dr Abdul Bari here today, do not underestimate the significance of all of these issues and all of these events in creating a very strong context for the delivery of this Equality Award today.

It is with particular pride that I present these awards today with my fellow judges, Judy McKnight and Mark Fysh. I was a member of the first TUC Equal Rights Department 16 years ago. Please do not start calculating my age but I was reasonably young at the time. In that 16 years I know that the commitment of the TUC, the commitment of individual trade unions, faces that I can see around this hall, has been significant. We can be very self-critical of ourselves at times but I think it is important at this moment to recognise the advances there have been in equalities within the movement. I am talking about the day-to-day tough choices that are made and collective bargaining, and the individual representation of often very vulnerable people at branch level, and so on. I think all of that is what this award recognises and rewards.

Congress, on behalf of my fellow judges I want now to turn to those awards. The first award is for unions with over 100,000 members. As part of a campaign to improve rights for working parents and carers USDAW made better leave and pay, together with flexible working, central elements of its collective bargaining strategy. As a result of this campaign half of USDAW's members are now covered by agreements with improved rights for parents and carers. In a union with a majority female membership this is a significant step forward for equality. It is my pleasure now to invite Jo Bird, USDAW's acting equalities officer, to accept the award on behalf of the union.

*(Presentation made amidst applause)*

**Jo Bird** (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*) said: Thank you. On behalf of USDAW I am delighted to receive the TUC Equality Award. The Award recognises USDAW's Supporting Parents and Carers Campaign. The aim of the campaign was to raise the profile of the needs of working parents and carers, urge employers to improve time-off arrangements, and lobby government for improvements to statutory rights. The campaign was only made possible with the full support and backing of the union's General Secretary, John Hannett, and the Executive Council. Nor would it have been possible without the efforts of women activists in USDAW. They ensured that this issue became a priority for the union. USDAW reps also played a crucial role in ensuring the campaign became a workplace campaign. Finally, Ruth Cross deserves a special mention. Ruth is currently on maternity leave. Ruth was the person as Equalities Officer who coordinated and shaped the campaign. She was the person who came up with many of the campaign's ideas, and with the campaign plan. The position of working parents and carers remains a key issue for all trade unions today. USDAW's Supporting Parents and Carers Campaign is set to continue. For as long as these issues remain a priority for our members, they will remain a priority for the union.

Congress, on behalf of USDAW it is with great pleasure that I accept this award. Thank you. *(Applause)*

**Claude Moraes** said: Congress, the photographer is just telling me, "Do the same for the next one." You can see that I am not used to accepting awards or actually holding one.

Congress, now the award for unions with less than 100,000 members. In 2004 BECTU had a project called Move on Up, which won the TUC Equality Award for its flair and imagination in helping black workers trying to break into a highly competitive world. BECTU has continued this good work, organising Move on Up North, which took place in Manchester this year. The union provided much needed advice and support to black and ethnic minority professionals through 400

individual meetings with key film and television executives. I have great pleasure in asking Suresh Chawla to accept the award on behalf of BECTU. Suresh is joined by Tunji Akinsehina from the BECTU Black Members' Committee and Janice Turner, organiser of the Move on Up programme.

**Suresh Chawla** (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*) said: President, sisters and brothers, as Chair of BECTU's Black Members Committee it gives me great pleasure to accept this award on behalf of our union and it is an honour to chair such a dynamic committee. Over the last two years we have seen some really positive changes, both within our union and the industries that we represent. BECTU itself has gone from having an all-white NEC to now being 20 percent BME. Our ongoing Move on Up programme has been a real success. Our latest event next month sees 170 BME radio professionals in one-to-one meetings with dozens of top executives. By the end of that event we will have made 1,500 introductions between BME professionals and industry executives in radio, film, and television leading to hundreds of invaluable contacts often resulting in commissions, placements, and ultimately jobs. Like in many industries BME professionals in the media and entertainment sectors are sick and tired of the employment barriers caused by the whole 'jobs for the boys', nepotism, who you know, environment. The numbers of BME professionals within our areas is ridiculously low. This is appalling since so much of our sector is based around London and the South East. We decided that unless we take a proactive stand to breaking down these age old barriers, then nothing will change and thanks to Skill Set, the BBC, and the NUJ, for their support on this.

Despite the significant inroads we have made there is still a hell of a lot of work to be done. As the trade union movement we still have a very high mountain to climb if we are truly to embrace diversity. Just looking around this conference centre today the shortage of black and ethnic minority delegates reflects that. It is statistically proven that BME workers are more likely to be union members than white workers and yet we are still faced with a shortage of reps and activists, particularly at the top levels of trade unions.

At BECTU we have embarked on a black leadership initiative to encourage and increase diversity at all levels of the union from branch committees to sub-divisional committees, divisional committees, and the NEC. We urge all our fellow delegates here today to take a look at your own unions and ask yourself one question: is your union doing enough to promote diversity? Only when the answer is, yes, can we really start to say that as a movement we are truly representative of our members. Let us all work together to make that happen. Thank you.

*(Presentation made)*

**Claude Moraes** said: In closing this ceremony I just want to say again that as someone who 16 years ago worked at the TUC and it is a source of great pride to me that Gloria Mills is now President of the TUC and that Kay Carberry who was my then head of department is here on the platform beside her. Having worked at the TUC you never forget your nervousness in front of your superiors. Brendan, I just want you to note that I may be getting on but I still remember where I have come from.

Congress, let me end by congratulating all the nominees, all the winners, very deserving winners, that we all three of the judges have found to be deserving, and let me encourage all trade unions a year after this to ensure that they too will strive to win this award



and to maintain the mainstream equality work of the trade union movement. Thank you.

**The President:** Thank you, Claude.

### European Migration

**The President:** I now call the General Secretary to move the General Council statement on European Migration.

**Brendan Barber** (*General Secretary*) said: President, Congress, in the global economy it is not only capital that has become more mobile, labour has certainly become more mobile too. The implications are huge. For the countries who supply labour, for the countries who attract it, and for the workers themselves. Indeed, this General Council's statement on Migration comes at a critical time with Bulgaria and Romania due to join the European Union either next year or the year after, migration has shot to the top of the political agenda here in the UK. This summer we have seen a media debate where the facts have often been wildly distorted. Tabloid scaremongering has gone into overdrive, with migrant workers accused of flooding into our country, swamping our public services, stealing our jobs, and dragging down wages. It is up to us to restore some balance and to get a better deal for workers who are included amongst the most vulnerable in our society, workers who contribute far more to the national coffers than they take out.

The General Council's position is clear, we believe that the expansion of the European Union is good for Britain and good for Europe; an expanding market means more jobs and more growth. We support freedom of movement for workers and oppose restrictions, including restrictions on Bulgarian and Romanian workers. We believe that the only way to avoid existing terms and conditions being undercut is to prevent the exploitation of migrant workers through stronger employment rights for everyone, more effective enforcement, and better union organisation. Whether they are from Warsaw or Warrington, Bucharest, or Barnsley, the TUC wants all workers to be treated with respect, treated equally and paid a decent wage. Across the country there are already many tremendous examples of unions reaching out to migrant workers and winning a better deal. Some of that work is described in the General Council Statement before Congress.

Our challenge now is to take this work on to the next level. It is clear that we need a fundamental change of thinking by government, too. There is a better way of doing things and for answers our government should look to Ireland. Ireland has welcomed an even bigger proportion of migrants to their workforce. As here, it has caused some strain but their response was to set up social partner talks between government, employers, and unions, on how best to respond. Now they have recognised that this means that they need to step up employment protection and enforcement, flexibility without exploitation. Ours is a prosperous country with a strong economy that has proved remarkably resilient to economic shocks. We do not need to build our economy on the back of an invisible army of exploited workers. As the fourth largest economy in the world, we can and must do better. Congress, I commend the General Council statement to you.

### Migrant Workers

**The President:** I now call Composite Motion 2: the General Council supports the motion.

**Kirsty Devaney** (*Educational Institute of Scotland*) moved Composite Motion 2. She said: I move this with the risk of a little repetition, I am afraid, but in doing so I feel I have to use some quite old-fashioned language. In fact, there is one particular word which has gone right out of fashion today and I will come back to that. My inclination to use old-fashioned language is because the current wave of migrant workers is only a continuation of what has been going on for centuries and I am willing to bet a fair number of people in this hall can trace their roots back to migrant workers who came to Britain for the same reason people are coming today, and face prejudice and local tensions in much the same way.

Some of our forward looking newspapers whip up, as they always have done, anti-immigrant feeling. *The Sun* the other week carried a picture of people outside the British Embassy in Bulgaria laying siege to the building suggesting they were intending to work in the UK when Bulgaria joins the EU. Most of them in fact wanted to come to Britain on holiday, and have any of you ever tried to renew your passport here in the summer and not encountered a long queue?

Some old-fashioned employers are going in for some good old-fashioned exploitation, not to mention forced labour, trafficking, and a little straightforward abuse which was highlighted in the TUC's 2003 report, *Overworked, Underpaid, and Over Here*, but maybe that is why old-fashioned millionaires are millionaires.

What is the situation? It is not clear and simple, nothing ever is, but here are a few figures. What kind of numbers are we actually talking about? Since 2004 when eight Eastern and Central European countries joined the EU just about half a million workers, mainly from Poland, have come to Britain. Who are they? They are mostly young, 82 percent under 35, and mostly male, 58 percent. What do they do? Mostly essential but low-paid jobs as process operatives, or factory workers, fish processing or fruit and vegetables, they are in warehouses or packing plants, kitchens and catering establishments, but there are also bus drivers, bakers, dentists, teachers, lawyers, and in the latest figures 15 circus performers; maybe they can juggle the figures!

For migrant workers coming from outside the EU just over quarter of a million were granted extensions of leave to remain in the UK. So where do they go, all over Britain but seasonal working means East Anglia has 27 percent of agricultural workers, whilst it is no surprise that London swallows up nearly 30 percent of those working in hospitality.

One feature of the current situation that is different from previous migrations is that a lot of the workers do not mean to say for ever and if you look at the figures for long-term migrants, which is defined as four years or more, the result is actually a net loss.

What should we as trade unionists do? The motion urges the General Council to encourage its affiliated trade unions to recruit migrant workers, to publicise the benefits of migrant workers nationally and locally, challenge myths about migrant workers and make public any exploitation, the issues of education, language, and racism must be seriously tackled, local services sometimes are undoubtedly under pressure and they must be supported.

The recent joint statement from the Home Office, the CBI and the TUC, is to be welcomed as a way to manage migration to ensure that migrant workers can make their contribution and maximise their own potential at work and in the community. To return to the old-fashioned word I wanted to use, it is something you do not often hear now in political circles but it expresses what workers are wherever they come from, and thanks to our migrant worker with a tray of canapés at one of the receptions last night I know that

in Polish the word is 'towarysz' and in English it is 'comrade'. Migrant workers are quite simply our comrades and as trade unionists we should treat them as such. Support the motion, comrades.

**Paddy Lillis** (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*) seconded Composite Motion 2. He said: Colleagues, my union began to prioritise the issue of migrant workers about two years ago primarily through our involvement with the gangmaster licensing authority. As one of the TUC's representatives involved in the drawing up of the gangmaster licence provision it became increasingly clear to us that this represented one of the most vital issues to face our members. Our first priority, colleagues, was to establish the extent of migrant workers in our sectors. We initially surveyed our companies in the food manufacturing and were astonished at the results. We then extended the survey into our distribution sectors and from those findings we developed policies which led to our signing a new agreement with a leading food manufacturer, unique to industrial relations and to migrant workers.

Our aim was to get the company to establish an inclusive working environment. This meant the company acknowledging that the employment of migrant workers carries responsibilities over and above the normal contractual relationship. This they did in providing services such as producing company literature in another language, providing translators and, for matters such as grievance hearings and through training and lifelong learning, to make the union accessible. To recruit migrant workers as a union, we completely revamped our foreign language leaflets and now have recruitment literature setting out the benefits of USDAW membership in over 35 different languages. We have also reaffirmed links with Solidarnosc through one of our Polish USDAW activists and this provided excellent opportunities to establish real concrete links with trade unions in other countries, especially as many migrant workers do come from trade union cultures and backgrounds. Our survey also indicated, colleagues, that there was not a great deal of resistance from established workforces towards migrant workers and racism was not a huge issue. There was a general understanding amongst our activists that we live in a globalised workforce and protection for all was the real issue, but we need constantly to assess our campaigns as migrant working continues to throw up unique employment and cultural issues we have not needed to address before, to ensure that we continue to fight the exploitation of migrant workers by recruiting, organising, and supporting them. Please support.

**Wilf Flynn** (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) supported Composite Motion 2.

He said: I want to take the opportunity to try in three minutes to explain how a report came about from UCATT, the TUC, and Northumbria University. It is fair to say in the northern region we have diverse communities but we do not generally find them on a construction site, they work in other walks of life. Once we came across groups here and there of Polish construction workers the UCATT organiser, and I would pay tribute to the work Dave Short has done on behalf of UCATT, pulled the situation together and held a meeting in Newcastle's Polish Club of some 50-60 construction workers. One thing they had in common, they all came to Britain through agencies from Poland, generally run by the same man and wife. What they also had in common they did not have bank accounts so it was difficult to try and get them on to direct debit. In the construction industry that is a sensible way to recruit, check off, you are here today and gone tomorrow. You will not be surprised to know that

when they did get their wages the rent was the first thing that was taken off. In case you are wondering what kind of accommodation it was, if you can imagine multiple occupancies in one building, that was the accommodation and that was where the rent went.

Dave has met on more than one occasion intimidation not by the lads on the tools but by the minder that happens to stand nearby. On more than one occasion we have had to go to the main employer and say, "In this day and age this is not the tactic that should be on building sites," and in fairness we have had the minders more than once removed. But we still are dealing with the situation as regards the company that employ. We walk a fine line as well because we have to have Polish workers on British building sites with the skills to do the job. What we cannot have is a situation where the employer decides whether they have the skills or they do not and terminates the employment of British workers to replace them with low-paid migrant workers. That has not happened in the northern region, as far as I am aware. So far as UCATT is concerned we do all we can to make sure it does not happen and any one that carries out physical violence UCATT will see them in the courts.

**Peter Jones** (*University and College Union*) supported Composite Motion 2. He said: In the UCU we see first hand the effects of education cuts in the adult sector. Quite often further education has meant a lead on to higher education and for many people it was a second chance. Now, for some people, there is no chance. Adult education cuts disproportionately affect the hidden one in five. Without the opportunity to access language and other training migrant workers and their families are doubly disadvantaged. As trade unionists we have always sought to protect workers from bosses. We have always sought to protect the weak from the strong. We have always fought for the rights of migrant workers to receive training and it is part of our long and proud heritage. Individually, collectively, through branches, through regions, and in the trades councils, we have in the past and we should now stand up and be counted. We should be saying we welcome migrant workers and their families. We should seek to dispel the myths about migrant workers and we should seek to highlight their positive contributions to our communities.

Comrades, we should go further, we should encourage our members, our branches, and our regions, and indeed our communities, positively to reach out the hand of friendship, to give real meaning and meaningful support to show what it is like to be a worker in Britain. For those migrant workers we should reach out that hand more than once and we should give help where it is really needed, direct with the migrant workers, befriending and making it a positive and practical reality. That is what will make the difference. We need to do what we do best, we need to do what we do best more than once again and again, we need to fight bigotry and continue that fight. We need to fight racism and continue that fight. We need to fight exploitation and continue that fight. For as we all know, comrades, an injury to one of us is an injury to all of us. Thank you.

**Vi Carr** (*Bakers, Food and Allied Workers' Union*) supported Composite Motion 2, and particularly paragraph 10. She said: Diversity is an important issue; that is why we made it our major Union Modernisation Fund bid, the idea being to find out what the problems are and where they are, and hopefully how to deal with them. We surveyed all of our members, the results of which we would be happy to share with the movement. A good idea was to ask people what they wanted rather than tell them. We would rather like to thank the Government for the setting up of the UMF,

therefore making it possible for a small union like ours. We need to take the whole issue forward. In order to do this, this motion is asking Congress House to provide affiliates with a template of generic leaflets in multiple languages, thus assessing those smaller affiliates with translation costs. Then it will be up to the affiliates to produce leaflets and distribute at their own costs. This composite will enable the movement to respond to workers from accession states in the UK and offering them the protection of trade unions which is the aim of all of us. Please support. Thank you.

**Jack Dromey** (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) supported Composite Motion 2.

He said: Today we speak up for migrant workers. We are on their side. We are on their side against the brain-dead boot boys of the BNP, against the svelte voice of xenophobia, Migration Watch, against the employers who exploit them and against politicians who fail to support them. Our economy needs migration. We welcome migrant workers to our shores. They enrich our lives. Our movement has been built on successive waves of migration, the Jews, the Irish, like my mum and dad, the Afro-Caribbeans, the Indians, and the Pakistanis. Our task now is to organise the newly arrived, organising all workers around equal treatment of all workers, combating that dangerous trend, and Paddy is right, that we are seeing in food and agriculture, of a growing two-tier labour market with fewer and fewer workers directly employed on better conditions of employment, workers who have been here for generations, and more and more agency workers, most of them migrant workers who are newly arrived, employed on poorer conditions of employment, creating division, damaging social cohesion. The response of the trade unions has to be to organise all workers around equal treatment. The employers have to accept their responsibility, so too have the supermarkets. They can no longer wash their hands of responsibility. They are responsible for driving down labour costs along the supply chain and that in turn is leading to that two-tier labour market.

The Government, too, must act now in introducing legislation here in Britain for equal treatment of all workers, agency and the directly employed. Government must give leadership. Politicians should stop pandering to tabloid prejudice. The Prime Minister is absolutely wrong to bracket together crime, migration, and security. Politicians need to be brave. They need to be brave for one other reason, there is a third tier here in Britain, that half a million undocumented workers, good men and women, many of them our members, pillars of our society, performing essential functions in the workplace, cooking, cleaning, catering, they are the most vulnerable, they live in a twilight world of exploitation, fearing arrest in the night as many of our members have been arrested. It would be quite simply impractical and immoral to try and hunt down half a million workers, many of whom have been here for many years, with a view to deporting them.

Finally, what shames our country and scars our society is modern day slavery. Brendan is right, this is a moral cause and we have a sacred duty to stand up for migrant workers. I support.

**Patricia Rowland** (*UNISON*) supported Composite Motion 2. She said: You will see quoted in the TUC's *Vulnerable Workers* booklet produced for this Congress that migrant workers are the most vulnerable of all vulnerable workers. Unfortunately, Congress, this continues to be the case but we can do something about this and, thankfully, many unions are. In Scotland UNISON recently set up a refugee learning

project, funded by the Home Office, which gave the refugees work experience in health, social care and related fields, supported and mentored by UNISON's stewards. This was part of UNISON in Scotland Opposing Racism action plan being undertaken with refugees in the Glasgow area. These refugees are provided with a personal development plan, training and work placements that include mentoring and support from trained lifelong learning advisors, with travel and childcare costs funded to enable the widest possible participation. At the end of the first year the project was given a five-star beacon award by the Home Office and has secured a year's extension of funding so that it can be rolled out to other trade unions across the UK. We also have a very active overseas network giving support to migrant health workers in Scotland. These initiatives show the achievements that can be brought by the proactive collaboration between unions and migrant groups. Scotland has an acute interest in migrant workers as for years it has suffered from trickling emigration. In the last couple of years Scotland has encouraged and enjoyed an influx of people from many of the former countries of Eastern Europe who have come to pay taxes and contribute to the economy and the ethnic and cultural diversity of our society. They are not the scroungers and criminals the prejudiced would have you believe. If the economic strength of Scotland is to improve further more new Scots are needed and this is recognised by the Scottish Executive through its 'fresh talent' policy. Unfortunately, this policy seems at odds with the UK government being hell bent on meeting targets to discourage immigrants and forcefully remove them from those seeking asylum or coming in by the back door. We as trade unionists have a duty to these workers, welcome them, and fight for them to be granted the same legal rights as every other worker in the UK. We need to recruit them into our unions and ensure by all means possible that they are aware of their rights as members of our society. Please support.

\* *Composite Motion 2 was CARRIED.*

\* *The General Council statement on European Migration was ADOPTED.*

**The President:** Delegates, I wish to point out that we are unable to take Motions 14, 15 and 16, and paragraphs 2.1 to 2.12. We will re-schedule these items for debate later in the week and we will advise you accordingly as to when this debate will be taken. That concludes this afternoon's business. Congress is now adjourned until 9.30 tomorrow morning and please be here on time so that we can make a prompt start. Thank you very much. Enjoy the evening.

*(Congress adjourned at 5.30 p.m.)*

**SECOND DAY: TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 12<sup>TH</sup>  
MORNING SESSION**

*(Congress re-assembled at 9.30 a.m.)*

**The President:** Good morning, delegates. May I remind delegation leaders that the ballot for the General Council takes place this morning. Ballot papers should be collected from the desk outside the TUC stand situated in the ground floor exhibition area, just inside the main front doors of the Brighton Centre. Ballot papers will only be provided in exchange for the official delegate form. Please note that the ballot closes at 12 noon today.

There is also the traditional delegates' questionnaire on your tables. Please return these to the Open University stall, Stand 98. This is your chance not just to comment on Congress but also to win some glittering Open University prizes. We are grateful for their sponsorship.

**General Purposes Committee Report**

**Annette Mansell-Green** (*General Purposes Committee*) said: I am pleased to report to you on behalf of the General Purposes Committee that Composite Motion 16 on Palestine in the name of the FBU has been approved, to be seconded by EIS and supported by TSSA. Copies of the Composite Motion will be placed on your seats at lunchtime and the President will indicate when it is hoped it can be taken. Thank you.

**The President:** Thank you, Annette. Congress, I intend to take Composite Motion 16 on Palestine in the international debate on Wednesday afternoon.

**Address by Sir Jeremy Beecham (Labour Party fraternal delegate)**

**The President:** This year's Labour Party fraternal delegate to Congress is the Chair of the Labour Party National Executive Committee, Sir Jeremy Beecham. As a councillor in Newcastle upon Tyne, former Chair of the Local Government Association, and solicitor specialising in industrial injury claims, Sir Jeremy has worked closely with trade unions over many years. Sir Jeremy, you are very welcome to our Congress and we look forward to hearing what you have to say to us.

**Sir Jeremy Beecham:** Thank you, Gloria. In view of the current litigation on equal pay and equal value, it is very generous of Congress to invite a North East solicitor to address this momentous occasion, but then we all have our cross to bear.

It is exactly 100 years ago since a new force burst on the political scene destined to play a significant role in the shaping of British society. Born of the union between the trades union movement, the ILP and socialist societies, the Parliamentary Labour Party achieved 100 years ago its first success with the repeal of the infamous Taff Vale Judgment, the first of a long catalogue of achievements in the interests of working people and their families promoted by that enduring partnership.

Now, as with any partnership there have been over the years, and still are, disagreements about the pace and sometimes even the direction of travel, but the best evidence of the value of that partnership lies in the persistent efforts of our political opponents to disrupt it. Currently, this takes the form of a naked attempt by the new cuddly Conservative Party to interfere with and destroy the constitutional relationship of trades unions affiliated to the Labour Party and to disrupt the financial links between us.

Their spokesman complains that trades unions have contributed £50m to the Party over a five-year period. Given that there are 2.5m affiliated members all of whom are entitled to participate in the working of the Party, that amounts to a contribution of 8 pence per week per head, and this is described by the Tories as "the elephant in the room" on the issue of party funding.

You may have seen a photograph in last week's papers of a garlanded and glum Sir Anthony Bamford, who is the boss of JCB, alongside David Cameron seeking to garner votes by doing world tours, meeting famous people, and in this case going to India. Sir Anthony Bamford has donated a million pounds through a very secretive body called the Midlands Industrial Council, a sort of alcoholics anonymous for Tory Party donors, to David Cameron. I would rather have an elephant in the room than a JCB in the garage. While we are talking about JCBs I do hope that Labour MPs will stop trying to use one on the Labour Party.

The current review of party funding must not interfere with Labour's century old trade union link or restrict the rights of trade unionists to support collectively the political party of their choice. The link with Labour, after all, has fostered huge social advances. People are inclined to forget just how much has been achieved even in these last few years with the Minimum Wage going up again next week, extra protection for part-time workers and people on strike, 250,000 modern apprenticeships with another 50,000 on the way, 2.5 million more people in work than in 1997, many of them in the public services, the virtual end of youth unemployment through the New Deal, a corporate manslaughter bill, and most recently action to overturn that unjust court decision affecting sufferers from mesothelioma. I hope that can be extended, by the way, to those who suffer from pleural plaques, equally the victims of a recent court decision. These are among the fruits of our partnership, most recently enshrined in the Warwick Agreement.

Let us not forget the great strides made in the realm of family life and work/life balance, with maternity and paternity leave, bank holidays, holidays with pay, and much improved childcare and child tax credits lifting hundreds of thousands of kids out of poverty.

The Tories' principal contribution to work/life balance when they were in power, of course, was to impose enforced leisure on 3 million unemployed men and women. They have consistently voted against all the legislation to help working people, which they now claim belatedly to support in principle, in principle but never in practice.

Progress has also been made in compensating the victims of failed pension schemes and Labour is committed to restoring the earnings link in pension provision.

Of course, there is still much to do in the realm of pensions and welfare reform, increasing the skills of our workforce and making our economy more competitive. In a mixed economy, public, private, and third sectors can learn from one another, but we need to be hard-headed about this. Productivity in the UK remains stubbornly low. It does not follow, therefore, that the private sector model could or should be translated to the public sector, or the public services, and it is outrageous that under-performance in the private sector seems to be grotesquely well rewarded with massive salaries, share options, and pay-offs.

I have to say as a Newcastle United supporter I have become used to the spectacle of excessive non-performance related pay!

The public service ethos, and I stress public service is not simply public sector ethos, has much to offer and it is time that local government and other parts of the public sector got off the back foot and began either on

their own or in partnership with other sectors to compete in the provision of services across a much wider range than traditionally we have been pursuing but, of course, on a level playing field. Here the trades union movement has a significant role to play in recruiting and representing members in all sectors, just as in the global economy they need to work with their counterparts abroad to protect workers from exploitation.

Brendan Barber's speech yesterday about the protection of the vulnerable employee has a key message: we must not allow right wing extremists or the tabloid press to inflame people against migrant workers but, equally, we must not allow unscrupulous employers to undermine responsible employers or the pay and conditions of workers generally. We therefore need more rigorous inspection and enforcement of the minimum wage, gangmaster and health and safety legislation, and indeed measured increases in the minimum wage to achieve these objectives.

Mention of that international dimension reminds me that it is exactly 70 years ago this summer since the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War which inspired so many in the trade union and labour movement to fight for freedom. Amongst a few survivors of the international brigades we can of course number that giant of the trade union and labour movement, Jack Jones.

Amongst much else the Spanish Civil War produced a poem by W. H. Auden in which he asks, "What's your proposal to build the just city?" Building the just city was then, is now, and always will be the shared aim of the trades union movement and the Labour Party, and I am delighted to bring the Party's fraternal greetings to Congress today. I will be equally delighted by an outbreak of fraternity in the Labour Party itself.  
(*Applause*)

**The President:** Thank you, Sir Jeremy. I am delighted to present to you the Gold Badge of Congress.  
(*Presentation made amidst applause*)

### Energy and climate change

**The President:** Congress, we now have a special feature on energy and the environment: first, we have a short extract from Al Gore's new film on climate change and a clip of Brendan interviewing Al Gore on why the environment matters to trade unionists. Then I will call on the Rt. Hon. David Miliband, Secretary of State for the Environment, to address us. We will then have a panel discussion with questions from the floor.

After that I will take Motion 59, Motion 60, and Composite Motion 13 in a single debate.

First we will see a short video with former US Vice President, Al Gore, who was in London last week to promote his new film, *An Inconvenient Truth*. Brendan met him to ask what role trade unions can play in combating climate change. (*Short video shown to Congress*)

**The President:** Delegates, "the challenge on climate change is bigger and more immediate and will result in more human suffering than most people realise". Those are not my words but those of our guest speaker this morning, the Secretary of State for the Environment, David Miliband. David, may I invite you to address Congress.

**The Rt. Hon. David Miliband, Secretary of State for the Environment** said: Thank you very much, Gloria, and thank you, too, for your leadership of the TUC over the last year. I do not know about you but it is a funny old world where Al Gore is making films and

Arnold Schwarzenegger is making policy, but climate change does bring odd bed fellows together, and it is also a funny old world where Brendan Barber is doing an impression of Jeremy Paxman. Stick to the day job, Brendan, would be my advice!

I am here for a very simple reason. I believe that social and economic change needs trade unions. If you think back for the last 100 years, I do not think there has been a single movement for social and economic change, either at home or abroad, that has not needed trade unions. If you think about the campaign for the vote, if you think about the campaign for the NHS, if you think about the campaign for civil rights, for the minimum wage, they have all needed trade unions. Internationally, campaigns against global poverty and against apartheid have needed trade unions.

My view is that we need trade unions again not just to continue those campaigns but for the challenge that we have made for ourselves, the challenge of climate change. I think we need trade unions because we need your values, we need your internationalism, and as Brendan and I saw on a visit to a really inspiring partnership between Amicus and Legal & General in Hove this morning, we need your partnership with business.

I know that you are debating big issues this week. You are debating manufacturing, you are debating pensions, you are debating public services, but I want to put to you, to argue with you, to plead with you, really, that climate change is not an add-on to your agenda, it is central to it. You are concerned with the lives and the quality of life of ordinary working people and they will be the first, and they are being the first, to be hit by climate change. You are concerned with the balance of power in society and climate change requires us to change the balance of power in society. I think you believe, too, in a humane model of industrial society and climate change requires us to humanise that model of industrial society.

Today, in the ten minutes I have before we have the question and answer session, I just want to go through three things: one, the science, which is worse and more immediate than I realised when I took up my post four or five months ago; second, how we approach the challenge; third, what we can do together, what government can do, what business can do and, critically, what I believe the trade unions can do as well.

As I say, I am new to this job, I have followed the environment issues for the last 10 or 15 years but not in enough detail, and, frankly, the science is more alarming and more immediate than people realise. I want to give you five facts.

The first is that we are in a unique situation. If you look at the amount of carbon dioxide that has been pumped into the atmosphere, it was because of the burning, above all, of fossil fuels. Some people say that we have had this amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere before. They are right; 740,000 years ago there was the same amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere as there is today. This is a unique problem in human history.

Second, the fact that we have this carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, along with other gases, greenhouse gases, is warming up our planet and it is warming up our planet so that the ten warmest years in Britain in the last 150 years have all been in the last 15 years. When people say to you there is something funny about the weather, they are right.

Third, life in our own country is changing. Spring comes ten days earlier than it did 30 years ago. The estimates for flood insurance are going through the roof. That is not an accident but part of climate change.

Fourth, all of the science now agrees that the sort of climate change we have seen, nearly one degree increase in the temperature of the planet, is likely to go up to two, three, four, or even five degrees unless it is checked. That means the sort of collapse of the ice sheets that you saw in Al Gore's film is going to happen not just in parts of Greenland or parts of Antarctica, it is going to happen all over.

The fifth and final point, this does not just affect nature, this is going to affect us as people. We all know, I think, that in 2003 it was very hot in Europe but what we did not know is that there were 30,000 extra deaths in Europe than usual; they were the old and the vulnerable, precisely the people the labour movement represents. Two-thirds of the world's population live within 80km of a coast. Those are the sort of figures you have seen there on the film about the floods that we face.

What I would say to you is that 100 years ago the crisis in our economic system was a social crisis and the symbol of that crisis was child labour. Today it is an environmental crisis and I think that the symbol is the ice sheets that you saw collapsing in that film. Just as people were exploited 100 years ago with disastrous consequences, so natural resources are being exploited today also with disastrous consequences.

How do we approach it? I think there are three principles that we have to apply. First, we have to do more with less. If you go and see Al Gore's film you will see him show a statistic which I think is the most shocking, really, and the most obvious but the most surprising. When he was born in 1950 there were 2 billion people on the planet. He says in his film that if he lives the average lifespan of an average American, by the time he dies there will be 9 billion people on the planet. We need to do more to feed and support those people, but we need to do it with less in terms of environmental resources. The good news is that actually we know how to do it. We know that the hybrid car is able to be energy efficient at a massively greater level than your traditional car. We know the building regulations already in our country have improved energy efficiency by 40 percent. We know that the triple AAA rated appliances that you can see when you go out to buy a dishwasher or a washing machine are already themselves nearly 50 percent more efficient than the next grade down. We should take credit for what has happened. Our country is one of only three in Europe that is meeting its Kyoto commitments but while we should be proud of that we have to up our game, I think, in a fundamental way. That is why the second principle is important. We need a fundamental shift in the way we create energy, from energy that is created from emitting high levels of carbon dioxide to those that are low.

If you look at the TUC's energy policy it supports precisely the sort of balanced approach that the Government have tried to outline in the energy review. It means renewable energy sources such as wind, solar, and wave power. It does mean investment in carbon capture and storage to make coal a low carbon fuel. Tomorrow I will be signing a memorandum of understanding with the Chinese government for a near zero coal emissions project that will produce the world's first near zero coal-fired power stations in the world.

I also say this, if we are faced with a choice after all the investment in renewables, after all the investment in energy efficiency and carbon capture and storage, if we have the choice between nuclear power which emits zero carbon and oil and gas-fired power which emits a lot of carbon, then the environmental requirement is to choose a contribution from nuclear power.

The third principle that we have to put in place is that we have, for the first time in our country, to put a

value on nature. In a way environmental pollution is the unacceptable face of capitalism, it is the unacceptable face of free markets. It is the pollution of what we hold in common, our atmosphere, because no one takes responsibility for the consequences.

The answer is not to abolish markets but to make them work by ensuring that we factor the cost of carbon into everything we do in the same way that we factor in the cost of labour. I think this is where politics comes in and where trade unions have to come in as well. This is not my problem, it is not your problem, it is not the problem of business, it is the problem that we all have and we all have to play our role. Government have to start, we have to work at an international level with the EU, with China, with India, with the United States, to forge an international consensus on stabilising climate change.

I know you have had debates about Europe in Congress before and you cannot be an environmentalist if you are also a Euro-sceptic. The environment is Europe's issue. It is around Europe and across Europe that we have the power of 450 million people to negotiate and make a difference to our environment. Government have to set the domestic policies but they have also to set an example by their own actions. We have committed to make government carbon neutral. That is the equivalent of taking 800,000 cars off the road in terms of the effect on the environment. We are also committed to use government procurement to deliver from £150bn the Government spends. Second, we need businesses and the public sector to play their part, right through from the production of goods to their disposal. We have outlined how we can do that. The responsibility is not just for government and for businesses, it is also for individuals; 44 percent of all of our emissions come from the electricity, the gas, and the transport that we use every day.

Government can help. They can provide the information, the advice, the support, the labelling – you are going to hear from the Carbon Trust in a minute in the panel discussion about how they can help individuals make a difference – but government, let us be honest, is only going to go part of the way. We need the people who are trusted in our community to make a difference, too; that means voluntary organisations as well as trade unions.

I was thinking about this. Each of us on average is responsible for four tonnes of carbon emissions every year. There are nearly 7 million members of the TUC. That means cumulatively TUC membership is responsible for nearly 30 million tonnes of carbon emissions every year. That is over 5 percent of the total carbon emissions in our country. That means you have potentially major purchase on the way in which we respond to the climate change challenge. Your commitment to create a thousand climate change champions in the workplace is very welcome. We saw this morning, Brendan and I, how it can affect the human resource policies of your company, as well as the bottom line of the company. Your commitment to make the TUC carbon neutral is genuine leadership by example, which is welcome, and your contribution through the Trade Union Sustainable Development Advisory Committee, of which Paul Noon is a co-chair, is also very very welcome but I have to come here and say we need more.

If you are representing members in the private sector, energy is vital not just for the planet but for the competitiveness of your business when oil is selling for \$70 a barrel. If you are representing teachers or support staff in schools, or local council workers, you have the opportunity to help lead your community. If you work and represent people in the voluntary sector you can lead the campaigns that will make a difference. I think in a way it is a simple pledge that we have to make to each other, that each year we will

reduce our carbon footprint, each year we will measure how much progress we are making, and each year we will redouble our efforts both as employees and as consumers.

I just want to finish on the following thought of the voluntary organisation, the WWF, which used to be the World Wildlife Fund for Nature. It has calculated that in Britain we are consuming natural resources as if there were three planets, not one. It is the environmental equivalent of childhood obesity, eating too much and making yourself sick as a result. The challenge that they put to us and that we want to respond to is how we move from living and working as if there were three planets for us to rely on when in fact there is only one planet that we share together. They call it one planet living, one planet environmentally secure, socially just, economically prosperous, not just for some people in some parts of the world but for all people in all parts of the world.

I think this is a project of social and economic change. It is a project that benefits ordinary people. It is a project that challenges vested interests. It is a project that calls for a different sort of politics, a different sort of relationship between central government and individuals, a different sort of relationship between central government and local communities and local government, and a different sort of relationship between us and the rest of the world. I think it is the sort of project, actually, that the trade unions were invented to be part of. It is a project that motivates millions of people around our country and I think with your help it can motivate millions more. Thank you very much indeed. (*Applause*)

#### Question and Answer Session

**The President:** Thank you very much, David, for those stirring and challenging words. You have given us much to think about.

Now, on the panel we have the Secretary of State for the Environment, the Rt. Hon. David Miliband, we also have as fellow panellists Tom Delay, Chief Executive of the Carbon Trust, and ensuring that the debate focuses on trade union issues, Paul Noon, General Secretary of Prospect and Chair of the Trade Union Sustainable Development Advisory Committee, and facilitating questions from delegates and responses from the panel will be Frances O'Grady, Deputy General Secretary. Over to you, Frances.

**Frances O'Grady (Deputy General Secretary):** Thank you very much, President. Thank you, David, for that interesting speech. David, your government is famous for setting targets. How about setting a target for jobs? Are you going to set a target for a number of new jobs to be created in new renewable energy industries with the kind of active industrial strategy that this Congress has been talking about.

**David Miliband:** It is interesting. There are now 400,000 people working in environmental industries in the UK at the moment, which I think is up (and Tom can correct me) from about 250,000 about 10 years ago. If you compare that to the rest of Europe, for example, Germany has 1.5m people working in environmental technology industries. I think the right approach, though, is to say what is the target for environmental improvement? Then, what is the jobs benefit, the output benefit, the productivity benefit, the wealth benefit? We have a very very clear target. It is that we need to reduce by 60 percent carbon dioxide emissions from the 1990 levels by 2050 and that is supported by the TUC, the CBI, and a range of the voluntary organisations. That is the minimum we have to do. I think it is from there that you derive your

drive on jobs, on productivity, and the rest of it. Certainly, the idea that you choose an environmental future or an economic future is completely wrong, the most successful societies in the future are going to be those that are environmentally at the cutting edge.

**Frances O'Grady:** Thanks, David. David also mentioned in his speech a reference to climate change champions or what I think we would call environmental workplace reps. The Minister was posing a challenge to us, Paul, to train up and get more reps out there in the workplace on this agenda. Are we up for it?

**Paul Noon:** Absolutely, Frances, and I say that not just on the basis of wishful thinking but on the basis of examples which we know are there. This booklet, *The First Steps to a Greener Workplace*, which has been distributed to all delegates and we can provide more copies, it is all recyclable, sets out some practical examples of what unions have done: my own union, the Scottish Agricultural Colleges, PCS in Her Majesty's Revenue & Customs, unions working together at United Utilities, projects which have been successful, which have involved members and which have as an end result, meant that less carbon has been released. We know that we can do it. Our challenge now is to bring about the step change.

It is great that Tom Delay is here from the Carbon Trust. Using the Carbon Trust grant we plan to build on what we have already done to increase the action that is there. We know this is a trade union issue because people working individually ask, can they make a difference, but working together (and again in the booklet we set out practical actions that can be taken) working collectively, which is what trade unions are all about, we know we really can make a difference. This is natural territory for us. We have always been, as unions, concerned about health and safety, and welfare in the workplace, so it fits in exactly with what we do.

I must say also there is an element of self-interest in it, too, because we want to connect with the new generation of environmentally aware young people entering the workplace. In all the studies we have done, all the surveys we have done, they say, or 8 out of 10 of them say, unions should be doing more in this territory. They are right. We have to acknowledge that, and we want to do more.

We are using the Carbon Trust grant, and it is great that there is support. We have been able to appoint Caroline Molloy as the Project Manager for that. Working with Philip Pearson and TUSDAC unions we want to step up, as the Minister was saying, at Congress House itself so that Congress House goes green, and maybe a little red at the same time. We accept that challenge in Congress House and in the regions as well. We want to make every workplace a green workplace. We are up for the challenge.

**Frances O'Grady:** Brilliant. Thank you, Paul. Tom, we have already acknowledged the support of the Carbon Trust, and thank you for that, for the trades union movement's work on the green workplace project this year. One of the issues about this agenda for me is that sometimes it rivals the trades union movement in terms of jargon. I would find it really helpful for somebody to explain to me what it means in plain language when the Minister was posing us the challenge of being 'carbon neutral'. What would that mean for the TUC?

**Tom Delay:** Thank you very much, Frances. I will do my best to put it in plain language as it is a complex

concept, and with a couple of very simple words to articulate it. To put it in that context I think it might help if we started to think not about the carbon emissions but more about the products and services that we all consume. The reality is that everything we do comes with a carbon price tag. It is the carbon embedded in the materials, in the manufacturing, and the delivery of the products and services that we all enjoy. We know that the UK emits about 164 million tonnes of carbon a year. We take into account the import/export balance, and we know that we consume in the products and services that we all enjoy about 176 million tonnes of carbon a year. That is the UK's carbon footprint, taking into account imported goods. Recreation and leisure would account for about 32m tonnes of that, space heating about 24m tonnes of carbon, commuting is about 13m tonnes of carbon, and so on and so on.

To try and understand what that means to organisations and businesses today let us just think of a typical organisation that we would work with as part of our efforts to reduce the UK's carbon footprint. The first step is to reduce energy waste; in doing so you can save a huge amount of money. We know that the Northern TUC manufacturing survey highlighted the high cost of energy as the number one issue at the moment and we recognise that there are significant steps that we can make not only to reduce carbon emissions but also to save money and improve competitiveness. Last year we identified carbon savings of almost 4 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>, but those represent cost savings of £390m per annum. That is very very significant, indeed. It is also where we are rolling up our sleeves and getting stuck in with organisations - and we worked with over 5,000 organisations on site last year - and that is where the work that we are doing with the TUC kicks in. That is step one.

Step two would be to look down the supply chain and up to the consumer to identify further opportunities to save carbon. I am going to take just one very simple example, a newspaper. Most of the carbon embedded in a newspaper comes in the manufacture of the paper pulp and if that is from a source that has hydro-electrical nuclear power behind it, maybe from Scandinavia, it will be a low carbon newspaper. If you manufacture the paper pulp in this country the chances are it will be a higher carbon newspaper because it will be reliant on electricity that has been generated from gas or from coal. So, if you actually want to reduce the carbon embedded in your newspaper, either find a clean energy source or move to online publishing as a different business model.

We believe there are huge growth opportunities in new low carbon technologies and we are actively engaged and investing in a number of areas where we believe the UK has a truly advantaged position. In particular, we would look to offshore wind, wave, and tidal stream technologies where there is a real opportunity to leverage the UK's experience in the oil and gas sector going forward. This really could create thousands of jobs and very significant export markets for UK businesses.

Step three, and only step three, if you have really done steps one and two, is to buy carbon offsets to cover the cost of your remaining emissions. You pay for projects, usually in the developing world, that will reduce carbon emissions by an equivalent amount to your emissions at home in the UK and you become carbon neutral. The issue is that, if you chose to offset all your current emissions, you will pay more while not directly reducing emissions here in the UK. If you do steps one and two first, you will save money, you will improve competitiveness, and you will have a direct impact on UK emissions. That is what we are here to help you do.

**Frances O'Grady:** Excellent; thank you, Tom. This is the moment when we get to put questions to the panel from delegates and first up is Dawn Nelson from the Transport and General Workers' Union. I think Dawn has a question for us about greening the workplace.

**Dawn Nelson** (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) said: As trade unionists we want to get involved in promoting greening the workplace but if the Government wants action across workplaces in the country there will need to be legal rights for the trade union reps who are already under pressure dealing with a whole range of other issues in the workplace. What is the Government planning to do about rights for reps on the environment?

**Frances O'Grady:** Okay, I think that is one for David.

**David Miliband:** The responsibility for this is obviously with the Department for Trade and Industry, Dawn, and they have a review going on at the moment, as you know from other discussions about rights at work, on how the agenda that has been taken forward over the last 10 years should be taken further forward. That is, if you like, the official answer to your question, it is being looked at in a serious way as part of a wider discussion about the role of trade unions at work.

What I would say to you as well, though, is that if you are looking for common ground between an employer and employees, whether they be in the public sector, the private sector or the voluntary sector, this is a way to serve the interests of employees and the interests of the company or the organisation at the same time. The people that we met today, the workplace reps from Amicus at Legal & General, were talking about how they had been involved in the design of a new building which is going to be low energy use, so it is going to save the company money. They have special facilities for cycling and transport to work, and car-sharing schemes, which benefit them, they said. They have a whole new drive on recycling at work and they have found common ground.

Brendan can offer his reflections but my sense was that it had brought unions and managers together in two ways, one, they had a common interest but, two, they have found a way to reach out to employees and potential members. So, the union reps were saying, "This allows us to talk to the next generation of employees." The personnel department were saying, "This allows us to motivate them." So, I think there is a win-win there.

**Frances O'Grady:** Thanks, David. David has a point, perhaps, Paul. After all, we have more and more green agreements being signed, we have more environmental reps in workplaces around the country, why do we need legal rights?

**Paul Noon:** The question is, if it is indeed, and we agree with this, the biggest challenge we face it needs a proportionate response. I had been hoping that David would come ready with an announcement for us today. We have had lots of discussions with ministers who recognise it is an issue and I hope we come to a sensible conclusion on it. The truth is that it is not enough to rely only on those employers who will do this voluntarily because we hear example after example of representatives and of shop stewards who want to go on some of the excellent courses that we can provide but are prevented from doing so by their employers. It may be the case that their employers are



short-sighted but it needs that further injection really to make it happen.

**Frances O'Grady:** Tom, why should business bother? Why should it be bothered about trade union or worker involvement on this agenda?

**Tom Delay:** I think dealing with the issue of the environment and tackling climate change is a business opportunity in its own right and almost all forward-looking businesses recognise that. There are opportunities to make significant savings and increase productivity but there are also opportunities to move into new markets and create new jobs. I have to say if we look at business, and we work with almost a third of the FTSE 100 but also thousands of smaller businesses, and look at the roll call they come from all sectors of the economy but they tend to be the leading companies in each of those sectors. I think that is quite interesting. We tend to be working with leading businesses. Our job is to move those who are maybe not quite so advanced in their thinking into the same place.

**Frances O'Grady:** Thank you. I want to move us on to energy prices. I know that is an area of key concern and we have had a couple of questions on this area from Helen Rose from UNISON and George Bloom from Amicus. I am going to take those two questions together. So, we have Rose and Bloom. We could open a garden centre!

**Helen Rose (UNISON)** said: Thank you, Frances. The privatisation of the electricity industry has resulted in record increases in energy costs which are having a devastating effect on British industry and increasing the number suffering from fuel poverty. I would like to ask, does the panel think that the market is the right framework to deliver secure and affordable energy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century?

**George Bloom (Amicus)** said: Good morning. Rising energy prices seem likely to frustrate the Government's ambition to end fuel poverty by 2010. Since 2003 electricity prices have risen by well over 11 percent. What is the Government going to do to lower the energy prices?

**Frances O'Grady:** I think you can get the mood of the Congress on that one, David.

**David Miliband:** I thought that was a question for Paul, actually.

**Frances O'Grady:** Is the energy market working in the UK interest?

**David Miliband:** The price of oil is not set for the UK, it is a global price. Since 2003, George is absolutely right, the price of oil has rocketed up to \$70 a barrel. That has a paradoxical effect. On the one hand it makes all sorts of renewable energy suddenly much more competitive. That is very very significant from an environmental point of view. The downside, obviously, is that it is more expensive for people and it is a special problem for those who are fuel poor.

I would say two things about that. One, we respond by raising the efforts we put into energy efficiency. What we find is that it is often the poorest households that have the least loft insulation and other cavity wall insulation that makes a difference. That is why we

have the Warm Front programme and why the Chancellor doubled in the last budget the amount of investment that is going into tackling energy inefficiency. Actually, we help the environment and we help the poor if we can do that.

I think the second thing to say is that the winter fuel allowance, which was brought in, I think, in 1998 and at the time energy prices were not what they are today, is not counted in the statistics for measuring fuel poverty but actually its time has come. That £200 now arrives and 17,000 of my constituents, who are of pensionable age and receive the winter fuel allowance in South Shields, can now see that that actually is a direct contribution to the energy costs issue.

So, I think this is an international issue, not just a UK issue, and whatever views you have about whether you should have a nationalised industry or a privatised industry in the UK you are going to face the same price of energy, or of oil. What you have to do is diversify and that is why the wind power argument has become so important, it is why the tidal issues that Tom was talking about are so important as well.

**Frances O'Grady:** Is that change happening fast enough? We have 100,000 manufacturing jobs a year going. Is the change going to happen fast enough or have we got to tackle issues around the market and around prices now?

**David Miliband:** It is not happening fast enough. That is evidently true. 4 percent of our energy comes from renewables at the moment rather than the 15-20 percent that is in other European countries. What do we do about that? We have taken some pretty dramatic steps. Number one, we have said we want 20 percent of our energy to come from renewables and we will have a legislative obligation for that to happen. Second, we are spending a billion pounds a year subsidising renewable technology and its development. A lot of these technologies are not yet ready for production. We are putting our money where our mouth is in a way that no other European country is doing. The third thing we have to do, and the energy review highlighted this, is we have to find a way of making sure that the barriers that still exist to renewable energy are actually overcome. In other European countries if you have solar panels on your house you can sell any excess electricity back into the grid. Those are the sorts of things we are looking at. You can do that whatever the ownership structure.

**Frances O'Grady:** Tom, Paul, have we been left exposed? There is faith in the free market approach but is it leaving us vulnerable?

**Tom Delay:** I think I would just like to make one point of fact, really, which is that although energy prices have risen very dramatically over the last two to three years with dramatic consequences for UK manufacturing and business at large, and of course for the consumer now paying in many cases the second or third price increase they have seen in the last year, we had seen before that through a period of privatisation but also liberalisation wholesale energy prices coming down for a decade. Really, we have seen a gradual reduction in prices over the previous decade followed by a very sharp increase. That has taken, I think, a lot of people by surprise. It is a very unpleasant surprise to face up to. All I can say is that it is a thumping great incentive, really, to tackle the issue of energy waste.

**Frances O'Grady:** Paul?

**Paul Noon:** I think there are problems because of the limits of the market in dealing with these issues. Left to its own devices the market will take a short-term view based upon the highest level of reward and not necessarily a longer-term environmental view. It is how the Government intervenes and regulates the market where we believe more needs to be done. I do think, and it connects with this, there is also a bit of an issue about the Government's enthusiasm for choice which is connected with markets. This is an area, really, where if we are to make the sort of progress we want, then frankly the choice of individuals, the choice of companies, the choice of industry in what they do has to be limited and they cannot have the choice to pollute.

**Frances O'Grady:** Thank you, Paul. Let us move on to some of the positive opportunities about renewables. We are in Brighton with the sun, waves and tides. Kath Owen from the GMB has a question on this area.

**Kath Owen (GMB):** The UK has a world lead in marine technology and wave and tidal power. We have already exported plants to Portugal, yet we see no full-scale plants in the UK. The same is true of clean coal. Again, we have no full-scale plants. The green economy should be providing UK manufacturing. When will the Government support the development of full-scale wave power and clean coal plants in the UK?

**Frances O'Grady:** I think you can understand that there is a fair bit of frustration, David. The UK is famous for developing the technologies but are we going to reap the employment benefits?

**David Miliband:** Let me say what we are doing and, Kath, you can come back and tell me whether you think it is enough. In respect of renewables overall, a billion pounds a year in subsidy is going to make sure that we develop the renewables of the future. We have a highly regulated market. There is subsidy going in precisely there. But you raised two specific issues about investment and I can give you answers directly on those two questions.

The first is about tidal. In the Orkneys there is a fantastic tidal power station that is working effectively. The Government have got something called the Marine Renewables Fund and £50 million is in that. We have just announced a £4.5 million project in Cornwall which replicates precisely the Portuguese example that you were talking about. In your question you said that Portugal has developed this wave and tidal power. We are putting £4.5 million into what is called 'The Hub' in Cornwall, which is doing precisely that, so that is a direct answer to what you are saying.

In respect of clean coal, £20 million, which is a very considerable sum, is being invested directly into developing the carbon capture and clean coal ideas. I hope you do not feel that we are doing nothing, because we are doing quite a lot. If you think there are ways that we can push harder and further, we are happy to look at them, but this is something which is massively in the Government's interest as well as in the country's interest and we are seeking to do it as fast as we can.

**Frances O'Grady:** I do not know whether there is anyone from the NUM or BACM-TEAM in the hall who wants to follow-up on that particular issue around clean coal? Kath is coming back.

**Kath Owen:** Scotland is the home of marine technology but the UK free market is not buying it.

**David Miliband:** This is a really interesting point because we have massive amounts of wind power, potentially, in Scotland and why is it not being developed? It is not because of a lack of private sector investment, not because of a lack of public sector investment but because it is blocked in the planning system. Essentially -- when you get into the telephone numbers you lose them -- there is the equivalent of 20 per cent of our total energy supply stuck in the planning system. Nine gigawatts -- that is a lot of energy -- or 20 per cent of our energy supply is stuck in the planning system because people object to having wind turbines because they do not like them, and there is a clash between landscape and the environment in producing low carbon energy. I have a very clear view about this. You cannot be for renewable energy and against wind power. It just does not make sense. We have to make sure that we have a planning system which serves the majority interest rather than the minority interest.

**Tom Delay:** The one point I would make as a general comment is that all these technologies are very new. The trouble with all low carbon technologies is that they tend to be pretty expensive at the moment. The job is to bring them down in cost as quickly as we can so that they become part of the affordable energy mix in the UK. I am delighted that the wave technology that is at the moment being deployed in Portugal is actually being manufactured here in the UK and we are an investor in that company. I am pleased we are. The reality is that we need to get more investment into these very early stage technologies to help them come down in cost. It does not help, I have to say, when the planning system and grid issues prevent the deployment of these very early units to companies which are too small to bear five years delay as part of their planning cycle. They have to be able to get on with it fast.

**Frances O'Grady:** What about other obstacles, Paul? What about skills? Are we skills ready for the opportunities here?

**Paul Noon:** We are in danger, actually, of losing some of the skills that we need. There has been insufficient focus on skills. I know it is something that the Learning and Skills Council is picking up and something that some of the sector skills councils are picking up, but more needs to be done.

**Frances O'Grady:** I am going to move on to a question about public transport. I call Piscilla from the RMT. From the trade union perspective, we see transport as a key dimension of this agenda.

**Priscilla Dada (National Union of Rail Maritime and Transport Workers):** My union has just commissioned an opinion poll which shows that two-thirds of people believe that more money should be invested in public transport for the sake of the environment. If we are serious about greening Britain and reducing harmful emissions, then railways must be a key part of the solution. So is it not time that we took some serious steps towards making rail travel attractive, affordable and available to all?

**Frances O'Grady:** Minister, is there any announcement you want to make on that?

**David Miliband:** I was absolutely dreading a question about transport because I do not know anything about transport. Do we need to make the railways affordable and attractive? Yes. How do we do it? I do not know.

I would say that only 6 per cent of journeys are done by train and buses, especially if you think about my part of the world, which is the north-east, they are a huge part of the transport mix. What Alistair Darling said and what Douglas Alexander is taking forward is that the system of bus regulation in London is completely different from the system of bus regulation elsewhere in the country, and they have said they want to try and get into why the bus system is working in London and why it is not working elsewhere. I think that that is, actually, an important step forward.

**Frances O'Grady:** So did you come on the train today?

**David Miliband:** I certainly did come on the train and I am going back on the train. We are transport friendly in that regard, but I do not bicycle to work with a fleet of Humvees behind me like David Cameron.

**Frances O'Grady:** Tom, did you come by train?

**Tom Delay:** I did come by train and I am going back by train.

**Frances O'Grady:** Paul?

**Paul Noon:** I came by car because I was playing cricket for the TUC, unsuccessfully, but I am going back by train.

Let me comment on the question, although I am perhaps not best placed to comment as the general secretary of a union which represents air traffic controllers. Even in that position we see the case for civil air transport, but it is a bit daft that some of the delegates here from Scotland will have flown down because it is cheaper to fly than it is to get the train in many cases. Again, however the market is structured, it really does need to be done in such a way that the polluting effect of air travel is taken fully into account.

**Frances O'Grady:** Brilliant. I am afraid that our time is up. I think we have had some excellent questions and pretty good answers. Everything that we have heard today in this session confirms the urgency of the challenge of the dangers of climate change, and the potential contribution that we can all make as trade union representatives.

I am sure that you will want to join me in thanking our panel for giving their time to be with us today as well as our questioners. Thank you. To Tom Delay, the chief executive of the Carbon Trust, Paul Noon from the General Council and TUSDAC and, of course, our distinguished guest speaker, David Miliband, thank you. *(Applause)*

### Energy Prices

**The President:** I now call the Energy and Environment debate. I call Motion 59, Energy Prices. The General Council supports the Motion.

**Doug Rooney** (*Amicus*) moved Motion 59.

He said: It is, perhaps, apposite that this resolution should be taken after the panel discussion which we have just listened to and was so welcomed.

Unfortunately, this particular resolution outlines the plight of a particular section of manufacturing, in particular, which we have to address if we are going to realise some of the aspirations and some of the objectives which were discussed during that panel discussion.

Energy prices are the DNA of any modern economy. They affect the quality of life of every single person. In the NHS, in a hospital, it would be far better to spend less on energy bills and divert that money to the well-being of the patients and the care of the staff. It would be far better if we were able, and always able, to assist the old and vulnerable people who cannot afford to pay the high energy bills, particularly during the winter months, and who can sometime die as a result. Because of that very discussion, it is also true to say that, as a result of climate change, the old and vulnerable are also disadvantaged during the summer months, so it is an all-year round problem now because of the heat. As was indicated, in 2003 many people died in France and in other continental countries because they were not able to defend themselves against the extreme heat.

The other group which is hit very hard is the competitiveness of business. We can only be competitive in the business area if we have good competitive energy prices. It is important because, to realise some of the objectives we aspire to achieve, we have to fund that increased energy cost from our manufacturing and business base and to do that we need energy prices which are competitive. Many of the resolutions to follow will go into the Energy Review and deal with the medium to long-term. However, this resolution addresses the immediate plight of the heavy-user industries and the manufacturing industry in general.

Manufacturing industry now generates less than 15 percent of the UK's GDP. This compares with 20 percent in 1998. It employs, however, 14 percent of the UK's entire workforce and accounts for £150 billion worth of exports. Let me give you an example. Within the manufacturing sector is the chemical sector, and it is one of the UK's largest sectors, with a turnover of £50 billion. It grew more than five times faster than the average of all industries over the past decade. It is now one of Britain's top exporters. However, this industry, together with the metals industry, including aluminium, food and drink and any of the heavy user industries, and other industries as well, has now been faced with massive electricity costs. Electricity at the moment is approximately £58 per megawatt hour compared with Germany and France where it is £39 per megawatt hour. That is to give just one illustrative example of the difference in the non-level playing field which exists in the European market.

Therefore, we are at an extreme disadvantage. The boards of these companies cannot live with increases in prices in the order of 30 percent - 50 percent. If I bring it direct to the coalface and take you to a place called Markinch in Fife, Scotland, to a company called Tullis Russell which employs about 300 people, that company cannot compete with these energy prices. It is a paper pulp manufacturing company but it is a company that is suffering because it cannot meet these energy price demands, and nor can it afford to invest in plant which could, perhaps, be green, such as biomass, because it is being hit so hard. Anglesey Aluminium is another company that has been hit very hard. Only last week an announcement was made of a company in Sheffield going into receivership. So if we do not take immediate action to deal with the plight of the manufacturing sector as it is being affected, we will kill the means by which we can realise some of the objectives we aspire to achieve in terms of improvements to the quality of life of the members who we represent.

So it is with that knowledge, colleagues, that I wish to make my contribution because the government at the moment ----

**The President:** Can you wind-up, please.

**Doug Rooney:** ---- are impervious to intelligent reasoning and, indeed, we must get the message across as best we can. Hopefully, you will support this resolution.

**Malcolm Sage (GMB)** in seconding the motion, said: The UK energy prices doubled last year, causing problems for domestic consumers with an extra quarter-of-a-million being plunged back into fuel poverty. However, it has also caused chaos in all sections of the economy, requiring a review of spending plans in companies across Britain. They have been shedding jobs and abandoning investment programmes due to price rises and the possibility of losing supplies. No sector is immune. Food and retail distribution costs have gone up dramatically. Local authority spending has risen on lighting and heating schools and libraries, and, of course, street lighting. The extra money being spent on these facilities is coming from other services.

The Government may have put another £20 billion into the NHS but it will not do the patients any good if this money has to be spent on increased gas and electricity bills rather than patient care.

Why are we in this mess? It would seem that the UK preference for market forces during the past 20 years may have resulted in lower energy prices for the UK than the rest of Europe. However, we have used our own North Sea gas reserves at a much faster rate than was ever envisaged and, of course, just like any kid with a packet of sweets, they have now all gone. So now we have to import gas at a higher price from North Africa, the ex-USSR and Norway, with the price of our energy becoming much higher than the rest of Europe.

Why have we been suffering far worse than Europe? One reason is that Europe decided not to embrace the free market. They still believe in security and continuity of supply, not just the price. This Government must improve continuity and security of supply in the UK with increased storage capacity and more encouragement to companies and the public sector to introduce energy saving measures altering the basis of interruptible contracts so that a minimum amount of energy is supplied to prevent damage to plant and equipment.

Finally, we would like to commend the TUC for joining with the employers' organisation to lobby the Government on this issue. However, the lobbying must continue until we have continuity and security of supply in the UK again. The GMB seconds. Please support.

### Energy Review

**John Evans (Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen)** moved Motion 60.

He said: It seems that the issue of energy has not been out of the media, whether it has been due to the increases in energy costs for householders, with increased bills due to higher oil prices or, as we saw last winter and this summer, the threats of power cuts due to increased levels of demand. This is why we agree with the premises of the energy review that not only must climate change be tackled but the UK must also ensure that it has secure energy supplies at affordable

prices so that the poorest in society are not adversely affected by changes in energy charges.

Already we have seen prices jumping by between 10 percent - 20 percent for householders, but have we seen wages or pensions increased by the same amount? To take the new price hikes into account, we must ensure that the poorest in society are protected and are not left to shiver or swelter in the heat. We believe it is time for the Government to do more to promote the use of renewable resources such as solar, wind and water power in combination with other initiatives.

For far too long the government has ignored the issue of renewable energy. Renewables have been dismissed as unable to make a real difference to the energy question. That is simply not true. Much of the disinformation has come from the oil industry, who are always keen to protect their profits and to ensure that no real investment is made in renewable energy in order to protect their position and safeguard their future profits. Renewable sources can make a difference to our energy needs. We need to be forward-thinking, we need to harness new technology, such as solar panels at train stations to power announcement boards and platform indicators. These may seem small initiatives but small initiatives can and will make a difference.

We must also look at the issue of clean coal technology. For many years people have dismissed coal as not an environmentally friendly option and this is simply not true. When it comes to clean coal technology, this form of technology must be integral to the Energy Review. We need a framework for energy in the UK that ensures a diverse portfolio of power generation. We need to eliminate all barriers to clean coal power plants and we need an emissions trading scheme that provides incentives for investment in coal, and we need to develop a legal infrastructure for CO2 capture and storage within the UK.

Clean coal is the only short-term solution to the urgent environmental, economic and supply challenges the UK is facing. What we need now is clean coal at the heart of a diverse energy policy in conjunction with renewable forms of energy. A framework for clean coal in Britain would see the Government maintaining the present number of coal-fired power stations in the UK, gradually converting them to clean technology and setting a green example for the rest of the world to follow.

The report says that home grown clean coal would meet all the objectives of the recently published Energy White Paper. Adapting clean coal technology would strengthen the security of energy in the UK, put the country on a lower carbon path and make fuel more affordable.

Transport is one of the worst polluters in the UK environment. We welcome the Government's target of 10 percent of transport fuel to be from renewable sources by 2015, but this does not go far enough. We should be looking to a figure of nearly 20 percent. If we are going to achieve the Kyoto levels and beyond. This could be achieved by working towards an integrated transport policy with a fully joined-up public transport system. However, to increase this figure further, the UK rail network should be fully electrified. This would be the first step to ensuring cuts in transport pollution and would be a great benefit to the environment and to the travelling public within the UK. I call on Congress to support the motion.

**Vicky Knight (Fire Brigades' Union)** seconded the motion.

She said: Congress, the motion, as it stands, unlike other motions, that welcome the review solely notes the review. It is positive noting, Congress, not

negative, but like ASLEF we in the Fire Brigades' Union firmly believe that progress must be made. To be frank, we have heard a great deal of rhetoric from governments regarding renewable energy but not too much in the way of solid action. We have no well-thought through government plan, based on proper consultation with those who know best. To date we have not witnessed a government-led plan based on government control and government investment.

Congress understands that many people and organisations believe that wind will provide energy, and it will, but there is a very powerful rural anti-windmill lobby already in place, and how much will windmills provide compared with other more reliable sources? The same could be said for solar. It helps but it is not a main contender. So all these things should go into the pot but are they the main components to a proper and well-thought out energy plan to sustain the nation's manufacturing base, to ensure that the wheels of industry keep turning and what we produce gets moved from place to place without damaging the environment.

It is also important to ensure that we keep people warm in the winter and cool in the summer without power cuts and with continuity of supply. Therefore, the question of climate change is extremely important for a vast number of reasons. Our role as trade unionists is to see that climate stability is on the agenda, not just for us but for those who follow us, for our children and our children's children. We need a responsible and stable approach to the Government's review.

The policy of Congress is clear. Congress supports clean coal technology and Congress supports the re-nationalisation of the coal industry for the good of all. So why was so little of the Government's Energy Review attributed to coal? As I understand it, it was just a few pages, compared with the Government's comments on other sources of energy? It is a concern and a worry that when this island has hundreds of years of coal reserves, with deep seam coal ready to be dug by coalminers, it begs the question of why is there not a pit opening programme rather than a pit closure programme? Why aren't government resources flooding into the pit opening programme when the price of gas is rocketing?

Congress also notes that transport is one of the worst polluters. We said before that there should be an integrated transport policy to cover all forms of transport, rail and road included. Congress, let us demand that our policies are met by government even, dare I say it, with the proposed change of leadership in government. The rail unions have, for a long time, called for the complete electrification of the whole of our rail network. It makes sense so let it be, but let us include in our new thinking the planned use of biofuels as well. Please support.

### **Clean coal and energy**

**Ian Lavery** (*National Union of Mineworkers*) moved Composite Motion 13.

He said: Before entering into my debate, I would like to thank Philip Pearson and the TUC for their immense help in ensuring that the issue of clean coal technology is actually now on the agenda and on the agenda big style.

Brendan Barber mentioned yesterday that the Energy Review was to be welcomed, and he said that the trade union movement got largely what it wanted. I have to say, Brendan, that that is not the case as far as the NUM is concerned and other unions within the mining industry because we believe, quite clearly, that it was a fudge once again. We did not get what we wanted. We got one-and-a-half pages out of 216 in the Energy Review. If we, as a union, agreed and welcomed that

report we would be sacked, and rightly so, because it would be seen as treason. That might be too strong a word, but it is to make my point. The Energy Review is not welcomed, but noted. We have an industry run by UK Coal which will transform the business from coal-mining to property, closing Harworth Colliery and Rossington Colliery this year, whilst every other nation in the world is expanding their coal production.

China, obviously, is a huge coal producer and they are looking, by the year 2030, to increase their production to somewhere in the region of 4.5 billion tonnes of coal. When we look at ourselves in the UK, the case is not that we do not use coal but it is a case where we rely on coal very, very much indeed. About 35 percent of the electricity generated, on average, is generated by coal burn. At times that figure has reached 50 percent. Last year we imported 45 million tonnes of coal, 17 million tonnes of which came from Russia. We now have the ability to burn coal cleanly. We have carbon storage and carbon sequestration among a whole range of other technologies which will allow us to burn coal cleanly and reduce the CO2 emissions to between 80 percent - 90 percent. That is the answer. It is the solution to the crisis of climate change and security of supply. However, it cannot be left to big business to secure what we need. Big business will not in any way, shape or form put money into clean coal technology schemes unless they can make a fast buck and a lot of money. It cannot be left to the vagaries of the free market and we need the Government to offer financial incentives for our indigenous coal reserves and CCT plants. We, of course, need a balanced, diverse and secure energy supply for the UK. It is essential. The Energy Review gave us a forum. We have not received an invitation as of yet, but we welcome it. It is a positive move. We will wait and see what happens when we meet with 'UK Property Developers' and see what their commitment is towards the coal industry in Britain.

What we need is to accentuate the urgency of this forum. We need to ensure that we embark upon the duties that have to be performed with urgency. They are closing collieries day after day. We are nearly extinct. We are nearly the proverbial dodos of industry.

Comrades, we seek the support of this TUC Congress on Composite Motion 13. It, genuinely, is the last chance saloon for the British deep-mine coal industry. At this point, we cannot secure support from our Labour politicians to continue the deep-mine coal industry, which is a very sorry state of affairs. We must all be ready for the consequences. I move.

**Patrick Garragher** (*BACM-TEAM*) seconded the composite motion.

He said: Along with Ian Lavery, I would like to thank the TUC for the sterling work that they have done within TUSDAC and the Clean Coal Task Force. Without that contribution, the role of coal in the Energy Review would be much less. Having said that, I think the Energy Review has much to commend it in terms of the themes of diversity, security of supply and sustainability.

The concern which my association has is that whilst those are warm and welcome words, they do not contain enough in the body of the report actually to give substance to them. I think that is best exemplified by just referring to two things which are going on at present. UK Coal has had discussions with EDF and one or two other generators in an attempt to sustain production of coal at the north Nottinghamshire coal mine at Harworth. However, they have been unsuccessful in those discussions and, as a result, discussions are continuing now in relation to the closure of that production unit. If we were serious

about sustaining indigenous production, that would not be happening.

We have a slightly more positive note, and that is the re-opening of the Hatfield Coal Mine in South Yorkshire and beside it the company operating that mine has proposals to build a clean coal power station. As the minister has referred to already, that is not proceeding in part because of planning concerns, but also in part because the market situation at the moment does not guarantee the level of security that the output from that mine and proposed power station can have a guaranteed place and therefore sustain itself.

There is no doubt in my mind – I have said this in previous years – that, globally, the role for coal is a bright one. The challenge for this country and for the developing world is to bring forward new clean technology through carbon capture and storage, through sequestration and to use those technologies to try and ensure that as coal continues to build its growth in the emerging economies, that we are able to sell technology to those countries and it will have a manageable impact in terms of reducing the carbon emissions from this particular fuel source. I think those are all cogent reasons why this motion should be supported. I hope that Congress will support it, and I look forward to working with the TUC to try and build on the work which they have already undertaken on behalf of the coal industry.

**Graeme Henderson** (*Prospect*) speaking in support of the composite motion, said: President and Congress, Prospect represents specialists and managers in the electricity supply industry and I am speaking on the second part of paragraph 1 on the skill shortages across the industry, which we believe were not adequately addressed in the Energy Review consultation document.

A snapshot across the energy sector reveals a shortage of power engineers. The Trade and Industry Select Committee commented in their inquiry into the resilience of the national electricity network, and I quote: "It is clear that the electricity industry is not attracting enough engineering graduates at the moment." They also said that they were not given the impression that either the Government or the regulator was fully apprised of the particular difficulties faced by the electricity industry. They concluded, and again I quote: "The government, as a matter of priority, should take appropriate measures to guarantee that this country has the skills required to secure the resilience of the electricity infrastructure, which is essential for all of us."

A recent report by the Energy and Utility Skills Sector Council on Overhead Lines Worker Shortage reinforces these concerns. The report identifies an immediate requirement to address the ageing profile of the workforce involved in the building, renewal and repair of transmission infrastructure. Currently representing coal, gas, energy and the nuclear sector, the Sector Skills Agreement state that 72 percent of companies were experiencing skills gaps, in particular in project management, technical and practical skills. In line with experience elsewhere, the sector has identified an ageing workforce in nuclear heat generation. It also reported difficulties in filling engineering vacancies with skill shortages in specialist areas, including nuclear safety and control and instrumentation.

Prospect members are already reporting an inability to reskill the existing workforce in trying to carry out their decommissioning programme, resulting in a heavy reliance on recruiting project managers from outside the industry.

In the renewables sector, the Energy Savings Trust has reported that one of the main barriers to increasing

the up-take of micro-generation devices is the shortage of appropriate skills and training courses for each of the emerging micro-generation technologies.

There is a similar need for enhanced research, development and demonstration for carbon capture and sequestration technologies to ensure the availabilities of skills to manufacture and retrofit super-critical and flu gas desulphurisation technologies, with which I am sure that Congress is fully cognisant.

These pressures are likely to be intensified by a cross-sectorial demand for skilled engineering workers for projects such as the Olympics, Terminal 5, the Defence Industrial Strategy and the wholesale transfer to digital communication technologies.

In conclusion, managing and maintaining the intensity of these pressures whilst avoiding the risks of energy shortfalls requires a strategic and co-ordinated approach across government. This is a vital issue for the future economy of this country for all our well-being. Support the composite and support the campaign for adequate skills within the electricity industry. Thank you.

**The President:** Thank you very much. Congress, it is important that we keep to our timetable for business this morning. I will take two speakers from unions which have not already participated in this debate.

**John Rowse** (*Transport & General Workers' Union*) supported Motion 60.

He said: Chair and Congress, this is the second Energy Review in three years. The first one was in 2003 and this one is in 2006. Hopefully, this is the final stage in securing a balanced energy portfolio, which will meet the needs of the UK well into the future. For the Government not to prioritise energy would be a fundamental mistake. It would be to completely misunderstand what drives modern and developing economies. Throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century and into this century, the huge improvements in health and living standards, food production and every aspect of our lives depends on energy. If anyone is in doubt, just imagine, for one minute, if the lights went out, that electricity was not readily available and in continuous supply. What would happen to transport logistics if there was no oil? We need to keep these things uppermost in our minds when considering the options covered in the Review.

My union has membership in all aspects of the energy industry, from open cast coal to nuclear generation, from oil workers to agricultural workers involved in biofuels. So it is obvious to us that future energy programmes must exploit all of these areas. But it cannot be done without due care and consideration for the environment. Therefore, we wholeheartedly support the motion recognising that climate change must be tackled alongside securing energy prices at affordable rates. The more difficult securing new primary sources of energy becomes, leaving it purely to market forces, as has been mentioned by other speakers, will raise prices beyond many people's ability to pay. If that happens fuel poverty and, therefore, real poverty will be rife, not just in developing countries but throughout the world.

As I have said before, the T&G's policy supports a balanced energy regime which must include renewables and, in particular, wind and tidal power. We want to see diverse energy sources, including the development of clean coal technology, and less dependency on importing oil and gas often from unreliable sources. Such technology has been around for a long time, but there has been little attempt to develop it.

In conclusion, let us hope that this is the last of the reviews for the foreseeable future and move on to ensure that it is implemented. Thank you.

**Richard Green** (*Community*) speaking in support of Composite Motion 13, said: I work in steel manufacture. Delegates, I speak to emphasise the gravity of the issues raised by the motion, particularly those manufacturing industries such as aluminium, chemicals, plastics and steel, and also other sectors which are heavy users of energy. There is a great disparity between the prices which British manufacturers pay for gas and electricity and what competitors in other EU countries have to pay, and that disparity is widening and putting manufacturers at a greater and greater disadvantage.

The Government will say that it is not their fault, that British companies labour under this handicap. It is also the result of the market, they say. As is so often the case, the British government is taking a blinkered and ideological stand in favour of free trade and non-intervention. Nowhere else in the European Union is the energy market so liberalised. No other government would leave their key manufacturing interests to the mercies of the energy market, but, delegates, the Government has gone even further to damage our industries. Perversely, it has changed the method for calculating CO2 allocations to penalise new investment which will remove bottlenecks and promote more carbon efficient production. This will give competing industries on the Continent another advantage since there is no way that they would be so stupid to apply the EU regulations in the British way.

The decisions of the Government amount to creating another disincentive to investment in Britain and another reason for building new facilities in other EU countries instead. Delegates, I hope that you will all support the motion and send a clear message to Westminster and Whitehall that it must lessen the unnecessary burdens its actions have placed on British manufacturing. Thank you.

\* *Motion 59 was CARRIED.*

\* *Motion 60 was CARRIED.*

\* *Composite Motion 13 was CARRIED.*

### **Presentation of awards to lay representatives**

**The President:** Congress, we now come to that part of the agenda where we recognise the immense contribution made by our lay activists. As I am sure you know, the awards are made in recognition of the vital work of those who are the bedrock of the trade union movement. There are no individual winners as such, but each year we do choose outstanding representatives to accept the awards on behalf of all the lay reps. In a moment, we will meet this year's representatives, but first we are going to show you a video which will tell you something about them and their achievements. (*Video shown*)

Congress, it is now time to meet our award winners. Four years ago, a tragic accident took place on a school trip for pupils with severe learning disabilities. A child ran off from his group and was killed by a train. Hank Roberts exposed a failure of management to undertake proper risk assessment and to put in place proper planning and staffing ratios. Hank's persistence led to safety improvements at the school and the creation of a workplace health and safety committee.

As a result of Hank's effort, two health and safety conferences took place at Wembley attended by nearly 300 safety reps, head teachers and governors looking at safety in schools. (*Presentation made amidst applause*)

Val Byrne is a member of the Transport and General Workers' Union. In 1974, Val led a sit-in at Imperial Typewriters in protest at a planned factory closure. The sit-in lasted for six months and only ended when the company took out a High Court injunction against the protestors. Val also worked at Reckitt & Coleman at a time when the vast majority of women were employed in the lowest grades. Val became the first woman forklift driver and, in doing so, encouraged other women to apply for higher positions. In 1996, Val became the first woman from the Chemical Oil and Rubber Trade Group to be elected to the T&G's General Executive Council. (*Presentation made amidst applause*)

Rory Palmer has been active in Community and, prior to that, the ISTC for the last five years. Rory has played a key role in helping his union to engage with young workers organising meetings with members and non-members alike and developing a strategy for the union.

Rory has also played an active role on the TUC Young Members' Forum drafting proposals which laid the basis for the current structure of the TUC Young Members' Conference. In 2004, Rory wrote a pamphlet published by the TUC to celebrate the 30th anniversary of the Youth Conference looking historically at the TUC's work with young people. (*Presentation made amidst applause*)

Ray Walters has taken a branch consisting of just 92 construction workers and increased its membership massively. Ray has worked hard to build up shop steward structures and to organise workers around equality issues. The branch now has more than 1600 members comprising cleaners, catering staff and care workers. As a result, the branch has seen a major increase in women membership. Out of all branches in the Transport and General Workers' Union with more than 1,000 members, Ray's branch now has the highest proportion of women members. (*Presentation made amidst applause*)

Congress, that completes the lay reps' awards save for the Union Learning Rep Award, which will be made this afternoon.

However, Congress, there is one more special award. Many of you will know Rick Sumner who has been the chief fund raiser for the Justice for Mineworkers Campaign. Rick has campaigned and raised thousands of pounds for mineworkers sacked during the 1984/1985 miners' strike. He has become a well-known figure at Congress for many years. This is to be Rick's last Congress and it is fitting that we recognise his hard work and dedication.

Before the presentation to Rick, I would like to ask Steve Kemp, National Secretary of the NUM, to come to the rostrum to say a few words. (*Applause*)

**Steve Kemp** (*National Union of Mineworkers*):

President, Congress, I am very proud to be given the opportunity to say a few words about a very special person. I do not have a lot of time, but for those of you who visit the stalls at the TUC Congress each year, and for many of you who during the last 20 years have visited and given money to the Justice for Mineworkers stall, it is with sadness that due to ill-health Rick who runs the stall is attending his final TUC Congress.

Justice for Mineworkers was set up in the mid-80s as an organisation to support those miners sacked and victimised by the Tories and the then National Coal Board; miners sacked often on trumped up charges; miners who were taken to court, proved innocent and who then were unable to get back their jobs; some miners put out of work because they put up leaflets at a pit in Nottinghamshire advertising a NUM meeting in opposition to the breakaway scab UDM and miners, some of whom since 1985 have not worked.

Thankfully, due to Rick Sumner, these men have not been forgotten.

They were desperate times; families on the bread line, victims of Thatcher's hatred of the miners, the NUM and the trade union movement. I, on behalf of the NUM, and those families, Rick, owe a debt of deep gratitude to you, comrade, for your sterling solidarity and commitment, 20 years of hard work, thinking of others and raising literally thousands of pounds. Please, Congress, visit the stall and dig deep into your pockets and say goodbye to someone who is a thoroughly decent man.

It is with great pleasure that I invite Rick to the platform to collect a gift from Brendan on behalf of the TUC. Thank you, Rick. You will never be forgotten, comrade. Please welcome Rick Sumner. *(Presentation made amidst a standing ovation)*

**The President:** Thank you, Congress, and thanks to Rick; we wish you all the best for the future.

### Agency Workers

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

He said: Congress, the 'Working on the Edge' campaign has been a truly eye opening initiative. The campaign has highlighted daily injustice faced by agency workers in the UK. They are often paid less than their colleagues with little or no protection in the workplace. They often are not given enough training to do their job well, let alone to develop themselves and progress through the organisations.

That is why so many are trapped in a vicious circle of short-term, low paid work. It is not just the agency workers who can lose out. The creation of a two-tier workplace will only undermine the terms and conditions that we have worked so hard for. The proposed Temporary Workers' Directive will put all workers on an equal footing for pay, working hours and protection against discrimination. A six-month qualifying period has been proposed for the directive, but agency workers often only stay in one job sometimes for a week, etc.; so the proposed qualifying period would make the directive useless in protecting those who, in fact, need it most.

Agency workers deserve equal rights from the minute they start work; so we want to see the EU directive implemented without a qualifying period and implemented soon. However, in the meantime, far more can be done to improve controls on agencies. The Agency Workers' Inspectorate needs stronger powers to investigate and prosecute those agencies who exploit workers, by making illegal deductions from workers, by placing them in substandard accommodation and by refusing to provide health and safety training.

The deaths of 23 cockle pickers in Morecambe Bay in 2004 brought home to us all the horrific conditions that some workers are subject to. Thankfully, some good did come out of that tragedy. The gangmaster licence provisions are a clear signal from the Government that worker exploitation should not, and will not, be tolerated. Labour providers in agriculture and food manufacturing now have to be licensed and rogue gang masters rightly face large fines and prison sentences. This is the sort of scheme that needs to be extended across all industries.

However, Congress, we also need to look beyond government action. The best way of protecting agency workers is by recruiting them into union membership. For unions to stay relevant, we have to stay representative. There are challenges in organising agency workers. The turnover of agency staff can be, and often is, very high. They often work irregular

shifts and it can be difficult for reps to spend time with them or even to see them.

Temporary workers often see their job as casual and so sometimes they do not see the value of union membership. It is our responsibility to make ourselves relevant. In some workplaces, agency workers do not even have any induction training, so we lose out on one of the best opportunities for recruitment that we have.

There can be communication barriers too where agency workers speak limited English. However, USDAW, I am proud to say, like many other unions, is working to overcome these challenges. We are working to promote life-long learning for agency workers so that they do not miss out on training opportunities. My union, USDAW, has produced recruitment leaflets in 35 languages aimed at agency workers and at some sites we have secured equal recruitment facilities for agency workers as well as for permanent staff. We have placed agency workers' rights firmly on the bargaining agenda with the employers.

We recently signed a ground-breaking agreement with a major food manufacturing company. It guarantees equal rights for all workers at their sites regardless of their employment status. Agency workers should not be the poor relations in the workplace. Congress, this is a major step forward for my union, USDAW, but there is far more to be done across the trade union movement. The issues that affect agency workers can only be resolved by sustained efforts from the trade union movement in organising, bargaining and campaigning.

Congress, I urge you to show solidarity with thousands of agency workers who have been treated as second class citizens for too long. Please support. *(Applause)*

**Jeannie Drake** (*Communication Workers' Union*) seconded Composite Motion 3.

She said: President, Congress, the unfair treatment of agency workers in this country is one of the enduring strongholds of workplace inequality and it has to be tackled. The CWU congratulate the TUC for their drive in the 'Working on the Edge' and 'Vulnerable Workers' campaigns. The CWU has recently launched its own campaign, "Euro-trashed: Justice for Agency Workers", in the struggle for equal rights for agency workers who have been failed by the EU.

The CWU has a membership of thousands of agency workers. Whilst we have recognition agreements with many of the employment agencies, the gross inadequacy of UK employment law leaves these workers vulnerable and exploited. Agency workers can sit in the same workplaces doing the same jobs as their permanent colleagues, have vastly inferior pay and conditions, including being subject to arbitrary dismissal, and it is perfectly legal. Their permanent colleagues cannot take industrial action to defend them because it is unlawful secondary action.

It is time that we turned up the heat and put pressure on the Government to show that we are serious when we say that unequal treatment of agency workers is unacceptable. The UK is one of only a handful of EU countries that does not have domestic legislation to ensure equal pay for equal work for agency workers. The Government has been part of a blocking coalition on the EU temporary agency workers' directive. They defend their position by arguing that flexibility is the key to high employment to the point where discrimination against a significant section of the UK workforce undermines the good work that they do on discrimination elsewhere.

However, let me address some of the myths as to why agency workers should not have equality of employment rights. Myth: agency workers are



necessary to maintain low unemployment. Reality: UK productivity is damaged and the employment opportunities are reduced because employment practices for agency workers leave them demotivated and poorly trained. Myth: equal rights will reduce the demand for agency workers. Reality: in countries like France and the Netherlands, where equal pay and rights exist, agency workers represent a higher percentage of the total workforce in those countries than they do here. Myth: employment agencies claim that equal rights will frustrate their ability to operate. Reality: the global agencies, Manpower and Adecco, do the lion's share of their business in France with one of the strictest frameworks for ensuring equal rights for agency workers. Myth: agency workers value the flexibility above equal pay and rights. Reality: TUC studies show that the majority want the security of permanent employment and the most often heard plea from CWU agency members is, "Can you get me a permanent job?"

It does not have to be that way. Fourteen out of 20 member states in the EU have domestic legislation that gives workplace justice to agency workers. In Denmark and the Netherlands, where agency workers have equal rights, flexibility combined with security achieves lower unemployment rates in those countries than in our own.

We have to use all the powers of our organisation, campaigning and lobbying to intensify pressure on the Government for legislation domestically to give equal treatment to agency workers. Let every agency worker know that it is the TUC that is fighting their cause. I ask you to support. *(Applause)*

**Steve Hart** (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) supported Composite Motion 3.

He said: This debate is about exploitation of workers and it is about us demanding that our Government honours its commitment given at Warwick to support the principle of the Agency Workers' Directive. At the outset, President, let me add the T&G's congratulations to Brendan and his team for their campaign to defend vulnerable workers and to the CWU for their 'Justice for Agency Workers' campaigning, because that is the very essence of trade unionism; the strong caring for the weak, defending, supporting and organising workers in need.

This debate is about exposing greedy bosses who use agency and migrant workers as a method of pushing down wages; company after company denying employment rights and decent working conditions, not just at peak times but all year round, creating the misery of institutional discrimination and the injustice of a permanently divided two tier workforce.

Colleagues, that is the increasing reality in modern day Britain; the reality of New Labour's flexible market; wages held down, jobs insecure and migrant and agency workers deliberately divided from the core workforce. Congress, this has to stop.

Of course, unions can, and do, organise agency workers. Our union is proud of the thousands of agency and migrant workers in cleaning, food production and agriculture whom we have organised in recent months, but the real answer lies in the hands of the Government. They can stop at a stroke the stress of the two-tier labour market. They are the ones that can stop the undercutting and the exploitation. Colleagues, we do not need any more excuses. We are past caring about the complexities and the difficulties of the EU legislative process. We want UK legislation and we want it now. They won rights for agency workers. Colleagues, it is time for them to deliver.

Congress, low pay and discrimination are evils. It is our class who suffer the indignities of low pay, who scrape together the pennies and the pounds to make ends

meet, who worry about which bill to pay and who go without in order that the kids can eat. It is dramatic, but it is the reality for tens of thousands of agency workers.

Poverty pay is evil. As we were once reminded, for evil to flourish, good men and women must stand silent. Well, this movement of ours must not be allowed to stand silent. It is time for our voice to be heard; it is time for us to exercise our power; so, comrades, please let's mean what we say. Let's fight for our brothers and sisters who are exploited by agencies. Please support this composite. *(Applause)*

**Kevin Kelly** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supported Composite Motion 3.

He said: The PCS has been campaigning for rights for agency workers and for permanent posts. We have had some successes; success in the Rural Payments Agency where we have secured new permanent jobs and skills training; success in the Scottish Parliament where we have achieved pay rises for agency workers and success in the Welsh Assembly with improved pay, equal holiday pay, sick pay and transfer to fixed-term employee status. Where we cannot secure rights for agency workers and for permanent posts, PCS is committed to fighting for recognition.

We have been campaigning for Adecco agency workers at the British Cattle Movement Service in Workington. Adecco is a multinational company which saw its profits rise from 100 million euros to 135 million euros during the last quarter. Those are profits based on the exploitation of low paid insecure workers.

Agency staff at BCMS are earning the minimum wage, that is, £4 less than their colleagues who do the same work. Staff have fought for recognition because they were angry. They were angry about the way they were being treated; angry at losing pay when computers crash; angry at using annual leave on bank holidays; angry that they had to come into work when sick because they could not afford to lose pay and angry about only being allowed to eat and drink at their desks at certain times.

This has been an historic campaign; historic because it is the first time ever a union agreed a legal bargaining unit with the Central Arbitration Committee for agency workers and historic because I can announce today at this Congress that we have won union recognition for those agency workers. It is the first time ever that this has been won for agency workers. *(Applause)*

It is historic because out of 368 ballot papers returned, 368 voted 'yes'; there were no spoilt papers; there were no 'no' votes; there was a 100 percent 'yes' vote. This was won on the back of six workplace meetings, leafleting, one-to-one discussions and media campaigning. Congress, this campaign was won amongst predominantly young workers and students, the so-called Thatcher generation.

Congress, we have organised the unorganised and organised our so-called Thatcher generation. It shows that when workers are given a lead and confidence in a fighting campaign, they can be won to trade unionism. The key now is to build on that success, organise agency workers across the length and breadth of this country so that we can secure fair and equal pay and conditions and security and dignity at work. *(Applause)*

**Tony Burke** (*Amicus*) supported Composite Motion 3.

He said: President and Congress, it is absolutely outrageous that a Labour Government continues to obstruct the delivery of equal treatment for agency and temporary workers in the UK on the back of the employers' position that such treatment would in some way undermine productivity and competitiveness. It is

also misleading, as the Government has attempted to do, to deflect from this issue by suggesting that the issue itself is solely about vulnerable workers and that they are addressing it through a series of measures. What is really happening is that they are using agency workers to replace permanent staff.

If you were to ask our members at Rover, Peugeot, in the paper mills that have closed, in the finance sector and in IT what choices they have when they lose their employment, their answer usually is low paid agency work. We are seeing many skilled jobs now being outsourced to employment agencies; so why should this growing proportion of UK workforce be denied the rights that this government support for other workers? Why should temporary and agency workers have to wait 12 months before they have a right to equal treatment?

The Government gave a commitment to us in the Warwick Agreement. They also gave a commitment to the electorate that they would work to support the implementation of the EU Directive designed to deliver equal treatment for agency and temporary workers but, instead, it has done the opposite. The provisions of this motion call for a basic human right of equal treatment. If the Government cannot get the EU to agree on the directive, then let's take a simple step by introducing UK legislation which meets the same objective.

We cannot allow a situation where major employers are in a position where they can terminate employees, agency workers, in these temporary jobs without any notice, deny them sick pay or access to occupational pension schemes. The use of agency labour not only exploits the unemployed and other vulnerable workers, but it undermines the security of those directly employed. We know that many agency and temporary workers suffer exploitation at the hands of unscrupulous employment agencies as well as receiving rates of pay and conditions that are way below those of their permanent colleagues.

We want that legislation to be implemented and we need it to be implemented soon. However, as John Hannett said in his contribution, it is not just about the legislation; it is about organising these workers, making sure that they join our unions and making sure they know that we are about to support them. Congress, support the Composite. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

\* *Composite Motion 3* was CARRIED

## Employment Status

**Alan Ritchie** (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) moved Composite Motion 4.

He said: Congress, fighting for employment rights has been a core aim of this movement. Our history has been one of struggle. This movement believes in rights at work. These rights not only protect workers from the worst employers -- and, unfortunately, in the construction industry we have plenty of them -- but it makes that employer treat his worker with respect. In the construction industry, hundreds of thousands of workers are classified by their employer as 'self-employed'. What this means for these unscrupulous employers is the non-payment of National Insurance, thereby denying much revenue for our public services, and no contracts of employment, which means no notice of redundancy and no redundancy pay. They, in fact, do not come under any employment legislation, including the minimum wage. These employers call this flexibility. As trade unionists, we call it slave labour.

As for tendering for contracts, the reality is that if you do not shift to this employment practice, you will lose the contract. However, this practice has had serious consequences for our industry and our members. Our

working hours are already the longest in Europe; our production levels are behind that of other industrial countries in Europe, like Germany, and our skills level is reaching crisis point. It is not that we are not getting young people coming forward for apprenticeships, because there are plenty, but there are no places for them to go because of this so-called 'self-employment' in the industry.

It is the workers again who pay for this so-called 'flexibility'. They have few employment rights; the worst accident rate of any other industry - top of the Health and Safety Executive's league - and poor welfare provisions. For the employer, this flexibility means workers hired on a Monday can be fired on a Friday with no risk of a tribunal. You cannot have fairness in the workplace if an employer can get rid of you for little or no cost. That is why employment status is important because it gives workers access to rights which provide protection.

UCATT moved a composite motion at last year's TUC calling for the Government to respond to the 2002 Employment Status consultation. We received it this year. It was called *Success at work*. Although the report deals with a number of issues of concern to trade unionists, UCATT was particularly interested in the response on employment status. We found it tucked away on pages 16 and 17. I would like to quote it:

"Having reviewed the evidence ... we believe changes to the legal framework would not prevent instances of abuse or lack of awareness. It could, however, damage labour market flexibility and result in a reduction in overall employment."

Their conclusion was to do nothing.

Congress, workers waited three and-a-half years for a response and all we got was a brush off. To do nothing is an abrogation of responsibility by this Government and disappointment for the workers we represent. Workers want rights, workers demand rights and workers expect a Labour Government to deliver those rights. The rights are not revolutionary - protection from unfair dismissal; equal treatment in pay, pensions and training; lay off pay, sick pay and redundancy pay and access to family friendly rights.

These minimum standards do not hamper flexibility; they prevent exploitation of workers. We know these rights are important because construction employers have always tried to avoid giving workers these rights. So we ask, what would happen if employment rights were extended? The DTI say it would cost jobs. The CBI used that argument against the minimum wage and the Working Time Directive. These rights are real achievements that we are rightly proud of. There is no evidence that jobs have been lost. This is a paper tiger and we believe it should be knocked down.

Rights for vulnerable workers should not depend on the judgment of an employment tribunal. Access to these rights should be clear and transparent. Employers attempting to deny these rights to workers should be penalised.

There is a lesson here for the DTI. The Working Time Regulations were introduced in 1998. It has taken eight years finally to secure holiday pay for all workers in the UK, but when workers take their holidays, my union, along with other unions, had to take the case to the European Court of Justice because they were not giving them the rights to holiday pay. Shamefully, the DTI supported the employers in not implementing holiday pay, but we won. We support the court ruling regarding holiday pay. We believe it is unjust that any worker in this day does not have rights, does not have dignity and does not get respect. Thank you.

*(Applause)*

**Martin Spence** (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*) seconded Composite Motion 4.

He said: This is really about clearing up confusion. If we can clear up the confusion, we will be tackling a major source of vulnerability for many, many workers across the UK because, as Alan has already indicated, the Government frankly ducked an opportunity to clear up real confusion in its Employment Status Review on a very specific but very important issue, and that is the definition -- believe it or not -- of a 'worker'.

This is the TUC, so I imagine most of us at this Congress today actually understand what an 'employee' is. If we do not, maybe we are at the wrong conference! We understand what an 'employee' is, but there is also a lot of legislation now that refers not to 'employees' but to 'workers'. It is a wider category; it is a looser category; it is defined in ambiguous ways; it refers to 'freelance workers' -- very important in the industries where we organise, film, television, theatres and entertainment -- 'casual workers', 'intermittent workers', 'atypical workers', in the EU jargon, but it is not clearly defined. This continuing uncertainty and confusion about the scope and the meaning of the term 'worker' is a gift to unscrupulous employers.

For instance, in our industries, that is, in television and in broadcasting, I deal more regularly than I would like with employers who draw up contracts where they state that members of ours, who are quite clearly workers, are not workers but 'contractors' or 'consultants'. In those contracts, those employers define their own status not as being 'employers' but as being 'clients'. So it is not a worker/employer relationship; it is a contractor/client relationship or a consultant/client relationship. You can see where this is going. If you are a consultant performing services for a client, you have no employment rights at all. You have no rights under the Working Time Regulations; arguably, you have no right to be represented by a trade union. So this confusion is not just a little matter of interest to a few employment lawyers; this is a matter of major material interest to thousands of workers across many industrial sectors of the economy whose rights are being denied.

It has really serious consequences. It touches directly on the TUC's strong emphasis and real campaign, which we welcome, to tackle vulnerable workers because this confusion is a major cause of vulnerability for many workers across the UK. We are asking the TUC, we are asking you, Congress, in this composite to continue to press for a clear definition of the status of 'worker' and for a clear definition of the rights attaching to that status. I ask you to support the composite. (*Applause*)

**Christine Blower** (*National Union of Teachers*) supported Composite Motion 4.

She said: Colleagues, this is a really major issue across the board for us. This is not just about low paid, vulnerable workers. There are a whole range of vulnerable workers. Within education, certain arrangements have been in place for a long time giving less job security, for example, to supply teachers and home tutors. Casualisation appears to be on the increase due to the growth of teacher agencies who offer employment to teachers on a so-called self-employed basis. As a result, there is little regulation of their pay and benefits. Agency teachers have little or no job security, less pay than other colleagues and no pension rights.

Regrettably, there seems to be an increase in the willingness on the part of local authorities and governing bodies to use fixed-term contracts to create so-called employer flexibility and, with greater fragmentation in the education service, the creation of

the academies and trust schools - so beloved of the current Government -- this trend is certainly set to continue.

The NUT already has too many examples of these kinds of problems for teachers, from the peripatetic teacher who was dismissed during her maternity leave to an agency teacher who was suspended without pay on the basis of allegations which proved to be wholly groundless, but neither the school nor the agency would offer support pending an investigation and, of course, because he was not an employee, he was not entitled to any kind of statutory hearing. The NUT has also fought and won the case of a home tutor who for 10 years was denied sick pay and holiday pay, but we have now established in the Court of Appeal that she is, indeed, an employee and not a casual worker.

As the composite motion says, we are extremely disappointed that the review, which took from 2002 until March 2006, has managed to conclude that all that is needed is some guidance to employers and then workers will get their full rights. Well, colleagues, don't hold your breath! If it were that easy, why would we need to be speaking on this very important issue today at our Congress?

We are left, therefore, with an urgent need for a vigorous campaign against casualisation and denial of basic rights and for full employment rights from day one. Colleagues, that, indeed, would be success and fairness at work. Thank you. (*Applause*)

**Graham Calk** (*Communication Workers Union*) supported Composite 4. He said: I want to refer in particular to the thousands of agency workers whose employee status makes them second class citizens in the eyes of the law and in the eyes of the employer -- workers who are denied employment rights and equality at work enjoyed by their fellow workers with permanent contract status. For these workers no change is not an option. The TUC's campaign to protect all vulnerable workers and deliver their same employment rights to all workers, whatever their employment status, needs to be stepped up, clearly. The trade union movement cannot tolerate a situation where a group of workers are defined legally as second class citizens. The trade union movement cannot tolerate a Labour Government that reneges on the Warwick commitment to work toward agreement on the Temporary Agency Workers' Directive. We cannot tolerate a Labour Government that continues to block the adoption of the Directive.

The Communication Workers Union campaign 'Justice for Agency Eurotrash' seeks to highlight the travesty of workplace justice, that is agency workers' second class status, and expose the erroneous myth that a flexible workforce requires a group of workers to have less rights than others. In terms of pay, pensions, career development, access to skill developments and training, attendance arrangements, annual leave and basic access to workplace justice, employers treat agency workers as second class. These workers are as gifted, hard working, committed and trustworthy as their co-workers, all for less pay and terms and conditions and at most risk of losing their jobs without recourse to a disciplinary process or tribunals.

It is not enough, of course, just to deliver the Directive. Trades unions need to recruit agency workers and truly represent them, and ultimately give them a voice for themselves. Agency workers are often the youngest and poorest and most vulnerable workers in most need of protection from unscrupulous employers. Giving them equal status is the very least we should demand.

I urge Congress to demonstrate solidarity with agency workers, support the CWU campaign and support Composite 4.

\* *Composite 4 was CARRIED*

### Trade Union Freedom Bill

**The President:** I now call Composite Motion 5. The General Council supports the motion, with a reservation. I call on Tony Woodley to explain the General Council's position.

**Tony Woodley (General Council):** The General Council is delighted to support the composite, but more than that we actually welcome it.

Let me deal first of all with two reservations that the General Council has. First of all, there is a call for another national demonstration in support of the Trade Union Freedom Bill. We confounded the critics last May Day who thought you could not get sizeable numbers of people on the streets in support of the repeal of anti-trade union laws and in support of the Bill. Well, they were wrong; it was a fantastic demonstration, well supported by many unions and well organised with our friends at SERTUC. I would like to say on behalf of the General Council "well done" and if we have to do more of it by having another demonstration as needs arise, we will indeed do that.

However, what we want to do is be flexible here as we see the Bill starting to go through that Parliamentary process. We want to see whether it is making good progress or not so good progress, and based on that assessment we can actually draw up what we intend to do with regard to future demonstrations.

Secondly, with regard to setting up a fund covering legal challenges, it is common sense and it tells you that you cannot lead an open ended demand for financial resources. What we are really saying is that we should look at each case on its merits, seek legal opinion and advice where necessary, before we commit those unlimited resources. In short, we are not recommending any change to the way we traditionally have done our business.

Now to the meat of the composite. The catalyst for the Trade Union Freedom Bill took place about a year ago when this Congress supported 700 predominantly low paid women workers who were set up for the sack, just to cut costs by a despicable employer who bullied and harassed and locked our members in a canteen and eventually sacked them by megaphone. The sad state of affairs is quite simply this: this could happen again today under our laws with workers having absolutely no rights whatsoever to get one job back, or indeed to get compensation that they would otherwise have been entitled to. The good news is that thanks to all of our efforts, particularly the solidarity supportive actions of other workers -- without whose help I have absolutely no doubt that not one worker would now have returned to work for Gate Gourmet, without whose help they would not have gone back to work -- we have seen close to 300 workers now back in work because they have chosen to do so, we have seen many hundreds of others who have chosen not to go back to work and have received £3.2 million in compensation that they were under this law not entitled to have, and as a side issue we paid £1.5 million in distress payments as well.

But the bad news, as colleagues saw yesterday with the demonstration outside, is that the laws presently have stopped us taking official action and giving those few members their wishes -- those few members who want their job back and cannot get them or want us to have an official strike and we cannot do it. I say this to Congress: when you see even one worker who is not happy having been victimised, harassed, threatened and bullied not getting the job back the law is wrong, the law is an ass and we should do all we can to make sure that this scandal never happens again.

I finish by saying to those workers who are members that I am sick to the guts of my stomach, truthfully, that I cannot give you what you want, your job back or official action to help you do. It sickens me, it really does. The scandal of Gate Gourmet was an in your face realisation of the pathetic protection that workers have in 21st century Britain today. The anti-trade union laws must be repealed and, of course, the Trade Union Freedom Bill is the first step towards that. We have to build on the historic decision that was taken in the vote that was taken at the Labour Party Conference a year ago. Who would have believed that if the NEC of our party had been allowed to vote they would have voted overwhelmingly for solidarity supporting secondary action? I do not say it with any pleasure. I say it because it is a party yet again out of touch with the realities that workers really need in Britain today. We have always known the price of weak labour laws, but this year we have seen a first again with the gaffer, the Chairman of General Motors Europe, saying that the reason why they are sacking 900 workers at my old plant, Ellesmere Port, is because it is easy to do so in our country, confirming what we all know. That is why we need a level playing field on employment law at least in line with all of our counterparts in Europe.

Our priority now is to make the Trade Union Freedom Bill law. I say this: we had the support of about 180 MPs, predominantly Labour, on our Early Day Motion to get this into law. Before anyone starts talking about giving support for any new leader, or for any of the 180 MPs who are in marginal constituencies, that we should make sure that these people are going to support the laws and the changes that we want.

Colleagues, we are supporting this but fear the balloting procedures are limited to the use of injunctions against us and not to restore the rights of solidarity action. Support Composite 5.

**Bob Crow (National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers)** moved Composite Motion 5. He said: I am asking you to pass this composite, and with all due respect to my good friend Tony Woodley -- who must be on a winning streak, he thinks, after Saturday's result -- I am asking you to pass it without any reservations whatsoever. The fact of the matter is the Thatcher Government, when they brought these anti-trade union laws in, made this Trades Union Congress united in that we would oppose those nine Acts that would systematically stop trades unions from systematically fighting back. There are people in the movement that said all she really wanted was democracy. She was going to give unions back to their members. Yes, and she gave them back to the members all right because when Thatcher was elected you people here today would have been representing 13 million people and today you are representing less than 7 million.

Before the New Labour Government was elected they had said in their previous opposition to the Conservative Government that they would oppose all those anti-trade union laws and repeal them. What happened in those nine and a half years? I have to say that if people have reservations about having a demonstration then tell me how you are going to win the hearts and minds of these people? All I hear is talk about who is going to be the leader of the Labour Party, who is going to be the Deputy Leader of the Labour Party. But what are their policies going to be? Let us start wagging the tail of the dog properly. We should be laying our policies down and dictating to these people if they want our support. Where are these 120-odd Labour MPs that every four years they come running around and skulking around looking for money from you and are not prepared to give the trades unions the right to fight back? Where is it about secondary action? I do not know what secondary action

is. I thought we were built on solidarity action. I thought when the fire fighters come up and ask for support you give it to them. I thought when Gate Gourmet workers come up here you give it. I hope that when Paul Kenny's union, the GMB, over Northern Foods, come up here, you give it to them. We should not have to worry about secondary action because the bosses know about secondary action. You talk to the people in the train industry about it because when the guards go on strike in one company they bring scab managers in from another company to run those trains. I would say the bosses understand secondary action because they get trains run by scab managers. If it is good enough for them to bring scab managers in and run trains on strike days, it should be good enough to ask workers in those companies where they are moving the managers to take strike action to defend those people in the industry they are coming from.

Of course, as Tony Woodley made it quite clear, this is about victimised workers. What about this Employment Tribunal? You were going to be guaranteed your job back or £55,000 in compensation. I would say to you: go and tell a young militant shop steward who is doing the business at the workplace that he is going to get £55,000 and not get his job back, divide that into fifteen or sixteen years of your working life and it is not much money. When we talk about reinstatement we mean reinstatement.

We were told we would have a fair playing field under Labour and what does it mean? The bosses can have an eminent QC, we can have an eminent QC, we then win a tribunal and the bosses say we are not going to accept the tribunal and it is worth them paying £55,000 rather than having a good organised convenor at the work place. We should say fair play is this: if the individual does not want the money then what we should be saying is that we take the money from the boss's profits each year to pay that worker until the time that individual is brought back into employment in the industry where he or she comes from. That is what fair play is all about.

Also, brothers and sisters, let us start talking about this balloting question, because people will say it is fair to have a ballot. I will tell you what, we want ballots and our union has always asked for ballots. Imagine 100 year ago when my former union leaders would have been coming to places like this in the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants and they were fined £16,000, equivalent to £2.9 million today. Year in, year out, after they were fined, the bosses never even cashed the cheque. They put the cheque on a notice board in a frame in the directors' office and every time our forefathers asked for a pay rise they were told "If you dare go on strike that cheque will be cashed in", very similar to what they said to us regarding check off. We lost our check off with the British Railways Board and it cost our union £5 million, but I will tell you that I can look the National Union of Mineworkers in the face and say we did everything proper to support them and give them solidarity and if it happened again I would do exactly the same that was in support. *(Bell sounded)*

Brothers and sisters, unlike other speakers, unlike the Vice President, I am a railway worker and I do not go through red lights! Thank you very much.

**The President:** Bob, before you go I just want to send our congratulations to you and your daughter on her graduation from Oxford with a politics degree. Well done. Now we know what the future will look like!

**Matt Wrack** (*Fire Brigades' Union*) seconded Composite Motion 5. He said: like everyone else in the room the Fire Brigades Union know all too well the implications of the anti-trade union legislation on our

ability to operate. We understand the restrictive procedures that are in place regarding balloting for industrial action. In our national dispute 2002/2003, we were forced to conduct 58 separate ballots in relation to what was in reality a national dispute, identical disputes with each individual employer. The complex process meant a single mistake on the fax machine would lead us to facing injunctions and challenges in the court from the employers, similar problems that colleagues have faced in relation to the pensions campaign that we faced recently.

In our own disputes also -- and this is mentioned in the composite now -- we saw the Government pushing through legislation that gave them powers to take control of the resources of fire and rescue services. We have seen measures introduced by the Government to impose industrial relations settlements in the fire and rescue service. We are engaged in negotiations with our employers about a National Joint Council and every time we negotiate it the employers say "Well, if we do not like it and the Government do not like it they will impose a new National Joint Council on you".

There are other forms of anti-trade union legislation that this movement needs to be challenging. We have a dispute on Merseyside -- and we are looking forward to that emergency resolution if we ever get round to moving it. We can see in Merseyside the games that are being played using anti-trade union legislation. We have endless letters from the Chief Fire Officer on Merseyside threatening us with injunctions over balloting procedures, over picketing, and yet at the same time, the same Chief Fire Officer can intimidate striking members. He can say, "If you go on strike your promotion prospects are finished in the Merseyside Fire and Rescue Service". What an absolute and utter disgrace and we will not accept that; I hope we will receive the support of this Congress on that issue. They are allowed to carry out these bullying and intimidation tactics. They have just removed our checkoff facilities in the Merseyside Fire and Rescue Service. As a result of that, when we notified them of a further period of eight day strikes, we had to revise the procedures. They are playing games using the anti-trade union laws to do so. They are harassing our members and our officials who turn up from elsewhere. I say to Congress, you will be welcome on the picket lines at Merseyside fire stations. Get up there. You may get your names taken, you may get photographs taken, because that is what is going on. That is the level of intimidation our members are facing in Merseyside. We will not be intimidated; you will be welcome.

We want to focus not on reservations but on the positives. These campaigns around the Trade Union Freedom Bill have seen enormous unity. We have a visitor later today who has boasted in the past that this country has the most restrictive laws on trades union in the industrial world. That visitor will be moving on. We want to see those anti-trade union laws moved on. Without any hesitation and without any reservation, the Fire Brigades Union seconds the composite.

**Brian Caton** (*Prison Officers Association UK*) supported Composite Motion 5. He said: I represent members that since 1993 have been abused, taken to court by the Tories and been given promises by Mr Blair that we would get back our trade union rights no different from those enjoyed by other workers in this country. We have been told we will be criminalised by New Labour if we refuse to sign a no-strike deal. We signed that deal in good faith in looking for partnership with the employers of prison officers in England and Wales, only to find that whenever we had a dispute the Prison Service refused to put it to arbitration.

The Pay Review Body was going to be independent; it would listen to both sides of industry and make a determination on pay. But we tumbled them. Last year we found a leaked letter from the Prison Service to the Home Secretary, encouraging and causing him to interfere with the independence of the Pay Review Body. That has caused my union to ballot its member for strike action. All the time a New Labour Government are saying to us "Stick to that deal or if you abuse it then we will return to criminalising prison officers not for taking industrial action but for taking any action that disrupts the Prison Service". I have news for them, the Director-General of the Prison Service, his Prison Board, a huge percentage of Prison Governors, have wrecked the Prison Service. They have taken it from an institution admired throughout the world and turned it into a laughing stock. I call upon the Director-General of the Prison Service, his Prisons Board and the majority of those ultra right-wing governors that want to kick my members around daily, to do the honourable thing and go. We do not need you, you have messed up our lives and you have messed up the Prison Service and you should go and hang your heads in shame.

Colleagues, we will support a Trade Union Freedom Bill but more than that we will show this Government why they need trade union freedom, because we will take strike action. If they want to put us in court or the prisons that my members man, that is fine. Bring it on, because we will take our trade unions rights back. We have been asking for too long. We will take them back and that is what we are going to do. Thank you, Congress.

**Dave Ward** (*Communication Workers Union*) supported Composite Motion 5. He said: First of all I would like to pledge the full support of the CWU to the ongoing campaign for the Trade Union Freedom Bill. It is a campaign that has already taken into account various political considerations and sensitivities. This has resulted in what must be said are quite modest reforms that we are asking for. It would still leave us, even if this Bill came into being, well behind our European counterparts, and still outside the requirements of international labour law. But despite the best efforts of the campaign to date, despite the despicable actions of companies like Gate Gourmet and despite the support of TUC policies, Labour Party policy, we have not yet persuaded this Government to act.

The Government are strong on the importance of employment as a route away from poverty. The Government are strong in advocating that all workers should be treated with dignity and respect at the workplace, and they have been strong and right in making the case that migrant workers must form a key part of a successful UK economy. But the reality is this. Dignity and respect for all workers can only exist when workers have the right to withdraw their labour as well as offer it, and where unions have the right as Bob, Tony and others have said to take solidarity action in support of other colleagues.

Congress, the CWU calls upon the General Council to set aside their reservations and calls upon the General Council and the general secretaries of the largest unions to give fresh momentum to the campaign in two key areas: firstly, I make no apologies but let us demand from all prospective Labour leadership contenders that they are prepared to act in protecting workers from abuse and exploitation that some of the stuff that they have brought in has created, and to impress upon those same contenders that we will never take them seriously until we actually see them start to act. Secondly, the TUC and all major unions should coordinate a campaign in the workplace to demonstrate to our respective members and workers

everywhere that employment rights really do matter. If we adapt the campaign now to the needs of the workforce, ultimately the workers themselves will force this Government to legislate.

We all know that the world at work is changing; we all know that we are operating in a vastly different environment and that there are huge challenges before us. We also know that we cannot be successful in the future by simply facing away from change and we have to shape change in a way that is acceptable to our members with our trade union values intact. Nor can we allow the Labour Government to face away from change, a change in direction that they must take to support the introduction of this bill and restore dignity and respect to workers everywhere.

**Miles Colombini** (*Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*) supported Composite Motion 5. He said: this composite represents a need for change, a change in the thinking by government that will in turn force a change in the thinking by employers. From ASLEF's point of view, this composite contains no new thinking whatsoever. The composite still maintains our position of seeking the repeal of all anti-trade union laws. We need to, and we should, enjoy the same protection at work as our sisters and brothers in the rest of Europe. We believe that our members' futures should be decided by collective action, not by the courts. We also believe that they have the right to support, or be supported by, other workers in their struggles against unfairness and injustice.

ASLEF believes that the existing legislation that surrounds and governs the actions of trades unions is outdated, draconian and does little for industrial relations -- a situation our Labour Government have done little to address. The anti-trade union laws were designed by the Tories to benefit one side -- the employers -- and they fail miserably to meet the international standard on trade union freedom. However, a more specific problem for us is the right to administer our own rule book and to act on the decisions that our members democratically pass at their annual conferences.

Last year at the TUC, ASLEF supported Composite 1 and explained to Congress a difficulty we were undergoing regarding the expulsion of a member. The member had used the courts to overthrow a democratic decision made by our Executive Committee and supported by our Conference, a decision that was morally right and equally important in line with ASLEF Rule Book. Composite 1 agreed to establish a fund to cover legal challenges as seemed appropriate by the General Council. Subsequently, ASLEF was advised that the cost of taking our case to the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg would be about £18,000 and a case was set in motion. With the reference lodged and Composite 1 in place, we began seeking support. To date we have had support from 18 trades unions. You learn who your friends are when you are embarking on an issue like this, so can we take the opportunity now of putting on record our gratitude to all of those friends who have to date made financial donations towards the cost of this case.

In the covering letter sent out to all affiliates, the TUC stated, "ASLEF raises an important issue under Article 11 of the European Convention of Human Rights on the freedom of unions to determine their own rule books and to choose with whom they wish to associate." In order to defend this principle ASLEF has already paid out a substantial amount of money in legal fees and we have not even left these shores for Strasbourg yet. Clearly, to carry on with the fight to win a position in Strasbourg -- that will benefit us and the rest of the trade union movement -- will cost a great deal more money and we need your support. This is not the time to be complacent. Do not assume that

you will not come up against the same poisonous forces of racism and fascism that might be lurking within your union.

On behalf of ASLEF I urge you to support the Trade Union Freedom Bill and to support Composite 5.

**Jonathan Baume** (*FDA*) opposed Composition Motion 5. He said: Let us recall our history. In the late 1960s the Wilson Labour Government proposed *In Place of Strife* and this offered a legal framework to regulate the powers of unions. It arose from real public and political concern about abuses of union powers, real concern from within the labour movement. Unions fought tooth and nail to stop *In Place of Strife*, a great victory but that victory was the turning point in union history and our long-term decline stems from that fateful decision.

The Heath Conservative Government made further attempts to regulate unions. Instead we boasted about bringing down an elected government in 1974. Finally, Margaret Thatcher passed the laws we all know about, with massive public support, and do not forget very many union members voted for Margaret Thatcher in the elections throughout the 1980s.

So what do we mean by repealing all anti-union laws? Do we mean ending the right of union members to a secret ballot to agree a strike or to elect union executives or to elect general secretaries? Of course, some of that union law needs changing, including fairer industrial action ballots and the use of injunctions. I have always supported the campaign by colleagues in the Prison Officers Association to regain their trade union rights. But the Government have made clear that they will never bring back secondary action or however else we badge it. Nor will any other likely future prime minister whether Labour, Conservative or Liberal-Democratic. Why? It is because the public, the electorate, will not let them, because the public remembers that unregulated union power led too often to abuse, intimidation and sometimes outright violence.

The Trade Union Freedom Bill is a dead end and over the past year we have wasted time and resources and another demonstration will not take us any further. We are wasting and squandering political capital. In doing so we are losing the opportunity to win a consensus on the legal changes that we would all agree on. We had our chance 40 years ago, and we blew it. The world of work is changing and it is time to acknowledge there is no way back to unregulated trade union powers. The Trade Union Freedom Bill is a distraction that will not in the end recruit a single extra member. Oppose this composite.

**Bob Crow** (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) replying to the debate said: I did not want to take the Congress's time because I thought this resolution was going to go through unanimously but I did not want to hear that the last taste you have of the Freedom Bill was someone certainly opposing because I was sitting back in the glare of the lights then and I closed my eyes and I thought it was Peter Mandelson speaking for a minute! In fact, same suit, same tie but different hair style!

Jonathan says that we do not want to go back to the seventies, eighties and nineties. It would be very hard to do that unless you were Dr Who anyway. But the reality is that I could not care less whether you want ballots or you do not want ballots, or you want your union officials elected every five years, three years or two years, personally I am in favour of ballots for going on strike and for electing officials, I always have been, but the only people who should be determining the unions' rule book are union members and that is the issue. Imagine going to a bowls club and saying "Right,

I have joined the bowls club but at the Annual General Meeting I am going to move that we play cricket on the lawn rather than bowls! You are told you cannot do it. But it is illegal because there is outside legislation that allows you to play cricket on a bowls pitch.

Jonathan says do not go back to the old days. The reason why that legislation was brought in was not just to do away with union representation, it was to boost profits for the bosses. Why in the last 25 years have profits gone through the roof? It is because they have restricted trades unions' right to fight back. Now you have the situation where 91 per cent of workers in private industry are not in a union, less than 40 per cent of people in this country are in a union, and the reality is that in the sixties and seventies and eighties, when we had the strength, even with those people who were not in a union: 82 per cent of the workers in Britain were covered by collective agreement. That is what took place.

Let us not be fooled by this Freedom Bill. We have the right to determine our own future and the reality is, the reason why people did join unions in the sixties and seventies is because they believed they could fight and they could do something. You will not join a video club if they do not sell videos and people will not join a union if they do not fight for workers. Pass this resolution and reject what the FDA say.

\* *Composite Motion 5 was CARRIED*

#### **TUPE regulations**

**The President:** I call Motion 10, TUPE Regulations. The General Council support the motion.

**Joanna Brown** (*Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists*) moved Motion 10. She said: It is hard to follow all of that because I am afraid this is quite a technical subject but it is important because it is about the way TUPE is applied for all your members.

We heard from BECTU yesterday about the unwritten law of TUPE and pensions, and this motion is really about another unwritten law of TUPE. As you all know, the TUPE regulations provide an important protection for workers when they are being transferred to a new employer. Under TUPE, the employer cannot pick and choose between workers and has to take on the whole workforce. The workers also retain the same contractual rights and collective agreements that they had with their previous employers. The TUPE regulations were amended in 2005 and some useful changes were made. We particularly welcome the broadening of the definition of an economic entity to apply to particular services and not just to whole organisations or companies so that TUPE can apply in a wider range of circumstances than before.

But less welcome is the fact that the amended regulations still include the ETO reason. The ETO reason is effectively a get of jail free card, which can be played by employers during a TUPE transfer. It enables an employer to dismiss workers during a transfer if they can show that the dismissal is for an economic, technical or organisational reason. Before the amendments in 2005, it was illegal to dismiss workers for ETO reasons but not to vary their terms and conditions of employment. The DTI argued that this was not logical because the only way that employers could make changes to workers' contracts was to dismiss them and re-engage them on new terms, so the regulations were changed in 2005 to permit employers to vary terms and conditions during a transfer providing that the employees agree. On the face of it, the changes that I have just described look like an improvement because most of the employees would probably prefer to have changes in their terms and

conditions rather than face dismissal or redundancy, but in reality there is a huge inequality in bargaining power between workers and employers in TUPE circumstances. The power is weighted so far in favour of employers that in most cases workers will have little choice but to accept the changes in order to preserve their jobs and we think that negates the whole concept of protection under TUPE.

The other problem is that the regulations have never actually defined what constitutes an ETO reason and so this provides a catch-all opportunity for employers to dismiss in transfer situations. If that happens, of course, the employees' only option is to put in a claim of unfair dismissal. Again, this conveniently shifts the burden of proof away from the employer.

The SCP has decided to raise this issue now because the NHS is going through a major re-configuration with the potential for NHS services to be transferred to the private sector. A number of NHS Trusts have already prepared the ground for putting forward ETO reasons later on by declaring staff to be at risk. The NHS Together campaign that was launched yesterday will be resisting health service privatisation, but that should not stop us from making sure that where transfers do take place, whether in health or all the other sectors in industries that we represent, our members get the best possible deal.

The Society believes it is time to protect workers properly and get rid of the ETO reason once and for all. We call on the TUC to open discussions with the Government to do just that so please support Motion 10.

**Tony Caffery** (*UNISON*) seconded Motion 10. He said: It is a sad that we take the need for TUPE regulations as a normal fact of industrial life these days. It is even sadder that we have to depend on their use to protect workers in today's world of contracting out and privatisation. The number of hours we have had to spend negotiating TUPE agreements, the number of hours spent on negotiating agreements beyond TUPE, the endless negotiations to ensure that TUPE even applies, are all because of the bent ideology which says competition provides better value and better services. The trade union movement and others have provided countless examples of evidence to prove that that is not the case.

However, the TUPE regulations provide those basic important legal safeguards we need and which we have to vigorously enforce, limited though they may be. One of those limitations from the start has been the use -- or should I say misuse -- of the economic technical or organisational reason for dismissal, such a broad definition that it gives carte blanche to employers and is wide open to abuse. The new TUPE regulations are a mixed bag, which were first promised in the 2001 election manifesto, and it has taken five years to clarify some of the situations. To be honest, it has made others more complicated. I do not need to tell you this, but staff transfers agreed or forced are stressful, for staff and for their representatives, and we still need greater clarity on TUPE and in a language that people can understand. More importantly, we need guaranteed jobs and mirror image pay pensions and conditions. In public contracting this will level the playing field and help the in-house team.

But employers should not be able to shirk their responsibilities to reasonable terms and conditions. The ETO reasons clause within the TUPE regulations is one of many areas still in need of reform and simplification.

\* *Motion 10 was CARRIED*

*(Congress adjourned until 2.15 pm)*

## **TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION**

*(Congress reassembled at 2.15 p.m.)*

**The President:** I call Congress to order. Many thanks to Singers Limited who have been playing for us this afternoon. Please give them a warm round of applause. *(Applause)*

### **unionlearn**

**The President:** Congress, we start this afternoon's business by turning now to Chapter 6 of the General Council Report, 'unionlearn', on page 120. I was very pleased to take part in the launch event of unionlearn in May this year, along with Brendan, Frances, and the Chancellor, Gordon Brown. We had a packed Congress House with over 600 people from all parts of the learning world present. So, to start off this part of the agenda we have a short video to give you a flavour of the launch and what unionlearn is all about. *(Short video shown)*

### **unionlearn and new opportunities for union members**

**The President:** I hope you enjoyed that.

I call Motion 75, unionlearn and new opportunities for union members. The General Council supports the motion.

**Bobby Barnes** (*Professional Footballers' Association*) moved Motion 75. He said: Good afternoon, President, Congress. I am very happy to be here. We have all seen the video and I think it is self-explanatory. The initiatives that were highlighted there are something that all unions should support. All around the country a lot of unions are taking a lot of initiatives involving their workers and providing educational opportunities for them, and it is something that is very much part and parcel of our work at the PFA. Without further ado, what I would like to do is to move Motion 75 and to call on my Chief Executive, Gordon Taylor, to give an insight into the work of the Professional Footballers' Association.

**Gordon Taylor** (*Chief Executive, Professional Footballers' Association*). He said: President, Congress, ladies and gentlemen, it is a delight to be here and if I could thank Bobby and introduce my colleagues on the stage who are all good examples not just of in-house training in the industry but those of their own volition who have been prepared to take qualifications to give themselves the confidence to deal not only with the football world but the outside world.

I will start off with my Chairman, Chris Powell, a full England International, you will know him with Charlton and West Ham, a sports science student and qualified football coach.

I then move on to the female member of our team, Simone Pound, who has a degree in the performing arts and she is now our equal opportunities executive and working on women's football.

John Hudson, midfield dynamo with Oldham and Rochdale and is now our community officer and education executive.

Next to John is Pat Lally, former centre-half with Millwall and a qualified graduate, post graduate certificate in education, now our education officer.

Oshor Williams, who is a midfield dynamo with Southampton, Preston, and Port Vale, and he is our very first union learning representative.

Earl Barrett, well-known fullback with Oldham, Aston Villa, Everton, full England International, England B.



Udo Onwere, football fans will know, with Chelsea, Fulham, Blackpool, and Lincoln, he is a legal graduate and he very soon qualifies as a fully qualified solicitor.

Bobby Barnes, as you know, a left-winger like myself, which is good background for the trade union.

*(Laughter)*

Excuse me for my football analogies but it is the very first time I have done a warm-up for the 3 o'clock kick-off for a Prime Minister. *(Laughter)* As you probably know, the only certain thing in life is death, taxes, and if you are a footballer that you will need another career after football is over. Thinking about it, that applies to a lot of other people, of course, including the Prime Minister as well. So, it is really there for everybody. Education really for 25 years has been the flagship of our union. I recall my predecessor, Cliff Lloyd, telling me that next year we celebrate our 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the oldest established sports union in the whole world. I am pleased to see how things have gone on from that, but how pleased those early forefathers, Billy Meredith, Welsh people in particular will know, he was like the Stanley Matthews of his day, he was well over 50 and still playing international football, and on his deathbed my predecessor went to see him and he pulled out a battered old suitcase and it was full of caps, medals, and trophies, and he said, "Always remind your members that they didn't look after me in my old age."

That is why I am so pleased to hear the likes of Brendan Barber, who said that union learning is the most significant development in trade unionism for a generation and to use union learning as a catalyst to enhance the union movement, and for everybody within to know that is what we are about, and for unions to play a full role in the democratic team of our country's social fabric and politics.

We know that 75 percent of youngsters who join football at age 16 will be out by the time they are 21. Fifty players a year are out of the game through permanent injury. The fact is when all players reach their 30s then they do need another career. It is interesting that we have a thousand grants a year. This has developed to a great extent and it is amazing the confidence it gives players to know they have something to fall back on. Interestingly enough, a third of those courses are for graduates, a third for football coaches wanting to stay in the game; then we have lawyers, we have accountants, and we have drivers.

It is the way ahead for unions. It has been the most important part of our union. It is important in this day and age when we have youngsters who have so many privileges and do not know where they come from to remind them of their responsibilities to the game, and you, and each of your unions to their particular profession, to work with employers, and in football terms if we are a left-winger and we have the CB on the right perhaps we will hit the target down the centre; it is being a valuable part of that process of collective agreements.

We have a role to play outside each of our own professions. We want footballers as well to have social responsibilities. You have seen the cosmopolitan nature of our game, the success of our anti-racism project. When we had a ballot a few years ago we had a 93 percent return, that is, with over half our members from foreign countries. Let us all play our role not only for ourselves but for our industries and for the world out there: anti-racism, charity work, employment law, learning all about this, social welfare, health, transport, and the greatest of all is education. Education is that key to unlock the door of all understanding.

Ladies and gentlemen, I know you will support the motion. Thank you.

**Adrian Askew** (*Connect*) seconded Motion 75.

He said: President, I hear around the hall, and maybe some stories going around perhaps in the media, that there are one or two disagreements between the trades union movement and the Government, but I suppose conflict does make a better headline than everyone agrees life gets better for a lot of working people. There are many examples where unions working with the active support of the Government have done much to make a real difference. Tens of thousands of people have been helped to find learning opportunities, helped to improve themselves, to raise their earning potential, and to drag this country out of a mounting skills crisis. That is thanks to all those union learning reps doing what all union activists are really for, which is to make life better for working people. Certainly, the Government has played a crucial role in funding and setting the skills agenda, but it is the unions that are now driving that agenda. Whilst some employers are committed to raising Britain's skills base, many just whinge from the sidelines, call on everyone else to do something, and leave others to invest in the UK workforce.

Yes, unions and government have a good story to tell but that does not mean that more cannot be done. We need to take this work further; we need to move the skills agenda on. These are modern times and things have changed. We are a globalised economy meaning we are competing with countries that will always win on price, where we must compete by being the most highly skilled and, incidentally, against a background where China this year will produce 4.1 million university graduates in one year.

We now have to build on the excellent work that has been done on basic skills and put some real emphasis and focus on high skills. We know that the demand for learning is there. My own union, Connect, launched its own project to establish Union Learning Reps earlier this year and already we have more involved than we had planned for the whole of the two-year project. What is more, these are not just existing trade union activists, these are people who have never engaged with a union before, new people in workplaces who can demonstrate the difference that being in a union can make.

Yes, we thank the Government for the investment they have made so far but, as I say, we must push for more, for a commitment to make bad employers accept their responsibility for investing in skills and a recognition that whilst professional workers have skills they also need to learn more, need to develop their careers, and build success in their chosen field.

Colleagues, working together, governments, unions, and employers, we can put high skills right at the centre of a strong economy. Please support the motion.

**The President:** A point of order has been raised.

**A delegate** (*Communication Workers' Union*): said: President, Congress, my point of order is that I came here to represent and our union came here to represent our members. I did not come here to be part of a sitcom or a media show. *(Applause)* This Congress belongs to the trade unions. I notice that the visitors' gallery is full. You should have been here all week to listen to the other problems we have. *(Applause)* I would request, President, that respect is given during all debates. The debate is not given respect with all that is going on and a lot of it is to do with the media. I would also suggest, and I only knew when I got to the bottom of these stairs, there is a health and safety issue because I nearly tripped up twice! *(Applause)*

**The President:** Thank you very much, delegate, for making that point.

**John Walsh** (*Amicus*) supported Motion 75.

He said: Hopefully, this is a point that is important enough to get your attention and it is not one for the media. (*Applause*)

**The President:** Can I say that we are pleased to have the press here with us but we also need to continue with our business so if we could have some quiet whilst a delegate speaks then we will get on with the rest of the business that you are here for. (*Applause*)

**John Walsh:** I am an Amicus young member and I am here to say that we represent and we support union learning. We are keen to underline the importance of a learning agenda in strengthening union representation and point out how much all unions owe to the mainstreaming of the learning agenda. The higher education sector of AMICUS has unique knowledge and training in provision of and would like to offer their experience and support to the unionlearn project.

In my brief comments I will talk on a key issue that affects young people and unions today, that is, apprenticeships. I am a third generation apprentice and I came out of my time with BAA Systems last year. I was introduced to my union rep for the first time on the first day and I have had my union support ever since.

Earlier this year I made a presentation to the apprenticeship ministerial steering group, chaired by Skills Minister, Phil Hope, and one of the key things I urged the ministerial group to do was address misconceptions about apprenticeships. I put the case that apprenticeships are vital but that we have concerns about them. Starting with the quality, we are concerned that young black people are less likely to end up with a job at the end of their apprenticeship and at 26 percent the gender pay gap for apprentices is higher than full-time workers. We are also concerned about the low completion rates for apprenticeships. It is improving but only half of young people complete their apprenticeships, often blaming the low pay allowed by the current exemptions from the National Minimum Wage.

Last Thursday I went back to the ministerial steering group with ideas to overcome these problems and I believe we are making progress in getting our issues heard. There is no single easy solution. There is a big role for the Government and, in particular, for employers. There is a lot that unions can do as well. Unions should put apprenticeships on the collective bargaining agenda. They should help to break down barriers to well-paid, high-quality apprenticeships for young women and black people, and they should organise apprentices. After all, who else is going to fill the skills gap that we are finding is rapidly taking over. Thank you very much for listening to me.

**The President:** I should say thanks to Gordon and to the PFA for the excellent work they are doing in transforming lives and helping people to achieve their ambitions and aspirations. Well done for that. (*Applause*)

\* *Motion 75 was CARRIED.*

**The President:** You will see that we have been joined on the platform by the Prime Minister, who will be addressing us shortly and presenting the Learning Rep Award. (*Applause*) Tony, I want to say that you are very welcome at our Congress.

I will introduce you properly in a moment. Thank you.

### **Union Learning Rep Award**

**The President:** Congress, we now present the final reps award, the Union Learning Rep. Nicky Simpson is an Amicus member and works for the Royal Bank of Scotland in Southend, Essex. She became a Union Learning Rep in 2004 and has organised more than 500 learning opportunities at her workplace. Through her promotion of the Learning Agenda Nicky's management has become union-friendly and have agreed that union officials can promote union membership in the workplace. Nicky has personally recruited more than 200 new members to the union. The management have now told her that they will agree to recognise another 50 Learning Reps in the workplace to give more workers learning opportunities. Nicky, please, come to the stage and receive your award from the Prime Minister.

*(The Prime Minister presented the award)*

### **Address by the Prime Minister: Rt Hon Tony Blair MP**

**The President:** Congress, it is always an honour to have the Prime Minister to address Congress, particularly a prime minister who has led the Labour Party to an historic three successive General Election victories. (*Applause*) Delegates it is something of a departure from our normal practice but I am delighted to be able to tell you that Tony has agreed to take a question and answer session after his speech. This session will be facilitated by Brendan giving delegates the chance to put their questions directly to the Prime Minister.

Congress, we should never forget the immense achievements of this Government, many of which resulted from longstanding trade union campaigns, including the National Minimum Wage, union recognition, devolution for Scotland and Wales, and unprecedented levels of economic stability and growth. Of course, there is still much to do and inevitably debate will continue on tactics and priorities but we should never forget just what has been achieved.

It is now my great pleasure to introduce the Prime Minister, the Rt Hon Tony Blair. (*Applause*)

**Rt. Hon. Tony Blair MP:** Thank you, Congress, for that kind introduction, more or less.

There was a point of order just a moment or two ago that was about why is the gallery full and why are all the media here. It is actually a pity the media is not here to hear about Union Learning Reps that we introduced rather than people making a protest. (*Applause*) I simply say to people who make the protest, you are perfectly entitled to do it but realise that those people who are in fact hostile to a Labour government and everything we have tried to achieve, you are doing precisely what they want; not very sensible. (*Applause*) Anyway, there we are.

Gloria, first of all, can I say a very heartfelt word of congratulations to you, the first ever black woman as President of the TUC; it is a tremendous achievement. Well done. (*Applause*) Especially as I gather you are an Arsenal fan! We had better not put that to the vote.

I would like to begin, Congress, by just reminding you that five years ago at this time I actually had to cancel my address to you because of the terrorist attack in the United States of America, which killed thousands, and the anniversary of which was yesterday. I would like to pay tribute to the way that the TUC handled itself that day. Before starting my speech I want to remember all those who died, including the many British people, to repeat our sympathy and condolences for the loss of

their loved ones and rededicate ourselves to complete and total opposition to terrorism anywhere, for whatever reason. I also wish to pay my respects to the British Armed Forces who since that time have fought, and in some cases sadly lost their lives, and express our thanks for their bravery, professionalism and commitment to duty.

Go back even further and you may recall, at least some of you, the first time I made a keynote speech at the Labour Conference in 1990, when I was Employment Spokesman. On that occasion I listed the policy agenda for a future Labour government. I re-read it the other day. We have done most of it, the big headline items like the minimum wage, but also things like restoring union rights at GCHQ, things small in themselves but massively symbolic of a changed government.

Now, in case we had all forgotten we have had three terms of a Labour government for the first time in over 100 years of trying and every year I have come to the TUC as Prime Minister, but remember the 18 years before when you never had sight or sound of a prime minister. For 18 years you were addressed by the Leader of the Opposition. The problem with that title is that it is true to what it says on the tin, the leader opposes. The leader does not do anything because he has no power to do anything and however difficult it is, and as we can see today however fraught our relations are from time to time, or the differences between us are, make no mistake, I want the TUC to continue to be addressed by a Labour prime minister, not to be addressed again by a Leader of the Opposition for 18 years. (*Applause*) The key to ensuring that this happens does not lie in today's headlines but in the answers to tomorrow's challenges.

I will have time to answer some questions after the speech and I know you want to talk about the NHS and other issues, but in my speech I want to talk about the real question which should dominate politics today, who has the answers to the challenge of global change?

Globalisation is debated so often today that it can just elicit a yawn. "The world is interdependent" has become a cliché. What is not clichéd, however, is the response to it. For the first time I can sense building up, here and around the world, a division that is not one of ideology but is one of attitude as to how we deal with the consequences of globalisation. Ten years ago the response was reasonably clear and adopted by consensus. Yes, globalisation was at one level frightening in its pace and reach, but the only rational response was to manage it, prepare for it, and in a sense roll with it. I do not think there is that consensus today. There is a mindset of fear that is different and deep. Yes, people see the burgeoning economic power of China, India, and the emerging economies that threaten jobs and stability but in a sense they are fairly used to it, it has been coming a long time.

I believe what has changed is the interplay between globalisation, immigration, and terrorism. Suddenly we feel under threat, physically from this new terrorism that is coming onto our streets, culturally as new waves of migrants change our society, and economically because an open world economy is hastening the sharpness of competition. People feel they are working longer but are less secure. They feel the rules are changing and they never voted to change them. They feel, in a word, powerless. This is producing a pessimism that is pervasive and fearful because there seems no way through it, or at least a way under our control.

So here we are at one level an immensely successful country, recently praised by the OECD for our economy, unemployment at record lows, and employment at record highs. For all the problems there is no serious doubt that the NHS and our schools are improving. No Western European country in the

past few years has made more progress than Britain in tackling child poverty. We produced the growth in business and prosperity at a time when, if I can remind Congress, we introduced the minimum wage, statutory rights to union recognition, and an end to blacklisting, full-time rights for part-time workers, and a host of other employment protection, most recently the gangmasters legislation.

Actually, virtually in any objective comparison of this tenth year of government and 1997, the present wins out over the past but yet people are fearful because it is the future which rightly concerns our country. Incidentally, similar concerns would be felt in virtually any European nation, or in America. For example, myself and other world leaders are trying hard to get a World Trade deal by the end of this year. The benefits for global prosperity will be much much greater than the last trade round and will literally lift millions out of poverty worldwide. But I tell you frankly, the leaders trying to do this do not have swathes of public opinion with them and in some countries have swathes against them.

In respect of terrorism there is a large part of the Western world inclined to believe the threat is George Bush, not Islamist terrorism. (*heckling*) You make my point. Thank you. Go to most countries and do a focus group and immigration will come out top of the list of anxieties.

There is a debate going on which, confusingly for the politicians, often crosses traditional left/right lines and the debate is open versus closed: do we embrace the challenge of more open societies or build defence against it? Indeed, underlying many of your debates this week is precisely that theme. I believe we need an approach that is strong and not scared, that addresses people's anxieties but does not indulge them, and above all has the right values underpinning it. This challenge will not be overcome by policy alone but by a powerful case made on the basis of values, most especially those that combine liberty with justice, security with tolerance and respect for others. In the policy debate I believe we have to escape the tyranny of the 'or', the false choice, and develop the inclusive nature of the 'and'.

The answer to economic globalisation is open markets and strong welfare and public service systems, particularly those like education, which equip people for change. The answer to terrorism is measures on security and tackling its underlying causes. The answer to concern over migration is to welcome its contribution and put a system of rules in place to control it.

Over the past few months we have witnessed both the dire conflict in Lebanon and the attempted terrorist conspiracies in the UK. At the same time there has been a raging debate about immigration from Eastern Europe and also about sentiment within our Muslim communities. In one form or another, such debates have been convulsing politics in many disparate nations.

It is no surprise that people are worried, that they are shocked by the fact that terrorists can be home-grown, shocked at death and destruction on our television screens whether from Lebanon, Palestine, Iraq, Afghanistan, Jordan, Turkey, or a host of other countries, and confused as to what is the right answer.

These past three days I have been in the Middle East. I have talked to many different people there. In media terms, there is a natural desire always to concentrate on the surface eruptions of conflict – the tragic death of so many innocent people. In an age where the picture dominates, the graphic human suffering has most impact.

But go even a little beneath the surface and the suffering is not less, but an understanding of what is

really happening is so much clearer. You might have thought from the news coverage, for example, that everyone I met in Lebanon was hostile. Some where, but most, including members of the Cabinet in Lebanon, still bearing the scars of previous assassination attempts by outside interests, were desperate for our help. Why? Because they know perfectly well that the conflict in Lebanon was just a proxy for another, deeper, conflict. They know their suffering was not the product of some chance event, but part of a strategy of outside powers in a bigger game.

The Palestinian leadership are passionate in their condemnation of their treatment of Israel. But don't believe that they do not know why the crisis in Gaza was started and who was responsible. In Iraq and Afghanistan likewise, there is no doubt about what is happening.

From the beginning in Afghanistan, US, UK and the troops of 25 other nations have been there with a full UN mandate; in Iraq we have been with such a mandate for over three years. People focus again on the terrible suffering of the innocent and the loss of so many brave soldiers. But again, there is a deeper reason for the suffering; and it's nothing to do with so-called failures of planning. There is a war being fought there, by proxy. Afghans and Iraqis have voted for their governments. Those attacking them, Al-Qaeda, the Taliban and Iranian backed militia are doing so to destroy those slender democratic roots. We are defending them. We should be proud of defending them. We should be proud of what we are doing to support democrats in Iraq and Afghanistan. I repeat, proud of it. And you should also be proud of the work that trade unions are doing in this country to support trade unionists in Iraq and Afghanistan who have trade union rights for the first time. *(Applause)*

If you don't mind me saying so, since I am on the subject, you can hold up your posters about 'Troops out', but the reason why troops are in is because the democratic governments of Iraq and Afghanistan need our troops to protect their people against the Taliban and Al-Qaeda. *(Applause)* I note that delegates are warming up a bit here. *(Heckling from the floor)* Oh, yes. You were warmed up already, but I am just getting there. *(Heckling from the floor)* Look, you can disagree, but listen to the argument, please, just for once. It is a democratic debate. Ask a question afterwards but listen to the argument. *(Applause)*

To continue, meanwhile, the global Muslim community feels humiliated and angry. They feel pinned between the policy of the US, the UK and its allies, on the one hand, and the extremists within, on the other. The result is that in the Lebanese conflict many people, Muslim and non-Muslim, will rail against Israel but often with barely a mention of the deaths of innocent Israelis, also, admittedly fewer, but each life is a life, or the 4,000 Iranian supplied rockets fired into the north of Israel.

So, what is the way through this? It is to stand strong and fight where we need to: for democracy in Iraq and Afghanistan; against terrorists, home-grown or otherwise. There is no justification for this terrorism, never was and never will be. We should fight it wherever it is.

But the answer is also to stand strong for the values of justice as well as democracy. Investing against global poverty in Africa is investing in our own future security. Peace in Palestine is not only just and right, it is the indispensable pre-condition for rolling back the momentum of this global terrorist movement which threatens us. The peace must be on the right terms, of course. I have shown my support for Israel's right to be secure and I will continue to do so. Peace which threatens its security is no peace. But on the right terms it must be done.

Yesterday's announcement of a government of national unity in Palestine is precisely what I hoped for. On the basis it is faithful to the conditions spelled out by the Quartet – the UN, EU, US and Russia – we should lift the economic sanctions on the Palestinian Authority and be prepared to deal with the government, the whole government. Then piece-by-piece and step-by-step, we must put a process of peace back together again.

This must go alongside a more intensive and more frank engagement with the Muslim communities here. Some days ago, I met some of the younger mainstream activists within the British community. I was excited by their intelligence and determination. They don't want to pander to this extremism. They want to confront it. We should support them in doing so. For example, it is not acceptable that some Imams, who cannot even speak our language, come here to preach hatred; or that women are not allowed into certain mosques. Where the mainstream of the Muslim communities challenges such behaviour, we should be on their side helping them.

There is no reason, therefore, to despair of this tide of extremism. It can be turned back, by strength in fighting it; and wisdom in how the fight is conducted. The same is true of the issue of migration. Incidentally, I applaud your TUC statement on this issue. It is so close to my own view that I thought of simply reading it out and letting it stand. That may be both the first and last time I can say that of a motion to the TUC.

As you say: "If migrant workers are treated fairly and paid a decent wage, they represent no threat to the livelihoods of people who are already living and working in the UK, and it is good for the people of eastern Europe because it provides them with growth, better jobs and wages, and spreads and deepens European democratic values. Creating a common market means that workers must have rights as well as businesses, and there must be freedom of movement for workers as well as for capital, goods and services." That is absolutely right.

We have recently had historically high levels of economic growth and historically low levels of inflation. That has been helped by migrant labour. The Department of Work and Pensions has found no evidence of a link between immigration and unemployment, and it is not true that the earnings of most UK-born workers are lower than they would have been. Indeed, migrant workers have had a positive impact on the economy – increasing growth rates over the past few years by anything between 0.5 percent and 1 percent, which makes a huge contribution, obviously, to the Exchequer.

You point out again in your statement to Congress that migrant workers have filled many stubborn vacancies in education, health, social services, transport, agriculture, construction and hospitality. They have filled labour gaps in key regions like East Anglia.

But there are real challenges. This is particularly the case in those areas where immigration has not been a feature of life in the past. This can create short-term funding problems and unexpected pressures on local authorities. There are problems of over-crowding in some private housing, homelessness and some anti-social behaviour. A small number of schools are struggling to cope with a sudden influx. There can be additional costs associated with language teaching. Some of the primary care trusts in Southampton and Slough are ensuring that new migrants working come to hospital services through their doctor and not through accident and emergency departments. We need, therefore, a thorough overhaul of how our local authorities and public services cope with this changing situation.

There is a lot, too, that we can learn from other countries about how to support integration, from Canada, New Zealand and Australia. We do, of course, need to be vigilant about the rights of the migrants themselves. Migrant workers will, typically, be less adept with the language and less aware of their rights. Pay levels below the minimum wage, unlawful deductions, low wages, long hours, poor accommodation – often contrary to the law – such standards for migrant workers are completely unacceptable and must be stopped.

Again, the TUC has done much good work in this area. The Polish and Lithuanian workers engaged for the daffodil season in Cornwall who did a 70 hour week and who, after all the deductions, were left with just 21 pence. The three Polish workers living in the back of a trailer lorry on an abattoir loading bay. This is utterly barbaric and wrong. As part of the Warwick Agreement, as you know, we have introduced the Gangmasters' Licensing Act, and this Act must not simply be in effect but it must be enforced and enforced vigorously.

These rules and their enforcement are not just important for migrant workers; they prevent organised gangs bringing more people into Britain than we need or can cope with. And this is at the heart of public concerns. People want migration controlled. They may argue about more or less migration, but there is no argument that we should, by right, be able to decide that ourselves, not have it decided by forces, often global in nature, outside our control.

That is why I say to you, in order to meet this argument and this worry, that we do have to have, as far as is possible, secure means of identifying who comes in, who goes out and who stays in Britain. In our country today the old methods will not work for the simple reason that 30 million people come to the UK every year. More than 200 million pass through our airports, and the vast bulk, of course, do so not just legitimately but vitally for our economy. Overseas students are part of the life blood of our universities; tourists and visitors, an essential part of our earnings; companies come and locate here as part of global business. If we put all that at risk, then we are sunk as an economy. So we need a means of identification which allows our open economy still to function.

The sophistication of document forgery means we can only be confident of people's identities if we have their biometrics – their fingerprints, irises and digital measure of their face. By April 2008 all visa applicants will have their fingerprints taken. All visa nationals will need biometrics to get through border control. By April 2009 people here for work or study will have biometric identity cards, and biometric travel documents will be issued to refugees by the middle of 2007. The first UK citizen ID cards will be issued by 2009.

Alongside this, like many other countries, we will have to have a system of electronic borders, checking in and checking out all of our visitors.

I know this answer is not always popular, but I can tell you that without secure identity, controlled migration just is not possible. You can have armies of inspectors, police and bureaucrats trying to track down illegals but without a proper system of ID – and biometric technology now allows this – it is a hopeless task. As identity abuse grows, and it is a huge problem now across parts of the private as well as public sector, so actually the gains for consumers, individuals and companies, will go through a secure ID database.

Migration from the European Union is a particular issue. There has been a big influx of Eastern Europeans, not just here but elsewhere. I have to say that the evidence is that they have helped our economy and not been a burden. 97 percent work

full-time. Only 3 percent of them bring their children with them, and preliminary figures suggest that up to 50 percent are returning home. We are not the only country doing this. Spain, Portugal, Finland and Italy have followed our example. Of course, the prospect of Bulgarian and Rumanian accession raises its own issues and means that very careful decisions will have to be taken about labour market access, although even without that access, there will still be freedom of movement.

The point I am making is that the danger with the public concern is that we lose the argument over something of crucial importance to the future of this country, and that is European enlargement. Remember how fragile is the agreement in Europe that Turkey should be allowed membership. Yet a denial of membership, even if Turkey were to meet the membership criteria, would be a seismic decision, with consequences far beyond Europe for obvious reasons.

I think we should be clear. An enlarged European Union has been good for Europe and good for Britain. Yes, we have had to support it financially, but in past times we supported Ireland, Portugal and Spain, today our trade with those countries far outweighs the subsidy, and I believe that Irish progress within the European Union has been a crucial dimension of success in the Northern Ireland Peace Process. So lose the argument over enlargement and we will rue the long-term consequences.

The true answer again is not to resist enlargement but to support economic development in the new states as last year's budget deal does; and to tackle the problems that can accompany enlargement – organised crime and gangs crossing into Europe through the enlarged Member States – with strong pan-European measures to combat the threat; crack down on illegal working and exploitation; and insist on full co-operation from all Member States in doing so.

My point is this. There are answers. It is just that they are new answers that require new thinking and ones that combine our values with hard-headed policy that realistically analyses the dangers and minimises them.

Now is the right time to debate these issues because the stakes are very high. Some of these issues that cause such concern, anger and disagreement, such as some of the issues that we have seen this afternoon, are about the nature of the society that we are creating, and it is necessary to debate it. For myself, I do not want to live in a closed society, one that hides away in the face of terrorism or leaves others to do the dirty job of fighting it, nor one that sees immigrants as swamping us, nor one that concentrates simply on protecting one job at the expense of creating others. I want an open society with rules; one that delights in its tolerance and pursues justice not only within our borders but outside them.

Such a society has in-built confidence. It is optimistic by nature. It sees opportunities before threats; looks to potential first and anxiety second. It knows that there is a price to pay in this world of change, but knows also that to refuse to pay it costs us much more in the longer-term.

Protectionism in the economy; isolationism in world affairs; nativism within our society; all, in the end, mean weakness in the face of challenge. If we believe in ourselves as a country, we can be strong. We can overcome the challenge of global change; better, we can relish its possibilities.

Over the coming months, we will be conducting this debate and refining policy on the basis of it. I say to you, participate in it. Organised labour has a crucial role to play, not one of us shouting at one another but debating issues sensibly, calmly and reasonably. That is exactly, of course, where modern trade unionism should be. These are precisely the issues that concern

your members today. If we can shape the debate in the right way and obtain solutions which are fair yet practical, we will do well by the country but we will also show that when the politicking of the previous two weeks passes, politics, true politics, which is about ideas and solutions, difficult decisions and hardheaded choices, through being in government can deliver the progress we all want to see. Thank you. *(Applause)*

### Question and answer session with the Prime Minister

**The President:** Thank you, Tony, for your interesting and challenging words.

**Brendan Barber:** Tony, thank you very much indeed for that address to Congress and thank you, too, for agreeing to do this question and answer session with delegates. We asked unions to indicate what were some of the issues on which they would like the opportunity to pose questions and, as you might imagine, some of the issues which have been most prominent in our agenda this week are amongst the issues on which, I hope, we will be able to give delegates the opportunity to raise points with you; issues around privatisation, about employment rights, the pressures facing our manufacturing sector and so on.

What I intend to do, in terms of trying to handle this process, is to ask those union delegates who have said that they want to ask a question to come and make themselves available. I hope the photographers will co-operate and leave some space on the seats at the front so that the delegates asking questions can use the microphone in the aisle in front of me. I see one or two already available.

I will start with UNISON, PCS and Prospect. I think the first question will come from Erica Petgrave from UNISON, and then we will hear from a number of colleagues on privatisation. Erica.

**Erica Petgrave (UNISON):** I am proud to be a member of operational police staff and a part of the public sector. Like many other UNISON members, my colleagues and I have been at the forefront of the Government's modernisation agenda, changing our roles and developing our skills to provide a better service to the public. When we were all making progress, benefiting from the investment and improving our public services, why now has the Government resorted to the old, fated Tory policies of introducing markets and competition into our public services, especially into our NHS? *(Applause)*

**Brendan Barber:** Colleagues, I think it is probably easiest if I try and take two or three colleagues at a time with questions in the same area. Janice Godrich from PCS.

**Janice Godrich (Public and Commercial Services Union):** Thank you, Brendan. Prime Minister, the consequences of Gordon Brown's continuing job cuts amongst PCS members are being widely felt. The National Audit Office has recently reported that 21 million calls to contact centres in the Department of Work and Pensions, the department that I have worked in for 25 years, go unanswered, and your own Select Committee described this as a failure. New threats to jobs will damage enforcement of both the National Minimum Wage and health and safety laws, yet we saw *The Guardian* recently revealing that the Government is spending more than £2.2 billion a year on private sector consultants. How do you think a public servant feels working opposite a consultant who is being paid, on average, about six times as much for doing the same work, while services are deteriorating

and they face more privatisation and the threat of compulsory redundancy?

**Brendan Barber:** I will take one more before asking Tony to respond on this area. Graeme Henderson from Prospect.

**Graeme Henderson (Prospect):** Prime Minister, why is the Government so wholeheartedly, almost dogmatically, committed to the privatisation of public services, contrary to public opinion and overwhelming experience? When will you ensure that your proposals are accompanied by a clear evidenced based business case to demonstrate how they will improve the specific public service, taking fuller account of the practical experience, expertise and knowledge of those expected to deliver them?

**The Prime Minister:** First of all in relation to the DWP and the job cuts, I understand the concerns and it is important that we discuss it with the trade unions and others, but the reason for making the changes was because of the reduced requirement because of changes in policy. I know there can be a lot of frustration, particularly when I talk to members of staff in Jobcentreplus, but it has to be set against the context of where we have massively increased the workforce in the public sector during the past few years. I say this to colleagues who go out and tell the public "We are privatising the National Health Service", there are a quarter-of-a-million more public sector workers working in the Health Service today than when we came to power. Pay rises used to be staged. They have not been. There have been real term rises of 25 percent - 30 percent. We have increased through Agenda For Change, negotiated with the trade unions, the opportunities for people to work in the Health Service and work in a way which gives them a greater chance of professional development. So it would be very curious, and I think most members of the public, as opposed to those in our movement, and very odd when they see massive amounts of additional money going into public services, a quarter-of-a-million more people in the Health Service alone, 90,000 teaching assistants and 30,000 extra teachers, the thousands of extra police and so on, to say that we are anti public service.

However, I do say – one of the good things about being in my position is that I can give people advice and whether they take it or not is up to them – that at the next election, believe me, the issue is not going to be whether we have put sufficient amounts of money or sufficiently supported public sector workers but have we managed to deliver the outputs for the money that the taxpayers feel that they have put in? My concern, very simply, is that without some of the changes that we have made, for example, opening-up to outside contractors to do things like cataracts, diagnostic services, in circumstances where, for ages and ages, people were waiting for months and months on waiting lists, we would never have got the waiting list falls that we have achieved. In the end, it has only been as a result not just of the money but reform so that today, as opposed to when we came to office, people who have heart disease wait on average a fraction of how long they used to wait ten years ago, and for cataract operations, which used to take two years, people wait for three months or less, and we have waiting lists at their lowest point since the Health Service began. So there are really difficult issues and we will try and sort them out with you.

Let us be absolutely clear about this. The National Health Service and our public services have got better. One reason for that is the money but the other reason is the reform. If we want to carry on with that

investment and not return to the Tory days of under-investment, we have to keep the reform going at the same time, in my view.

**Brendan Barber:** Thank you, Tony.

**The Prime Minister:** That point did not meet with riotous applause.

**Brendan Barber:** I am sure it will come. *(Laughter)*

**The Prime Minister:** Next year.

**Brendan Barber:** One area in which there have been very particular concerns.... Don't put me off my stroke.

**The Prime Minister:** Do you know what he was going to start this session with -- I am going to tell this -- but he was not brave enough? He was going to turn to me at the outset and say, "What is it you will miss about the TUC?" Anyway. *(Applause and laughter)*

**Brendan Barber:** I was going to save that up to the end and now you have ruined it.

**The Prime Minister:** Sorry. It gives me time to think, anyway.

**Brendan Barber:** Prisons and probation services are two parts of the public services where there are major concerns about privatisation and reforms are being pressed through. Colin Moses of the POA and Judy McKnight of NAPO, I think, would like to raise some particular points on those areas.

**Colin Moses (Prison Officers Association):** Prime Minister, I am pleased you made reference to privatisation because when you came to office in 1997 we only had four private prisons. We now have eleven. When you came to office we had 61,000 people in custody. We now have 79,000 -- that is a 30 percent increase -- in prison for profit. In Opposition you promised us, the POA, the return of our trade union rights. You made reference in your opening speech to GCHQ. You have not returned our trade union rights so we, as prison officers, stand without human rights. So what we actually have is a larger prison population being kept there for profit -- that is my question -- why have you put so many people in prison for profit, and continue to do so? Before you leave, are you going to give us our trade union rights back and stop putting people in prison for profit?

**Brendan Barber:** Thank you, Colin. Judy.

**Judy McKnight (napo):** Prime Minister, given that all the evidence today suggests that the Probation Service is most effective in reducing the offending and protecting the public when it works on an integrated basis, when it works in partnership with other key players, can you explain why competition is being introduced to replace partnership and why no evidence-based business case has been produced for dismantling and fragmenting the Probation Service?

**Brendan Barber:** Thank you, Judy. Prime Minister, perhaps you might want to respond to those two points as they are in the same area.

**The Prime Minister:** Colin, I need to speak to you more about the trade union rights. My understanding is that of course trade unions are recognised in the prison system. There are private prisons, which are also unionised, incidentally, but the reason why we have extra numbers of prison places is perfectly simple. We have had to deal with rising levels of the prison population because of the sentences that are being passed. I am sure you did not mean to suggest this, but it would be a bit bizarre to suggest that the reason why we have extra numbers of people in prison is because of private prisons. The reason we have that is because the public, generally, wants a tougher line, particularly with violent offenders in prison.

As to the second point which Judy was making, there will be, whether it is in relation to the Probation Service or any other part of the National Offender Management Service.... *(Heckling)*. Look, it is not a question again of privatising but a question of realising that sometimes there is an expertise out there, for example in the voluntary and charitable sector, that can sometimes be better able to deal with some of the issues.... *(Heckling)* It is important to keep an open mind on it because there are groups which work with prisoners who have had severe alcohol and drug abuse problems and can actually work better from the voluntary sector but within the system which exists.

The Probation Service has made great changes in the past few years, and I applaud the work which they are doing, but there are instances -- this is right across the public service -- when a more open attitude towards breaking down the barriers between the public, independent and voluntary sectors delivers a better service. If the Probation Service is confident of its ability, it should not be afraid of that process.

**Brendan Barber:** Thank you, Tony. I would like now to move to a different area. In your speech, Tony, you talked a lot about the huge issue of migration. We have put a statement to Congress this year which addresses that issue and you touched on that, but where we put a very strong emphasis on the case for much stronger protections, not only for migrant workers but for other workers, too. The abuses that people can suffer, people employed through agency arrangements, people in bogus self-employment relationships, are the most vulnerable to abuse. I think a couple of colleagues want to raise more detailed questions in those areas. We have John Thompson from UCATT and Sandra Walmsley from CWU.

**John Thompson (Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians):** Prime Minister, the construction industry is well-known for the problems of bogus self-employment. On many sites up to 60 per cent of site workers are self-employed. Many of them are misclassified by their employers to avoid payments of employers' National Insurance contributions. Tax avoidance costs the Exchequer billions of pounds a year and has allowed employers to evade many of their responsibilities on employment rights.

Although our industry has a training levy, construction has a worse record for training than any other sector. Pension provision is virtually non-existent amongst the bogus self-employed. We have the worst accident record in industry, and migrant workers are engaged in this way because they have few rights, leaving them vulnerable to exploitation. When is the Government going to end bogus self-employment in the construction industry?

**Brendan Barber:** Thanks, John. Sandra.

**Sandra Walmsley** (*Communication Workers Union*): The CWU is campaigning to secure justice for agency workers. In the absence of legal protection, agency members are suffering inferior terms and conditions and are excluded from a whole range of other employment rights. Other European countries show you can have a flexible workforce, strong social policies and high levels of employment where agency workers have been given equal rights from day one of their employment.

Can the Prime Minister confirm, therefore, when the Government will introduce legislation into the UK to guarantee equal rights for agency workers and support the implementation of the Temporary Agency Workers' Directive?

**Brendan Barber:** Perhaps you would like to take those last two points, Tony.

**The Prime Minister:** On the last point, it is still subject to negotiation, Sandra, within the European Union. It is true that we have been worried about certain aspects of the protections given because we do not want to put other people's jobs at risk and we have to be careful of that. The flexibility of our labour market, on the whole, has been a plus for this country, which is one of the reasons why we have such low levels of unemployment compared with other countries. Tomorrow, I think, we will probably see, for the first time in some months, a fall again in unemployment, which is very welcome indeed. That we, none the less, hope we can agree a directive, but it just has to be on the right terms.

The point that John has made on the construction industry and bogus self-employment, we are looking at this issue now and we will be making certain changes that will come in in the Construction Industry Scheme which should allow us to take care of some of the most acute problems. It is a real issue. It is a real issue of exploitation of people, and also it can often relate to health and safety issues as well. I hope, John, that we will be able to deal with at least some of the issues which you raise.

**Brendan Barber:** Thank you, Tony. The next area involves some of the pressures on the manufacturing sector. Again, you have talked about some of the issues arising from globalisation. Richard Clifton from Amicus and Simon Williams from Connect have questions to raise in those areas.

**Richard Clifton** (*Amicus*): Since you have been Prime Minister over one million jobs have been lost in manufacturing in the UK, a large proportion of those being from my sector, the motor industry. One of the reasons for this is because this country's employment legislation is far behind that of virtually every other European country. This means that it is easier, cheaper and quicker to sack UK employees and to close their plants. What are you and your Government going to do about this decline?

**Brendan Barber:** Next is Simon Williams from Connect.

**Simon Williams** (*Connect*): Thank you. Prime Minister, one of the consistent themes of your Government has been that UK workers have to compete in the global economy, but that can only happen if the competition is fair. What is the Government doing to ensure that employers here meet their obligations to tackle the UK skills gap and to ensure that workers throughout the global supply

chain have decent working conditions and have the right to join and be represented by independent trade unions?

**Brendan Barber:** Perhaps you could take one more question in this area. I think Mick Ryan from the GMB has a question in this area.

**Mick Ryan** (*GMB*): Prime Minister, you believe in fairness. How do you equate this with issues such as Thames Water, which has served drought orders on their customers whilst increasing their bills by 24 percent over five years, their directors have received a 40 percent pay increase since 1997, they have failed to meet their leakage targets and the regulator has told them to invest another £150 million in the water infrastructure? Their present owners, RWE, a Germany company, paid £4 billion for Thames only three years ago, and now want to sell it for a minimum of £7 billion, a small £3 billion profit. To ensure they achieve this, they have announced 700 job losses. Do you think that these excess profits and pay are fair to consumers, with higher bills, and to workers who will lose their jobs? Is this in line with your view of fairness? I do have a vested interest. I spent 35 years in the industry as a worker, now a pensioner. Thank you.

**The Prime Minister:** Mick, I understand the concerns. The trouble is that they are a private company today and that is the issue and the problem. So it is not a question of whether I think it is fair. The question is what we can do about it. In the end, they need to realise that if they want to maintain customer confidence then fairness in the way that they treat their employees is one part of that.

As to the point which you made, Simon, on the skills gap and also on manufacturing, this is the issue, really. I know there is a very common view that it is because our employment legislation is less strong than that of other European countries and that is why they make redundancies here. Actually, manufacturing jobs have been falling right across the western world, and it is for a very simple reason. As technology changes, as working processes change and as the market becomes incredibly competitive with competition from emerging economies, such as China and India, but also economies such as Vietnam today, which are huge growth areas then, necessarily, I think we will find, that jobs are tougher in the manufacturing sector. The only thing we can do, if we are honest about it, because you cannot by legislation prevent these changes in the global market, is (i) to continue to run a stable economy, which we are doing, and (ii) to invest in skills, science and technology, which we are also doing.

There no doubt are many complaints about what the Government has or has not done, but if you look at our investment in skills, not just the union learning reps but actually investment in skills, we have seen a massive up-skilling of the UK workforce just over the past few years.

Before I came on to the platform there was talk from one of the delegates – I think it was from John of Amicus – about apprenticeships. We have trebled the number of apprenticeships over the past few years. We are trebling the funding of British science. There is a massive amount going into new technology, but in the end the only way that we can make our manufacturing industry strong is to make it compete not on the basis of low wages but on the basis of high skills. That is the only honest answer. There is no one who can promise, in today's world, that jobs are not going to change in manufacturing because of the forces of globalisation.



**Brendan Barber:** Thank you, Tony. An issue which has been hugely important on our agenda in the last couple of years is that of pensions. I think Peter Hughes from Community wanted to raise a question on that issue. Peter.

**Peter Hughes (Community):** The reason why I am asking this question, Prime Minister, is that after 32 years in Allied Steel & Wire, I lost my job and I lost my pension. My question to you concerns the Financial Assistance Scheme. Even after its extension it will not provide me and tens of thousands of other people similarly affected with a pension. When will the Government restore confidence in the UK pensions system and show that it is addressing the concerns of ordinary British people in addressing this scandal?

**Brendan Barber:** Thank you, Peter. Would you like to respond to that issue on pensions, Prime Minister?

**The Prime Minister:** I can. As you know, the Financial Assistance Scheme was introduced by this Government for the first time, initially, with a budget of £400 million, and we then increased it in May to £2.3 billion. That has allowed us to go back now and we will pay 65 percent or 80 percent of pensions to people who have lost their pension entitlement because their pension schemes have been wound-up and going back to the last 15 years of their employment.

Truthfully, I am afraid, we cannot do everything for everybody, but it is an over-£2 billion scheme, and it was introduced by the Government. It would not have been introduced by a Tory government. The payments to ASW, in particular, will be made over the coming period of time. We will not be able to help everybody, but there will be substantial numbers of people, and in times to come thousands of people who will benefit from that scheme introduced by us.

**Brendan Barber:** Thank you, Tony. I think we only have time for one more block of questions now, and they are in the area of education and work with young people. From the NUT, we will hear from Judy Moorhouse; Sam Allen from UCU and Jeff Broome from USDAW, all of whom, potentially, have questions in those areas.

**Judy Moorhouse (National Union of Teachers):** Good afternoon, Prime Minister. Today the OECD published figures which show a shocking disparity between average class sizes in the public and private sectors in the UK compared to other countries. Previous OECD evidence has shown that education systems with different types of school lead to educational inequality and segregation. When drafting the Education and Inspections Bill why did the Government ignore the OECD evidence? When will the Government act to achieve its target of raising the average public investment per pupil to today's private school levels?

**Brendan Barber:** Thank you, Judy. Sam Allen from UCU.

**Sam Allen (University and College Union):** Prime Minister, my question is very simple. When you came into power you said your priorities were: "Education, education, education". As a lecturer in a further education college I was so enthusiastic and I was waiting for these priorities to be implemented in terms of practicality and public funding. Despite the increasing funding that we have been told about by Ministers, in my particular sector of education, which is

further education, the funding has not shown through, in terms of conditions of service, in terms of pay and the sort of situations that colleagues in our sectors are actually going through.

I know that you are going to leave in 12 months' time, but is there anything you can do to actually investigate this issue and to properly fund the further education sector? I am not saying that that should be at the expense of any other sector of education, but this sector needs more input. This sector has been so neglected. The morale is very low and the number of people losing their jobs, including myself, or who are facing possible redundancy soon, is just not acceptable. Thanks, Prime Minister.

**Brendan Barber:** Jeff Broome.

**Jeff Broome (Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers):** Prime Minister, we were delighted that you listened to USDAW members and working people and decided not to extend Sunday trading hours. Thank you.

Young people are the future of our country, and USDAW is currently involved in a campaign to organise young workers to ensure they join our union and get the support and protection they need at work. What can the Labour Government do to support young workers at work?

**The Prime Minister:** First of all, in relation to Sam, I think it is true that we need to make a greater commitment to the further education sector in the years to come, because it can often be the poor relation between the schools and the universities. We do actually have in the Spending Review an increase in the funding but I also think that there is a genuine issue because the further education system does so much good in helping people at the workplace as well as people who leave school. I hope, very much, that the combination of the Tomlinson Report on Vocational Training in Schools and also the changes we are making in further education with the extra money will make a difference to people like yourself, Sam, who do a great job in the further education sector.

What is quite important is that occasionally we look back on what we have been able to achieve in this period of time. If you go into my constituency, and I suspect in any number of constituencies anywhere in the country, and into your local schools, you will see the investment and the extra money in education. It is there. It is there in the computers, in the extra staff and in the new school buildings. Over the next eight or nine years, literally, every single school in this country will either be rebuilt or refurbished. That is a Labour Government delivering for people in this country. It will not happen without it. I know there are lots of issues to do with the changes we are making in schools, but occasionally, as I say, we should recognise that money has gone in and, not only that, in primary school results, GCSE results, A Level results and Key Stage 4, this country is performing better than it has ever performed before, and that is a great tribute to the pupils, their parents and teachers in our schools. I think it is important to balance that out.

I also happen to believe, however, that, as with the Health Service, we need change there as well. When specialist schools first began people said, "This is going to introduce elitism". It did not happen. The trust schools will be the same. There are very strong rules on selection. City academies have shown very, very good results.... (*Calls of "No" and heckling*) They have. Well, I am afraid that the proof of it is that parents are wanting to send their children to them

and, in the end, that is not a bad test. I am sorry if we disagree on it, but I believe that.

**A delegate** (*From the floor*): We've no control. It's an experiment.

**The Prime Minister:** You have a very good control on the experiments, if you really want to know and that, in the end, is the parents. You have to give a certain amount of trust to parents as to where they want to send their kids to school.

Anyway, I can see that we are not going to reach an immediate consensus on that one.

Let me go back to the point I do make and reach a consensus on this point at least, I hope. We do not want to see a return to academic selection, but we do want to see increased investment in our schools. Let me tell you that the only government which would deliver that investment is a Labour government and that has been proved over the past few years.

*(Applause)*

That brings me to Jeff's point, which is in relation to young workers in particular. This, again, is where the trade union movement has a tremendous role to play. It does have a tremendous role to play, not just in vocational schooling, which needs to be changed. I think we, as a Government, have had a great emphasis on academic education but we need to put alongside that a sufficient emphasis on vocational skills, and that is the next challenge for the next decade. In addition to that, not just in further education but also in making sure that there are great connections between the world of work and what kids are being taught at school. There is absolutely no point in sending our kids to school unless they are going to come out of it with qualifications which mean that employers want to employ them. This is an area where we, the TUC, employers and Government, have to work very closely together.

Jeff did mention the point about the Sunday trading laws, and our decision not to extend them over the Christmas break. I said right at the very outset that sometimes in the small decisions you see what a difference a Labour government makes. Again, that is something which would not have been done by a Conservative government but it was done by a Labour government.

**Brendan Barber:** Colleagues, I am sorry that it has not been possible to get everyone in. We got the great majority of those in who indicated they wanted to speak. I think we have to draw this session now to a close.

As you have said, Tony, this is your last occasion at the TUC Congress as Leader of the Labour Party and Prime Minister. The waves of relief may now be sweeping over you, I guess. You have one final opportunity to say anything about the occasions that you have enjoyed, any highlights to your visits to the Congress over the years.

**The Prime Minister:** For those of you on the Conference floor, don't worry. I have got the message. To those of you holding up the posters, I've got the message.

I would like to say one thing to you which is worth reflecting upon. Some of you may have thought that there never should have been a first time, and for all of you this is the last time, but, quite contrary to what many of you think, I have always had a great respect for the work that the trade unions have done. I believe that healthy trade unions are a healthy part of democracy in our country, and if we ever forget it we

will be in trouble. The fact that we do not agree all the time, and sometimes none of the time, is no bad thing. I ask you to reflect on this. The trouble with doing my job, and this applies to whoever does my job, is that you take difficult decisions and you realise that you cannot please all of the people all of the time, but you do also get a sense of perspective at a certain point to look back over ten years. When I look back, I realise that certain things have changed in this country for the good. There may be some things that people think should not have been done and decisions were taken that they did not want to see taken. I understand that. The great thing about a democracy is that people are entitled to make their views very clear to their Prime Minister, to their government and to their political leaders.

However, I do remember one thing. I remember, when I first became a Member of Parliament, the March for Jobs, and I know today we have the highest levels of employment that this country has ever seen. I remember campaigning for a minimum wage, and this government has introduced one, and along with Tax Credits has helped people at work to earn better incomes. I also remember when I came to power that there was no Sure Start, no record rises in Child Benefit, no help for pensioners in poverty, no fuel allowance for pensioners, and I remember that our public services were under-invested in. I know today that in the course of this government we have gone from a country, literally, way below the level of public investment of the European average to the European average.

Furthermore, I know that for the first time we live in a country where people can be proud, whatever their background and whatever their class, because we are a more open and decent society than we were ten years ago. I am not saying that everything has been great, because it has not. Incidentally, for those of you who think that you will ever get a government where everything is fine, that does not happen, but what does happen is progress if we have the courage and determination to remain in government. The most important thing to remember of all of this – just reflect on it for a moment – is that we did for years and years pass our resolutions, have our debates and it never made the blindest bit of difference because we could never do anything about it.

I want to see a Labour Party continue in government, but it will only ever continue in government if it focuses on policy for the future and accepts that government is a hard, difficult business, but it is a darned sight better than wasting our time in Opposition passing resolutions which no one ever listens to and which we can do nothing about. That is the brutal truth.

The brutal truth about all politicians and all political leaders is that we have our difficult times and we have our better times. The decisions you take are often very, very hard to take, but actually it is a privilege to take them. The reason for that is that, just occasionally, you meet people, and I do, in different parts of the country, whose lives we have changed. I meet people teaching in inner city schools who, for the first time, have the equipment they need. I meet people who have been treated by the Health Service in a way that their lives have been saved. I meet people who, for the first time, have been able to afford a holiday abroad because of the changes we have made and the extra money we have given them. Above all else, I meet people who recognise, for all the faults, the progress that there has been during the past ten years, and if we ever forget it we will repeat the lessons of the past. Thank you very much indeed.

*(Applause)*

**Brendan Barber:** Tony, thank you for your visit today and thank you for all of our other visits. Congress, please show your appreciation. (*applause*)

**The President:** Thank you, Brendan, and thank you, Tony. I would like to thank the journalists and the press for their co-operation during the last session. We respect and appreciate that you have an important job to do so thank you as well.

### Regional pay in the public sector

**Pauline Betteridge** (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*) moved Motion 36.

She said: President and Congress, having spent about five years negotiating Agenda for Change and a further two years on implementation to have a pay system in the NHS which provides equal pay for work of equal value, I was concerned to hear that Gordon Brown in his speech to the CBI on June 6<sup>th</sup> said he wanted to encourage local and regional pay, thereby, effectively, sounding a death knell for national pay bargaining. This also came in a suggestion by the Department of Health to the Pay Review Body earlier this year and was not accepted by the unions.

Andrew Oswald of Warwick University also believes that different pay in different parts of the country would be both fair and efficient. He advocates a situation where teachers, physiotherapists and civil servants in London would be paid 50 per cent more than those in the North of England and Wales. He said that the details need to be worked out but the details appear to be covered in three lines.

Interestingly, the majority of the private sector, when surveyed by Income Data Services, still has a national pay system, and to move away from this structure would increase the administrative costs and create problems in keeping control of the overall pay bill. Attempts at locally negotiated pay have failed in the past as it adds inefficiencies and costs.

Increased time is needed by both management and unions in each workplace. This time has to be taken from other priority areas and gives the potential for some unions to break away from the group to try and gain benefit for their members. All this time and effort adds an increased cost to the pay bill and can cause workforce instability as people move jobs for better pay.

Recruitment and retention problems can at best be dealt with by recruitment and retention premia and high cost areas with high cost supplements. In 2002 local government discontent about pay levels and other issues led to the establishment of the Local Government Pay Commission to look at pay, recruitment, retention and bargaining arrangements. The Government had called for local pay and geographically differentiated pay, but the Commission dismissed this as inappropriate and it dismissed regional pay as a simplistic response to recruitment and retention difficulties. They stated that these are often down to local areas within regions. This proposal to change is one-sided and is counter-productive to the partnership working now established in the NHS.

We, therefore, ask why introduce change for change sake? Let Agenda for Change embed itself into the NHS so that its benefits can be demonstrated. Let the established Pay Review Body continue with its valuable work. We must find a better way to deal with those who live in high-cost areas, remembering that many people live and work in different areas, as reducing the pay of those living in areas of deprivation could perpetuate the problem of poverty and even make it worse as the ability to earn a decent wage would be impossible. The proposals for regional pay are unfair. We do not want it and it won't work. I move.

**Micky Nicholas** (*Fire Brigades' Union*) in seconding the motion, said:

In recent years, especially since our 2003 pay dispute in the Fire Service, this Government, our Government, has been hell-bent on introducing regional structures into your UK Fire Service. Its high risk proposals for regional fire controls was also heavily criticised in a recent Select Committee Report as part of that process. We have had to deal with all of this, despite the failed Regional Assemblies' Project led by the man, who I still believe is our Deputy Prime Minister, John Prescott.

The Government and our employers are now beginning to discuss the issue of regional and local pay in your UK Fire Service. Chancellor Gordon Brown's comments earlier this year will certainly encourage them along that particular path. Our fire-fighters and control members do the same job, they undergo the same training and face the same risks. Therefore, as far as we are concerned, they deserve the same wages. We already have different pensions and other fringe benefits, which are fundamentally unfair. When one of our members dies on duty, which sadly happens all too often, will their families receive different benefits based on different wages depending on where they happen to work and live whilst saving lives? How utterly unfair and morally unjust is that?

Our Government and employers have been attempting to dismantle our Fire Service National Pay Bargaining and Conditions of Service since way before many of our members were born. This will, no doubt, be intensified during the proposed pay talks on our new pay formula for our members next year. We have already heard the rumours.

Regional pay is, primarily, about making profit, making profit for the private sector within the public service, with businesses competing as to who can pay the least, have the most basic standards and, of course, it all leads to a downward spiral for our members and the communities that we serve. Regional pay is used as a means to divide and undermine the trade union movement. Of course, regional and local pay is not a new idea. It also is not the way forward towards some shiny new future. Its Victorian, Victorian in its history, concept and its outcome. When we won the right in 1948 to negotiate pay and conditions on behalf of our members in the UK Fire Service, we rightly acknowledged it as a major victory. Without a shadow of a doubt, it is, seemingly, the most important moment in our union's history. Unlike Bob Crow, we do cross red lights, President, but we look both ways first.

The FBU is quite clear. We are totally committed to national pay bargaining for our national pay. We are totally committed to equal pay for equal work. We are totally opposed to regional and local differences in pay for doing the same job. The motion is absolutely right. Please support this motion.

**Pam Baldwin** (*UNISON*) supported Motion 36.

She said: Congress, Gordon Brown's remarks do not mark the first time that the Government has called for a move to regional pay. Public sector employers argue that this would give them greater flexibility to respond to recruitment and retention problems. We suspect that their real agenda is to use local bargaining to erode conditions of service protected by national agreement. When you look closely at the potential effect, there are pitfalls everywhere for both the workers and the employers.

Unions have been working hard with employers to establish fair and transparent pay systems based on equal pay for work of equal value, but local and regional pay arrangements open the door to pay discrimination and we are driven back to square one. There is evidence to show that costs are driven up, not

down. Despite the hype, employers are not actually rushing to embrace regional pay and that is for very good reasons.

Few local managers have the HR capacity to bargain on their own. Look what happened in the NHS when they attempted local pay bargaining. In Wales, we have 'Making the Connections', which is similar to the *Gershon Report* in England, all about efficiency savings, all about working in partnership and collaboration and sharing services across all sectors. But just how do you convince an employee to move from one locality to another if it would mean going to a lower paying region?

Whilst letting pay rates drift downwards in low cost areas might save money in the short run, it will have a knock-on effect in depressed economies where the private sector is relatively weak. Pay from public sector jobs injects essential cash into local economies, as we have seen in Wales and the north-east. We do not want local pay bargaining driving down already low pay which affects the majority of our women workers. Regional pay will make poor communities poorer.

As trade unions, we have often been tempted to go down the road of regional pay as a way of meeting the needs of workers in high cost areas. But, as the motion says, this is a dead end. We have to protect our national bargaining structures which ensure equality and fair play and at the same time join forces with other organisations to tackle the sky rocketing costs that make it so hard for our members to make their ends meet. Please support this motion. *(Applause)*

**Hank Roberts** (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*) supported Motion 36.

He said: Congress, our trade union movement, the world's first, was born in illegality. The Combination Acts made joining together illegal. For obvious reasons, employers do not want workers combining together. The greater the level of combination, the less they like it.

Since Thatcher, serious inroads have been made into destroying national pay and conditions and, to Labour's shame, they were only accelerated under Tony Blair. They mostly encompassed the private sector. The next step is to encompass the public, that area of our national life which we created, protected from the god of the market - profit.

Why did we, the trade union movement, historically step-by-step develop national pay and negotiations as and when we could? Did the employers want it? No. Did governments? No. We needed it to increase our power. To destroy this, they need to destroy our power. Their desire is simple and applicable not just to teachers, but to all. It is, if possible, to move to regional pay and then, from that, to local, to school and, finally, to the individual, if they can get away with it. It is no coincidence that the increase in individually 'negotiated' pay rates was accompanied by a huge fall in trade union membership, nor is it coincidence that this has been accompanied by an increase, again to Labour's shame, in the inequality of the distribution of wealth.

Regionalisation is not just being promoted for Britain. The EU Commission wants regionalisation also. Why? For the same reasons, divide and rule. In the oldest military treatise in the world, *The Art of War*, Sun Tsu said, as advice to defeat an enemy, "Cause division among them".

For historic reasons, there are different pay systems for teachers within the UK. Wales needs to stay with England in national negotiations or fall into Government plans, to divide and rule and reduce pay. Northern Ireland, where rates of pay are already lower, needs to be brought up to, and included in, a national minimum.

108

Teachers spend their lives teaching, but there is one particular recent lesson that they have taught. They, the Government, wanted to steal teachers' pensions -- yes, steal because pensions are simply deferred wages. We stopped them dead in their tracks, and how? Unitedly, unanimously and unprecedentedly, the teachers' unions, ATL, NASUWT and NUT, said that they would take strike action.

The poet Shelley wrote:  
"Rise like lions after slumber  
In unvanquishable number -  
Shake your chains to earth like dew  
Which in sleep have fallen on you -  
Ye are many - they are few".

We are many; they are few. Our unity defeated Blair on pensions. We can defeat anyone who tries it on in respect of regional pay, or anything else, in that timeless manner of united action in our collective defence and in the advance of our, the peoples', interest. Support the motion. *(Applause)*

**Neil License** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supported Motion 36 and the amendment.

He said: Civil Service trade unionists know about pay fragmentation and we know about regional pay. Every Treasury pay remit cleared over the past three years, some 750 in total -- and that is too many, but that is another debate -- has included the specific argument and entreaty that departments and agencies should, "adapt their pay arrangements to local economies in which their staff work, to pay staff with the same skills, the same experience, doing the same job different salaries based on where they live". Their message is clear. If you live in Rotherham, like I do, or in parts of Wales or Merseyside, or anywhere else that has not had its fair share of economic growth, anywhere with a pool of cheap, available labour, what you can expect are lower salaries, worse terms and conditions and second class status.

PCS are not willing to play that game and we do not think the wider trade union movement should either. There are some who argue that regional pay will begin to address the problems faced by those in high cost areas. We accept that those living and working in London and the immediately surrounding counties do face some additional living costs, particularly with regard to housing. There is, indeed, a long running debate about key workers being priced out of the housing market in places as diverse as London and the Lake District - anywhere where average house prices exceed anything most workers can afford.

For the PCS, the answer to this problem is simple and straightforward: you allow local authorities to build council houses and you have allocation policies that address key workers as a priority. Regional pay does not begin to answer that problem; it is divisive, it is unfair, it is simply wrong and we should oppose it in all its guises. Do not let your members be dragged into a Dutch auction to lower salaries and benefits; do not reward those in London at the expense of those in Rotherham, those in Edinburgh at the expense of those in Glasgow, the economically successful at the expense of the economically disadvantaged. Oppose division, oppose regional pay and support the motion.

*(Applause)*

\* *Motion 36 was CARRIED*

### **Fire and rescue service strategic planning**

**Tom McFarlane** (*Fire Brigades' Union*) moved Motion 37.

He said: I am particularly excited because I get to speak about fire engines just now!

Comrades, you used to enjoy a national standard of fire cover. This stipulated the requirements of every

fire brigade in the country to mobilise a set minimum number of fire appliances to respond within a minimum laid down time to different areas depending on a set risk criteria.

These standards were far from perfect. The FBU had long campaigned to make them more robust, but, importantly, they were a recognition that no matter where you lived in the UK, whether it was in the Highlands and Islands or right down to the tip of Cornwall, you would receive, in relative terms, the same fire service delivered in line with the same standard. That has gone. National standards have been torn up and replaced with the post code lottery grandly entitled 'Integrated Risk Management Plans', for we, in the fire service, have been modernised!

I have heard a lot about that word in Congress and it has all been within the same context, that of cost-cutting and service reduction. They cannot call it that, of course. That is why they have invented this surreal language, the language of 'modernisation'. When it was universally understood that national standards of fire cover were scrapped, we were told that the replacement would be "locally driven solutions for local people within local communities developed in consultation with key stakeholders driven and resourced to match end-user expectations".

When you put that sort of rhetoric away, put it to one side and cut to the chase, you actually find out what this and, indeed, every other piece of modernisation is actually about. It is about sacrificing the frontline services that the public need and require in order to deliver the financial savings that the Government demand. That is what this piece of modernisation is certainly about.

That is why the national standards have been removed, so local authorities would be free to get rid of jobs, close fire stations and reduce fire cover in order to pay for the PFIs, deliver the Gershon savings and scramble after a financially driven CPA rating, but it is a false economy.

The recent massive oil refinery fire at Buncefield was the biggest peacetime conflagration since the Second World War. It made headlines across the world. Not so well reported, however, were the cuts that were proposed by the local fire and rescue authority shortly after this massive incident. They were financially driven and they were only made possible by the scrapping of national standards of fire cover. They included the closing of the fire stations and the removal of fire appliances, almost all of which had been the first to respond to the fire at Buncefield. This is happening all over the country.

However, FBU members know the consequences of cuts and we know how to fight them. The reality on the ground is that cuts mean that response times increase; response time increasing means that fire growth increases, and that means that the safety of the public and of the fire fighters is compromised. That is not even to mention the environmental and financial cost of fire.

We fight against cuts and we fight for safety. That is why recently FBU members have taken to the picket lines in Suffolk, in the West Midlands, in Hertfordshire and soon you are going to hear about action in Merseyside -- in Merseyside, particularly, they have been modernised right back to the 19th century -- all to fight against local cuts which have only been made possible by the deliberate removal of national standards.

We have put forward the solution. We have told the Government what is required. We have placed before them a fully risk assessed, resilient and effective method of delivering a national standard of fire cover. We developed this using the experience, knowledge and expertise of the professionals who actually work in

the service and deliver the service, the expertise of Fire Brigades' Union members.

I have to tell you that up to now we have hit a blank wall. This is what really gets me, because at incidents like 7/7, the bombings in London, all our members, the FBU members, involved were hailed as heroes, but when we actually want a say on how our fire service is run, we are dismissed as militant dinosaurs and cast into the wilderness.

We want your support to get the Government to address this issue. We want you to support this motion. Say "no" to cuts disguised as modernisation and say "yes" to a national standard of fire cover. *(Applause)*

**Caryl Nobbs** (*UNISON*) seconded Motion 37.

She said: I work in another of the emergency services, the police service, and, as a result, we can totally support this motion because we can relate to the concerns that the FBU are expressing as being akin to those within the police service.

During the last few months, we have seen the Government policy on the strategic modernisation of the police service as being somewhat confused with the collapse of the proposals on police force mergers. The push now appears to be about shared services and collaboration between police forces. UNISON policy would be to oppose this principle if it resulted in reduced services emanating from reduced resources, in other words, staffing level reductions, as this will, no doubt, reduce the service level provision to the public.

The police service now finds itself with a standstill budget for the next three years and we fear the financial limitations will manifest themselves in the service we provide.

The media is always full of praise for all emergency services when major disasters or unpleasant events occur, where trade union members, in order to save life and limb, risk their own lives. As a result, proper strategic planning is not only necessary but absolutely essential.

We see, in my service, our members constantly being asked to go that extra mile to ensure responses to emergency incidents are not compromised through cost-cutting and reducing levels of emergency cover to which the efficiency savings now being imposed will undoubtedly lead.

Strategic planning must involve the trade unions who represent not only the interests of the service, but our members who are the service providers. Grass roots involvement is fundamental to getting this right. The priority of strategic planning should not be about cost-cutting and reducing levels of emergency cover, but about the needs and requirements of the public and all of our members in the emergency services, fire, police and ambulance. We are, therefore, pleased to second this motion and urge Congress fully to support. *(Applause)*

\* *Motion 37 was CARRIED*

### **Obesity Crisis**

**Alison Nelson** (*British Dietetic Association*) moved Motion 43.

She said: To be a normal weight in Britain now is abnormal. You are in the minority if you are a normal weight. Only 35 percent of men are a desirable weight, 44 percent of women are a desirable weight and almost a quarter of our children are overweight or obese. Within four years, nearly a third of us will be obese. That is dangerously fat. This is not just your middle-age spread generation; this covers toddlers to grandparents.

The obesity crisis has not been creeping up unnoticed. It has been storming upon us. In the UK, we have the fastest rate of childhood obesity anywhere in Europe apart from Poland. The number of overweight children is rising at 400,000 every year. In the UK, there are one million obese young people under the age of 16. The health behaviours of this nation's children need to be addressed immediately if we have any hope of stopping the long-term effects of poor nutrition and lack of exercise.

It appears that we do not know how to solve the crisis. It is a crisis that is costing the nation at least £2 billion every year. The current way of thinking that just improving information and education of individuals is the answer to the problem must be wrong. This approach in isolation will not stop obesity. Why do we not know how to solve this apparently simple problem? Simply because we have considered obesity as just that, a simple problem; just eat less and exercise more.

Let's get real. Individuals are asked to take personal responsibility for their own weight, but do you really believe that obesity can be checked by the current framework of health and leisure services? Some things are beginning to change, but we need to take this change beyond the tipping point. Changes in school meals are positive, but alongside these changes we have PFI contracts for new schools that only allow a regeneration kitchen, which warms up food cooked elsewhere. This is not the best way to serve healthy meals.

We live in an environment that encourages and promotes high-energy intakes and low activity levels; one that undermines parental efforts to give children a healthy lifestyle. These environmental factors have a disproportionate effect on low-income families. If we finally recognise that obesity is complex in origin, we have to accept that it needs a complex approach to start to correct it.

This needs an investment in a mix of better policies; a better, simple and consistent food labelling; a better education of the health risks; a better understanding of the influence of food advertising and we need better skills. We are entertained by our celebrity chefs, but we do not adopt their skills or their food choices. We need a better environment. We live in an obesogenic environment, one that encourages us to use lifts and escalators rather than stairs, to eat supersized portions and to 'BOGOF', that is, 'buy one, get one free'.

We need further investment in local food projects that improve food skills and confidence of young people and their parents. We need to stop junk food advertising targeted at young people. We need schools that consistently promote healthier lifestyles. We need workplaces that demonstrate the benefits of the healthier lifestyle.

Children who are fat achieve poorer educational outcomes. Remember that. They are offered fewer university places; they have poorer job prospects; poorer quality of life from low self-esteem and bullying and a life hampered by the diseases that obesity brings with it, heart disease, cancer and diabetes.

For the first time, this generation of five-year olds is predicted to have a shorter life than their parents. No one is to blame. No parent should feel guilty, but we need to grab the moral high ground. Obesity is limiting our life-span and we need to work in alliance and campaign vigorously to agree policies, programmes and investments that force change in public health provision to support a healthier lifestyle. I hope you will support this motion. *(Applause)*

**Mary Turner** (GMB) seconded Motion 43.

She said: I am not so delighted to second Motion 43 when 20 years ago I stood on this platform and I reminded this country and Congress of our fears as to what would happen to our young people. Colleagues, sadly, what I said has come true. Children's health has been affected by obesity. Year in and year out, my colleagues in the trade union movement, in UNISON and T&G, brought this message to you until you were probably sick to death of it. Well, I wish you had listened.

Together with my colleagues, we have campaigned. We urge the Government to stop the privatisation of our school meals. Don't let anyone in here tell you it is creeping privatisation. It is privatisation from the top to the bottom. The school meal service was privatised for profit by a Tory Government. We urged more investment; did we get it? No. A balanced nutritional meal; did we get it? No. Fresh food brought locally; did we get it? No. More training for staff; did we get it? No. The lunch hour to be made part of the school day; did we get it? No, we did not. School meals free to all; did we get that? No, we did not. A proposal to open our kitchens to pupils and parents to learn how to cook; did we get that? No, we did not. We all know what we did get and that was privatisation and privatisation; sky high prices; reduced portions and burger vans and ice cream vans welcomed into our schools. It is bad enough that they have been feeding our children rubbish, but the kids do not even know that they are eating rubbish.

In this fast-food society where junk food is available everywhere day and night, seven days a week, schools should be a safe haven. Children are fed rubbish at schools, they learn nothing about cooking or shopping and grow up ignorant about how to feed and cook for their own families.

Congress, bad eating habits start in childhood. Families have a part to play, but so should the schools, colleges and the Government. We have had to pay a heavy price for government not taking a political decision on the welfare of our children. Yes, Tony was right. There were weapons of mass destruction. That was one thing that I agreed with him on, but the weapons were not in Iraq; they were here under his nose whilst they were destroying our children's health. That is where they were. Well, if you can afford the money to try to locate the weapons in Iraq that were never there, find the money to locate the weapons of destruction which are here and safeguard our children.

If the steps that are at last being taken to improve school meals mean that instead children bring in lunch boxes full of junk food or go to the chippy, that indicates that the message is not getting across. We need a total re-education process involving adults, children, workers and manufacturers to move towards healthier eating, otherwise nearly 25 percent of children aged 2 to 15 and around 30 percent of adults will be obese by 2010. Our statistics in respect of obesity are catching up with those of America. Let's junk the junk food culture and look at our children's future because they are our future. We want more moving around.

Finally, as you know, there has been a real move in school meals. I asked the Prime Minister why it was necessary to call in celebrities to promote the school meal service when this TUC had given it to him chapter and verse 10 years ago. Were we not good enough? Well, we should have been because the people who brought that issue here were mothers, grandmothers, but, most of all, we were the loyal workers in school meals supporting our children on low pay whilst Thatcher privatised the lot. Thank you. *(Applause)*

**The President:** Thank you very much for that, Mary. Congress, seven unions have asked to speak in this debate, but we are already behind time by half an

hour. I am unable to allow all the unions who have indicated they wish to speak in this debate to do so. I will take one more speaker, and that is the Transport and General Workers' Union, who have indicated first that they wish to speak in this debate.

**Barrie Roberts** (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) supported Motion 43.

He said: I welcome the opportunity to speak in support of this motion. Within our union we have more than 100,000 members in the food industry stretching from plough to plate and the T&G have a long-standing interest in the debate on food quality.

In support, I want to touch on three key issues that affect T&G members; (1) the importance of local food supply; (2) the importance of clear, simple and easily understandable food labelling, and (3) the importance of access to food facilities at work. We believe that the key to delivering high quality food and tackling the obesity crisis is the development of and commitment to a UK sustainable food strategy.

The globalisation of food supply has led to a decline in quality of product and to a decline in supply chain transparency. In other words, we do not easily know where the product has come from. The retailers' drive to cut costs has led to many suppliers looking abroad to source the product. This led to a reaction, albeit relatively small, in Wales where local farmers protested outside supermarkets in support of local produce.

This drive to cut costs has been to the detriment of food quality and particularly to the detriment of thousands of workers who have seen factories shut. For example, we have a motion coming up in respect of Northern Foods Bakery in Trafford Park, Manchester, and also where production is relocated to countries with a ready supply of cheap labour. It is also to the detriment of our rural and agricultural workers. These are all British jobs occupied by British trade unionists. The race to the bottom driven by the retailers' relentless pursuit of profit needs to be stopped. The Government needs actively to encourage local food production to drive up quality and secure jobs.

We also need action on food labelling. Consumers are often unaware of where their food is produced. They are unaware of whether the food they are eating is really fresh or has just been flown in from another country and repackaged. We believe the Government should campaign at EU level to develop a European-wide framework of labelling regulations which allows consumers to make informed decisions when buying food and making it clear where it is made.

As an example, you can see on page 4 of the Congress edition of *Tribune* an article regarding five of the world's biggest food manufacturers and the country's largest supermarket chain deciding to put in their own labelling codes as opposed to the one recommended by the Food Standards Agency and the Government. The Government and the FSA are suggesting a traffic light method where foods are clearly flagged with a red light if they contain saturated fat, sugar or salt. Healthy amounts of the substance would get a green light. As I say, you can read the article on page 4.

Our members want to see companies delivering greater access to quality food at the workplace, see an end to the outsourcing and reduction in decent canteen facilities and good quality meals available at low cost and in comfortable surroundings.

Congress, we support local food, properly labelled and made accessible to the workplace. We believe that this Government could and should do a lot more to secure a healthier future for our children and employment for food workers. Please support the motion. Thank you, Chair. (*Applause*)

\* *Motion 43 was CARRIED*

### **Zahid Mubarek Inquiry**

**Colin Moses** (*Prison Officers Association*) moved Motion 44.

He said: Congress, on behalf of my union, the way I wish to move this motion is, as has been said on many occasions in respect of this, under the heading "A preventable death".

Zahid Mubarek was to be released from prison on 21st March 2000. On the night before his release, he was attacked by his cell mate, Robert Stewart. He died from his injuries a week later. He had shared the cell with Robert Stewart for six weeks. Stewart was later convicted of murder and the jury rejected the suggestion that he should be convicted of manslaughter.

The Director General of the Prison Service at the time, Martin Narey, stated to Zahid's family: "You had a right to expect us to look after Zahid safely. We have failed and I am very, very sorry." The POA would ask Congress to express its heartfelt condolences to the Mubarek family; yet another family suffering from a racist murder; yet another family whose son has come into the care of the state and in that care was murdered.

Congress, the question is of murder and could that murder have been prevented? As I have stated, Zahid was in the care of the state. Yes, he was a victim of Robert Stewart; yes, he was a victim of a racist, but the question which may have to be asked is, was he as much the victim of a government and a justice system? Mr Justice Keith, the judge who conducted the public inquiry into Zahid's death -- it was reproduced on the front page of *The Independent* on 30th June this year in bold print, 'Guilty'. I have just asked the Prime Minister a question and received a very clear answer, didn't I? I received an answer which everyone could understand -- he stated: "Either you keep the prison population down by changing sentencing policy, or you accept that it will increase, and you inject sufficient funds to ensure prisoners are treated decently and humanely." The trouble is that neither of these options is a vote winner.

There are no votes in prisons. There is a vote in the sad death of Zahid Mubarek, but can we make changes? What the POA wants -- we anguished over this and many of our members were on duty and involved -- and what we should have is zero tolerance for racism. I have said it from this rostrum earlier this week. How do we identify racism and how do we identify mental illness? That is what should come out of the Zahid Mubarek sad murder, not trying to hang blame on individuals, but to look at the system, a system that failed not one but two young men, the victim, Zahid, and also Robert Stewart. It continues to fail. We will continue to have murders in prison. Could another Zahid Mubarek happen? Yes. Have we put enough measures in place to stop it happening? No.

Whilst we want to invest in private prisons and whilst we want to hear what we heard this afternoon -- there is nothing wrong with building more private prisons and nothing wrong with investing in them -- at the same time we cannot place more and more dependent young men and young women into an overstretched system and then ring our hands when there is a racist murder.

We are asking Congress to support the POA in lobbying government for the correct monies to be spent on our prisons and also, just as importantly and in many ways much more importantly, to prevent any further racist murders. We should be in a position to kick racism out of the Prison Service.

If Tony Blair, as he leaves office, and whoever follows him, cannot do that, I would say this. 'Stop overcrowding our prisons and stop sending more young black men, young black women and more Muslims to prison than any other country in western Europe. Invest and let's prevent another Zahid Mubarek'. Thank you. *(Applause)*

**Mike McClelland** (*Napo*) seconded Motion 44.

He said: Racism was at the heart of the Mubarek Inquiry, but, in truth, in its conclusion, the report could not say definitively that this was the primary motivation behind this murder. The reality is that we will probably never know exactly why Robert Stewart killed Zahid Mubarek. It seems that Stewart himself does not even know.

The report ran to more than 600 pages and made 88 recommendations. It painted a picture of a highly complex situation with many improvements that could be made to reduce the likelihood of any repetition. The mover of this motion has already pointed to insufficient resources as being at the heart of this matter. The very first recommendation in the report was to eliminate enforced cell sharing. This is unlikely to be realisable in the foreseeable future, given the current size of the prison population. If nothing else, this must be a clear indication to the Government of the need to take urgent steps to reduce the pressure on the prison service caused by excessive numbers.

However, I want to spend a few moments focusing on three particulars, at least two of which are linked to that shortage of resources, which, in large part, is brought about by prison overcrowding. The first of these is simply time. The staff in prisons, our colleagues in the POA and the probation staff working both inside prisons and in the community need sufficient time to observe and communicate with prisoners and ex-prisoners. Proper risk assessment and risk management takes time, time to know the individual, time to read files, time to enter information and to ensure that it is properly collated and available to all those staff who need it.

The second issue is that of training. The report made it clear that current training was outdated and outmoded and did not meet the needs of working with racially motivated offenders and mentally disordered offenders. It deals insufficiently with how to work with prejudice. Basic prison officer training was reduced from 11 weeks to nine about three years ago, and now probation officer training is also under threat with no clear plan for how it will be provided after next year's intake of trainees.

The Government appears to be of the view that work with the most difficult, disturbed and dangerous members of our society can be undertaken with minimal training. This is wrong. As in all public services, we should demand the best and the most comprehensive training that underpins public services that have been emulated and envied around the world.

The third point, and this is more difficult, is about working with prejudice. Yes, we should not tolerate racism or violence in the prison system, as the motion states. This must be clearly evident to all, but, nevertheless, it does little for the process of risk management and, indeed, the aim of changing attitudes and behaviour if we simply do not engage with individuals because their views are abhorrent to us.

The perhaps unpleasant reality is that professionals in the field must engage with those whose prejudice we find unacceptable. All this reflects back to my earlier points. It takes time, patience, meticulousness, training and great skill to do this work. To skimp on this task is to do a disservice to our members who work in the

criminal justice system, to do a disservice to those with whom we work and, ultimately, to do a disservice to the public whose safety and well-being we seek to ensure. Please support this motion. *(Applause)*

**Lynn Chamberlain** (*University and College Union*) supported the motion. She said: Besides further education colleges, universities and specialist colleges like mine -- I teach blind people -- our members also work in the Prison Education Service and witness first hand the horrors that can occur there. Since Zahid's death in custody, there have been nine homicides and 529 self-inflicted deaths all from ethnic minorities. POA's motion calls for zero tolerance against racism and violence. Correct. You cannot really get a more vicious act of violence than that suffered by Zahid. Since records began, there have been more than 2000 deaths in custody -- in custody! Whether it is a prison or a police station they have a duty of care.

I live in Stephen Lawrence country in Plumstead. Seven years ago the landmark MacPherson Inquiry into Stephen's murder led to findings of utter racism within the police force. What has changed since then? Not a lot. A year ago now, in exactly the same area, involving exactly the same police force, Paul Coker, who was young, fit, healthy -- he went to the gym every day -- and black died in Plumstead Police Station. Sixteen police -- sixteen -- arrested Paul, following a non-violent domestic dispute in his house. When the police arrived they were told everything was sorted. Would you go? No. Sixteen of them arrested Paul and he was heard screaming for his life. Two hours later in Plumstead police station he died. What they should have done is take him straight to hospital but they did not. He was just 32.

How many more of our brothers and sisters -- and they are our brothers and sisters -- have to die in custody before we have real change? We in the UCU, as well as everyone here, of course, believe passionately in social justice and we hope that the recommendations into Zahid Mubarek's death do not disappear into thin air.

\* *Motion 44 was CARRIED*

### **Education and Inspections Bill and marketisation of education**

**Steve Sinnott** (*National Union of Teachers*) moved Composite Motion 10. He said: This is a motion for all delegates to this Congress, a motion for every parent, every grandparent, every school governor here and every councillor. It is a motion for every delegate who wishes to live in a decent and thriving community. This motion highlights the damage that the Education and Inspections Bill currently before Parliament -- embedding even further a market approach -- will have upon children in schools in England. If delegates hear these things for the first time today, then we in the education unions have not lived up to our collective responsibility to protect and indeed to cherish our education service.

Markets, of course have their place, but not in the provision of state education. Claiming to give parents choice and encouraging schools to compete one against another on the basis of tests and league tables has consequences, damaging consequences. Some children are wanted by schools, those who will enhance the school's league table position; but some children are unwanted, those who are expensive to teach and those who will depress a school's test results and league table position. The creation of a group of unwanted children in our education system is immoral.

The Education and Inspections Bill takes these market consequences even further. The Bill creates new types of schools, trust schools, adding a new school type to a growing boutique of schools. In other countries, the consequences of this approach have been increased



ethnic and social segregation. Our cities and towns do not need more ethnic segregation. There is a better approach: the creation of a good local school for every child. Is this achievable? Well, the answer is a resounding yes, and the funding for such an approach, an approach like this, could be there.

The Chancellor in his last Budget statement said that our state schools should be funded at the level of private schools, £9,000 per child, not £4,000. Such increased funding would deliver improved teacher pupil ratios. That level of funding would help us to provide a good local school for every child. At a recent TUC meeting with the Chancellor I raised the issue of his commitment to such improved education funding and smaller classes. I raised it with him. He did not back away from his commitment even when I told him that a senior official at the DfES was doing so. But he did remark that we needed to create a national consensus for this level of funding. Let the TUC be at the forefront of creating that national consensus. It is affordable.

Funding our state schools at the 2006 level of that in the private sector would require an additional £17 billion. The Institute of Fiscal Studies says that if the increases in education funding of recent years continued at the rate of 5.3 per cent per year it could be delivered by 2014. Therefore, 2014 needs to be the year in which our schools are funded at the level of the so-called independent schools, the year in which our children are in classes the size of those in the independent schools, the year in which our children get the individual attention they deserve from teachers and support staff. The TUC should launch this initiative at a high profile conference and give it even greater prominence at a well-supported national demonstration.

Congress, let us have a really effective campaign and let us ensure that in such a campaign we celebrate all areas of our education service including our youth service, and let us celebrate by 2014, if not before, the creation of a good local school for every child.

**Mary Bousted** (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*) seconded Composite Motion 10. She said: the Warwick agreement and the social partnership between unions and employers has led to a raft of improvements, including a better pension scheme for teachers and enhanced pay and working conditions, but these gains are jeopardised by the Government's obsession with privatisation of the state education service.

Let us take academies, a pet project of the Schools Minister, Lord Adonis. Academies have a chequered achievement record but another 18 are due to open this month to augment the 27 already in existence and the Government have plans for 200 by 2010. The sponsors, who range from Christian charities to carpet magnets get to set the pay and conditions of staff and the tone of the curriculum for an investment of as little as up to £2 million and the 'up to' is a recent addition to combat the lukewarm interest shown from big business, which is actually beginning to doubt that the education of the poorest children in our inner cities is a good way of making a fast buck. Already we have seen a fall in the proportion of young people from disadvantaged backgrounds going to academies, as selection is brought in through the back door. ATL fears that academies are a dry run for trust schools that are, in ATL's view, a solution in search of a problem.

Currently, organisations involved in pornography and brewing are precluded from forming trusts but that still allows the like of McDonalds and Walmart to bring their fast food culture into schools along with anti-union practices and abysmal working conditions. Further education is also becoming increasingly subject to market demands. The recent FE White Paper

proposed setting up trusts along similar lines to those outlined in the Education Bill for schools but with even less reason. Do the Government not know that colleges, FE colleges, are already independent corporations? The FE White Paper also introduced the concept of contestability, a term that not only mangles the English language but gives private training organisations the opportunity to take over failing and coasting colleges and courses. Whilst multinational companies wait in the wings, colleges are frantically cutting their A level and adult education courses so that they can compete in the lucrative vocational skills market. Just as top-up fees have driven students from poorer backgrounds away from universities, a higher fees for non vocational courses in FE will do the same. Whilst there is no evidence that this market approach has improved educational attainment there is substantial proof that pay and conditions have deteriorated. Support staff in schools who have no national negotiating machinery, and whose rates of pay are decided locally, often get paid little more than the minimum wage.

Where academies have been set up from scratch, teachers are not protected by the Transfer of Undertakings Protection of Employment Regulations and have had to work longer hours and be subject to gagging clauses in their contracts. Lecturers in FE have seen a 13 per cent pay gap opening up between them and those teaching the same age pupils in schools since colleges became independent from local authorities in 1993. All this is bad for children, it is bad for staff, and my union ATL does not share the view that privatisation is better than public. Quite the opposite: ATL believes that the market fragments the education service and distorts proper accountability. We do not want to go down the American route where cans of Coca Cola replace water fountains in school corridors.

**Kenneth Bell** (*UNISON*) supported Composite Motion 10. He said: I am from the North East, a region that is feeling the full weight of the push to academies, trusts and marketisation and the message from our region and from UNISON is that there a real urgency to respond to this. We have Labour Councils -- mostly Labour Councils -- setting up academies, prepared to hand schools over to a motley collection of sponsors that include Lord Irvine Laidlaw, the millionaire businessman who bankrolls the Scottish Tory Party, Peter Vardy, the right wing Christian fundamentalist who thinks homosexuality is a sin, and the Duke of Northumberland, aristocrat and the region's largest land owner. Councils are telling us we have no choice. Northumberland County Council say they cannot get the money to build badly-needed schools itself and have to go the academies route. Sunderland and Newcastle Councils are being blackmailed by the Labour Government to accept academies or risk missing out on moneys from the Building Schools for the Future programme, a £40 billion ten to fifteen year programme to rebuild all secondary schools and key to the Government's agenda.

Tony Blair made reference to that investment in his speech. What he did not make reference to was the conditions attached to the Building Schools for the Future programme, conditions that mean the academies programme is being delivered under Building Schools for the Future. Building Schools for the Future is being used to promote PFIs; it is being used to provide the private sector with a key role in developing and implementing education policies. If councils build new schools under Building Schools for the Future, it is expected they will be PFI. In the Northern region councils are planning to go down this route, including Newcastle City Council which built a PFI school four years ago. It is now empty; it is standing empty. It closed and yet they are paying the PFI

contractor more than £50,000 a month and will have to pay that over the next 20 years. Madness.

North Tyneside Council, another Labour council unfortunately, has recently announced plans to turn every school in the borough into a trust school and to create a trust of the LEA. Trade unions in the Northern region are launching a campaign next week around this issue and we hope that we will have support from general secretaries and others nationally.

The implications of these policies cannot be overstated. In schools run by private and commercial interest, there is no control or influence by councillors or parents; our children's education is at the mercy of the market. Let us not forget the impact on workers. In trusts and academies, our members are being faced with cuts in pay and conditions when schools can set their own terms and conditions. Under PFI, the normal school meals workers and cleaners' jobs are transferred with all the attacks that that brings.

Government policy forces councils towards marketisation but we have seen little, if any, opposition. Too often councils go down the route, ignore the views of local councillors, school governors or parents. Local democracy is being undermined. There is a responsibility on the trades unions to lead this fight back, as we have been doing in the Northern region.

Support the motion and let us get out here from today and begin the fight.

\* *Composite Motion 10 was CARRIED*

### Early years education

**The President:** I call Motion 47, Early Years Education. The General Council supports the motion.

**Mary Jenkin** (*Association of Educational Psychologists*) moved Motion 47. She said: President, Congress, mums and dads, grannies and grandpas, uncles and aunties, I would like to remind you about something you already know, and that is how crucial the early years of a child's education are for their social, emotional and cognitive development. This Government has recognised the fundamental importance of early years experiences and rightly has set out to increase access to pre-school provision and to improve the quality of that provision for all. It is also seeking to increase accountability of all early years providers, which is of course to be welcomed. But the high level of specificity and the necessary observation, assessments and reports that this curriculum requires means there is real concern now that what is proposed will be at the expense of children's own development.

I would like to make three points: firstly, that the pre-school experience should be a positive one, whatever the ability or social skill of the child; secondly, that the high degree of specificity and formality of the curriculum leads inexorably to assessment to ensure that the learning has indeed taken place; and finally, we should consider experiences in other countries. The time between birth and the end of reception year at school, now known as the foundation stage, is a time of exploration, testing ideas and developing an understanding of self and of others. Entering pre-school at three or four years of age is the first real separation from the primary carer and for many a time of increased vulnerability. The foundation they experience should be one that promotes a strong self image, develops appropriate social behaviour and one that recognises that success is very individual.

Secondly, a very formal curriculum will fail to recognise other skills and talents and may lead to judgments that are premature and inaccurate about the child's longer-term academic future. We all know from observation of our own families, as well as from research, that

children develop at different rates. Some take far longer to consolidate a new idea or concept. There is a real danger that this highly formalised learning may lead to the development of a negative self image and self fulfilling predictions of failure and will serve to emphasise the differences in development of skills. There is a place for formal testing and assessment but this should be for older children who have developed a strong enough self-confidence to benefit from the experience and the resulting feedback. Where early experiences are positive, outcomes -- both educational and social -- are much more likely to be successful. Where these experiences are negative results can be under achievement, social exclusion and disaffection leading to antisocial behaviour. Of course we must celebrate success; we should recognise progress and thus offer specific help where it is needed. But we must be very careful about putting significant academic pressure on very young children, especially those who may have experienced negative social circumstances even before they have reached nursery.

Finally, how do others do it? The Welsh Assembly Government have replaced the Standard Assessment Tests, or SATS, for infants with teacher assessments. This has been welcomed by the educational profession in Wales and the new foundation stage there, extending through to year 2, is now based on structured play with positive outcomes for children and families. We start what amounts to our children's formal schooling at three or four years of age. We make judgments about them before they are seven. In Finland the education for early years children is far more informal. Indeed, they do not even start school until they are seven. But in the last international education league tables produced by the OECD Finland's 15-year-olds were judged to have the highest standards of literacy in the world. Starting so late may be a step too far for us but the message is clear: to encourage a high achieving, literate and socially aware society we must give young children the opportunities they need to develop at their own pace. We should be very careful when judging reporting as unintended messages are as easily absorbed as intended ones.

This motion asks you to consider the experiences that our youngest people have at a time when they can be highly vulnerable. It asks you to support a relaxation of the highly prescriptive and formalised curriculum that the Government are promoting for early years education and which, in other countries with better results, has been found to be unnecessary. It asks you to be mindful of the psychological research on early development so that young children will not be found wanting by the time they are seven.

**Carolyn Poulter** (*ASPECT*) seconded Motion 47. She said: the first formative years are not just important, they are essential in forming all life's future chances. Opportunities to explore, create, ask questions, and form opinions are vital ingredients. A curriculum that provides fun, challenges and develops social skills needs to be rich, varied and active. Children are unique. The Government's programme for children from birth to five fails to recognise the unique nature of active learning. It is muddled, unworkable and unwieldy as a curriculum. My association is very happy to support the motion and I urge you to do the same. Thank you.

\* *Motion 47 was CARRIED*

### Remploy

**The President:** Congress, we are running behind schedule and therefore, with the agreement of unions I intend to take Motion 21 on Remploy. The General Council support the motion.

**Phil Davies (GMB)** moved Motion 21. He said: I move Motion 21 on behalf of all of our members in Remploy. Congress, it is a sorry state of affairs that this is the second time in the last seven years that I have had to come to Congress to ask for your support for disabled workers who work by hand and brain in Remploy. It is a disgraceful situation that this is the second time that this Labour Government have tried to close down and destroy manufacturing in Remploy.

For over ten years the trades unions have been warning government that Remploy needs to change, and during those ten years we have campaigned tirelessly for Public Procurement Directives. It was our GMB officer, Kathleen Walker-Shaw, who changed for ever the Public Procurement Directive by the inclusion of Article 19 and Recital 7, which calls on local authorities to look favourably on those organisations which employ a majority of disabled workers. The Directive and the guidance notes became law in January 2006, so why then in March 2006 did the Government announce that a complete review would be taking place by PricewaterhouseCoopers, a review that we all know was a nice word for factory closures.

Congress, there has never been a better time for Remploy and other similar works to take advantage of contracts from the public sector. The Government are hiding behind a group of people who do not understand how manufacturing plants work. Let me say to those who believe that all disabled people should be integrated into open employment, we are not there yet. There is still discrimination by the employers and if you do not believe me just go down and look at the thousands of employment tribunal cases on discrimination that there are every year. Our members have the right to choose where they want to work; they have the right to choose to work together. Would anyone take away the right of blind or deaf people to form organisations that represent themselves? I do not think so. Remploy manufacturing provides products for the MOD and some blue chip companies -- JCB, Body Shop, Wedgwood, Stanley Tool, Honda, Siemens, Hewlett Packard, BMW, I could go on for the next 20 minutes. Anyone who believes that Remploy is a basket weaving, low-skill company is totally wrong and should go and visit our members in the factories.

Congress, just recently, one of our members wrote to me from Remploy about the proposed review and the threat to his job. He said that "...after a traumatic nervous breakdown I started work for Remploy in 1997. As I was unable to drive, my wife used to drive me to work. I cried all the way there. At the end of the day she fetched me and I cried all the way home. I now realise I was still very ill when I went back to work. Depression is a terrible illness. There were many days when I broke down at work and just sat crying. Those disabled people used to take turns to sit with me and hold my hand." Colleagues, Remploy disabled people and workers are helping each other, sharing the good and the bad times together. I do not know of any other group of workers that can offer this level of support. The unions will not accept factory closures.

Trades unions are about protecting people at work. We are about shaping society for the better. The Government have been misled by the fat cat Remploy directors, all of whom should be sacked today. Changes can take place without the closure of any Remploy factory. The company is being run so badly by the Remploy Board of Directors that they have become arrogant without any moral thought for disabled people. This is a major dispute, not over pay, not over conditions, but about the rights of disabled people to choose the type of employment they want. It is a way we treat disabled people, it is about disabled people's rights in our society.

This dispute is not only industrial but also political. At the end of the day, however bad the Remploy Board of Directors are, it is a Labour Government that holds the purse strings and it is no good Ministers telling me and the trades unions that the directors run the company when it is the Government that appoints the board. There are some principles and traditions that the Thatcher years and New Labour would like us to forget. These principles and traditions in this movement are part of our past and we should never forget them. Workers in struggle demand to be supported.

I commend this motion to Congress in the full knowledge and belief that our movement will support our Remploy members to keep Remploy manufacturing and disabled people in work. There will be no sell out, there will be no surrender by the trades unions and there will be no factory closures.

**Sean McGovern (Transport & General Workers' Union)** seconded Motion 21. He said: Congress, this motion is not just about closures, it is about the principle of listening to disabled workers. It is also about working class disabled manual workers standing up and saying "We will not be patronised by management or the government". Remploy workers do not want to be told what is best for them; they want their voices to be heard.

Remploy workers are, like the rest of us, subject to the same disciplines of the workplace as mainstream employment. Remploy workers are highly skilled and they make quality goods. But they have been let down by an incompetent management and a totally unresponsive government. 'Sack the Board' is not just a slogan, it is a necessity. Contracts have been turned down and Remploy has been run down. Public procurement has not been taken advantage of and neither have the opportunities to grow the business, but the trade union business plan offers a way forward for the company.

Let us be clear, this is about cutting costs; it is not about integrating disabled workers into mainstream employment. But the key issue is choice. If all Remploy factories are shut then our members are having a decision made for them. Remploy workers are in well organised workplaces with decent terms and conditions, pensions and sick pay. The Remploy factory network provides a unique opportunity for our members to work in a supportive environment with dignity and respect. They do not want to be forced into low pay, low status jobs and the possibilities of discrimination within the workplace. It should come as no surprise that many of our members are extremely fearful about this prospect. The factory network is vital to provide skills and to build the confidence of disabled workers who may have been out of work for a long time.

Congress, please do everything you can to support the joint union campaign against these proposed closures. We are fighting back and our voices will be heard. Please support the motion.

**Ged Demsey (Amicus)** supported Motion 21. He said: I call on Congress to give full support to our members, some of the most vulnerable workers in UK industry who are faced with losing their jobs at Remploy. You have already heard from GMB's Phil Davies about the issues at stake. The review of Remploy must not lead to our members losing their employment. Yes, savings can be made and, yes, we all want a business that is successful but not at the expense and cost of our members' jobs. Let us be clear, we will not allow the closure of any Remploy factory.

Over the years Remploy workers have had to have a belly full of having to defend their jobs from both tory

and new labour ministers who are playing politics with their livelihoods. It is perverse and it is degradable. Remploy's board of directors are renowned and what are they renowned for -- for their deception, for their incompetence and for their failure. This rabble of directors must be sacked and sacked at once today so that our committed Remploy workers get the dignity, the respect and the job security that they deserve.

Amicus members work in Remploy in highly skilled jobs. We have members working in IT components, in printing and many highly skilled workers in print finishing. Their skills are irreplaceable. If one of these Remploy factories closes, disabled workers will not be able to find a job. Our members, once secure at work, are now fearful of losing their job. That is the real world. It is time for the Ministers to wake up. Rather than finding alternative work, many will face a lifetime on benefit rather than in workplaces where they are valued. Losing employment through the closure of Remploy factories will mean that they are the mercy of the market. These are workers who are unable to compete for jobs because of their disabilities.

Therefore, let us support our members in Remploy, help us to defend our members' jobs and have solidarity with them. Let the message go out from this Congress. Yes, we will help Remploy to become a successful business but not at the cost and expense of our members' jobs and the closure of Remploy factories. I urge you to support this motion.

**Barry Morris** (*Community*): This is an argument about manufacturing; this is an argument about giving all members a choice in real meaningful jobs, and that is a choice that we are not prepared to give up lightly.

Phil Davies has touched on some of the highly skilled jobs in Remploy and I will just very briefly talk about electronics. If we talk about the police force, protective clothing, we talk about the leading seller in the most sophisticated life jacket in the country; the largest supplier of furniture to education authorities; wheelchair manufacture; book binding of the most intricate nature. Remploy is not basket weaving, Remploy is highly sophisticated. We are not prepared to sacrifice these kinds of jobs for our members. Yes, there is a future in Interwork, we do not argue against Interwork, but let us remember that with Interwork the factories are the breeding ground, the recruiting areas, for Interwork and without the factories that creates another problem. We are not prepared to let our members in Remploy lose this opportunity, and the unions together -- and I am ashamed to be saying this whilst there is a Labour Government in power, because the Tories never tried this mass closure plan -- will not stand back and see our disabled members' jobs taken away from them. Please support.

\* *Motion 21 was CARRIED*

## Disability

**Richard Reiser** (*National Union of Teachers*) speaking to paragraph 2.11 of the General Council Report said: I just wanted to update people. There is a section in the report, the Committee Report -- I am on the Disability Committee -- and I wanted to update Congress on three quick points.

The first is that it mentions in the Report that there have been negotiations taking place at the United Nations on a Convention for the Rights of People with Disabilities, as it is called. I want to say how proud I have been to represent the British disability movement in those negotiations for the past year and to report to you that on 25 August we concluded an international treaty which covers the lives of disabled people throughout the world, 650 million people, which will actually benefit all disabled people around the world.

What was quite amazing about that process was two things. First of all, that 118 countries reached agreement on a consensual basis, which is quite unusual; and, secondly, that the people that the Convention was about, disabled people, were actually part of the process. Rather than diplomats who have made all the other international treaties that we are signatories to, the disabled people were entitled to be there as NGOs but also 80 disabled people were state representatives on government delegations. This made a real change to the quality of what was negotiated.

If I can tell you that the Convention is actually based on the social model of disability which sees that the problem is not us and our impairments but the barriers in society of attitude and environment, you will see what a major step forward this has been for disabled people in the world. It will be, I hope, adopted by the General Assembly of the UN before Christmas and it will be up to us to push hard for ratification by the British Government, because it will change things here.

To give you just a couple of examples, it will for instance lead to the issue that Leslie Burke took to the European Court and failed to get. There is a right not to have food and water withdrawn as part of your medical treatment in this. There is a right to have legal capacity with supported decision-making for all disabled people. These are major changes that even in a country that has quite a lot of legislation will challenge the way our Government deal with disabled people.

The second point I want to make is that the Disability Rights Commission came out with a survey just a few months ago that suggested that over half of the people who are legally entitled to call themselves disabled in this country, which comes to nearly 11 million people now, do not recognise themselves as disabled. That is a job for you and me, colleagues, to convince our workplace colleagues that they have rights and entitlements under the Disability Discrimination Act. For instance, with sickness monitoring if you actually are a disabled person you are entitled to more time off than your colleagues for things such as a reasonable adjustment. You are also entitled not to be the first person to be picked off for redundancy. These are things that apply. I fully support Remploy but we need to remember that there are 3.4 million disabled people in the open market working out there and they need the trade union movement to defend them and to build and support them. This is very important.

The last point I wanted to bring to delegates' attention is that we are now just four months away -- or less than four months away -- from the introduction of the public duty which will actually require all public bodies, whether they are the courts, the hospitals, the police, the fire service, schools or universities, to actually promote disability equality. That does not mean complying with the law; it means positively changing the attitude of customers, of the management, of workplace colleagues. This will require a mind set change of everyone and the only way we can do it is by actually getting mass disability equality training and getting our colleagues to take this forward.

I call on all the trades unions here to do with public sector, or those who provide services from the private sector, because they will be caught up in the procurement arrangements, to start putting the pressure on their employers to take this duty seriously.

**The President:** Thank you for that progress report.

## Report of the Scrutineers

**The President:** I invite Hilary Bills, the Chair of the Scrutineers, to give the results of the ballots for the General Council and the General Purposes Committee.

**Hilary Bills** (*Chair of Scrutineers*) presented the Scrutineers Report. She said: Before I start I would like to thank the scrutineers for the professional and diligent manner in which they have conducted their business today. They are all sitting at the back there. Well done everyone. It has been an enjoyable day

### General Council

#### Section A

*(unions with more than 200,000 members)*

Amicus *(six members)*

|               |               |
|---------------|---------------|
| Gail Cartmail | Tony Dubbins  |
| Doug Rooney   | Derek Simpson |
| Ed Sweeney    | Paul Talbot   |

UNISON *(six members)*

|              |                 |
|--------------|-----------------|
| Bob Abberley | Jane Carolan    |
| Dave Prentis | Alison Shepherd |
| Liz Snape    | Sofi Taylor     |

Transport and General Workers  
*(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)*

|                 |              |
|-----------------|--------------|
| Pauline Foulkes | John Hannett |
|-----------------|--------------|

#### Section B

*(unions with between 100,000 and 200,000 members)*

Association of Teachers and Lecturers

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Mary Bousted |  |
|--------------|--|

Prospect

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| Paul Noon |  |
|-----------|--|

University and College Union

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Paul Mackney |  |
|--------------|--|

Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Alan Ritchie |  |
|--------------|--|

#### Section C

*(unions with fewer than 100,000 members eleven to be elected)*

|                 |                    |         |
|-----------------|--------------------|---------|
| Jonathan Baume* | <i>(FDA)</i>       | 397,000 |
| Brian Caton *   | <i>(POA)</i>       | 603,000 |
| Bob Crow *      | <i>(RMT)</i>       | 335,000 |
| Jeremy Dear *   | <i>(NUJ)</i>       | 370,000 |
| Gerry Doherty*  | <i>(TSSA)</i>      | 517,000 |
| Michael Leahy*  | <i>(Community)</i> | 404,000 |
| Joe Marino      | <i>(BFAWU)</i>     | 232,000 |
| Judy McKnight*  | <i>(Napo)</i>      | 530,000 |
| Robert Monks    | <i>(URTU)</i>      | 48,000  |
| Ged Nichols *   | <i>(Accord)</i>    | 407,000 |
| Brian Orrell *  | <i>(NUMAST)</i>    | 401,000 |
| Tim Poil *      | <i>(NGSU)</i>      | 358,000 |
| Matt Wrack *    | <i>(FBU)</i>       | 237,000 |

#### Section D

*(women from unions with fewer than 200,000 members four to be elected – no contest)*

Sue Ferns *(Prospect)*

Anita Halpin *(National Union of Journalists)*

Sally Hunt *(University and College Union)*

Lesley Mercer *(Chartered Society of Physiotherapy)*

#### Section E

*(Member representing black workers from unions with more than 200,000 members)*

Mohammad Taj *(Transport and General Workers Union)*

#### 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 disabled workers)*

|             |                 |           |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------|
| Mark Fysh * | <i>(UNISON)</i> | 5,489,000 |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------|

|              |              |         |
|--------------|--------------|---------|
| Tony Sneddon | <i>(CWU)</i> | 906,000 |
|--------------|--------------|---------|

#### Section I

*(Member representing Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Workers)*

Maria Exall *(Communication Workers Union)*

Section J

*(Member representing young workers)*

John Walsh \* *(Amicus)* 5,296,000

Stephen Gribben *(CWU)* 1,051,000

**General Purposes Committee**

*(five to be elected – no contest)*

Phil Davies *(GMB)*

Peter Hall *(National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers)*

Linda McCulloch *(Amicus)*

Annette Mansell-Green *(UNISON)*

Tony Woodhouse *(Transport and General Workers Union)*

**The President:** Thank you very much for that. That concludes this afternoon's business.

*Congress adjourned for the day*

**THIRD DAY: WEDNESDAY SEPTEMBER 13<sup>TH</sup>  
MORNING SESSION**

*(Congress reassembled at 9.30 a.m.)*

**The President:** Good morning, delegates. I call Congress to order. Could we, first of all, begin by saying many thanks for the Beaufort String Quartet who have been playing for us this morning. *(Applause)*

**Report of the General Purposes Committee**

**The President:** Delegates, I now invite Annette Mansell-Green to give a further report from the General Purposes Committee.

**Annette Mansell-Green** (*General Purposes Committee*) said: Good morning, Congress. The General Purposes Committee has approved three further emergency motions and these will be placed on your seat before this afternoon's session. They are Emergency Motion 3, HSE Job Cuts, Emergency Motion 4 on Corporate Manslaughter, and Emergency Motion 5, Closure of Northern Foods Bakery in Trafford Park. The President will indicate when these Emergency Motions will be taken.

Congress, please note also that the GPC has approved the withdrawal of Motion 67 in the name of the Bakers, Food and Allied Workers' Union. I can also report to you that the NUJ has agreed to remit Motion 73 on Venezuela.

As the President mentioned yesterday, we are behind on Congress business so could you please ensure that you respect the allotted speaking times. Thank you.

**The President:** Thank you, Annette. Congress, as you have just heard, we now have three further Emergency Motions. These will be placed on your chairs before the afternoon session. In addition, the General Council has agreed its statement on Trident, which will also be placed on your chairs before the afternoon session.

I intend to take Motion 65, Trident, and a General Council statement after the debate on the Middle East this afternoon.

I intend to take Emergency Motion 1 on the Merseyside fire dispute at the end of this morning's business, and Emergency Motion 2 on the closure of the Thomson/TUI call centre in Glasgow at the end of the transport debate this afternoon.

Emergency Motion 3 will be taken after the end of the scheduled business and after taking unfinished business on Thursday.

In addition, there are now ten motions which were not taken through lack of time. They are: Motion 14, Flexible Working; Motion 15, Equality Reps; Motion 16, Violence Against Women; Motion 11, Redundancy Law; Motion 12, Irish Ferries; Motion 13, Penalties for Failure to Implement Statutory Provisions; Motion 48, Class Size; Motion 49, Local Authority Support for Schools; Composite Motion 11, Education & Training, Age and Employment Rights, and Motion 20, Access to Work and the Public Sector.

Finally, Congress, may I urge all speakers to be mindful of the time pressure on all remaining business. It may not be possible to take all those unions which have indicated that they wish to speak. Delegates, please respect the time limits and not repeat points made by other delegates, and the red light should certainly be respected. Thank you, delegates.

**Address by Bill Lucy, AFL/CIO Fraternal Delegate**

**The President:** I now want to welcome to the rostrum a good friend of the TUC and the most senior black

trade unionist in America, Bill Lucy, a fraternal delegate from the AFL/CIO. Bill is the Secretary Treasurer of the American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees as well as being a member of the AFL/CIO Executive Council, and chairs the International Committee. He founded and leads the coalition of black trade unionists, led the Free South Africa Movement in the USA in the 1980s, and is past President of the Public Services International.

Bill, it will be a real pleasure to hear your address this morning and I now invite you to address Congress.

**Bill Lucy** (*AFL/CIO*): Brothers and Sisters, Thank you so much, Gloria, for that kind and generous introduction. You made me sound so important I can hardly wait to hear what I have to say. Let me join with every colleague in this Congress and congratulate you, Gloria, on your leadership of the TUC during your term of office, and before, and what you will do after office; my union, AFSCME, and yours, UNISON, has enjoyed a very close relationship for many many years. Congratulations to Brendan for his steady and courageous leadership during these very difficult and trying times.

Sisters and brothers, I bring you greetings in solidarity from the President, John Sweeney, of the AFL/CIO, Secretary Treasurer, Richard Trumka, Executive Vice President, Linda Chavez-Thompson, and the entire Executive Council of the AFL/CIO. We thank you for 112 years of friendship in solidarity between our two federations. While we have many things to thank you for, on a practical matter most recently we were grateful for the ongoing assistance of the TUC, and Prospect and the Civil Service Union, in helping us to organise the staff at the British Embassy and Consulate in the United States. That case is ongoing before the ILO Committee on Freedom of Association. The United Steelworkers and the AFL/CIO are resolved to fight along with the Transport and General Workers' Union against Imereys' plan to move British production. Finally, along with the TUC and GMB we are letting the Asdas and Wal-Marts of the world know that when they take on one of us they take on both of us. *(Applause)*

During the past 112 years the AFL/CIO and the TUC have indeed shared tears as well as solidarity. On the fifth anniversary of the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks we will never forget your immediate support, as was the case last year when Hurricane Katrina devastated New Orleans and the Gulf region. We felt your grief over a year ago on July 7<sup>th</sup> when terrorists struck at innocent citizens of London. Importantly, we also share a broader vision and many of the same struggles, be it the effects of globalisation, the outsourcing of jobs as you now face in the NHS, threats to our pension system, public services, education, healthcare, creating decent jobs for citizens of our communities and our countries, defending the rights of immigrant workers, striving for equality at the workplace, and so much more. We are fighting the same battles in the USA, to fight for equality at the workplace, to defend the rights of migrant workers, and to struggle to eliminate racism and discrimination is a fundamental part of labour's role and responsibility.

At the global level where so many of these issues must be confronted, after nearly a century of political and ideological division we are overcoming separation and division for the greater good, creating a strong and unified global trade union movement. Together we will make this unification an historic event for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Working closely with the TUC and with our other global union partners in the International Trade Union Confederation, otherwise to be known as Unions International, we have the possibility of creating, as Gordon Brown said last night, a globalisation that serves the common good, ending

poverty, racism, and all forms of discrimination, eliminating child labour, tackling the multinational giants, bringing global employers to a global bargaining table, defeating the old liberal right wing governments, and reversing the privatised and deregulated agenda for the World Bank and the IMF. The creation of Unions International, the AFL/CIO has repeatedly and forcedly underscored as a top priority making freedom of association and the right to join a union and collective bargaining a reality for workers everywhere.

We are especially pleased to be able to report that in this past year we have made outstanding progress on organising. Four of our affiliates, auto, teachers, communication workers, and my own union, have collectively allocated an additional \$100m specifically for organising activities. Over the last three years 50,000 heavy manufacturing workers have been organised by the United Auto Workers, mainly in the southern part of the United States, communication workers recently organised some 18,000 high-tech workers in just 10 months bringing the total to 40,000 at Cingular Wireless, and our new partnership with the largest independent teachers union in the US, the National Education Association, will allow for affiliates of the NEA to join the AFL/CIO at local levels.

This is all happening in spite of the most deceptive and deceitful administration in the history of our movement. We will win in spite of the difficulties and bring the American labour movement into its rightful role in the battle for change. The administration that we serve under, I have to tell you, is the worst administration in the history of organised labour in our country and we as organised labour should not be reluctant to say so, the Bush administration is devastating to the interests of workers across the world. *(Applause)*

Contrary to what you may have heard, the great issues that are on the minds of the American workers are not gay marriage or prayer in school. Most people believe, and rightly so, that if you do not want a gay marriage do not have one, and so far as the issue of prayer in school, as long as students are taught algebra and trigonometry there will be prayer in school. The issues that concern our voters are the Government's deception in getting the world engaged in a war of choice rather than pursuing the threat that was real in Afghanistan. The issues on voters' minds is the state of the household economics of millions of workers, the plight of millions of our senior citizens, the education futures for all of our children, the absence of healthcare for 45 million Americans, the immoral and obscene levels of pay and benefits for CEOs of corporate America, the loss of three million good paying jobs since this president came into office.

Today, we are preparing for a movement for the greatest contest to win the hearts and minds of the American voter that has ever taken place. As we do so, we do so remembering just a few short years ago that for eight years we enjoyed the longest economic expansion in 60 years. Just six years ago our nation and the world looked very different, family income was up, net spendable income was up, home ownership was at an all-time high, 22 million new jobs were created in the American economy, unemployment was 3.7 percent, the lowest in 50 years, crime had declined for five consecutive years, bankruptcies both business and personal were declining year after year, poverty was decreasing and people once again could see some light at the end of their economic tunnel. The national budget was balanced for the first time in decades and we had on hand a \$236bn surplus and we were paying down the national debt of America.

If we look at income, what does the economy look like now under the Bush administration? Income is stagnant or declining, unemployment stands at 7

percent while they claim 4.7 percent, bankruptcies are running at record levels personal and small businesses, foreclosures are escalating, people are simply walking away from homes they can no longer afford, crime is on the rise for five consecutive years, poverty is on the increase, 1.7 million people have dropped out of the middle-class into poverty in three short years. College tuition is escalating beyond the reach of many people; 3.5 million jobs have gone, 2.5 million in manufacturing alone; 850,000 federal jobs downsized or privatised. Our federal budget of \$477bn is destined to go even higher if we remain in Iraq and Afghanistan. All of these setbacks have been attributed to September 11<sup>th</sup> 2001. Let me remind this Congress that on September 10<sup>th</sup> 2001 we had already lost 900,000 jobs from the economy, not because of terrorism but because of bad economic policy.

Albert Einstein once said as he described an optimist, "someone who does the same thing over and over and expects a different result." I would describe the potential victim as someone who knows that an axe will harm them and does nothing to protect themselves. We must not, either you or ourselves in the American labour movement, allow our industries and our jobs to continue to be dealt away like cards in a game of draw poker. We must unite and fight. We must do what common sense dictates. We must fight back and we intend to fight back against the Bush administration with every resource that the American labour movement has. We must fight back against an administration that will allow our industries just to die off. We must fight back against an administration too blind to see that the value of a strong industrial manufacturing sector is good for our nation and the world. We must fight back against an administration that rewards the already rich and wealthy at the expense of working people. We must put an end to this policy of socialism for the rich and wealthy and free enterprise for workers and the poor. We have to bring this to a halt as quickly as possible. We must find a way to bring to an end this dreadful war of choice which has cost the lives of the best and the brightest of our allies and ourselves. Iraq was not a war necessary, it was a war of choice, what I choose to call the 'Halliburton war'. We must bring this to an end as quickly as possible and bring our military troops home as soon as possible. *(Applause)*

On the domestic front just a few weeks ago President Bush had the nerve to say that the American economy is solid and strong, and creates a real benefit for American workers and families. I have to ask the question, what planet is he on, or even better yet, what is he on! *(Laughter)* Workers know that they are not benefiting from the wealth that they have helped to create. That is why the latest polling shows that most voters are going to be voting with their pocketbooks in November, and that is good for us. During this critical mid-year election the AFL/CIO is making the largest effort in history in an off-year election. We will spend a record \$40 million with the vast majority of that money going to our grassroots mobilisation efforts, not campaign contributions to individual candidates.

Sisters and brothers, we must build upon our collective power and mobilise united as never before. Many of you are aware that several unions left the AFL/CIO within the past year. We want you to know that for us in the US, and for workers everywhere, a divided movement weak in worker unity is more than tragic. As we create a unified movement at the global level, I want you to know that in the AFL/CIO we are deeply committed to doing everything possible to bring the American labour movement back together. This is not the first time we have been separated; we will come back together.



In concluding, sisters and brothers, I want to leave you with some thoughts from the late Dr Martin Luther King Jr. As you may know, he was assassinated in 1968 while working in support of an AFSCME sanitation strike in my home town of Memphis Tennessee. I worked very closely with Dr King and in these very difficult times when millions of workers around the world are struggling just to survive daily existence, I am inspired by one of his letters from the Birmingham jail in 1963. Dr King wrote: "Freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor, it must be demanded by the oppressed," and to accomplish this he later reminds us our task is to discover how to organise our strength into compelling power.

Brothers and sisters, that is what we must do across the globe, in your country and in our country, workers and their movement must take their rightful place and participate in the decisions that affect not just their work life but their social systems as well.

We have an ongoing responsibility to fight on behalf of those who work every day and, secondly, to fight on behalf of a sane and civilised society.

I thank you for your hospitality during this Congress and look forward to working with you, each and every one of you, in your capacities as leaders of your union. Thank you so very much on behalf of the AFL/CIO. *(Applause)*

**The President:** Bill, I just want to say thanks for your address and especially for your mixture of inspiration and pragmatism, which is a lesson to us all. Bill will be speaking later today at a TUC Black Workers' Rally at lunchtime. Bill, in recognition of all that we have in common I would like to take the opportunity to present to you a small token of our esteem, a present for you, and a Congress Gold Badge. *(Presentation made)*

**Address by Rt Hon Margaret Beckett MP, Foreign Secretary**

**The President:** Delegates, today is international day at Congress. Earlier this year a longstanding friend of the trade union movement, Margaret Beckett, took over one of the four great offices of state as the first woman Foreign Secretary. It is an enormous pleasure, Margaret, to welcome you to Congress today. Delegates, Margaret will first address Congress and has agreed to take a question and answer session giving delegates a chance to put their questions to her directly.

Margaret, we are delighted to have you here today and I now invite you to address Congress.

**Rt. Hon. Margaret Beckett MP:** Thank you very much, Gloria, and thank you for the invitation to speak to Congress. Can I just begin by saying, and I cannot resist saying, how much I enjoyed your speech last night. It made me feel I was coming home. I recognised the tone and the approach.

I am very honoured to be invited to address Congress and particularly proud to do so, not just as Foreign Secretary, if one can say that, but as the third T&G Foreign Secretary. *(Applause)* The first, of course, Ernie Bevin, was by common consent probably the greatest Foreign Secretary Britain has ever had.

It is absolutely in the mainstream tradition of our union movement that we have and share an international vision for social justice and for solidarity. From the individual contribution of trades unionists, men and women like our own Jack Jones who fought in the Spanish Civil War, to the debates and decisions of unions and of Congress down the years, it is one of the finest of our traditions. No one has done, or is

doing, more than the trades union movement to advance social justice in every corner of the world. That depth of engagement will, I am sure, be reflected in the very wide range of concerns and interests that delegates here today will have. I do not intend even to attempt to address them all in this short speech. There will be an opportunity, as Gloria said, for people to raise specific issues afterwards.

What I would like to do is to say a little about the wider framework of this Government's international agenda and something about how I see the trades union movement playing a vital role in realising that agenda. It was Ernie Bevin who said, "Foreign policy isn't something that is great and big, it's common sense and humanity as it applies to my affairs and yours." I like that definition because it seems to me a very distinctive Labour view of foreign policy, one rooted in our concern for and our understanding and appreciation of our common humanity. It is an approach that does not confine itself to the traditional big ticket items, the things that grab all the headlines and that arise from a focus solely on the world stage. It is a less obvious but more solidly grounded approach in which you endeavour to promote sound global values and build multilateral systems within which nations and individuals can cooperate, coexist, and each achieve their potential. If we get the fundamentals right, Bevin's "common sense and humanity", and the rest, the "great and the big" as he called them, stand a better chance of being achieved.

Bevin was speaking in 1950 but, if anything, his words have even more resonance today. Half a century of technological progress, of massive global population growth, and of increased demand on shared and limited resources have given us a world which is more obviously and self-evidently interdependent, mutually dependent, than ever before. In such a world the idea that any government can provide prosperity and security to its citizens in isolation through solely unilateral action, or what people call *machtspolitik*, the old great game, balance of power view of foreign policy, is now patently absurd.

We used to argue, and I have heard it many times in this hall, at TUC and Labour Party Conferences, that tackling some of the underlying problems of global insecurity was mainly about showing solidarity, that it was in 'their interests', the people who were most directly affected or at risk, that we should act. Increasingly today I think we all realise that it is in our direct interest too. If as an international community we fail to build the pillars of global security, food security, water security, energy security, climate security, then we are living in a house with extremely shaky foundations. Put simply, and one of the oldest clichés of all, it is as a human race that it is now clear that united we stand and divided we will fall.

When I spoke at the John Hopkins University at the beginning of the summer I called for 'a globalisation of responsibility', an understanding, in other words, that in a world of global threats, dangers and risks, the self-interest of individual countries is inseparable from the common interest of the international community as a whole. I am not, of course, suggesting that a focus on the underlying causes should be to the exclusion of tackling individual problems and crises. We cannot afford to do that. We deal with those as and when they arise. But in line with that globalisation of responsibility on which I touched, increasingly what all of this means is the international community as a whole taking action. I was delighted, for example, to see a UN Security Council resolution at the end of last month on the worsening tragedy in Darfur which refers for the very first time, in a resolution which is country-specific, to our collective responsibility to protect. Recognition of that responsibility is increasingly evident in sheer practical terms. In

Lebanon troops from the European Union will be working alongside Muslim troops from Indonesia and from Turkey trying to maintain a durable peace there. One of the most noticeable aspects of the ongoing negotiations over Iran's nuclear ambitions has been the breadth and strength of the international consensus of concern. All parties, in the region and outside it, are going to have to make concerted efforts to work together if we are going to get the Middle East peace process moving again.

So, any government has to and will react to individual instances of insecurity in the world around it but what differentiates this Labour Government is that we do not see the underlying causes to that insecurity that I have identified as some kind of fluffy alternative agenda, a luxury we can allow ourselves when more pressing matters have been resolved. We recognise that if we do not want to be constantly dealing with the eruption of new fires, we have to douse the smouldering embers of global insecurity.

So to tackle conflict or the flow of refugees, or to minimise global pandemics, you have to deal with poverty, hence the massive increases in development aid under this Government and the progress on debt relief and immunisation.

If your focus is on the danger that economic growth in China might falter, on further famine in Sub-Saharan Africa, or on water stress (already severe) in the Middle East, then you have to deal with the climate instability which will have a direct impact on all these areas. So, at the beginning of the summer we announced a new international strategic priority for climate security that looks at what we can do now to slow global warming rather than waiting to adapt to each new impact as it hits us.

If you are concerned by failed states offering havens to organised crime or to terrorists, you have to be committed to building the culture of human rights and democratic governance which will bring more stability in those vulnerable countries. We must never fall into the trap of thinking that pushing democratic values in the world is some sort of unacceptable cultural imperialism. When millions of Iraqis braved bombs to go to the polling stations, when men and women in Burma face prison or worse for advocating change, when 80 year olds walk for miles to vote in the Democratic Republic of Congo, then surely the least we can do is lend them our active support.

As I said at the beginning, I know that is what the trades union movement is doing and has been doing in various forms and contexts for many years. More recently, British trades unions played a huge role, for example, in the 'Make Poverty History' campaign. The TUC itself has at its very core a belief in those fundamental human rights and freedoms that empower individuals and which are the bedrock of true democracy. Just last week in Iraq I was hearing about the work the TUC is doing in supporting and training the General Federation of Iraqi Workers, work which is as brave as it is vital.

People across the world have more freedom to meet, to speak their mind, and to earn a decent living wage because of what union activists in this country have done. In some places the FCO and the trades union movement are already explicitly working together. The TUC/FCO Advisory Council now meets three times a year. I know both sides find these sessions very helpful. It is leading to more cooperation on the ground. For example, we are running a project with the TUC in Brazil on dispute resolution and another with the NUJ on free media in the Ukraine. In November, the FCO and TUC are holding a joint conference on 'Strengthening labour standards in the global economy'. We are conscious that we ought to be doing a lot more with the trades union movement, and as economic decisions become more global, so British

trade unions have ever-closer links and ever more influence with international organisations and with their counterparts overseas.

Like Gloria and Brendan, I would like to see a step change in the level of cooperation between the FCO and trade unions, so I want to end on this point. I hope you will as trade unionists, with and through the TUC, come to us with your ideas and suggestions on how we can work together in the future. We are open to ideas, very willing to work with you, and very much recognise what is our common cause and the need to work together in every way that we can to advance it.

Thank you for the work that you do, and thank you for listening this morning. (*Applause*)

**The President:** Thank you, Margaret.

**Brendan Barber** (*General Secretary*): Colleagues, as Gloria indicated earlier, Margaret has kindly agreed to take questions and a number of unions have indicated that they wanted to take advantage of that opportunity. I wonder if those colleagues could, as we did yesterday, get ready and make themselves available near the microphone in the corridor here.

Amongst the areas that colleagues have indicated they want to raise questions on are issues around Latin America, Iraq, China, ILO standards, European Union issues, and I hope that in the time available we will be able to cover all of those issues.

Could we begin, perhaps, with Mary Bousted from ATL, who I think has a question to raise about Colombia, a country with whom the trades union movement in Britain has been doing an awful lot of work in recent years. Mary?

**Mary Bousted** (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*): Foreign Secretary, I have just returned from a TUC delegation visit to Colombia organised by Justice for Colombia. During the week's visit I heard testimony from political prisoners in gaol, trade unionists, opposition politicians, civil society leaders, campesinos and human rights lawyers, and I still cannot come to terms with what I heard and what I saw, that assassination, torture, disappearances, displacements, false imprisonment, people held for years without trials because the judges will not hear the trials, that this is happening to trade unionists and civil society leaders and it is practised by the Colombian Government as a deliberate policy of state-sponsored terrorism.

I want to ask you, why is the UK government giving Colombia military aid? Why will it not disclose the amount of this aid and which Colombian military units are receiving it?

On my first question, 'why are we giving Colombia military aid?' if your answer is that it is for human rights training I have to tell you that this training is not working and that this support, the British Government support, is being used by the Colombian Government to legitimise its oppression by terror of civil society and of social and political opposition. If you need independent testimony of what I have said, please read Appendix 2 of the United Nations Report on Human Rights in Colombia in 2005.

**Brendan Barber:** Thank you, Mary. Like yesterday I would like to take two or three questions at a run. I think Jane Stewart from Amicus wanted to raise a question about Cuba.

**Jane Stewart** (*Amicus*): Thank you. The TUC recognises that there are differences between our government and the Cuban government but we would

like to focus on the positive element of the relationships between the two countries, therefore we congratulate this government for maintaining a positive relationship with Cuba and rejecting the aggressive US policies on the blockade. However, along with 201 MPs who signed the Early Day Motion 1959 on Cuba this year, we are very concerned that the FCO has so far declined to reveal the content of the meeting it had in November with Caleb McCarry, who is the Transition Coordinator for Cuba from the US Government. The Foreign Secretary will know that this administration is against the Cuban regime and we would like to ask the Foreign Secretary why the FCO had this meeting and why, despite the questions from the MPs, you have not responded or answered them.

**Brendan Barber:** Thank you, Jane. Margaret, perhaps you might respond to those two?

**Margaret Beckett:** First of all on the question of Colombia, yes, I am conscious, Mary, that there are very real problems in Colombia. I am certainly well aware of the kind of charges that you make and the concerns that are expressed about the ill-treatment of a range of groups, as you identify. I think there is some dispute about whether this is (and I think you used the words) 'state sponsored'. I am not sure whether everyone wholeheartedly accepts that but what I do accept is that whether it is officially the policy of the state or not it is certainly happening, and if the state is not sponsoring it, it is not succeeding yet in mitigating and tackling it.

You are right that we do not believe the very small amount of military aid that we give is a contributory factor but I take your point that while these abuses continue you cannot say that there is the proper recognition for human rights that we would wish to see in Colombia and everywhere else across the world. On the other hand, I think one cannot just say it is not working because if there are people being affected that is the beginning of a movement towards change; nothing happens all in one fell swoop.

I can certainly assure you that we do on many and frequent occasions intervene with the Colombian government, we do urge that Government to work with civil society and to impede the kind of persecution that you refer to, and with the project funds that we spend in Colombia we do support a range of human rights-related projects on issues such as freedom of expression, rule of law, rights for children, and so on. We do what we can to have an active and constructive engagement with Colombia but pressing them to go in the right direction. I accept that it is not yet anything like as successful as you and we would like it to be.

Jane, thank you for your kind remarks about the Government's relationship with Cuba. It is certainly the case that this is not an issue on which we adopt the same approach as the United States. For example, we reject the imposition of sanctions on Cuba. I am afraid I am not familiar with the meeting that you raised or why the MPs' questions have not yet been answered. I will look into that when I return to the office. What I can certainly say to you is that, while on the one hand we do not share the approach which says that we impose sanctions on Cuba, we are also mindful of the fact that there are events in Cuba which I think none of us would wish to see in terms of whether or not people have real freedom of expression, whether there are people exercising their rights as trade unionists as freely as we would wish. I think here too it is a two-way street, there are concerns to be expressed as well as recognition of some of the problems Cuba has faced.

**Brendan Barber:** Thank you very much, Margaret. On the issue of Iraq a couple of unions wanted to raise

points: first, Jimmy Kelly, Transport and General Workers' Union.

**Jimmy Kelly** (*Transport and General Workers' Union*)

said: Thank you, Brendan. The question is Iraq and indeed the context for the question is the slaughter of so many thousands of innocent Iraqi people. We do not even know the full extent of that slaughter on those innocent people in Iraq. The other context for the question, of course, is the growth in the anti-war movement and indeed the role of our own trades union movement in the anti-war movement. The specific question, therefore, is: is there anything that your Government now regrets over the Government's decision to invade Iraq and, if so, what?

**Brendan Barber:** Thank you, Jimmy. Sue Rogers, NASUWT?

**Sue Rogers** (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*) said: Foreign Secretary, the fall of Saddam Hussein in Iraq saw the immediate revival of the trades union movement as a free and independent movement. These unions in fact bring together Iraqi workers across the religious and sectarian divide and are therefore a very cohesive force for uniting and stabilising Iraq, but these unions are struggling against legal constraints. At the moment Saddam's Decree 150, which actually forbade unions to be formed in the public sector, is still on the statute books. In addition, in August 2005 Decree 8750 was passed by the Government which sequestered trade union funds and therefore limited the effectiveness and the ability of trade unions to organise and to develop. Their life is difficult enough as my friends from the General Federation of Iraq Workers (who are here with us now) would testify.

So, I have to ask: what is the Foreign Office doing to try to get the Iraqi government to remove these decrees and to support the growth of the trade union movement in Iraq?

**Brendan Barber:** Thank you, Sue. Margaret?

**Margaret Beckett:** First of all, Jimmy, you said was there anything at all that the Government now regrets. Of course, any military action is bound to lead to deaths on both sides and it is bound to be the case that there is regret for those deaths. It would be extraordinary if it were otherwise. So, of course, there are things that I regret. I certainly regret the fact that the tenor of debate about Iraq in this country has become of a kind that no longer recognises almost, in some cases, that there was anything wrong with the regime of Saddam Hussein. I think there is a balance here. Of course there are things that give us concern, of course there have been episodes of misbehaviour, of things being done that should never have been done, as well as, tragically, the inevitable casualties that come with conflict, but there are many things that I do not regret.

I do not regret the fact that when I talk to the Foreign Minister of Iraq about the decisions that have to be taken at the United Nations in the near future, he says: "Of course I have to take that to my parliament. I will not be able to agree that without the consent of my parliament." I do not regret the fact that we are seeing increasingly now in many parts of Iraq the growth of a peaceful and more secure, and more stable, regime within which there is more freedom for people to express themselves and also we are seeing a repair and restoration, and in many cases

improvement, of infrastructure, but there is a huge amount still to do.

One of the things I very much regret is that there are so many people operating in Iraq, whether they are or are not native Iraqis, whose zeal for destruction is such that they almost want to wreck anything that can be achieved, so that we saw infrastructure repairs in the early days being destroyed by people who claimed to speak for those who such repairs were supposed to try and help.

Yes, of course, these are very difficult decisions. They are decisions about which often there is violent disagreement, but I hope in this Congress and in this movement we can all accept that decisions of that gravity and those dimensions are not taken lightly and they are not taken without people trying to consider very hard what they see on balance at that time as the right thing to do, and weighing it very carefully against their conscience.

Then Sue asked specifically about trades unions in Iraq. Yes, I accept one of the things that has been a potential sign for hope is both the re-emergence and the way people are working with the Iraqi trades unions, and I think it is an amazing tribute to the courage and tenacity of those Iraqi trade unionists that they clung to their principles and continue to try and work and organise through the days of real terror in Iraq.

I share your regret and concern that at present we are not seeing as free a role in operation for trades unions in Iraq as we would like to. It is an issue that we raise with the now elected Iraqi government, it is an issue we will continue to raise, and we will continue to try and work to see that trades unions can operate as freely in Iraq as they do in the United Kingdom.

**Brendan Barber:** Thanks very much, Margaret. I think Mary Hutchinson from the GMB has a question on China.

**Mary Hutchinson (GMB)** said: Foreign Secretary, we know Britain is committed to improving human rights but what I would like to ask this morning is: what efforts are the Government making to improve human rights in China, and what are the British Government doing to assist and establish free independent trade unions in China? Thank you.

**Brendan Barber:** Thank you, Mary. A question in relation to ILO standards that has some bearing on the question about China, Ged Nichols from Accord?

**Ged Nichols (Accord)** said: Foreign Secretary, this is a very brief question just to ask what you and the Government can do to promote ILO standards, decent work, and trade union rights around the world.

**Brendan Barber:** Thank you, Ged. Margaret, could you perhaps try and respond to those?

**Margaret Beckett:** First of all, Mary, yes, I do understand the point you are making. There are tremendous changes in China, many of them in the end one hopes are beneficial, but it is certainly the case that we continue to share and indeed to express the concern to which you have given voice about human rights, about the reaction when, for example, people from civil society raise issues and raise problems and the degree to which that is permitted without any response which tries to deaden those rights.

We have quite a large number of meetings in a whole variety of ways and from a whole variety of ministers

with the Chinese government. There are very many areas where we have issues in common and, of course, we are also both permanent members of the Security Council. I can say to you with absolute certainty that not one of those meetings goes by without us raising the issue of human rights, without us urging China to recognise the advantages, as well as the merits, of coming to sign some of the international covenants and conventions. Indeed, I had a meeting only yesterday with the Chinese Foreign Minister at which I raised those points with him. Also, of course, we do raise from time to time various particular individual cases, some of which relate to issues such as trade union rights. We do continue to urge moves in that direction on the Government and the people of China, and we will always do so.

Similarly, Ged, with regard to ILO standards and decent rights, we do try to work across the world with the ILO and again to urge on people the recognition that it is possible to have economic growth and prosperity, and to maintain such standards and freedoms, and that indeed it is to your advantage to do so.

I think one of the lessons that perhaps over the period of time that I have been in politics we have learnt in this country, in some cases rather grudgingly, is that actually it is a huge advantage to have good enough standards and good rights so that people work wholeheartedly in any enterprise or organisation, seeing themselves as part of a cohesive whole and bringing their full interest and their full participation into what they do in the world of work. That is certainly something that some British employers have been perhaps a little slow to learn but we hope they are doing so; it very much results in real improvements for all concerned. We do recognise that and we do raise these issues, for example, when we are talking about trade talks and things of that kind to try to make sure that these issues are not overlooked, and we will continue to do so.

**Brendan Barber:** Thanks, Margaret. We only have time, I am afraid, for one final question from Joe Mann of Community on the European Union.

**Joe Mann (Community)** said: Foreign Secretary, do you not see that the Government's minimalist approach to European Union social policy initiatives is undermining support amongst British working people for the European Union and weakening our position with other European Union governments?

**Brendan Barber:** Thank you, Joe. That is the final question, Margaret.

**Margaret Beckett:** First of all, Joe, I have to disagree with you slightly on your final few words. I think we have a strong position, actually, with fellow European Union governments where we do not always agree, of course - among 25 governments that is inevitable - but where Britain's point of view is respected and where there is also mutual respect and mutual understanding, and increasingly we do listen to each other.

I would like to think that the key to the British people's concerns about the European Union lie only in a social policy which goes more in the direction you would wish to see, and I have a feeling that perhaps it is a little bit more complicated and a little bit more difficult than that, but I do not accept that our approach to social policy is minimalist.

I do accept, and I think it was Mary who said right at the beginning, that there are issues where the TUC and the Government do not 100 per cent see eye to eye, but we do have a very different attitude to social policy from that which would be expressed by our political

opponents. It is a distinctive attitude for the Labour Party and for the Labour Government. I was lucky enough when I was at the Department of Trade and Industry to push through the improvements in the law with regard to trade unions, the minimum wage, and also to make sure that we signed the Social Chapter.

I know these are not steps that go as far as the trade union movement would like but they are certainly steps that go a lot further than anyone else has shown any willingness to do in this country. We do continue to try to keep the balance right between making improvements in terms of social policy and trades union rights, and also making sure that we have a strong economy, that we have people with the opportunity to have work, and that we are working for full employment. It is a natural and it is a healthy thing that within the union and the labour movement we air our concerns and our disagreements as well as the issues we have in common.

I think if you cast your minds back to 1994, 1995, 1996, never mind earlier, if we had gone into the Election in that period saying that we were committed to and would bring about pretty much full employment in this country, it would have been regarded as a pledge that was impossible to keep and a pledge that it was dishonest to make. I hope very much that with all the concerns you have, and I am very conscious that it is entirely possible to be an honourable, active, and tremendous trade unionist delivering very great social good without necessarily being involved in the Labour Party per se, you do recognise the difference that having a Labour government has made, and can continue to make, and make sure that we work together to preserve and build on those achievements and not do things which might undermine each other.

**Brendan Barber:** Margaret, thanks very much indeed for your address earlier and for responding to questions so openly. You said at the conclusion of your remarks earlier, Margaret, about the work of the TUC/FCO Advisory Council, and certainly from my perspective there has been a new responsiveness to the concerns of the trades union movement that I very much welcome and I know you have strongly supported the work of that new body.

Congress, could you show your appreciation to Margaret in the usual way. (*Applause*)

### Internationalism and globalisation

**Michael Leahy** (*Community*) moved Composite Motion 14. He said: The labour movement is distinguished by its commitment to justice and peace, at least outside our own ranks. The spirit of internationalism and solidarity is still alive and well in our unions as the report demonstrates but not, as it seems, the British Government. On a whole range of issues of immediate and great interest to British trade unionists, the Government has continually undermined the authority and influence of international organisations which are the beacons of justice and peace in the world. For example, since the early 1980s the ILO and the Council of Europe have pointed to serious violations of the Freedom of Association Convention and the European Social Charter, perpetrated in the British legislation and in British practice. The Government has responded on many occasions with total disinterest. The result is that British unions are denied the basic right to determine who their members should be in violation of ILO Convention 87. Our ability even to deny membership to the BNP activists has been taken away.

The British state has stronger rights to intervene in internal union affairs than anywhere else in Europe, and the rights of British unions to take industrial action are more narrowly limited than those of any other

national movement, save in Belarus and Burma. Again, few of us will be holding our breath for a positive response to the call of the General Council to the Government to give effect to the Social Agenda in the European Union. The Prime Minister has made it clear that there will be no end to the Working Time opt-out. There will be no Temporary Agency Workers' Directive, no protection for those in domestic work.

Delegates, the British Government is by far the strongest obstacle to the new social legislation in the European Union. The ILO and the European Union were created in the immediate aftermath of two terrible world wars, unparalleled in their destructiveness. They represented a perception that freedom, economic justice and peace are interdependent and inextricably linked. You might ask what abuses of the ILO conventions and avoidance of the EU directives have to do with peace? The point is that both mark a disregard for the authority of international organisations which have, as their fundamental aim, the promotion of economic progress and justice. The British approach undermines them. It also undermines the effectiveness of Hilary Benn and his colleagues in promoting employment and the practice of basic human rights in developing countries.

I ask: is a country like Zimbabwe likely to listen to British calls to end the attacks on our trade union friends when precisely that sort of solidarity that is banned in Zimbabwe is also banned in Britain? The task of persuading British based multi-nationals that they should facilitate the organisation of their employees in Africa or Asia in independent unions would be far easier if they had to accept it on the same terms at home. Please support the composite.

**Leslie Manasseh** (*Connect*) seconded Composite Motion 14.

He said: I want to talk, in particular, about off-shoring and global trading because these are very difficult and sensitive issues for our members but, none the less, TUC policy, rightly, reflects an internationalist rather than a protectionist position. We recognise that workers in the developing world must be able to benefit from the globalisation of some manufacturing and technology enabled work, but not only must the off-shoring of work be properly managed and negotiated in order to protect our members here in the UK, but it must also visibly benefit communities and workers overseas. However, there remains a question mark. We all know that off-shoring creates jobs, but what kind of jobs, for what pay and in what conditions? What are the wider benefits to local communities?

We have all seen and heard far too much of sweatshops in the developing world paying pennies for children. We all know that poverty remains the reality for billions of people who live there. Even relatively high quality workplaces such as call centres tend to benefit the few rather than the many and exist as privileged islands amidst vast tracts of poverty. UK companies can help change the situation. They can and must do much more to bring about the benefits of global trading to a wider community. They should drive up labour standards, not simply exploit low labour costs. They should invest in local communities, not just rely on a huge pool of low cost labour. They could help transform the lives of people and eliminate poverty, but too often they serve to widen inequality and dislocate communities. That is why we are pressing for them to abide by the base code of practice of the Ethical Trading Initiative, which itself is based on ILO core standards, which provides for safe working conditions, living wages, reasonable hours of work and an end to child labour. It also provides for collective bargaining with independent trade unions, and we know that this is the best guarantee of justice in the workplace. However, we want UK companies to do

more than this. They should ensure that a living wage is paid throughout the supply chain and make a financial contribution to the health, education and housing of local communities. Please support.

**Victoria Steeples** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) speaking in support of the composite motion, said: The UK's approach to globalisation is not all doom and gloom. For example, last year, PCS, working with War on Want and others, successfully campaigned on behalf of these organisations, and we saw an announcement by the Secretary of State for International Development that the UK would no longer attach conditions such as privatisation and economic restructuring to its aid to development countries. Of course, we know that is only a small victory because we still put a lot of our aid through bodies like the IMF, the World Bank and the EU, who do impose those conditions. I think that both the Department for International Development and PCS members working there who helped to bring this about are to be congratulated.

As well as the on-going problem of aid and privatisation and the lack of access that the poor have to services because they cannot pay the prices imposed by the multi-nationals, we do, as the previous speaker said, have the problem of off-shoring, and that is not just a movement from here to other countries but when companies here take on new contracts then locating it in developing countries. The drive to liberalisation of developing countries' markets, the idea that opening up markets will give people the benefit of inward investment, has to be questioned. When the jobs of some of our members, who were moved from the Civil Service to the private sector, were off-shored to India, we were told that the work could be done there at a quarter of the price. These were relatively well-paid jobs for India. India is one of the better off countries. Clearly, there is scope for an awful lot more exploitation in the less developed countries.

The economies of the less developed countries are very vulnerable to exploitation all round. They often cannot afford the cost of regulating company behaviour or enforcing employment laws effectively, even if they have those laws in place in the first place. We think the UK has a responsibility to ensure that companies here are not exporting bad practice and low pay. The basic principle that the motion calls for for UK companies to adopt are the absolutely minimum that we should be demanding. Please support the composite.

\* *Composite Motion 14 was CARRIED.*

### **Control Arms Campaign**

**Tom Harrison** (*Accord*) moved Motion 66.

He said: Colleagues, Accord represents colleagues in Halifax Bank of Scotland. I am very proud to tell you that we in Accord have been involved with the Control Arms Campaign for some time now, having proposed our first motion on the arms trade at the TUC's 2000 Congress.

President and Congress, in a world of governments obsessed with weapons of mass destruction, do not let us forget that all weapons, both big and small, destroy human life. As the drug addict moves from cannabis to crack cocaine, so it would appear that the world is hooked on the ever-increasing hit of the destruction of human life. I ask you, do you really think it matters to a child whether their father was killed by a weapon of mass destruction or a single bullet? Congress, we understand the logic of the Make Poverty History Campaign, and we also support and applaud its endeavours, but spare a thought for these figures. Annually, the world spends £450 billion

on defence, around £163 billion on agriculture and only £30 billion on aid. That means we spend almost three times as much on the potential to destroy us all than feeding us all. Worse still, we spend 15 times less in helping poorer nations than in buying the weapons that could, potentially, wipe us all off the face of the earth. Doesn't this madness indicate how much we need a campaign for an arms trade treaty?

In 1995 a group of Nobel Peace Laureates drafted an international code of conduct on arms transferred. Over time this initiative has developed into what has become known as the Arms Trade Treaty. If developed and implemented correctly, this treaty could be the single, most effective tool in helping to stop weapons falling into the hands of indiscriminate killers and human rights abusers. Three years ago Amnesty International, Oxfam and IANSA launched the Control Arms Campaign. This campaign is now active in more than 70 countries with the support of 700 NGOs worldwide with the key objective of building support among governments for an international arms trade treaty.

Congress, substantial progress has been made, with at least 43 countries declaring their support for the development of an arms trade treaty, including all EU Member States and, notably, the 52 members of the Commonwealth also made a supportive statement at a Commonwealth Heads of Government Summit. Even the British Defence Manufacturers' Association supports the treaty as it will help create an international level playing field ensuring that all defence companies are bound by the same rules. The key to the universality of support is that of our colleagues in the trade union movement as demonstrated by the Transport and General Workers' Union.

Congress, 2006 is a crucial year for the Control Arms Campaign. There is, currently, no international process underway to establish an arms trade treaty, but many governments, including the UK, have made a commitment to start discussions. It is hoped, however, that this negotiation will happen at the UN General Assembly in October. The UK, as the world's second largest arms exporter could lead on the world stage in this issue but only if it is seen to be putting its own house in order. It must continue to strengthen its own domestic control systems and close remaining loopholes to ensure that arms are not exported to countries or groups who will use them to commit grave human rights violations or to undermine development.

We have a deep interest in this area. Some of our members manufacture arms. Others, such as journalists may see them put to use in human rights abuses. Indeed, sometimes these abuses are directed at themselves, with 150 deaths, murders and killings of journalists in 2005 alone. Finally, around the world fellow trade unionists are intimidated and killed by arms, such as in Colombia, the most dangerous place in the world to be a trade unionist, with 5,000 murders, killings, kidnaps and disappearances in the past 20 years.

Unions across the globe stand for peace and our General Council can ensure that our Government is lobbied on our behalf regarding the potential of an arms trade treaty, which will help to bring about that peace. They must also urge them to persuade and lobby other governments to follow suit for, as trade unionists and socially conscious human beings, the continuing global cost in terms of death, intimidation, fear and poverty is unacceptable. Let us show our Government, other governments and trade unions of the world that we fully support the Arms Trade Treaty by unanimously supporting Motion 66.

**Walter Wright** (*Nationwide Group Staff Union*)

speaking in support of the motion, said: In proposing the amendment to Motion 66, I must, first, state that the NGSU is in full support of the substantive motion. The amendment adds 26 words to sub-paragraph (ii). This adds the requirement that UK legislation controls those involved in the manufacture, brokering and trafficking of arms, not just within the UK territorial limits but wherever those arms end up. We want a regulated arms trade, where if you make a gun or a bullet you are held responsible. If you sell a gun or a bullet, you are held responsible. If the person you sell the gun or bullet to then sells them to someone else, you are still held responsible. If the guns or bullets are used illegally, no matter where, the manufacturer and the person who sells them are held responsible. When a human body is struck by a bullet fired from a gun, it will be damaged. The extent of that damage will vary. It can cause pain, loss of blood at the very least, but it can cause death. It can cause the loss of life to people around the globe. In many cases the firing of one bullet will kill a human being. Twelve billion bullets are produced every year! That is enough to shoot everyone on the planet twice. The global misuse of arms has reached a crisis point. The flow of arms to those who open flaunt international human rights and humanitarian laws is being ignored by many governments and companies. Guns, especially, have never been so easy to obtain. Their increased availability threatens life and liberty in communities and cities around the world, including yours. Lack of controls in the arms trade is fuelling conflict, poverty and human rights abuses worldwide. Every government is responsible.

The Control Arms Campaign is asking governments to toughen up controls on the arms trade. This motion and its amendment seek to achieve an international arms treaty that will, at the very least, reduce the needless deaths that occur daily from the abuse of arms. I ask you, Congress, to help save many lives. Support the amended motion. Thank you.

\* *Motion 66 was CARRIED.*

**The President:** Congress, I remind you that Motion 67, 'new trade union international body', has been withdrawn.

**Responsible use of the internet**

**Chris Wilson** (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*) moved Motion 68.

He said: Congress, access to knowledge is an essential and fundamental human right. Knowledge and skills transform lives, enhance opportunities, benefiting the individual, their community and the country as a whole. Access to knowledge is not a peripheral issue. It is a central concern for all trade unionists, for those who see education as a means of liberation. The internet is increasing becoming the key provider of information, a place where ideas can be accessed, shared, promoted and discussed. Skills may transform lives but ideas, Congress, can still change the world. There is a powerful burden of responsibility upon internet providers, upon search engines, to promote the responsible use of the internet. Their record in this regard is not great. Irresponsibility prevails. ATL knows and Congress knows of the continued threat from far-right groups, such as Redwatch which, some years after the question was raised by my union in this forum, continues to publish the names and addresses of trade unionists involved in anti-racist and anti-fascist struggles from across the movement with a view to intimidate them into silence. Their list of our people is now the longer. There is no responsibility here.

We know also that some governments in some countries now block access to certain websites which

would normally be used to promote democratic ideas. Countries have developed and welcomed notoriety in this regard. Why is it, then, Congress, that hate merchants are free to promote their wares but democrats and trade unionists are not? We say, again, there is no responsibility here. This is an issue for all trade unionists. Knowledge, as once was famously said, is indeed power. Those who restrict access to progressive ideas allow reactionary ideas to flourish in cyber space. They know what they are doing. They are eroding human rights. They are denying human progress. They are collapsing the democratic space. Google is a conflict here. It appears to respond to pressure from government to restrict access, to police legitimate knowledge and, as trade unionists and internationalists, this is not acceptable. Google is also watching you. Don't just take ATL's word for it. *The Guardian* on Monday, 28<sup>th</sup> August of this year, did an expose on Google. All of your internet enquiries are logged, however personal or private. There is no data protection. With AOL, in one example, publishing the details of 23 million searches made by 650,000 customers in a three month period. This was a massive and unprecedented leak of private information. It was claimed to be a mistake.

Congress, the point is again made – there is no responsibility here. Then we have *The Guardian's* comments on the Government in China. *The Guardian* said: "Search engines that do business in China must censor their results if they are to do business". If this means restrictive access to democratic ideas, which you or I would take for granted, then we must say that that is wrong.

It is time to call a halt to the chaos. Liberty should not be confused with licence. Redwatch is still unacceptable. Restricting access to democratic ideas is unacceptable. Leaking personal details is unacceptable.

President and Congress, it is time to campaign for the responsible use of the internet, in the interests of knowledge, in the interests of democracy, in the interests of trade unionism and in the interests of education. On behalf of ATL, the education union, I move.

**Jeremy Dear** (*National Union of Journalists*) seconded the motion. He said:

There are those who believe that the internet represents the ultimate in media freedom, and there are those who believe that it represents the epitome of control and surveillance. Both are wrong. The internet, at its best, represents a massive increase in access to information, a massive opportunity for the exchange of ideas and information which can enhance our education and welfare. At its worse, it is a massive and pernicious source of hate, a platform for misinformation and commercial pressure. The choice is ours. Like any medium, unregulated, lacking professionalism, in the hands of those who exploit its potential for their own narrow and selfish political or commercial interests, it can operate against the principles of justice and freedom that our movement holds dear.

The reality is that around the world those who would control the internet do so not for noble reasons but to serve their own ends. Shi Tao is serving a ten-year prison sentence in China for sending an email which included information on the Government's response to the Tiananmen Square massacre. Shi Tao sent the email to the US using his Yahoo account. The Chinese authorities accused him of illegally providing state secrets to foreign entities. According to the court transcript, the evidence that led to Shi Tao's sentencing included account holder information provided by US internet company, Yahoo. Shi Tao is not alone. China

is not alone. But it is not just political pressure. Those companies which seek to own cyber space do so for their own commercial reasons, and where freedom of information and their commercial concerns clash, money talks.

So at AOL we see a financial news service driven by the need not for impartial information but driven by the take-up of advertisers' products, but they, too, are not alone. The internet and freedom of information is too important to be left to a failing market, or in the hands of governments who would suppress dissent. Please support.

\* *Motion 68 was CARRIED.*

**Tony Donaghey** (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*): On a point of order, Sister President. When are you going to deal with Motion 65 on the Agenda on Trident?

**The President:** I did say this morning, I think, in my opening statement that we will take Motion 65 on Trident and the General Council's Statement later this afternoon in the debate on the Middle East.

**Tony Donaghey:** Thank you. I missed that.

#### **Fairtrade and seafarers**

**Mark Dickinson** (*National Union of Marine, Aviation and Shipping Transport Officers*) moved Motion 69:

He said: I am from NUMAST, the Merchant Navy officers' union, soon to be known as Nautilus UK, from 2<sup>nd</sup> October. That will be the Union for Maritime Professions and what we hope will be the world's first transnational trade union merger. Please forgive me, President, for that blatant bit of self-promotion, but please, delegates, spare me the jokes about Captain Nemo. I have heard them all, believe me.

Fairtrade tea, Fairtrade coffee and, perhaps for some of the Council members, according to the *Guardian*, the most important one, Fairtrade organic chocolate. Apparently, we love it. UK sales of Fairtrade products are up 40 per cent over the past year alone. Every self-respecting supermarket and supplier is eager to promote their own ethically sound products. No one in our movement should take issue with the desire to create a better world by ensuring equitable treatment and just rewards for those who produce our food and other staples of our everyday life.

However, my union is concerned that a key element has been excluded from the Fairtrade equation, the seafarers. Society today is so divorced from the realities of mass production, distribution and transportation that few people appreciate the fact that supermarket shelves do not magically restock themselves each night. More than 90 per cent of this country's imports and exports go by ship. The sad fact is that too many of those ships are substandard; as many as 15 per cent, according to some statistics.

According to the International Commission on Shipping, sponsored by the International Transport Workers' Federation, many seafarers are little more than slaves, with life at sea for many crew members involving physical and mental abuse, non-payment of wages, excessive hours of work and atrocious living and working conditions. The International Labour Organisation has described the way in which the vicious circle of low freight rates, extremely poor conditions and standards, weak national regulatory mechanisms and a general reluctance to enforce internationally applicable labour standards drives a race to the bottom in maritime employment standards.

Two of my officials are seconded to the ITF to check ships which come into UK ports. They have secured nearly half-a-million US dollars in unpaid wages for crew members already this year. Incidentally, collectively, ITF inspectors worldwide recover \$20 million to \$30 million in unpaid wages year after year. Often our officials come across seafarers who are too scared to involve the union for fear of retribution back home. This can range from pressure on their other family members, to the taking back of wages recovered by unions, beatings and blacklistings. Only last week our Liverpool-based inspector dealt with a young Philippino officer whose foot was chopped off by an accident on board his ship. We offered to assist him. We offered to press a claim for compensation under the terms of his contract of employment which had officially been endorsed by his government, but he said he did not wish to take any action against his employer. The point was that when he left the Philippines he had left behind a document guaranteeing that he would not contact the unions or the ITF if he needed any assistance of any kind.

In the same week the same inspector visited a Panamanian flag ship in Liverpool and quickly discovered that the crew were the victims of systematic and habitual cheating. The Greek owners initially denied the claim but, eventually, \$160,000 was secured, delivered to the vessel and paid over to the grateful crew members. These cases are typical of a cut-throat industry with global competition which plagues the shipping industry. They are among the reasons why earlier this year governments, union and shipowners reached an historic agreement on what is being termed a 'Bill of Rights' for the World's 1.2 million seafarers. It is impossible to under-estimate its importance. The Maritime Labour Convention is innovative and it will make a huge difference in regulating the working conditions in the world's most global industry. It will mean a lot to my members. However, they need your support to ensure that the UK and other governments around the world ratify and implement the Convention.

Where is the link to Fairtrade? The standards in *this* Bill of Rights can be enforced through the Fairtrade process. We believe it is wrong that people may be buying products with the rosy glow that Fairtrade gives them when such products are being brought to these shores in ships which are all too often unseaworthy rust buckets, with crews which are poorly trained, poorly paid and ill-treated coming from the Third World. It is not good enough that Fairtrade promises a fair deal to Third World producers. We want a fair deal for the Third World's seafarers who are being exploited. That is why my union seeks your support. Please support this motion. We are not knocking Fairtrade but we do want to ensure a fair deal for seafarers who risk their lives transporting their goods around the world.

Seafarers, all too often, are the unseen workers in this world. They put their lives on the line to deliver these goods. Support the motion, support their treatment and support Fairtrade and seafarers. Thank you.

**Pauline McArdle** (*Transport Salaried Staffs Association*) seconded the motion.

She said: My union is pleased to second this motion because it brings to the attention of Congress a very real problem – the exploitation of seafarers. In February of this year, as you have heard, a comprehensive labour charter for the world's 1.2 million seafarers established a socio-economic floor of global competition in the marine sector. More than 90 per cent of world trade travels by sea, and without more than 400,000 officers and 800,000 ratings, this would not be possible.



In today's shipping market many costs are outside the shipowners' control, but crew costs are not. They have become the main source of competition between shipowners. Savage cost-cutting means low wages, inadequate manning, excessive hours, bad shipboard conditions and exploitation of all seafarers. The International Transport Workers' Federation comes across thousands of seafarers each year who have been abandoned in ports far away from home without pay, cheated and abused. Seafarers face continuing problems, such as increasing violence, hi-jacking, piracy and armed robbery at sea. In European ports last year 1,700 cases were found of ships with deficiencies related to the International Labour Organisation's rules on crews. Living and work conditions are absolutely terrible and it is time that we did something about it. The protection and enhancement of conditions of employment of maritime workers, regardless of race, colour, sexual orientation or creed is vital. Seafarers have to be protected from exploitation by bad employers. Please support.

\* *Motion 69 was CARRIED.*

**Address by Thabitha Khumalo, Third Vice President, Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions**

**The President:** Congress, we now turn to a very important speaker who will be addressing you on international development and good governance. As the Vice President of the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions, Thabitha Khumalo is one of the bravest women I know. She came to the UNISON National Conference earlier this year and gave an inspiring speech. Despite the appalling situation in Zimbabwe, with raging inflation, terrible shortages and state repression of trade unions, Thabitha and her colleagues represent all that is best about our movement. With the Respect Period Campaign they showed that even when things are at their worst, trade unions can make people's lives better. Thabitha has shown courage and resilience, spreading the message that trade unions will fight passionately for democracy and freedom. Thabitha, welcome to Congress. *(Applause)*

**Thabitha Khumalo** (*Vice President, Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions*) said: Congress, ladies and gentlemen, brothers and sisters, comrades and friends, I bring greetings from the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions, my President, Comrade Lovemore Matombo, and the General Council members. I am deeply honoured to be afforded this opportunity by yourselves to address you.

I am standing in front of you today with a heavy heart because at exactly this time the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions and the workers in Zimbabwe are going on a general strike. The Government has advised the army to be on high alert. I am praying and hoping that none of my comrades are going to die tonight. I know that your support, your emails and faxes to the government of Zimbabwe might stop them brutalising the workers of Zimbabwe. All they are asking for is a living wage and access to anti retro viral drugs. That is what we are asking for today. So I hope, with the information technology that you have in this country, you will help us on this general strike today.

Madam President, it is ironic that you have invited me to come and talk about international development and good governance, which does not exist in my country. I will touch on the issue of good governance. Good governance in Zimbabwe is just a pipe dream. It does not exist. To hold a Congress like *this* in my country you have to advise the police because we have a law called the Public Order and Security Act, which,

literally, requires you to inform the police that you are holding a congress in Brighton and tell them what is going to happen. It is entirely up to them as to whether they will accept you holding it or not. Three people cannot gather together at any one time because that is deemed to be an illegal meeting, and it calls for you to be incarcerated for 48 hours, you will appear in court and then you will pay a fine or whatever the case may be.

As I am standing here today, we have a Bill that is sailing through Parliament, as I speak, which is called the Interception of Communications Bill. You will be talking about the Google, the internet, Yahoo and God knows what next. In Zimbabwe the Government say that they want the Commissioner of Police, the Commissioner of the Army and the Director of Zimbabwe Immigration to intercept our emails, our cell phones, our landlines and our mail. They have the right to do that and it is now a criminal offence.

To add insult to injury, we have got what we call the Access to Information and Privacy Act, where journalists have no right to do what they are doing now. You have to be an accredited journalist to do that. I, as a Zimbabwean citizen, have no right to use my camera to take photos. I was arrested for that by the army. Last week they moved another Bill called the Criminal Codification Ratified Bill, which makes it a criminal offence for me to stand in front of you and tell you that there is chaos in my country. It is now calling for 25 years in jail without the option of a fine. Anyway, Nelson Mandela stayed for 27 years. I want to break that record by two. *(Applause)* I will and I am prepared to serve 54 years because, technically, I am dead so I have nothing to lose any more.

I am still talking about good governance. I had the opportunity, Madam President, to see the Prime Minister *here* and my heart was in my mouth because I was thinking, "Oh, my God. The police will just walk in with tear gas and all of us would be diving for cover because we had insulted the Prime Minister", because we are not allowed to talk ill of the president of our country. It is an offence.

I am glad that the topic that I am discussing is international development. I will try and talk about women's issues. I have been in this country since last year and thank God for international solidarity. I am standing here today and proud to be associated with the workers of this country.

In 2000 women in Zimbabwe had no sanitary towels. We were forced to insert, literally, tissue papers, newspapers and pieces of cloth. I was honoured to be assaulted by ZANU thugs in Zimbabwe in July and they left me for dead. I was honoured to meet one very important man from this country, and his name is Ewan from Action for Southern Africa. When I met him with a black eye he asked me what we, as Zimbabwean women, wanted from the labour movement, and I told him that we needed sanitary towels. All that he said to me was "Cool". He gave me hope. That word "Cool" gave me hope, because I had totally lost hope because I have been campaigning for five years just for us to get sanitary towels. Then a month down the line I received an email from him saying that I was going to be coming to the UK to meet the unions. Our struggle would not have succeeded if I had also not met the union Amicus, which has done a tremendous job for us to achieve what we have achieved today. I would love to thank you, including UNISON, the TUC, you name it, the workers of this country.

Today I am able to carry a packet of tampons in my bag. *(Applause)* Comrades, believe me when I say, as Zimbabwean women, we are now sticking them on, sticking them in and pushing them up. *(Applause and cheers)* I am now more courageous than ever because you have restored our dignity as women. I am so proud to be a Zimbabwean woman who is able to use

hygienic means and fight the system that is denying us the right to be human, not women.

Poverty is now the order of the day. We were once the bread basket of Africa and today we are living in abject poverty. We have got what we call "zero, zero, 1" but as of last month it is now "zero, zero, half"; no breakfast, no lunch and half dinner. Trust me, we are doing that. You must be clear and be proud and protect what you have in this country. You will only realise how important what you have is when you do not have it. Can you imagine just failing to get sanitary towels? I am not worried about food. I am worried about a small little item which makes me a woman.

Madam President, talking about poverty, the world is talking about Africa in abject poverty. There is a need for us to eradicate poverty. Is poverty the cause of Africa's problems or are we talking about issues of bad governance? These are the symptoms of bad governance which we are experiencing in my country. Just look at good governance. Consider sustainability and human development. We were colonised by yourselves and you gave us the best education that Africa could ask for. Today our country has an unemployment rate of 80 percent. As a labour movement, we are trying to fight for 20 percent of those jobs, and half of that is the informal economy. The 10 percent of the workers in Zimbabwe are trying to feed 80 percent of us. That is why we are on the streets today. We are sitting on an inflation rate of one thousand, two hundred per cent. The average wage of a woman working in the agricultural industry is £2 a month, and a packet of sanitary towels costs £9. If you have four female children, you have to buy food, you have to send your kids to school and take them to the doctor. Getting sick in my country is now a luxury. If you get sick, just repent and tell God that you are coming. There is no time to get medicine because you cannot afford it. So being sick is a luxury.

I heard Madam President talking about the NHS. Fight for the NHS and fight really hard. We have no drugs. I am diabetic. I have half-a-meal a day, so you can imagine what is happening to me. I am not taking any medication because I cannot afford it. Comrades, if you do not fight for the NHS, only God knows what is going to happen to you.

Empowerment. How can I be empowered when I am unemployed. Look at the triangle of the labour movement and the workers at large. At the top is our work. On my right is health and in the left corner is life, but in my country at the top it is life, on my right it is health and on my left is work. How can I have life when I am not working? How can I have a healthy life when I cannot afford it? So what is important, first, is my job. Then I live a healthy life. This is in order for me to have the most brilliant life one can ever expect.

Co-operation. It is very important for us to work with you. I am absolutely proud that I have been given this opportunity to talk to you about it. We need your support, be it in kind or cash. I am sure you have heard that our informal economy was displaced by the Government because we had organised it as labour. Today we are re-organising the informal economy, but what is needed is for us to educate them and for them to defend their rights to be in the informal economy in our legal front. There is need for us to train those people to defend their livelihood because that is their job and they need to be trained. International development will play a very crucial role towards us empowering the informal economy because that is the economy which is sustaining us at the moment.

Security. What securing can I talk about? I am going home on Sunday and, obviously, when get I out of the plane I have already violated the Criminal Codification Ratifying Bill, which is being implemented before it is law, so I am expecting to be charged for whatever it is.

130

Believe me, being in Zimbabwean cells is no joke. You are made to stand for 48 hours in human faeces because our cells' ablution system is not functioning and the government does not have enough money to work on that. That is nothing compared with the occupational health hazards of being a trade unionist in a country where governance does not exist and where we urgently need a democratic dispensation. The only way out is to stand up and bite the bullet so we are biting the bullet.

Madam President, civil society. We have civil society in my country and they all being silenced because the Government came up with what we call an "NGO Bill" which directs you to tell the Government your source of funding, but that should not stop you from funding us. We are prepared to fight but we need ammunition and that is the funding. Do not worry, we will pay the price as long as you are there supporting us.

Looking at the economic structural adjustment programme, which was introduced into our country as a market driven reform programme, it has totally failed. The point is that growth needs to be inclusive. Social expenditure needs to be protected and targeted measures to deal with poverty should not been seen as edge on but as an integral part of the problem. That was said by a representative of the World Bank in 1999 when he agreed that the economic structural adjustment programme has failed in our country, and his name was Tom Allen. He went further to say: "State intervention is necessary. Getting the prices right and making markets work better are important, but these need to be complemented with measures to ensure an equal balance of power of those who can operate within the market and those who cannot does not lead to injurious levels of social tension". Today we are going through social tension. He went further to say: "The need for national ownership is absolutely critical". We did not own the economic structural adjustment programme. Somebody came to our country and asked us the time, and I told him it was 9 o'clock, and he turned around and said it was 09.00 hours. Today we are living in abject poverty because somebody told us what to do without asking us what is affecting us.

Madam President, without wasting any time, I would like to leave you with this thought. Fear can hold you prisoner but hope will set you free because it is your heart, and no one can touch it and take it away from all. All that the Zimbabwean government is doing to me is bashing my flesh but not my heart. They will never touch that.

Having said that, Madam President, on your seats you will have *this* paper: Stand Up Against Poverty. Even though many, many people in my country are living in abject poverty, as I speak now, when we are sad, we sing; when we are happy, we sing; when we are crying, we sing. I have noticed that *here* that culture does not exist, so you will bear with me because I need you to make me feel ready to come up with a slogan on poverty because it is affecting me. All that I am asking you to do is just to wave your hands and give me the courage to triumph to try and bring you on board on what I am feeling about my country, and I am proud of fighting.

"We shall overcome,  
we shall overcome,  
We shall overcome some day,  
Oh, deep in my heart, I do believe,  
We shall overcome some day."

Thank you, comrades. (*A standing ovation*)

I would like to give you the slogan for this (*indicating Stand Up Against Poverty leaflet*). I am going to say,

"Workers of the world stand up against" and you say, "Poverty". I say, "When?" You say, "Now". OK? I am going to say "Workers of the world stand up against what?" (*Conference responded*): "Poverty". Great. "Workers of the world stand up against what?" (*Conference responded*) "Poverty". "Against what?" (*Conference responded*) "Poverty". "When?" (*Conference responded*) "Now". "When?" (*Conference responded*) "Now". I thank you.

Madam President, I forgot to say one thing. I become excited when I come here because there is so much support. *This is my 'Dignity' campaign leaflet for sanitary towels for women in Zimbabwe. We are currently supplying women on a monthly basis through ACTSA in the Amicus union, but we need to raise more funding because I get my periods every single month! Trust me. I have told the Government that there is no remote control for us to stop our periods because it is nature!*

If you look at the leaflet, the string represents the year 2000 when we started and we have moved on six years and today we are pushing them up. For those who want the leaflets, please could you go to the Amicus stand where you will find us? Please support us because we want to be dignified. I thank you, Madam President. (*Applause amidst cheers*)

**The President:** Thank you, Thabitha, for those truly moving and inspiring words.

### International development

**Deirdre Smith** (*Derbyshire Group Staff Union*) moved Motion 70.

She said: We are proud to be one of the smallest members of the TUC. I really feel I have made it today because for the first time ever the DGSU had a mention in the FT. It was not a very complimentary one, I might add, but we have made it!

Turning to the motion, 'Make Poverty History', and 'Ditch the Debt' are familiar phrases and concepts that I am sure we all support wholeheartedly. The UK Government can be rightly proud of the role it played in driving for major concessions on debt, trade and aid from its fellow G8 members at last year's Gleneagles Summit. The TUC can be immensely proud of the massive number of people they mobilised for last year's 'Make Poverty History' march in Edinburgh.

Great progress has been made. India lifts 12 million people out of poverty every year. Seventy-five million more children are in primary education today than in 1990. Ten times more people are receiving effective treatment for AIDS than in the year 2000. So can we pat ourselves on the back? Well, yes and no. There is still a huge amount to be done. Every day 30,000 children die from preventable diseases. One billion children live in poverty. That is every second child on the planet. Forty-six per cent of people in Africa live in poverty and the life expectancy on that continent is 46 years of age and falling.

By the year 2015, nine out of ten of the world's poorest people will live in Africa and South Asia. Economic growth is the single most powerful way of pulling people out of poverty. Tackling inequality helps poor people participate in economic growth and trade. The trade union movement is uniquely placed in its ability to build capacity, develop and support effective civil societies. It is not enough to lift people out of poverty only to condemn them to slavery in unprotected working environments where they are open to shameless exploitation. Sustainable jobs and the right to work with dignity in an environment of mutual respect are not unobtainable goals.

Therefore, I ask Congress to call upon the UK Government to make greater resources available for

the trade union movement to carry out this work. It is common practice in the Nordic countries, in Germany and in the Netherlands and it must become common practice here in the UK. It is not as if we cannot afford it. At the present time, about half a penny in every pound of our taxes goes towards the UK's efforts to reduce world poverty. Compare that with the budget for arms and defence. I make no apology for reminding you that the world could be fed for a year on what the West pays on arms and defence in a week.

We are engaged in a war in Iraq that is costing us dearly in lives as well as in financial terms. It is a war that was entered into against the wishes of many of us here. I, like many of you here, have been on demonstrations to remind this Government that they went to war not in my name. Now I ask that increased effort and financial support be made available finally to make poverty history. I ask for it to be done in my name and in our name, but it must be done. (*Applause*)

**Annette Mansell-Green** (*UNISON*) formally seconded Motion 70. (*Applause*)

**The President:** Thank you, Annette. If others could follow that example, I am sure we could complete a lot of business this morning. Thanks for that.

\* *Motion 70 was CARRIED*

### General Council's Statement on Europe

**The President:** I now call Billy Hayes to move the General Council's Statement on Europe, which is on page 113 of the General Council's report.

**Billy Hayes** (*General Council*): Chair, Congress, for many years at the TUC and, indeed, in the wider society, Europe has always been the subject of debate and an area of contention, whether that is the euro or, more recently, the European Constitution. However, in those debates, where we may take particular positions, the General Council asks, "do we disagree about what sort of Europe we want?" That is what this General Council's statement is about.

Congress, there are not a lot of alternatives to the European social model around the world. That is why in places like Latin America they look to the European social model as a model that they would like to emulate. We heard Bill Lucy today describe private healthcare in America, it is the type of healthcare that Sir Keith Joseph and Margaret Thatcher could only have dreamed about; the sort of welfare safety net that produced the tragedy in New Orleans where we have seen what the phrase, 'There is no such thing as society' really means.

Of course, Europe is not perfect: far from it. The General Council's Statement sets out a number of areas where we want to see improvements; a shift from neo-liberalism to socialism; a Europe for workers and not just a Europe for bosses; a balance between the free movement of capital, goods, on the one hand, and, on the other, a free movement of workers and a labour market that is regulated to ensure workers are treated decently and equally across Europe.

We want politicians to understand that they cannot win support from their electorates if all they continue to promote is unbridled globalisation and unbridled liberalism. What the people of Europe want from the European Union is security. We want a secure Europe; we want a safe European home where, if workers do their lose their jobs, whether that be in England, Germany, France or Holland, they enjoy the same level of protection. We want a level playing field in Europe. As John Monks, from the European Trade Union Confederation, said, if we cannot do it in Europe,

where can we do it? We can do it in Europe if we put our efforts into it.

Earlier this year, we saw the port workers defeat the liberalisation of ports. We managed collectively -- and I was on that demonstration with many, many others -- to draw the teeth of the Services Directive, but obviously that is not enough. We need the Working Time Directive opt-out ended; we need the Temporary Agency Workers Directive adopted and we need a tougher globalisation fund, not just to pay compensation to the bosses, but also to deal with workers.

Across Europe, we must mount a serious organising campaign. Jack Dromey of the T&G was in discussions with John Monks yesterday. We need to make the case for a Public Services Directive, something that UNISON is campaigning for, to defend public services from privatisation. We need British workers to benefit from the sorts of protection that workers in European manufacturing benefit from, as Amicus and GMB have pointed out. As I said, we need a level playing field. Europe has provided enormous benefits for workers in this country. That is why the TUC issued that pamphlet on the benefits that Europe has produced for workers. Conference, Europe is not the land of milk and honey in the Biblical term, but neither is it the land of a bitter harvest. Europe has provided rights for workers. Our involvement in Europe has provided our ability to defend workers in this country during those 18 years of Thatcherism. It is not a land of milk and honey, but this statement today, Conference, says what we need to be saying now, not simply what we are against in Europe and what we are for, but we need to begin to build a European social model that continues to be the envy of the world. *(Applause)*

**Martin Mayer** (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) said: First of all, I appreciate the difficulties in compiling a statement on such a controversial topic as this and still achieve some unity, but we have to raise concern about the terminology which appears twice in the statement, that the TUC supports 'a single market in trade and services'. What? That is not trade union language. That is the parlance of the arch liberalisers in Europe. It means what it says, the opening up of the market in our public services.

When we fought against the Bolkenstein Directive on services, the European Transport Workers Federation and the European Public Services Union formed an alliance because we knew very well its real agenda was to force through the privatisation of our vital public services.

For the past six years, I have been involved in a successful ETF campaign to stop the liberalisation of local public transport in Europe. I will tell you how the EU Commission sees it. Certain member states, like the UK, have opened up their public transport markets. That has led to the creation of transport operators who now wish to access markets in the rest of Europe, but they cannot do so because of the so-called 'closed markets' in Germany, Austria, Belgium and Luxembourg, which have retained high quality, municipally-owned public transport networks. These closed markets must be opened, otherwise it would infringe the single market in public transport services.

The TUC statement speaks as if Jacques Delors' Social Europe is still alive and well. It fails to realise that in the year 2000 the three most right wing leaders in Europe pushed through a new neo-liberal agenda for Europe with the Lisbon Agreement. This has been designed to implement the objectives of the WTO's General Agreement on Trade and Services, i.e. opening up our precious public services to global capital. Who were those right wing leaders? Berlusconi, Anzar and, yes, our very own Tony Blair.

Our T&G dock workers understood very well the need to fight back hard alongside their fellow dock workers in the ETF against the two attempts to liberalise port services. This would have allowed ship owners to use low paid foreign crews to unload ships undermining trade union labour in the docks.

The dock workers in Europe understood the problem, linked together, fought back and won. Unfortunately, the TUC Statement falls well short on analysis and strategy to deal not with yesterday's Social Europe, but with the neo-liberal Europe of today. Thank you, Chair. *(Applause)*

**Bob Oram** (*UNISON*) said: This is a very important statement, too important, some would say, to be 'tucked away' in the annual Report.

The cynics in UNISON -- and we have consistently been cynical about Europe -- see this, to some extent, as a back door way of trying to breathe life into the corpse that is the European Union "constitution". The "let's champion a Social Europe" is not new. Remember how we fell for it under Jacques Delors? On pages 81 and 82, the Report talks about the Social Europe as being stalled, 'the social model is stalled', which is very true.

So let's be under no illusions, Congress. The proposed new health directive, the occupational pensions directive, and many more besides that are not listed in the statement, are still real threats. The drive to develop an internal single market is as strong as ever and will bring greater competition, liberalisation and privatisation, et cetera. At the same time, we still have a move towards economic and monetary union and the adoption in a binding treaty of the Maastricht criteria with its restrictions on public spending and borrowing, the rigid application of which has led to low growth, or even no growth, across most of the Eurozone from the mid 1990s onwards whilst Britain has been able to use investment in public services to boost UK growth. We do now agree that Social Europe seems to be no more. The Services Directive showed what the neo-liberals in the European Commission really think about the future of the European social model.

There has been no progress on social employment legislation. The revision of the Working Time Directive, including the ending of the UK opt-out, has been blocked. The Temporary Agency Workers Directive has been blocked. A new Green Paper on Employment Law planned for later this month will, we believe, mark a further step away from Social Europe.

This statement accepts this and it recognises that working people across the European Union will withdraw their support from the European Union if the attacks on our rights are continued. That was the clear message from the French and the Dutch referenda on the European Constitution.

However, importantly, this statement marks a major shift in relation to economic and monetary union, recognising the need for major reform to the Maastricht criteria, a change in the remit of the undemocratic European Central Bank and a great public accountability in Eurozone economic and fiscal policy. UNISON has been consistent in making these criticisms of EMU and we welcome the fact that the General Council now shares them.

The European Union, as other speakers have said, has never been a panacea for Britain's trade unions and this statement does signal a change in the TUC line. No more the uncritical belief that the EU is the answer to all our problems at home. The statement recognises that the EU is a political body that can work in favour of working people, but it can also work against their interests. The statement clearly recognises that the challenge for trade unions in Britain and in all the member states of the EU is to change the political direction of the EU.

UNISON supports this statement, but will continue to be a vigilant critic in ensuring that a Social Europe is a real aspiration and the emperor does have some real clothes. Thank you. *(Applause)*

**Brenda Fraser** (*GMB*) said: GMB welcomes the General Council statement and its commitment to campaign for a stronger European social model. Congress, we have to protect this social model, not just for British and Europe workers, but as a vital benchmark for global trade union rights and standards to be set world-wide to avoid a race to the bottom.

The trade union movement at European and national level must ensure that we have a clear voice in this process. We are not general 'stakeholders', nor are we an undefined grouping of 'civil society'. We are trade unions and we must ensure that our identity is reasserted and respected in legislative process.

With the help of the European Parliament, we have shown that we can derail the neo-liberal agenda as we did this year in rewriting the Services Directive. We need to build on this solidarity and strength at European level.

However, we also have to ensure that the European social model is fully implemented at national level. For too long, British workers have failed to see the same levels of benefits from the European social model as many of our European counterparts. This is, in large part, due to the grudging way that many European rights have been implemented in the UK by successive governments, which continues today.

As unions, we have had to spend too much valuable money and resources in seeking justice in the courts to ensure proper implementation of rights, TUPE, parental leave, working time, time and time again, and only last week establishing our workers' rights to their rest breaks.

We are still fighting for our full rights under the original Working Time Directive whilst the Government is busy in Brussels hell bent on keeping the opt-out and further weakening these rights under the revised proposal. Congress, we won't have it!

Congress, the change of Labour leadership gives us the opportunity to campaign for the full involvement of our trade unions in implementation of employment and social rights. That does not mean more paper consultation in a vacuum. It means serious negotiations. GMB asks the TUC General Council to seize this chance and assert our rightful role in this process. Thank you. *(Applause)*

**Tony Donaghey** (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) said: Colleagues, the RMT moved last year at this forum a successful motion outlining Trades Union Congress policy on the European Union. With all due respect, my union does not think in any way, shape or form that the General Council's statement on page 113 of the General Council's Report reflects the spirit or the intent of that policy decision made here last year. In actual fact, you could be forgiven for thinking that the decision that was made last year has not totally, but almost totally, been ignored.

Let us examine the facts of what is happening. This week we have debated and discussed at length what is happening on this island. Just let's have a quick recap on what is happening. The fundamentals of our manufacturing industry are continuing to erode; our National Health Service has been affected by creeping privatisation, as has our postal service, our fire service, our education service, our railway service and our transport services generally. If we are going to continue as a campaigning organisation, we need to

reflect the reality of what is happening on this island. I am afraid that statement of the General Council does not do that.

I would, for those reasons, President, move the reference back of the General Council's statement on page 113 of the General Council's Report. *(Applause)*

**Doug Nicholls** (*The Community and Youth Workers' Union*) said: We are seconding the attempt to move a reference back on this part of the General Council's Report mainly because we believe that it contains some inaccuracies and it is very misleading.

For many years, in our view, there has been a strain within the movement that has had illusions about the benefits of the European Union. However, if you keep those illusions going for too long, they actually become delusions and we think that in this report some of the delusions are properly expressed.

As Bob from UNISON has said, the General Council recognises elsewhere that the social model has stalled. This is, in a way, a valiant attempt to try to kick start it again. There are worthy ambitions within it, but in the process it underestimates the size and, in fact, impossibility of the task, conveying the delusion that the big business club that is the European Union can be transformed and the tidal wave of neo-liberalism can be easily turned back by some amendments within the EU.

It says that the battle against the Services Directive was successful. It was a successful battle in achieving some amendments, but there still is a Services Directive which gives big business sway over our public services, all of which are put up for auction first by the Health Service recently in the *European Journal*.

It says in this report that many trade unionists in Latin America look towards the European Union as a model. I have never met one. The trading and cooperative agreements between Venezuela, Cuba, Mexico and many other countries in Latin America do not reflect and aspire towards the highly centralised undemocratic model of the European Union where individual nation states lose their sovereignty and self-determination.

It says in this report that the EU has delivered peace. We, in our union, think that is an insult to all those who died in the Balkans conflicts and the pulling apart of Yugoslavia. *(Applause)* That, in our view, would not have happened had the EU not supported the German recognition of Croatia.

Last year's motion at the TUC asked the TUC to be very critical of this new wave of the European directives, one of which was on pensions. It was that directive which caused the pensions crisis throughout Europe, not just in our country; a simple statement from big business in Europe that our pensions would be reduced, employers' contributions reduced, our benefits reduced and our retirement ages increased; a deliberate systematic strategy being adopted by the EU. I live near the Peugeot plant and here, of course, it is the case that we are easier to tip out than those in other places, but our British Government wanted to invest in Peugeot. The EU prevented that investment for a number of years while it poured money into Slovakia to enable Peugeot to get cheaper labour there. The EU is the regional arm of globalisation and it is the cause of most of the problems that we have been debating at this Congress. I move the reference back.

**The President:** I will now ask Billy Hayes to reply on behalf of the General Council.

**Billy Hayes** (*General Council*): I will ask Conference to support the General Council's statement. There are some drafting points about the statement and also

some recognition from some of the delegates that we are trying to get a unified position here today. That is why I ask Congress to endorse the statement. Doug said in his contribution that the source of all our problems is the European Union. However, when we are campaigning to seek the adoption of the Working Time Directive in this country, I detect the source of that Working Time Directive not being adopted in the UK is the British Government and not the European Union. When we talk about the source of all our problems. You can take the view which Doug, I respect Doug, has campaigned long and hard and his union has campaigned long and hard on everything European -- puts forward, but it is a simplistic view that says the source of all our problems is in Europe. I beg to differ. The source of all our problems is neoliberalism. It is not completely black and white, it is not milk and honey or a bitter harvest.

I will give you one example from my own industry. This year the 350-year old post office monopoly ended in the UK. In Europe, through a process of social dialogue, the likelihood of the monopoly going will not be reviewed until 2009. So the monopoly in Europe does not go until 2009. In fact, that is the period when the ending of the monopoly is reviewed. If simply Europe is the source of all our difficulty and problems, please explain that particular thing to me. Think about what Europe's position has been on the war in Iraq. Look at it in terms of the European approach to the war in Iraq vis-à-vis our own Government.

Although this statement is not perfect in terms of the drafting -- it is certainly an attempt to pull this Congress together on Europe and on campaigning; to get a united position on this in terms of where we want to go on Europe because we need to be pushing much harder in terms of a model on Europe that does involve workers. Yes, there are lots of problems. It is an attempt to have a unified position on Europe and that is why I commend the General Council's statement to Congress.

\* *The General Council's statement on Europe was ADOPTED*

### European Union Trade Policy

**The President:** I now call Motion 71, European Union Trade Policy. The General Council support the motion with a reservation and I will call on Billy Hayes to explain the General Council's position during the debate.

**Roy Rickhuss** (*Community*) moved Motion 71. He said: This motion addresses two recent developments that concern all working people. They have in common a concern about the approach of the European Union to dumping, that is the targeting of overseas markets with goods or produce offered for sale at less than the cost of production. In July, the Doha round of talks failed. The European Union, along with United States, refused to phase out the export subsidies they lavish on rich farmers in their own countries so that produce may be dumped in poorer countries. The Common Agricultural Policy may not have been designed to lower prices for the poorest farmers in developing countries but unfortunately this is precisely the impact it has.

The Doha failure was a disaster. It dashed the hopes of Africa, Southern Asia and Latin America, condemning hundreds of millions of the world's poorest people to a continuing desperate daily struggle to keep starvation at bay. Those people exist on less than \$2 dollars a day, whereas the largest 200 cereal producers in England get £2 every five minutes from the EU. We have to acknowledge a certain consistency in the approach of the European Union to dumping. Peter Mandelson no less, a good friend of ours, let it be known that he

wants to dismantle the measures available to combat dumping of exports into the 25 countries of the European Union. He spoke with full magisterial authority as the Commission Member for Trade and he clearly wants to use his portfolio to hasten fulfilment of his vision of a European Union where manufacturing will have no place. We have to acknowledge too that the former MP for Hartlepool may well have found the most effective way of bringing about the post-industrial era of which he speaks with such enthusiasm.

Three years ago President Bush introduced steel tariffs, which closed US markets for nearly all steel imports. The British steel industry was in an extremely difficult position at that time and our Prime Minister was too close to Bush to fight US protectionism. It is no exaggeration to say that the British steel industry was saved by the anti-dumping measures of the EU, which ensured that steel from other countries -- denied access to US markets -- was not dumped in Britain or in other EU countries. Again, it was the collective strength of the EU, backed by its trade defence powers, which enabled the leather and footwear industry this year to withstand an attack by China and Vietnam on European markets. Even Mandelson had to accept that tax breaks, low rents, improper asset valuation and a range of other unfair trade practices amounted to dumping and were causing serious damage to European leather footwear producers. The Commission was able to impose duties on exports of leather shoes from those two countries.

If Mandelson has his way, the EU will surrender unconditionally its powers to defend European industries against targeted unfair attacks on our markets and our members' jobs. There you have it, save rich farmers and let the jobs of manufacturing employees be abandoned in the service of unfair trade.

I hope that Congress this morning will call on the Government to demand that the EU retains its powers to resist dumping as this motion suggests. Delegates should note that the motion does not call for the elimination of agricultural subsidies; it merely expresses concern about the failure of world trade organisations' negotiations to advance their gradual and fair elimination. Of course, this process has to start with the ending of export subsidies, which are absolutely indefensible for anyone who believes in solidarity. Of course, the employment needs of agricultural workers in Britain and elsewhere have to be addressed with at least as much care as the jobs of textile and clothing workers and people in other industries who receive no support from the EU.

Congress I move.

**Christopher Goldthorpe** (*Accord*) seconded Motion 71. He said: I am happy to second this motion which reaffirms the commitment of the British trade union movement to justice for the poor of the world and seeks to head off the threat that jobs in manufacturing in Britain will come under in a new attack from unfair trade.

The Commission seems to be intent on surrendering the legitimate defences in place to combat unfair trade. It is not protectionist. We know that China will be an increasingly dominant force in world manufacturing because of its natural advantages, in particular low labour costs in a vast country without trade union rights. The absence of independent unions is wrong but the World Trade Organisation does not regard it as an unfair advantage. However, we see no reason why in addition China should be able to wipe out manufacturing jobs in Britain through maintaining a vastly undervalued currency and using a whole range of dumping measures to penetrate and overwhelm British markets.

This dumping is against WTO rules and the European Union at the present is able to prevent its worst excesses by imposing duties, as it did in the spring in respect of leather footwear. The Commission plans to abandon this possibility in the future and leave manufacturing unemployment in Europe at the mercy of countries and companies that can dump produce here. We want to stop dumping by Europeans of agricultural produce which literally kills the poorest and most vulnerable people in developing countries. They are not able even now to compete against the sugar or cotton or cereal crops on the world markets thanks to vast export subsidies. The European Union and the Americans would not negotiate the phasing out of even the worst export subsidies in the recent Doha round. Our Congress and General Council called for this. I ask delegates now to reaffirm the call.

**Brian Revell** (*Transport and General Workers' Union*): Speaking in opposition to Motion 71 because it calls for the elimination of agricultural subsidies. There is much in this motion that is laudable and deserves support, in particular the call for the ending of dumping of food exports. However, in reality, subsidised exports of agricultural products are almost non-existent in the UK, but that is not the case with a number of other EU countries and the USA.

The Transport and General Workers' Union has, since the merger with the National Union of Agricultural & Allied Workers in 1982, had responsibility for 10,000 agricultural workers, our members. They face the same problems as others in manufacturing -- global competition from very cheap labour. If we are to retain some self sufficiency in food production, it is essential that agriculture is subsidised to some extent. Motion 71 calls for the elimination of agricultural subsidies, albeit gradually. This we reject. This is an attack on our agricultural members and would result in the loss of agricultural and rural jobs.

Let us consider the current changes in the sugar regime where the guaranteed price has been reduced by one-third. Two British sugar mills are closing with the loss of nearly 200 jobs. Caribbean sugar growers are being forced out of business as they no longer have privileged access to the UK market. Many islands in the Caribbean will no longer grow sugar. The winners are the big food multinationals and, in particular, one country, Brazil, where more rain forests will be destroyed to provide for increased sugar production. Most agricultural subsidies are now targeted at environmental requirements rather than production. Therefore, they do not undermine farmers in developing countries.

Our agricultural membership seeks the solidarity of Congress. Delegates, vote for sustainable British agriculture. Vote for British agricultural jobs. Vote for continued agricultural subsidies and oppose Motion 71.

**Billy Hayes** (*General Council*): I was given this particular job by a big Evertonian, so that will give you a flavour of our position.

The General Council supports this motion because we believe in a world trade system that protects manufacturing jobs in both the developed and developing countries, that prohibits dumping whether it is in developed economies or less developed countries. This is the position of the global trade union movement, of trades unions in Europe, South Africa, Latin America and Asia. We believe in trade justice, and that is what most of this motion is about. In particular, it is critical of both the free trade bonanza without regard to people's livelihood or, on the other hand, the protectionist trade war.

It is the beginning of the motion that the General Council have some problems with. We and the

agricultural workers around the world want to see an end to agricultural export subsidies, but this does not mean -- as the motion goes on to say -- that we want to see agricultural subsidies themselves abolished. We believe that agricultural industries can be defended without begging our neighbours, and we believe rural communities need support if we are not to kiss goodbye to a way of life that has existed for centuries. We want fair trade and trade justice. This is not incompatible with free trade because, without the level playing field we feel that trade justice delivers, trade is not free at all, and trade justice does not mean trading jobs in one country for jobs in another either. That is why the General Council has reservations on this motion and we are asking Conference to support the motion with reservations. Thank you.

**Roy Rickhuss** (*Community*) replying to the debate said: I repeat that the motion does not call for the elimination of agricultural subsidies, although the Make Poverty History campaign, which we all supported enthusiastically last year, went a little bit further in that direction. We certainly do not expect British agricultural workers to bear the brunt of job losses that a change in trade patterns may entail. We should protect the incomes of British agricultural workers.

However, there are a few whose incomes we would like to hit. We find it an obscenity that the Duke of Marlborough should receive £500,000 a year and also the Duke of Westminster -- and he is obviously short of a bob or two -- gets £450,000 a year. We find it also an obscenity that Tate and Lyle get over £120 million a year, most of it in export subsidies to dump sugar on world markets and impoverish poor farmers in Cuba in and elsewhere even further.

The T&G has a motion down for debate this afternoon about the danger that manufacturing will disappear in Britain within 20 years, and the specific point in our motion is for the Government to veto Mandelson's plans to abandon the minimal defences against dumping that we at least have at the moment in the EU. I hope that those unions who, like Community, represent members in manufacturing industries, understand that their members' jobs will indeed disappear if the Commission gets the green light on this.

President, at the beginning of Congress you yourself said that there is no greater calling for us as trades unionists than the promotion of international solidarity. Our motion promotes the extension of solidarity to the people who need it most of all. Delegates, I appeal to you to send a clear message to the Government and the Commission and to support the motion. Just a few minutes ago you all joined in and you all shouted out, End Poverty. So let us do it.

\* *Motion 71 was LOST*

## Cuba

**The President:** I call Motion 72 on Cuba. The General Council supports the motion.

**Steve Kemp** (*National Union of Mineworkers*) moved Motion 72. He said: The continuing blockade of Cuba by the United States of America is a disgrace and a scandal that should rest uneasy on any person. It is a blockade not supported by the international community or indeed the European Union. It is an illegal blockade by any standards of international law, that America only points to and relies upon when it suits America's purpose to do so: intervention in the Middle East, intervention in Iraq, intervention in Afghanistan and 50 years of attempted intervention in Cuba where the Americans have roundly failed. That is

not good enough for George W; he seems to have it all worked out for the future of Cubans up to and including how they should run their lives.

In July of this year the Bush Administration's Commission for Assistance for a Free Cuba seemingly have come up with a plan that gives the notion that Washington not only knows what kinds of a government Cuba is going to have but also the report seeks to change and say what economy and civil society Cuba also ought to have. The report urges Bush to allocate \$80 million dollars this year with the sum rising by \$20 million dollars each year in an effort to end Cuba's government. Washington, the document says, should prepare to effect a speedy transition. It tells how the Cuban Government would be brought down, what would replace it and how it would introduce US-style democracy, market forces, privatisation, to a new US transitional Cuba. There would be \$31 million dollars to fund opposition groups in Cuba and, in a more sinister move, the US in relation to Cuba's economy says "The revenue does not go to the Cuban people but it is diverted to maintain the repressive security apparatus and fund Castro's interventionist and destabilising policies in other countries of the hemisphere". Bush has the nerve and the gall to talk about destabilising countries. What the US of course really means, and cannot stand, what sticks in their throat, is how Cuba rejects the US belief that countries' political systems have to be run by the free market, right wing philosophy, where money and who has the money dictates how they get on in society. It annoys the Bush administration that Cuba's health service, free at point of need, available to all without phoney insurance systems, ensures that child mortality rates are better than the richest country in the world as well and it really annoys the US administration when Cuba shows true international solidarity with the world's community by sending doctors and medics to parts of the world where knowledge and expertise is welcome, including, by the way, offers of Cuban health workers to go to the US and help the victims of hurricane Katrina last year in New Orleans.

Congress, the earthquake that struck Pakistan last year left 75,000 dead, 120,000 wounded, 3.3 million homeless. Cuba's response was not any weasel words or political posturing, they sent 2000 health workers and in the eight months in the country cared for over one million people, performed 12,000 operations, hospitalised 12,000 patients and had 440,000 people in tents and provided 432,000 physiotherapy treatments for 76,000 patients, not reported by the way ever in the British and the world press.

I tell Congress this, that is what I call global solidarity; that is what I call internationalism. It is not about intervening but is doing what I hope we all in Congress believe, and that is helping others in their hour of need. We should applaud it and not attack it like we have heard this week from the Bush administration.

Cuba is not perfect, not by any means, and in response to the Foreign Secretary this morning she and Congress should note Cuba's election in May to the new UN Human Rights Council. She should also note that the US refused to stand because it was afraid it would not be voted on because of its record of human rights abuse in Guantanamo Bay and Iraq prisons. I applaud the superb work of the Cuban Solidarity Campaign and the TUC in organising the Solidarity Conference this year. Campaign against the Bush proposals on Cuba; support Motion 72.

**Tony Kearns** (*Communications Workers Union*) seconded Motion 72. He said: As you heard from the speaker from the NUM, the US Government is stepping up its pressure on Cuba. Caleb McCarry's report was to aim for regime change in Cuba. A question was asked of the Minister this morning about the British response.

136

In November 2005 the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office had a meeting with Caleb McCarry and so far the British Government have refused to reveal the content of that meeting. The direct question to the Minister today was not so much a fudge -- she completely ignored answering that question. The refusal of the British Government to give transparency to that issue is a disgrace. It is about regime change and we say here and now, no more meetings in support of the US foreign policy on Cuba.

We have seen the US Government's idea of regime change around the world -- Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran. That is the reality of regime change as far as the US Government is concerned, and McCarry's Report claims that Cuba has an interventionist and destabilising policy in other countries.

This is the country complaining about interventionist policies: interventionist policies in, I suspect, countries like El Salvador, Nicaragua, Grenada and Vietnam. These are the models they would like the world to adopt. They know a thing about interventionist foreign policies but it is scant hypocrisy of the first order from the US Government -- destabilising policies, as the comrade from the NUM said, about the work in Pakistan.

By the way Cuba sent 2,000 aid workers, 40 per cent of whom were women, to Pakistan. Cuba's medical brigade, 25,000 doctors, are volunteering in 68 countries. That is more than the World Health Organisation and Medicines Sans Frontieres put together can supply around the world. Not only that, but when they are there these doctors are living and working in some of the poorest communities and countries in the world -- countries like Bolivia, Guatemala, Haiti, Venezuela, the type of countries where interventionist policies by the US Government economically have created the mess that Cuba is trying to resolve.

Cuba's operation miracle has provided eye operations to many thousands of people in Latin America and the Caribbean and without Cuban medical help these people would certainly go blind. The comrade from the NUM has pointed to the work in Pakistan. What this is all about -- let us be honest -- is that the United States Government just cannot stand the idea that there is an alternative economic political and moral model that is different from theirs, that actually helps the poor of the world whilst theirs destroys the poor of the world.

We as the CWU follow the lead of the NUM in defending Cuba against United States aggression. It is as simple as this. If supporting Cuba means healing the world's poor and sick, and if supporting Cuba means curing the world's poor and blind, and if housing the world's poor and displaced means supporting Cuba's interventionist policies, then count me in, count the CWU in and the TUC should support this proposition.

\* *Motion 72 was CARRIED*

### **Venezuela**

**The President:** I call Motion 73 on Venezuela. We have been informed that the motion has been remitted. I call on Sally Hunt to give the General Council's position and then I will call on the Jeremy Dear of the NUJ to move and then to remit.

**Sally Hunt** (*General Council*): Congress, this motion as you know welcomes a number of progressive social and economic developments in Venezuela, and new media organisations, and it applauds the really solid work that is taking place amongst UK campaigners. It calls for coordination by the TUC of the solidarity work of various existing organisations that we believe should help the affiliates in the work that they do in order to help our comrades in Venezuela.



So why are we remitting or asking for remission? We do not believe at this stage that we have actually got to a point where such coordination as is asked for in this motion is possible. The General Council is therefore, as we have said, seeking remission so that we can actively consider how best to build relations with the Venezuelan trades unionists; campaign against external interference; and work towards and support the development of greater coherence amongst our people here. Having said that, we have spent the last few days listening to inspirational words from our comrades in Venezuela. We have equally had to listen to the tragedy that is still taking place in Colombia. We have to support, and we have to work as much as we can together, good trade union organisation, good socialist governments in Latin America in order to make sure that not only do they survive but we enable our comrades in other countries in Latin America to be safe and to live.

**Jeremy Dear** (*National Union of Journalists*) moved Motion 73. He said: Brendan Barber opened Congress by celebrating the visit of President Hugo Chavez to the UK and to Congress House. That visit, along with many others by trades unionists and community campaigners over the past 12 months, was a sign of the importance that Venezuelan politicians, community organisations and trades unions attach to this movement's support for the social and economic changes happening in Venezuela. It was a proud moment for me to stand before the Congress of Venezuela's largest trade union confederation, the UNT, to deliver on the TUC's behalf a message of solidarity with Venezuela's working people.

Comrades, as a young trade union activist I recall reading the booklet *Nicaragua, The Threat of a Good Example*. It explained the social gains made in that country under the Sandinista Government in literacy, in education and in health, and how as a result of the beacon it had become for the peoples in other Latin American countries it had also become a target for the US-backed Contras and a victim of economic sabotage. If that was the case with Nicaragua or Cuba, as we have just heard, how much more so in Venezuela that has reclaimed its oil, many of its industries and much of its land to benefit those forced into poverty, unemployment and landlessness by years of IMF imposed austerity?

No one believes that overnight Venezuela has become a paradise, No one believes crime, transport and housing are not real issues, but let us also not believe the lies that this is an unpopular dictatorship; let us too not underestimate -- indeed let us celebrate -- the huge achievements the Venezuelan working people have made: the country declared free of illiteracy by UNESCO; more than 1.2 million people now being given access to health care previously denied them; the building of 657 new schools and universities; millions of hectares of land re-distributed. But the social and economic revolution is about more than statistics, it is about the humans, the individuals, in education for the first time, given the right to learning, the right to work with dignity, the right to basic health care, those freed from illiteracy.

The social and economic revolution has also given rise to new media, seizing control from the millionaires who own so much of Venezuela's media, giving rise to new unions replacing the old corrupt unions with independent militant and participatory unions, and giving rise to debates and movements for workers' control and community and democratic accountability. Hugo Chavez will go to the polls in December, backed by independent unions, health workers, teachers and community and youth organisations. In a fair election he will win. But there is a threat: not content with support for a failed coup or economic sabotage, the

new CIA Commission covering Cuba and Venezuela is already seeking to interfere in those elections. Our principles demand that we must support the Venezuelan trades unions and working people who demand nothing more than the right, free from interference, to determine their own future. Whilst there is a threat there is a force capable of undermining that threat: it is a force we call solidarity, solidarity with the Venezuelan people with independent trades unions and in support of their gains and in defence of their rights. We must build further solidarity, delivered by trades unionists and trades unions to trades unionists and trades unions.

Our motion welcomes the solidarity work being carried out by three solidarity organisations, and applauds all those campaigners who have taken this cause to union meetings, union conferences, community organisations and beyond, but between its lines it also expresses some despair and frustration. There are too many occasions when, as solidarity organisations, we spend more time seeking to score points off each other or find arcane points of disagreement than delivering what the people of Venezuela really need, solidarity. It may satisfy some of us, but to the people of Venezuela it is not only incomprehensible but potentially disastrous.

Our motion is a plea for trade union unity to deliver greater trade union solidarity and for the TUC to help coordinate that work. We are asked to remit. We understand the concerns about how we propose that coordination. We are not wedded to a single means but we believe there must be action because we are implacable in recognising that in unity is greater strength and that, in the face of the momentous challenges and the serious threats that Venezuelan working people face, the greatest strength possible is needed to defend the enormous gains they have already made. On that basis, that Sally has pledged that there will be further action to create that unity, we will remit.

**The President:** Thank you for agreeing to remit the motion.

\* *Motion 73 was REMITTED*

**Alan Donnelly** (*Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*): I ask for Emergency No. 1 to be first business debated after lunch. There are striking fire workers outside and I thought this was what it was about. I think it should be debated first business after lunch because the ultimate sacrifice you can make for the trade union movement is to withdraw your labour.

**The President:** I am trying to find out what exactly the position is but I have the emergency motion here to be taken before the close of business this morning. It is scheduled for debate. (*Shouting from the floor of Congress*) (*Applause*) It is scheduled for debate. (*More shouting from the floor of Congress*) It is up to the FBU in terms of how that debate takes place, but it is scheduled for debate and I intend to take it. So let me carry on with business and then we can move on to the Emergency Motion 1.

### **Global organising and international trade unionism**

**Craig Nelson** (*UNISON*) speaking to paragraph 5.2 of the General Council's Report, said: Congress, I would like to draw your attention to the final paragraph on page 83 relating to our work with ICFTU. We very much welcome action by the TUC in raising issues affecting lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender workers with counterparts in ICFTU, especially in our work with the ILO. This is a significant development

which will hopefully have an impact on countries who deny workers protection from discrimination on sexual orientation and gender identity grounds.

My question to the General Council is to ask whether both gender identity and sexual identification are covered in this work, as often gender identity issues do not get profiled.

Finally, can I ask that the General Council keep affiliates updated via the TUC LGBT Committee and reports to Congress on developments in this area. Thank you.

### **Attacks on fire cover and trade union organisation by Merseyside Fire Authority**

**The President:** I now call Emergency Motion 1. The General Council support the motion.

**Matt Wrack** (*Fire Brigades Union*) moved Emergency Motion No. 1. He said: I note the time; I thank the comrades for suggesting this debate should perhaps be taken later. I will ask delegates to stay in the hall and allow us to expand on what is going on in the Merseyside Fire and Rescue Authority, and other colleagues may wish to make comment on the disputes as well.

The first thing I would like to say is that it is an extremely sad situation in the Merseyside Fire and Rescue Service, because nobody wants to see fire fighters out on picket lines, no one wants to see fire fighters out on strike and fire fighters themselves certainly do not want to be taking strike action. Unfortunately, when we have employers who refuse to negotiate, employers who refuse to listen to our concerns, employers who impose cuts, who impose working conditions that are outside of national agreements, unfortunately in those situations our members feel they have no alternative but to take industrial action.

I know that in certain quarters there are talks that this is some sort of plot from our Head Office in Kingston to destabilise the fire service. That is undoubtedly not the case. The simple fact is that since 2003 we have had a move -- as was mentioned yesterday -- to local standards of fire cover and to local bargaining over issues like duty systems and shift systems, and the more intelligent people on the employers side have acknowledged that if you move towards local bargaining you will end up with local disputes. Unfortunately that is what has happened over the past two years. We end up in the situation in Merseyside with 120 front line fire fighter posts being cut off the establishment. That is ten per cent of the established work force. That is completely unacceptable to us and we hope unacceptable to Congress and to the people of Merseyside.

Fifteen emergency fire control jobs are being axed as a result of introducing new duty systems, the introduction of a shift system that includes working 96 hours continuous. They call it modernisation. They are modernising us back to the Victorian times and we are sick and tired of having the word 'modernisation' rammed down our throats in the fire service because all they are talking about really is cuts. There is nothing modern about getting rid of front line fire fighters or front line workers in any of the essential public services.

Our local officials on Merseyside have made at least five attempts to resolve this dispute through negotiation. I want to be absolutely clear here today -- because I understand that the Chief Fire Officer is probably watching us on the Parliament Channel, I do not want to conduct negotiations through the Parliament Channel or through the media in any way, shape or form -- that the Fire Brigades Union wants to

settle this dispute on Merseyside. We will do that through negotiation and not through a media war, which unfortunately we face from the Chief Fire Officer and certain people on the Fire Authority in Merseyside.

Today is 'international day'. There are international aspects to this because we have concerns that there is a wider agenda going on here because we have a chief fire officer who travelled to New Zealand last year and at an international conference of fire officers, in a meeting with trade union officials, actually outlined in great detail what he intended to do to the Fire Brigades Union on Merseyside, that he would sideline them and isolate them and take them on. Remarkably here we are some months later with an industrial dispute that, in our view, has been deliberately created by the management of that fire and rescue service. But two can play at that game and our colleagues in New Zealand Australia have provided that information. As a result the public on Merseyside are fully aware of that.

In 1926, in the general strike, we had certain city gentlemen, retired colonels, who drove trams and lorries through picket lines to teach the workers a lesson, and unfortunately in Merseyside today we have the same situation repeated. It is a farce because we have non-uniformed employees, dressed up in fire fighters' uniforms, sent out to fight fires. The clerk to the authority is a solicitor by trade apparently. Well, I do not know what he would do if I turned up in court claiming to be a solicitor. There may even be a law against it, but unfortunately they are doing that in reverse. Fire fighting is a profession; it takes years to learn. You do not just dress up in fire fighters' outfits, play with a hose for a few days and go out and fight fires.

We have had ministers come here talking about progress under the Labour Government. I ask you this: is it acceptable that members of an emergency service like this are told "If you stay in the Fire Brigades Union your promotion chances are finished. If you take part in industrial action your promotion chances are finished"? Unfortunately, and sadly, that is what is happening in the Merseyside Fire and Rescue Service.

I ask Congress for your support. Our colleagues there in the balcony are striking fire fighters from Merseyside -- (*prolonged applause*) -- and I will finish by saying this. We want a settlement but we will not accept union busting. My message to the Chief Fire Officer of the Fire and Rescue Authority is, "Come and negotiate with our officials locally in Merseyside and with the national joint secretaries, if necessary, but one last thing: you will not break the Fire Brigades Union on Merseyside. In fact, you will not break the Fire Brigades Union full stop."

**Bob Crow** (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) seconded Emergency Motion 1. He said: I have pleasure in seconding this resolution. I will say that I hope to speak on behalf of my brothers from ASLEF and TSSA who might not be able to get to the rostrum here today but also from a selfish point of view, that when our members are involved in crashes in privatised rail companies the first people who arrive are the fire fighters and the ambulance workers. We want to send a special message to them because it was not too long ago when people had a minute's silence for July 7, for those terrible bombings in London's Tube, and all of a sudden those fire fighters and ambulance workers who were heroes on July 7, and are heroes today, are now classified as enemies.

I have listened to some of those appalling attacks by that horrible individual in Merseyside, that Chief Fire Officer, who makes The Sopranos look like a Walt Disney movie the way he is operating up there. We are saying that we have heard speaker after speaker today,

quite rightly so, saying that we want solidarity with Venezuela, quite rightly solidarity with Cuba, solidarity with Zimbabwe. That is what this movement stands for. But if you start saying you want solidarity all over the world, to preach it, the best way to operate that is by supporting workers in this country for the people we represent and especially in Merseyside. We want professional people and that is what the fire fighting service is up in Merseyside. I hope that on Friday, at the demonstration they are having, that as many people as possible can get up to Merseyside and let the Liverpool fire fighters know that we stand by supporting decent services.

Speaker after speaker this week -- David Miliband, Margaret Beckett, the infamous Tony Blair -- have come to this rostrum. He talked about the way in which he has operated over the last nine years. What a legacy we have in place when we can start considering spending money on mass destruction when we should be spending money on constructing a society better than the one we have now.

Let us stand by the fire fighters up in Merseyside and get full support, and also dig deep for the buckets at lunch time, but more importantly let us dig deep for those ethical trade investments that you have in your general funds and start supporting working who are fighting for decent services, fighting for integrity and for decent safety standards for workers in Britain.

**Pat O'Hara** (*Communication Workers Union*) supported Emergency Motion 1. He said: We were anxious and that is why there was a little bit of a furore before because I was back on Merseyside when the last bout of industrial action took place and I took the opportunity to go and speak to some comrades who were on strike. It was inspirational for me to speak to those men and women on strike for eight days, not for better wages, not for a shorter working week, but for the right to do the job that they have taken on, a dedicated job, to save lives. I hope Mr McGurk is watching the Parliamentary Channel because I will say that when my wife saw him getting interviewed on Granada television she said, "Hasn't he got a gob on him that you would never get fed up of smacking!" So take that, Mr McGurk, and I hope you never bump into my wife in Liverpool city centre because I have had a few bouts with her.

I love Dad's Army and when you hear him talking you laugh at Captain Mainwaring and because it is a comedy everything is OK and everyone is happy. But to listen to this crackpot talk, it makes you wonder how he has got to the position he is in. He says everyone should feel safer when the fire fighters are on strike because people are more careful in what they do. Oh yeah, that is strange. He says, "We have had a look at the survey and there are less fires now". I think we should be raising the flags because there are less fires, but what do we do? We lose jobs. Mr McGurk, when asked a question, "Are there are 120 jobs going?" said "No, there are not, not 120 jobs, there are 120 posts going". "Isn't that jobs, Mr McGurk?" "No, we do not call them jobs." This is the kind of crackpot, unfortunately, that the FBU have to deal with.

More importantly you see, as Matt says, it goes further. What happens in Merseyside will go to the rest of the country. On Friday there is a national demonstration. I want you to mobilise your branches, get the banners there, and get people there. The people of Merseyside are supporting the fire fighters because they know the cause is right. We as the TUC, with all our noble and proud aspirations for the future, have to stop it today and get there on Friday and support the fire fighters of Merseyside.

\* *Emergency Motion 1 was CARRIED*

*Congress adjourned until 2.15 p.m.*

## WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

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

**The President:** I call Congress to order. Many thanks to Torfield Minstrels who have been playing for us this afternoon. Let us show our appreciation. (*Applause*)

We start this afternoon by returning to the General Council's Report, Chapter 5, Global Solidarity on page 118. I call Composite Motion 16 on Palestine. The General Council support the motion with an explanation, and I will call Sally Hunt during the debate.

### Palestine

**Ruth Winters** (*Fire Brigades Union*) moved Composite Motion 16. She said: The other day I read in the papers comments from international aid agencies about the dire situation in Gaza. The Israeli military and the economic seizure of Gaza has led to a collapse in Palestinian living conditions -- in fact, we should say a further collapse in living conditions -- and many people only survive by scabbling for food in rubbish dumps whilst trying to dodge the bombs. This should not be new to us, should it, as delegates should know that Israel closed the entry and exit points into the Gaza strip. home to 1.5 million Palestinians on 25 June?

I have to say that when we are talking about Gaza, for Tony Blair to say "we know who is responsible", I quote, and inferring that the blame only lies with elements of the Palestinian community without standing up and strongly and unequivocally condemning the Israeli Government's reaction, is an absolute disgrace. As well as insulting to the Palestinian people it sums up our problem in a nutshell, does it not?

Malnutrition and starvation are not the only things inflicted on Palestinian people. Israel has conducted frequent raids and bombings, indiscriminately slaughtering people en masse, and they do not apologise for it. We do not apologise for the Palestinian people forming and enacting a just and understandable resistance. The humanitarian crisis in Gaza has been largely ignored by the rest of the world. I know our members were sickened when not that long ago we watched Ariel Sharon's illness portrayed, a war criminal, given more air time and more publicity and more concern by the world in one week than the Palestinians had had that whole year. We hear rightly about the wars in Iraq, Afghanistan and Lebanon, and we are hammered on a daily basis, in a largely stale debate, on the succession of the leader of the Labour Party. Are we going to allow the Palestinians to be forgotten? I hope not.

This motion sets out its condemnation of the Government of Israel's suspension of revenue payments to the Palestinian people and of the Palestinian Authority and of the suspension of aid by the European Union, the United States administration and others. These actions threaten the already restricted wages of almost 160,000 Palestinian workers. What hypocrisy. They are told they cannot fight back by people who use war against others under false pretences. They are told they must be democratic, so they hold fair elections and they are rewarded by having their funding withdrawn because the hypocrites do not like the results of those fair elections. They are told that if there is anything other than peaceful resistance they will be condemned as terrorists, yet the Israeli Government -- the fourth largest military power in the world -- can use military means as it wishes. If the Palestinians who fight back to defend themselves are terrorists, Israel is enacting state terrorism as we speak.

We are continually told that we have to be even handed in this debate. There is nothing even handed about what is happening in Palestine. There never has been and we should not be fooled by the fact that people try to tell us it has. Again Tony Blair -- I am talking about him a lot today! -- said he had been in the Middle East just recently and was welcomed, and he was spoken to and he spoke to Palestinians. So have we Tony. We have been continually talking to the workers in Palestine through the Palestine General Federation of Trades Unions. They do not agree with what you are saying, but of course you do not listen to trades unions, do you? He mentioned yesterday peace in Palestine and it is just and it is right. Thanks for that, Tony, but you never mentioned the right to self-determination for the Palestinian people. You did not talk about ending the occupation, you did not talk about ending the shuffling around the so-called settlements as an excuse for a peace plan, and that is why it is always the Palestinians who have to move their position. This needs to stop. How can you expect justice for a people who are told they must be peaceful to negotiate with a state gun pointing at their heads? It is absolutely absurd, it is obscene and it is unjust.

We must continue to defend the Palestinians' right to self-determination. We must tell our Government what we want them to do. It is a bit rich to hear the Prime Minister say that we should not have imams who cannot speak our language coming here and speaking in our mosques. I might not agree with what any imam says but maybe, Tony, you should not be going over to Palestine not speaking their language in their homeland and telling them how to get their right to self-determination.

This motion asks specifically for you to support four key principles and demands. We want you to support the right of the Palestinians to self determination; the right of Palestine refugees to return to their homelands; the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied territories; and the removal of the illegally constructed apartheid wall. We must also affiliate to the Palestinian solidarity campaign, that is the main campaign, THE campaign, that has been working with the Palestinian trades unionists.

A final message for Tony Blair: he started off talking yesterday about what happened five years ago at Congress, about 9/11 and how everyone acted. He actually said it was something along the lines of we reacted wonderfully. I disagree. Our delegation disagreed at the time. Apart from the fact that hundreds of fire fighters had died, I did not want to stand up and give him a standing ovation for that for that reason alone. We had a motion on the Congress, it was about Palestine, and everybody and everyone else kept saying "You cannot possibly be putting that forward now" because everyone assumed it was the Palestinians who had enacted the 9/11 attacks. I will tell you something, if every time a Palestinian's name is mentioned and it is linked with terrorism, that is racism and it should be stopped and it is absolutely disgraceful.

In terms of debate again, Tony, you told us yesterday not to shout at you. God love him! What a shame, told us not to shout at him. Let us tell you something, we are sick and tired of debating time and time again the same issues. We have debated until we are blue in the face although I have to say we will never be blue in the ballot box, but do not tell us not to shout at you, because I will tell you something, Tony, we are only shouting because you will not damn well listen! Support this composite.

**Linzi Moore** (*Educational Institute of Scotland*) seconded Composite Motion 16. She said: There must be peace in Palestine. There must be justice for the people of Palestine. This is the key to a wider Middle

East peace settlement. This must be a priority for the trade union movement. Only when peace is achieved will it isolate those on both sides who want to see a never ending war. Peace will not be achieved with Israel using 73 per cent of the water in the West Bank, building illegal settlements, dismantling the Palestinian infrastructure, and the creation of apartheid through the medium of a wall that is a physical barrier but also causes mental anguish. However, you cannot build walls in people's minds. Education and knowledge are the mechanisms for breaking down people's prejudice and hatred. You must support the Palestinian people's historic respect for education and higher learning but this has been undermined especially in the West Bank. In Gaza, some schools have been occupied by the Israeli army. Teachers have not been paid since after the election, as funds have been frozen by the EU and especially by the USA. But the dedication of teachers is a shining example to all of us as I believe education is the key to a better future in Palestine. Many schools in Gaza, because of the shortage in infrastructure, are working two shifts to give children an education. Children are scared and traumatised by sonic booms, the demolition of buildings and cluster bombs.

Sixty per cent of Palestinians are now living in acute poverty and one fifth of children under five are suffering from malnutrition. A recent NUT delegation, in 2005, found that the mental health of children in the area was deteriorating, especially among girls. It found that boys were becoming violent and girls were becoming withdrawn. It found an urgent need for tackling mental health issues in schools as it was affecting the children's right to health and security.

The sense of hopelessness and disaffection, especially among the young, is increasing and can only have a negative effect for the future. This alienation can only be increased when they see their elected representatives being kidnapped and put in Israeli prisons. Trade unions were born from solidarity, struggle and internationalism, and that spirit of internationalism, the international trade union movement, must do more to promote contacts between Palestinians and Israeli trades unions. These contacts lead to a building of confidence and dialogue. We need to secure better cooperation and solidarity among the different organisations that are active in promoting Palestinian rights. This solidarity may be the only thing that is needed to start the healing process. Solidarity is increasingly important in the current political climate as a new Middle Eastern war looms on the horizon. There must be justice and peace in Palestine.

**Mitch Tovey** (*Transport Salaried Staffs' Association*) supported Composite Motion 16. While the world's eyes were turned towards the barbarism that was unfolding in the south of Lebanon, the Israeli state had an almost free hand to further tighten their grip over the Palestinian people -- surely one of the most oppressed people on the planet until the Israeli state tried to pedal the myth that somehow the Palestinians were to blame. They are the problem. Although the Palestinians occupy not one inch of Israeli land, although the Palestinians own not one Apache helicopter, although the Palestinians blockade not one Israeli company, to the Israeli state the Palestinians are the problem.

We have heard much about the two Israeli soldiers kidnapped in the Lebanon. We have heard little about the democratically elected Palestinian representatives being kidnapped by Israeli defence force. We should be clear. As trades unionists we call for all kidnapped and illegal captives, Israeli, Palestinian or Lebanese, to be returned to their families immediately. The real problem is that Israel refuses to accept the democratically elected Palestinian authority. While western powers screeched for an election after the

death of Yasser Arafat, they were not prepared to accept the will of the Palestinian people. They wanted an election but only with the right result. They wanted a pliable figure, a moderate who would bend the knee to the Israeli might, but none came forward. That is the thing about elections, is it not? Sometimes you get the wrong result.

It would be a great help if the Israeli trade unions were at the absolute forefront of calls for the release of all detainees. It would be a great help if there were genuine expressions of sorrow to the families of all civilians killed in Israel, in Palestine and in Lebanon. For ever and ever, the usual excuses for killing civilians arise. They should be treated with the contempt they deserve. State-prompted murder is never acceptable. Unfortunately, if used against Palestinians it seems to be OK. The Israeli defence forces know they are protected by the Israeli state. The Israeli state knows it is protected by the Bush regime. They regard themselves as untouchables, truly a David against Goliath, but maybe not in the way it was originally meant.

A word must be said about Britain's role in Palestine. The problem is that because of our murderous policies in Iraq, because of our imperialist adventures in Afghanistan, because of our complicity in prolonging the war in the Lebanon, we probably have little role to play. We could have. If New Labour had not invaded and rampaged, tortured and lied around parts of the Muslim world we could have had a pivotal role in promoting a just settlement based on an independent Palestinian state, with the right of refugees to return and with East Jerusalem as its capital. The oppressed and the oppressors are never equal, never will be and must not be treated equally.

**Bernard Roome** (*Communication Workers Union*) supported Composite Motion 16. He said: Once again we have seen an area where Mr Bush has said a word, has forgotten his dictionary and meant totally another word. He can tell you that he wants stability in the Middle East but what he really wants is subservience in the Middle East. He does not want stability at all. He does not want a stable Middle East where people know what is going on, where people can live their lives normally, where they can elect democratic governments -- democratic governments that they want, not the democratic governments that the imperialist United States wants. It is a farce for the United States to keep funding millions if not billions of dollars into Israel but at the same time taking funds away from the new government in the Palestine area that prevents those people from getting basic life supporting things.

If we are going to have stability in the Middle East we have to have a position whereby a Palestinian mother can see her children go off to school in the morning and know they are going to come home at night, where Palestinian workers can go off to work and know their homes will be there when they come back in the night. That is sort of stability we want in the Middle East, we want a stability where they can elect the people they want without fear that someone will come in and undermine their governments.

May I also say on behalf of the CWU that the CWU has no truck with Hamas attacking workers for taking strike action because they were not paid. They also have the right to be paid like any other worker and they should be protected by their government, not attacked for doing so. We have no truck with that whatsoever. We want a position in the Middle East whereby, when people go out to work they come home safely, when their children go to school they come home safely, when they have problems they can go to hospital and feel safe that they will be able to go there.

I am a telephone engineer and I am fed up with hearing the Americans and the Israelis talking about they have had to take out communication assets. Let me tell you that a communication asset is a telephone exchange and inside that telephone exchange are telephone engineers, and they do not give a toss how many of those telephone engineers die. They are trades unionists who went to work in the morning, hopefully going to go home to their families at night, and just because they are seen as a communication asset they get murdered. That is no longer good enough.

We want a situation whereby whether you are a trades unionist in Israel, Palestine, Lebanon, Iraq or Iran you can join together as trades unionists, support each other and bring a better society to the whole of the Middle East.

**Keith Sonnet** (*UNISON*) supported Composite 16. He said: Throughout my lifetime much of the terrorism experienced in the world has, in my opinion, been as a direct or indirect consequence of previous British and American foreign policy mistakes. The decision by our Government to support an illegal war in Iraq was such a mistake, which we said at the time would do nothing to make the world a safer place. Equally, the refusal to call for an immediate cease-fire in Lebanon was a disgraceful mistake that we must condemn, creating the impression throughout the Middle East and elsewhere that we were conniving with the Americans and Israelis to get at Hezbollah regardless of the cost in terms of the destruction of the Lebanese infrastructure and the widespread death of Lebanese civilians. Far from weakening Hezbollah, it has been strengthened. Israel did not even achieve its immediate aim of getting the release of the captive service men.

If we genuinely want to make the world a safer place there can be no more important international issue than the need to give freedom and justice to the Palestinian people -- one that provides for an independent viable Palestinian state alongside a secure Israel, but if our Government -- which I want it to do -- is to play a role in this process, we cannot demonstrate in our foreign policy the double standards that we currently do.

For example, if UN resolutions are so important and they have to be respected by Iraq and now Iran, then I say Israel should abide by the United Nations resolution and withdraw from all the occupied territories and stop the expansion of the settlements in the West Bank. If international law is so important, as it is, then Israel should recognise and implement the decision of the International Court of Justice and demolish the apartheid wall. If preventing nuclear proliferation is so important, as we are telling Iran, then we cannot ignore Israel's nuclear arsenal, developed in secret partly with our help.

We should be demanding that Mordechai Vanunu is allowed to move freely, having spent 18 years in prison for disclosing the nuclear weapons programme. If UN resolutions, if Geneva conventions and international law are ignored by Israel then we should be applying sanctions. We should be boycotting Israel, as my trade union is calling for, to show that their actions are totally unacceptable. We should stop selling arms to Israel, as we currently do, and we should end the favourable trade status that Israel has with the European Union. If democracy is so important, as it is, then I say we must recognise the legitimacy of the decision of the Palestinian people to elect the government they want and they should not be collectively punished by the withholding of European and other international aid, stopping funding the Palestinian authorities.

Equally we must condemn the imprisonment of members of the Palestinian Parliament. It is shameful that they have been held prisoner in Gaza.

The TUC has made it clear that we condemn suicide bombing and missile attacks to kill and injure Israeli civilians, and Israel does have the right to take steps to defend itself. But the response in Gaza and in the Lebanon has been completely disproportionate to the threat faced, and by any standard is unacceptable. The Palestinians have suffered too much for too long. They deserve justice and peace.

**Maggie Ryan** (*Transport & General Workers' Union*): First-time speaker at the TUC. We in the T&G strongly support Motion 74 on Palestine, especially the last paragraph. I work in the car industry in the West Midlands and I am a shop steward, a branch equality rep, and represent the branch on Birmingham Trades Union Council. I want to stress the importance of the last part of the motion and how we, as activists can build direct links with the Palestinian trade union movement.

Most workers do not know what the reality is for Palestinians living in the occupied territories. That is why we should as trade union activists be supporting the vital work of the Palestinian Solidarity Campaign, not just supporting but actively affiliating and getting involved with their campaigns. This is a good way to build direct links with Palestinian trades unionists. For example, Birmingham Trades Union Council set up alongside the Palestinian Solidarity Campaign the Birmingham/Ramallah initiative and that is how we discovered that the people of Ramallah needed us to fund raise for a library for the children in refugee camps, a practical example of trade union solidarity with Palestinian workers and their families.

Support the motion, support the Palestinian Solidarity Campaign. I urge everyone here to raise this in their unions and their branches.

**Sully Munir** (*Amicus*): Israel is an apartheid state. I thought that we had rid the world of apartheid but it exists today in Israel. It treats Palestinians like second class citizens. It has rights and laws based on race, which enshrine these injustices -- for example, the law of return for Jews. This is discrimination that none of us here would stand for.

The UN General Assembly Resolution 194 on the right of Palestinian refugees to return and to be compensated has been reaffirmed 135 times. During South African apartheid the Government of South Africa was armed by Israel. Today Israel is armed by the US. The President of the Congress of South African Trade Unions earlier on this year said that boycotts, sanctions and other pressures are the solidarity tools of the trade union movement, and these tools were used to succeed and free South Africans. They can now and will be used to free the Palestinians. This is what we must do otherwise history will not smile at us. They will look back and spit on our graves.

Those of you who are liberated, I beg you to liberate the Palestinians. We all know that Israel is acting as an agent of the US in the Middle East. Since the US lost its dictator in the Shah of Iran, Israel now receives more aid than the whole of Africa put together. The US has a project to reshape the Middle East by military means. The wars in Iraq, Afghanistan and Lebanon, along with the proposed attacks on Syria and Iran, form part of this regime. So does the support for the brutal Israeli regime.

Yesterday I stood up and I wore a red boiler suit because of the injustices that are faced by the people in Guantanamo Bay, Abu Ghraib and Israeli prisons. We as trades unionists must give a voice to the voiceless.

That is why we are trades unionists. Yesterday I was followed around the Congress here by the security services. I did not see anyone else having to put up with that. Afterwards my Muslim friends contacted me by phone and text; they were afraid I would get arrested, perhaps even worse. This is a climate of fear that has been created by the war on terror. It has been promoted by Tony Blair and funded by Gordon Brown. I stand here as a British citizen. When we are under attack we must stand together, whether I am Cuban, Irish, Arab, Venezuelan, Iraqi, Palestinian, Jewish or Kurdish. Above all we are human beings.

**Hugh Lanning** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supported Composite Motion 16. He said: As a union we have no special rights or legitimacy to speak on this issue. We have a conference policy to campaign for an independent, viable Palestinian state. As part of this, we support a two-state solution. We support working with democratic and workers' organisations in Israel and Palestine. We have tried to establish links with the Musawa Centre to provide support to the Palestinian Arab citizens who live and work in Israel, like the refugees often forgotten. However, supporting two states, working with both Palestinians and Israelis, does not and should not imply the same identical treatment and action on our part. In this country we recognise we have to take positive action to redress inequality. To support one does not mean we oppose the other.

We congratulate the FBU on putting forward this motion, congratulate the TUC on its response over the summer, but you could probably paper the walls that are left in Ramallah with the resolutions that have been passed supporting Palestine. UN resolutions say the refugees have a right to return, the occupation is illegal, the settlements are illegal, the Palestinians have the right to self-determination. But none of these are a reality.

After affiliating to the PSC, one of our earliest acts -- along with other unions -- was to sponsor their trade union conference on Palestine. In talking to the Palestinian trades unions at the conclusion of that conference, what were their two most important issues? They were not outrageous; they were not utopian. They wanted the maintenance of EU funding to the Palestinian authority and they wanted to get rid of the wall. The EU used the salaries of public servants, doctors, teachers and nurses as a bargaining chip, a draconian sanction, all because the Palestinians had the nerve to vote for the government of their choice. The wall is not just a little fence. If placed here it would have the beneficial effect of hiding the platform, the stage and the screens. It is imprisoning the Palestinians in an ever-diminishing part of their own land, creating a Palestinian ghetto from which some are allowed out to work.

France's invitation at that conference to the Palestinian unions to come and discuss practical support that we would give was welcome and I know will be followed up. This has been a difficult issue to debate for many years but there has been a shift. The marches in the summer were well supported but not festooned with huge numbers of trade union banners. Let us step forward together in support of workers in Palestine and Israel and make clear that the essential building block for peace is an independent viable state of Palestine.

**Steve Sinnott** (*National Union of Teachers*): I bring a special request from trades unionists in Palestine in the West Bank and Gaza, trades unionists who are teachers, trades unionists who are currently on strike and have been for the past ten days. Their request is for support and for solidarity for those teachers who are now in the most desperate of circumstances,

because they have not been paid for months, teachers who have relied upon what savings they had to support themselves and their families but their savings have run out, teachers who have been trying to borrow money from a whole range of different people and organisations, but they can no longer secure any credit. Teachers and their families are in the most desperate of circumstances, and they made an appeal to us in the National Union of Teachers to speak to the TUC and to ask for support.

I raised these issues on the General Council and I was fortunate enough to be able to raise those issues with the delegation that met with the Foreign Secretary during the course of this morning. We did not just go with a plea, we went with some suggestions and some ideas. Amongst our suggestions and our ideas was to call for those funds that are held by the Israeli Government, that should be there supporting the public services in the West Bank and Gaza, to be released. We made that call very, very strongly indeed to the Foreign Secretary. I have to say it was very pleasing indeed to receive a positive response from the Foreign Secretary. She authorised us to be able to say yes, she believes that the Israeli Government should release those funds now and without condition.

We also appealed for some emergency relief for those teachers, and to use the fund that the Foreign Office has set up to release emergency funds for front line public sector workers in health and indeed in education. We have offered the good services of Education International, our international trade secretariat, indeed also of the General Union of Palestinian Teachers and the TUC, to receive those funds and distribute them if necessary, but it should not be necessary. All the funding should be released to the legitimate Palestinian Authority and now that there have been some significant moves in order to establish a government of national unity we call upon the European Union and the British Government to do everything they can to support the public services, to support education and let us support all those people who are trying to build a good and a peaceful society in the West Bank, in Gaza, in Palestine.

**Sally Hunt (General Council):** The General Council supports this motion and we thank the movers of the original motion and the amendments for agreeing the composite.

I want to enter an explanation to make the General Council's position on this very important issue of refugees very, very clear. I want to draw your attention to the General Council's statement on the Middle East, which starts on page 118 of the General Council Report, and I want to report back formally on the meeting we had this morning with the Foreign Secretary.

First, on the issue of the right of refugees to return to their homeland, the road map, which the TUC supports, includes the provision for an agreed, just, fair and realistic solution to the refugees issue. The General Council remains completely committed to the road map's formulation on the refugee issue and the two state solution, as set out most recently in the General Council's statement agreed in July, and which is included, as I have said, in the General Council's report to you.

Congress, this morning, as you have already heard, after the Foreign Secretary spoke to Congress, a delegation met with her. We raised your concerns about the crisis in the Middle East, the prospects for the road map and the funding of the Palestinian Authority including the need to support teachers in Palestine who have, as Steve has said, gone without wages for several months and are now on strike. We spent over an hour and, in that tried and tested phrase,

had "a full and frank exchange" about developments in the Middle East and the Government's response to the crisis. She has made clear her commitment to the road map and her view that peace between Palestine and Israel is the main priority for the region without which no progress can be made on any other issue. We have briefed her on the plight of Palestinian trades unionists and their families and pressed her particularly hard on the need to assist the Palestinian teachers. She has committed to investigate what can be done.

She also made clear that the British Government are pressing the Israeli Government to release tax revenues, which rightly belong to the Palestinian Authority, without conditions.

Colleagues, ordinary people are paying the price once again. As trades unionists we commit ourselves to work with our brothers and our sisters in the region. What they need is peace, what they need are jobs, what they need is our solidarity. Please support the composite.

\* *Composite Motion 16* was CARRIED

### Trident

**The President:** We now move to the debate on Trident. First, I will call on Sally Hunt to move the General Council's statement on Trident and to indicate the General Council's attitude to Motion 65.

**Sally Hunt (General Council):** We are seeking your support for the General Council's statement, which was circulated to you all this morning. Our attitude to the RMT motion is to leave the matter to you, Congress, to debate and decide, which is unusual is it not!

I do not know about you but it is a bit groundhog day-like to me as we look back 25 years ago and celebrate the achievements of the women at Greenham Common. Many of you, I suspect, feel the same as I do about that particular issue and I am sure many of you were, like me, at Greenham. But the General Council's statement is not about that; it is about recognising that many unions in the TUC have not yet taken a position on the replacement of Trident, or not.

The statement that you have in front of you sets out the issues that we think unions will want to look at in reaching their decisions, such as diversification and public expenditure implications, and it pledges to consult unions without delay. It is purposefully broad because we want unions to make the decisions and we want the debate to start today. Congress, we believe that the Government should not rush into any final decisions about an issue that will affect us for decades, and our children, and we want them to consult with us fully, frankly and listen to our views.

Congress, please support the General Council's statement.

**Bob Crow (National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers)** moved Motion 65. He said: I am asking unequivocally that you support this resolution. The General Council have asked you to make your own minds up and I have to say that I am sure that since you just agreed to seek a peaceful solution in Palestine you will want peace all over the world. But if we start talking about nuclear weapons we will never have peace, because all the things that we have argued for this week, quite rightly so, whether it be in the manufacturing industries, social provisions, transport, we will never achieve unless we have peace. The fact of the matter is that the TUC has always had a proud, principled way of having no weapons of mass destruction. I find it remarkable that arguments are taking place in the Post Office services about privatisation and you hear government ministers saying we do not have enough money. We do not have

enough money in Liverpool and so they want to get rid of fire appliances. Not enough money in any kind of industry, it is all about money. You have to have a PFI or a PPP if you want it. Just like that old comedian, Tommy Cooper, if you remember, 'just like that' Gordon Brown can find £20 billion when it comes to weapons.

The reality of these weapons is that there is no necessity for it. I have to say about nuclear weapon, I find it hypocritical of this Government and the American Government when it turns around and says to the Government of Iran, "You cannot have nuclear weapons", that you cannot have nuclear weapons in North Korea, but it is OK for Great Britain and America and other countries to have nuclear weapons. I want to see no nuclear weapons in any country and the best way we can do it is not have the replacement of Trident in this country of ours. Two days ago we witnessed, after that horrific event in New York, the five years after the twin towers. What one of these weapons would do would make the twin towers look like a pimple on your backside if one of them went off.

The reality is that everyone I speak to says, "Well, we want to get rid of these nuclear weapons as well but the problem is that we have people working in the nuclear industry." I understand that. What happened when we had asbestos? We had people working in the asbestos industry and we diversified the work. What about when we used to hang people? We had chief executioners? We had to find work for them. We had to diversify them! No doubt they are now looked after by the First Division of Civil Servants. Of course, I tell you what you can do with those brilliant people in that industry, which they are, with their fantastic skills. No good telling people where I come from -- and other people can give me far better evidence about what take place in their own industry, for instance in UNISON, GMB and T&G -- but at Whipps Cross Hospital in Leytonstone there is an argument about whether to keep the cancer ward open. I see people on the TV saying that they cannot get hold of cancer drugs. I will tell you how you can diversify those people in that industry. You can give them the skills and you can give them the investment to go out there and start building hospitals instead of bombs; you can start giving them the industries to build public services; and, more importantly than that, I thought that this body stood for peace, I thought that what we campaign for is peace. Why do you want weapons of mass destruction to destroy society when we should be spending money on constructing society? We should send a clear message from the TUC, no replacement of Trident, no nuclear weapons and look after the people who serve in the nuclear industry.

**Chris Tapper** (*Communications Workers Union*) seconded the motion.

He said: I think we are going to have to understand that what Bob has been saying in relation to the whole of this issue is that it is one of the most fundamental motions at this Congress which we will be voting on today. It is not one nuclear weapon that we are talking about, but two hundred! Each one of these nuclear weapons is eight times more powerful than that which was dropped on Hiroshima where 140,000 people died. The Government has said that it is about to make the decision on whether to replace or extend Trident. That decision, they are saying, is going to be made this year. The decision, they say, is in our interests as a defence mechanism against terrorism. We have seen what terrorism has done. On 7<sup>th</sup> July we possessed Trident. That did not stop terrorism happening in London. Unfortunately, it did not dissuade the terrorists from their actions.

What nuclear weapons are doing is giving the opportunity to other countries to say to the UK "Well,

if you've got Trident, then we are going to have some nuclear weapons". If we turn round and adopt the policy we adopted thirty years ago of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, then this country should say, "If we are not having nuclear weapons, no one else is". We cannot, as Bob said, turn round to the rest of the world and say "We are keeping them, but you are not having them". Korea and Iran have been threatened with war for wanting to have nuclear weapons, yet we still have them.

Bob also mentioned the cost of Trident -- £25 billion to replace! Let me give you a couple of facts as to what £25 billion would mean to the people of Great Britain. It would provide pay for 125,000 newly qualified nurses for the next ten years; scrapping student top-up fees completely for the next ten years; 60,000 newly qualified teachers; 100,000 extra firefighters; protecting 90 million acres of rain forest. All of this you will see in the fact sheets that CND has produced. You will also see that some MORI polls have been conducted on whether we should replace Trident. Let me give you a couple of facts. The ICM poll in July 2006 indicated that 59 percent of the population said they did not want Trident replaced. However, the poll showed that 81 percent of those who took part in the poll want Parliament to vote on Trident. I think that is a good idea. Let us have a Green Paper in Parliament; let us have a public debate and let us have a debate in Parliament to assess whether or not we need nuclear weapons. My view is that we do not because the £25 billion, as I have mentioned, could be utilised elsewhere.

I have one final point to be made regarding jobs and the myth of jobs. It has been established on the jobs argument that for every pound put into Trident missiles is equivalent to more deaths. However, out of the 7,000 jobs we can put elsewhere, why don't we look at the wave technology in Faslane. Our members in Faslane could be utilised for diversification into other jobs. That is why the CWU seconds this motion and I hope the rest of Congress will follow.

**Harry Donaldson** (*GMB*) spoke in support of the motion and the General Council's Statement on Trident. He said: Let us be clear, the GMB has a lot of sympathy with Motion 65. However, our Union's position is that we have not debated the future replacement of Trident at present, so we will be abstaining on Motion 65. However, we welcome the General Council's statement and we wish to address some points within it.

The GMB is pleased that the General Council's statement recognises the difficulties of the union members who work within the MoD civilian workforce and the UK defence industries. Congress, those union members would be put out of work by this decision. These workers undertake highly skilled jobs on our behalf, and they also live and work in some of the most remote parts of Britain where there is very little alternative work, let alone skilled employment. The future of these union members, their families and communities in which they live, must be taken into consideration in a full, frank and open debate on the future of Trident.

Alternative and skilled work must be available for them in the future or the economic stability and social fabric of some of these remote communities will be significantly at risk. We ask you to support the General Council's statement.

**Barry Camfield** (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) in speaking in support of Motion 65 and the General Council's statement on Trident, said: In 1960 Frank Cousins went to the Labour Party Conference and had the courage to change the whole debate



about nuclear weapons in Britain. The T&G at that time and Frank took so much flak but opened real opposition and a movement against these weapons of mass destruction. He set alight a series of ideas which, in my union in particular, was so magnificently picked up by Ron Todd. Ron used to say: "When they fire them bombs, when one of their nuclear missiles comes over to me on one of their Merv rockets, I want to be standing right underneath it". What he meant was what they do to people, just as we saw what happened to people in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, is too horrific to contemplate. So these weapons are utterly unusable. Who are they going to aim them at? There is no Soviet Union threat any more against the West, or so-called threat. Take Afghanistan. Who are they going to fire them at? So this issue about the replacement is a complete fallacy. It will cost at least £25 billion worth of public expenditure.

What it does is to open up the issue of how rich a nation we are in Britain and how these resources can be spent. I think the courage of Frank Cousins has to be picked up by this generation today, and we should be arguing with Margaret Beckett and other comrades in the Labour Party for a new world order in which Britain plays a role in the world as a peacemaker and not a war monger.

The alternative that the GMB has given shows, I think, a very balanced position. I appreciate that people's jobs will be affected, and the General Council's Statement, I think, fully takes this point into account. Such an amount of money could be used in other ways. Why are our pensions suffering on £84 a week, yet we are preparing to blow £25 billion on a replacement for Trident. The NHS is suffering. We have heard of the firefighters' dispute in Liverpool and elsewhere. We have the wealth to sort out our own problems in this country.

We are comfortable that this Congress should make its own position clear in opposing the replacement of Trident. A discussion and debate involving wide government consultation should take place, as should a vote in Parliament on this matter and that the subject is fully transparent. Please support.

**Steve Warwick** (*UNISON*) in supporting Motion 65 and abstaining on the General Council's Statement, said:

The present Labour government leadership is committed to the replacement of Trident. They claim that this is to defend the UK, but the main threat at the moment to the UK, as has been said before, is terrorism. We know that the terrorists who carried out the terrible attacks in the US and in London were not deterred by nuclear weapons. A nuclear deterrent cannot serve any practical purpose in countering a terrorist threat, so why replace Trident? The government argues that the replacement for Trident is necessary in case we face a nuclear enemy in the future. Unfortunately, government thinking will not lead to more security for the UK, but it will lead to a proliferation of nuclear weapons.

How can we persuade countries like Iran not to develop nuclear weapons when we are spending billions developing our own replacement weapon system? Aren't those countries entitled to question our credibility and accuse the UK government of hypocrisy? The UK government claims that our nuclear deterrent is independent. How can it be when it is totally dependent on the US? We could not use it, even if we wanted to, without the support of the US, and we have to question how politically dependent we are on the US when it comes to nuclear weapons. After all, the actual missiles would be leased from the US military.

I come from UNISON, a public sector union. When we see the grotesque amounts of money being spent on weapons of mass destruction, we know it is immoral. At a time when we see services and jobs being cut in the NHS, for example, we need more resources put into mental health services, care for the elderly services and so many other public services which our communities depend on and need. We need a widescale public campaign against spending public money on Trident and we need to use our taxes to enhance the lives of millions of people instead of having the potential to destroy the lives of millions of people.

Yes, we have to solve the question of jobs but that is why UNISON is supporting the CND research on jobs diversion. It is not beyond us to resolve that. Please support the motion and, as I said, we will be abstaining on the General Council's Statement.

**Paul Noon** (*Prospect*) spoke in opposition to Motion 65. He said: I speak against Motion 65, and I also want to make a point about the General Council's statement. We agree most of what is in Motion 65. In particular, we agree that there needs to be a full and proper debate about the replacement of Trident before a decision is taken. We also agree very much with the consultation process, which is set out in the final paragraph of the motion, which seems sensible. We think that that consultation process needs to take account of a number of things. It needs to take account of the maintenance of safety and security for the UK, for the utility of the weapons system, of cost and economic issues, but also employment and the economic consequences for the areas and people concerned.

I make no apologies for saying that my union does not represent hangmen but it does represent a lot of the staff at the Atomic Weapons Establishment at Aldermaston and at Burfield, on the Clyde at Fulbrook, at Faslane and elsewhere. I am not saying that their interests should be the sole determining factor but it is a point that must be taken into account. In our view, this motion does not do that, and particularly the penultimate paragraph, which pre-emptly and seeks to pre-determine that consultation process. What is the point of a Green Paper and considering all the options when you have already made up your mind what the conclusion is going to be? It is an Alice in Wonderland situation; verdict first, trial later. So let us have that debate. Then, after we have consulted the people and the unions concerned, let us take a final view of the position and press that view on government. The workers in the industry deserve that at least.

The point about the General Council's statement is that we accept it as a reiteration of the 2003 policy and a multi-lateralist approach. We support the statement but we oppose Motion 65 and ask you to do likewise. Thank you.

**Alan Gibson** (*National Union of Journalists*) spoke in support of Motion 65. He said: This week gives us a fantastic opportunity to tell the next Prime Minister of this country precisely what sort of country we want that Prime Minister to help deliver. I think this issue goes to the very heart of the sort of country that we want. We need to ask ourselves three critical questions about this. First of all, do we or do we not want to continue to be a boot boy for the United States Administration's war machine? Let me quote from CND excellent brochure, which I would certainly advise colleagues to get hold of if they can. "All the features of the UK Trident system, the platform, the delivery system and warheads of Trident depend on US support. Trident warheads are based on a US design and several of their crucial components, without which they would not work, are manufactured in the US". In other

words, this is not an independent weapons system. Almost certainly its use would have to be cleared by the US Administration and so on and so forth. In other words, the continuing features of what we have seen with the foreign policy of the government to now will continue with the Trident system.

We also have to ask a question about whether we want this country to be a force for stability or instability in the world. As has already been said by speakers in this Congress, what about the utter hypocrisy of the UK government telling other countries that they cannot develop nuclear weaponry when the UK Government itself is doing precisely that? There is no doubt that if the UK adopted a new Trident system that many other countries in the world would follow the example of North Korea and develop their own system, leading to an even greater instability and danger throughout the world.

Finally, we need to ask ourselves the question that colleagues have already asked from this platform on this issue. Isn't there something better we can do with £25 billion? This week we have heard speeches against cuts in the Health Service, transport, the need of greater resources for pensions and the need of greater resources to solve world poverty. All of these things could be greatly helped by £25 billion.

On the issue of dangers to jobs, I do not think that there is any doubt that that £25 billion could be used to develop new technologies, alternative energies, new medical equipment, all of which we desperately want. That sum of £25 billion could be used to create all the jobs which could be lost as a result of the Trident programme not being pressed ahead with.

Finally, the most important thing which we can probably do about this issue is to go to 23<sup>rd</sup> September demonstration in Manchester at the Labour Party Conference to demand that the Government not only gets the troops out of Afghanistan and Iraq now, but also does not go ahead with the Trident missile programme. Thank you.

**Mary Compton** (*National Union of Teachers*) spoke in favour of Motion 65. She said: The National Union of Teachers has a long history of opposition to nuclear weapons. I suppose the most obvious reasons for teachers being in opposition to nuclear weapons is the amount of money that these weapons cost. As a matter of fact, Tony Blair admitted yesterday that for the past almost 10 years education spending in Britain has not even been up to the OEDC average, and during most of that time Britain was the fourth largest economy in the world. So that is a very cogent reason to be against nuclear weapons. Actually, I do not think that for teachers that is the most important reason.

As teachers we try to teach young people to resolve conflict peacefully. They learn about Hiroshima in English and history. How can we as teachers support the replacement of Trident, which could reap the destruction of 1,500 Hiroshimas. We as teachers teach young people the importance of fairness and justice. How could we defend, as other people have said, the idea that the UK, the USA and Israel can have nuclear weapons but Iran is not allowed to develop nuclear energy? We teach young people to keep their word and promises.

Well, the UK government in 2000 signed off on the Non Proliferation Treaty Agreement, which says that they would give an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenal. How does that square up, six years later, with saying that they want to replace Trident? Lastly, we teach young people the importance of science and knowledge, and how it can tackle the real injustices in the world like hunger and Aids. So how can we support science and knowledge being abused to murder

hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of people through nuclear bombs?

Colleagues, in this debate, I would like to see the TUC leading the factions in the debate which are against the replacement of Trident.

**Chris Murphy** (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*): Chair, thank you for letting me contribute. Anybody who has read the front page of the *Guardian* today will be able to read the first interview with the new chief executive of the National Health Service who is talking about cuts to A&E departments and maternity departments across the country. Yet we are sitting here today talking about supporting a policy which is going to cost, allegedly, £25 billion, yet at the same time we are going to see cuts in the health service, which has struggled in past years. Speaking as someone who is waiting for an operation on my throat, as you can gather, what I say is self-motivated.

Seriously, were nuclear weapons any deterrent to the Argentinians in the Falklands War? Has it been a deterrent to any other war since the Second World War? No, it has not. Every other year we are in some conflict across Africa or Europe. We have had Bosnia and Croatia. Has having had nuclear weapons made any difference to the situation? No, it has not. As was said earlier, the great alleged threat of the Soviet Union does not exist any more, principally because the Soviet Union does not exist, yet we are determined to go down the road of spending all this money just to support the Americans, for something which will never be used.

Let me ask you all a question. How many of you would go out and buy a brand new car today, take it home, park it outside your house or stick it in a garage and never use it for ten years? None of you would do that.

I ask that Congress supports Motion 65. I can appreciate what the TUC's statement is trying to do but, unfortunately, it does not achieve what they want. I think that needs to be opposed because this Congress must send a clear message and not walk away from this hall looking both ways at the same time. Thank you.

\* *The General Council's Statement was CARRIED.*

\* *Motion 65 was CARRIED.*

## Manufacturing

**Tony Woodley** (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) moved Motion 27.

He said: Colleagues, manufacturing is not just an economic question. It is not just an issue for the business pages but it is an issue which is at the heart of what we stand for – our class, our communities and, indeed, the economy of our country.

Last year when I came to this Congress I warned that we were facing a manufacturing meltdown. The situation is worse today with manufacturing being massacred, with a government devoid of any strategy whatsoever. Presently, we are less than a generation away from year zero for our manufacturing industry. The closure of the profitable Ryton plant is an act of pure corporate greed as they move east to make still greater profits at the expense of our people. The shutdown of the HP sauce plant in Birmingham – an historic British brand – is as a result of production being shipped overseas whilst, again, the British workforce is thrown to one side. The list is endless. Look at the thousand job losses at Vauxhall and other plant closures right across the country by the bucketful. One hundred and twenty thousand jobs have been lost in the past 12 months alone. At what price to our members? Many will not work again, certainly not on skilled and high paid jobs. That is absolutely for

certain. What is our Government's response? Let market forces rule – Okay! As one thick minister suggested, let skilled manufacturing workers do those low-paid shelf-stacking jobs which are out *there*.

Colleagues, this crisis is not going away. With China and India already on stream as manufacturing giants, at the end of the day, they have only scratched the surface of their potential. Left to the free market alone, China and India could be making everything we use in the next 20 years. Every other country in Europe recognises this situation, but it is only Britain which is leaving its industrial workforce to face this storm without any shelter. It is now time, we believe, to mobilise for a different policy. A new leader of the Labour Party, a new Prime Minister, must also mean a new agenda for manufacturing. It is time to take on the do-nothing dogma.

This composite spells out how. We need manufacturing champions to be nourished and, indeed, supported. That is what people want. Public opinion, clearly, is with us.

We conducted an opinion poll which showed that 90 percent of people believe that the government should do more for manufacturing. More than half – 53 percent -- believe that the Government should hold a financial stake in major manufacturing companies. That is what other countries do in Europe as well. Why should the public/private partnership always mean bringing private money into the public service? Why not put public money into strategically important private industry which has some short-term difficulties? We must also advance arguments for other forms of action as well; for a public spending policy and priorities which really does support our manufacturing industry, including public procurement. One hundred and fifty billion pounds is spent each year buying manufacturing goods. This Government could start by giving that work to our 64 Remploy factories which they are trying to close in this country today. That is a good start. We should also do what other governments do, and that is to protect British jobs, with changes to laws which do make our workers at present quick and easy to sack.

Manufacturing industry needs cheaper energy costs, which are presently crippling manufacturing industry. British workers and British companies must be given a real chance to survive in the difficult world out *there*. There is a window of opportunity opening to re-shape our government's agenda. Let us organise to make sure that anyone – anyone – who wants to lead this government or serve in the government – indeed, every Labour MP – is fresh to act on this agenda that will secure our manufacturing industries.

Comrades, if manufacturing matters to the economy of this country, and I believe it does, then we have to take action now, and this Government has to start listening. Thank you. Please support the composite.

**Barry Morris** (*Community*) seconded the motion.

He said: I am happy to second this motion, which reflects the profound concerns expressed at our conference in June. Jim O'Boyle of the T&G addressed our delegates about the proposed closure of Peugeot at Ryton. This dismal story follows Rover and is being repeated all the time in a whole range of manufacturing industries in this country. These are the real signs of a dramatic loss of jobs.

In March of this year, there were 3,051,000 manufacturing jobs in the UK. If the rate of loss is anything like the previous 12 months, the figure will fall below 3 million this month. Of course, it is true, as the Prime Minister said yesterday, that all western European economies are losing manufacturing jobs. Production of a whole range of manufacturing jobs is moving east to central Europe and China. But no

country is experiencing the haemorrhaging of jobs in industries at the rate that is being experienced in the UK. The overall high employment rate disguises the manufacturing crisis. The mounting balance of trade deficit and the slow rate of productivity improvement in Britain are the facts that tell the real story. The challenge for the TUC as a whole is to make the regeneration of manufacturing the top, national economic priority for this government. It is ignoring the major social costs to our nation – the destruction of communities. We are failing to admit that it will not be possible to maintain the improvement in public services without the increase in productivity which can only be generated through manufacturing.

One of the main reasons why we are losing more manufacturing jobs than other countries is because our workers are easier to sack than their counterparts across the Channel, so part of the answer is to make it as difficult to make people redundant here as it is there. Three weeks ago Corus closed the Workington rail plant, whose community had an unblemished record for more than 130 years, supplying the needs of British Rail and Irish Rail systems. Most of the production has been switched to Scunthorpe but the Corus plant in France, with much higher production costs, will receive additional work.

Colleagues, it was about five years ago when I stood at this platform with colleagues from the GMB and T&G when thousands and thousands of Coats Viyella workers heard of their pending redundancies on the radio. Progress has been little. The Government must always have an eye to the interests of manufacturing across a whole range of public policies. I second.

**Amarjit Singh** (*Transport Salaried Staffs Association*) spoke in support of Motion 27.

He said: Congress, since the privatisation of the railways, rolling stock manufacturer and maintenance has been dominated by multi-national companies like Alstom and Bombardier. Congress, the privatisation of the railway industry has been a disaster in many ways, but no sector of the industry has paid the price more than the rolling stock manufacturer.

Privatisation has directly led to the demise of this country's indigenous train building capability. Most are built overseas at the expense of our indigenous rolling-stock manufacturing industry. The short-comings in rolling stock provision are the direct result of the fragmentation consequent upon privatisation. The separation of rolling-stock from the train and infrastructure operators has made it more difficult to coordinate the activities of the industry to meet the needs for public transport.

Congress, the Prime Minister came here yesterday and gave us a notable speech highlighting amongst other things what Labour in government has delivered. Much as I recognise many of these achievements, there is one request I would still make of the Labour Government. It is a request that I would ask you to endorse. Tony, when public money is being used to deliver manufacturing in the UK, please make sure that the goods concerned are delivered by British workers. Congress, what could be more simple -- the British Government using British taxes to support British manufacturing.

**Keith Hazlewood** (*GMB*) spoke in support of Motion 27. He said: In April 2006 a report by Barclays Bank concluded that manufacturing was still an important part of the UK economy. It accounted for 14.5 percent of the economy, employed three million workers, comprising 155,000 different enterprises with a combined turnover of £465 billion. UK manufacturing jobs have declined by a third. Manufacturing has lost 1.1 million jobs in the past nine years spread across the

UK. A CBI survey in August showed that manufacturing is expected to shed a further 23,000 jobs during 2006. There are a number of reasons for job losses in UK manufacturing. These include globalisation and restructuring, competition from low waged cost economies, ranging from eastern Europe to China, environmental factors, including taxes and, of course – wait for it – weaker employment protection laws in the UK compared with other western EU states.

The Manufacturing Forum set up by the DTI is still more interested in the hi-tech side of manufacturing, industries such as aerospace, electronics and pharmaceuticals, rather than the widget/nuts and bolts end, where many ordinary jobs are. These jobs are better paid than similar jobs in the service sector, yet the DTI seems to think that it is okay if all of these jobs go to China and India. Manufacturing opportunities do exist in the UK through government procurement – they spend £150 billion on goods, services and buildings and purchase a range of products from pens to nuclear submarines. With this amount of purchasing power the public sector can create and transform markets.

Climate change and energy can also provide opportunities in wind, wave and tidal power, including biofuel, clean coal, carbon capture and micro-generation. However, these need pump priming, support and promotion. These are examples of the way in which the government can improve and maintain a manufacturing base in the UK. As has been seen, the government has the power to create and influence markets, even in a free-market economy. However, there needs to be a will and attitude to do this. I ask you to support this resolution.

**Michael Kavanagh** (*Communication Workers' Union*) speaking in support of Motion 27, said: As somebody who lives in Coventry, I am supporting the Peugeot workers because I have friends who worked in that plant and I have seen them lose their homes, trying to re-mortgage having lost their jobs. It is an absolute disgrace that this Government allowed firms like Peugeot and Ford, with Jaguar in Coventry, to pull up stakes and sack people from their jobs. It is about time, as a TUC, that we got behind these people and gave them 100 per cent support. The campaign that is being run concerning Peugeot, about people not buying Peugeot vehicles, is absolutely dead right and it is about time we started supporting that campaign.

**Richard Clifton** (*Amicus*) spoke in support of Motion 27. He said: The amount of manufacturing jobs in the UK is half what it was when Labour came into power in 1997. This is due, in part, to countries like China and India emerging as industrial powers. What we must have now is a level playing field to stop multi-national companies closing down their manufacturing plants in the UK and moving their work to other plants in Europe and beyond. This situation was seen in the disgraceful decision to close the Peugeot plant in Ryton to name just one example.

Yesterday, I had the opportunity to ask the Prime Minister a question. I asked him what the Government was doing to change the fact that it is easier, quicker and cheaper to sack UK workers? It came as no surprise to me that he did not answer the question. He did not answer that question and, as a result, did not satisfy the thousands of workers who work in the manufacturing sector.

Let us not forget what is in the Warwick Agreement. It states: "Labour will be pro-active to ensure manufacturing does not lose critical mass and disappear." I hope that does not happen too late for our members. Please support the motion and the amendments.

\* *Motion 27 was CARRIED.*

## Science

**The President:** I call Motion 28. The General Council supports the motion.

**Sue Ferns** (*Prospect*) moved Motion 28.

She said: Hundreds of millions of people in the UK and throughout the world today are alive and healthy because of the pioneering work of our scientists and researchers. Those are not my words but those of the Prime Minister. The value of research cannot simply be measured by its economic impact. Those are not my views, but those of Boris Johnson in a recent media interview. Boris is not generally known as the most progressive of thinkers, but in this context Prospect agrees wholeheartedly with them both, yet the rhetoric does not match the reality, at least not if you are a scientist in the public sector.

In the past couple of years, the Government has closed world leading institutes and programmes, including research into breast cancer, chemicals in food and animal diseases, and research into the impacts of climate change, pollution and biodiversity all face substantial cuts. The remaining staff face uncertain futures, continual organisational reviews and poor career prospects. No wonder that moral is low and many scientists vote with their feet, even before the axe falls.

Furthermore, Prospect's own investigation show that once public research facilities close, less than one in four of the staff find alternative employment in scientific research anywhere in the economy. This represents a major loss of investment in highly qualified and highly skilled staff. But why should you be bothered? After all, you have already this week debated many other urgent and important issues, not least public services, the NHS and pensions. However, though the achievements of public science are often unsung, every one of us will, in some way, benefit from it. Have you ever suffered from food poisoning? If so, you will know the importance of the work to tackle diseases such as campylobacter and salmonella. Has anybody who you know ever had medical treatment involving magnetic resonance imaging; for example, to diagnose a tumour or a stroke? Do you think that biomass crops should help in combating climate change? If so, it is thanks to public sector scientists.

Public scientists also provide the front line of defence for disease outbreaks such as FMD, BSE and Avian Flu. Yet despite the remarkable achievements and resilience of our members, we know that the current approach is completely unsustainable.

Prospect is not opposed to change where it is needed and justified, and we are not saying that we have an anti-science government. Far from it. However, in trying to understand how we have reached the current parlous position, we are bound to conclude that there is a strategic failure across government to take on the key responsibility of care for the national science base. We know that devolved decision-making is the fashion, but it is not appropriate in every case. In this context, it allows departments and research institutes to proceed to cut or close facilities on the basis of business cases which may make sense in the context of their own narrow remits but have no regard for the wider implications or potential losses to Britain's core scientific capability. Add to this the effects of complex, competitively based funding arrangements that leave many research institutes with the low level of core funding from their parent bodies. It, then, only takes a change in the research priorities of one funding body to destabilise the entire organisation. Finally, the Government simply does not know how

many scientists it employs, let alone their areas of expertise. It, therefore, cannot make any credible assessment of its own capability to meet future needs. That is why earlier this week, with welcomed support from the TUC and sister unions, we published a charter setting out the actions that the government needs to take to contain the mounting crisis in public science. The charter, like our motion, calls for recognition of the crucial role played by science for the public good, decent pay and careers for staff based on a better knowledge of existing capability, a halt to cost-driven lab closures and privatisation and open decision-making. We also want a Cabinet Minister with authority and accountability for public sector science and a similar ministerial role in the devolved administrations.

Please support our motion and our charter. You can do so easily and quickly by logging on to Prospect's website and following the links on our home page.

Throughout the year we have been asking for a series of campaign briefings: Who is looking after UK science? Who is looking after Scottish science and, only last week, who is looking after DEFRA science? So far we have not had a satisfactory answer to any of these questions. In the public interest, it is about time we did. Please support the motion.

**Dennis Hayes** (*University and College Union*) seconded the motion. He said: Science for the national good is under threat. That is the message in the motion. It might as well read "Science for human good is under threat". Why? Because there is a widespread loss of confidence in science, and that is because there is a widespread loss of confidence in human progress. Sadly, academics are at the forefront of promoting this widespread loss of confidence. If any of you have read the best seller by John Gray *Straw Dogs*, which actually argues that the struggle to change the world is something that we should never attempt, that we should be happy just staying where we are and living in servitude. He actually puts that view forward. The book has been described a wonderful work of philosophy.

But the widespread loss of confidence in science is something that can be tackled, but it has consequences. Let me mention two of them, one of which we have heard a lot of nonsense about. If you take homeopathy, the alchemy of turning water into money, as it has been called – massive profits are being made from it – based on the idea that water has a memory. What absolute nonsense. Two minutes in a chemistry class would refute that idea.

I have students who, occasionally, come up to me and declare themselves to be witches. Look at the superstitious nonsense that is paraded on every single programme. Worst still, if you have no faith in science, then there is no point in teaching it and if you look at the new science curriculum, it is not really about science but awareness of science and attitudes to science. There is very little science in it. Increasingly, science is becoming an option in schools. In universities science teaching is threatened with departmental closures. There is no consistent defence of science. You will remember that in Victorian times 60 percent of human misery was toothache. That has all gone. The benefits of science are there for everyone to see. Most importantly, if we do not confidently defend science, knowledge and progress, we are never going to achieve everything we want.

In 1626 Bacon wrote in the *New Atlantis*: "Science allows you to have knowledge of the causes and secret motions of things and the enlarging of the bounds of human empire to the effecting of all things possible". Science brings about the effecting of all things possible.

Congress, have confidence in science. Be actively pro-science and support this motion. Keep trying to change the world. Thank you.

\* *Motion 28 was CARRIED*

### The Economy

**Allan Garley** (*GMB*) speaking to paragraph 4.2 of the General Council's Report said: I speak with specific reference to globalisation. The paragraph makes reference to the UK gaining from globalisation of trade and investment, but that the gains were not spread evenly. It goes on to say: "And some workers' jobs were at risk." Congress, the phrase "some workers' jobs were at risk" is very much an understatement and makes it seem like a small issue. Everyone is aware, of course, that it is not a small issue and all too often redundancies are declared by companies who are the main or the only major employer in towns and cities across the UK.

Only last week we saw Thomas Burberry, supplier of high class goods, declaring a profit forecast of £170 million and at the same time announcing closure of a factory in Treorchy in the Rhonda Valley. The union was advised about the closure via an answer machine message on the telephone! As you would expect, the 300-plus GMB members are expressing anger and rage at the way Burberry has conducted itself. That is corporate greed at its worse.

The company needs to be made aware that this closure will be resisted. The company should not be surprised if the so-called high-class corporate image takes a battering over the next few weeks and months.

President, paragraph 4.2 quite rightly demands employment protection, but, in addition, we should also take every opportunity to demand an end to the claptrap of the free trade and open market philosophy. Thank you, President. (*Applause*)

### Quality of Work

**The President:** I call Composite Motion 7, quality of work. The General Council supports the motion with an explanation. I will call the General Secretary during the debate to explain the General Council's position

**Jonathan Baume** (*FDA*) moved Composite Motion 7.

He said: First, let me give you the good news. About 20 percent of the workforce remain union members. The bad news, of course, is the other 80 percent are not. As we know, 30 years ago this Congress was a major national event. Now we are just a sideshow to Labour Party politics and tumbleweed rolls again around the ghost town that is the Conference Centre press room. Any objective observer would say that unions just do not matter that much any more. So what should we do?

The challenge is clear. We must rebuild our membership, our legitimacy with employers and our credibility with the Government. Of course, sometimes this may require a robust challenge to bad employers and a focus on enhancing the protection for the most vulnerable. But an adversarial or conflict-driven strategy is unlikely to be successful in most circumstances. All the evidence shows that most employees report at least some job satisfaction and they want to join unions and "work with the employer to improve workplace and working conditions" rather than organisations that simply see themselves as having the main function of defending workers against bad treatment.

I have argued before that it is absurd to suggest that a return to the lost world of the pre-1979 period is either possible or desirable and we will never recover our status as an estate of the realm. If we want to grow in the future, we need a subtle understanding of

contemporary problems and we have to be able to work with good employers to develop sustainable solutions.

There can be little doubt, for example, that people are working harder now than ever. We can say with confidence that the world of workers got tougher during the past 20 years. Read the Workplace Employment Relations Survey. People say in that they never get the time to get the job done, that their work makes them feel tense most of the time and many workers report that they worry a lot about their job outside working hours.

Despite the rhetoric of empowerment, the best research shows that task discretion control over the process of work has declined during the past decade. Whilst job insecurity has fallen amongst most groups, the best paid workers express a higher level of job insecurity than was the case 10 years ago.

I am not going to suggest for a moment that the experience of work is relentlessly awful. Indeed, when we look back over the past 40 years, the problems we face today often feel relatively small-scale and manageable. Long-term unemployment has virtually disappeared; inflation is low and pay growth in the private sector has actually been robust, as it has been in many parts of the public sector. All of this suggests that it is the quality of work rather than the quantity of work that should be of most concern to employers, to us as trade unions and to the Government today.

Of course, that means that we also require a definition of what we mean by good work or quality employment. There is a wealth of research out there to look to. Good jobs are characterised by the degree of employment security, a high level of interest and challenge, procedural justice in the workplace and a proper balance between a worker's effort and the rewards that he or she receives. This, in turn, embraces non-pecuniary rewards, praise for good performance, support from managers and respectful treatment at work. Of course, jobs that lack these characteristics are self-evidently bad jobs and are much more likely to generate work-related physical or mental illness.

A focus on improving the quality of working life ought to appeal to the Government, to employers and to those 80 percent of unorganised workers that we must reach out to. It speaks to real problems in the world of work. It takes employers at their words when they say, "My employees are the greatest assets in the business." It offers governments the prospect of a constructive dialogue rather than futile arguments. It can help to enhance or rebuild trust and respect in relationships with employers and members themselves, which, in turn, can improve overall productivity.

Creating more sustainable, high quality jobs must be at the centre of any strategy for building the trade union movement. We must be advocates not of justice, not just of fairness, but of high productivity and performance and come to the table with solutions and not just a litany of complaints. That, I argue, is a route for resurgence for Britain's trade unions. *(Applause)*

**Terry Hoad** (*University and College Union*) seconded Composite Motion 7.

He said: This composite motion is about people's satisfaction with their working lives and about the relationship between job satisfaction and the quality of work done. I am going to talk about these things primarily as they affect members of my union, namely, professional staff in further and higher education, but almost everything I am going to talk about will resonate with all workers right across the public sector.

Dissatisfaction with the quality of their working lives has been growing amongst HE and FE staff for a long time. The older ones can still just remember better times. What are the reasons for this decline in

satisfaction? Firstly, our jobs have simply become more demanding. Many more people now have the chance to pursue their education in FE colleges and in universities. That is right and good, but there has been no corresponding increase in staff providing these services.

Staff/student ratios in higher education, for example, are now worse than those in secondary schools. Successive governments have consistently failed to provide the necessary investment and, as a consequence, our members in FE and HE institutions carry increasingly heavy workloads and work longer hours.

Secondly, pay. Has pay risen in recognition of this increase in workload? No, of course it has not. Over the past two decades or so, HE professionals' pay has fallen 40 percent behind that of equivalent groups. Even Tony Blair admits that pay levels are unacceptably low.

Finally, managerialism. In FE and HE, in common with the rest of the public sector, our members are being subject to management theory and techniques practised in the private sector and imported into our public services. Predictably enough, the results have been extremely damaging. Staff are made to work within tight budgets, devise more to satisfy some notion of a business plan than to achieve teaching and research goals. When departments fail to balance their books, what happens? The automatic response is to resort to redundancies or even closures of whole departments. Those of us lucky enough to keep our jobs are being subjected to micromanagement to ensure that we meet our performance targets, which have little to do with the quality of service and everything to do with maximum volume for minimum expenditure.

All these factors, increased workloads, poor pay, intrusive management and growing job insecurity are producing record levels of stress. Research commissioned by the UCU found 50 percent of respondents reporting signs of stress and we know that we are not alone. Stress is endemic throughout our public services. Work-related stress accounts for more than one-third of all the cases of ill-health throughout society. In 2004/2005, almost 13 million working days were lost due to stress, depression and anxiety. This situation cannot go on.

Our public services are absolutely essential to the well-being of society, but, however hard we work and however dedicated we are, our colleges, universities and the whole public sector will fail in their task if staff are exhausted, stressed and demoralised. I second the motion, therefore, and I urge you to give it your full support. *(Applause)*

**Simon Williams** (*Connect*) supported Composite Motion 7.

He said: Congress, I am one of a growing mass of workers who cannot be seen on the trains or in the traffic jams of the daily commute. We cannot be found in the canteens or around the water coolers catching up on last night's television. In fact, we cannot really be seen anywhere because we work from home.

On the whole, homeworking is pretty positive. I get to save on my own time and I do my bit to help the environment by cutting down on the travel to and from work. It allows me to work more productively wherever I am and it means that I can make work fit around my home life.

However, it is hard to live without day-to-day social contact that most people take really for granted, like having a chat with a colleague while passing through the office or making a cup of tea. I cannot really call a workmate just to say, "Isn't the weather nice?" Yet,

working alone without just this kind of personal contact can be a pretty lonely experience.

In addition, we often feel that we have to work harder than our office-based colleagues just to prove that actually we do not spend most of our time watching daytime television. Whilst I know that this debate might not seem relevant to every union here, as a movement, we do need to look at how technologies, like mobile communications and email, have changed the way in which we work. They make it increasingly difficult to draw a line between work and home. Managers begin to expect their employees to be checking their emails at weekends and to take a work call at any hour.

Trade unions can use communication technology to help people get a better work/life balance, but we must also ensure that Britain does not sleepwalk into an "always-on" culture. Please support the Composite Motion 7. (*Applause*)

**Dave Bean** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) supported Composite Motion 7.

He said: I draw Congress's attention to a dispute currently in the HM Revenue and Customs Department which is due to the introduction of new working patterns into large processing offices called 'LEAN'.

LEAN is supposed to simplify the processing of tax work done in those large processing offices, but the reality is very different indeed. Essentially, LEAN is about the Government's aim of cutting 12,500 jobs in Revenue and Customs by April 2008 with the aid of consultants, which have so far cost the Department £7.5 million. The result is that staff who remain to carry out those alleged efficiency savings have to work harder to compensate; hence, the introduction of LEAN management techniques which were developed in the motor industries of Japan and the USA.

However, how LEAN is being rolled out in HM Revenue and Customs is based on the dumbing down of work and hourly monitoring of individuals with a culture of naming and shaming with the use of white boards; white boards in areas such as not reaching targets; league tables of individuals' work done and, instead of rewarding good performance, actually introducing a system of 'A Worst Performer of the Week' award.

Not only is this having an adverse effect on the service to the public in respect of an ever-increasing backlog of work, which is often not done properly and sometimes not done at all, and that includes cases such as deceased cases and repayments of tax, it is also having an adverse effect on PCS members who have become demoralised and demotivated leading to higher stress levels. This is all because the highly trained and experienced revenue workers who exist are being told to always put quantity before quality. The LEAN working process has been rolled out without the involvement of PCS in its evaluation or, so far, involvement with the roll-out programme itself. Importantly, management refused to shift on the issue of hourly monitoring of the individual leading to what could be termed as 'corporate bullying'. That is why on 31st July those members working in the large processing offices in Revenue and Customs took strike action to secure demands which are quite simple; a proper evaluation of LEAN; union involvement in the roll-out programme and, most importantly, a shift back to quality work based on team work rather than the harassment of the individual.

That is why PCS support this composite because in Revenue and Customs LEAN processing is based on bad work organisation and job design with no control over your own work leading to sick absences due particularly to stress.

Congress, PCS says put quality back into our work and the resultant effect on members' morale will then

result in a better service, which is, surely, what the tax-paying public deserve. Thank you. (*Applause*)

**Brendan Barber** (*General Secretary*): Gloria, thank you. I can be very brief. The General Council support this composite motion and the range of important issues it identifies that have an impact on the quality of working life. The reservation simply relates to the best way of picking up that agenda and developing the TUC's work programme.

You will see that the final paragraph of the composite proposes the establishment of a task group. The General Council would like to look at that specific procedural way forward. There may be other better ways of engaging unions in the debate on these issues. The General Council wants to have scope to consider the different options rather than being specifically committed to the establishment of a task group.

\* *Composite Motion 7 was CARRIED*

**The President:** Congress, as you know, we have significant outstanding scheduled business. I took a large number of additional speakers on Palestine and Trident. They are clearly important issues for us at Congress. However, as a result, we are now running substantially behind schedule. I have consulted with the General Purposes Committee and their advice is that additional speakers should not be taken unless opposing the motion.

From this point, I will, therefore, begin to restrict the number of additional speakers. If we are unable to regain time, I may have to consider reducing speaking times tomorrow to four minutes for movers of motions and two minutes for all other speakers. Delegates should begin to prepare their contributions and speeches for tomorrow accordingly. I hope it is clear. If we do not regain time, four minutes tomorrow for your speeches if you are moving and two minutes for all other speakers. That means seconds as well as any other contributors.

#### **Bank Holidays**

**Derek Simpson** (*Amicus*) moved Composite 30.

He said: Congress, I will do my best to help you catch up on the time by being very quick. I do not have to argue to you why this motion is here. It has to be wrong to work for additional promised holidays. It has to be wrong to consider that the payment for those holidays may be taken out of the minimum wage; so I do not reckon I need to persuade anybody.

However, there is just one point because I think this is important. When you get to my age, you forget things; so I cannot remember whether it was in this Congress or whether it was in the Labour Party Conference -- I think it was in this hall -- when Alan Johnson, shortly after the elections and shortly after Warwick, strode proudly across to the rostrum and actually told us that the Government had already delivered on holidays. Can any of you who were at either of those conferences, whichever one it was, remember how pleased and delighted we were at how quickly the Government had responded? Well, of course, they had taken the power to do it; what they had not done was do it. That is the difference. Since you were a part of Warwick, it is really a matter of concern and is behind some of the other arguments.

Let me tell you this. It is one thing to come forward to the platform and deliver fancy speeches; it is one thing to exploit the emotions of it; it is indeed another thing that is needed actually to do it. If anybody wonders why Labour has lost 4 million votes, lost half its membership, lost the local elections, lost in by-elections, remains fearful of the Scottish elections and the Welsh Assembly and is 10 points behind the Tories, it is because they do too much talking and not

enough doing! *(Applause)*

**A delegate** (*Transport and General Workers Union*) formally seconded motion 30.

\* *Motion 30 was CARRIED.*

### Transport Policy

**Andy Bain** (*Transport Salaried Staff's Association*) moved Motion 56. He said: I believe that at the Labour Party Conference two years ago a motion calling for public ownership of the railways was won. This was despite enormous pressure being put on the TSSA, particularly our General Secretary, and on the conference delegates. The pressure was applied by some of the same people who have been here this week, smiling, answering questions and dining with us. The big lie technique was used and claims of £22 billion to renationalise the railways were made. The rail unions have worked together commissioning research to analyse the financing of the industry. We made an overwhelming case for public ownership on the grounds of costs, as well as for environmental, performance, planning and safety reasons, but the Labour Party refused to include this popular conference policy in its manifesto. As we know, the election was won fairly convincingly. The next time, though, it is likely to be much closer.

Opinion polls are on our side, so why do Labour leaders persist? Is it because a reversal of privatisation of the railways would be an admission that the 'private good - public bad' ideology has failed and that this would lead to increased demands for the same in housing, health, education and public services? The TSSA will certainly be asking this question of prospective leaders and deputies.

We in the TSSA have tried to make it easy for our politicians. We undertook a very successful consultation with our members to look at the details of how we could bring the now very complex railway industry into public ownership and to prioritise this. The report is on our website. We hope it will assist the Labour Party when it eventually sees sense.

Network Rail brought the maintenance of the real infrastructure in-house and this was welcomed by the rail unions at the time. This motion calls for the next step to be the bringing of the passenger train operated companies into public ownership with Network Rail acting as the parent company.

Many of our members have expressed concerns about the industrial relations style of Network Rail, and this would certainly have to be addressed in the process. We considered handover at the end of the franchises, but this would take up to 20 years which is too long. We could start, however, with GNER, who, we hear, are going cap-in-hand to the Government asking for more taxpayers' money.

The motion also addresses the issue of safety and security at stations from lower level crime up to the threat of terrorism. Stations will be safer and will be perceived to be safer if they are adequately staffed, equipped and protected. We would all, of course, rather wait in a weather-proof, clean, well-lit and maintained station rather than the opposite.

The role played by front line transport and emergency personnel on the day of the bombings in London last year was praised at the 2005 TUC and also by government ministers. However, the Government's transport security agency, TRANSEC, and the railway companies do not seem to have recognised this in their reluctance to meet the unions on security issues. We want to talk to them about your and our safety and security. The eyes of well-trained, well-treated staff in adequate numbers have to be one of the best safeguards.

Whilst we are on terrorism, the majority of the British public knows that our following of US foreign policy has a significant impact on the risk of terrorism. The Prime Minister blames people who come here, do not speak English and preach hatred, but, Tony, the cat is out of the bag. The public knows. The Haliburton war and your support of Israel occupation is the cause. Reverse these and we make the railways, the stations and the cities of Britain safer for the public passengers and railway workers.

Congress, support this motion. It is good for Labour, it is good for the railways and it is good for our own safety. Thank you. *(Applause)*

**Bob Law** (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) seconded Motion 56.

He said: I have only three minutes to defend my own job when Tony Blair had an hour and-a-half to defend his, but that's life! *(Applause)*

In 1985, I was kicked out of the East London Line when Ken Livingstone was then back in charge of the GLC and, at the same time, in 1985 Tony Blair said, "To anyone thinking of grabbing our railways so that they can make a quick profit, so our network is broken up and sold, I say this. There will be a publicly owned and publicly accountable railway system under a Labour Government." Well, I am still waiting for that to come back on the main line and now, during the last few years, they have been trying to sell off all sections of the London Underground.

Twenty years on from that, Livingstone is back in charge of the London Underground and he is getting rid of me again. I am beginning to take it personally! In the words of Kenneth Williams, "Infamy, infamy, he's got it in for me!" *(Laughter amidst applause)* He is saying it is not privatisation, but, no one knows what job and under what conditions we are going to be working in 2010 when the line re-opens. Of course, we welcome the extension of the East London Line, we need more transport, but we want it publicly owned and publicly accountable. If it looks like privatisation, if it smells like privatisation, it is privatisation, and we are not going to stand for it.

All privatisations have been a disaster for the workers and for the public. The only people who like it are those who have been making the profits, i.e. BT, gas, water, the lot. British Rail takes more in subsidies now to these fat cats than it did under the old British Rail system. As they say, it is not even a proper market economy which is something they all go on about. There is no risk. It is just profit after profit after profit. They make Roman Abramovich look honest!

However, the main thing about privatisation is not the fact that it affects my job, my wages and conditions, but that it is dangerous. Privatisation is dangerous. We hear horror story after horror story at our district council about what our infrastructure workers have to put up with where the various agencies are using untrained, undertrained people to work alongside, whilst putting their lives at risk. We have had all sorts of things go wrong. We had a situation last year where circuit breakers, which were supposed to help trip out the power, did not work because they had not been maintained by the private contractors because no one realised they needed to maintain them!

I have to say this. There have been disasters on British Rail since privatisation, like Paddington, Southall, and so on. When those things happen underground, as you know from the disaster last year on 7th July, it is a horror. To anyone who says we cannot fight against privatisation, I would quote what the great man said: "The great only appear great because we are on our knees." Well, it is time we got up and started fighting! *(Cheers amidst applause)*



**The President:** I will not comment on a RMT member going across a red light, but never mind!

\* *Motion 56 was CARRIED*

### Integrated Transport

**Andy Reed** (*Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*) moved Composite Motion 12.

He said: We move Composite Motion 12 from a position of talking in great depth with our colleagues in the T&G and the United Road Transport Union. We believe, as a union, that the time has come in this country for the transport workers to start getting organised. We do so from a belief also that each and every one of us has a role to play in this country in moving the infrastructure, the goods and the customers around the rail network. However, we do not do it from a position also of agreeing with any form of privatisation of the network. We do not accept when light rail comes into being that it is at the expense of drivers' jobs within the main line side of things. We believe that they should be complementary and they should be supporting each other around the country.

We also do this on the back of the debates that we have had during this Congress about the environment, pollution and what is going to happen. This week I have heard the Government telling us, "It is for you to sort out", for us as individuals. They are not prepared by any stretch of the imagination to put any resources into this. Well, let's take this as a first step, then, that if we start as a real union promoting the movement of goods and services to hubs around the country where it can be collected and moved on to the points that are required by road haulage, by the van drivers and other people in that field, that should be done because if we are looking at the CO2 emissions from transport itself, some 40 percent of CO2 emissions come from within that particular area. We are prepared to move forward to try to eliminate that CO2 emission.

However, we also want to sit down with the other unions in the transport sector and start to talk with seriousness about how again we move forward on the integration of transport. We believe from ASLEF that the only way we can do that is through the good auspices of the TUC, to facilitate those meetings and that we, as trade unions, at long last can sit down and have serious debates instead of petty squabbles that continue within the transport sector at this moment. *(Applause)*

**Rob Monks** (*United Road Transport Union*) seconded Composite Motion 12.

He said: I address you on behalf of all professional lorry drivers in the UK. In deference to Gloria's request, I will not deliver a long-winded speech to Congress. It just is not necessary. The issues to be voted on and outlined in Composite Motion 12 are clear for everyone to understand. I would add this short comment, though, speaking on the FBU emergency motion before lunch, our comrades in the RMT were absolutely right. It is right and proper that international issues of solidarity are debated. However, we must look inwards, sometimes at our own TU solidarity. It is encouraging to hear the mover of Composite Motion 12 talk about unions working together for the good of our members. Comrades, I urge you to vote for Composite Motion 12 and, in doing so, can we please have some solidarity within the TUC to ensure its swift implementation? *(Applause)*

**Graham Stevenson** (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) supported Composite Motion 12.

He said: We wholeheartedly welcome the call for a TUC transport committee. The need cannot be

overstated. Freight transport workers get the lowest wages and highest workload of any transport worker with the least social protection. The industry operates at the lowest cost margins possible, yet logistics now by air, sea and land have replaced manufacturing as the core of modern industry and transport workers occupy a new strategic position in the global economy. Just-in-time production and the massive reliance on imported goods places the UK in a remarkably vulnerable position to concerted action by workers if they have petty squabbles.

As BBC's Newsnight noted during the West Coast US ports lock-out three years ago, "If the wheels stop turning, the economy stops working". Good transport infrastructure costs money, yet more than a billion pounds has been fruitlessly spent by the Government on transport investment inquiries since the year 2000; £254 million on Crossrail with not a single inch of tunnel dug whilst the figure of 25 new tramlines promised by John Prescott to be completed within the next three years has so far turned out to be two.

All over the country we hover on gridlock. Our cities have the lowest levels of investment in public transport in the European Union, perhaps a tenth of that which is typical in other countries, and the highest fares, sometimes three times that of European levels. Munich has three times as many bus lanes as Manchester, which has one of the highest car parking levels per population in the whole of Europe. It is New Labour's ideological fixation that the private sector must lead that prompts this stunning record of inaction. The cost of replacing Trident is £15 billion. Imagine what such a sum would do to transport provision and free up our cities and motorways.

All trade unions, especially transport trade unions, need to work cooperatively in the interests of the economy, of society and of our members to make this composite the start of something truly big. Let's mark this day as the day that we truly put transport at the highest level of our political agenda. I support.

*(Applause)*

\* *Composite Motion 12 was CARRIED*

### Thomson/TUI Call Centre, Glasgow

**Gerry Doherty** (*Transport Salaried Staffs' Association*) moved Emergency Motion 2.

He said: In moving this emergency motion, I call to the attention of Congress the plight of those workers so callously treated by an employer that either does not know or does not care about workers' rights in this country in the 21st century.

We have heard quite a bit this week about vulnerable workers and about how this movement should and could organise the unorganised, protect the vulnerable and give a voice to the currently voiceless. Just allow me to give you an insight into what we have tried to do as a trade union in recent times. Some years ago, we identified the travel trade as a potential for trade union organisation; an industry of some 100,000 people currently largely unorganised, crying out for trade union representation to tackle the very real human problems that exist in all too many of those workplaces, low pay, high turnover, sexism, bullying and discrimination, to name but a few. We put a lot of limited resources into trying to organise that industry. I am not ashamed to say that, in the final analysis, we did not achieve all of our goals, but we did achieve some. We have had a comprehensive report into that project. I want to thank Alison McGarry of the TUC for doing that job for us. That report is available to any union that wants to go into an unorganised sector of industry to share with you the lessons that we learned.

One of the aims that we did achieve during that campaign was recruitment of previously unorganised workers in various locations around Britain. One of

those locations was Thomson Holidays Call Centre in Glasgow. Congress, I want you, if you would, to give a very warm welcome to some of the people from that call centre who have taken the trouble to come down and seek your support here today. *(Applause)*

Ironically, two weeks ago, I was on a Thomson's holiday in Majorca. If you want some advice on holiday destinations, just pin back your ears. If you are in your 50s, as I am, and you want a break, a nice rest in the sun, don't let your 14-year old daughter coerce and blackmail you into taking her to Magaluf in August! *(Laughter)* Sun, sea and sand were in abundance. Sleep was somewhat rationed! *(Laughter)*

I am not an avid reader of the red top media, but when I am abroad, I like to keep up with events in the football world. Can you imagine my absolute horror in flicking through the Scottish *Daily Record* whilst sipping a cool San Miguel next to the pool to discover that Thomson without warning, without discussion and, as far as we are concerned, without any proper justification, delivered an early Christmas present to 450 people in their Glasgow Call Centre on 12th December: "You don't have a job - Merry Christmas."

This is a company that in May of this year threw a party for its Glasgow staff to congratulate them on their performance; a performance, by the way, that has seen an increase in productivity since the performing targets were set when it opened in 1999. It is also a company, by the way, that in 2004 disciplined one of their colleagues who is sitting in the balcony for poor performance and, in the very same year, gave her the accolade of 'Employee of the Year'. If anybody is guilty of poor performance, it has surely to be Thomson's management.

I have spent most my working life in and around the railway industry. I can tell you that prior to privatisation, my knowledge of redundancy law was non-existent. Redundancy was something that just did not happen. Congress, let me tell you this. I know redundancy law inside out now since privatisation. My members and my officers deal with it on a daily basis, and if there is one thing that I have learned it is that Thomson does not understand redundancy law. They told my officer in Glasgow that the statutory requirement for 'meaningful' consultation would be conducted. How can you have 'meaningful' consultation over a decision that you have already taken?

On my way back from Majorca, I looked around the Thomson flight that I was on and it was all working people. I thought, "Well, this is how this company make their money. I wonder how many people on this flight know how they treat their staff?"

Today, we are asking you to give support to these people. We have economic clout as working people in this country. If employers in the 21st century want to behave in the same manner as Thomson, we will stop using their products. Please support this emergency motion. *(Applause)*

**Ed Blissett** (*GMB*) supported Emergency Motion 2.

He said: Sisters and brothers, can I first praise the members who have travelled down from Scotland, from Thomson Holidays. You have the full support of the GMB and the call centre workers that we represent in the aviation industry.

Sisters and brothers, this callous treatment of call centre staff in the aviation industry is not simply limited to Thomson Holidays. British Airways, who ask you and your families, and your workmates, to fly the flag and to fly with British Airways, have also been shutting their call centres in Britain. In Belfast and in Glasgow they have put GMB members out of work and back-office staff of British Airways have been put out of work and that work moved to India.

The irony of this is that when you ring and ask to speak to a British Airways back-office member of staff who may have sent you a letter telling you about the re-booking of your flight, our members have been told to tell you that the person has stepped out for the time being. Stepped out? Stepped out to Mumbai, that is where they have stepped out to, to a private sector contractor.

Sisters and brothers, there is a real problem for the aviation unions with this movement of labour overseas. We need to counteract it and make sure that profitable companies such as Thomson and British Airways continue to employ workers in Britain, which in British Airways case means many black and Asian women.

Sisters and brothers, I call upon you to support this emergency motion.

\* *Emergency Motion 2 was CARRIED.*

### Transport

**Ed Blissett** (*GMB*) speaking to paragraph 4.17 said: Like London buses, I am here again. Many of you will have seen on 10<sup>th</sup> August of this year the chaos that results at Britain's airports when the Government moved to critical in their security alert. Our members and those of the other aviation unions struggled manfully to cope with the chaos that ensued. That chaos has for them not lasted a few hours, not lasted even a few days, but has lasted for weeks. The fact of the matter is that at London Heathrow, and at many other British airports, it is simply impossible with the number of staff employed, both by BAA and also by the private security firms, for our members to cope with the problems that the security levels which we are currently at are setting them.

We urgently, sisters and brothers, need a meeting with the Minister in order that they can be aware that until there is further and better investment in the security at our airports we cannot sustain these levels of security alert with the people we currently have. I therefore ask you to support the GMB in calling upon the Minister for Aviation to see the aviation unions in order to have that meeting and to address this very serious problem. Thank you, President.

**Frances O'Grady** (*Deputy General Secretary*) said in reply: The TUC General Council shares the concern of the GMB and the other aviation unions. We will convene a meeting of the aviation unions, seek a meeting with the Minister, and look to press the case with BAA as soon as possible.

### Zimbabwe

**The President:** Thank you for that, Frances. Congress, we have just heard that Wellington Chibebe, the General Secretary of the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions, has been arrested along with other union leaders ahead of a major demonstration by the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions. This is clearly an attempt to prevent the demonstration and restrict the rights of the trade unions in Zimbabwe to mount peaceful protest. Given what Thabitha said this morning about the importance of good governance in her country, I hope Congress will join me in strongly condemning this action by the Government of Zimbabwe. The TUC will raise this matter immediately with the Zimbabwean High Commission and the Government of Zimbabwe, and we will be keeping in close contact with our brothers and sisters in Zimbabwe as the situation develops. *(Applause)*

## Journalism Matters

**The President:** I now call Motion 52 on Journalism Matters. The General Council supports the motion.

**Chris Morley** (*National Union of Journalists*) moved Motion 52.

He said: Last year the NUJ came before you and declared not all journalists are bastards and judging by the feedback on the presence of the press and broadcasters here yesterday I fear we may not have fully persuaded you! (*Laughter*) I would like to take this opportunity to point out that they are workers and trade unionists doing their jobs. There again if they were not here, where would we all be? We may not always agree with how Congress is reported to our members and the world at large but if they were not there not one line would get out about our battle to win justice in the workplace and for the weak and vulnerable in our society.

My day job is an industrial correspondent for a Birmingham daily paper but I am one of a very select band within the regional press, select because we are disappearing faster than an Arctic iceberg. So what? Apart from the fact that in-depth reporting of the issues that trade unions want highlighted and hold dear to their hearts goes AWOL, our society loses one aspect of quality reporting. This has been a slow attrition over the years but what the NUJ wants to alert Congress to now is that this trickle has become a torrent.

The ruthless pursuit of profit in an already super rich media industry is now corroding the very fabric of our democracy. In newspapers, TV, and radio broadcasting, magazines and books, we are seeing wave after wave of editorial job losses. Take ITV, once a proud series of independent regional programme makers each with a local identity, now it is a single nationwide beast which only heeds the demands of shareholders and Ofcom bows down before it, craven. Once given the green light to merge, the successor to Granada and Carlton set out mass sackings, including the axing of a whole studio in Nottingham, and you have the bizarre daily ritual of Nottingham news bulletins being presented in Birmingham.

In newspapers, the big four regional publishers, Trinity Mirror, Newsquest, Northcliffe, and Johnson Press, have set upon their journalists like vampires at a blood bank. As their monopoly control in towns, cities, and regions has become complete so they have contrived to diminish our democracy.

Newsrooms up and down the country have been looted of resources. There seems no limit to not only managements thinking the unthinkable but actually doing it, too, just to shave the profit margins up a little higher.

Within the regional newspaper industry it is the norm for companies to count 30p out of every pound they have coming in as pure profit; sometimes it is 35 percent. That is unheard of anywhere else but that is still not enough for them so they dream up ever more incredible ideas, like turning regional evening newspapers into a morning daily serving up news 24 hours late, yesterday's news tomorrow, or what about sacking four out of six editors of the local papers in the West Midlands where I come from and leave them with two roving super-editors.

I ask you, what sort of commitment does that show to the community they seek to serve? It is a two-fingered salute, I would suggest.

Behind the scenes the massacre of journalist jobs goes on, largely unreported in the community for the very reason that those making the cuts control the means to report it, so reporters have become deskbound having to fill the pages with the easy stuff that switches

readers off in their droves, and the circulation figures speak for themselves, they are plunging by the day. People are asking why they should pay more for less.

What about the impact on all our lives? Who is scrutinising local democracy? Who is making our judicial system work properly so that offenders are identified in their own community? Who is looking over the shoulders of the local hospital trusts as they misuse money, or school and college bosses, and the police consultative bodies? Who publicises the activities of trades councils or goes to the neighbourhood meeting where grievances are aired about the things that really matter to working people? NUJ members have deluged MPs with a call for a select committee investigation into the monopoly control in the media and MPs of all parties have picked up our cause.

You may have seen we have been handing *these* out and I have to give tribute to our good colleagues in Amicus because these have been returned to us, and if you have these on your table please bring them to the NUJ delegation. In the words of Delia Smith, "let's be 'aving ya". We need to lift the lid on the brutal nobbling of distinctive quality journalism. The NUJ needs to ask the question, who will ask the questions when we are gone?

Congress, please lend us your support for quality journalism, join us in saying loud and clear, journalism matters, good journalism matters not just to a journalist but to everybody. Thank you.

**Tony Lennon** (*Broadcasting, Entertainment, Cinematograph and Theatre Union*) seconded Motion 52.

He said: The reason we need this motion and the campaign is that we are now living in a world of 24-hour news done badly, a world where quantity is often in inverse proportion to quality and content for all the reasons that the mover outlined. If you have not experienced this world yet, take yourself back 24 hours. I was struck by the similarity between this new news world and a well crafted Labour speech. You sit in your chair, make yourself comfortable, and the words begin to flow. They are comforting words, they are familiar words, and they form patterns, syntactical patterns which you have heard before, and you get very relaxed, so relaxed, actually, you do not notice that all the verbs have disappeared, they have been wolfgang'd, they have been ejected physically from the script, wrestled to the floor by a crack team of spin doctors, and all the time you think, "Because these words are flowing I must be hearing something." Then it finishes and you realise you have not heard that much at all and the only lasting feeling is mild anaesthesia. Welcome to the world of 24-hour news done badly.

Please do not blame the workers if you recognise that picture. They have been presented with an impossible challenge by the consolidated, concentrated owners of the media industry whose prime interest now is profit. The challenge they have been set is to generate much much more content, content for the internet, content for electronic distribution, content for 24-hour news, content for extra newspapers published several times a day, and they are expected to do it all with fewer people. That is the simple challenge that they cannot meet and that is why we need this campaign to try and put some quality and standards back in journalism.

If you want proof of what is happening in the media, you can ask members of my union in ITN, they support the journalists who were sacked. Once there were hundreds of them who took pride in making top quality local news and current affairs; now they are all redundant.

It is fair to ask the question, why is this important to us because the mover admitted it even as an NUJ member, journalists do not always write the things we want to hear but we should not let that minor irritation stand in the way of their other important democratic task, which is to write things that politicians and big business do not want to hear. If they are not given the time, the tools and the people to be able to ask those difficult questions and bring us the answers, then our democracy will be worse off and so will we.

I ask you to fill in the cards and I pledge that BECTU supports fully the campaign being organised by the NUJ. I hope you will support it as well by voting for Motion 52. Thanks.

\* *Motion 52 was CARRIED.*

### Zimbabwe

**Paul Russell** (*University and College Union*).

He said: In view of the announcement that you made before the last motion, President, could I ask, I am sure on behalf of Congress, that the General Council also conveys our concerns to our distinguished visitor this morning and the distinguished visitor we had yesterday, that they take this matter up and express their concerns in the same way. (*Applause*)

**The President:** Thank you very much, delegate. Yes, we will ensure that is done.

### Status of the artist

**The President:** I now call Motion 53, Status of the artist. The General Council supports the motion. I understand that John Smith of the Musicians' Union has an important announcement to make before moving the motion.

**John Smith** (*Musicians' Union*) said: Congress, thank you for your indulgence. We have heard lots of bad news stories associated with the Government this week but this is a good news story for a change.

Some of you may have seen in the press the campaign we have been running about taking musical instruments on planes that actually reached fever pitch this weekend when the conductor, Mark Elder, at the last night of the proms, referred to it from the rostrum. The union has been very active this week and I have just heard we have a result. The Department of Transport is going to let musicians take instruments on planes, which is great news in itself, it is a victory for the union. As far as we are concerned, more importantly, this is a dispensation for professional musicians and the way that you prove you are a professional musician is by showing the union card when you get to the check-in desk. (*Applause*)

I hope you come along to the Grand Hotel at 10 o'clock tonight to the Federation of Entertainment Unions do and we will have a drink on that one. It is not very often you have that feeling. Thank you. Thank you for that, President.

I now move Motion 53. It has this rather convoluted title 'Status of the artist'. I apologise about this but what we have done is try to use a UNESCO treaty, which uses that title, and apply the situation that our members find themselves in, in the creative industries. The whole drive of this motion is the Government's aim to support the creative industries, which we applaud. The problem is they are not looking at the actual creators and the people who provide that raw material for the creative industries. We do have a problem with that.

Let me give you a couple of quotes that encapsulate what we are trying to say. "Creative people and creative businesses producing high quality innovative goods and services, it is the only way we are likely to compete in this global marketplace." Patricia Hewitt speaking in 2004.

"The real capital in the creative economy is people. We require a revolution in our support for creative individuals and businesses and ensuring support meets their needs rather than expecting them to adapt to traditional delivery mechanisms." Tessa Jowell speaking in 2005.

Thank you to Tessa and thank you to Patricia for those sentiments but we actually need more emphasis on the people and less emphasis on the businesses. The irony of all this is that the UNESCO Treaty and the associated recommendations were actually primarily aimed at the developing nations, the developing world. It was not to afford protection to their artists, it was not really intended for mature Western democracies, but the way things are going we need all the help we can get.

For instance, most of our members are self-employed, they are freelance; I think it is 90 percent of our membership at the moment have self-employed status. There are some very awkward things happening in that arena. We have been told, and we are investigating this quite seriously, that we are in breach of competition law if we set minimum terms and conditions for what the Competition Act determines are undertakings. We are an association of undertakings, our members are undertakings as far as competition law goes but the UNESCO Treaty says that whatever the employment status of people they should be allowed to come together and to combine into associations, guilds, and, dare we say, unions for their mutual protection. Surely such a human right does not need spelling out but it seems it does these days. It is something we are looking at. It could be the most serious issue that our union has ever faced and we will certainly keep the TUC informed about the progress we make on this.

The Status of the Artist Treaty deals with all sorts of other things, things that we have talked about in this Congress, pensions, social security training, and lifelong learning. I was listening with great interest to the debate yesterday on lifelong learning and union learning. In our sector the union is the only organisation that provides this for our members. We provide lifelong learning, continual professional development. In fact, I was on the music panel of the new Sector Skills Council for cultural and creative industries. Somebody was there from EMI, who have a bob or two as you probably know. They are quite happy to train their own staff but they look upon the artists that supply them with their raw material as commodities; they buy them in, they sell them on, no other obligations. This has to change if we are going to build these industries. We will produce a report in the late autumn and we will be launching it, we hope, in a blaze of publicity. We ask you to support this and to back this campaign to have the UNESCO recommendations implemented in this country. If we succeed, it will benefit all sectors that organise atypical workers. I think it is going to be a great victory with the trades union movement. We are on a bit of a high so I think we can do it. President, I move.

**Bryn Evans** (*Equity*) seconded Motion 53.

He said: I am attending Congress for the first time. I am very pleased to second this motion. As a freelance opera and concert singer I am acutely aware of how important it is that the status of professional performers in the entertainment industry is recognised and that their work is properly remunerated. The MU is right to stress the importance of the actual creators

of this work. Performers often spend long periods on low pay or between jobs. In a recent survey we found that the average pay of Equity members working in the industry was £10,500 a year. Also in any given week only 41 percent of our members do any work as performers. A further 43 percent are working in other jobs away from the entertainment industry and the rest, 16 percent, are not working at all. The reason that I am able to be here in Brighton this week is that no one has offered me any work for these four days.

In its 2005 General Election manifesto the Government stated that we will modernise copyright and other forms of protection of intellectual property rights and look at how to ensure content creators can protect their innovations in a digital age. This is welcome but Equity is concerned that the Government should not talk only to record companies, film producers, and broadcasters, who run the legal and business side of our creative industries; they need to engage as well with the creators of this work, the creative artists. Inevitably employers and entrepreneurs will see things from their own perspective. Their perceptions may not always coincide with the perceptions and experience of the people who actually do the creative work.

We also need to make sure that performers, actors, musicians, and dancers, are not disadvantaged because our employment patterns are atypical. It is obvious, or should be obvious, that the working life of a performer will never equate to that of someone working in an office or on a factory floor. Government needs to recognise this and make sure that the message gets properly down the line.

One of our members of staff spends a lot of her time fighting appeals when an Equity member has wrongly been denied Job Seekers Allowance or other state benefits. We have a high record of success in these appeals because we are efficient and because we understand the legislation. If information and knowledge was properly disseminated down the line, many of these appeals would never have to take place. It is for these reasons that I urge you to vote for Motion 53. Please support.

\* *Motion 53 was CARRIED.*

### **New technology and payments to performers**

**The President:** I call Motion 54, new technology and payments to performers. The General Council supports the motion.

**Natasha Gerson** (*Equity*) moved Motion 54.

She said: I would like you all to imagine you are a master plumber, you have just finished a very big job and your employer is thrilled. Quite naturally, you expect some more work from the same firm. Suddenly you find they have employed a virtual plumber to do your job. He does it again and again and you get nothing for it. Not fair? That somewhat far-fetched situation has virtually become a reality for Equity members. That is what this motion is about.

Do not get me wrong, the new technology is great. Our members' work is getting more exposure and there is a huge big sweetie shop for the consumer. That brings me to the bullet points of this motion. I will be brief and I will certainly not bore you by being too technical.

One: The introduction of a small levy on recordable media and associated devices would help, blank tapes being one example. This would bring us in line with 20 out of 25 European member states. It would be harmonisation, one of the core European principles at its best used for the benefit of the workers. It would not be bad for the consumers either if it was coupled with an effort to end the odd legal anomaly which makes it illegal in the strict sense to carry out purely

private copying of digital images, or commit format shift by putting a CD on to an iPod. It would be fair to workers and fair to consumers.

Point two speaks for itself: We must keep on pushing for an international treaty enshrining our members' rights through the World Intellectual Property Organisation. If there are no collective agreements there is no legal certainty. That applies to every worker in every union here today.

Three: Extension of the term of legal copyright for sound recordings and performers' rights. It is currently only 50 years in the UK and the EU as opposed to 95 years in the US, and averaging 75 years in most non EU countries.

Last but not least, let us work to eradicate piracy. The economy as well as the worker is losing out. I am sure nobody here has ever bought a pirate DVD in a pub and I am equally sure they are rubbish.

Equity already supports BECS, its associated collecting society which gathers tens of thousands of pounds from other EC countries where our members' work is shown and manages the near impossible task of distributing it. This has come about through a statutory not a contractual right. Please help us to do more of the same. Ultimately, these media developments should be positive for everyone but we need the assistance of Congress to nag the Government to ensure what all of us want for our workers, fair remuneration without exploitation. A lot of people are going to make a lot of money out of these exciting and constantly changing advances. Help us to make sure that a decent part of it goes to the artists who made it possible. Please support. Thank you.

**Gerald Newson** (*Musicians' Union*) seconded Motion 54.

He said: As a performer I am just checking the three things I do before I go on the stage: make sure I have my glasses on, my mobile phone off, and my flies done up. I think I have actually qualified for all those.

Today I have an enormously difficult task in front of me because I have to convince you in the next three minutes that Cliff Richard, Mick Jagger, and Paul McCartney, all need your help and support! I am standing in front of you as both chairman of the Musicians' Union and as a professional musician, and I want to convey to you the challenges we have to face today in the audiovisual industry.

The creative industry is of art, design, high culture, popular entertainment, music, drama, film, key contributors to a modern Britain and we contribute more than 8 percent of GDP to the UK economy, and growing. Our artistic and cultural industries are major contributors to the success and wealth of Britain today. Our impact on the world with our artists, composers, writers, actors, producers, designers, inventors, and creators, are achievements of which Britain can be truly proud. We are an expanding and vibrant industry but we must not lose this momentum. Today technology has revolutionised the way we see, hear, and absorb culture. It has revolutionised the way art and entertainment are delivered to the consumer.

It may sound frivolous to be asking for support for Cliff, Mick, and Paul, but the rights that we are looking at for them are the same rights that we are looking at for workers at all cultural genres, the low-paid workers in our industry, such as the session musician, the backing singers, the orchestral musician, pop and rock Indie groups, actors, film extras, the hourly gigging musicians, writers, composers, authors, playwrights, all have a right for their labours and creations to be protected, respected and rewarded by fair and proper remuneration.

It is sobering to think that much of the music of the 1950s is now out of copyright, that the music of the Beatles from the 1960s period will soon be out of copyright, and before I hear you crying into your handkerchiefs, the more important point is that a vital economy will be lost for the thousands and thousands of low-paid performers and creators who at the end of their lives need this income the most. Copyright legislation must be reformed. We have the poorest protection for performers of any Western nation and many artists and creators now choose to work abroad where they find better commercial rewards under better legislative protection.

We ask for legislation to extend the copyright period, introduce a fairer practical levy on media devices, to confirm our commitment to WIPO and to tackle head-on the ever-increasing problem of piracy. Piracy drains the economy, funds criminal and terrorist activities, and undermines the ability of the creative industries to invest in future development. We need a change of mindset where we acknowledge that the purchase of CDs and DVDs from the local car boot sale is not seen as some harmless minor Saturday afternoon activity but as a major destabilising threat to our industry and the consumer is participating in a very real and very serious threat, theft.

With China and India, two giant markets, entering the world industrial community and becoming major trading partners, it is even more urgent that intellectual property rights are recognised as global issues and that binding treaties and agreements are put into place. The UK must be at the top table in these negotiations.

Cliff, Mick, Paul, and I, all earn our living by music. They are at one end of the financial spectrum and I at the other as an hourly paid orchestral musician, but we both understand the need for policies that will encourage the long-term vibrancy and survival of our huge and economically successful creative and cultural industry, for the UK to continue to be a major industrial exporter. Congress, I ask you to support this Motion.

**The President:** Thank you, delegate. I must say that was a great performance and it is reassuring to know that you are fully fit. (*Laughter*) Sorry, I should not have said that.

\* *Motion 54* was CARRIED.

### Public funding for theatre

**The President:** I call Motion 55, Public funding for theatre. The General Council supports the motion.

**Harry Landis** (*Equity*) moved Motion 55.

He said: President, Gloria, you are a breath of fresh air! (*Applause*)

When I was 15 working in a factory I used to go to the Hackney Empire first house every Monday. That was because the first house was cheaper than the rest of the week and that was because the musicians had only just seen the music two hours earlier and after a quick run generally in the first house of the week chaos ensued, which made it all worthwhile.

The next morning I would go to work and being a cheeky little sod I would go and do all that show on the factory floor for the lads. I would do Max Miller's jokes; I would do the impressions that the impressionist did, all of whom are now dead and forgotten. I do not know, though, you might remember this one: "We shall fight on the land, on the sea, and in the air. We shall never surrender. Long live the cause of liberty. God save the King." (*Applause*) There you are, Brendan, more laughs needed in Congress!

One morning the shop steward came up and said, "Harry, you should be on the stage." He said, "Have you ever seen a play?" I said, "No, I go to the Hackney Empire every week. Where do you see plays?" He said, "In London it is generally the West End and if you go there you will see a wonderful set with French windows at the back and the play will be about the trials and tribulations of the upper classes." I said, "Pardon?" He said, "The play will be about the problems of posh people." I said, "Oh." He said, "But there is a theatre near Kings Cross, it is the Theatre of the Trades Union and Labour Movement, it is called Unity Theatre and they do plays about the problems of real people." He said, "I am going on Sunday with my wife if you would like to come." I went and I could not believe it; it knocked me out. The play was about a bus strike. It was called *All Change Here*, by Ted Willis. The people on that stage could have been my neighbours. The dialogue was exactly what was spoken down my street. So I thought, "This is for me," and I auditioned and I learned to act.

Of course, they did not only do plays about contemporary life. Shaw, Chekhov, the first play of Brecht ever done in this country, Arthur Miller, and many others.

What I learnt from that experience was that theatre was about human values, philosophy, life itself. One day a great actress of the time, Sybil Thorndike, came to speak to us. She said, "We can do for the human spirit what the doctor does for the human body." She said, "Our work at its best can illuminate the human condition so that people look at their neighbours in a new light." Small companies going into schools to encourage youngsters to participate in drama so they could learn and understand these values was stopped by Thatcher, who withdrew their grant because their work did not coincide with her view that there was no such thing as society.

This Government has been pretty good to the arts and theatre. I am not too happy about our present situation, 0.2 percent of overall government expenditure. A grant two or three years ago of £25m, a one-off, for non commercial theatre was a great boost but we need continuous support otherwise we cannot look forward. Theatre in this country is the envy of the world, a base on solid subsidy from the state which helps to enrich the cultural health of this nation. We are campaigning for a more consistent approach and a long-term funding plan.

I hope you have all had postcards from us which we implore you to send to your MPs. This is the beginning of a very big campaign and we want everybody to be part of it so that the Government gets our message. If you believe, as I do, as my union does, that man does not live by bread alone you will support us in our struggle. I move.

**Gerald Newson** (*Musicians' Union*) seconded Motion 55.

He said: It is extremely difficult to follow Sir Laurence Olivier. Today I am carrying on the great English tradition in that I am doing exactly the same as William Shakespeare did when he had to go to the Royal Court of Queen Elizabeth I, bend his knee, and ask most graciously if Her Majesty could fund his opening performance of *Hamlet* at The Globe next month. We have no record of her reply but being the queen that she was we can only assume that it was a favourable one. She was a far-sighted queen who saw England in global terms and who brought a new age of culture, stability, morality, and a belief in herself as a world force, and she could see that the society needed to grow not just materialistically but also culturally and spiritually. Today I am carrying on that tradition and standing in front of you and asking for your support

and lobbying government for crucial and meaningful investment in our cultural industries.

We recognise that the British Government have a general understanding of arts funding and that they have an idea that somehow art is good for society and needs to be on the political agenda, but all too often many still regard it as a favour to even meet and talk with us. The Government needs to understand and appreciate that spending on the arts is not spending but it is investing in the arts by recognising that by fully supporting and embracing the arts industries there are enormous financial and employment benefits to be gained by government from all the associated second industries.

Theatre, drama, film, creative education, musical genres, design, fashion, are just some of the activities which we call creative industries. Often in these fields we are unable to produce end-of-year profits, which in some sectors judges a product as being successful or not. The demand for immediate annual profit is a serious threat to our cultural life.

One of our greatest exports is undoubtedly the English language, rich in texture, subtlety and nuance. Our language has spread throughout the globe through drama, film, and popular entertainment, and is a bonding force in much of the world today. The English language spread with the British Empire, which later became the British Commonwealth, and it united peoples from all over the world. As a New Zealander myself, we all look toward Mother England as a beacon for cultural and artistic excellence. The English language unites us, the Commonwealth unites us and culture unites us. I find great unity with Kenya, Canada, Malaysia, India, even Australia, but especially Zimbabwe, and who of us cannot be moved by the solidarity and bonds about which we heard this morning from the Vice President of the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions? We are all bound by British culture and British heritage. All of us from the Commonwealth with all our various cultural diversities have that thread of Britishness, which is always in our backgrounds.

Culture and art are major industries of the UK today. Our call is to ask you for your endorsement for our motion, which seeks a realistic arts funding increase enabling us to absorb and develop new technological innovation. We need tools to build on past investments and to rationalise and to develop more efficient working structures, and particularly we need to ease the burden on actors, a desperately low paid industry but contributes so much to UK plc. If the politicians fail to deliver in this particular field, they will have contributed much to our country's decline and our nation will become a global second-rate player. One of our greatest assets is the cultural industry. Let us not squander this treasure. Colleagues, I second this motion and ask you to support it. Thank you.

\* *Motion 55 was CARRIED*

### **Marge Carey**

**The President:** Congress, Gold Badges of Congress are awarded to those are retiring after long service on the General Council on the final day of Congress. However, today we are making an exception for a great woman, somebody who I have worked with for a number of years and who has been a very special General Council member, known and loved for many years by many in the trades union movement, Marge Carey. Marge is not able to be with us tomorrow so Marge, I have great pleasure in now presenting you with the Gold Badge of Congress. *(Presentation made)*

**Marge Carey** (*Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers*) said: I only dropped it to see if it was plastic! Thank you, Gloria, for those kind words. Congress, I am really conscious of time, we are running late, so I will only take a few minutes.

I am delighted and humbled to receive the Congress Gold Badge but I would just like to say a few thanks to the people who have supported me during my time in the movement. I have always felt very very fortunate, as I suppose most of you do, to work on behalf of the members of the movement and I have enjoyed all of my time with my union, USDAW, and with the TUC both regionally and nationally. I will just mention a few individuals out of many that have supported me:

To Alan Manning in the North West TUC, he is the Regional Secretary and we go back some years. I served my TUC apprenticeship with Alan, who actually 20 years ago explained to me that social exclusion meant unemployment. I was Vice Chair. We used to have meetings and I would get the minutes of the meetings but I did not really understand the meeting that I had been to, and Alan used to have to explain that meeting to me.

To Liz Smith, who I have worked with both regionally and nationally for some 20 years. Liz is director now of unionlearn and I wish every success to unionlearn and I am sure that she will do a good job.

To Brendan and all the staff at the TUC who I know work very very hard in supporting the Executive and the General Council.

To the many friends and colleagues on the TUC General Council. I would just like to name a few, especially to Jeannie Drake and Gloria Mills, and to Mark Fysh. Many of the people on the General Council I would consider friends as well as colleagues.

Lastly, but most importantly, to my own union, USDAW, for allowing me to represent our members on the TUC over the years. I have always tried to represent our members truly and honestly.

A final big thank you to Sir Bill Connor, USDAW's previous General Secretary, and to our current General Secretary, John Hannett, two general secretaries with vision and commitment to the union and who are moving USDAW forward.

I would like to wish every success to the TUC for the future and to all of you in your unions. Thank you. *(Applause)*

**The President:** Thank you, Marge. Thank you, Congress. That concludes today's business. Congress is now adjourned until 9.30 tomorrow morning. Thank you.

*(Congress adjourned at 5.30 p.m.)*

**FOURTH DAY: THURSDAY SEPTEMBER 14<sup>TH</sup>***(Congress reassembled at 9.30 a.m.)*

**The President:** I now call Congress to order. Will delegates please take their seats. Could I say many thanks to Haringey Young Musicians Steel Orchestra, who have been playing for us this morning. *(Applause)* I had to make a quick decision this morning. Someone actually came up and said, could we suspend standing orders so that we can have more of the band and less of the speeches. *(Applause)*

Congress, I am now going to explain how I intend to take today's business. Please listen carefully.

I intend to take the remaining scheduled business for today first as published in your *Congress Guide*, that is, Composite 15, Workplace bullying, to be moved by the NUT, Motion 78, Occupational Health to be moved by UCATT, Motion 79, Health and Safety Executive to be moved by Musicians' Union, Motion 80, Safety Footwear, to be moved by SCP.

Then I will take Composite Emergency Motion 3 on HSE job cuts and Composite Motion 4 on Corporate Manslaughter during the health and safety debate. Then I will take the remaining scheduled business, which is Motion 82, the Importance of Equality moved by the TUC LGBT Conference, Motion 81, TUC policy and campaigning moved by the POA. I will then take the outstanding business in the order in which they were lost. Motion 14, Flexible Working to be moved by USDAW, Motion 15, Equality Reps to be moved by NGSU, Motion 16, Violence against Women, to be moved by the TUC Women's Conference. I will then call paragraphs from Chapter 2 of the General Council Report on Equal Rights.

Motion 11, Redundancy Law, moved by ACM, paragraph 1.7, Motion 12, Irish Ferries, moved by NUMAST, Motion 13, Penalties for Failure to Implement Statutory Provisions, to be moved by NASUWT. I will then call paragraphs from Chapter 1 of the General Council Report on Organising and Rights at Work, Motion 48, Class size, moved by EIS, Motion 49, Local Authority Support for Schools, moved by ASPECT, Composite Motion 11, Education and Training, Age and Employment Rights, moved by UCU, paragraph 4.12 and 4.13, and Motion 20, Access to work and public sector, to be moved by the TUC Disability Conference.

Finally, I will take the Emergency Motion, Closure of Northern Foods Bakery in Trafford Park.

Congress, in order to complete all our business it is essential that delegates respect speaking time limits. If you hear that your point has already been covered in a debate, I am sure other delegates would be very appreciative if you did not repeat it.

In order to progress business, if you are able formally to second a motion I would be very grateful. I would also like to remind you that if you are taking up time speaking on paragraphs you are likely to be restricting your colleagues' contributions to their tabled debates.

As advised by the General Purposes Committee yesterday, I will be restricting the number of additional speakers unless opposing the motion. If we do not make good progress, I may also have to cut speaking times as I warned yesterday.

Thank you, Congress, and I hope for your cooperation.

**Workplace Bullying**

**The President:** We now turn to Chapter 7 of the General Council Report, Protecting People at Work, page 141. I call Composite Motion 15, Workplace Bullying. The General Council supports the Composite Motion.

**Judy Moorhouse** (*National Union of Teachers*) moved Composite Motion 15.

She said: Bullying is a pernicious sort of harassment in which the bully undermines, belittles, or even assaults the recipient. Teachers have been criticised for allowing a pervasive culture of bullying to take place in schools, of not taking action against bullying behaviour. In the experience of the NUT it is an inaccurate portrayal of what actually does take place in schools. The vast majority of teachers do not and never have ignored bullying behaviour. The biggest difficulty encountered by teachers is the silence surrounding bullying behaviour. To overcome this all schools endeavour to provide a safe environment in which pupils feel supported and have trust that their concerns will be acknowledged and acted upon.

But bullying does continue in schools and, unfortunately, there is still a culture of silence. In this case the recipients, the victims of bullying, are teachers. The NUT takes bullying and harassment extremely seriously, it affects working conditions, health and safety, and undermines equality at work. The NUT will therefore provide full support to members who are being bullied or harassed at work. All teachers should have the right to a safe working environment free from intimidating and insulting behaviour. Employers have a legal obligation to provide such an environment. Dignity and respect are paramount.

Workplace bullying has a negative impact on the self-confidence, self-esteem, and health of teachers. Bullying causes stress and stress is linked to all manner of ill health. It is not surprising that the bullying of teachers is increasing in schools. Pressures and targets from government are placed on local authorities who in turn place them on governing bodies and headteachers, and thus on to classroom teachers and other support staff in school.

You may have seen on the TV or read in the papers, or indeed heard on Radio 4's On the Ropes programme, the story of John Ellingworth, past President of the National Union of Teachers, and a primary headteacher. At the NUT Conference this year during a debate on workplace bullying John Ellingworth gave one of the bravest and most emotional addresses ever heard at a NUT Conference. John spoke of his heart-rending experience of battling the stress and pressures of being a headteacher. His was one of many of the stories we heard during that debate and we hear similar stories in our casework with members.

That motion on workplace bullying was endorsed unanimously and the union has stepped up its campaign by providing new and enhanced support to members and local officers in their work to combat bullying and harassment in schools. We have provided expanded guidance for members and safety representatives to include a step-by-step guide to dealing with instances of bullying; the publication of an NUT news bulletin to be sent to all schools to raise awareness of the problem of bullying; the production of a pack for local officers to assist with casework, local training, and represent negotiations on bullying and harassment policies; the publication of an article in the NUT's journal, *The Teacher*, and increased training for school-based safety representatives and local officers.

The NUT has provided a model harassment and bullying procedure for schools. It makes clear the responsibilities of local authorities and governing bodies that have a duty to take complaints of harassment seriously. Research has proven that schools with union appointed safety reps suffered 50 percent fewer accidents and ill health than those without. The role of safety representatives is therefore of vital importance in the NUT's campaign to eradicate the bullying of teachers, pupils, and support staff from our schools. Thank you.



**Denise McGuire** (*Connect*) seconded Composite Motion 15.

She said: Given the time pressures, I will not dwell on the pernicious impact of bullying because I know that is well understood by everyone here. I will just describe a newer form of bullying using performance management systems to bully people.

Congress, all bullying is bad but it is worse when your job is on the line. Targets at work are set higher and higher, year on year performance has to improve. We have initiatives, raising the bar, maximising my performance, and we have processes such as performance improvement plans known as PIPs. Managers at all levels are told that 10 percent of their team has to be put on a PIP and if they protest and say there are no issues and everyone is working well, then they are told, "If you don't put them on a PIP then you'll be on a PIP." When you are on a PIP you are put on regular reporting. The bullies do not go for monthly meetings, not even for weekly ones, they insist on daily discussions. One marvellous middle-manager has turned that into an art form; not content with doing the reporting himself he sends people to meet with his boss for what is described as coaching and development, and people go through this ordeal every day at half past eight every morning. This coaching and development does not take place in their office, they have to travel 50 miles to be subjected to ritual humiliation.

Congress, I have given a more extreme example but many members are told, "If you don't do such-and-such, then you'll be marked down on your appraisal," and when you are on performance related pay that is a very real threat. Even more members work in offices where the daily mantra of their manager is JFDI (just f\*\*\*\*\* do it). Command control, it is the refuge of the incompetent manager. A survey of our members showed that people are not competent about reporting and complaining when they are bullied. The cases we deal with are the very tip of the iceberg. As the NUT said, the vast majority of people suffer in silence.

Congress, many people learnt bullying in the playground but support the composite and ensure that bullying has no place in the workplace. I second.

**Martin Fletcher** (*FDA*) supported Composition Motion 15. He said: When my children were first learning about public speaking my advice to them was to start and end with a famous quotation. It makes a speech appear to be well researched and there are less words you need to write for yourself. So, following that very wise advice I am going to begin with a quotation from Dave Barry, who famously said, "If you have ever seen the movie *Night of the Living Dead* you have a rough idea how modern corporations and organisations operate, with projects and proposals that everybody thought were killed constantly rising from their graves to stagger back into meetings and eat the brains of the living."

Over four years ago a National Audit Office report on the NHS highlighted the way health service delivery was disastrously subverted by waiting list targets. As an article in *The Guardian* pointed out at the time, "management by targets is inevitably counterproductive", but the misuse of targets has not gone away, it has come back from the dead to eat our brains. Targets are set that arbitrarily reduce civil service numbers with no reference to the work that needs to be done. Targets are set that arbitrarily move posts out of London and the South East with no reference to the impact on staff or customers. Targets are set as a stick to beat the staff with or as an excuse to remove the carrots.

Twelve months ago the Social Market Foundation published a report on government target setting. It helpfully set out the criteria for good targets but before the ink was even dry on the report at the very launch meeting of the event the government minister was supporting the approach to targets that had been criticised by the National Audit Office three years earlier, and so it goes on.

I am not calling for targets to be abolished but I do call for the appropriate use of those targets and I call for an end to institutional bullying through targets. So, to finish with a quotation, as Darth Vader said in *Star Wars*, "We can dispense with the pleasantries, commander, I am here to get you back on schedule."

\* *Composite Motion 15* was CARRIED.

### Occupational health

**The President:** I call Motion 78, Occupational Health. The General Council supports the motion.

**Ivan Moldawczuk** (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) moved Motion 78.

He said: Chair, Congress, whenever health and safety on construction are mentioned the first thing that comes to mind is the enormous amount of accidents and fatalities, but there is another side to the picture, that is, one of ill health suffered by building workers during the course of their working lives as a result of work. Construction is an industry where according to statistics supplied by the HSE muscular skeletal disorders, vibration white finger, and asbestos related diseases are more prevalent than in other sectors of industry. It is an industry where over 100,000 workers are affected by illness caused by or made worse by their work and where an estimated three million working days are lost through occupational ill health.

If this is not bad enough, we are informed by the Building and Civil Engineering Benefits Scheme that the average age for retirement out of the industry is 62 so it is no surprise that UCATT has for many years campaigned for a viable comprehensive and proactive occupational health scheme to cover all construction workers, with trade unions playing an active role in all aspects of the scheme, including its management. As a result of our years of campaigning, and here tribute has to be paid to the work done by the late George Brumwell, the Health and Safety Commission set up a pilot scheme in Leicestershire to ascertain the viability of such a scheme. In both the promotion and the running of the pilot UCATT played an active role. The pilot was a success with over 450 companies being actively involved. Over 1,700 on-site health checks were delivered with the unfortunate result that a third of the workers checked were advised to seek further medical assistance. The pilot not only confirmed occupational health problems which we already knew were endemic in the industry but managed to point out in many cases serious health issues predominantly relating to blood pressure, respiratory problems, and abnormal urine tests.

With the success of the pilot the time is ripe to introduce a national scheme, a scheme whose features would be to identify health problems and when necessary to investigate their cause and do something about them, not a scheme favoured by some employers, which is purely a health screening exercise designed to screen workers out of work; secondly, to help address the question of rehabilitation and to help disabled workers secure and retain work in construction. These progressive aims can only be achieved by an industry-wide scheme run by a stakeholder board with active trade union participation, funded from within the construction industry and government, with government also

providing the necessary legislative back-up to compel the 'won't do, can't do' faction amongst the employers to participate.

Congress, the potential benefits of such a scheme are enormous. Apart from having the potential to improve the health of building workers, it will be open to all workers whether they work for a multinational corporation or a small builder. We would be in a position to stem the skills wastage through ill health. We would get an increased awareness of health issues amongst workers, a point that became apparent during the pilot. Construction will become less of a burden on the National Health Service and state benefits.

Finally, Chair, in order to achieve our objectives and make our dreams a reality, we not only need the support of the TUC but the active support of all of you in the hall. I move.

**John Sheridan** (*Transport and General Workers' Union*) seconded Motion 78.

He said: For our members in construction occupational health is literally a matter of life and death. Sisters and brothers, we all know the danger of working in construction, the fatalities, the injuries, the poor health. In 2004/2005 32 percent of all workplace fatalities occurred in construction. Failing occupational health helps create silent victims, not crushed by machinery, not killed by the 100ft fall, not the big bang, but a slow decay after years of relentless strain. It is estimated that twice as many deaths are caused by failures in occupational health than are caused by accidents. These workers are victims of employers' negligence, victims of government inaction.

So, what is to be done? We need to drive forward a national campaign to establish an occupational health scheme for construction workers. We need the scheme governed by the board with the unions at its heart. The Constructing Better Health pilot needs to be highlighted and developed. The pilot that ran for 20 months up to June 2006 spent £1.4m evaluating the health of construction workers in Leicestershire. We need to build on its success and take note of the lessons learnt. Of the workers that took part 40 percent were referred for further medical advice and support: that is 40 percent who are still working with health problems; that is 40 percent who are victims of poor site safety. This is not just an indictment of industrial management but also of government policy. Construction workers are forced to struggle through employment and poor health. They are then expected to survive under poverty of state benefits all because of management's failure to introduce decent pension coverage. Workers suffering from ill health receive little or no help with rehabilitation and many are just left on the scrapheap. It should not be lost that for every person in France receiving disability benefit the figure is nine times higher here in the UK.

Congress, it is time to deliver for construction workers. We need a national trade union campaign to end the misery of occupational ill health. We need a national construction scheme to deliver a national programme on health improvement. We need workers to be at the heart of the scheme. We need their unions on the board of the scheme. Construction workers deserve to retire in good health and with dignity. Please support Motion 78. Thank you.

\* *Motion 78 was CARRIED.*

### Health and Safety Executive

**The President:** I now call Motion 79, Health and Safety Executive. The General Council's position is to support the motion.

**Barbara White** (*Musicians' Union*) moved Motion 79.

She said: I am moving Motion 79 and accepting the amendment of the GMB.

Noise regulation may not appear to be an exciting topic but it should be as it affects every single one of us. Only last week the Royal National Institute for the Deaf ran a 'Don't lose the music' campaign to raise awareness amongst music fans of the danger of over-exposure to loud music. This campaign was supported by Jools Holland.

The World Health Organisation states that exposure to excessive noise is the major avoidable cause of permanent hearing impairment worldwide. Noise-induced hearing loss is an important public health priority because as populations live longer this will add substantially to the global burden of disability. Excessive noise is at least partially the cause in more than one third of those with hearing impairment.

This motion calls for better enforcement of health and safety legislation. In 1997 the World Health Organisation noted the lack of effective legislation against noise and stated that where legislation did exist it was poorly enforced and implemented. Awareness must be increased about the harmful effects of noise on hearing. A positive image of hearing should be promoted emphasising its contribution to the daily quality of life. Noise pollution has had a much lower priority than air and water pollution. Noise-induced hearing loss is insidious, permanent, and irreparable. In Europe directives to industry have improved noise emission loads over the last two decades and reduced the risk of damage to hearing by providing hearing protection for workers. However, improvements in industrial noise have been offset by increasing environmental noise, including that from traffic and recreational activities.

At a Health and Safety Commission meeting in March 2005 the issue of the approval of the control of noise at work was debated following public consultation. The date of February 2006 was given to introduce the new regulations as required by the European Directive. The Directive and draft regulations allowed for a transitional period of two years for the music and entertainment sector because noise is not an unwanted by-product and the use of hearing protection could influence artistic integrity. Concerns relating to the music and entertainment sector were mainly about the practicalities of being able to comply with the new values. When speaking of workplace wellbeing this should mean the promotion of a healthy workforce and healthy workplace. This not only improves workplace performance but reduces pressure on health, welfare and social security systems. The Health and Safety Executive has tended to treat the music and entertainment sectors as a low risk area and has not always put in the necessary resources to deal with the sector that has so many difficult working situations and quite often very difficult employers. This in turn requires the Health and Safety Executive to liaise with the environmental health officers who often carry out the enforcement in many areas of our industry. Our members who give such tremendous pleasure to millions are suffering noise induced hearing loss whilst at work. We welcome the introduction of new legislation. This will only be effective if there is a proper enforcement in place that ensures that employers, venues, owners, etc. are properly carrying out their duties. I move.

**Linda Lord** (*GMB*) seconded Motion 79.

She said: It might seem slightly surprising that the GMB inserted a reference to asbestos on workplace noise levels but it is designed to highlight two very important issues. Firstly, that the HSE did weaken the asbestos licensing regime when they took textured

coating out of the need to be removed by proper licensed contractors and not just by any cowboy. Secondly, it illustrates the HSE's increasingly lax approach to enforcement in general.

Now the HSE insists that it is better to target those industries that have the worst safety records. Perhaps someone could tell me why it is that one of the worst industries for accidents, well known for its appalling record, suffered five deaths in the first three months of the year, namely, the waste and recycling industry. The HSE are well aware of the inherent dangers in this sector but the accidents and deaths still occurred. Cutting back on inspectors is not just bad in principle, it is bad in fact as well. It does not matter if it is in assessing asbestos stripping, emptying dustbins, or failing to monitor noise levels adequately, if it is left to a voluntary system or an enforcer which fails to enforce, then a government body is failing to carry out its principal duty, protecting people at work. Please support.

\* *Motion 79 was CARRIED.*

### Safety footwear

**The President:** I call Motion 80, Safety Footwear. The General Council supports the motion.

**Jackie Smith** (*Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists*) moved Motion 80.

She said: I am very nervous as this is my first time here. As part of Health and Safety at Work all employees at risk of damaging their feet in the workplace from injuries such as crushing, penetration, absorption, are entitled to protective footwear. Whilst we accept that this footwear on the whole is being supplied, it is our contention that in many cases it is not fit for purpose. Employers buy in bulk and often the cheapest shoes and boots which meet short-term economic pressures ignoring or being totally ignorant of the long-term adverse occupational ill health effects of this short-sighted approach.

Bulk buying does not take into consideration that we all have different shapes of feet. Women's feet differ greatly in size and shape to men's. It is difficult and at one time was almost impossible to get protective footwear for women. I am sure that I have not seen the entire range available but it appears that the footwear is not in fact designed with the shape of women's feet in mind, but the size: they have shrunk men's footwear. It does not take into account that many people have intrinsic foot problems such as hallux valgus (bunions to you and me), and many foot conditions such as high insteps which make the footwear uncomfortable to wear and cause long-term foot problems and disabilities. These problems do not just affect the feet but the knees, hips, and back. It is like that song which I will not sing, "the thigh bone is connected to the knee bone", etc. From a health and safety point of view there is also an increased risk of slips, trips, and falls by wearing footwear that is inadequate, too big, too wide, and clearly does not fit properly.

We also have an additional responsibility for young people, those under the age of 18, not just from a health and safety point of view but from a developmental point of view. These young people's bodies are still growing and developing and putting their feet into ill-fitting footwear before they are fully developed can and will have a long-lasting adverse effect in skeletal development.

If we buy a pair of shoes we go to a shop, we try various types on. We do not just buy the ones that we like the look of - we ladies tend to do that - but we make sure that they fit properly, that they are comfortable for walking, do not rub anywhere, they

are not too wide, they are not too narrow; we take time. Why, then, would we expect employees to accept ill-fitting footwear that they will spend a significant amount of time wearing and could ultimately cause long-term pain and disability.

I work in Bradford and I am told that in the good old bad old days of the mill industry they had to wear clogs. These clogs were custom-made. The clog-makers would measure the person's foot and produce a last specific to that person's foot. I am not suggesting that we all go back to wearing clogs but that we adopt a similar ethos of making sure that protective footwear is suited to the individual.

We believe that podiatrists are well-placed to provide a service whereby we can supply footwear advice, foot health advice, ensure feet are measured and appropriate shoes supplied for foot function, and any deformities present. There is a need for industrial podiatry services to be supplied or offered by employers. We need to keep health and safety at the top of everyone's list and keep pressing for improvements. Therefore, it is not enough for employers simply just to provide off-the-shelf protective footwear. I call on Congress to support this motion. Thank you.

**Tom Lannon** (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) seconded Motion 80.

He said: The construction industry is a dangerous place to work. The working environment is constantly changing. It is a hard manual job working on your feet all day. As health and safety statistics show falls from a height are still the most common cause of workplace fatality and we have above-average level of muscular skeletal illnesses. Accidents and ill health are caused by a number of different factors but as the motion states footwear is an important issue in ensuring that workers are safe and healthy at work. It would be unthinkable today to go on to a major building site and see building workers not wearing a helmet. The same attention needs to be given to building workers' footwear, but we have a problem. Under health and safety legislation personal protective equipment must be provided by employers but our members often have to fight for proper footwear paid for by an employer.

I can assure Congress that my union will be taking this issue back to employers inside our industry and will be working with the SCP to find the best way of making sure building workers have the right footwear, but I have to be honest, Congress, the challenge of this motion is more fundamental than that. I am a convenor steward at Heathrow, Terminal 5, in London. I have worked on many major sites in central London also. On the sites I work on there is an understanding of the importance of occupational ill health, an issue that will be central to the Olympic Games project when it starts in a couple of years' time. The challenge is getting the right footwear for workers throughout the building industry. The damage inferior footwear does to your feet - claw hammer toes, damage to the nails that often have to be surgically removed, heel pain, and arch pain.

On sites up and down the country building workers are expected to provide their own footwear and often there are illegal deductions from their wages. This is totally unacceptable. Personal protective equipment can save workers' lives. The right footwear can save a worker's life. We have to ensure that this issue gets the attention it deserves in our industry. I ask Congress to support Motion 80. Thank you.

\* *Motion 80 was CARRIED.*

### HSE job cuts

**The President:** I call Emergency Motion 3, HSE job cuts. The General Council supports the Emergency Motion.

**Graeme Henderson** (*Prospect*) moved Emergency Motion 3.

He said: I represent inspectors, scientists, and information officers in the Health and Safety Executive, and I indeed also work for the Health and Safety Executive. I have a job. I am not entirely certain whether I will do after making this speech when I get back next week, but we will see about that.

It came as a considerable shock to everyone in the HSE to hear the announcement of substantial cuts in the HSE last month: 250 to 350 jobs to go by March 2008. That actually represents just under ten percent of the current workforce of HSE, but there could actually be much worse to come. The Department for Work and Pensions as a result of Gordon Brown's announcement a couple of years ago is expecting to reduce its budget year on year by five percent. They sponsor HSE and it is likely that we are also going to face a cut of that order; indeed, it could actually be worse. Some senior managers in DWP are looking to impose a much a greater cut than five percent and I can only get you to imagine the impact that is likely to have.

I actually forget whether it was Marx or Engels who once described factory inspectors as the heroes of the English working class. I have to say that not even I would make such extravagant claims on behalf of our current members but they do an extremely good job in very difficult circumstances. I know it is easy to criticise many of the things that the HSE comes out with. It is largely determined by policy and obviously by politics as well.

The old satanic mills may have actually gone but that does not stop over 250 people dying every year, thousands of people dying from occupational ill health as we have heard in the earlier debate and hundreds of thousands of people being injured, and seriously injured, at work. There is a massive job still to be done. One of the themes of this Congress concerns vulnerable workers, protecting vulnerable workers, and we have seen recent reports on the impact of health and safety on young persons in particular, and also by migrant workers. These cuts will make it very very much more difficult for us to tackle those particular challenges.

We have heard of the cuts so far. The HSE has set out a set of principles, one of which is that they will fill posts covered by costs recovery. So, on the one hand our nuclear installations inspectorate, which does by and large manage to get its money from the nuclear industry, should not suffer any significant cuts. Whether that is very much of a compensation I do not know but you can all sleep in your beds safely at night knowing there is no chance of a Chernobyl here.

The inspectorate covering construction and agriculture, the two most risky industries in this country, does not have any capacity to get its money back and it is those types of activities which are going to be seriously under threat. In addition, there have been substantial cutbacks in the communications budget, which obviously involves publicity and education, a new project called Workplace Health Connect which gives advice to small businesses and safety representatives, and occupational health, and also in science and technology research. I am not a conspiracy theorist necessarily but this is actually very convenient.

We have seen the Gershon report setting out the Government's proposals on deregulation in which Gershon actually suggests there should be a cutback of total government regulatory inspection of one million, reducing from three million to two million.

That is a very significant cutback and I have to say that is not just across HSE, it covers all government regulation. In fact, HSE senior management did a calculation and they worked out that our contribution to those million cuts would actually put our inspection figures in negative figures. That means not only will we not do any inspection but somehow we are going to have to apologise to employers for having done some in previous years. It is a complete and total nonsense.

Congress, I know occupational health and safety may not be the most important issue facing this Congress but it is something which impacts upon all of us, it is something which can determine people's lives; it can actually destroy lives. We are calling upon you and we are calling upon the General Council to give us the support to try to ensure that HSE can continue to do its good work fighting on your behalf and on behalf of workers. Thank you very much.

**Jane Aitchinson** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) seconded Emergency Motion 3.

She said: Congress, this motion rightly condemns the announcement last month of up to 350 job cuts in the Health and Safety Executive; 350 further job cuts may seem like a drop in the ocean when we are already fighting 100,000 job cuts in the Civil Service. But, Congress, these jobs which represent almost 10 percent of the workforce in the HSE, these jobs if lost would severely damage the service these members provide. Health and safety inspectors were fought for and won by this trades union movement. These members protect our lives at work. As usual, these cuts are being dressed up as just cutting unimportant backroom jobs but, Congress, we do not have a paper clip counting department in the HSE. These members are doing vital support work arranging inspections and preparing the necessary paperwork to prosecute the worst and most dangerous employers in this country, employers who profit by putting our lives at risk. Congress, these cuts let those bosses off the hook.

Last year saw the lowest ever level of work-related fatalities but these are still unacceptably high. Last year 212 workers suffered a fatal injury at work, 384 members of the public also died; almost 600 people died needlessly. How many more will die this year? We need the staff to eliminate these needless killings. The money is there but it needs to be spent on public sector workers instead of filling the boots of private profiteers and their shareholders.

Defend these workers so critical to us. As we heard yesterday from the striking firefighters in Merseyside who we so rightly supported, cuts cost lives. Just like our brothers and sisters in the FBU we too may be forced to take strike action to defend our livelihoods and everybody's lives at work. Please support that action and support the motion.

\* *Emergency Motion 3 was CARRIED.*

### Corporate Manslaughter

**The President:** I call Emergency Motion 4, Corporate Manslaughter. The General Council supports the Emergency Motion with an explanation and I will call the General Secretary during the debate to give the General Council's position.

**Tony Burke** (*Amicus*) moved Emergency Motion 4.

He said: Congress, we brought forward this motion as we need now to act urgently to get the legislation that we need on corporate manslaughter as soon as possible. The Government bill will be debated next month and we expect it to go through the committee stages shortly after that. I am sure that many of your

members will be supporting the bill and Amicus members certainly do so. Our members are saying it is about time we saw guilty employers going to prison for killing people at work but, Congress, the Government's bill will mean that whilst we can prosecute organisations more easily it will not put anyone in prison. It is Amicus policy to include in corporate manslaughter law a secondary duty on directors and senior managers which means if they are directly responsible for corporate manslaughter they can be held liable.

Congress, the House of Commons Home Affairs and Work and Pensions Committee agree with us. The Scottish Executive expert group on corporate homicide agrees with us. It is only the Home Office and the Government, and of course those guilty employers, who disagree.

President, last week we saw a disgraceful episode where a papermaking company was fined £200 for killing an Amicus member, Dean Thomas, who died three years ago. Yes, you heard right, £200; a complete and utter disgrace, almost beyond belief. Why did it happen? The company is in administration and the judge said that he would have fined them £250,000. They were banged to rights. We have it documented that managers stood by every day and openly accepted unsafe working conditions. Workers used home-made tools, staff were untrained in proper procedures, and Dean was crushed to death when an untrained assistant pressed the wrong button. £250,000 would not bring Dean back to his family but the £200 just does not offer justice to anybody, not Dean's family, not his children, his workmates, or other workers who have been killed doing their jobs. That £200 fine shows the failing and the weakness of the current system. Yes, we want big fines but we want more than that as well, we want sentences that can be applied to individual directors and we want those guilty directors put in prison. I know there could be difficulties in regard to identifying which directors may be responsible but we can resolve that. We want some more imaginative sentencing. The judge I referred to had little else available to do other than to make this small fine. What about corporate probation? What about stringent health and safety orders against directors and senior managers? What about, more importantly, putting those directors and managers in prison? That paper mill where Dean was killed in 2003 is still operating today. Yes, it now has different owners but most of the same people are working there, including the senior management.

That is why we are looking for justice, justice for our members, justice for their families, justice for people going to work carrying out their ordinary duties without the fear of being killed. We want the General Council to fight for justice and, more importantly, we want that legislation on the statute book that makes sure our members do not get killed when they go to work. Support the fight. Support the campaign. Let us get legislation in that puts these people in prison. Thank you. I move.

**John Thompson** (*Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians*) seconded the emergency motion.

He said: Last year 59 building workers lost their lives. That is 59 too many. For the families it is devastating, an experience many never overcome. The Health and Safety Executive found that in 70 percent of the cases managers had failed to take measures to prevent accidents at work. The current legislation needs to be strengthened. For example, as Tony has explained, in cases of fatalities the employer escapes with a fine, and the level of fine is £32,000. So £32,000 is the cost of a workers' life. In comparison, killing someone while drink driving will no doubt, under the law, receive a jail sentence, and rightly so. Since Labour came to

power only 13 jail sentences have been passed, four suspended sentences and one Community Order for work-related accidents. All of these cases involved small employers.

In an industry like construction where more than 90 percent of companies employ ten or less employees and where, at the subsequent company, the mortality rate is high, taking the company to task can just be a hollow exercise, especially if, as has happened in many cases, a company ceases trading on a Friday and re-opens on Monday under a different name. Companies that do not exist cannot be prosecuted. To make matters worse, the current proposals on corporate manslaughter place no responsibilities on directors, which is an omission which drives a coach and horses through the effectiveness of the proposed legislation. It is only the threat of a custodial sentence that will force employers to take workers' health and safety seriously. Until there is an individual duty on directors, deaths at work will continue.

Since this Government has been in office, more than 3,000 people have been killed in work-related accidents, yet we are still waiting for effective corporate manslaughter legislation. It is time to stop the carnage at work and remember Workers' Memorial Day, and the slogan "*Fight for the living, remember the dead*". I ask Congress to support the emergency motion.

**The President:** Thank you. I now call Brendan Barber, the General Secretary, to give the General Council's position.

**Brendan Barber:** President and Congress, this will be a very brief intervention to express very strong support on the part of the General Council for this motion on an issue which we have been campaigning on for so long now and where we expected the government to respond and to act. Indeed, our campaign has been for clearer accountabilities and stronger penalties, not just on manslaughter but for all health and safety offences.

The point of explanation that the General Council wanted to enter was the reference in the emergency motion to the specific Bill which is currently being put before Parliament. The advice that we have received is that, technically, there may be difficulties because of the title of the Bill, adding to that any new offences beyond corporate manslaughter itself. In making directors personally accountable in the way that we have campaigned for, we may run into Parliamentary obstacles to using *this* Bill to deliver that objective. If that does prove to be the case, do not be in any doubt about our determination to take this campaign to the Government. They have made a commitment on this issue. We do expect to see directors held personally accountable for the actions and decision they make. In one way or the other, we are determined to deliver that reform. Thank you, Congress.

\* *Emergency Motion 4 was CARRIED.*

### **The importance of equality**

**The President:** Congress, I call Motion 82, The importance of equality. The General Council oppose the motion. I will be calling the General Secretary during the debate to explain the General Council's position.

**Maria Exall** (*Communication Workers Union*) moved Motion 82 on behalf of TUC Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Conference.

She said: Congress, in this motion we are asking the General Council to consider proposals which we believe

make clearer the voices of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender workers, women workers, black workers and disabled workers at the heart of our movement, proposals that will develop the trade union movement in an open, progressive and outward looking way. We believe that increasing the number of motions from TUC equality conferences to this Congress from one to two, and directly electing a representative from the conference to the General Council are positive ways forward for TUC democracy. We are asking Congress to be open with a request that comes not only from our conference but from all the other TUC equality conferences. All four conferences have carried motions similar to *this* one both this year and last year.

We are asking Congress to support progressive change. Previous reforms to equality structures, including, for example, the setting-up of a TUC LGBT conference had been controversial initially, but they have more than proved their worth over time. The LGBT Conference is larger and more inclusive with every year that passes.

Now we are asking you to give us the credibility of electing our own representative. We believe that if you take our conference and the other equality conferences seriously our movement will be strengthened collectively. There are many, many workers out *there* who do not see unions for them. Campaigning on equality issues is a way of reaching them. We can take our movement into new areas where we have yet to organise. Equality issues are ways of showing people the relevance of trade unionism for their lives. It is a way of organising all our class.

We are asking Congress to be outward looking, to acknowledge the increasing importance of equality issues in our society. The issues of work-life balance, gender and race pay gaps, rights for disabled workers, opposing harassment and bullying will all form greater not lesser parts of the union reps' work in the future. We are asking you to acknowledge the strategic importance of equality issues. Many employers are fully aware of the potential of equality issues for their agenda. They are setting up separate networks for their staff. They are using expert equality bodies which sideline unions, and this is happening both in the public and private sectors. We know the employers' commitment to equality is shallow, restricted to a very narrow business case. It cannot deliver. It is up to us to argue for workplace justice on equality issues. We need to capture this ground. To do this, we need to think creatively, act positively and be prepared to change.

Congress, we are aware of the opposition to this motion. As far as we can see, it seems to be based on a reservation on the matter of direct representation. But, Congress, we believe that the moderate reforms that we are asking for are in line with the existing trade union principle that members directly affected by issues should have a say in the decisions which are made on those issues on their behalf.

We believe that our proposals will enhance our existing democracy. It is a change that is in line with our tradition.

The concerns of women workers, black workers, disabled workers and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender workers are not added extras to union organisation that we can take or leave. They are vital for our movement's future. We urge you to give delegates to the TUC equality conferences – your own members and activists, that is – the respect they deserve. We ask you to support the motion and the changes proposed, changes which would strengthen our movement as a whole.

We, as trade unionists, will argue with better and greater effect on the basic class politics for our movement if we represent our class in all its diversity.

Please, Congress, support this motion. Let us show that unity really is strength.

**Jim O'Neill** (*Prison Officers Association*): President, this motion is calling for a report to be produced and its proposals to be considered. We believe that this is the way forward in a multi-cultural society so that every working person, irrespective of gender, race, sexual orientation, should have access to trade union representation. We should be moving forward to organising in workplaces where bullying and harassment is rife because of a lack of union representation.

Congress should be congratulated on the advances already made. They should be using this as a springboard for further advances. To me equality equals fairness, and that is what we are fighting for on a daily basis. So why should anyone be treated differently, or is it unfairly, because of their sexual orientation, race, gender or disability?

As a prison officer, I am discriminated against on a daily basis because I have not had my full trade union rights returned to me and we want them back. As an organisation which believes in equality and fairness, all voices should be equally heard. Please support.

**Mary Davis** (*University and College Union*) said: I am very pleased to be speaking on this motion probably for the fifth year running. This motion is supported by all the equality conferences of this TUC. That is, I would say, half the membership of the British trade union movement. You ignore that at your peril. If there is opposition to this motion, let it come forward, let us hear it and debate it. We had it last year and the opposition was quite specious. I gather that some of the unions which opposed this motion last year have now, very sensibly, changed their minds. Perhaps they have been listening to their women, black, lesbian and gay, LGBT, and disabled members who all say the same thing. We are this movement. We are not just out *there* in our equality conferences. We want to bring what we do into this movement.

If you do not like that, then I say you are putting the death knell on this movement of ours. The General Council has said that it will have further discussion on these constitutional issues with the chairs of the equality committees following conferences. I say, let's cut out all of that. Let's make the decision. Then they do not need to meet the chairs because the chairs will only say what we told them, anyway. It is a complete waste of time. Conference needs to make a decision and it should make a decision. The decision you are required to make here is not a major decision. Do you know what you are asked to do in this motion? I ask you to read it very carefully. You are asking the General Council to consider the right of conferences to submit to motions and to have direct representation from the equality committees on to the General Council. I do not want to see anyone coming to this rostrum and saying, "We believe in the principle of direct election" because you do not elect at least two of the sections directly, anyway. So what is the problem? What is the problem?

The fact is that if this issue is not addressed in the way that it should be – I think this is very sensible – the General Council is asked to consider a question, so for God's sake at least pass that. Make them consider it. We have won the business about having one motion. Can we have another one? We are half the membership. Look. It is time that we drew a halt to this situation and that people understood that the equality structures are not some optional extra in the British trade union movement. They are here to stay, they play a role and we will not go away. Let me tell you this. This motion is going to come back again and

again and again, and we will wear you out. I repeat, we will wear you out. You will have to think about it. You are going to have to make sure that every single delegate who you send to any of these conferences really is on the line. At the moment, there is no opposition at the equality conferences. So who are they representing? (*Bell rang*) I am not asking you to get heavy-handed, but I am asking you to pass this motion today overwhelmingly.

**Jude Jackson** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) in supporting the motion, said: Congress, we have already discussed the importance of organising for increasing and promoting active membership. This approach will make us stronger as a movement and consolidates our legitimacy. Members must self-organise if we are to be fit to take on the attacks being made on all sections of the workforce, and equality issues are core to the organising agenda. It is crucial that all unions develop structures to encourage the participation of under-represented groups, whether they be black, minority ethnic, LGBT, disabled or women members.

The TUC should take a lead in encouraging these structures across all the unions to enable equality groups to get their voices and concerns heard in the trade union movement as a whole. The current arrangements for TUC Conference means that the range of equality issues debated is limited whereas these issues need to be taken up by the entire trades union movement. We have to ensure that the trade unions are relevant to all sections of workers. By agreeing to have two motions submitted by each equality conference, the whole movement benefits from the knowledge of our issues.

PCS is concerned about improving the democracy of the TUC structures, and we have to ask why it is that Congress decides who will represent each equality strand on the General Council and not the TUC equality conferences themselves, who must have a greater legitimacy by virtue of the fact that the delegates to these conferences have been elected by the members they represent, presumably in the belief that they will represent their interests or be removed from office. Doesn't it smack just a little of chauvinism, and isn't it patronising to deprive these equality sections from electing their own candidates who will be accountable to the equality strands they represent? Doesn't this fly in the face of the concept of legitimate self-organisation, representation, accountability and democracy?

Equality issues are at the core of the organising agenda, so why does this agenda, apparently, grind to a halt when it comes to electing equality seats onto the General Council? Congress, if we are serious about democracy, equality and organising agendas, then let the equality sections and, by extension, the members making their choice. Support this motion.

**Vicky Knight** (*Fire Brigades' Union*) spoke in support of Motion 82.

She said: I proudly support Motion 82. Congress, if this motion was asking for the General Council to consider being elected solely by the equality conference, then the opposition may just have a point; in fact, the very point which is being made in this motion. The LGBT Conference does not want to elect our Congress representatives, and they, Congress, do not want you electing theirs. No equality conference does. We have told you this year on year on year. Congress, this motion is not questioning the individuals representing them at present, but just how we select them. Comrades, I understand your possible trepidation in supporting this motion, and that is why we are not asking you to agree today for equality conferences to

have two motions to Congress and direct representation from the equality conferences to the General Council. It is asking you to ask the General Council to consider *this* and produce a report for the LGBT Conference 2007.

Sisters and brothers, delegates, to vote against this motion is to vote against considering change. Surely, you are not opposed to consideration, Congress? If the bosses refuse to consider a proposal year on year on year, this movement would have a reaction. Well, the FBU's reaction to *this* is similar. What is the General Council so scared of and what is the opposition to this motion so scared of? I do not know.

Many unions have consistently argued, and quite correctly, that if the traditional systems within unions and the TUC worked, we would have hundreds of young officials, black officials, women officials – you see the point – representing those at all levels of all organisations, and there would be no such thing as a minority issue or an equality issue. There would only be a trade union issue. But that is not how it is, Congress, if we are being honest.

To support Motion 82, however, is to advance the agenda of all trade unionists, to consider getting LGBT members elected for and on behalf of their own members. We are aiming for true progress, democratic progress and accountable progress. Anything less is aiming low and unacceptable. Please support Motion 82.

**The President:** Thank you. The final speaker will be from the NUT before I call the General Secretary to reply.

**Baljeet Ghale** (*National Union of Teachers*): This motion, as has been said, has been debated and passed at each of the equality conferences and asks the General Council to give urgent attention to the issues it raises. Black, LGBT, disabled and women trade unionists have been calling for many years for our voices to be heard within the trade union movement and, particularly, at Congress. No doubt, we will hear about how members of the General Council are elected at Congress and to elect members directly at the equality conferences would somehow undermine the legitimacy of such members. The fact is that this is a red-herring. Fewer than 50 per cent of General Council members are elected at Congress. The majority are elected by guaranteed places, usually dependent on the size of the individual affiliates. I am not saying that the system is wrong, but let us not use red-herrings as an excuse. Such representation would be perfectly legitimate if delegates to the conferences are representatives of their respective unions, speaking on behalf of their members.

What delegates to equality conferences want is a say in the choice of those who represent them. This can only happen if we take this progressive step, which is hardly likely to turn the trade union movement on its head but will take it forward. Two motions from each of the conferences would be equitable with affiliate entitlement, be less restrictive and would enhance the equality debate at Congress.

We in the National Union of Teachers support this motion because we believe it will enhance the TUC's leadership in campaigns for equal rights and dignity at work for all workers, will strengthen the TUC's reputation for equalities work and will ensure that there is greater involvement from all within the trade union movement. Please support this motion.

**Brendan Barber** (*General Secretary*): President and Congress, during the past year unions and the equality committees have taken part in a wide-ranging exercise

on TUC structures and services which originated in part from a motion carried at last year's Congress and, as a result, you have seen some changes at this Congress and over the next few months I hope we will see further changes, such as more focused General Council meetings, greater clarity about the respective roles of the General Council and the Executive and stronger links between the work of individual unions and that of the TUC.

The relationship with the equality structures is an outstanding and a difficult issue. I will be meeting with the chairs of the equality committees about this soon after Congress. I do not think that there can be any doubt that equality issues have risen up the TUC agenda in recent years, and that is thanks to the work of our cross-union equality structures. Our aim as a movement has to be to embed equality in unions' own work and, most crucially, in the workplace as well as within the TUC.

That is the background against which this motion needs to be considered. Further, it is a motion which raises two specific issues. On motions to Congress, it asks for parity between the conferences and unions with each having the right to submit two motions. As well as adding to an already crowded agenda, that would upset the compromise reached in 2001. What was clear in that debate, and what is still clear, is that whilst some unions would go along with the demand for parity, others are firmly of the belief that Congress is a parliament of unions, and that unions alone should have the right to submit motions to the agenda. So the decision to enable each equality conference to forward one motion represented a compromise. The General Council does not think that that compromise should be disturbed.

The second issue is that of elections to the General Council. This issue was debated at Congress just last year. The Congress was clear. It wanted to retain the current position that all General Council members are accountable to their unions and to Congress and not to any other body. Break that principle and you break a fundamental tenet of our democracy. Not only that, you also raise a whole series of practical problems and questions. For example, would the implication be that we should, for example, drop the current requirement that large unions include at least one woman in their General Council membership? Would Congress have no role in the election of all the members in the specialist equality seats?

As speakers have said, yes, the motion only asks for consideration and for a report. Yes, we will be discussing the relationship between the equality structures and the General Council in Congress, but it is important that the General Council makes it clear that we do not consider that these proposals, which have been debated time and time again, should be supported. On that basis, Congress, I have to ask you to oppose the motion.

**Maria Exall** (*Communication Workers Union*): On behalf of the TUC LGBT Conference, I am exercising the right of reply to Brendan's remarks. Brendan, I must say that I am a bit confused. You are actually acknowledging the need for change and accepting that issues of equality mean that we will have to consider our structures in the future, yet you are saying that because we made a compromise four years ago, we cannot move on. I do not think that two motions rather than one is going to break anybody's bank. I think it is a fairly legitimate and moderate demand. We are pleased to hear you say that you are going to meet with the chairs to discuss future equality structures but, as has already been pointed out in the debate, the chairs have got their mandate from the

equality conferences which they actually represent, not one year but for two years.

You are quite right, and we totally agree, that the issue of reforming and making us more outward looking in terms of equality does not just happen at TUC equality conferences. It has to happen in unions themselves and go down to the workplace, but that is exactly where the strength of the TUC equality conferences are. They are able to support affiliates in doing that and they are very important for that reason.

You talked about the difficulty of the accountability of the TUC equality conferences. The people who send delegates to equality conferences are the affiliates who are here now. I really do not see what the problem is.

You also raised the issue around the specialist equality seats. Again, we think that is a red-herring. They are totally untouched by our proposals for direct representation in the equality conferences.

Let me finish with two points. This is a plea to those unions who we know have already said that they are going to oppose this motion. We ask you to think what it would be like if you came to Congress and you were being told by other people who should be on the General Council from your union. You would not be very happy about that. I am coming to give you the message from the TUC LGBT Conference and from all the other conferences that they want to have some sort of accountability of the people who represent them.

Finally, this motion is asking the General Council to consider. We are asking for further dialogue. We urge you to vote for that. We are asking you to hear our voices, to take on board what we are proposing and accept the legitimacy and importance of the voice of LGBT workers, black workers, women workers and disabled workers at the heart of this movement. Please support this motion.

**The President:** Thank you, Maria. Congress, I now move to the vote on Motion 82.

A card vote was called, the result of which was as follows:

|                     |           |
|---------------------|-----------|
| For the motion:     | 2,411,000 |
| Against the motion: | 3,789,000 |
| Majority against:   | 1,378,000 |

\* *Motion 82 was LOST.*

### TUC Accounts

**The President:** I draw the attention of Congress to Appendix 3, from page 186 of the General Council's Report, which is the TUC Accounts. The auditor is present on the platform. Does Congress accept the accounts as set out in the Appendix?

\* *The TUC Accounts were agreed.*

### TUC policy and campaigning

**The President:** We now move to Chapter 9 of the General Council's Report, Campaigns and Communications on page 159. I call Motion 81. The General Council support the motion.

**Brian Caton** (*Prison Officers Association*) moved Motion 81.

He said: The POA this week at Congress and at the fringes has been able to progress our campaign and our view on our plight as the most oppressed, suppressed and, at times, depressed affiliate of this organisation. Our restrictions have only been exceeded by those of the oppressive regimes referred to in the international debate. Having your right stripped from



you is bad enough, but having all industrial relations within your workplace committed through the courts remains an unacceptable legacy for this New Labour Government.

Our campaign to return our trade union rights to our members is something at the heart of this TUC. The POA lost its rights and came constantly to Congress to further its campaign, but we lost them while campaigning against privatisation and prison overcrowding. These are on-going policies which exist in this TUC. It is our belief that this Congress needs to be honest with its affiliate unions and needs to be honest with itself. If we are not going to progress policies adopted by this Congress, be honest, Congress, and do not accept them. If you do accept them, progress them and do it wholeheartedly. If I am asked by any suitable group or organisation to speak on TUC policies, I will do it because I think and believe that I am obliged to as a representative of an affiliate union. It is our TUC policies that we move forward, regardless of where we do it. We do it not because it happens to be the view of the government of the day, or not, and not because you will gain as individuals but because this TUC adopts policies in order to progress them and bring about change.

If we are in the TUC, we are together, united by our policies and our desire to achieve them, even if it offends the Government, government ministers, potential prime ministers or anybody else. We should progress them regardless of the size of the union because small unions seem to want to shout out while sometimes bigger ones do not. If we do nothing else within this movement and at the TUC, let us be honest, direct and united in supporting our policies. Please support the motion.

**Alan McClean** (*Fire Brigades' Union*) seconded Motion 81.

He said: We welcome the POA's motion both in its spirit and intent. Across the movement we have campaigned on a whole range of issues. These are reflected in the various debates here at Congress. Some are more sexy than others, but all are very important - health and safety, trade union rights, international affairs, like Cuba, southern Africa, the Middle East and so on. We have also heard discussion on individual disputes such as Remploy and the FBU Merseyside dispute. The TUC itself initiates such campaigns. Sometimes individual unions do so and often it is down to individual activists. They are the key to the movement. We see campaigning bodies grow and they may become officially supported by the TUC, but we need to note that they often start as initiatives by small groups of individual activists. There will often tend to be suspicion, but we need to encourage such initiatives because they are the key to progress on campaigning. The example of the Public Services/Not Private Profit Campaign demonstrates this approach. We saw a number of unions supporting a lobby of Parliament which brought together activists from across many areas of the public sector.

Congress, campaigning lies at the heart of our activity and at the heart of any progress we make. We need to ensure accountability and democratic control. We also need to ensure that initiative is not stifled. Thank you.

\* *Motion 81 was CARRIED.*

### **Flexible working**

**The President:** I call Motion 14, Flexible Working. The General Council supports the motion.

**Maureen Williams** (*Union of Shop Distributive and Allied Workers*) moved Motion 14.

She said: I am a first-time delegate at Congress. (*Applause*) Congress, you are aware that the UK have the longest working hours in the European Union. The long-hours culture is here and if business has its way it is here to stay. Not just content with that, the UK persistently appears at the top end of the working hours league table. Business is often pushing the boundaries, pressing for extensions, undermining the abilities of parents to balance their paid work with their unpaid caring commitments.

Our members in USDAW have very recently been at the sharp end of the push by retailers to further increase their working week. The proposal was to extend Sunday trading hours for larger stores. In a bid for deregulation retailers claim that they had staff queuing up to work extra hours on Sundays. We in USDAW conducted our own research. Not surprisingly, we discovered that in every company far higher numbers wanted to work less hours, not more. In large stores less than three percent wanted to work longer hours. Some retailers claim that Sunday working tends to be limited to young workers and students. Wrong again. Our research shows that the vast majority, that is 80 percent of shop workers, work on Sundays with a third working every Sunday and a quarter working more than one Sunday in four. Nor is Sunday working always voluntary. Nearly half of shop workers feel pressured to work Sundays with parents and carers feeling the pressure more than most. Saturday is the busiest trading day of the week, so Sunday is particularly precious to shop workers. For many Sunday is the only day they definitely get to spend time with their families.

USDAW's campaign persuaded the Government to drop the proposal to extend Sunday trading hours. Congress, just under 300 MPs signed the Early Day Motion supporting USDAW's position to oppose further deregulation on Sunday trading. I would like to express our appreciation to those MPs and the Labour Government which listened to USDAW's case.

The research has been done, the evidence is clear. Long working hours have a negative impact on physical and mental health, stress, family life and the productivity of the worker. Furthermore, it serves to entrench the inequality between men and women. Men work long hours. Fathers work the longest hours in the UK to make up for the lost income of mothers. Women, on the other hand, have little or no choice other than to take up part-time work which fits in with their caring responsibilities. All too often, women work below their potential or are prevented from developing or progressing in work. Our experience is that women in part-time jobs, in low paid industries, are second-rate employees. All too often they are ignored, overlooked and regarded as dispensable and easily replaced.

A culture change is not only needed but long overdue. The division between full-time and part-time work needs to be broken down, and extending flexible working is the key. It is crucial to tackle occupational segregation. It is critical to raise the standard of part-time workers, and it is crucial to UK businesses if they are to maintain their competitive edge and boost productivity. At the moment, only parents of young and disabled children have the legal right to request flexible working. We want the right to flexible working extended to all parents and, ultimately, all workers. Congress, good employers recognise that flexibility goes both ways. It is important that employees' working hours are given appropriate consideration in order to balance their work commitments and social responsibilities. Just because the demands of older children may be less obvious, it does not make them less real. The point is that flexible working hours are needed during children's teenage years, which is an important stage in a child's

life. *(Bell rang)* Flexible working is also important is the move from primary to secondary school or the move into further education. There is no doubt that the battle for flexible working is heavily stacked against us. The Government's message is that flexible is good for children, good for parents and good for business. So let us hold them to their word. I move.

**Stuart Herdson** (*Association of Teachers and Lecturers*) seconded Motion 14.

He said: This might be my last speech at Congress. I will not take an hour and-a-half over it and I don't have a dry eye!

Since April 2003, employees with children aged under six years and with children under 18 years if disabled have the right to request a change in their hours and time and place of work. That is not enough. That excludes all those workers with children aged 6 to 16 who are in mainstream education and who are not disabled. ATL, as a good employer, is presently seeking to extend the statutory right to all its employees. We encourage all the unions to follow the practice and lead the way in good employee management.

What about our members who work for employers who are not flexible in their approach; often the lowest paid workers who work most unsociable hours, for example, care workers, cleaners, supermarket employees or the ridiculous 96-hour continuous shift for the fire-fighters? Employees have the right to make a request to change their working hours. That can be turned down, and often is, usually, as it says, for justifiable business reasons. In other words, every time they ask, they get turned down. Social dialogue, which is supposed to change their working hours, just does not exist.

Consider the position of a single parent or a working parent who always seems to be on the 4.00 pm to 8.00 pm shift, the very times when most pupils require help from their parents. A little lad comes home from school and says, "Mum, can you help me with my maths homework? I don't really get it." And mum says, "Sorry, son, I have to go to work. I will help you when I come back." "But, mum, I will be in bed then and you will be tired." "Well, I will help you tomorrow". "But it has to be done by tomorrow." "Just do your best." And so he does his best; he fails; he does not do it very well and becomes disillusioned.

That is not the way to enhance education and it is not the role of the childminder to help young people with their education. It is the role of the parents. Those pupils who need most help may not be performing well at school and they are often the children of those parents who are forced into working non-flexible hours. It is because they get less help that they perform less well.

If the Government is keen on raising standards, it should look again at the Act and extend the right to request flexible working hours to all parents of children of compulsory age. I ask you to support the motion. *(Applause)*

\* *Motion 14 was CARRIED*

## Equality Reps

**Walter Wright** (*Nationwide Group Staff Union*) moved Motion 15.

He said: Congress, discrimination of any form, whether it be on the basis of sex, age, race, disability, sexuality, religion or belief, is, and will remain, unacceptable. Discrimination infringes our basic right to equal treatment. Discrimination on any of these grounds gives rise to a truism that employers and the Government should hate.

A workplace where discrimination is allowed to undermine the respect and dignity of individuals and

to perpetuate unfair practice will breed an unhappy workforce. An unhappy workforce is less productive. So it is in the interests of both employers and workers to tackle the root cause of discrimination and to ensure all workers are treated equally. The nature and make-up of the workforce has changed dramatically in the last 50 years and will continue to do so. Today, half the workforce are women. We now have a workplace with workers from many ethnic minority communities. There are fewer younger workers than in the past and employers have been forced to encourage more people to consider working beyond retirement age. The needs of workers who are parents and carers require changes in attitudes and the introduction of more flexible working practices. Whilst the CBI seeks flexibility for itself, it is not so forthcoming in recognising its employees' needs. This must change.

We have laws relating to discrimination already. Many are, however, relatively new and with age legislation next month adding to an already complex area, much of this legislation is open to interpretation. The Government's discrimination law review is, therefore, welcomed. All of this poses challenges for unions and identifies the need for a new specialised union rep, the equality rep. Equality reps will provide the focus for collective strength, unity of purpose and enable real strides to be made in developing fairer workplaces. The recommendations made in the Women and Work Commission's Report, *Shaping a Fairer Future* in respect of equality reps was also welcomed.

The Commission has recognised the important role that employee involvement has in tackling discrimination in the workplace, and that equality representatives have a critical role to play in the development. We welcome these recommendations and ask Congress to commend them to the Government.

Also, we urge the Government to ring-fence the recommended funding of £5 million within the Union Modernisation Fund. This must be protected money and not watered down in the generality of the fund. We need these reps to make us even more effective in defending the fundamental principle of the right for equal treatment. Please support this motion.

*(Applause)*

**Judy McKnight** (*napo*) seconded Motion 15.

She said: Congress, we all know that the higher the level of trade union organisation in any given workplace and the higher level of collective bargaining, the more the equality agenda is progressed in those workplaces. That is the significance of the Women and Work Commission's recommendation that £5 million should be put into capacity building for equality reps through the Union Modernisation Fund.

Ideally, those equality reps would have been put on a statutory basis, but the recommendation for them to be there and the recommendation for their funding is still very significant and very much down to the efforts of the TUC nominees on the Women and Work Commission.

The context of our amendment to the original motion around the funding was because during the past weeks and months we were getting increasingly nervous about the cut-backs across public expenditure and Civil Service budgets as to whether or not the full funding in those recommendations would be given.

It was, therefore, with some relief that we heard earlier this week that the funding would be given. We were pleased to have Ruth Kelly, the Minister for Women, address the Women's Committee reception on Sunday night. It was the first of those receptions -- and I hope not the last Women's Committee reception -- at the TUC. She gave us a preview on the Government's action plan that was launched on Monday on

implementing the Women and Work Commission recommendations, which did include her going ahead with the equality reps.

I would have to admit some disappointment on seeing that, when you look through the Government's action plan, nearly all the recommendations which involve hard cash are only partially accepted. So money exists, but not necessarily the full amount as recommended by the Commission. Nevertheless, there is significant money there for us to work with.

Similarly, I make the point about the Equal Opportunities Commission. The EOC has never been adequately funded throughout its history, but it is critical that it is funded adequately at the moment, both because of the extra responsibilities put on it because of the Women and Work Commission recommendations, but also in the final year in the run-up to the establishment of the Commission for Equality in Human Rights next year, it is really important that the gender issues are not overlooked at this critical time.

Congress, please support Motion 15 and let us all in our affiliated unions, as well as through the TUC, keep up the pressure on the Government to put its money where its mouth is on the equalities agenda. Thank you, Congress. *(Applause)*

\* *Motion 15 was CARRIED*

### **Violence against Women**

**Pat Lerew** (*National Association of Schoolmasters' Union of Women Teachers*) moved Motion 16.

She said: I am speaking on behalf of the TUC Women's Conference in finally proposing Motion 16, violence against women. Having proposed Motion 16 at the Women's Conference in March, I was delighted when it was voted to be the one to go to the TUC Congress. I was very honoured when my sisters asked me to be the one to propose it here.

My interest in this problem had been heightened when I attended the fringe meeting on violence against women here at last year's Congress. I was so shocked by the awful statistics and the problems caused by the number of government departments involved in supposedly giving women a better deal that it was something I really wanted to bring out of the fringe and put centre stage, first at the Women's Conference and now here, which is a real bonus because too often it is only women hearing about this problem and it is too big an issue to be marginalised.

This is not a personal issue. I count myself as one of the fortunate two-thirds of the female population in this country who have not been affected by personal abuse. For me, home is my favourite place. Having done a great deal of travelling for my union during the past few years, I know the value of getting home and I cannot begin to contemplate the deprivation that people must feel when this is not the position.

We know that all around the world women face the threat of violence in their homes, in their workplaces and in their communities. It happens in private and public spheres. Women around us conceal bruises that are both physical and mental. During peacetime and in conflict zones, women find themselves in the frontline. Violence, whether physical, emotional or sexual, is inflicted on their minds and bodies by private individuals, by armed groups and by governments. It is a human rights issue; it is a public health issue and it is a legitimate trade union issue.

Why do I call it a trade union issue? Violence affects a woman's working life; physical injuries, sleep deprivation, low morale and low self-esteem can affect times at work, performance and productivity. Leaving home to escape a violent situation can sometimes mean that the workplace becomes physically inaccessible. Violence against women kills. The Council of Europe has estimated that domestic violence

is the major cause of death or disability for women aged 16 to 44 and accounts for more deaths and ill-health than war, cancer or traffic accidents.

Worldwide, it has been estimated that at least one in three women has been beaten, coerced into sex or otherwise abused during her lifetime usually by someone known to her. In the UK, it is our colleagues, our friends and our relatives who are suffering. The emergency services receive an average of one call a minute about violence in the family. On average, in Great Britain, one woman is murdered every three days by a violent partner or ex-partner.

We must also be concerned for the children who are caught up in these situations. A British study has found that 90 percent of children in violent homes are in the same or an adjacent room when the violence occurs. One-third of children in violent homes are injured whilst trying to protect their mothers. We know there is a risk to the emotional well-being and safety of children witnessing an abusive relationship; there is an adverse effect on their capacity to learn and their behaviour in school, and also that children exposed to violence are more likely to become both victims and perpetrators.

It is estimated that domestic violence costs in excess of £23 billion a year in the UK, but the true cost of violence against women has not yet been uncovered; the effect on women's life chances, lost working time, psychological damage and the restrictions it places on their full participation in the lives of their communities. It is tragic to think that in 21st century Britain, women are still prevented by bullying partners from either voting in elections or voting the way they wish. Amnesty International's excellent report, 'It's in our hands - Stop violence against women' contains harrowing stories from across the world. Some of these concern aspects of cultural practices and conditions, particularly those related to notions of purity and chastity, which are invoked to explain or excuse cruelty. Others are the result of warfare and conflict which devastate the lives of men, women and children, but the systematic rape and violation of women and girls have become the norm as a weapon of war in many conflicts. Gender-specific forms of violence are also endemic in many militarised societies. Another manifestation of violence against women and girls internationally is the growth of inhuman trafficking which targets them in particular; an aspect which looks set to increase with the continual enlargement of the European Union. Everyone has a responsibility to condemn it, challenge attitudes that perpetuate it and confront those who fail to act against it.

The motion calls for the compilation of evidence on the impact that violence has on women throughout their lives on their access to education and employment and for the raising of public awareness of this issue so that we can understand the full extent of the problem. It calls upon the TUC and affiliates to participate fully in the campaign here in the UK and internationally. Finally, it calls upon the TUC and affiliates to demand from the Government a coherent, national, cross-departmental strategy to end violence against women. Congress, I urge you to support this vital motion. *(Applause)*

**Barbara White** (*Musicians Union*) seconded Motion 16.

She said: I regard it as a great privilege to be seconding such an important motion. The TUC is part of the coalition against violence against women. This is a trade union issue because amongst our membership we have people who perpetuate violence and people who experience violence. Equality is at the heart of the trade union movement. However, how can we achieve equality when there is a climate which allows violence to continue?

The British Crime Survey 1996 found that 43 percent of all female homicides were carried out by the woman's partner or ex-partner. The World Health Organisation has stated that 70 percent of female murder victims are killed by their male partners.

The level of abuse constitutes a human rights crisis where millions of women in the UK are unable to enjoy their basic human rights because of sexual violence or stalking. This includes violence in the same sex relationships. Figures from Broken Rainbow research demonstrate that same sex domestic violence not only exists, but has been experienced by both lesbian and bisexual women and gay and bisexual men. This is compounded because lesbians with children may fear the outcome of custody hearings if they were to ask for help. Both groups may find it difficult to seek help because of society disapproval of same sex relationships. We have to mobilise organisations and individuals to rise up and demand that the UK Government and foreign administrations honour their obligations to end violence against women.

Amnesty International UK's Trade Union Network is here throughout Congress. Visit them on stand 32 -- that is if they are still here, of course -- to talk with them about this campaign and other work to take action in solidarity with trade unionists and other individuals at risk. Whilst there, ask them about the European Convention against trafficking, which was opened for signatures in May 2005, but still has not been signed by the United Kingdom. There are cards on the stand which you can send to the Home Secretary requesting that the UK sign.

I hope that you are all listening to this. May I go as far as to say, we are not asking you but we are telling you to listen. We know from Ruth Kelly that she is committed to taking this forward through her new department, the Department of Communities and Local Government. *(Applause)*

**The President:** Congress, I am unable to take the eight additional unions requesting to speak in support of this motion.

\* *Motion 16 was CARRIED*

### Women's Equality

**Janine Booth** (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) spoke to paragraph 2.8.

She said: Hello, those of you who are still here. I have two questions on this paragraph. Firstly, this is the TUC Women's Conference that voted to organise an annual demonstration for working women's rights on International Women's Day starting next year. I would like the General Council to confirm that it will give this demonstration the support and the resources that it needs. I would like to encourage all unions to mobilise your members to take part in that demonstration next year and the years following.

Secondly, in response to a question from me last year, the General Council reassured us that it would campaign to defend abortion rights. Anti-abortionists continue to press for a cut in the time limit, a move which would attack women's freedom and choice and affect most severely the most vulnerable women. We see a lot of religious leaders and others calling for abortion rights to be restricted, but, in my view, we do not see enough of the TUC speaking out in defence of those rights and against the attacks on the time limit. I would like the General Council to tell us that the TUC will campaign more vocally for women's abortion rights and will not wait for a legislative attack on those rights before it speaks out. *(Applause)*

**The President:** I now call Judy McKnight to reply to the two questions raised.

**Judy McKnight** (*General Council*): I would like to give an assurance to the delegate and to Congress that the General Council and the Women's Committee, working to the General Council on this issue, are very much committed both to the demonstration and to progressing the campaigning issues around abortion rights. The Women's Committee is meeting in October and will certainly make sure that both those items are on our agenda, to take them forward and progress through the General Council. Thank you.

### Redundancy Law

**John Lowe** (*Association for College Management*) moved Motion 11.

He said: Congress, I am, by the skin of my teeth, a first-time speaker. *(Applause)*

Motion 11 is about improving this country's redundancy laws so that workers threatened with redundancy are properly consulted and so that workers who are made redundant receive decent compensation. I am from the Association for College Management. It is almost certain that in the last couple of years your local FE college will have been restructured and staff will have been made redundant. I was made redundant myself last year. Nearly half the calls to our union helpline are from members threatened with restructuring or redundancy. Of course, this is not something that just affects staff in further education colleges. We heard yesterday about the disgraceful treatment of staff at Thomson Call Centre in Glasgow. The General Council's own report to this Congress states that for many years the General Council has raised concerns that UK redundancy laws are substantially weaker than those enjoyed by workers across the EU. The workers at Peugeot at Ryton know all about that.

What is wrong with existing UK redundancy laws? The main problem is that they do not require employers to consult properly to enable workers and their trade union representatives to negotiate ways of reducing the impact of any redundancies. In particular, employers are not required to consult workers and trade unions at all if fewer than 20 employees are threatened with redundancy. This allows unscrupulous employers to plan redundancies so that they can pick off small groups of workers and no one is consulted at all. This arbitrary threshold of 20 must be dropped immediately.

Furthermore, there is great confusion about when employers are required to start the process of consultation. The EU directive says one thing, UK legislation says another and case-law says something else. Once again, this allows unscrupulous employers to make a mockery of consultation. Workers and their representatives need to be informed of the threat of redundancies at the earliest possible moment so they have time to prepare a strategy to reduce the impact of redundancy. The law must be clarified to ensure that we know our rights to meaningful consultation and so we can negotiate a better outcome for the workers concerned.

Sometimes the outcome will be that workers are made redundant. In these cases, it is vital that they should receive decent compensation. The Government must increase the limit to statutory redundancy pay in line with its own manifesto commitment. At the moment, the highest statutory redundancy payment anyone can receive is £8,700 after at least 20 years of service. It would be no higher after 30 years or after 40 years. This is clearly unfair and inadequate.

We need to challenge the Government to change the laws and regulations about redundancy. We need meaningful consultation to protect the rights of every individual worker threatened by redundancy and we need decent statutory compensation for those who are

made redundant. I urge you to support the motion. Thank you. *(Applause)*

**Shirley Rainey** (*Chartered Society of Physiotherapy*) seconded Motion 11.

She said: Not so long ago, our Government were promising an increase in all health workers, so I can entirely understand the disbelief of a fellow colleague at our SOS NHS rally in Plymouth last weekend when she said, "I never believed that nurses would be made redundant." Unfortunately, as we have heard this week, many workers are being made redundant across the country. Trusts have been told to deliver savings and efficiencies in this financial year. We are seeing the redundancy laws being manipulated as managers make knee-jerk decisions to fulfil this remit. We have heard trusts starting consultation on making staff redundant before they have even tabled their proposals. They come three to four weeks later, so valuable time is lost in those 90 days. What can you do to support your members if you do not even know if their jobs are affected?

Other trusts have tried to treat their workforce as separate units. If there are less than 20 people, only 30 days' notice is required. That is not enough time to enter into meaningful discussions or to look at possible redeployment or alternative solutions before people quickly join the unemployed. Two years ago, more staff were needed in the NHS. Today, after another redesign of the service, we are looking at many staff being threatened with redundancy and unemployment. Let's make sure redundancy laws allow time for meaningful discussions. Maybe we could then have time to negotiate to save jobs. Please support. *(Applause)*

\* *Motion 11 was CARRIED*

**Irish Ferries**

**Paul Moloney** (*National Union of Marine, Aviation and Shipping Transport Officers*) moved Motion 12. He said: Colleagues, towards the end of last year, a dispute over pay and conditions escalated into one of Ireland's most significant industrial disputes. A dispute that started as a determined attempt to protect jobs turned quite literally into a battle between an unscrupulous employer and a workforce determined to make a stand. It is a familiar story. This time, however, the dispute took place on ferries operating between the UK and Ireland. The employer, Irish Ferries, mounted a sustained attack on professional seafarers, members of NUMAST, RMT and our sister union in Ireland, SIPTU. They attempted to sack these workers and employ others on wages well below any threshold of decency in a blatant attempt to maximise profits. Congress, please allow me to pay tribute to those trade unionists on board the Irish Ferries' vessels who fought back. When faced with the takeover of the ship by so-called security guards, they barricaded themselves in the engine room, initially not certain whether the ships were, indeed, the victims of a terrorist attack. I ask you to put yourselves in the position of those workers. For 23 days they remained barricaded into a small area with no hot food, no natural light and only a bunch of hairy-arsed engineers for company! Sacrifice indeed, but one that led to the Irish minimum wage becoming the lowest rate on board regardless of nationality.

NUMAST takes this opportunity to condemn the tactics of Irish Ferries and states quite clearly that never again should uniformed security staff be used in an attempt to wrestle command of a ship from its masters and officers. However, colleagues, this dispute highlights the complete lack of protection seafarers have. Irish Ferries wanted to sack its highly trained workforce for Britain and Ireland because it could exploit seafarers from other countries without any legal impediments to its actions. Some reports even suggested they were

paying some on board one euro an hour.

Whilst we applaud those seafarers who took a stand, we must also call on our Government and others in Europe to make a stand and end this exploitation. Congress, we must remember that the officers and crew of a ferry accept without question their legal responsibility for all who sail in her. They deserve better. They deserve not to be exploited and they deserve not to live in fear of their jobs being stolen by those seeking to maximise profit.

Congress, we need action now; we need enforcement of the ILO Convention requirements and we need a commitment that in the ferry sector competition on costs will not be tolerated. We need our Government to recognise that if we tolerate this form of competition on vessels in our waters, we actively encourage a dash to the gutter with companies falling over each other in the search for cheaper and cheaper sources of labour to exploit; a scenario that spells the death knell for maritime skills throughout Europe, raising questions not just about the employment of skilled mariners, but also about the safety of the ships.

NUMAST demands that this stops and calls on the TUC to ensure that our Government takes a lead. NUMAST does not want to stand here in the aftermath of a disaster saying, "We told you so." Congress, even the European Services Directive with all its faults regulates competition in many industries; so why leave the ferry sector untouched, able to exploit seafarers in an unregulated free-for-all with the lives of passengers at stake?

Our members have played their part, as have the many thousands who marched in Dublin in their support, and those who attended the Wales TUC demos in Pembroke and Holyhead. Now let's have some political leadership. Congress, please support this motion and let us work to turn the EU ferry sector into a sector of excellence where seafarers from across Europe can work free from the exploitation that will always now be associated with the words 'Irish Ferries'. *(Applause)*

**Malcolm Dunning** (*National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) seconded Motion 13.

He said: I fully endorse everything my colleague from NUMAST has just said. The Irish Ferries dispute, basically, is symptomatic of the industry in which we work, as Paul has well illustrated. The RMT believe that there needs to be urgent action to address section 9 of the Race Relations Act 1976. Indeed, the National Union of Seamen -- remember them -- my former union, and now the RMT, have campaigned for more than 30 years to see this piece of legislation amended. Sometimes when you talk about the Race Relations Act people receive the wrong signal. Section 9 exempts seafarers, like so many pieces of other legislation exempt seafarers, from the protection of the Act. It allows seafarers recruited from abroad to serve on British ships at local, i.e. lower, rates of pay. This continued discrimination against this group of workers is morally indefensible in an egalitarian society. Ship owners have always resisted change. They cite the shipping industry's global nature, but all business is now becoming increasingly global and some minimum standards must, therefore, surely apply. The exemption from the Race Relations Act does not fuel labour shortages in certain UK-registered vessels, but it enables ship owners to displace large numbers of UK workers to such an extent that UK maritime employment skills have been completely replaced in some sectors. Excluding the off-shore sector and the Royal Fleet Auxiliary, the ferries are now the main source of employment for UK ratings, and even that sector has been eroded, as you have already heard. Going back to the Irish Ferries dispute, of course, in the tremendous mobilisation that took place of Irish workers in demonstrations in Dublin -- thousands were on the streets -- solidarity action was taken that would

have been illegal in this country because of anti-trade union laws. As I have pointed out, for the past 30 years we could not have carried out similar action. So it is no good the Prime Minister turning up here and lecturing delegates about the impotence of passing motions when you are in opposition because 10 years into a Labour Government they still allow institutionalised racism in the maritime sector.

On the issue of the minimum wage, again, merchant seafarers are only covered by minimum wage legislation when employed on a UK-registered vessel serving in UK internal waters. Internal waters is interpreted by the Government as river estuaries and the straits between mainline and islands just off the coast; so the UK has jurisdiction over territorial waters for 12 miles. Even UK-registered vessels, benefiting from millions of pounds in subsidies that have come via the tonnage tax scheme, are allowed to be exempt again from the minimum wage legislation. As you have already heard, people are being paid one euro an hour. That is happening now as we speak; so please support motion 12 and let's put an end to institutionalised racism in the British workplace. *(Applause)*

\* *Motion 12 was CARRIED*

### **Penalties for failure to implement statutory provisions**

**Brian Garvey** (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*) moved Motion 13.

He said: Why did the NASUWT feel it needed to bring a motion like this to Congress? Firstly, there have been lots of changes to the position with regard to governance and management within the public services. For example, in our own sector, in education, what has happened there is that the relationship between schools and local authorities has virtually been turned on its head. Schools now purchase services from local authorities, so the local authorities are very reluctant actually to act as any sort of enforcement agency with regard to the conditions of employees in case, of course, the schools stop purchasing those services.

Secondly, many of the people who are working for rogue employers are low paid. They are the people who cannot afford to effect any changes. Many of them are the parents of the children whom we actually teach, children who are caught in the poverty trap. Just as an aside, could I encourage you to join the End Child Poverty campaign and support their month of action, which starts in the middle of October?

The most common provisions, of course, that employers fail to implement are, firstly, equalities provisions, where many of our workers, particularly women, are treated far less favourably with regard to their terms and conditions and salaries; secondly, health and safety provisions -- I will not rehearse those; we have heard about them this morning already -- and, thirdly, failure to uphold statutory terms and conditions and the rights of workers with regard to trade union membership and facilities.

Colleagues, at present, the responsibility to bring employers to book rests with the individual employee or his/her trade union if he/she belongs to one; if he/she does not, we all know they should. Many individuals, of course, are very reluctant to take on their employer at an employment tribunal. They often face long delays and the potential for high costs, not just financial, but also potentially the loss of current and sometimes future employment. It cannot be right or fair that when statutory provisions to improve working conditions have been acquired that the onus rests on individuals or unions to have to pursue complex courses of action to secure implementation. Colleagues, if our members broke their contracts, they would soon be disciplined even as far as losing their jobs. So we want to change the

system. This flagrant abuse, of course, of the statutory provisions is encouraged by the fact that employers sit in the comfort zone. They know that if they ignore any statutory terms or conditions, penalties will be fairly low or, at worse for them, cost effective.

This motion seeks to provide a mechanism to put the onus of implementation on the employer and to introduce penalties for non-compliance. We envisage a system of fines and, in the most serious cases, some of which have been described to us this morning, custodial sentences to act as a deterrent. Colleagues, there is something very wrong with a system where an employer thinks that compliance with the law is optional or voluntary. I urge you to support this motion. Thank you. *(Applause)*

**Alison Shepherd** (*UNISON*) seconded Motion 13. She said: We come to the motion which puts the focus on something we have all been putting up with for rather too long. For one thing, it challenges the culture that it is OK to reach agreements and not to stick to your part of the bargain. For some reason, education seems to be particularly susceptible to doing this. It really is not on that employers sit round a table and then go back and decline to implement agreements that they have just reached. For years we have dealt with this by mixture of exasperation, invoking moral and peer pressure, naming and shaming and in the last resort entering into dispute.

What the movers of the motion have highlighted is that it is quite a short step from that sort of culture, from ignoring collective voluntary agreements, to evading the law. If we pass laws, if we legislate for the common good, for social and employment rights, we should not accept that it is OK to get out of it by various devices or by blatantly ignoring it, knowing that maybe not too much will happen.

In the debate that this was part of on Tuesday morning, there were an awful lot of examples given of ways that employers get out of doing things that they are supposed to do. This motion says quite clearly that it should not be up to an individual to seek redress, and it really should not. UNISON is happy to support finding a way forward, exploring some kind of mechanism that can extract damage and penalties against persistent offenders, to make sure that there is a stronger incentive for employers to abide by the law and collective agreements. Please support the motion.

\* *Motion 13 was CARRIED*

### **Class Size**

**The President:** I call Motion 48. The General Council supports the motion.

**Peter Quigley** (*Educational Institute of Scotland*) moved Motion 48. He said: Through the recent debate on union learning and the presentation of that part of the General Council report, the TUC and affiliated trades unions have once again reaffirmed their commitment to education and learning. The questions to the Prime Minister further reinforced the commitment of trade union members to education, and continuing concerns about education will not have gained much comfort from his answers.

What the EIS motion reaffirms is that the basic building blocks of education are laid in the classroom. Most modern educational developments in Britain, whether it be the curriculum for excellence in Scotland or the national curriculum in England and Wales, point to smaller sites, smaller classes, work with groups, focusing on individual pupils as the most effective means of delivering learning in schools.

But what is the current situation in the UK? In partnership with the EIS, the Scottish Executive produced its own interim report on class sizes in June 2006. Taking as it does a world-wide overview on class sizes, its findings are compelling. Take the ratio of primary school pupils to teaching staff in 2002 to 2003, in a graph of 28 countries, including EC countries, United States and Japan, Scotland was a little beyond the halfway point in terms of pupil/teacher ratio. However, only three countries – Turkey, Mexico and Korea -- had a higher ratio of pupils to teachers than primary schools in England and Wales. What about secondary schools? In a graph of, by and large, the same countries, Scotland was a little below halfway point. However, only three countries -- Korea, Turkey and Mexico -- had a higher ratio of pupils to teachers than secondary schools in England and Wales. Figures produced by Eurydice, the European body which collates statistical information, confirmed this picture. The average number of pupils in a Scottish primary school class is 23.9. The average number of pupils in an English Primary school class is 26.2, the highest in all the countries surveyed.

Leaving aside class sizes in developed countries, compare these figures with class size averages in former Eastern bloc countries. Despite huge economic problems, Poland has managed to produce a class size average of 21.1 pupils, Slovakia 20.8, Hungary 20.5, down to Lithuania with 15.2 pupils per primary school class. Here is another statistic. The average number of pupils in a Scottish private primary size class is 18.7, that is five pupils fewer than a Scottish primary class and 7.5 pupils fewer than an English primary school class. Do our children and the children of our fellow workers not deserve similar provision? The Chancellor seems to think so and has promised to increase spending on public education to the level of that of private education. What we say is that such an enhanced spending must be translated into smaller class sizes and for this we call on your support.

What is the effect of smaller class sizes? Amongst sources that the Scottish Executive report quotes is the Tennessee style report and the Prisms report in England. According to these reports, the benefit of smaller class sizes include the following: more pupil contact with teachers, more higher order learning, more individual attention to each pupil, more focused teaching, fall in drop out rates, drop in absence rate, improvement in attainment, reduction in anti-social behaviour, reduction in excessive teacher workload, better discipline. Let me repeat that, better discipline. Better discipline makes children less likely to be drawn into challenge mode with authority. This is better for the children concerned and better for every other pupil in that class. The very rich do not get that way by throwing good money after bad, so they must see smaller class sizes for their children as being a worthwhile investment.

The Educational Institute of Scotland says that all our children deserve the same investment. Give our children the best start in education, give them smaller class sizes, support the motion.

**Lesley Auger** (*National Union of Teachers*) seconded Motion 48. She said: You will hear the same arguments as you have just heard because they are what reducing class sizes is all about. At our union's conference this year, the union agreed to launch a campaign to highlight workload implications for teachers and support staff and barriers to educational achievement created by large classes. Research commissioned by the NUT from Leicester University found that in smaller classes pupils spend more time on tasks; there are more sustained interactions between teachers and pupils; there is more teacher feedback on pupil's work; and less time is spent on routine supervision sorting out

resources and classroom control. We have ample evidence to link class size and work load, but even the Department for Education's own research found that, "Teachers adopt a variety of coping strategies as their classes grow in size, whilst retaining their ideal model of meeting the needs of every pupil. This attempt puts them under enormous strain, as the ideal outcome becomes more and more impossible to achieve."

Congress, the Chancellor of the Exchequer has stated that he wishes to create a level playing field between educational provision in the public and private sectors. Reducing class size would be the obvious first step. The capital cost of an average academy has soared to £25 million, compared with £14 million for a new comprehensive school. Public money flows into the private coffers of education consultants such as Capita and Jarvis. This money would be better spent on decreasing class sizes.

Finally, we are all aware of the power and influence that the privilege of a private education can bring. With just ten per cent of the population receiving a private education, 40 per cent of the Labour Cabinet were privately educated and 100 per cent of the original authors of the Education and Inspections Bill -- Tony Blair, Lord Adonis and Ruth Kelly -- received a private education. Our own President here has made reference to her belief in the power of education as a route out of poverty. If small classes are right for those who can afford them, then it is our duty to demand them for those who cannot.

\* *Motion 48 was CARRIED.*

#### **Local Authority Support for Schools**

**The President:** I call Motion 49. The General Council supports the motion.

**John Chowcat** (*ASPECT*) moved Motion 49. He said: I accept the helpful amendment from NASUWT.

Democratically accountable local authorities play a vital, albeit changing, role today in supporting the nation's schools. They support the local schools systems as a whole in raising educational standards. Today our schools and their work forces face sharp challenges and very real pressures, sometimes from disaffected children and parents, too often from tensions and short-termism within certain areas of government education policy, frequently from constrained local resources. So schools and the local communities they serve gain from local authority monitoring, concrete support and, where necessary, challenge in striving to meet inevitably complex and multifaceted educational objectives.

The common aim is to help all school children to prosper and achieve in today's society. Local councils work with schools in many ways, some of them listed in this motion. Briefly, they help with curriculum development; they help to train and develop staff; they enhance the quality of teaching and learning, especially in schools causing concern; they improve links to other children's services; they help collaboration between local schools and the local family of schools; they give specialist support. Some recent DfES policies have actually recognised this, and parts of the now amended Education and Inspections Bill before the House of Lords strengthen the local authority role vis-à-vis schools causing concern. I have to say, however, that other government policies -- including the introduction by statute of undertrained School Improvement Partners, SIPs, who act as a rather odd type of intermediate broker between schools and local support services -- risk weakening this key relationship between democratic local authorities and schools. In fact, in some areas the problems attached to the rather mechanistic SIP role seem to be growing;

local wags in the schools are saying that SIP now stands for Second Rate Inspector (Part-Time). We actually need the opposite. We need more systematic professional training in skills development at all levels of the education system, including for school improvement professionals of all types.

But to end on a positive note. DfES has now publicly and openly supported my Association's sustained efforts of recent years to further enhance the professionalism of our members who work in supporting local schools. We have updated and promoted a key set of national standards for educational improvement professionals and introduced a credible and independent professional accreditation system based on those standards. Congress, local authorities and schools in partnership can achieve further real progress across our educational sector. Please support Motion 49.

**Sue Rogers** (*National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers*) seconded Motion 49. She said: I am speaking with particular reference to the amendment.

Colleagues, I am old enough to remember a time when local authorities were a very dominant force. They guided and they led public services. I am from Yorkshire and the name Clegg still has a resonance amongst colleagues in Yorkshire. Now their role has moved to one of being commissioned for work, of handing down millions of pounds of money to schools and the schools then make the decisions about what they are going to do. The heads and the governors decide on the expenditure, and decide sometimes whether they will use those local authorities or the local authority's services. The result of all this is that the school pays the piper and the local authorities caper and jig along to the school's tune. They get nervous, they get in fact very hesitant about intervening. In addition, on top of that nervousness, because it is their own jobs they may be looking at, there is a legal ambiguity over their power to act, they argue, because of the role and relationship with government bodies.

The result of all that is that too often poor management of schools is left totally unchecked, it is uncontrolled by a weak local authority. We have many examples of casework, where staff have endured bullying, there has been exploitation, there has been a denial of their contractual rights, they have been subject to unreasonable demands and this has gone on for months. The trades unions stepped in to argue and fight over it and the local authority has sat back. We had one classic case in a primary school in the North-West where over a 12-month period a head bullied and harassed 12 staff so much that six of them were on medication and at the end of the 12-month period ten of them resigned. Suddenly a little light seemed to go on somewhere in the local authority, who realised there might have been a bit of a problem in the school with its bullying, intimidatory head. Only then did they wake up and step in and try and deal with some response. Their general role is almost to put sticking plasters on the broken leg because the broken leg is being broken by the head, but rather than deal with the problem of such a head teacher they simply back away.

NASUWT has used the opportunity presented by the Education Bill to lobby the Government to try and ensure that what we get are local authorities who are prepared to use their powers to intervene in schools where they have concern about standards, and that arrangement includes reference to management and how the management is impacting and dealing with the workforce. What in fact Ruth Kelly did, is that she accepted those representations. Already there are illustrative regulations and guidance which have gone

to the House of Lords, and that has incorporated the provisions we want.

This motion has fine aims. ASPECT is right to be talking of high standards, of collaboration, of improved performance, of in-service training. We want to see all these things. What we want are effective, active local authorities prepared to stand up and be there for schools and ensure those schools are operating well and that the management in them is operating well.

\* *Motion 49 was CARRIED*

## **Education and Training, Age and Employment Rights**

**The President:** I call Composite Motion 11, Education and training, age and employment rights. The General Council support this composite motion.

**Anne-Marie Greene** (*University and College Union*) moved Composite Motion 11. She said: I am very pleased finally to be moving Composite 11. To make clear the context of this motion, it is concerned with two main areas: age and employment rights; and access to adult education. The introduction at long last of legislation outlawing age discrimination is more than welcome. However, its protections do not apply to everyone. Indeed, as Andrew Harrop from Age Concern stated in the fringe meeting on Monday evening, over half a million workers of the age over 65 represent one of the last frontiers of discrimination because they receive such limited employment protection.

Our motion makes an explicit call for full employment protection for people over the age of 65, including protection from dismissal and allowing them to continue working if they are willing and able to do so. Please do not misunderstand our intent here. As good trades unionists we are completely committed to a position that protects workers' rights to retire at 65; it is not about a threat to the statutory pension age nor about saying people should work past 65. This is about choice for those who want to work or, unfortunately, those who need to work beyond the age of 65. This is about the right to retire with a decent income.

I know there will be some in the hall who will say why should we listen to someone who works in a university talking about retirement ages? We understand that someone working, for example, on a construction site or an assembly line might have concerns to ensure that nothing seems to undermine the right to retire at 65. We do not believe that endeavouring to extend full employment protection to all workers, regardless of age, does this. In our sector, further and higher education, there are some 120,000 people being forced out at 65, and yet many people not only wish to continue to work but, more importantly, need to continue to work for financial reasons.

It is clear that our sector is not unique. In Age Concern's recent national survey, over 80 per cent of people supported the abolition of a mandatory retirement age. All our motion commits to is that the basic employment protection afforded to other workers is also given to the over 65s.

So we come to the second core issue, access to education for older workers. What use is it to say, as Ministers do, that there is a demographic time bomb in our labour market that must be addressed by more adults filling jobs, when at the same time they are cutting funding for adult education which provides a way back into work for many thousands of mid-career and older workers? UCU remains firmly opposed to all fees for education and remains committed to ensuring that the level of fees that unfortunately currently exist are not increased. The Government's vision, on the other hand, will see the proportion of fees already paid by all those over 25 rising to 50 per cent.



We were somewhat heartened to hear an announcement by the Select Committee on Further Education a couple of days ago calling for a levy on employers for education. Funding for adult education must not be transferred any further to the learner, and employers must also meet their responsibilities. Additionally, how can Ministers say that they want to expand the numbers entering higher education while at the same time overseeing a research funding structure that marginalises our members with the longest service? Older workers in our sector are often made to feel demoralised, under-valued and ultimately superfluous. Because of the never-ending round of redundancies, it is generally those who have been there the longest, or who are the oldest, who are pushed out, often against their will and not with a decent retirement income. We want to combat age discrimination in further and higher education and in the labour market more broadly. We want the Government to back up its claims to value adult education by proper investment in our sectors. Finally, we want to ensure that like any other vulnerable group of workers the over 65s, should they choose to continue to work, should receive full employment protection. I move this motion and ask for your support.

**John Lowe** (*Association for College Management*) seconded Composite Motion 11. He said: In view of the shortage of time I am going to concentrate on the adult education aspect of the motion. In funding further education, adult education, there must be a commitment to social justice. Those people who lack basic skills and qualifications, or live with other kinds of significant disadvantage, must have access to free education. We are a rich nation and it is unthinkable that we cannot provide such support.

We must oppose cuts to adult education provision. Indeed, as the TUC itself says, in 20:20 Vision for Skills, the first priority for the Leitch Review of Skills is that employers and government must invest more in adult skills. We must ensure that we are focused on developing this country's economic prosperity through securing a highly skilled workforce. We are concerned that the Government are reluctant to insist that employers take their proper responsibility for training their workers. Employers should be asked to contribute more to the cost of training their workers so that those adults who are less well off can continue to receive free education.

Colleagues, I urge you to support the motion.

**Diana Holland** (*Transport & General Workers' Union*) spoke against Composite Motion 11. She said: The T&G is, of course, very supportive of adult education and much of this motion. However, among all the many good things in the motion there are two paragraphs hidden away that we feel at this time would send out a confused message from unions on retirement age. On Monday in our first debate we agreed clear Congress policy opposing any increase in the state retirement age. We would also oppose employers making our members work longer before they can claim a decent pension. This motion endangers that unity. There are many ways that workers can be forced to work beyond their retirement age: they cannot afford it, employer pressure and mis-information, for example. That is why we oppose the individual opt-out from a collective agreement on retirement age.

Think about the Working Time Directive. In the real world an opt-out means workers can be cajoled and coerced into working longer hours. The law really must be clear. Yes, of course there is an issue of choice and it must be real choice for working men and women. All working people deserve the right to a long retirement.

While many of us are living longer we cannot ignore major differences in life expectancy. In Glasgow, average life expectancy for men is 69; in Kensington and Chelsea it is 81. Life expectancy of women manual workers is actually decreasing nationally.

The danger in this motion is that employers will take it as a green light to change their pension schemes so that the age of retirement for a full pension will rise and rise. Let us remember that the CBI are calling for a retirement age of 70. No one should have to work into their old age to get a decent pension. That is why we campaign with the National Pensioners Convention and retired members associations, why we need justice for women pensioners and a state pension that provides a living wage for all.

As I said, the T&G strongly supports adult education but we cannot support undermining our pensions policy. We would call on the movers to remit, but if they do not the T&G will oppose. At this moment in time our task as a movement is to defend the right of working people to choose to retire as early as they can, rather than defending the rights of a minority to work until they drop.

**Anne-Marie Green** (*University and College Union*) replied to the debate. She said: I really respect the very impassioned speech from Diana and totally understand where they are coming from. Diana talked about the real world. In the real world, many, many hundreds of thousands of people reaching a retirement age of 65 are already having to work beyond that age, and are perhaps being coerced to do so. The age discrimination legislation as it stands is already giving us confused messages and is being used by employers to exploit the over 65s. Real choice can only be given to employment rights. If we really want to defend the rights of working people this has to include that those who have to work post-65 are protected and get full employment protection. Surely that is our job as trades unionists.

\* *Composite Motion 11 was CARRIED*

### **Access to Work and the Public Sector**

**The President:** I now call Motion 20, Access to Work and the Public Sector. The General Council support the motion. This will be moved by Sasha Callaghan on behalf of the TUC Disability Conference.

**Sasha Callaghan** (*University and College Union*) moved Motion 20. She said: as you can see I am completely prepared for this! We did not think that this motion was going to get taken. Great stuff. I am delighted to be moving Motion 20 on behalf of the Disability Conference.

I am going to be talking about what we call in the UCU the 'Homer Simpson guide to joined up government thinking'. Access to Work is a brilliant scheme, a brilliant source of support for disabled workers, and it has absolutely transformed the lives of many disabled people, empowering them and actually ensuring that they can take their place in the world of employment.

Of course, when we heard from John Hutton at Disability Conference that Access to Work funding was going to be removed from workers in the public sector you can imagine that there was outrage and there was bitterness, but there was not that much surprise. Unfortunately, the Government have let down disabled people on many, many occasions; it is a catalogue of disappointments, failure to implement full scale human rights for disabled people and inability to tackle wholesale unemployment. More than half disabled people of working age are unemployed. Nothing has been done to tackle that.

The new disability equality duty, which should really move things on for disabled workers, will only apply to the public sector, not to the private sector because the Government was too scared to take on the Institute of Directors and the CBI. The so-called reforms in incapacity benefit would manage to intimidate, harass and terrify disabled people, and now Access to Work. Access to Work provides specialised equipment funding, taxi fares, drivers, support workers, to ensure that disabled people can take their part in the workplace. Now to learn that workers in the public sector will no longer enjoy the support of Access to Work I have to say is a very, very worrying thing. There have been Access to Work implemented programmes that have really, really ensured that disabled workers are treated fairly and equally, and now that is to be removed. The Government acknowledge that taking away Access to Work funding from people who actually are their own employees will have consequences. They do not know how many disabled people will be affected by it and they do not care; they are just going to go ahead anyway.

The Government might not know, or might not choose to know, the effects on their own workers but I can tell you that workers in my sector, further and higher education, will suffer because of this if the Government go ahead with this absolutely wilful folly of an experiment. We have a management, as seen in our last HE pay dispute, that bullies, locks out workers, unlawfully deducts workers' wages when they are on strike. Are you seriously telling me that those employers will actually fund a disabled worker to the tune of £45,000 a year for specialised support and equipment? I do not think so. Are you seriously saying to Government Ministers that college managers, one of whom, not 100 miles away from here today, told me quite openly that their college would be defying the law, would actually prefer the risk of being taken to court rather than implement the Disability Discrimination Act because that would be cheaper. Are you saying seriously that those kinds of managers in our institutions will pay for the kind of support that Access to Work provides? No, of course not.

This is, I have to say, the most absolutely unthought out decision that the Government have come to, and I have to tell them, just get a grip on reality here because if you believe -- as they are saying -- that these costs will just be absorbed into main stream budgets within the public sector, well it is not going to happen. We already have the scandal of mass unemployment of disabled workers and this is simply going to add more disabled people on to the dole queue figures. I think that is perfectly clear, and the only people who do not seem to understand the reality of the situation are the Government, who really seem completely indifferent to the fate of disabled workers. They have allowed the criminal mismanagement of Remploy to go on for how many years, so presumably other workers in the public sector, when they are equally mismanaged or equally pushed into unemployment, will just be disregarded. Please support the motion.

**Sue Bond** (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) seconded Motion 20. She said: This is the last motion but I trust not the least important. My union represents civil servants, the first to be hit by this retrograde and insulting step because with no consultation, no evaluation, no impact assessment and ignoring the advice of the Disability Rights Commission Ministers announced that from October this year Access to Work funding will be withdrawn from Central Government departments. Just like that, as a colleague said yesterday. The biggest losers will be our disabled members. Their entitlement to independent funding for their workplace adjustments gives them equal treatment irrespective of where they work, but if that

funding has to be found from budgets already cut to the bone, as a result of massive cuts right across the civil service, they will suddenly become second class citizens, made to feel they are a burden on their colleagues for using up resources, taking away from the delivery of essential public services. What if they move to another public sector job? The equipment they require will now belong to their current employer. They cannot take it with them. Will the new employer even want to offer them a job in the first place, if they come with costs attached?

The Government call this policy, wait for it, improving the life chances of disabled people -- a classic piece of double speak worthy of George Orwell's Ministry of Truth. I call it penny pinching discrimination of the worst kind. Access to Work funding for DWP staff has already been withdrawn and our members are already feeling the effects. This has to be stopped. If the Government are saying they want to support more disabled workers in small businesses, which is their justification, well fine; you just put more money in the Access to Work budget, you do not take it away from disabled public sector workers. What kind of sick priorities are these, where they can find billions to spend on waging war abroad?

PCS supports a united fighting campaign against these changes involving every trade union represented here, because we all believe -- even if the Government do not -- that you cannot put a price on equality.

\* *Motion 20 was CARRIED*

#### **Closure of Northern Foods Bakery in Trafford Park**

**The President:** I now call Emergency Motion 5, Closure of Northern Foods Bakery in Trafford Park. The General Council supports the motion.

**Edna Greenwood** (*GMB*) moved Emergency Motion 5. She said: On August 24 this year Northern Foods announced the closure of their Trafford Park bakery, the largest factory in Trafford, with the loss of 700 jobs. The announcement came on the back of an earlier closure with the loss of 400 jobs. Northern Foods have shed over 1,000 jobs in six months in Manchester alone. They say there is no hope of selling the business as a going concern, no hope of a rescue package and no chance of making the contract profitable. Northern Foods' decision to close was a commercial one, but driven by the pressure to produce products at below cost price. Why? Because of the supermarkets' relentless push for the lowest possible price.

Morrison, Tesco and Asda -- and I am sorry General Secretary I have mentioned that word -- are all the same. The principle of cutting costs at any cost drives every aspect of how supermarkets do business. The complex monopoly and power that supermarkets now exert within the supply chain is, quite frankly, unacceptable and out of control. Over the last couple of years we have seen the pressure being put on food manufacturing companies, squeezing the prices, controlling the production lines and destroying jobs. That is the real cost of a relentless price war that GMB members have been at the sharp end of -- big brand names pulling out of the sector, shutting up shop on moving production abroad, major job losses in Terry's of York, Birds Eye, Unilever, Kraft Foods and now Northern Foods. There will be more unless the Government introduce a robust regulatory framework that is independent and can control supermarket power.

We do not want anyone thinking that this is a union supermarket-bashing programme, it is not, but we cannot ignore the fact that while the multi retailers return massive profits, buy up land banks and deliver

lower and lower prices, it is at the expense of other workers in the supply chain, it is at the expense of local communities and, yes, it is actually at the expense of consumer choice.

The reality is that supermarkets cannot and will not regulate themselves. Codes of conduct and mission statements are all very nice, but they do not address the harsh realities of the cut-throat industry that operates between retailer and supplier. The reality is of GMB members negotiating pay and conditions down to keep their jobs and the harsh realities of thousands of job losses. The GMB is calling for an independent regulator, which has the powers to intervene in planning issues and land banks, the power to prevent supermarkets from abusing their suppliers, both in the UK and abroad, the power to prevent exploitation and destruction of jobs in those associated industries, and a confidential process that allows suppliers to make complaints. We are calling on the TUC to make further representation to the Competition Commission investigation into the power of supermarkets, citing Trafford Park as prime example of the abuse of the purchasing power and the direct link between the power and the detrimental impact supermarkets will have on manufacturing jobs. GMB are campaigning to save the 700 jobs at Trafford Park, campaigning for proper independent regulations. Do not feed the supermarket greed, support the resolution, support the campaign and for those in Lancashire when the cries go out across the terraces in Wigan, "Who ate all the pies?" the call will come back, "Those fat bastards in the supermarkets closed down our bakery; we ain't got no pies."

**Joe Marino** (*Bakers, Food and Allied Workers' Union*) seconded Emergency Motion 5. He said: I want to make two very quick points. The mover of the motion has absolutely put the situation in Trafford Park very, very well indeed and certainly on the very last point she made. This closure of Trafford Park Bakery that came as a bolt out of the blue to everyone, particularly as we thought we were in discussions with the company about re-structuring, is merely the tip of the iceberg. There are in actual fact between 4,500 and 9,000 jobs at risk because of what is happening over the re-structuring of Northern Foods -- not just GMB members, not just our members, but thousands of members as well in the Transport & General Workers' Union and in Amicus. This is a very, very serious situation and we thought we would get the support of the General Council and the TUC in the fight over re-structuring.

Yes, part of it is to do with supermarkets, it is of course, it would be naive not to say that, but we see another hand on the bloody dagger that has been plunged into Northern Foods here. For over a decade those people in the City of London, who have been looking to maximise their bonuses, have had Northern Foods within their sights. The break-up of Northern Foods is a campaign that has gone on through the City of London for well over a decade now, and they are the people who are responsible for driving the break-up of this company: 4,500 jobs to be sold off with half the company going away. This is a profitable company. This is a company that is making money year on year. The problem is that the City does not think it is making enough money and therefore what they are doing is using their influence on share prices in order to break Northern Foods up. That is a disgrace. How on earth can trades unions negotiate and consult with the company when all this is outside their hands, outside our hands, and decisions have already been made in the City? I say this to the General Council, I hope you take this on board.

One of the other areas we want to look at, not just what colleague from the GMB have said here, is to

start looking at some regulation of these people in the City who are gambling with our people's jobs, who are gambling with the lives of workers, not just in Northern Foods, not just in the food industry but elsewhere, and that is the tragedy that is happening here. We hope the General Council will take that on board.

I hope Congress will support this motion, will support the GMB campaign at Trafford Park. They certainly have our support in doing that; I am sure they have the support of other unions within Northern Foods as well. We have to stick together. What we have to do is drive this campaign forward so that we can make sure that there is some regulation on these people in the City so that they stop playing on their bonuses and stop playing with our people's jobs.

\* *Emergency Motion 5 was CARRIED*

### **Adoption of the General Council Report**

**The President:** Delegates, that completes the formal business of Congress. I call for the General Council's Report to be adopted.

\* *The General Council's Report was ADOPTED*

### **Vote 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 course of the week. (*Applause*)

I would like to thank the crèche workers and a special thank you to the team of sign language interpreters and the verbatim reporters who have worked so hard throughout the week. (*Applause*)

A number of colleagues are leaving the General Council. Doug Nicholls has served for just one year but he has made a distinctive contribution during his short stay. (*Applause*) Marge Carey, who joined the General Council in 1998, received her Gold Badge yesterday. (*Applause*) David Lascelles joined the General Council in 2001 and was the first member to be elected to the newly created seat representing lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender workers, a group that continues to suffer largely unrecognised discrimination at work and in large parts of society. David's contribution to the work of the General Council won widespread regard and affection from his colleagues on the General Council. David is leaving us on health grounds and is not well enough to be with us today. He receives the Gold Badge of Congress, and we will be sending it to him with our very best wishes. (*Applause*)

### **Congress President 2007**

**The President:** Finally, Congress, it is my great honour to announce that the next President of the TUC, who takes office from the close of Congress, is Alison Shepherd, who is sitting next to me. (*Applause and cheers*) I wish her well and hope that she enjoys her year as President as much as I have.

### **Vote of Thanks to the President**

**Brendan Barber:** I call on Alison to move the vote of thanks to the President.

**Alison Shepherd** (*UNISON*) moved the vote of thanks to the President.

She said: I am standing in for Jeannie Drake who has been the chair's aide for most of the week. Jeannie is

on TUC business today. It gives me a chance, and I am absolutely delighted to be able to do so, to give the vote of thanks to Gloria. (*Applause*) (*Video shown*) I think that sums things up.

Gloria is a friend of mine and a fellow member of UNISON. I am really very proud of her. As you can see from the way she has conducted herself this week, that is the way in which she has conducted her Presidency all the way through. As you have seen, Gloria is pretty feisty, and her passionate commitment to trade union values and social justice shines through. She shows respect but no deference. As we have enjoyed this week, she has a very down to earth sense of humour and remembers just in time that her mother might be listening. Gloria has no airs and graces. She will talk to a government minister in the same way that she will talk to you and me. She is a good friend and one who you can trust. She is very loyal to all who she has met along the way. I know that she has earned your respect and affection this week, and I am delighted to move the vote of thanks to our President for 2005-2006, Gloria Mills. Thank you. (*Applause*)

I have some presents to give out. One is the Gold Badge of Congress and the other, I understand, is something appropriate. Gloria, *this* is from all of us and thank you for what you have done for us in the trade union movement. You get the Congress Bell as well. (*Presentation made amidst applause*)

**The President:** Thank you, Alison, for your kind words and thank you for your support and friendship over many years. Let me thank Brendan, Frances and Kay for everything they have done this week, for everything you have done during the course of the past year and for your outstanding leadership of the TUC. Let me also thank my colleagues on the General Council, my friends at UNISON and a huge thanks to Dave Prentis and UNISON members for your support. I also want to say thank you to the TUC staff for their support during the year. Some Presidents of the TUC can be very demanding. I hope I was not too demanding but I would like to say a special thank you to Mike Smith and Ben Louvre for their support during the course of the year, and also to Tom Wilson for ensuring that I had a daily supply of Scottish oats to ensure that I was able to maintain my energy levels. I am very pleased to tell you that I could not survive on a muesli bar. Finally, let me thank my beloved Arsenal for finally winning a game last night.

I cannot tell you what an honour it has been for me to be President of the TUC. I have always been a trade unionist. I come from a trade unionist background. It happened that I am a woman and black and I became the first black woman President of Congress. I hope that being the first I am one of many other black women who will follow in the trade union movement.

Let me extend my congratulations to you, Alison, on your election as President. It is really important that Alison takes over. She will be the third consecutive woman President of the TUC. You wait a long time and then you get three of us at once. That is a measure of progress in the last two decades. In many ways, that is the result of the contribution of women who have been really good sisters in the trade union movement. I want to say thank you to all the sisters and brothers who have supported us in our struggle over the years.

This has been a memorable year for me. I did not spend too much time travelling abroad, but I did make sure that I travelled across the UK, learning and listening first-hand to what trade unionists are saying about their experiences in the workplace. I have met great people and together we have worked to advance great causes. I have seen how our movement transforms the lives of ordinary working people in this

country and right across the world, giving them genuine opportunities and, in some cases, through our unionlearn giving people a second chance in terms of education. I want to say a huge thanks to all the people who, over the years, have supported trade union skills and trade union learning.

This Congress week has been quite an experience. I have suffered bouts of the giggles which would even have impressed Nigel de Gruchy. I have survived late nights and early mornings. I have also entertained the great and the good. However, the real highlight has been meeting my fellow trade unionists, people like Rick Sumner, the national organiser of the Justice for Mineworkers' Campaign. He is a true hero to this movement.

I have also met people like Bill Lucy, our fraternal delegate from the AFL/CIO, fighting for trade unionism in the land of George Bush and Wal-Mart. I have also met as you have seen people like Thabitha Khumalo, from the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions, who has been fighting for labour rights, women's rights and human dignity in Zimbabwe. Her address was truly inspirational. It reminded us that the need for trade union values has never been greater. So in the hear ahead let us re-double our efforts to fight for everything we believe in. Let us do what we have always done – make a difference where it is needed most today, tomorrow and always. Thank you, Congress. You have been great. Thank you for everything. Good luck. (*Applause*)

#### Vote of Thanks to the Media

**The President:** I call on the General Secretary, Brendan Barber, to give the vote of thanks to the media.

**Brendan Barber** (*General Secretary*) said:

I am Brendan Barber, TUC, moving the vote of thanks to the media. I thought I had better introduce myself because, according to yesterday's *Sun* and the headline "TUC-OFF" fewer than one in ten people know who I am, and that was before last night's Entertainment Alliance do. Today, some of you look like you are not too sure who you are either. (*Laughter*)

This week Congress highlighted the plight of vulnerable workers and attracted the majority of the Cabinet to Brighton. I would like to think that they came to offer support to the one in five workers in this country for whom poverty pay, minimal rights and exploitation are a daily reality, but I fear that ministers might be feeling just a bit vulnerable themselves. If they did not before they came here, I am sure that they did by the time they left.

We all know that unions exist to offer help to workers whose careers are at a crossroads. They may be being bullied into doing something that they might regret, under threat from a new boss or even looking for advice on what to do in retirement. I think there has been plenty of that sort of advice being given to Cabinet Ministers this week.

It has been quite a week. Like the media, we need to find themes. Food is one that stood out for me. As usual, the media took a lot of interest in the General Council's Dinner. The British Dietetic Association and *The Guardian* warned us of the dangers of obesity. The anti-privatisation campaign got a bit traditional by offering free beer and sandwiches at their meeting and, of course, as Dave Prentis told us on Monday, our President, Gloria, knows all there is to know about bringing home the bacon. (*Laughter*)

We also had a novel approach to card votes. You bring your own with a slogan on them. Personally, I have to say that I prefer the traditional way. Of course, we actually had the excitement of a real card vote this

morning, and I noticed that Jancie Godrich from PCS got a little muddled and, for the one and only time this week, was seen turning to the right. *(Laughter)*

Of course, there was that walkout. When thanking the media, I should not really complain, but why break the habit of a lifetime? They did report in some detail a small walkout at the start of the Prime Minister's session in Congress. What they did not mention was the much bigger walkout at the end of it. One of the great things, though, about Congress, is that even if you are not in the hall, you can follow what is going on. There was a really big crowd around the big screen on the RMT stand, for example, desperate to follow every twist and turn of Tony Blair's contribution to Congress. *(Laughter)*

This week we have heard a lot about the problems facing workers in this country and of the need for us to work together, uniting, amongst others, the National Union of Students and the Muslim Council of Britain. For me the contribution which stood out was that of Thabitha Khumalo. As you said, Gloria, she is one of the bravest women I have met. Not only did she win my prize for the most imaginative use of props, but she put into real perspective what it is like for unions working in a country where there really is a hostile government. Some of her colleagues today are in jail in Zimbabwe, with reports coming out now of beatings and abuse. We are doing everything possible to apply pressure to secure their release. I hope we all remember Thabitha and her colleagues when we are safely back at home and she is in Zimbabwe facing who knows what. *(Applause)*

Congress, as ever, some people are moving on. As she leaves the President's chair, I hope that Gloria will look back on her presidential year with real pride and pleasure. She has been an absolute joy for everyone at the TUC to work with. Warm congratulations must go to Alison on her election. I know we have a great year to look forward to.

Yesterday, of course, we said farewell to Marge Carey, who has been a wonderful friend and colleague to us all. But there is one other farewell that should be noted. The Brighton Centre is saying goodbye to one of its colleagues, and that is Andy Carslake. Some know him affectionately as 'Captain Birds Eye'. Andy has worked at the Brighton Centre since 1981, for 25 years, and he has worked on every TUC Conference in the soundbox at the back of the main hall. Without him you would not be able to hear this small tribute. Andy, we wish you well and a long and happy retirement. *(Applause)*

As Chris Morley reminded us yesterday, we now live in an age of 24 hour news, and these days, of course, the media does not just report things which have happened but they forecast what is going to happen. I thought I would finish by giving you the headlines from next year's Congress. On the sports pages: 'President Alison Shepherd leads the General Council to a stunning victory over the press in its first ever pre-Congress netball fixture. Token man on the team, Bob Crow, said "You've got to hand it to the skipper. She was terrific"'. *(Laughter)* In the transport news, 'RMT and FDA in surprise merger talks'. *(Laughter)* 'Outcome hanging by a thread'. On the politics pages: 'Prime Minister, John McDonnell, appoints Tony Woodley Foreign Secretary'. *(Laughter and applause)* 'Peace talks with Peugeot begin'. In the labour news, 'Brown and Blair in clash for seat on T&G Congress delegation'. *(Laughter)* In the home news: 'New Home Secretary, Colin Moses, refuses to take part in Congress question and answer session'. On the showbiz pages: 'Doug Nicholls refers back statement on Eurovision Song Contest'. *(Laughter)* Finally, back to the sports pages again: 'Everton's Champions' League Campaign gets off to a storming start with a 3-0 win over Barcelona, while newly relegated Liverpool

struggle at Southend.' *(Laughter and applause)* We can all dream. Have a safe journey home. *(Applause)*

**The President:** Thank you, Brendan, for that enjoyable and warm address. I now call on Andrew Taylor of the industrial correspondents to reply on behalf of the media. *(Calls from the floor of "Andy out; Andy out" and then the hecklers left the hall))*

**Andy Taylor (Industrial Correspondents Group)** said: You have probably noticed some of my colleagues. *(Laughter and cheers)* This is the high respect in which I am held by my peer group and the solidarity that the press corps always shows in moments like this. I was going to say "At least they have not walked out yet", but I see they have.

My name is Andrew Taylor and I am the employment correspondent of the *Financial Times*. It is my pleasure to propose a vote of thanks to Congress on behalf of the media for your help and hospitality during this week. It has been rather an odd Congress to cover, and I can understand the frustration of delegates, some of whom have complained from the rostrum, that the media coverage has concentrated on events happening outside of the hall rather than the debates taking place within it. I make no apologies for this. These are momentous events, and it is right that we should have sought the views of general secretaries and union executives on the leadership and policies of a political party with which the union movement is closely linked.

However, I would at this stage like to consider a broader picture of why it is that you attend and we, the media, come to cover this annual meeting of trade unions. Brendan a few moments ago touched on some of those issues. In that spirit, I would like to share two short anecdotes. One concerns a 50 year-old IT manager who two years ago was told that his company was relocating to a city 150 miles away from where he lived. My friend, a good and kind man, had never joined a union. He considered the dues a waste of money and he could not see the value of becoming a member. We often used to argue about this. When he applied two years ago under a voluntary redundancy scheme he was refused. He and his family did not want to leave their home but it was a good job and he had been with the firm for more than 25 years. My friend's family finally moved to the new home last year, taking on a much bigger mortgage. Six months ago he was told that he was no longer needed by his company, that it was unlikely that he could be re-trained and he was given just ten days to accept a redundancy package. He had no union to turn to, nobody to accompany him to what were rather brutal meetings and, reluctantly, he accepted that he had to leave.

I compare this to my own situation. I have been a member of the NUJ for more than 30 years, most of that time working for the *Financial Times*. They have, for the most part, been very good employers. But earlier this year the paper announced that it needed to make fifty staff redundant, which is about 10 per cent of the editorial complement, mostly through voluntary redundancy, but the management could not rule out compulsory redundancies or the request that voluntary redundancy would be accepted. As you can understand, it was a worrying time. However, my union stood firm, opposing cuts or opposing compulsory redundancies. Meetings were held and the outcome has been that all of the redundancies have been achieved voluntarily and, as far as I am aware, anyone who has wanted to go has been able to do so.

I do not know the extent to which that situation might have been achieved, anyway. As I said, my firm has been a good employer, but what I do know, unlike my friend, is that I had the advice and help of my union to

turn to when I was anxious and concerned, an organisation which would support me and have my best interests at heart. Last night I attended a hospitality event generously sponsored by Thompsons, the union solicitors, compared superbly by Alan Jones of the Press Association and Stephen Cape of the BBC, at which our man from the Beeb played the drums. I am now receiving counselling and I am told that I should be able to reduce my medication within a few weeks.

While I was at last night's event rumours started emerging about the job cuts at Aviva, which we have heard of today. I watched union press officers, as we were enjoying ourselves, hit their mobile phones, working late into the night preparing their officials so that they could represent the interests of their members whose jobs were threatened. This is the memory that I want to take away from this Congress. It tells me why the subjects that you debate in this hall and which we cover in our newspaper and the electronic media remain of such importance and interest, even if our editorials do not always agree with your policies. I have already mentioned Thompsons, but I would also like to extend the thanks of my colleagues to Unity Bank, who sponsor the annual cricket match between the journalists and the TUC General Council. I am happy to say that the journalists won this year, and those of you closest to the rostrum may notice the remains of a small head wound I picked up driving to try and prevent a well-struck boundary by the General Secretary of the RMT. So like others who have been in this hall, I have, in my own small way, been Bob Crow'd. *(Laughter)*

My thanks to those many union staff and employees who have helped us this week, making our lives easier, ensuring that press releases are delivered promptly to meet deadlines, arranging conferences and meetings with general secretaries and union officials, always having time for us and, most importantly, the patience to explain to some poor ignorant hack the background and reasons behind policies and decisions. Without the help of your office, we would not be able to function. Then there are the legions of other workers who help arrange accreditations, 'phone lines, IT systems and printers for press releases. To all of these and more, we say "thank you". *(Applause)*

**The President:** Thank you very much for that entertaining and important reply.

I now declare the 138<sup>th</sup> Congress closed and I ask you to join 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 7,644 f 18,292 total 25,936

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

Vicki Berry Christopher Goldthorpe

Tom Harrison Ged Nichols

Douglas Scott Nancy Timms

Male 4, female 2, total 6

### ACM

#### Association for College Management

35 The Point, Market Harborough  
Leicestershire LE16 7QU  
t 01858 461110 f 0858 461366  
e administration@acm.uk.com  
www.acm.uk.com

m 2,029 f 1,772 total 3,801

main trades and industries representing managers in the learning and skills sector

Chief exec and gen sec Peter Pendle

Delegates

David Green John Lowe

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 798 f 2,252 total 3,050

main trades and industries educational psychologists in local educational authorities and other public and private organisations (England, Wales & Northern Ireland)

Gen sec Charles Ward

Delegates

Mary Jenkin Charles Ward

male 1 female 1 total 2

### AFA

#### Association of Flight Attendants

AFA Council 07,  
United Airlines Cargo Centre  
Shoreham Road East, Heathrow Airport  
Hounslow, Middx TW6 3UA  
t 020 8276 6723  
f 020 7276 6706

e afa@afalhr.org.uk

www.afalhr.org.uk

total 619 male/female split not available

main trades and industries airline cabin crew

LEC Kevin P Creighan

Delegates

Elisabeth Schwaabe Michael Schwaabe

### 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 710 f 1,809 total 2,519

main trades and industries represents the majority of staff working for the Alliance and Leicester plc

Gen sec Debbie Cort

Delegates

Debbie Cort Peter Greenwood

male 1 female 1 total 2

### Amicus

35 King Street, Covent Garden  
London WC2E 8JG

t 020 7420 8900 f 020 7240 4723

www.amicustheunion.org

m 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

Ann Abbott Lindsey Adams

Barry Allen Ian Allison

Bill Ayre Teresa Baier

Malcolm Ball Karen Barber

Les Bayliss James Beazley

George Bloom Bob Braddock

Alan Bradshaw David Braniff-Herbert

Jennie Bremner David Brockett

Tony Burke Mark Campbell

Gail Cartmail Ray Chapman

Gwynda Charles Richard Clifton

Doug Collins Brian Comins

Peter Currall Steve Davison

|                   |                  |
|-------------------|------------------|
| Tim Davison       | Bill Day         |
| Ged Dempsey       | Sybil Dilworth   |
| Ben Dodd          | Jimmy Donaghy    |
| Tony Dubbins      | Dave Dutton      |
| Dave Eastham      | Chris Elliott    |
| Siobhan Edean     | Lorene Fabian    |
| David Fleming     | Graham Fletcher  |
| Pauline Frazer    | Nigel Gawthorpe  |
| Graham Goddard    | Joyce Hampshire  |
| Andy Hanks        | Trevor Hanslow   |
| Paul Hiett        | Georgina Hirsch  |
| Mark Hodge        | Roger Jeary      |
| Dave Jones        | Phil Jones       |
| Margaret Lawson   | Rod Laycock      |
| Lesley Mansell    | Chris Matheson   |
| Linda McCulloch   | Danny McLellan   |
| Martin McMulkin   | Lesley McPherson |
| Terri Miller      | Tom Miller       |
| Mick Millichamp   | Andy Mills       |
| Raymond Morell    | David Morgan     |
| Sully Munir       | Dave Oldfield    |
| John Oliver       | Tony Owen        |
| Ananthi Parkin    | Janet Pearce     |
| Brian Pemberton   | Sally Pirrie     |
| Paul Prendergast  | Doug Rooney      |
| Danny Ryan        | John Scarola     |
| Cornelius Sheehan | Derek Simpson    |
| Jeff Smith        | Jane Stewart     |
| Ray Stewart       | Joyce Still      |
| Craig Studley     | Ed Sweeney       |
| Paul Talbot       | Carolyn Taylor   |
| Steve Tattershall | Agnes Tolmie     |
| Dave Trigg        | Sheila Tucker    |
| Adam Umney        | Andrew Walker    |
| John Walsh        | Brian Watkins    |
| Keith Wilmer      | Mohammed Zubair  |
| Richard Angell    |                  |

Male 73, female 26, total 99

**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 2,054 f 6,009 total 8,063  
 main trades and industries staff employed in the Abbey National  
 Gen sec Linda Rolph  
 Peter Gruenewald Linda Rolph  
 male 1 female 1 total 2

**ASLEF**

**Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen**

9 Arkwright Road, London NW3 6AB  
 t 020 7317 8600 f 020 7794 6406

www.aslef.org.uk  
 m 16,212 f 586 total 16,798  
 main trades and industries railways (drivers, operational supervisors and staff)  
 Gen sec Keith Norman  
 Delegates  
 M Colombini Alan Donnelly  
 John Evans Andy Reed  
 male 4 female 0 total 4

**ASPECT**

**Association of Professionals in Education and Children's Trusts**

Woolley Hall, Woolley, Wakefield  
 West Yorkshire WF4 2JR  
 t 01226 383428 f 01226 383427  
 e naeiac@gemsoft.co.uk  
 www.naeiac.org  
 m 1,796 f 2,135 total 3,931  
 Gen Sec John Chowcat LI.B (Hons)  
 Delegates  
 John Chowcat Caroline Poulter  
 male 1 female 1 total 2

**ATL**

**Association of Teachers and Lecturers**

7 Northumberland Street  
 London WC2N 5RD  
 t 020 7930 6441 f 020 7930 1359  
 e info@atl.org.uk  
 www.atl.org.uk  
 m 29,767 f 83,641 total 113,408  
 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  
 Sam Bechler Jane Bennett  
 Mary Bousted Paul Day  
 Martin Freedman Stuart Herdson  
 Shelagh Hirst Mark Holding  
 Gerald Imison Sherry Jespersen  
 Martin Johnson Terry Kenny  
 Pat Kyrou Martin Lawes  
 Julia Neal Martin Pilkington  
 Hank Roberts Ann Rowswell  
 Angie Rutter Eric Stroud  
 Ralph Surman Chris Wilson  
 Joan Yarker  
 Male 14, female 9, total 23

**BACM-TEAM**

**British Association of Colliery Management – Technical, Energy and Administrative Management**

6a South Parade, Doncaster DN1 2DR  
 t 01302 815551 f 01302 815552  
 e gs@bacmteam.org.uk  
 www.bacmteam.org.uk



m 2,998 f 192 total 3,190  
 Gen sec Patrick Carragher  
 Delegates  
 Patrick Carragher  
 male 1 female 0 total 1

**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 7,959 f 379 total 8,338  
 main trades and industries airline pilots and flight engineers (commercial)  
 Gen sec Jim McAuslan  
 Delegates  
 Mervyn Granshaw 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 195 f 5,715 total 5,910  
 main trades and industries the science of dietetics in the private and public sector  
 National officer employment relations  
 David Wood  
 Delegates  
 Dennis Edmondson Alison Nelson  
 male 1 female 1 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 18,331 f 9,023 total 27354  
 main trades and industries broadcasting, film, video, theatre, cinema and related sectors  
 Gen sec Roger Bolton (*died November 2006*)  
 Delegates  
 Jack Amos Christine Bond  
 Suresh Chawla Tony Lennon  
 Norma Ndebele Martin Spence  
 male 4 female 2 total 6

**BFAWU**

**Bakers, Food and Allied Workers Union**

Stanborough House, Great North Road

Stanborough, Welwyn Garden City  
 Herts AL8 7TA  
 t 01707 260150 f 01707 261570  
 e bfawuho@aol.com  
 www.bfawu.org  
 total 26,219 male/female split not available  
 main trades and industries food  
 Gen sec Joe Marino  
 Delegates  
 Vi Carr Joe Marino  
 Colin Morgan Roy Streeter  
 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  
 m83 f 1,338 total 1,421  
 main trades and industries orthoptists  
 Executive Officer Denise Malone

**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 764 f 2,207 total 2,971  
 main trades and industries finance sector union representing staff working in Britannia Building Society and its group of companies  
 Gen sec John Stoddard  
 Delegates  
 Lisa Beverley John Stoddard  
 male 1 female 1 total 2

**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 130 f 3,489 total 3,619  
 main trades and industries community and district nurses  
 Chair Rowena Smith  
 Delegate  
 Anne Duffy  
 male 0 female 1 total 1

**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 55,505 f 11,945 total 67,450

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 Gareth Davies

|               |               |
|---------------|---------------|
| Kevin Edwards | Helen Elliott |
| Mick Fell     | Richard Green |
| Peter Hughes  | Michael Leahy |
| Joe Mann      | Tony McCarthy |
| Barry Morris  | Roy Rickhuss  |
| Gill Stroud   | Michael Walsh |

Male 11, female 3, total 14

**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 15,686 f 3,900 total 19,586

main trades and industries telecommunications, information technology and related industries

Gen sec Adrian Askew

**Delegates**

|                |                 |
|----------------|-----------------|
| Adrian Askew   | Leslie Manasseh |
| Denise McGuire | Simon Williams  |

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**

|                    |               |
|--------------------|---------------|
| Pauline Betteridge | Iain Loughran |
| Alex Mackenzie     | Lesley Mercer |

Shirley Rainey  
Male 1, female 4, 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 195,329 f 49,123 total 244,461

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**

|                   |                  |
|-------------------|------------------|
| Stephen Albon     | Norman Candy     |
| Pat Clouder       | Graham Colk      |
| John Donnally     | Jeannie Drake    |
| Maria Exall       | Stephen Gribban  |
| Billy Hayes       | Michael Kavanagh |
| Tony Kearns       | Martin Keenan    |
| Peter Keenleyside | Bobby Kelly      |
| Jane Loftus       | Bob McGuire      |
| Pat O'Hara        | Bernard Roome    |
| Tony Sneddon      | Chris Tapper     |
| Sandra Walmsley   | Dave Walton      |
| Dave Ward         | Dave Wilshire    |

male 19 female 5 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  
Male 1,687 female 3,228 total 4,915

main trades and industries youth workers, workers in youth theatre, community education, outdoor education, play, personal advisers/mentors.

Gen sec Doug Nicholls

**Delegates**

|               |               |
|---------------|---------------|
| Maggie Foster | 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  
male 112 female 375 total 477  
Chair Deidre Smith

Delegates

Deirdre Smith  
male 0 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 175 f 274 total 449  
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 14,255 f 42,831 total 57,086  
main trades and industries teachers, lecturers,  
associated educational personnel (Scotland)  
Gen sec Ronald A Smith

Delegates

Kirsty Devaney June McCulloch  
Linzi Moore Peter Quigley  
Ronnie Smith Ken Wimbor  
Male 3, female 3, total 6

**Equity**

Guild House  
Upper St Martin's Lane  
London WC2H 9EG  
t 020 7379 6000 f 020 7379 7001  
e info@equity.org.uk  
www.equity.org.uk  
m 18,475 f 18,014 total 36,489

main trades and industries performance workers in  
theatre, film television, radio and variety

Gen sec Christine Payne

Delegates

Bryn Evans Natasha Gerson  
Harry Landis Albert Moses  
Christine Payne Andrew Prodger  
Stephen Spence  
Male 5, female 2, total 7

**FBU**

**Fire Brigades Union**

Bradley House,  
68 Coombe Road  
Kingston-upon-Thames, Surrey KT2 7AE  
t 020 8541 1765 f 020 8546 5187  
e office@fbu.org.uk  
www.fbu.org.uk

total 46,811

main trades and industries local authority fire brigades

Gen sec Matt Wrack

Delegates

Stewart Brown Warren Gee  
Vicky Knight Alan McClean  
Tom McFarlane Micky Nicholas  
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 9,235 f 6,974 total 16,209

main trades and industries civil service, public bodies  
and NHS

Gen sec Jonathan Baume

Delegates

Jonathan Baume Martin Fletcher  
Jon Restell David Watts  
male 4 female 0 total 4

**GMB**

Britain's general union  
22/24 Worple Road  
London SW19 4DD  
t 020 8947 3131 f 020 8944 6552  
e info@gmb.org.uk  
www.gmb.org.uk  
m 337,731 f 241,374 total 579,105

main trades and industries public services-primarily  
NHS, local government, care education; also  
engineering, construction, shipbuilding, energy,  
catering, security, civil air transport, aerospace,  
defence, clothing, textiles, retail, hotel, chemicals,  
utilities, offshore, AA, food production and distribution

Gen Sec Paul Kenny

Delegates

Kathy Abu Bakir Richard Ascough  
Sheila Bearcroft Allan Black  
Ed Blissett Jude Brimble  
Phil Callendar Brenda Carson  
Samantha Caveney Jean Chaplow  
Linda Clarke Rosemary Clewes  
Naomi Cooke Debbie Coulter  
Georgia Cruickshank Maria Davey  
Phil Davies Pat Devine  
Harry Donaldson James Donley  
Peter Dow Alan Dudson  
George Emmerson Tommy Fallows  
Trevor Fellows Peter Foley  
Brenda Fraser George Fraser  
Allan Garley Gordon Gibbs  
Edna Greenwood Margaret Gregg  
Paul Grieve Tommy Hall

|                    |                 |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| Rowena Hayward     | Keith Hazlewood |
| Sharon Holder      | Mary Hutchinson |
| Chris Jackson      | Harpal Jandu    |
| Paul Kenny         | Charles King    |
| Mick Laws          | Anne Leader     |
| Jim Lennox         | Linda Lord      |
| Kath Manning       | Joni McDougall  |
| Don McGregor       | Shaila McKane   |
| Noreen Metcalf     | Berni Moberg    |
| Joe Morgan         | Cath Murphy     |
| Dolores O'Donoghue | Kath Owen       |
| Robin Richardson   | Mick Rix        |
| Richard Robinson   | Mick Ryan       |
| Malcolm Sage       | Kath Slater     |
| Gary Smith         | Martin Smith    |
| Brian Strutton     | Eileen Theaker  |
| John Toomey        | Mary Turner     |
| Rob Whilding       | Andy Worth      |

Male 39, female 31, total 70

**GULO**

**General Union of Loom Overlookers**

9 Wellington Street, St John's  
Blackburn BB1 8AF  
t 01254 51760 f 01254 51760  
total 195 male/female split not available  
main trades and industries weaving manufacture  
Gen sec Don Rishton

**HCSA**

**Hospital Consultants and Specialists Association**

1 Kingsclere Road, Overton  
Basingstoke, Hampshire RG25 3JA  
t 01256 771777 f 01256 770999  
e conspec@hcsa.com  
www.hcsa.com  
m 2,583 f 466 total 3,049  
main trades and industries hospital consultants,  
associate specialists, SpR grade and staff grade (all  
employed in the NHS)  
Gen sec Stephen Campion  
Delegate  
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 23,264 f 7,884 total 31,148  
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  
Gerald Newson John Smith  
188

Eileen Spencer Barbara White  
male 4 female 2 total 6

**NACO**

**National Association of Co-operative Officials**

6a Clarendon Place, Hyde,  
Cheshire SK14 2QZ  
t 0161 351 7900 f 0161 366 6800  
m 1,808 f 641 total 2,449  
main trades and industries retail distribution,  
insurance, dairy industry, funeral services, motor trades  
(retail), retail pharmacy, travel industry, agriculture  
Gen sec Neil Buist

**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 410 male/female split not available  
main trades and industries mining  
Gen sec Ian Parker  
Delegates  
Ian Parker Rowland Soar  
male 2 female 0 total 2

**NAPO**

**The Trade Union and Professional Association for  
Family Court and Probation Staff**

4 Chivalry Road, London SW11 1HT  
t 020 7223 4887 f 020 7223 3503  
e info@napo.org.uk  
www.napo.org.uk  
m 2,898 f 5,779 total 8,677  
main trades and industries probation officers, including  
hostel assistant wardens and community service  
sessional supervisors and family court staff  
Gen sec Judy McKnight  
Delegates  
Mike McClelland Judy McKnight  
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.nasuwt.org.uk  
www.teachersunion.org.uk  
m 77,026 f 171,453 total 248,479  
main trades and industries education  
Gen sec Chris Keates  
Delegates  
Jerry Bartlett Rachel Cashman  
Julian Chapman Lena Davies  
Nigel De Gruchy Kathy Duggan

Sue Foreman            Brian Garvey  
 Amanda Haehner      Julia Harris  
 Alan Homes            Karen Hopwood  
 Bob Johnson          Michael Johnson  
 David Jones            Chris Keates  
 Roger Kirk             Pat Lerew  
 Chris Lines            Maurice Littlewood  
 John Mayes            Peter McCloughlin  
 Pam Milner            Dafydd Morgan  
 Jennifer Moses        Darren Northcott  
 Mary Page             Sara Platt  
 Patrick Roach         Paula Roe  
 Sue Rogers            Peter Scott  
 Tracey Twist          Steve White  
 Dave Wilkinson       Sarah Wust  
 Male 19, female 17, total 36

**Nautilus UK**

(NUMAST at the time of the 2006 Congress)  
 Oceanair House, 750/760 High Road  
 London E11 3BB  
 t 020 8989 6677 f 020 8530 1015  
 e enquiries@nautilusuk.org  
 www.nautilusuk.org  
 m 17,669 f 336 total 18,005  
 main trades and industries merchant navy and all related areas  
 Gen sec Brian Orrell  
 Delegates  
 Mark Dickinson      Peter McEwen  
 Paul Moloney         Brian Orrell  
 male 4 female 0 total 4

**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  
 total 12,062 (male/female split not available)  
 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  
 Glenys Britton      Tim Poil  
 Walter Wright  
 male 2 female 1 total 3

**NUJ**

**National Union of Journalists**  
 Headland House, 308 Gray's Inn Road  
 London WC1X 8DP  
 t 020 7278 7916 f 020 7837 8143  
 e info@nuj.org.uk  
 www.nuj.org.uk

m 17,824 f 12,386 total 30,210  
 main trades and industries journalists  
 Gen sec Jeremy Dear  
 Delegates  
 David Beake          Jeremy Dear  
 Alan Gibson          Anita Halpin  
 Chris Morley         Rotimi Sankore  
 Michelle Stanistreet  
 Male 5, female 2, total 7

**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 1,813 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

**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 61,116 f 193,746 total 254,862  
 main trades and industries teachers  
 Gen sec Steve Sinnott  
 Delegates  
 Dorothy Amos        Bill Anderson  
 Lesley Auger        John Bangs  
 Hilary Bills         Christine Blower  
 Amanda Brown       Chris Brown  
 Ellie Campbell-Barr   Graham Clayton  
 Sue Coggins         Mary Compton  
 Kevin Courtney     Caroline Cowie  
 Hazel Danson        Barry Fawcett  
 Nina Franklin        Baljeet Ghale  
 Jerry Glazier         Bill Greenshields  
 Dave Harvey         Janey Hulme  
 Max Hyde            Arthur Jarman  
 Alex Kenny          Roger King  
 Mike Lerry          Gary Lewis  
 Tim Lucas            Nuala McGinn  
 Judy Moorhouse     Ian Murch  
 Veronica Peppiatt   Martin Reed  
 Bernard Regan       Richard Reiser  
 Steve Sinnott        Angela Ssekkono  
 Male 20, female 18, total 38

**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 124,,241 f 188,48 total 312,725  
 main trades and industries government departments  
 and agencies, public bodies, private sector information  
 technology and other service companies  
 General secretary Mark Serwotka

Delegates

|                   |                  |
|-------------------|------------------|
| Jane Aitchinson   | Chris Baugh      |
| Dave Bean         | Sue Bond         |
| Kathy Bracy       | Chris Chorlton   |
| Janice Godrich    | Lorraine Harding |
| Austin Harney     | Fran Heathcote   |
| Zita Holbourne    | Jude Jackson     |
| John Jamieson     | Martin John      |
| Emily Kelly       | Julie Kelly      |
| Kevin Kelly       | Hugh Lanning     |
| Neil License      | Laura Martin     |
| Jackie McWilliams | Glenys Morris    |
| Mike Nolan        | Emmet O'Brien    |
| Gordon Rowntree   | Mark Serwotka    |
| Victoria Steeples | Graham Taylor    |
| Danny Williamson  | Sevi Yesildalli  |

Male 15, female 15, total 30

**PFA**

**Professional Footballers Association**

20 Oxford Court, Bishopsgate  
 Manchester M2 3WQ  
 t 0161 236 0575 f 0161 228 7229  
 e info@thepfa.co.uk  
 www.givemefootball.com  
 m 2,369 f 0 total 2,369  
 main trades and industries professional football  
 Chief executive Gordon Taylor

Delegates

Bobby Barnes Simone Pound

male 1 female 1 total 2

**POA(UK)**

**The Professional Trade Union for Prison,  
 Correctional and Secure Psychiatric Workers**

Cronin House,  
 245 Church Street  
 London N9 9HW  
 t 020 8803 0255 f 020 8803 1761  
 www.poauk.org.uk  
 m 26,767 f 8,492 total 35,259  
 main trades and industries persons employed in any  
 penal or secure establishment or special hospital as a  
 prison officer, a nursing grade, a non-industrial stores  
 grade and NHS secure forensic staff  
 Gen sec Brian Caton

Delegates

|             |             |
|-------------|-------------|
| Brian Caton | Dave Cook   |
| Steve Cox   | Alan Miller |

190

Colin Moses

Brian Traynor

Male 6, female 0, total 6

**Prospect**

New Prospect House,  
 8 Leake Street  
 London SE1 7NN  
 t 020 7902 6600 f 020 7902 6667  
 e enquiries@prospect.org.uk  
 www.prospect.org.uk  
 m 80,781 f 21,380 total 102,161  
 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    | Emily Boase      |
| Beryl Brine         | Irene Danks      |
| Catherine Donaldson | Sue Ferns        |
| Charles Harvey      | Graeme Henderson |
| Dai Hudd            | Aimee Kentish    |
| Craig Marshall      | Paul Noon        |
| Geraldine O'Connell | Robbie Ridoutt   |
| Samantha Smith      | Nigel Titchen    |

Penny Witham

Male 7, female 10, 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 65,629 f 7,718 total 73,347  
 main trades and industries railways and shipping,  
 underground, road transport

Gen sec Bob Crow

Delegates

|                 |               |
|-----------------|---------------|
| Eddie Bolton    | Janine Booth  |
| Robert Crow     | Tony Donaghey |
| Malcolm Dunning | Mark Facey    |
| David Gott      | Peter Hall    |
| Dennis James    | Bob Law       |
| Peter Macleod   | Gerald McCann |
| Peter Rowland   | Mark Russell  |

Peter Skelly  
 Male 14, female 1, 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 2,231 f 6,060 total 8,291

Chief Executive Joanna Brown  
Delegates  
Joanna Brown Jackie Smith  
male 0 female 2 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  
total 1,337 (male/female split not available)  
main trades and industries staff employed by the  
Skipton Building Society  
Chair Jennifer A Tate  
Delegates  
Richard Simpson 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  
total 18,132 (male /female split not available)  
main trades and industries  
National Health Service  
Chief exec officer Richard Evans  
Delegates  
Richard Evans Zena Mitton  
Andrew Pitt Gemma Richardson-Williams  
Male 2, female 2, total 4

**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 614,455 f 162,870 total 777,325  
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

|                   |                     |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| Joyce Aslett      | Bob Baldwin         |
| Hilda Ball        | Mary Brannigan      |
| Rawle Burke       | John Burston        |
| Barry Camfield    | Martin Carroll      |
| John Childs       | Ray Collins         |
| Sue Cope          | Collette Cork-Hurst |
| Gerard Coyne      | John Cryer          |
| M Cullum          | Mick Dowds          |
| Jack Dromey       | Sher Dulai          |
| Joe Elba          | Jennifer Elliott    |
| Roz Foyer         | John Fraser         |
| Ajit Singh Gill   | Davey Gordon        |
| A Hansdot         | Sandra Harrison     |
| Steve Hart        | Brian Hewitt        |
| Diana Holland     | Paul Hopson         |
| Sucha Hundle      | Pat Hutchinson      |
| Sharon Hutchinson | Brenda Irvine       |
| Marie Jockins     | Jimmy Kelly         |
| John Kelly        | Tony Lewis          |
| Danny Maher       | Stella Matthews     |
| Martin Mayer      | Len McCluskey       |
| Ian McDonald      | Sean McGovern       |
| Eric Mullings     | Dawn Nelson         |
| Brian Norbury     | Mick O'Reilly       |
| Odette Pink       | Brian Revell        |
| Andy Richards     | Barrie Roberts      |
| John Rowse        | Maggie Ryan         |
| Gerry Sawdon      | Gerard Sheridan     |
| John Sheridan     | Kuldev Singh        |
| David Smith       | Ian Smith           |
| Graham Stevenson  | Pat Storey          |
| Patricia Stuart   | Robert Studham      |
| Mohammad Taj      | Jayne Taylor        |
| Monica Taylor     | Phyllis Thompson    |
| Joseph Welch      | Dave Williams       |
| Tony Woodhouse    | Tony Woodley        |
| Val Yilmaz        |                     |

Male 50, female 23, total 73

**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 21,091 f 8,402 total 29,493 (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 Gerry Doherty  
 Jan Hamilton Pauline McArdle  
 Amarjit Singh Mitch Tovey  
 Male 4, female 2, total 6

**UBAC**

**Union for Bradford and Bingley Staff and Staff in Associated Companies**

18d Market Place, Malton  
 North Yorkshire YO17 7LX  
 t 01653 697634 f 01653 695222  
 e ubac@btconnect.com  
 m 539 f 1,030 total 1,569  
 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  
 total 4,065 (male/female split not available)  
 main trades and industries education - teachers and lecturers  
 Gen sec Gruff Hughes

**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 119,554 f 1,555 total 121,109  
 main trades and industries construction and building  
 Gen sec Alan Ritchie  
 Delegates  
 Roy Bleasdale Michael Farrell  
 Wilf Flynn Terry Harbour  
 John Kemp Tom Lannon  
 Jim McCloskey Ivan Moldawczuk  
 ChrisMurphy Alan Ritchie  
 John Thompson K Trudgill  
 Frank Tyas W Whalen  
 Male 14, female 0, total 14

**UCU**

**University & College Union**

Egmont House  
 25-31 Tavistock Place  
 London WC1H 9UT  
 192

t 020 7670 9700 f 020 76709799

[ehq@aut.org.uk](mailto:ehq@aut.org.uk)

and  
 27 Britannia Street, London WC1X 9JP  
 t 020 7837 3636 f 020 7837 4403

e hq@natfhe.org.uk

www.ucu.org.uk

m 61,032 f 53,085 (plus 2,193 male/female split not available) total 116,310

main trades and industries post-school academic and academic-related staff

Joint Gen secs Sally Hunt and Paul Mackney

Delegates

|                     |                   |
|---------------------|-------------------|
| Sam Allen           | Mick Barr         |
| Gargi Bhattacharyya | Sasha Callaghan   |
| Lynne Chamberlain   | Mary Davis        |
| Tina Downes         | Nigel Gates       |
| Joe Gluza           | Anne-Marie Greene |
| Jim Guild           | David Guppy       |
| Dennis Hayes        | Terry Hoad        |
| Sally Hunt          | Jacqui Johnson    |
| Peter Jones         | Paul Mackney      |
| Andrew Price        | Simon Renton      |
| Paul Russell        | Jim Thakoordin    |
| Steve Wharton       | John Wilkin       |

Male 16, female 8, total 24

**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 340,923 f 967,077 total 1,317,000

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      | Gilly Anglin-Jarrett |
| Pam Baldwin       | Roger Bannister      |
| Sarah Barwick     | Kenneth Bell         |
| Mandy Berger      | Angela Bowen         |
| Jim Burnett       | Tony Caffery         |
| Malcolm Cantello  | Ivy Carlier          |
| Jane Carolan      | Joyce Clarke         |
| Linda Coey        | Guy Collis           |
| Louise Couling    | Ruth Davies          |
| Lesley Discombe   | Margaret Dunbar      |
| Christine Durance | Derek Earnshaw       |
| Pat Earnshaw      | Mary Ferris          |
| Mike Folliard     | Sue Forster          |
| Martin Francis    | Mark Fysh            |
| Gerry Gallagher   | Peter Gaskin         |
| Jean Geldart      | Paul Glover          |
| Moz Greenshields  | Tony Grieve          |
| Gloria Hanson     | Mike Hayes           |
| Ian Headley       | Susan Highton        |



|                    |                       |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Alan Jarman        | Helen Jenner          |
| John Jones         | Rosemary Kangangi     |
| Denis Keatings     | Diane Kelly           |
| Glenn Kelly        | Mike Kirby            |
| Diana Leach        | Angela Lynes          |
| Ann Macmillan-Wood | Colm Magee            |
| Iris Magill        | Carole Maleham        |
| Gill Malik         | Annette Mansell-Green |
| John McDermott     | Ross McGiven          |
| Steve Milford      | Bev Miller            |
| Gloria Mills       | Iain Montgomery       |
| Craig Nelson       | June Nelson           |
| Caryl Nobbs        | Bob Oram              |
| Sonia Palmer       | Raphael Parkinson     |
| Mary Pearson       | Erica Petgrave        |
| Lynn Poulton       | Dave Prentis          |
| Katrina Purcell    | Khi Rafe              |
| Elizabeth Ring     | Rod Robertson         |
| Julie Robinson     | Jon Rogers            |
| Helen Rose         | Patricia Rowland      |
| Jessie Russel      | Tom Sexton            |
| Clive Shakespeare  | Alison Shepherd       |
| Sam Singh          | Fiona Smith           |
| Spurgeon Smith     | Liz Snape             |
| Keith Sonnet       | Marie Souter          |
| Irene Stacey       | Tony Staunton         |
| Norma Stephenson   | Chris Tansley         |
| Sofi Taylor        | Steve Warwick         |
| Monique Watson     | Junetta Whorwell      |
| Christine Wilde    | Clare Williams        |
| Malcolm Wing       | Rena Wood             |

Male 42, female 58, total 100

#### UNITY

Hillcrest House, Garth Street  
 Hanley, Stoke-on-Trent ST1 2AB  
 t 01782 272755 f 01782 284902  
 www.catu.org.uk  
 m 5,123 f 2,953 total 8,076  
 main trades and industries the ceramics industry (all areas)  
 Gen sec Geoff Bagnall  
 Delegates  
 Geoff Bagnall Mervyn Stanier  
 male 2 female 0 total 2

#### 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 17,654 f 288 total 17,942  
 main trades and industries drivers, warehousing,  
 ancillary workers in the  
 logistics and food sectors  
 Gen Sec Robert Monks

Delegates  
 Brian Hart Rob Monks  
 Steven Yohe  
 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 143,168 f 197,485 total 340,653  
 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

|                   |                   |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| Terence Adair     | Simon Benyan      |
| Maureen Bowen     | Mike Brewer       |
| Jeff Broome       | Pat Buttle        |
| Susan Coutts      | Michael Dixon     |
| Sonia Foster      | Pauline Foulkes   |
| Richard Fricker   | Nick Gerrard      |
| John Hannett      | Peter Hunt        |
| Jan Jervis        | Brian Kenny       |
| Jonathan Lambert  | Paddy Lillis      |
| Ann Lloyd         | Yvonne Mathieson  |
| John McGarry      | Anne O'Shea       |
| Amanda Owens      | Geoffrey Page     |
| Angela Partington | Val Pugh          |
| Irene Radigan     | Steve Rydzkowski  |
| Wendy Subhan      | Anthony Threlfall |
| Greg Vogiatzis    | Maureen Williams  |

Male 18, female 15, total 33

#### 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 1,305 f 801 total 2,106  
 main trades and industries television, radio, film,  
 books, theatre and multimedia  
 Gen sec Bernie Corbett

#### YISA

##### Yorkshire Independent Staff Association

c/o Yorkshire Building Society,  
 Yorkshire House, Yorkshire Drive  
 Rooley Lane, Bradford BD5 8LJ  
 t 01274 472 453  
 e kmwatson@ybs.co.uk  
 m 407 f 990 total 1,397  
 Chair Karen Watson  
 Delegates

Patricia Cook     Susan Hampson  
male 0 female 2 total 2

Summary  
Number of affiliated  
unions: 63  
membership:  
m 3,504,536  
f 2,845,106  
male/female split not  
available 113,517  
total 6,463,159

# **Section 4**

## **Details of past Congresses**



|     | Date | Venue    | President             | General Secretary | Delegates | Unions | Members represented |
|-----|------|----------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------|--------|---------------------|
| 138 | 2006 | Brighton | Gloria Mills (UNISON) | Do                | 742       | 63     | 6,463,159           |

# Section 5

## members of the general council 1921-2006

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 – 2005-06  
 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 – 2005-06  
 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 – 2001-06  
 Bearcroft, S - 1997-2006  
 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 - 06  
 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 - 06  
 Campbell, J - 1953-57  
 Callighan, A - 1945-47  
 Cannon, L - 1965-70  
 Carey, M – 1998–2005  
 Carolan, J – 2005-06  
 Carr, J - 1989-92  
 Carrigan, D - 2001  
 Carron, WJ - 1954-67  
 Carter, J - 1989-92  
 Cartmail, G – 2005-06  
 Caton, B – 2001-2006  
 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, 2006  
 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 – 2002-06  
 De Gruchy, N - 1989-2002  
 Dhamrait, M - 1995-2000  
 Doherty, G – 2004- 06  
 Donaghy, R - 1987-99  
 Donnett, AM - 1973-75  
 Doughty, GH - 1968-73  
 Douglass, H - 1953-66  
 Drake, JLP - 1990-2006  
 Drain, GA - 1973-82  
 Dubbins, AD - 1984-2006  
 Duffy, D - 1988-91  
 Duffy, T - 1978-85  
 Dukes, C - 1934-46  
 Dunn, V – 2001-2002  
 Dwyer, P - 1992-94  
 Dyson, F - 1975-78  
 Eastwood, H - 1948  
 Eccles, JF - 1973-85  
 Eccles, T - 1949-58  
 Edmonds, J - 1986-2002  
 Edmondson, LF - 1970-77  
 Edward, E - 1931-46  
 Ellis, JN - 1988-91  
 Elsom, R - 1996-97  
 Elvin, HH - 1925-39  
 Evans, AM - 1977-84  
 Evans, D - 1991-99  
 Evans, L - 1945-52  
 Evans, RL - 1985-91  
 Evans, W - 1996-99  
 Evans, WJ - 1960-62  
 Exall, M - 2006  
 Farthing, WJ - 1935-43  
 Fawcett, L - 1940-51  
 Fenelon, B – 1998  
 Ferns, S – 2005-06  
 Figgins, JB - 1947-52  
 Findlay, AAH - 1921-40  
 Fisher, AW - 1968-81  
 Ford, SWG - 1963-70  
 Forden, L - 1958-65  
 Forshaw, W - 1933-34  
 Foster, J – 1999-2003  
 Foulkes, P - 2006  
 Fysh, M – 2001- 06  
 Gallie, CN - 1940-46  
 Garland, R – 1983  
 Garley, A – 2005-06  
 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 - 06  
 Godwin, A - 1949-62  
 Golding, J - 1986-87  
 Gormley, J - 1973-79  
 Gosling, H - 1921-23  
 Graham, JA - 1982-83, 1985  
 Grant, J - 2002  
 Grantham, RA - 1971-74, 1983-91  
 Gray, D - 1982-83  
 Green, GF - 1960-62  
 Greendale, W - 1978-85  
 Greene, SF - 1957-74  
 Gretton, S - 1969-72  
 Grieve, CD - 1973-82

Griffiths, AE - 1963-69  
 Guy, LG - 1977-82  
 Hagger, P - 1988-94  
 Haigh, E - 1982  
 Hall, D - 1996-97  
 Hall, E - 1954-59  
 Hallsworth, J - 1926-46  
 Hallworth, A - 1955-59  
 Halpin, A – 1996, 1999, 2001- 06  
 Hammond, EA - 1983-87  
 Hancock, F - 1935-57  
 Handley, RC - 1938-39  
 Hanley, P - 1968-69  
 Hannett, J – 2004-06  
 Harrison, HN - 1937-47  
 Hawkes, P - 1992-2004  
 Hayday, A - 1922-36  
 Hayday, F - 1950-72  
 Hayes, W – 2002-06  
 Haynes, E - 1964-68  
 Henry, J - 1989-90  
 Hewitt, H - 1952-63  
 Heywood, WL - 1948-56  
 Hicks, G - 1921-40  
 Hill, AL - 1955-57  
 Hill, D - 1992  
 Hill, EJ - 1948-64  
 Hill, J - 1921-35  
 Hill, JC - 1958  
 Hill, S - 1963-67  
 Hillon, B - 1987-97  
 Hindle, J - 1930-36  
 Hodgson, M - 1936-47  
 Hogarth, W - 1962-72  
 Holloway, P - 1997-2000  
 Holmes, W - 1928-44  
 Houghton, D - 1952-59  
 Howell, FL - 1970-73  
 Hunt, S – 2002-06  
 Isaacs, GA - 1932-45  
 Jackson, Sir Ken - 1993-2001  
 Jackson, T - 1967-81  
 Jarman, C - 1942-46  
 Jarvis, FF - 1974-88  
 Jenkins, C - 1974-87  
 Jinkinson, A - 1990-95  
 Johnson, A - 1993-94  
 Jones, J - 1934-38  
 Jones, JL - 1968-77  
 Jones, JW - 1967-69  
 Jones, RT - 1946-56  
 Jones, RT - 1921-32  
 Jones, WE - 1950-59  
 Jordan, WB - 1986-94  
 Jowett, W - 1986-87  
 Kaylor, J - 1932-42  
 Kean, W - 1921-45  
 Keates, C – 2004-06  
 Kelly, J – 2004-06  
 Kelly, L - 2004  
 Kenny, P - 2000 - 06  
 Keys, WH - 1975-84  
 King, J - 1972-74  
 Knapp, J - 1983-2000  
 Laird, G - 1979-81  
 Lambert, DAC - 1984-93  
 Landles, P - 1995-2003  
 Lascelles, D – 2001-05  
 Lawther, W - 1935-53  
 Leahy, M – 1999-2006  
 Lee, P - 1933  
 Lenahan, P - 1991-92  
 Leslie, J - 1925  
 Littlewood, TL - 1968-70  
 Lloyd, G - 1973-82  
 Losinska, K - 1986  
 Loughlin, A - 1929-52  
 Love, I - 1987-94  
 Lowthian, GH - 1952-72  
 Lyons, CA - 1983-88  
 Lyons, J - 1983-90  
 Lyons, R - 1989-2003  
 Macgougan, J - 1970-78  
 MacKenzie, HU (Lord) - 1987-99  
 Mackney, P – 2002-06  
 Macreadie, J - 1987  
 Maddocks, A - 1977-90  
 Maddocks, WH - 1979-81  
 Manasseh, L – 2001-2006  
 Martin, A - 1960-70  
 McAndrews, A - 1949-54  
 McAvoy, D - 1989-2003  
 McCall, W - 1984-88  
 McCarthy, CP- 1983-84  
 McCulloch, L - 2003  
 McCullogh, E - 1958-62



McDermott, JF - 1949-57  
 McGahey, M - 1982-85  
 McGarvey, D - 1965-76  
 McGonigle, A - 1992  
 McGrath, H - 1995-98  
 McGregor, M - 2004  
 McGurk, J – 1932  
 Mckay, J – 2002-03  
 McKnight, J - 2000 - 06  
 Mercer, L - 2000 - 06  
 Mills, G - 1994-2006  
 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 – 02, 2005-06  
 Nicholas, HR - 1965-66  
 Nicholson, B - 1983-87  
 Noon, P – 2001-06  
 O'Brien, T - 1940-69  
 Ogden, JW - 1921-29  
 O'Hagen, J - 1953-66  
 O'Kane, E - 2003  
 Openshaw, R - 1948-56  
 Orrell, B – 1999-2006  
 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 – 2005-06  
 Poole, L - 1957-58  
 Poulton, EL - 1921-29  
 Prentis, D - 1996-2006  
 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 – 2005-06  
 Rix, M – 2001-2002  
 Roberts, A (Sir) - 1940-62  
 Roberts, A - 1967-71  
 Robinson, SA - 1959-69  
 Rogers, S – 2002-06  
 Rooney, D – 1998-2006  
 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 – 2002-06  
 Sexton, J - 1921  
 Sharp, L - 1957-65  
 Shaw, A - 1929-38  
 Sheldon, J - 1992-97  
 Shepherd, A - 1995-2006  
 Sherwood, W - 1934-36  
 Simpson, D – 2002-06  
 Sinnott, S – 2005-06  
 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 – 2001-06  
 Sonnet, K – 2001-06  
 Spackman, EW- 1945-46  
 Spanswick, EAG - 1977-82  
 Spence, WR - 1931-41  
 Stanley, BC - 1983-85  
 Squance, WJR - 1936-39  
 Stuart, P – 2005-06  
 Steele, NJ - 1983-90  
 Stevens, L - 1983  
 Stevenson, RB - 1984-89  
 Stott, W - 1936-39  
 Stuart, P – 2004-06  
 Swales, AB - 1921-34  
 Sweeney, E - 1996-2006  
 Swindell, B - 1962-65  
 Switzer, B - 1993-97  
 Symons, E - 1989-95  
 Taj, M - 2000 - 06  
 Talbot, P – 1999-2006  
 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 – 2005-06  
 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 - 06  
 Wright, LT - 1953-67  
 Wrack, M - 2006  
 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

### **Aitchinson, Jane**

HSE job cuts 164

### **Allen, Sam**

Organising 62

Question to the Prime Minister 105

### **Allison, Ian**

Pensions 42

### **Angell, Richard**

Strengthening workplace democracy 63

Askew, Adrian

unionlearn and new opportunities for union members 97

### **Auger, Lesley**

Class size 175

## B

### **Bain, Andy**

Transport Policy 152

Baldwin, Pam

Regional pay in the public sector 107

Barber, Brendan

Address by General Secretary 57

Corporate Manslaughter 165

European Migration 73

Islamophobia and Racism 69

Joint Statement with the Muslim Council of Britain 65

Quality of Work 151

Question and Answer session with the Foreign Secretary 122-125

Questions to the Prime Minister 102-107

The importance of equality 167

Vote of Thanks to the Media 180

### **Bari, Dr Muhammad Abdul**

Joint Statement with the Muslim Council of Britain 66

### **Barnes, Bobby**

unionlearn and new opportunities for union members 96

### **Baugh, Chris**

Organising 60

Baume, Jonathan

Quality of Work 149

Trade Union Freedom Bill 95

### **Bean, Dave**

Quality of Work 151

### **Beckett, Rt Hon Margaret**

Address by Foreign Secretary 121-125

Beecham, Sir Jeremy

Labour Party fraternal address 76

### **Bell, Kenneth**

Education and Inspections Bill and marketisation of education 113

### **Betteridge, Pauline**

Regional pay in the public sector 107

### **Bills, Hilary**

Report of Scrutineers 117

### **Bird, Jo**

Equality Awards 72

Blair, Rt Hon Tony

Address by the Prime Minister 98

### **Blissett, Ed**

Thomson/TUI Call Centre, Glasgow 154

Transport 154

### **Bloom, George**

The Environment 81

Blower, Christine

Employment status 91

### **Bond, Sue**

Access to Work and the Public Sector 178

### **Booth, Janine**

National register of assaults on public sector workers 52

Women's Equality 172

### **Boustead, Mary**

Education and Inspections Bill and marketisation of education 113

Questions to the Foreign Secretary 122

### **Broome, Jeff**

Pensions 42

Question to the Prime Minister 105

### **Brown, Joanna**

TUPE regulations 95

### **Burke, Tony**

Agency workers 89

Corporate Manslaughter 164

## C

### **Caffery, Tony**

TUPE regulations 96

### **Callaghan, Sasha**

Access to Work and the Public Sector 177

### **Camfield Barry**

Trident 144

Pensions 43

### **Carey, Marge**

Gold Badge of Congress 159

### **Carolan, Jane**

Public Services 46

### **Carr, Vi**

Migrant workers 74

### **Cartmail, Gail**

National Health Service 55

### **Caton, Brian**

Trade Union Freedom Bill 93

TUC policy and campaigning 168

### **Chamberlain, Lynn**

Zahid Mubarek Inquiry 112

Chowcat, John

Local Authority Support for Schools 175

### **Clarke, Tracy**

Organising 61

### **Clifton, Richard**

Manufacturing 148

Question to the Prime Minister 104

### **Colk, Graham**

Employment status 91

**Colombini, Miles**

Trade Union Freedom Bill 94

**Compton, Mary**

Trident 146

**Couling, Louise**

Vote of Thanks to the President 38

**Crow, Bob**

Attacks on fire cover and trade union organisation by Merseyside Fire Authority 138

Trade Union Freedom Bill 92, 95

Trident 143

**D****Dada, Priscilla**

The Environment 82

**Danks, Irene**

National Health Service 55

**Davies, Phil**

Remploy 115

**Davis, Mary**

The importance of equality 166

**Dear, Jeremy**

Pensions 44

Cuba 137

Responsible use of the Internet 127

**Delay, Tom**

The Environment 79

Demsey, Ged

Remploy 115

**Devaney, Kirsty**

Migrant workers 73

**Dickinson, Mark**

Fairtrade and seafarers 128

**Dilworth, Sybil**

Valuing trade union race equality committees 52

**Doherty, Gerry**

Pensions 41

Thomson/TUI Call Centre, Glasgow 153

**Donaghey, Tony**

General Council statement on Europe 133

Point of order 128

**Donaldson, Harry**

Trident 144

**Donnelly, Alan**

Pensions 43

**Drake, Jeannie**

Agency workers 88

General Council Statement on Pensions 39

TUPE and Pensions 46

**Dromey, Jack**

Migrant workers 75

Organising 59

**Dunbar, Margaret**

Deportation of children of asylum seekers 70

**Dunning, Malcolm**

Irish Ferries 173

**E****Evans, Bryan**

204

Status of the Artist 156

**Evans, John**

Energy review 84

**Exall, Maria**

The importance of equality 165, 168

**F****Fabian, Lorene**

Islamophobia and Racism 69

**Ferns, Sue**

Science 148

**Fletcher, Martin**

Workplace bullying 161

**Flynn, Wilf**

Migrant workers 74

**Foyer, Roz**

Public Services 49

**Franklin, Nina**

Deportation of children of asylum seekers 71

**Fraser, Brenda**

General Council statement on Europe 133

**G****Garley, Allan**

The Economy 149

**Garragher, Patrick**

Clean coal and energy 85

**Garvey, Brian**

Penalties for failure to implement statutory provisions 174

**Gerson Natasha**

New technology and payments to performers 157

**Ghale, Baljeet**

The importance of equality 167

**Gibson, Alan**

Trident 145

**Glazier, Jerry**

Public Services 48

**Godrich, Janice**

Pensions 40

Question to the Prime Minister 102

**Goldthorpe, Christopher**

European Union Trade Policy 134

**Green, Richard**

Clean coal and energy 87

**Greene, Anne-Marie**

Education and Training, Age and Employment Rights 176,177

**Greenshields, Bill**

Organising 61

Greenwood, Edna

Closure of Northern Foods Bakery in Trafford Park 178

**H****Haehner, Amanda**

Campaign for Workplace Justice and Trade Union Freedom 64

**Hank, Robert**

Regional pay in the public sector 108

**Hannett, John**

Agency workers 88  
**Harrison, Tom**  
 Control Arms Campaign 126  
**Hart, Steve**  
 Agency workers 89  
**Hayes, Billy**  
 European Union Trade Policy 135  
 General Council statement on Europe 131, 133  
 Islamophobia and Racism 67  
**Hayes, Dennis**  
 Science 149  
**Hazlewood, Keith**  
 Manufacturing 147  
**Henderson, Graeme**  
 Clean coal and energy 86  
 HSE job cuts 164  
 Question to the Prime Minister 102  
**Herdson, Stuart**  
 Flexible working 170  
**Hoad, Terry**  
 Quality of Work 150  
**Holbourne, Zita**  
 Valuing trade union race equality committees 53  
**Holland, Diana**  
 Education and Training, Age and Employment Rights 177  
**Hudd, Dai**  
 TUPE and Pensions 46  
 Public Services 49  
**Hughes, Peter**  
 Question to the Prime Minister 105  
**Hunt, Sally**  
 Cuba 136  
 Palestine 143  
 Trident 143  
**Hutchinson, Mary**  
 Questions to the Foreign Secretary 124  
 Deportation of children of asylum seekers 71

**J**

**Jackson, Jude**  
 The importance of equality 167  
**Jandu, Harpal**  
 Islamophobia and Racism 68  
**Jenkin, Mary**  
 Early years education 114  
**Jones, Peter**  
 Migrant workers 74

**K**

**Kavanagh, Michael**  
 Manufacturing 148  
**Kearns, Tony**  
 Cuba 136  
 Pensions 41  
**Keates, Chris**  
 National register of assaults on public sector workers 50  
**Kelly, Jimmy**

Questions to the Foreign Secretary 123  
**Kelly, Kevin**  
 Agency workers 89  
**Kemp, Steve**  
 Cuba 135  
 Pensions 43  
 Presentation to Rick Sumner 87  
**Kenny, Paul**  
 Pensions 40  
**Khumalo, Thabitha**  
 Address on behalf of Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions 129  
**Knight, Vicky**  
 Energy review 84  
 The importance of equality 167

**L**

**Landis, Harry**  
 Public Funding for theatre 158  
**Lanning, Hugh**  
 National register of assaults on public sector workers 51  
 Palestine 142  
**Lannon, Tom**  
 Safety footwear 163  
**Lavery, Ian**  
 Clean coal and energy 85  
**Law, Bob**  
 Transport Policy 152  
**Leahy, Michael**  
 Internationalism and globalisation 125  
**Lennon, Tony**  
 TUPE and Pensions 45  
 Journalism Matters 155  
**Lerew, Pat**  
 Violence Against Women 171  
**License, Neil**  
 Regional pay in the public sector 108  
**Lillis, Paddy**  
 Migrant workers 74  
**Lord, Linda**  
 Health and Safety Executive 162  
**Loughran, Iain**  
 Pensions 44  
**Lowe, John**  
 Education and Training, Age and Employment Rights 177  
 Redundancy Law 172  
**Lucy, Bill**  
 AFL-CIO address 119

**M**

**Mackenzie, Alex**  
 National Health Service 56  
**Mackney, Paul**  
 Strengthening workplace democracy 62  
**Maleham, Carole**  
 Pensions 44  
**Manasseh, Leslie**  
 Internationalism and globalisation 125

**Mann, Joe**

Questions to the Foreign Secretary 124

**Mansell-Green, Annette**

General Purposes Committee Report 39,76,119,

International development 131

Strengthening workplace democracy 63

**Marino, Joe**

Closure of Northern Foods Bakery in Trafford Park 179

**Mayer, Martin**

General Council statement on Europe 132

**Mayes, John**

Public Services 48

**McArdle, Pauline**

Fairtrade and seafarers 128

**McClelland, Alan**

TUC policy and campaigning 169

**McClelland, Mike**

Islamophobia and Racism 67

Zahid Mubarek Inquiry 112

**McFarlane, Tom**

Regional pay in the public sector 108

**McGovern, Sean**

Remploy 115

**McGuire, Denise**

Workplace bullying 161

**McKnight, Judy**

Equality Reps 170

Public Services 47

Question to the Prime Minister 103

Women's Equality 172

**Miliband, Rt Hon David**

The Environment 77

**Mills, Gloria**

President's Address 36

Adoption of General Council Report 179

Gold Badge of Congress 159

Presentation of lay representatives awards 87, 98

TUC Accounts 168

Votes of Thanks 179

Congress President 2007 179,

Reply to Vote of Thanks 180

Zimbabwe 154

**Mitton, Zena**

National Breast Screening Programme 56

**Moldawczuk, Ivan**

Occupational health 161

**Moloney, Paul**

Irish Ferries 173

**Monks, Rob**

Integrated Transport 153

**Moore, Linzi**

Palestine 140

**Moorhouse, Judy**

Question to the Prime Minister 105

Workplace bullying 160

**Moraes, Claude MEP**

Presentation of Equality Awards 71

**Morley, Chris**

Journalism Matters 155

206

**Morris, Barry**

Manufacturing 147

Remploy 115

**Moses, Colin**

Islamophobia and Racism 68

Question to the Prime Minister 103

Zahid Mubarek Inquiry 111

**Munir, Sully**

Palestine 142

**Murch, Ian**

Islamophobia and Racism 68

**Murphy, Chris**

Pensions 42

Trident 146

**N****Nelson, Alison**

Regional pay in the public sector 109

**Nelson, Craig**

Global organising and international trade unionism 137

**Nelson, Dawn**

The Environment 80

**Newson, Gerald**

New technology and payments to performers 157

Public Funding for theatre 158

**Nicholas, Micky**

Regional pay in the public sector 107

**Nicholls, Doug**

General Council statement on Europe 133

**Nichols, Ged**

Organising 60

Questions to the Foreign Secretary 124

**Nobbs, Caryl**

Regional pay in the public sector 109

**Noon, Paul**

The Environment 79

**O****O'Connell, Geraldine**

Accountability and standards in public life 49

**O'Grady, Frances**

The Environment question and answer session 79

Transport 154

**O'Hara, Pat**

Attacks on fire cover and trade union organisation by Merseyside Fire Authority 139

**O'Neill, Jim**

The importance of equality 166

**Oram, Bob**

General Council statement on Europe 132

**Owen, Kath**

The Environment 82

**P****Page, Mary**

Islamophobia and Racism 69

**Petgrave Erica**

Question to the Prime Minister 102

**Poulter, Carolyn**

Early years education 114

**Prentis, Dave**

National Health Service 54

Vote of Thanks to the President 38

**Q****Quigley, Peter**

Class size 174

**R****Rainey, Shirley**

Redundancy Law 173

**Reed, Andy**

Integrated Transport 153

**Reiser, Richard**

Disability 116

**Restell, Jon**

Organising 60

**Revell, Brian**

European Union Trade Policy 135

**Richardson-Williams, Gemma**

National Health Service 55

**Rickhuss, Roy**

European Union Trade Policy 134, 135

**Ritchie, Alan**

Employment status 90

**Roberts, Barrie**

Regional pay in the public sector 111

**Rogers, Sue**

Local Authority Support for Schools 176

Questions to the Foreign Secretary 123

**Roome, Bernard**

Palestine 141

**Rooney, Doug**

Energy prices 83

**Rose, Helen**

The Environment 81

**Rowland, Patricia**

Migrant workers 75

**Rowse, John**

Clean coal and energy 86

**Russell, Paul**

Zimbabwe 156

**Ryan, Maggie**

Palestine 142

**Ryan, Mick**

Question to the Prime Minister 104

**S****Sage, Malcolm**

Energy prices 84

**Serwotka, Mark**

Public Services 47

**Shepherd, Alison**

Penalties for failure to implement statutory provisions 174

Vote of Thanks to the President 179

**Sheridan, John**

Occupational health 162

**Simpson, Derek**

Bank Holidays 151

**Singh, Amarjit**

Manufacturing 147

**Singh, Kuldev**

Valuing trade union race equality committees 53

**Sinnott, Steve**

Education and Inspections Bill and marketisation of education 112

Palestine 142

**Smith, Deirdre**

International development 131

**Smith, Jackie**

Safety footwear 163

**Smith, John**

Status of the Artist 156

**Sonnet, Keith**

Palestine 141

**Spence, Martin**

Employment status 91

**Stanistreet, Michelle**

Organising 60

**Steeple, Victoria**

Internationalism and globalisation 126

**Stephenson, Norma**

National Breast Screening Programme 57

**Stewart, Jane**

Questions to the Foreign Secretary 122

**Strutton, Brian**

Public Services 48

**Suresh Chawla**

Equality Awards 72

**T****Taj, Mohammad**

Race Equality 54

**Talbot, Paul**

Organising 62

**Tapper, Chris**

Trident 144

**Taylor, Andy**

Reply to Vote of Thanks to the Media 181

**Taylor, Gordon**

unionlearn and new opportunities for union members

**Thompson, John**

Corporate Manslaughter 165

Question to the Prime Minister 103

**Tovey, Mitch**

Palestine 140

**Tumelty, Gemma**

Address on behalf of National Union of Students 64

**Turner, Mary**

Regional pay in the public sector 110

**W****Walmsley, Sandra**

Question to the Prime Minister 104

**Walsh, John**

unionlearn and new opportunities for union members

**Ward, Charles**

Deportation of children of asylum seekers 70

**Ward, Dave**

Trade Union Freedom Bill 94

**Warwick, Steve**

Trident 145

**Watts, David**

Accountability and standards in public life 49

**White, Barbara**

Health and Safety Executive 162

Violence Against Women 171

**Williams, Maureen**

Flexible working 169

**Williams, Simon**

Quality of Work 150

Question to the Prime Minister 104

**Wilson, Chris**

Responsible use of the Internet 127

**Winters, Ruth**

Palestine 139

**Wood, Rena**

Islamophobia and Racism 69

**Woodley, Tony**

Campaign for Workplace Justice and Trade Union  
Freedom 64

Manufacturing 146

Trade Union Freedom Bill 92

**Wrack, Matt**

Attacks on fire cover and trade union organisation by  
Merseyside Fire Authority 138

National register of assaults on public sector workers  
51

Trade Union Freedom Bill 93

**Wright, Walter**

Control Arms Campaign 127

Equality reps 170

**Y**

**Yesildali, Sevi**

Islamophobia and Racism 68